



University of Victoria

Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research

Institut canadien de