



Policy Scoring Rubric

(Provincial/Territorial)

Suggested citation: Naimi, T., Stockwell, T., Giesbrecht, N., Wettlaufer, A., Vallance, K., Farrell-Low, A., Farkouh, E., Ma, J., Priore, B., Vishnevsky, N., Price, T., Asbridge, M., Gagnon, M., Hynes, G., Shelley, J., Sherk, A., Shield, K., Solomon, R., Thomas, G. & Thompson, K. (2023). Canadian Alcohol Policy Evaluation (CAPE) 3.0: Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial). Victoria, BC: Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, University of Victoria.

Acknowledgments: Thank you to all federal, provincial and territorial stakeholders who provided valuable feedback for this project as well as assisting with data collection and validation activities. Thanks also to our three external expert reviewers, all the extended members of the project team, and our CAPE Community of Practice.

Funding: This project was funded primarily by Health Canada's Substance Use and Addictions Program. Additional funds were provided by the Public Health Agency of Canada and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of Health Canada or the other organizations acknowledged.

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| 1. Pricing and Taxation | 10 | |
| Note: Indicator scores were pro-rated to reflect percentage of total ethanol sales (off-premise and on-premise) in instances where policies do not apply equally across all beverage types. | | |
| 1.1. Minimum pricing for off-premise sales Jurisdictions were scored based on whether they had minimum pricing for alcohol sold from off-premise retail outlets with the ideal form of this policy being indexed minimum unit pricing (iMUP). The indicators below (1a.-1e.) assess the degree to which a jurisdiction has implemented iMUP. | 3.75 | |
| 1.1a. Coverage of off-premise minimum prices Jurisdictions were scored according to whether they had minimum prices for alcohol sold in liquor stores based on beverage category (e.g. beer, wine, spirits, coolers/'Ready-To-Drinks') using percent of sales to assess coverage. | 0.75 | A maximum of 0.75 points were awarded based on the proportion of ethanol sale by beverage type for which min prices apply. |
| 1.1b. Level of off-premise minimum prices Jurisdictions were scored according to the level of minimum price for products of typical ethanol content and container sizes sold in government liquor stores (5%-beer, 40%-spirits, 12.5%-wine and 7%-coolers/RTD). The average minimum price per standard drink for these products (based on the 2021/2022 fiscal year) was compared across jurisdictions. | 0.75 | A maximum of 0.75 points were awarded based on the average minimum price for common container sizes and strengths for beer, wine spirits and coolers/cider. The score was calculated as a proportion of the ideal minimum price of \$1.83 (based 2021 dollars using Bank of Canada Inflation rates). |
| 1.1c. Automatic indexation for off-premise minimum prices Jurisdictions were scored on whether they automatically indexed minimum prices to inflation each year | 0.75 | 0.00 = No minimum prices or no documented adjustments to minimum prices, 0.375 = Infrequent (e.g. less than every two years) ad hoc adjustments to minimum prices, 0.75 = Automatic annual indexation of minimum prices to inflation. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| <p>1.1d. Pricing on ethanol content for off-premise minimum prices Jurisdictions were scored on the degree to which the minimum prices for each major beverage type reflect the ethanol content of the beverage.</p> | 0.75 | <p>0.00= Minimum prices were set according to volume of beverage, 0.375= Minimum prices were set according to volume of beverage and graduated based on percentage ethanol content for broad ranges of products within a beverage category (price bands). 0.09375 pts for each beverage category with 2 price bands or more, 0.5625= Minimum prices were set using a hybrid system that incorporates both graduated min pricing and volumetric pricing. 0.140625 pts for each beverage category that implements a hybrid between graduated and volumetric pricing, 0.75= Minimum prices were set according to a volumetric formula that ties the minimum price directly to the ethanol content of the beverage. E.g. +0.1875 pts for each beverage category that implemented a volumetric formula.</p> |
| <p>1.1e. Penalty - Loopholes for off-premise minimum pricing Jurisdictions were penalized for having any minimum pricing loopholes that undermined the integrity of off-premise minimum prices.</p> | -0.375 | <p>0.375 points were deducted from the total score for off-premise minimum prices if a jurisdiction had any minimum pricing loopholes for off-premise sales (e.g. discounting of de-listed products below minimum prices, ferment on premise products being exempt from minimum prices, cross promotion or value added promotions that offset the cost of alcohol to a level below minimum prices etc.). Note: penalty deductions were only applied within an indicator (e.g., 1.1. Minimum pricing for off-premise sales) and if it resulted in a negative score, was adjusted to zero.</p> |
| <p>Bonus: Implementation Synergy</p> | 0.75 | <p>Jurisdictions received up to an additional 0.75 points to reflect the synergistic effect of the four iMUP components when implemented together. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the percentage of optimal score obtained on the iMUP components (1a.-1e. above).</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| <p>1.2. Minimum pricing for on-premise sales Jurisdictions were scored based on whether they had minimum pricing for alcohol sold form on-premise establishments with the ideal form of this policy being indexed minimum unit pricing (iMUP). The indicators below (2a.-2e.) assess the degree to which a jurisdiction has implemented iMUP.</p> | 1.25 | |
| <p>1.2a. Coverage of minimum prices, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored according to whether they had minimum prices for alcohol sold through licensed establishments based on beverage type using percent of sales to assess coverage.</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = If a jurisdiction does not have any minimum prices, 0.0625 = Jurisdiction with less than 50% coverage, 0.125 = Jurisdictions with 74%-50% coverage, 0.1875 = Jurisdictions with 99%-75% coverage, 0.25 = Jurisdictions with 100% coverage. |
| <p>1.2b. Level of minimum prices, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored according to the level of minimum prices. The price per standard drink for on-premise minimum prices (based on the 2021/2022 fiscal year) was compared across jurisdictions.</p> | 0.25 | A maximum of 0.25 points were awarded based on the lowest minimum price for common container sizes and strengths for beer, wine spirits and coolers/cider. The score was calculated as a proportion of the ideal minimum price of \$3.66 (based on 2021 dollars using Bank of Canada Inflation rates). |
| <p>1.2c. Automatic indexation for minimum prices, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored on whether they automatically indexed minimum prices to inflation each year</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = No automatic indexation, 0.125 = Ad hoc increases to minimum prices, 0.25 = Jurisdiction had annual automatic indexation of minimum prices to inflation. |
| <p>1.2d. Pricing on ethanol content for minimum prices, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored on the degree to which the minimum prices for each major beverage type reflect the ethanol content of the beverage.</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = Minimum prices were set according to volume of beverage, 0.125 = Minimum prices were set according to volume of beverage and graduated based on percentage ethanol content for broad ranges of products within a beverage category (price bands). 0.03125 pts for each beverage category with 2 price bands or more, 0.25 = Minimum prices were set according to a volumetric formula that ties the minimum price directly to the ethanol content of the beverage. 0.0625 pts for each beverage category that implemented a volumetric formula. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|---|
| <p>1.2e. On-premise minimum pricing loopholes Jurisdictions were penalized for having any minimum price loophole for on-premise sales.</p> | -0.125 | 0.125 points were deducted from the total score for on-premise minimum prices if a jurisdiction had any minimum pricing loopholes for on-premise sales (e.g. complimentary drinks, discounted gift certificates, cross promotion or value added promotions that offset the cost of alcohol to a level below minimum prices etc.). Note: penalty deductions were only applied within an indicator (e.g., 1.2 Minimum pricing for on-premise sales) and if it resulted in a negative score, was adjusted to zero. |
| <p>Bonus Points: Implementation Synergy</p> | 0.25 | Jurisdictions received up to an additional 0.25 points to reflect the synergistic effect of the four iMUP components when implemented together. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the percentage of optimal score obtained on the iMUP components (1a.-1e. above). |
| <p>1.3. General Pricing</p> | 1.00 | |
| <p>1.3ai. General price levels keeping pace with inflation, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored by examining the differences between jurisdiction specific alcohol price indices for off-premise alcohol sales and consumer price index (CPI) for each beverage category from Statistics Canada. Differences were examined for the last reporting year as well as over a 5 year trend in order to interpret degree of congruence with overall inflation.</p> | 0.75 | <p>0.00 = an average CPI differential below <-3.0 across beverage types, 0.20 = an average CPI differential between -3.0 and <-2.0, inclusive across beverage types, 0.30 = an average CPI differential between -2.0 and <-1.0, inclusive across beverage types, 0.40 = an average CPI differential between -1.0 and <0, inclusive, across beverage types, 0.50 = An average CPI differential of 0 or higher, across beverage types, 0.75 = Jurisdictions with a differential CPI score of 0 or higher for each beverage type.</p> <p>General price level keeping pace with inflation score: A score for the off-premise general price levels was generated for the most recent year and for the 5 year trend. These scores were given a weight of 2/3rds for the most recent year and 1/3rd for the trend score.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| <p>1.3aii. General Price levels keeping pace with inflation, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored by examining the differences between jurisdiction specific alcohol price indices for on-premise alcohol sales and consumer price index (CPI) for each beverage category from Statistics Canada. Differences were examined for the last reporting year as well as over a 5 year trend in order to interpret degree of congruence with overall inflation.</p> | 0.25 | <p>0.00 = an average CPI differential below <-3.0 across beverage types, 0.05 = an average CPI differential between -3.0 and <-2.0, inclusive across beverage types, 0.10 = an average CPI differential between -2.0 and <-1.0, inclusive across beverage types, 0.15 = an average CPI differential between -1.0 and <0, inclusive, across beverage types, 0.20 = An average CPI differential of 0 or higher, across beverage types, 0.25 = Jurisdictions with a differential CPI score of 0 or higher for each beverage type.</p> <p>General price level keeping pace with inflation score: A score for the on-premise general price levels was generated for the most recent year and for the 5 year trend. These scores were given a weight of 2/3rds for the most recent year and 1/3rd for the trend score.</p> |
| 1.4. Alcohol Sales Tax | 3 | |
| <p>1.4ai. Provincial/territorial alcohol sales taxation levels, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on the level of total provincial/territorial tax applied to alcohol based on an ideal total P/T sales tax rate of 37.5%.</p> | 1.5 | The score was determined based on the proportion of the actual alcohol sales tax rate against the ideal of 37.5%. |
| <p>1.4aii. Provincial/territorial alcohol sales taxation levels, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on the level of total provincial/territorial tax applied to alcohol based on an ideal total P/T sales tax rate of 22.5%</p> | 0.5 | The score was determined based on the proportion of the actual alcohol sales tax rate against the ideal of 22.5%. |
| <p>1.4bi. Provincial/territorial alcohol sales taxation levels relative to other goods, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which alcohol was taxed higher than other goods with the ideal being a 27.5% differential.</p> | 0.75 | <p>0.00 = Jurisdiction had no additional alcohol specific sales tax, 0.375 = Jurisdiction had additional alcohol specific sales tax of < 20.0% 0.50 = Jurisdiction had additional alcohol specific sales tax of 20.0 to < 27.5% 0.75 = Jurisdiction had additional alcohol specific sales tax of 27.5% or more.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| <p>1.4bii. Provincial/territorial alcohol sales taxation levels relative to other goods, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which alcohol was taxed higher than other goods with the ideal being a 12.5% differential.</p> | 0.25 | <p>0.00 = Jurisdiction had no additional alcohol specific retail sales tax, 0.125 = Jurisdiction had additional alcohol specific retail sales tax of <12.5% 0.25 = Jurisdiction had additional alcohol specific retail sales tax of 12.5% or more.</p> |
| <p>1.5. Markups</p> | 1 | |
| <p>1.5ai. Level of retail markup, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored on the level of retail markup for alcohol sold from off-premise outlets (E.g. 4092 mL 5%-beer, 750 mL 40%-spirits, 750 mL 12.5%-wine and 2000 mL 7%-coolers/RTD) with an ideal markup of at least 100% of the landed cost for all beverage types.</p> | 0.375 | <p>0.00 = No minimum markup or min markup is <50% of the landed cost for all beverage types, 0.125 = Retail markup was between 50-74% of the landed cost for all beverage types, 0.25 = Retail markup was between 75-99% of the landed cost for all beverage types, 0.375 = Retail markup is at least 100% of the landed cost for all beverage types.</p> |
| <p>1.5aii. Indexation of markups, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored on the frequency of markup changes and whether they were automatically indexed annually to the jurisdiction-specific CPI, with the ideal being an ad valorem markup structure or automatic annual indexation.</p> | 0.375 | <p>0.0 = No minimum markup mandated, 0.1875 = No automatic indexation of markups, ad hoc adjustments made to flat rate markups in the last 2 years, 0.375 = Ad valorem markup structure or automatic annual indexation of a flat rate markup in alignment with jurisdiction specific CPI.</p> |
| <p>1.5aiii. Penalty – markups loopholes, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored on whether their markup schedules had exceptions where markups did not apply or were reduced (e.g., lower markup rates for microbreweries).</p> | -0.125 | <p>0.125 points were deducted for policies that allowed for exceptions where markups did not apply or were reduced (e.g. reduced markups for local or craft products). Note: penalty deductions were only applied within an indicator (e.g., 1.5. Markups) and if it resulted in a negative score, was adjusted to zero.</p> |
| <p>1.5bi. Level of minimum markup, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored on the level of markup for on-premise establishments with the ideal being at least equivalent to the off-premise retail price.</p> | 0.25 | <p>0.00 = On-premise licensees purchase below the off-premise retail price, 0.25 = On-premise licensees purchase at the off-premise retail price or higher.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| 2. Physical Availability | 10 | |
| 2.1. Off-Premise outlet density and placement | 3.75 | |
| <p>2.1a. Off-premise outlet density policies Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had provincially or territorially mandated limits on outlet density (e.g. limits on population density, geographical density, or number of outlets).</p> | 0.85 | 0.00 = No limits on outlet density, 0.425 = No provincially or territorially mandated limits on population based outlet density but regulations provide power to determine number of outlets or limit geographical density, 0.6375 = Provincially or territorially mandated limits on number of outlets or limits on geographical density, 0.85 = Limits on population based outlet density that are set through provincial/territorial legislation/regulation. |
| <p>2.1b. Off-premise outlet placement policies Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had provincially or territorially mandated limits on placement of off-premise outlets (e.g. mandated minimum distance from schools, community centres, substance use treatment centres etc.).</p> | 0.4 | 0.00 = No limits on placement of off-premise outlets, 0.40 = Regulations provide power to determine placement of off-premise outlets. |
| <p>2.1c. Practice Indicator- off-premise outlet density Jurisdictions were scored according to the density of their outlets per capita 15+. Data were collected on the density of all off-premise outlets, including private, government run and ferment on premise outlets.</p> | 2.5 | 0.00 = Density per 10,000 capita age 15+ was 15.00 or above, 1.50 = Density per 10,000 capita age 15+ was between 8.00 and 14.90, 2.00 = Density per 10,000 capita age 15+ was between 2.00 and 7.90, 2.50 = Density per 10,000 capita age 15+ was below 2.00. |
| 2.2. On-premise outlet density and placement | 1.25 | |
| <p>2.2a. On-premise outlet density policies Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had provincially or territorially mandated limits on outlet density (e.g. limits based on population density, on geographical density or on number of licensed establishments or permits).</p> | 0.35 | 0.00 = No limits on outlet density, 0.15 = No provincially or territorially mandated limits on population based outlet density but regulations provide power to determine number of licensed outlets/permits or limit geographic density, 0.25 = Provincially or territorially mandated limits on number of outlets or limits on geographical density, 0.35 = Limits on population based outlet density that are set through provincial/territorial legislation/regulation. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| <p>2.2b. On-premise outlet placement policies Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had provincially or territorially mandated limits on placement of on premise licensed establishments or permits (e.g. mandated minimum distance from schools, community centres, substance use treatments centres etc.).</p> | 0.15 | 0.00 = No limits on placement of on-premise outlets, 0.15 = Regulations provide power to determine placement of on-premise outlets and/or permits. |
| <p>2.2c. Practice Indicator- on-premise outlet density Jurisdictions were scored according to the density of their licensed establishments per capita 15+ Data were collected on the density of all licensed establishments where alcohol is served on-premise.</p> | 0.75 | 0.00 = density per 10,000 capita aged 15+ was 25.0 and above, 0.35 = density per 10,000 capita aged 15+ was between 15.0 and 25.0, 0.75 = density per 10,000 capita aged 15+ was 15.0 or below. |
| <p>2.3. Off-premise hours and days of operation</p> | 2.5 | |
| <p>2.3ai. Off-premise opening hours Jurisdictions were scored based on whether policies allowed for early opening hours as stated in legislation or regulation. Hours of operation for off-premise outlets were scored against an ideal of limited availability (i.e. not before 11am).</p> | 0.45 | 0.00 = Hours of sale extend more than a total of 2 hours before 11 am, 0.225 = Hours of sale extend no more than a total of 2 hours before 11 am, 0.45 = Hours of sale do not extend before 11 am. |
| <p>2.3aii. Off-premise closing hours Jurisdictions were scored based on whether policies allowed for late closing hours as stated in legislation or regulation. Hours of operation for off-premise outlets were scored against an ideal of limited availability (i.e. not after 8pm).</p> | 0.9 | 0.00 = Hours of sale extend more than a total of 2 hours after 8 pm, 0.45 = Hours of sale extend no more than a total of 2 hours after 8 pm, 0.90 = Hours of sale do not extend after 8 pm. |
| <p>2.3bi. Off-premise days of sale Jurisdictions were scored based on the number of days per week alcohol is available for purchase.</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = 7 days of sale, 0.25 = <7 days of sale. |
| <p>2.3bii. Off-premise maximum number of hours of operation per week Jurisdictions were scored based on the maximum hours of operation their policies allowed for as stated in legislation or regulation. Hours of operation were reverse scored against the maximum possible hours of sale in a week (i.e. 168 hours).</p> | 0.9 | 0.00-0.90 = The score was determined based on the proportion of the legislated hours of sale to the maximum possible hours of sale in a week. The proportion was reverse scored to reflect an ideal of fewer hours of sale in a week. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| 2.4. On-premise hours of operation | 1.5 | |
| 2.4ai. On-premise opening hours Jurisdictions were scored based whether policies allowed for early opening hours as stated in legislation or regulation. Hours of operation for on-premise establishments were scored against an ideal of limited availability (i.e. not before 11am). | 0.3 | 0.00 = Hours of sale extend more than a total of 2 hours before 11 am, 0.15 = Hours of sale extend no more than a total of 2 hours before 11 am, 0.30 = Hours of sale do not extend before 11 am. |
| 2.4aii. On-premise closing hours Jurisdictions were scored based whether policies allowed for late closing hours as stated in legislation or regulation. Hours of operation for on-premise establishments were scored against an ideal of limited availability (i.e. not after 1am the following day). | 0.6 | 0.00 = Hours of sale extend more than a total of 2 hours after 1 am the following day, 0.30 = Hours of sale extend no more than a total of 2 hours after 1 am the following day, 0.60 = Hours of sale do not extend after 1 am the following day. |
| 2.4b. On-premise maximum number of hours of operation per week Jurisdictions were scored based on the maximum hours of operation their policies allowed for as stated in legislation or regulation. Hours of operation were reverse scored against the maximum possible hours of sale in a week (i.e. 168 hours). | 0.6 | 0.00-0.60 = The score was determined based on the proportion of the legislated hours of sale to the maximum possible hours of sale in a week. The proportion was reverse scored to reflect an ideal of fewer hours of sale in a week. |
| 2.4c. Penalty – Hours of operation exceptions and extensions Jurisdictions were penalized for allowing discretion in granting exceptions to policies restricting availability (hours and days of sale) e.g. extending the hours of operation for community events. | -0.13 | 0.13 points were deducted from the total physical availability score if a jurisdiction allowed for discretion in granting exceptions to the hours and/or days of sale. E.g. allowing the extension of hours of sale for sporting events (e.g. World Cup) or cultural events (e.g. film festivals) etc. Note: penalty deductions were only applied within an indicator (e.g., 2.4. On-premise hours of operation) and if it resulted in a negative score, was adjusted to zero. |
| 2.5. Alcohol take-out and home delivery | 1 | |
| 2.5a. Home delivery of alcohol, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored on regulations restricting home delivery of alcohol for off-premise retail outlets and whether alcohol delivery is permitted by the retailer, an employee or agent of the retailer or a third party delivery service. | 0.65 | 0.00 = no restrictions on delivery: home delivery permitted by the retailer, an employee or agent of the retailer or a third party delivery service, 0.325 = third party delivery restrictions: home delivery is permitted by the retailer, an employee or agent of the retailer but not a third party delivery service, 0.65 = No home delivery permitted. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| <p>2.5bi. Take-out of alcohol, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored on regulations restricting take-out of alcohol from on-premise establishments. Requirements around purchase of food must be defined and be adequate.</p> | 0.2 | <p>0.00 = no restrictions on alcohol take-out: alcohol take-out permitted, no food purchase required, 0.10 = alcohol take-out requires purchase of an adequately defined food component, 0.20 = no alcohol take-out permitted.</p> |
| <p>2.5bii. Home delivery of alcohol, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored on regulations restricting home delivery of alcohol for on-premise establishments and whether alcohol delivery is permitted by the licensee, an employee or agent of the licensee or a third party delivery service and if a food component is required for delivery. Requirements around purchase of food must be defined and be adequate.</p> | 0.15 | <p>0.00 = home delivery is permitted by the licensee, an employee or agent of the licensee or a third party delivery service, a food component is not required, 0.0375 = home delivery is permitted by the licensee, an employee or agent of the licensee or a third party delivery service, a food component is required, 0.075 = home delivery is permitted by the licensee, an employee or agent of the licensee but not a third party delivery service, a food component is not required, 0.1125 = home delivery is permitted by the licensee, an employee or agent of the licensee but not a third party delivery service, a food component is required, 0.15 = No home delivery permitted.</p> |
| 3. Control System | | 10 |
| 3.1. Ministries overseeing alcohol retail and regulation | | 2 |
| <p>3.1ai. Ministries responsible for alcohol regulation Jurisdictions were scored based on whether the ministry to which the alcohol regulator reports focuses on health and safety.</p> | 0.9 | <p>0.00 = Regulation is overseen by a non-health/safety focused ministry (e.g. Ministry of Finance), 0.90 = Regulation is overseen by a health and/ or safety-focused ministry (e.g. Ministry of Health, Justice).</p> |
| <p>3.1aai. Ministries responsible for alcohol retail/distribution Jurisdictions were scored based on whether the ministry to which the alcohol retailer/distributor reports focuses on health and safety.</p> | 0.9 | <p>0.00 = Retail/distribution overseen by a non-health/safety focused ministry (e.g. Ministry of Finance), 0.90 = Retail/distribution is overseen by a health and/or safety-focused ministry (e.g. Ministry of Health, Justice).</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| <p>3.1b. Separation of retailer/distributor and regulator Jurisdictions were scored against an ideal of having both the retailer/distributor and regulators report to a health and safety-focused ministry (as assessed in 5ai and 5aii). If the retailer/distributor and regulators were not both directly overseen by a health and safety-focused ministry then they were scored on whether there was ministerial separation of the alcohol retailer/distributor and the regulator.</p> | 0.2 | <p>0.00 = Retailer/distributor and regulator are not separate, 0.10 = Retailer/distributor and regulator are partially separate (e.g. some part of liquor control and/or licensing acts overseen by different ministries), 0.20 = Full separation of the retailer/distributor and regulator or both are overseen directly by a health and/or safety-focused ministry (e.g. Ministry of Health, Justice).</p> |
| <p>3.2. Government wholesaler requirements</p> | 1 | |
| <p>3.2a. Government wholesaler requirement Jurisdictions were scored on whether a government wholesaler (or equivalent government wholesaling fee) is always required in the supply chain between the producer/manufacturer and the retailer.</p> | 1 | <p>0.00 = Government wholesaler not required or private wholesaler, 0.50 = Government wholesaler not required in certain cases (e.g., manufacturer store selling directly to the public with no government wholesaling fee and no private wholesaler), 1.00 = government wholesaler (or wholesaling fee) always required.</p> |
| <p>3.3. Government retail monopoly</p> | 3 | |
| <p>3.3a. Proportion of off-premise retail stores that are government owned and run Jurisdictions were scored on the proportion of outlets that are publicly owned and run. Jurisdictions were scored against an ideal of a full (100%) government monopoly.</p> | 3 | <p>Jurisdictions were scored proportionately, up to a maximum of 2 points, for the proportion of their retail outlets that are government owned and run. A jurisdiction was awarded an additional 1 point, for a maximum of 3 points, if all (100%) of off-premise outlets were public (no private retail outlets).</p> |
| <p>3.4. Alcohol sales beyond traditional channels</p> | 2 | |
| <p>3.4ai. Sales beyond traditional off-premise retailers Jurisdictions were scored on whether regulations allowed for alcohol sales in retail outlets that sell other goods alongside alcohol (e.g. grocery stores and markets, corner stores, gas stations, other retail stores)</p> | 0.8 | <p>0.00 = Alcohol sales permitted by retailers that sell other goods, 0.80 = No alcohol sales permitted by retailers alongside other goods.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|---|
| <p>3.4a.ii. Sales beyond traditional on-premise establishments Jurisdictions were scored on whether regulations allowed for alcohol sales beyond restaurants and bars, in environments that provide other goods and services as their primary business (e.g. hair and nail salons, spas, movie theaters, book stores, golf greens, sporting facilities, community centres, etc.)</p> | 0.4 | 0.00 = Alcohol sales permitted in licensed establishments that offer other goods and service, 0.40 = Alcohol sales not permitted in licensed establishments that offer other goods and services. |
| <p>3.4a.iii. Online alcohol sales Jurisdictions were scored on whether regulations allowed for online sales from off-premise outlets.</p> | 0.6 | 0.00 = online sales permitted in regulation, 0.60 = online sales not permitted in regulation. |
| <p>3.4a.iv. Ferment on premise (FOP) outlets Jurisdictions were scored on whether regulations allowed for ferment on premise outlets.</p> | 0.15 | 0.00 = FOP permitted in regulation, 0.15 = FOP not permitted in regulation. |
| <p>3.4a.v. Ferment at home/home brew kits Jurisdictions were scored on whether regulations allowed for ferment at home/ home brew kits.</p> | 0.05 | 0.00 = Home brew kits permitted in regulation, 0.05 = Home brew kits not permitted in regulation. |
| <p>3.5. Relative emphasis on health and safety vs product promotion</p> | 1.5 | |
| <p>3.5a. Legislated health promotion funds Jurisdictions were scored on whether legislation exists mandating earmarked funds to support evidence-based alcohol harm prevention, research or treatment programs. Programs must be independent of industry influence and/or involvement in design and delivery of programs and activities.</p> | 0.4 | 0.00 = No dedicated funding or funding is not independent of industry, 0.20 = Dedicated funding, but not inscribed in legislation, 0.40 = Dedicated funding inscribed in legislation. |
| <p>3.5b.i. Regulator health and safety mandate Jurisdictions were scored on whether protecting public health and safety (beyond reference to 'social responsibility') is stated as an explicit objective of the alcohol control system for the regulator (e.g. guiding principles, mission statement, mandate etc.).</p> | 0.5 | 0.00 = Regulator mandate only refers to 'social responsibility', 0.25 = Regulator mandate refers to only public health OR safety, 0.50 = Regulator mandate refers to both public health and safety. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| <p>3.5bii. Retailer/Distributor health and safety mandate Jurisdictions were scored on whether protecting public health and safety (beyond reference to ‘social responsibility’) is stated as an explicit objective of the alcohol control system for the retailer/distributor.</p> | 0.5 | <p>0.00 = Retailer/Distributor mandate only refers to ‘social responsibility’, 0.25 = Retailer/Distributor mandate refers to only public health OR safety, 0.50 =Retailer/Distributor mandate refers to public health and safety.</p> |
| <p>3.5c. Practice Indicator – focus of liquor board social media Jurisdictions were scored based on the proportion of social media posts dedicated to promotion vs. adequate health and safety messaging (beyond ‘social responsibility’ and ‘responsible drinking’ messages) as a reflection of their dual mandate. A sample of the 25 most recent social media posts from each liquor board’s main Facebook, Twitter and Instagram accounts during the last week of December 2021 and the last week of June 2022 and were analyzed.</p> | 0.1 | <p>0.00 = 0% of social media posts had a health or safety focus or no social media accounts, 0.05 = At least 25% of social media posts had a health and safety focus, 0.10 = At least 50% of social media posts had a health and safety focus.</p> |
| <p>3.6. Public health-informed policy decisions</p> | 0.5 | |
| <p>3.6a. Public health input on alcohol policy Jurisdictions were scored on whether they have legislation requiring public health guidance or input from the ministry of health/public health for decision-making and legislative changes around alcohol policies.</p> | 0.25 | <p>0.00 = No legislation requiring health/public health involvement, 0.25 = Legislation requiring health/public health involvement in decision-making and legislative changes around alcohol policies.</p> |
| <p>3.6b. Targeted public consultation Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a formal legislated process for engaging underrepresented groups in public consultation pertaining to alcohol policy changes focusing on health impacts (e.g. a process for engaging non-industry stakeholder groups such as people with lived/living experience, Indigenous and LGBTQ+ groups). Note: Consultation process must be led independently from the alcohol industry to be scored.</p> | 0.15 | <p>0.00 = No legislated targeted public engagement with a focus on health, 0.15 = Legislated targeted public engagement with a focus on health for stakeholders beyond industry groups.</p> |
| <p>3.6c. Transparency of industry lobbying Jurisdictions were scored on whether there was mandated centralized online public reporting of industry lobbying activities at the P/T level geared to the lay public that provides transparency in which organizations are lobbying the government by topic.</p> | 0.1 | <p>0.00 = no centralized, user-friendly public reporting of industry lobbying, 0.10 = industry lobbying activities transparently reported in centralized user-friendly public online platform.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| 4. Impaired Driving Countermeasures | 10 | |
| 4.1. Graduated Licensing Program (GLP) | 2 | |
| 4.1a. Minimum age of 16 to start the GLP Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a minimum age of 16 to start the GLP regardless of whether the applicant is enrolled in a driver education course. | 0.5 | 0.00 = Minimum age of below 16 for GLP, 0.50 = Minimum age of 16 or higher for GLP. |
| 4.1b. Stage 1 GLP duration Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a minimum duration of 12-months for Stage 1 of the GLP, regardless of whether the applicant is enrolled in a driver education course. | 0.25 | 0.00 = Stage 1 of GLP is less than 8 months or exceptions allow for it to be shortened to less than 8 months, 0.125 = Stage 1 of GLP is a minimum of 8 months, 0.25 = Stage 1 of GLP is a minimum of 12 months, no exceptions. |
| 4.1c. Stage 2 GLP duration Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a minimum duration of 24-month for Stage 2 to the completion of the GLP, regardless of whether the applicant is enrolled in a driver education course. | 0.75 | 0.00 = From stage 2 to completion of GLP is less than 12 months or exceptions allow it to be shortened to less than 12 months, 0.375 = From stage 2 to completion is between 12 and 23 months, 0.75 = From stage 2 to completion is a minimum of 24 months, no exceptions. |
| 4.1d. Nighttime driving ban for Stage-2 drivers Jurisdictions were scored on whether stage 2 drivers had a nighttime driving ban (e.g. 12am-5am) subject to limited exceptions (e.g. exceptions for drivers who are 22 or older, supervised and/or are driving for employment purposes). | 0.3 | 0.00 = Not subject to nighttime driving ban, 0.30 = Subject to nighttime driving ban with limited exceptions. |
| 4.1e. Passenger limit for Stage-2 drivers Jurisdictions were scored on whether stage 2 drivers were limited in the number of non-family passengers they were permitted to transport beyond number of seatbelts. | 0.2 | 0.00 = no passenger limit, 0.20 = passengers limited to two passengers, unless they are family. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| 4.2. Extended 0.00% Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) Limits for New and GLP Drivers | 2 | |
| 4.2ai. Prohibition on being positive for alcohol for all GLP drivers Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had prohibition on being positive for alcohol for all GLP drivers regardless of whether their driving ability is impaired or affected. | 0.7 | 0.00 = No prohibition of GLP drivers from testing positive for alcohol use while under the GLP, regardless of level of impairment, 0.70 = Prohibition of GLP drivers from testing positive for alcohol use while under the GLP, regardless of level of impairment. |
| 4.2aii. Prohibition on being positive for alcohol for all new drivers Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had prohibition on being positive for alcohol for all new drivers with less than 5 years of experience regardless of whether their driving ability is impaired or affected. | 0.7 | 0.00 = No prohibition of new drivers from testing positive for alcohol, regardless of level of impairment, 0.35 = Prohibition of new drivers from testing positive for alcohol, regardless of level of impairment applicable to younger drivers only (within 5 years of the GLP start age) 0.70 = Prohibition of all new drivers with less than 5 years of experience, regardless of age, from testing positive for alcohol, regardless of level of impairment. |
| 4.2bi. Penalties for violations of the zero tolerance laws for alcohol for GLP drivers Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mandatory 30-day ALS, 7-day AVI and restarting of the relevant GLP stage for GLP drivers who violate the zero tolerance laws. | 0.3 | 0.00 = Penalties do not meet the minimum of a 30-day ALS, 7-Day AVI and restarting the GLP stage, 0.3 = Penalties meet the minimum of a 30-day ALS, 7-Day AVI and restarting the GLP stage. |
| 4.2bii. Penalties for violations of the zero tolerance laws for alcohol for new drivers Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mandatory 30-day ALS, 7-day AVI and 1 year extension of the zero tolerance period for fully licensed new drivers with less than 5 years of experience who violate the zero tolerance laws. | 0.3 | 0.00 = Penalties do not meet the minimum of a 30-day ALS, 7-Day AVI and extension of the zero tolerance period by 1 year, 0.15 = Some components met and/or applicable to younger drivers only within 5 years of the GLP start age. 0.30 = Penalties meet the minimum of a 30-day ALS, 7-Day AVI and extension of the zero tolerance period by 1 year. |
| 4.3. Accessible container laws | 0.25 | |
| 4.3a. Accessible container laws Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had penalties for alcohol (opened or unopened) that is readily accessible to any person in the vehicle. | 0.25 | 0.00 = No accessible container laws in place, 0.25 = Accessible container laws in place. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| 4.4. Penalties for poly-substance detection | 0.25 | |
| 4.4a. Penalties for poly-substance detection Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had any increased penalties when the presence of a drug is detected in addition to alcohol. | 0.25 | 0.00 = no modified or increased penalties for the presence of other drugs in addition to alcohol, 0.25 = any modified or increased penalties for the presence of other drugs in addition to alcohol. |
| 4.5. Administrative Licensing Suspensions (ALS), and Administrative Vehicle Impoundment (AVI) | 3.5 | |
| 4.5ai. ALS for drivers reasonably believed to be affected by alcohol Jurisdictions were scored on whether their impaired driving laws included a mandatory 24-hour ALS for drivers who are reasonably believed to be affected by alcohol (no breath test or SFST conducted). | 0.125 | 0.00 = No mandatory ALS, 0.125 = Mandatory 24-hour ALS. |
| 4.5a.ii. AVI for drivers reasonably believed to be affected by alcohol Jurisdictions were scored on whether their impaired driving laws included a mandatory 24-hour AVI for drivers who are reasonably believed to be affected by alcohol (no breath test or SFST conducted). | 0.125 | 0.00 = No mandatory AVI, 0.125 = Mandatory AVI. |
| 4.5bi. ALS for drivers with 0.05-0.079% BAC levels Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol impaired driving laws included a mandatory 7-day ALS for drivers with a BAC of 0.05% to .079% or who fail an alcohol-related standardized field sobriety test (SFST). | 0.75 | 0.00 = No mandatory ALS, 0.375 = Mandatory 3-day ALS, 0.75 = Mandatory 7-day ALS. |
| 4.5b.ii. AVI for drivers with 0.05-0.079% BAC levels Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol impaired driving laws included a mandatory 7-day AVI for drivers with a BAC of 0.05% to .079% or who fail an alcohol-related standardized field sobriety test. | 0.75 | 0.00 = No mandatory AVI, 0.375 = Discretionary 7-day AVI 0.75 = Mandatory 7-day AVI. |
| 4.5b.iii. Escalating penalties for repeat impaired driving occurrences at the 0.05-0.079% BAC level Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had escalating ALS, AVIs and mandatory remedial requirements for repeat alcohol impaired driving occurrences at the 0.05%-0.079% BAC level (or failed SFST) within a lookback period of 5 years. | 0.15 | 0.00 = no escalating penalties, 0.075 = escalating ALS or AVI or remedial programs, 0.15 = Escalating ALS, AVI and remedial programs. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| <p>4.5biv. ALS and AVI recorded on the driver abstract or record for at least 5 years for drivers with a BAC of 0.05-.079%</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol impaired driving laws required that the ALS and AVI be recorded on the driver abstract or record for at least 5 years.</p> | 0.15 | <p>0.00 = ALS and AVI are not recorded on driver abstract or record or is recorded for less than 5 years, 0.15 = ALS and AVI is recorded on driver abstract or record for 5 years or more.</p> |
| <p>4.5ci. Mandatory 90-day ALS for drivers with 0.08%+ BAC levels</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol impaired driving laws included a mandatory 90-day roadside ALS for drivers with a BAC of 0.08% or more on two alcohol screening devices (ASD), or one approved instrument (evidentiary breath testing machine) or who fail or refuse to submit to any required impairment related test or examination.</p> | 0.5 | <p>0.00 = No mandatory 90-day ALS, 0.50 = Mandatory 90-day ALS.</p> |
| <p>4.5cii. Mandatory 30-day AVI for drivers with 0.08%+ BAC levels</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol impaired driving laws included a mandatory 30-day roadside AVI for drivers with a BAC of 0.08% or more on two alcohol screening devices (ASD), or one approved instrument (evidentiary breath testing machine) or who fail or refuse to submit to any required impairment related test or examination.</p> | 0.5 | <p>0.00 = No mandatory or discretionary 30-day AVI, 0.25 = Discretionary 30-day AVI, 0.50 = Mandatory 30-day AVI.</p> |
| <p>4.5ciii. Escalating penalties for repeat impaired driving occurrences at the 0.08+ BAC level</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had escalating ALS, AVIs and mandatory remedial requirements for repeat impaired driving occurrences at the 0.08% BAC level within a lookback period of 5 years.</p> | 0.1 | <p>0.00 = no escalating penalties, 0.05 = escalating ALS or AVI or remedial programs, 0.10 = Escalating ALS, AVI and remedial programs.</p> |
| <p>4.5civ. Mandatory interlock programs for drivers with a 0.08+ BAC and subject to 90-day ALS levels</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol impaired driving laws required drivers who register a 0.08%+ BAC and receive a 90-day ALS be subject to a 6 month interlock order.</p> | 0.1 | <p>0.00 = no mandatory 6 month interlock for drivers subject to 90-day ALS, 0.10 = mandatory 6 month interlock for drivers subject to 90-day ALS.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| <p>4.5cv. Penalties for aggravated BAC levels (0.12%+) Jurisdictions were scored on whether they imposed additional administrative penalties (e.g. fine, longer ALS) for federal alcohol-related impaired driving offenders with aggravated BAC levels (e.g. 0.120%+)</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = No additional penalties for drivers with aggravated BAC levels, 0.125 = Additional penalties for drivers with an aggravated BAC of 0.16%, 0.25 = Additional penalties for drivers with an aggravated BAC of 0.12%. |
| <p>4.6. Administrative Sanctions and Interlock programs for federally impaired driving offenders (BAC of 0.08%)</p> | 2 | |
| <p>4.6ai. Long-term ALS for first 0.08+ BAC federal impaired driving conviction Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol impaired driving laws required a mandatory 1-year ALS for drivers' first federal impaired driving conviction in addition to any court imposed sanctions imposed at the federal level.</p> | 0.3 | 0.00 = no mandatory 1-year ALS, 0.30 = mandatory 1-year ALS. |
| <p>4.6aii. Escalating long term ALS for second time 0.08+ BAC federal impaired driving conviction Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol impaired driving laws required a mandatory 3-year ALS for drivers' second federal impaired driving conviction in addition to any court imposed sanctions imposed at the federal level.</p> | 0.1 | 0.00 = no mandatory 3-year ALS, 0.10 = mandatory 3-year ALS. |
| <p>4.6aiii. Escalating long term ALS for third time+ federal impaired driving conviction Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol impaired driving laws required a mandatory 10-year ALS for drivers' third and subsequent federal impaired driving conviction in addition to any court imposed sanctions imposed at the federal level.</p> | 0.1 | 0.00 = no mandatory 10-year ALS, 0.05 = Indefinite ALS 0.10 = mandatory 10-year ALS. |
| <p>4.6b. Interlock as a condition of relicensing for first 0.08+ federal impaired conviction Jurisdictions were scored on whether they required successful completion of a 1 year interlock program for a first federal alcohol-related driving offence in addition to any court imposed sanctions imposed at the federal level.</p> | 0.75 | 0.00 = if completion of the program was not mandatory for any federal impaired driving offenders, 0.50 = if completion of the program is mandatory for only some categories of federal impaired driving offenders with minor exceptions, 0.75 = completion of the program is mandatory for all federal impaired driving offenders. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| <p>4.6c. Escalating interlock periods for repeat 0.08+ BAC federal impaired driving convictions</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether they required successful completion of 3 year and 5 year interlock programs for second and third time federal alcohol-related impaired driving offenders for offences within a 10-year period in addition to any court imposed sanctions imposed at the federal level.</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = No escalating 3 & 5 year interlock periods, 0.25 = Escalating 3 & 5 year interlock periods. |
| <p>4.6d. Reduced “hard” provincial/territorial license suspension for enrollment in interlock program for 0.08+ BAC federal impaired drivers</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether their interlock programs included incentives for enrollment to discourage unlicensed and uninsured driving. Specifically, federal impaired drivers were given reduced “hard” provincial/territorial license suspension periods (i.e. reduced periods of no driving) that align with the federal driving prohibitions, see below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •First federal impaired driving conviction: no hard provincial licence suspension period (i.e. driver is eligible for immediate interlock enrollment post sentencing) •Second federal impaired driving conviction: minimum 3 month hard provincial licence suspension period (i.e. driver is eligible for interlock enrollment 3 months post sentencing) •Third federal impaired driving conviction: minimum 6 month hard provincial licence suspension period (i.e. driver is eligible for interlock enrollment 6 months post sentencing). <p>Credit was also given if offenders convicted of impaired driving causing death or bodily harm were ineligible for a reduced “hard” provincial licence suspension periods.</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = no reduced hard suspensions for alcohol related federal impaired driving offenders enrolled in the interlock program, 0.125 = Reduced “hard” suspension period for all alcohol related federal impaired driving offenders enrolled in the interlock program, including those offenders convicted of impaired driving causing death or bodily harm, 0.25 = Reduced “hard” suspension period for all alcohol related federal impaired driving offenders enrolled in the interlock program, except offenders convicted of impaired driving causing death or bodily harm. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|---|
| <p>4.6e. Relicensing based on interlock performance criteria for 0.08+ BAC federal impaired drivers Jurisdictions were scored on whether their interlock programs included relicensing based on performance criteria (e.g., interlock log data indicates the driver no longer poses a significant risk of reoffending).</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = Relicensing not based on interlock performance, 0.25 = Relicensing based on interlock performance criteria. |
| 5. Marketing and Advertising Controls | | 10 |
| <p>5.1. Comprehensiveness of alcohol marketing and advertising restrictions for paid advertisements</p> | 7.00 | |
| <p>5.1a. Quantity restrictions Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had advertising bans or restrictions on the volume of alcohol advertising permitted, across all media types (e.g. advertising bans or restrictions on the number of ads or % of ad space occupied by alcohol ads etc.).</p> | 3.00 | <p>Jurisdictions were awarded full points on indicators 1a-1d for a complete advertising ban. For jurisdictions without a full ban on alcohol advertising the following scores for volume restrictions were applied to each of the following media types: +0.75 for full ban or +0.20 for volume restrictions for broadcast media (radio and television), +0.75 for full ban or +0.20 for volume restrictions for internet, +0.75 for full ban or +0.20 for volume restrictions for social media, +0.25 for full ban or +0.10 for volume restrictions for print media (newspaper, flyers etc.), +0.25 for full ban or +0.10 for volume restrictions for out-of-home advertising (signage), +0.125 for full ban or +0.05 for volume restrictions for mass electronic mail outs (SMS/text and email campaigns), +0.125 for full ban or +0.05 for volume restrictions for promotional materials and sponsorship (events or infrastructure).</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|---|
| <p>5.1b. Content restrictions Jurisdictions were score on whether they had content restrictions that go beyond the CRTC code for all media types.</p> <p>(CRTC code for broadcast advertising of alcoholic beverages: https://crtc.gc.ca/eng/television/publicit/codesalco.htm)</p> | 1.00 | <p>Jurisdictions were awarded the following scores for content restrictions, beyond the CRTC code, that applied to each of the following media types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +0.25 Broadcast media (radio and television), +0.25 Internet, +0.25 Social media, +0.10 Print media (newspaper, flyers etc.), +0.10 Out-of-home advertising (signage), +0.025 Mass electronic mail outs (SMS/text and email campaigns), +0.025 Promotional materials and sponsorship (events or infrastructure). |
| <p>5.1c. Placement restrictions Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had any restrictions on the placement of advertisements within all media types (e.g. restrictions prohibiting alcohol ads near schools or treatment centres, bans on alcohol ads in media where the target audience is under the minimum legal age) in order to minimize alcohol advertisement exposure of priority populations (e.g. youth, individuals in recovery).</p> | 1.75 | <p>Jurisdictions were awarded the following scores for placement restrictions that applied to each of the following media types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> +0.45 Broadcast media (radio and television), +0.45 Internet, +0.45 Social media, +0.15 Print media (newspaper, flyers etc.), +0.15 Out-of-home advertising (signage), +0.05 Mass electronic mail outs (SMS/text and email campaigns), +0.05 Promotional materials and sponsorship (branded items, sponsored events or infrastructure). |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|---|
| <p>5.1d. Ban on price based promotions Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had restrictions on price based marketing strategies/promotions, beyond policies prohibiting the advertisement of alcohol below the minimum price, across all media types (e.g. policies restricting the advertisement of “cheap” drinks or volume based specials such as 2 for 1 deals).</p> | 0.25 | <p>Jurisdictions were awarded the following scores for price based promotion restrictions that applied to each of the following media types: +0.06 Broadcast media (radio and television), +0.06 Internet, +0.03 Social media, +0.03 Print media (newspaper, flyers etc.), +0.03 Out-of-home advertising (signage), +0.02 Mass electronic mail outs (SMS/text and email campaigns), +0.02 Promotional materials and sponsorship (events or infrastructure).</p> |
| <p>5.1e. Restrictions/bans on third party advertising Jurisdictions were scored on whether they prohibited alcohol advertisements by non-licensees (e.g., third parties not involved in the production, manufacturing, or sale of alcohol such as food delivery services).</p> | 0.50 | <p>0.00 = non-licensee permitted to advertise alcohol, 0.50 = non-licensee not permitted to advertise alcohol.</p> |
| <p>5.1f. Coverage of alcohol marketing and advertising regulations across advertisers Jurisdictions were scored on whether their alcohol advertising restrictions (see 5.1 a-d) applied to all advertisers (e.g. government retailers, private retailers and licencees, FOPs, Manufacturers and their agents, SOP holders)</p> | 0.50 | <p>0.00 = No marketing restrictions or marketing restrictions do not apply to all advertisers, 0.50 = Marketing restrictions apply to all advertisers, including government retailers.</p> |
| <p>5.2. Enforcement of marketing and advertising regulations</p> | 3 | |
| <p>5.2a. Mandatory pre-screening of advertising Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a mandatory pre-screening process across media types, regardless of the advertiser, that was conducted by a representative independent from the alcohol industry and alcohol sales, for ensuring alcohol advertisements adhere to the regulations.</p> | 1 | <p>Jurisdictions were awarded the following scores for mandatory pre-screening that applied to each of the following media types: +0.35 Pre-screening for broadcast media (radio and television), +0.35 Pre-screening for internet and social media, +0.15 Pre-screening for print media (newspaper, flyers etc.), +0.15 Pre-screening for signage (in-store and public spaces).</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| <p>5.2b. Enforcement authority over alcohol advertising Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a specific enforcement authority, independent from industry and alcohol sales (e.g. health), responsible for enforcement regardless of the advertiser (i.e. government or private).</p> | 1 | 0.00 = No independent authority responsible for enforcement, 0.50 = An independent authority responsible for enforcement, but some advertisers (e.g. government stores) are exempt, 1.00 = An independent authority responsible for enforcement with no exemptions. |
| <p>5.2ci. Independent online complaint system Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had an online complaint system geared to the lay public, which was run independently from industry and alcohol advertisers, for ensuring alcohol advertising and marketing violations and complaints are effectively addressed.</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = No online complaint process for the lay public or process is not independent from industry, 0.125 = Online complaint process for the lay public, independent from industry, but does not apply to all advertisers (e.g. government stores exempt), 0.25 = A formal online complaint process that applies to all alcohol advertisers. |
| <p>5.2cii. Timelines for complaint adjudication Jurisdictions were scored on whether complaints against alcohol advertisements were adjudicated efficiently with an ideal timeframe being within 30 days.</p> | 0.15 | 0.00 = no defined timelines, 0.15 = adjudication timelines do not exceed 30 days. |
| <p>5.2di. Penalties for advertising violations Jurisdictions were scored on whether their penalties for violations of the alcohol advertising and marketing regulations are commensurate with the severity of the violation and escalate with the frequency and severity of the violation.</p> | 0.5 | 0.00 = No penalties, 0.25 = Penalties commensurate with the severity of the violations or escalate with repeat violations, 0.50 = Penalties are both commensurate with the severity of the violation and escalate for repeat violations. |
| <p>5.2dii. Publicly available listings of violations Jurisdictions were scored on whether they have a publicly available listing of violations of the alcohol advertising and marketing regulations that includes the name of the advertiser and nature of the violation.</p> | 0.1 | 0.00 = Absence of publicly available listings of violations, 0.10 = Presence of publicly available listings of violations. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| 6. Minimum Legal Age (MLA) | 10 | |
| 6.1. Minimum Legal Age Level Laws | 9 | |
| <p>6.1a. Minimum legal age legislation – sale age Jurisdictions were scored on the level of the minimum age for individuals to whom alcohol can be lawfully sold and/or supplied.</p> | 4 | <p>0.00 = No minimum age or an minimum age of 17 or younger, 0.50 = 18 years*, 1.50 = 19 years*, 2.50 = 20 years*, 4.00 = 21 years.</p> <p>*An additional 0.50 points were given if a jurisdiction had strengthened their minimum age policies by granting graduated access to alcohol by way of stepped restrictions based on strength of alcohol, volume of alcohol or hours of availability.</p> |
| <p>6.1b. Minimum legal age legislation – purchase age Jurisdictions were scored on the level of the minimum age for which individuals may purchase, or attempt to purchase, alcohol.</p> | 3 | <p>0.00 = No minimum age or an minimum age of 17 or younger, 0.50 = 18 years*, 1.25 = 19 years*, 2.00 = 20 years*, 3.00 = 21 years.</p> <p>*An additional 0.50 points were given if a jurisdiction had strengthened their minimum age policies by granting graduated access to alcohol by way of stepped restrictions based on strength of alcohol, volume of alcohol or hours of availability.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| <p>6.1c. Minimum legal age legislation – possession age Jurisdictions were scored on the level of the minimum age for which individuals may possess alcohol.</p> | 2 | <p>0.00 = No minimum age or an minimum age of 17 or younger, 0.33 = 18 years*, 0.67 = 19 years*, 1.00 = 20 years*, 2.00 = 21 years.</p> <p>*An additional 0.25 points were given if a jurisdiction had strengthened their minimum age policies by granting graduated access to alcohol by way of stepped restrictions based on strength of alcohol, volume of alcohol or hours of availability.</p> |
| <p>6.1d. Penalty –Furnishing to minors Jurisdictions were penalized for having any practices that undermine the minimum age. This indicator focused on exceptions pertaining to supplying alcohol to minors in specific environments beyond private residences such as licensed establishments.</p> | -1 | <p>1.00 point was deducted from the total minimum age score for policies that permit, parents/guardians, spouses or other adults having lawful custody of the person to serve or supply alcohol to individuals below the MLA in environments that extend beyond the home. Policies permitting the administering of alcohol for medicinal or religious purposes were not penalized. Note: penalty deductions were only applied within an indicator (e.g., 6.1. Minimum legal age level laws) and if it resulted in a negative score, was adjusted to zero.</p> |
| <p>6.2. Proof of age laws</p> | 1 | |
| <p>6.2a. Proof of age requirements Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had legislation that requires staff to request proof of age in the form of government issued photo identification for all individuals purchasing alcohol.</p> | 0.5 | <p>0.00 = no law requiring proof of age for anyone purchasing alcohol, 0.50 = law requiring proof of age for anyone purchasing alcohol.</p> |
| <p>6.2b. Age verification laws- remote/online sales Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had legislation that requires proof of legal age for alcohol sales made remotely (e.g. not in person, online etc.). A two-stage verification process was considered ideal (e.g. proof of age to place the order and proof of age upon receipt of the order).</p> | 0.5 | <p>0.00 = no legislation requiring two-staged proof of age process for remote/online sales, 0.50 = legislation requiring two-staged proof of age process for remote/online sales.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| 7. Health & Safety Messaging | 10 | |
| 7.1. Status of enhanced alcohol labelling components | 2.00 | |
| 7.1ai. Legislation for enhanced alcohol labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had legislation in place that would allow for enhanced alcohol labelling components. | 0.15 | 0.00 = no legislation for enhanced alcohol labeling components, 0.15 = legislation for enhanced alcohol labeling components. |
| 7.1aii. Status of alcohol warning labels The jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) evidence-based alcohol warning label message, developed and designed independently from the alcohol industry, across a range of topics as a requirement of manufacturer labelling. | 0.55 | +0.15 warning on alcohol use and cancer risk, +0.08 warning on alcohol use and health risks, +0.08 warning on alcohol use by youth and young adults (e.g. MLA laws and health impacts), +0.08 warning on alcohol use and violence, +0.08 warning on alcohol use and impaired driving, +0.08 warning on alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks (e.g. FASD/FAS). |
| 7.1aiii. Status of standard drink labels The jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) standard drink information on labels as a requirement of manufacturer labelling. Note: Label content must be developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored. | 0.55 | 0.00 = no standard drink information on alcohol containers, 0.55 = legislated standard drink information on alcohol containers. |
| 7.1aiv. Status of national alcohol guidance labels The jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) national alcohol guidance information on labels as a requirement of manufacturer labelling. Note: Label content must be developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored. | 0.55 | 0.00 = no guidance information on alcohol containers, 0.55 = guidance information on alcohol containers. |
| 7.1av. Status of calorie labels The jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) calorie information on labels as a requirement of manufacturer labelling. Note: Label content must be developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored. | 0.20 | 0.00 = no calorie information on alcohol containers, 0.20 = calorie information on alcohol containers. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| 7.2. Quality of enhanced alcohol labelling | 2.00 | |
| <p>7.2a. Adequacy of label messages Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had enhanced alcohol labeling components that contained an adequate message that would support consumers in making an informed health decision regarding the use of the product. Note: Label content must be developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored.</p> | 0.75 | +0.15 adequate warning on alcohol use and cancer risk, +0.10 adequate warning on alcohol use and health risks, +0.10 adequate warning on alcohol use by youth and young adults (e.g. MLA laws and health impacts), +0.10 adequate warning on alcohol use and violence, +0.10 adequate warning on alcohol use and impaired driving, +0.10 adequate warning on alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks (e.g. FASD/FAS). |
| <p>7.2b. Rotation of warning messages Jurisdictions were scored on whether their health warning messages on alcohol labels rotated across all alcohol products at least annually in such a way that warning messages could not be selectively applied to certain products. Note: Label content must be developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored.</p> | 0.35 | 0.00 = label messaging is not rotating or no enhanced label component, 0.35 = label incorporates rotating messaging. |
| <p>7.2c. Use of pictorials on labels Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had at least one enhanced alcohol labelling component that was supported by a pictorial such as an image, graphics, icon etc. Note: Label content must be developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored.</p> | 0.15 | 0.00 = label does not include graphics or no enhanced label component, 0.15 = label incorporates graphics. |
| <p>7.2d. Prominence of labels Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had at least one enhanced labelling component that was displayed prominently using contrasting colours, occupying at minimum 30% of the display panel and legible under customary conditions of purchase and use (e.g. a min of 6 point font). Prominence was specifically defined as front-of-package for alcohol warning messages. Note: Label content must be developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored.</p> | 0.75 | 0.00 = label component is not prominent or no enhanced label component, 0.375 = label component includes some elements to enhance prominence, 0.75 = label messaging is prominent. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| 7.3. Mandatory alcohol health and safety messaging, off-premise | 2.50 | |
| 7.3a. Variation in mandatory ongoing health and safety messaging, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on whether they had mandatory ongoing health and safety messaging for off-premise outlets that includes a variety of evidence-based message topics. Note: Messages needed to be mandatory and developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored. | | |
| 7.3ai. Variation in off-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and cancer risk | 0.4 | 0.00= no mandatory ongoing health and safety messaging around alcohol use and cancer, 0.40 = messaging includes warnings around alcohol use and cancer risk. |
| 7.3aii. Variation in off-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and health risks | 0.175 | 0.00= no mandatory ongoing messaging around alcohol use and health risks, 0.175 = messaging includes information around alcohol use and health risks. |
| 7.3aiii. Variation in off-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and impaired driving, acute injury and/or violence risk | 0.175 | 0.00= no mandatory ongoing messaging around impaired driving or acute injury and/or violence risk, 0.175 = messaging includes impaired driving or acute injury warnings. |
| 7.3aiv. Variation in off-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use among youth and young adults (MLA laws and health impacts) | 0.175 | 0.00 = no mandatory ongoing messaging around minors (MLA laws and health impacts), 0.175 = messaging includes warnings for minors (MLA laws and health impacts). |
| 7.3av. Variation in off-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks | 0.175 | 0.00 = no mandatory ongoing messaging around FASD/pregnancy, 0.175 = messaging includes FASD/pregnancy warnings. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|---|
| <p>7.3b. Adequacy of off-premise health and safety messaging Jurisdictions were scored on whether their mandatory off-premise messaging contained evidence-based health and safety information that was adequate in supporting consumers to make an informed choice and was accompanied by graphics. Note: Messages needed to be mandatory and developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored.</p> | | |
| <p>7.3bi. Adequacy of off-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and cancer risk</p> | 0.4 | 0.00= message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.40 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.3bii. Adequacy of off-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and health risks</p> | 0.175 | 0.00 = message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.175 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.3biii. Adequacy of off-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and impaired driving, acute injury and/or violence risk</p> | 0.175 | 0.00= message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.175 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.3biv. Adequacy of off-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use among youth and young adults (MLA laws and health impacts)</p> | 0.175 | 0.00= message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.175 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.3bv. Adequacy of off-premise health and safety messaging -alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks</p> | 0.175 | 0.00= message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.175 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.3c. Placement of health and safety messaging displayed in off-premise outlets Jurisdictions were scored on whether they were mandated to display prominent messaging in locations visible to all customers within the outlet.</p> | 0.3 | 0.00 = no mandated signs or mandated signs with no specified location, 0.30 = mandated signs with a specified location visible to all patrons. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|---|
| 7.4. Mandatory alcohol health and safety messaging, on-premise | 1.5 | |
| <p>7.4a. Variation in mandatory ongoing on-premise health and safety messaging</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored based on whether they had mandatory ongoing health and safety messaging for on-premise establishments that includes a variety of evidence-based message topics.</p> <p>Note: Messages needed to be mandatory and developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored.</p> | | |
| <p>7.4ai. Variation in on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and cancer risk</p> | 0.2 | <p>0.00= no mandatory ongoing health and safety messaging around alcohol use and cancer, 0.20 = messaging includes warnings alcohol use and cancer risk.</p> |
| <p>7.4aii. Variation in on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and health impacts</p> | 0.1 | <p>0.00= no mandatory ongoing messaging around alcohol use and health risks, 0.10 = messaging includes information around alcohol use and health risks.</p> |
| <p>7.4aiii. Variation in on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and impaired driving, acute injury and/or violence risks</p> | 0.1 | <p>0.00= no mandatory ongoing messaging around impaired driving or acute injury and/or violence risk, 0.10 = messaging includes impaired driving or acute injury warnings.</p> |
| <p>7.4aiv. Variation in on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use among youth and young adults (e.g. MLA laws and health impacts)</p> | 0.1 | <p>0.00 = no mandatory ongoing messaging around minors (MLA laws and health impacts), 0.10 = messaging includes warnings for minors (MLA laws and health impacts).</p> |
| <p>7.4av. Variation in on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks</p> | 0.1 | <p>0.00 = no mandatory ongoing messaging around FASD/pregnancy, 0.10 = messaging includes FASD/pregnancy warnings.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| <p>7.4b. Adequacy of on-premise health and safety messaging Jurisdictions were scored based on whether on-premise messaging contained evidence-based health and safety information that was adequate in supporting consumers to make an informed choice and was accompanied by graphics. Note: Messages needed to be mandatory and developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored.</p> | | |
| <p>7.4bi. Adequacy of on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and cancer risk</p> | 0.2 | 0.00= message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.20 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.4bii. Adequacy of on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and health impacts</p> | 0.1 | 0.00 = message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.10 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.4biii. Adequacy of on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and impaired driving, acute injury and/or violence risks</p> | 0.1 | 0.00 = message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.10 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.4biv. Adequacy of on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use among youth and young adults (e.g. MLA laws and health impacts)</p> | 0.1 | 0.00 = message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.10 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.4bv. Adequacy of on-premise health and safety messaging - alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks</p> | 0.1 | 0.00 = message is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice, 0.10 = message is adequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice. |
| <p>7.4c. Placement health and safety messaging- on-premise Jurisdictions were scored on whether they were mandated to display messaging in locations visible to all customers within the establishment.</p> | 0.3 | 0.00 = no mandated signs or mandated signs with no specified location, 0.30 = mandated signs with a specified location visible to all patrons. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| 7.5. Health and Safety Campaigns by Ministry of Health | 2 | |
| <p>7.5ai. Health and safety campaigns by the Ministry of Health Jurisdictions were scored on whether the Ministry of Health ran on-going annual health and safety campaigns specific to alcohol, beyond campaigns limited to the holiday season. Note: Campaigns needed to be developed and funded independently from the alcohol industry and their corporate social responsibility organizations to be scored.</p> | 1.4 | 0.00 = no annual campaigns, 0.70 = campaigns limited to holidays, 1.40 = campaigns run at least annually beyond holiday based campaigns. |
| <p>7.5aii. Comprehensiveness of health and safety campaigns by the Ministry of Health Jurisdictions were scored on the variation in health and safety topics included in the MoH campaigns.</p> | 0.6 | +0.15 campaign on alcohol use and cancer risk, +0.09 campaign on alcohol use and health risks, +0.09 campaign on alcohol use by youth and young adults (e.g. MLA laws and health impacts), +0.09 campaign on alcohol use and violence, +0.09 campaign on alcohol use and impaired driving, +0.09 campaign on alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks (e.g. FASD/FAS) |
| 8. Liquor Law Enforcement | | |
| 8.1. Risk-based licensing and enforcement (RBLE), off-premise | | |
| <p>8.1a. Risk-based licencing and enforcement (RBLE) - outlet characteristics, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored on whether they used risk-based licensing and enforcement for off-premise outlets that formally assessed outlet characteristics to determine and assign a risk level that informed licensing conditions, inspection activities, and enforcement schedules. Criteria include outlet characteristics such as license type, hours of operation, and outlet location.</p> | 1.5 | 0.00 = outlet characteristics not used to determine licensing or RBLE, 1.50 = outlet characteristics (e.g., license type, hours of operation, location) used to inform RBLE for off-premise outlets. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| <p>8.1b. Risk-based licencing and enforcement (RBLE) - license holder characteristics, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored on whether they used risk-based licensing and enforcement for off-premise outlets that formally assessed license holder characteristics to determine and assign a risk level that informed licensing conditions, inspection activities, and enforcement schedules. These criteria include license holder past violations such as service to minors or intoxicated patrons, and experience as a license holder.</p> | 1.5 | 0.00 = license holder characteristics not used to determine licensing or RBLE, 1.50 = license holder characteristics (past violations e.g., service to minors or intoxicated patrons, experience as a license holder) used to inform RBLE for off-premise outlets. |
| <p>8.2. Compliance checks, off-premise</p> | 1.45 | |
| <p>8.2a. Frequency of regular compliance checks, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored based the frequency of regular compliance checks for liquor law violations (e.g. service to minors and/or intoxicated patrons) at off-premise outlets, with the ideal frquency being at least annually, and whether more frequent checks were done based on an assigned risk level.</p> | 1 | 0.00 = regular compliance checks completed less than annually and not based on assigned risk level, 0.50 = regular compliance checks completed at least annually or based on assigned risk level, 1.00 = regular compliance checks completed at least annually for off-premise outlets with more frequent checks based on assigned risk level. |
| <p>8.2b. Follow-up checks for failed compliance, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on the frequency of follow-up checks for failed compliance, with the ideal being within 3 months, and whether they were based on the severity or number of violations.</p> | 0.2 | 0.00 = follow-up longer than 6 months or no follow-up checks performed, 0.1 = follow-up within 3-6 months, or follow-up based on severity or number of violations but with no defined timeline, 0.2 = follow-up within 3 months and based on severity or number of violations for off-premise outlets. |
| <p>8.2c. Mystery shopper program, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on whether they had a mystery shopper program in place to verify compliance with minimum legal age laws at off-premise outlets. Note: Program had to be active within the last two years to be scored.</p> | 0.25 | 0.00 = No mystery shopper program in place for off-premise outlets or not active in the last 2 years, 0.25 = Mystery shopper program in place and active within last two years for off-premise outlets. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| 8.3. Risk-based Licensing and Enforcement (RBLE), on-premise | 1 | |
| <p>8.3a. Risk-based licencing and enforcement (RBLE) - outlet characteristics, on-premise</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether they used risk-based licensing and enforcement for on-premise establishments that formally assessed outlet characteristics to determine and assign a risk level that informed licensing conditions, inspection activities, and enforcement schedules. These criteria included outlet characteristics such as license type, hours of operation, and outlet location.</p> | 0.275 | <p>0.00 = outlet characteristics not used to determine licensing or RBLE,</p> <p>0.275 = Outlet characteristics (e.g., license type, hours of operation, location) used to inform RBLE for on-premise establishments.</p> |
| <p>8.3b. Risk-based licencing and enforcement (RBLE) - license holder characteristics, on-premise</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether they used risk-based licensing and enforcement for on-premise establishments that formally assessed license holder characteristics to determine and assign a risk level that informed licensing conditions, inspection activities, and enforcement schedules. These criteria include license holder past violations such as service to minors or intoxicated patrons, and experience as a license holder.</p> | 0.55 | <p>0.00 = License holder characteristics not used to determine licensing or RBLE,</p> <p>0.55 = License holder characteristics (past violations e.g., service to minors or intoxicated patrons, experience as a license holder) used to inform RBLE for on-premise establishments.</p> |
| <p>8.3c. Coverage of risk-based licencing and enforcement (RBLE), on-premise</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored based on the coverage of risk-based licensing and enforcement for on-premise establishments and whether it covered all license types including special occasion permits (SOPs).</p> | 0.175 | <p>0.00 = RBLE does not apply to all on-premise establishments including SOPs,</p> <p>0.0875 = RBLE applies to all on-premise establishments except SOPs,</p> <p>0.175 = RBLE applies to all on-premise establishments including SOPs.</p> |
| 8.4. Compliance checks, on-premise | 1.55 | |
| <p>8.4a. Frequency of regular compliance checks, on-premise</p> <p>Jurisdictions were scored based on the frequency of regular compliance checks for liquor law violations (e.g. service to minors and/or intoxicated patrons) at on-premise establishments, with the ideal being at least annually, and whether more frequent checks were done based on assigned risk level.</p> | 1 | <p>0.00 = regular compliance checks completed less than annually and not based on assigned risk level,</p> <p>0.50 = regular compliance checks completed at least annually or based on assigned risk level,</p> <p>1.00 = regular compliance checks completed at least annually for on-premise establishments with more frequent checks based on assigned risk level.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| <p>8.4b. Follow-up checks for failed compliance, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on the frequency of follow-up checks for failed compliance, with the ideal being within 3 months, and whether they were based on the severity or number of violations.</p> | 0.2 | <p>0.00 = follow-up longer than 6 months or no follow-up checks performed, 0.10 = follow-up within 3-6 months, or follow-up based on severity or number of violations but with no defined timeline, 0.20 = follow-up within 3 months and based on severity or number of violations for on-premise establishments.</p> |
| <p>8.4c. Police inspection program, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored on whether the police held powers to inspect on-premise establishment and if they had a dedicated police inspection program for conducting inspections and walk-throughs of on-premise establishments.</p> | 0.35 | <p>0.00 = Police do not hold powers to do inspections and no dedicated police inspection program, 0.25 = Police hold powers to do inspections but no dedicated police inspection program, 0.35 = Police hold powers to do inspections and dedicated police inspection program in place for on-premise establishments.</p> |
| <p>8.5. Penalties for liquor control and license act violations, all premises</p> | 1.5 | |
| <p>8.5a. Penalties for liquor control and license act violations commensurate with severity of violation Jurisdictions were scored based on whether there were a variety of penalties for liquor control and licensing act violations commensurate with the severity of the violation (e.g., range of sanctions include warnings, education, fines, mandatory license suspension etc.).</p> | 0.7 | <p>0.00 = No penalties for liquor control and licensing act violations or penalties not commensurate with severity of violations, 0.70 = Penalties for liquor control and licensing act violations in place and penalties commensurate with severity of violations.</p> |
| <p>8.5b. Escalating penalties for repeat liquor control and licensing act violations Jurisdictions were scored based on whether penalties for liquor control and licensing act violations escalated with repeated violations.</p> | 0.7 | <p>0.00 = Non-existent or non-escalating penalties, 0.70 = Penalties exist and escalate with repeat violations.</p> |
| <p>8.5c. Tracking and public reporting of liquor control and licensing act violations Jurisdictions were scored based on whether penalties for liquor control and licensing act violations were tracked and publicly reported, including both the violation type and establishment name in disaggregated form.</p> | 0.1 | <p>0.00 = Violations tracked but not publicly reported, 0.05 = Violations tracked and publicly reported in aggregate form only, 0.10 = Violations tracked and publicly reported with both violations and establishment name identified in disaggregated form.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| 8.6. Alcohol Sale and Service Training Programs, Off-premise | 0.75 | |
| <p>8.6a. Alcohol sale and service training programs, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on whether they had mandatory evidence-based alcohol sale and service training programs for all off-premise outlets that include a public health focus (i.e. content of the course goes beyond liability to address public health issues) and developed free of industry involvement.</p> | 0.375 | 0.00 = Voluntary or no training program, or program has no health focus or developed with industry, 0.1875 = Training program mandatory except for some license types or has no health focus or developed with industry, 0.375 = Training program mandatory for all off-premise licence types, has public health focus, and developed free of industry. |
| <p>8.6b. Coverage of alcohol sale and service training programs, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on whether completion of evidence-based, public health-focused alcohol sale and service training programs was mandatory for all paid staff and volunteers involved in or overseeing the sale, service or delivery of alcohol at off-premise outlets.</p> | 0.075 | 0.00 = No training program or training program voluntary for paid staff and volunteers, 0.03 = training is required for some staff only (e.g., not required for managers or volunteers), 0.075 = training required for all paid staff and volunteers at off-premise outlets. |
| <p>8.6c. Recertification requirements for alcohol sale and service training programs, off-premise Jurisdictions were scored on whether their mandatory alcohol sale and service training programs required all paid staff and volunteers to get recertification every 2 years or less.</p> | 0.3 | 0.00 = No training program, voluntary training program, or no recertification requirement, 0.15 = required recertification period greater than 2 years, 0.30 = required recertification period of 2 years or less for off-premise outlets. |
| 8.7. Alcohol Sale and Service Training Programs, On-premise | 0.75 | |
| <p>8.7a. Alcohol sale and service training program, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on whether they had mandatory evidence-based alcohol sale and service training programs for all on-premise licensed establishments (e.g., bars, pubs, restaurants) and all licensed events (e.g., those requiring special occasion permits) that include a public health focus (i.e. content of the course goes beyond liability to address public health issues) and developed free of industry involvement.</p> | 0.375 | 0.00 = Voluntary or no training program, or program has no health focus or developed with industry, 0.1875 = Training program mandatory except for some license or event types or has no health focus or developed with industry, 0.375 = Training program is mandatory for all on-premise license and event types, has public health focus, and developed free of industry. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| <p>8.7b. Coverage of alcohol sale and service training programs, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored based on whether completion of evidence-based, public health-focused alcohol sale and service training programs was mandatory for all paid staff and volunteers involved in or overseeing the sale, service or delivery of alcohol at on-premise establishments.</p> | 0.075 | 0.00 = No training program or training program voluntary for paid staff and volunteers, 0.03 = training is required for some staff only (e.g., not required for managers or volunteers), 0.075 = training required for all paid staff and volunteers at off-premise outlets. |
| <p>8.7c. Recertification requirements for alcohol sale and service training programs, on-premise Jurisdictions were scored on whether their mandatory alcohol sale and service training programs required all paid staff or volunteers to get recertification every 2 years or less.</p> | 0.3 | 0.00 = No training program, voluntary training program, or no recertification requirement, 0.15 = required recertification period greater than 2 years, 0.30 = required recertification period of 2 years or less for off-premise outlets. |
| <p>9. Screening and Treatment Interventions (formerly SBIR) (10 pts)</p> | 10 | |
| <p>9.1. Population level national alcohol guidance</p> | 0.5 | |
| <p>9.1a. Provincial/territorial adoption of national alcohol guidance Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had formally adopted and/or endorsed the most recent evidence-based national alcohol guidance.</p> <p>Formal adoption: Formal adoption requires an official statement of support from government acknowledging their support of and commitment to use the guidance in their jurisdiction. Adoption implies a level of government approval and commitment that would allow for funding to be assigned for activities around the guidance and their promotion.</p> <p>Failing this we would look for signs of: a) Formal endorsement: a formal statement that says they are in support of the guidance OR b) Informal endorsement: the act of publicly showing support or approval of the guidance (without a formal statement) such as posting the guidance on their website.</p> | 0.5 | 0.00 = no adoption, informal or formal endorsement or guidance were not developed independent of industry, 0.15 = informal endorsement of the guidance, 0.25 = formal endorsement of the guidance, 0.50 = formal adoption of the guidance. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|---|
| 9.2. Screening, brief intervention, and referral (SBIR) tools & services | 3.5 | |
| 9.2ai. SBIR services by healthcare professionals Jurisdictions were scored based on whether SBIR training was available for healthcare professionals and whether provincially or territorially funded SBIR services administered by healthcare professionals were available for individuals to assess their drinking and receive brief intervention (either remote/online or in-person). | 2.5 | 0.00 = No SBIR services by healthcare professionals available, 1.25 = SBIR training is available for healthcare professionals, 2.50 = SBIR services by healthcare professionals are available. |
| 9.2aii. Online self-guided SBIR resources Jurisdictions were scored based on whether online SBIR resources developed and/or hosted by P/T governments were readily available for individuals to assess their drinking and receive brief intervention. Note: Resources must be hosted and developed independently from the alcohol industry to be scored. | 1 | 0.00 = No P/T online SBIR resources or SBIR resources are not independent from industry, 1.00 = Online P/T SBIR resources are available and independent from industry. |
| 9.3. Treatment services | 5 | |
| 9.3a. Treatment Services – withdrawal management/ detoxification Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had publicly funded alcohol withdrawal management/detox programs available. | 1.5 | 0.00 = Jurisdiction does not have publicly funded alcohol withdrawal management/detox services, 0.75 = Jurisdiction has publicly funded out of P/T alcohol withdrawal management/ detox services available, 1.50 = Jurisdiction has publicly funded alcohol withdrawal management/ detox services available within the P/T. |
| 9.3b. Treatment Services – inpatient services Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had publicly funded inpatient treatment services (beyond 12-step peer-to-peer model) available. | 1.5 | 0.00 = No publicly funded inpatient services or limited to 12 step model, 0.75 = Jurisdiction has publicly funded out of P/T inpatient services available, 1.50 = Jurisdiction has publicly funded inpatient services beyond 12-step model available within the P/T. |
| 9.3c. Treatment Services – outpatient services Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had publicly-funded outpatient treatment services (beyond 12-step peer-to-peer model) available. | 2 | 0.00 = No publicly funded outpatient services, 2.00 = Jurisdiction has publicly funded outpatient services beyond 12-step model available within the P/T. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| 9.4. Harm Reduction Services | 1 | |
| 9.4a. Managed alcohol programs Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had permanent managed alcohol programs (e.g. beyond temporary COVID-responses and pilot projects). Programs must be at least partially government funded to be scored. | 1 | 0.00 = No publicly-funded managed alcohol programs, 0.50 = Publicly-funded managed alcohol programs are temporary, 1.0 = Publicly-funded permanent managed alcohol programs. |
| 10. Alcohol Strategy | 10 | |
| 10.1. Status of the provincial or territorial alcohol strategy | 3 | |
| 10.1a. Status of a provincial/territorial alcohol strategy Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had an alcohol focused public facing strategy or action plan that addresses alcohol as a public health issue. Jurisdictions were scored against an ideal of a standalone provincial or territorial alcohol strategy/action plan that was developed independently from the alcohol industry. | 3 | 0.00 = No provincial/territorial strategy that includes alcohol or the strategy was drafted by/with industry, 1.50 = A provincial/territorial addictions, mental health, public health or other strategy that includes alcohol that was not drafted by/with industry, 3.00 = A standalone provincial/territorial alcohol strategy or action plan that was not drafted by/with industry. |
| 10.2. Comprehensiveness of the alcohol strategy | 4 | |
| 10.2a1-a10. Evidence-based strategy recommendations Jurisdictions were scored on whether the above mentioned strategy included a wide range of evidence-based alcohol policy interventions. a1. pricing and taxation a2. physical availability a3. alcohol control system a4. impaired driving countermeasures a5. marketing and advertising controls a6. minimum legal age a7. health and safety messaging a8. liquor law enforcement a9. screening and treatment interventions a10. monitoring and reporting. | 4 | + 0.82 for pricing and taxation recommendations, + 0.71 for physical availability recommendations, + 0.39 for alcohol control system recommendations, + 0.38 impaired driving countermeasures recommendations, + 0.38 for marketing and advertising controls recommendations, + 0.32 for minimum legal age recommendations, + 0.31 for health and safety messaging recommendations, + 0.28 for liquor law enforcement recommendations, + 0.24 for screening and treatment interventions + 0.18 for monitoring and reporting recommendations. Note: Scores reflect the CAPE domain weights. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| <p>10.3. Implementation of the provincial or territorial alcohol strategy Note: If the strategy did not include evidence-based alcohol recommendations across more than 1 evidenced-based domain the jurisdiction was not eligible for points under indicator 3 for implementation.</p> | 3 | |
| <p>10.3a. Provincial/territorial strategy funding Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had dedicated government funding to support the strategy.</p> | 0.75 | 0.00 = no dedicated government funding, or no strategy, 0.375 = Partial government funding or funding is part of a larger addictions, mental health, or other strategy funding portfolio, 0.75 = Has dedicated government funding to support the provincial or territorial alcohol strategy. |
| <p>10.3b. Provincial/territorial strategy leadership Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had an identified public health leader (individual position or working group) to implement the strategy. Strategy leadership must be free of alcohol industry involvement.</p> | 0.75 | 0.00 = No strategy, no identified public health leader or strategy leadership includes membership from the alcohol industry, 0.75 = Has an identified public health leader to implement the provincial or territorial strategy. |
| <p>10.3ci. Implementation timeline Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had developed an implementation timeline for their strategy (e.g. 5 year time line) independently from the alcohol industry.</p> | 0.375 | 0.00 = No strategy, no implementation timeline or the implementation timeline was set by/with industry, 0.375 = Jurisdiction has an implementation timeline for their strategy. |
| <p>10.3cii. Implementation Assessment Jurisdictions were scored based on the rigor with which they monitor and publicly report on the implementation of the provincial or territorial alcohol strategy. Jurisdictions were scored against an ideal of an on-going implementation assessment that examines implementation through the life of the strategy, beyond one time point in time. Note: The assessments must be free of industry involvement and publicly reported to be scored.</p> | 0.375 | 0.00 = No strategy, no public facing assessment(s) or assessment plan or the assessment plan involves industry, 0.1875 = There is a one-time public facing implementation assessment or assessment plan for the alcohol strategy that is free of industry involvement, 0.375 = There is regular or reoccurring public facing implementation assessments of the alcohol strategy (e.g. every 3 or 5 years) that are free of industry involvement. |
| <p>10.3d. Alcohol strategy endorsement Jurisdictions were scored on whether the government endorsed the alcohol strategy.</p> | 0.75 | 0.00 = Strategy is not endorsed by government, 0.75 = Strategy is endorsed by government. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| <p>10.3e. Penalty - Recency of the provincial/territorial strategy Jurisdictions were scored on how recently their strategy had been developed or updated.</p> | -1 | <p>0.00 points were deducted from the overall strategy score if the strategy was created or updated in the past 5 years, 0.50 points were deducted from the overall strategy score if the strategy was developed or last updated 6- 9 years ago, 1.00 point was deducted from the overall strategy score if the strategy was developed or last updated 10 or more years ago. Note: penalty deductions were only applied within an indicator (e.g., 10.3. Implementation of the provincial or territorial alcohol strategy) and if it resulted in a negative score, was adjusted to zero.</p> |
| 11. Monitoring and Reporting | | 10 |
| 11.1. Comprehensiveness of alcohol monitoring mechanisms | | 4 |
| <p>11.1a. Comprehensiveness of alcohol monitoring mechanisms Jurisdictions were assessed on whether they conducted or supported (e.g., provided funding or other resources including providing data) provincial/territorial level systematic tracking of a variety of alcohol-related indicators.</p> | | |
| <p>11.1ai. Comprehensiveness of alcohol monitoring mechanisms: per capita alcohol consumption and drinking patterns</p> | 0.50 | <p>0.00 = No tracking or support, 0.25 = Conducted or supported the tracking of per capita alcohol consumption, 0.50 = Conducted or supported the tracking of per capita alcohol consumption and drinking patterns (e.g. heavy episodic drinking).</p> |
| <p>11.1aii. Comprehensiveness of alcohol monitoring mechanisms: alcohol-attributable hospitalizations</p> | 0.50 | <p>0.00 = No tracking or support, 0.25 = Conducted or supported the tracking of wholly alcohol-attributable ER visits or hospital admissions, 0.50 = Conducted or supported the tracking of wholly and partially alcohol-attributable ER visits or hospital admissions.</p> |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|---|-------------|--|
| 11.1aiii. Comprehensiveness of alcohol monitoring mechanisms: alcohol-attributable deaths | 0.50 | 0.00 = No tracking or support, 0.25 = Conducted or supported the tracking of wholly alcohol-attributable deaths, 0.50 = Conducted or supported the tracking of wholly and partially alcohol-attributable deaths. |
| 11.1aiv. Comprehensiveness of alcohol monitoring mechanisms: alcohol-related crime | 0.50 | 0.00 = No tracking or support, 0.50 = Conducted or supported the tracking of alcohol-related crime (e.g. assaults, single vehicle night time crashes). |
| 11.1av. Comprehensiveness of alcohol monitoring mechanisms: alcohol-related costs | 0.50 | 0.00 = No tracking or support, 0.50 = Conducted or supported the tracking of alcohol-related costs. |
| 11.1avi. Comprehensiveness of alcohol monitoring mechanisms: alcohol policy changes | 0.50 | 0.00 = No tracking or support, 0.25 = Announcing of alcohol related policy changes, 0.50 = Conducted or supported the tracking and consolidation of alcohol related policy changes. |
| Bonus: comprehensiveness synergy | 1 | Jurisdictions received up to an additional 1.00 point to reflect the synergy of comprehensively tracking all alcohol indicators . The synergy score was in direct proportion to the number of indicators that are tracked (includes indicators with full marks only). |
| 11.2. Transparency of Reporting | 3.00 | |
| 11.2a. Transparency of reporting Jurisdictions were scored on the degree to which the monitoring results were made public. | | For indicators to which the P/T contributed data to national monitoring projects (e.g. CSUCH, CIHI reporting, Stats Canada, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey) and conducted no other monitoring or reporting, a score of 0 was awarded for 11.2a transparency of reporting and 11.2b frequency of reporting. |
| 11.2ai. Transparency of reporting: per capita alcohol consumption and drinking patterns | 0.25 | 0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting of per capita alcohol consumption and drinking patterns |
| 11.2aii. Transparency of reporting: alcohol-attributable morbidity | 0.25 | 0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting of alcohol-attributable morbidity. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| 11.2aiii. Transparency of reporting: alcohol-attributable mortality | 0.25 | 0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting of alcohol-attributable mortality. |
| 11.2aiv. Transparency of reporting: alcohol- crime | 0.25 | 0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting of alcohol-related crime. |
| 11.2av. Transparency of reporting: alcohol-related costs | 0.25 | 0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting of alcohol-related costs. |
| 11.2avi. Transparency of reporting: alcohol policy change | 0.25 | 0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting of alcohol policy change. |
| Bonus: comprehensiveness synergy | 0.50 | Jurisdictions received up to an additional 0.50 points to reflect the synergy of comprehensive public reporting of all alcohol indicators. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the number of indicators that are publicly reported. |
| 11.2b. Frequency of reporting Jurisdictions were scored on the frequency of which the monitoring results were made public. | | For indicators to which the P/T contributed data to national monitoring projects (e.g. CSUCH, CIHI reporting, Stats Canada, Uniform Crime Reporting Survey) and conducted no other monitoring or reporting, a score of 0 was awarded for 11.2a transparency of reporting and 11.2b frequency of reporting. |
| 11.2bi. Frequency of reporting: per capita alcohol consumption and drinking patterns | 0.125 | 0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5+ years, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = annual reporting of per capita alcohol consumption and drinking patterns. |
| 11.2bii. Frequency of reporting: alcohol-attributable morbidity | 0.125 | 0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5+ years, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = annual reporting of alcohol-attributable morbidity. |
| 11.2biii. Frequency of reporting: alcohol-attributable mortality | 0.125 | 0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5+ years, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = annual reporting of alcohol-attributable mortality. |
| 11.2biv. Frequency of reporting: alcohol-related crime | 0.125 | 0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5+ years, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = annual reporting of alcohol-related crime. |

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Provincial/Territorial)

| INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS | POINT VALUE | SCORING BREAKDOWN |
|--|-------------|--|
| 11.2bv. Frequency of reporting: alcohol-related costs | 0.125 | 0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5+ years, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually - alcohol-related costs. |
| 11.2bvi. Frequency of reporting: alcohol policy change | 0.125 | 0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5+ years, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = annual reporting of alcohol policy change. |
| Bonus: comprehensiveness synergy | 0.25 | Jurisdictions received up to an additional 0.25 points to reflect the synergy of comprehensive frequent reporting all alcohol indicators. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the number of indicators reported on an annual basis. |
| 11.3. Knowledge Translation Activities | 3 | |
| 11.3a. Central reporting Jurisdictions were scored on whether they implemented public centralized database or reporting system (i.e., website) for alcohol-related indicators (e.g. alcohol consumption, harms, costs and policies). | 1 | 0.00 = No centralized system, 1.00 = Central public database or reporting system. |
| 11.3b. Leadership for alcohol monitoring and reporting Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had formally identified a government knowledge broker (or cross-sector committee or organisation) who was tasked with publicly reporting on alcohol consumption, harms, costs and policies. | 1 | 0.00 = No knowledge broker within government, 1.00 = Knowledge broker within government accountable for public reporting on alcohol. |
| 11.3c. Knowledge translation in past two years Jurisdictions were scored on whether their knowledge broker (see 11.3b) had produced and released a government supported (funded or produced) knowledge product (e.g. report, resource etc.) supported by a knowledge translation strategy (e.g., available on a public facing website, news release etc.) in the past 2 years. The knowledge product should provide information on alcohol and guidance or recommendations on how to effectively address alcohol issues in their jurisdiction from a public health perspective. Note: the jurisdiction must have identified a knowledge broker under 11.3b. to be scored on this indicator. | 1 | 0.00 = No knowledge products or activities in the 2 past years, 0.50 = Knowledge product in past 2 years with no knowledge translation strategy, 1.00 = Active knowledge translation in the past 2 years. |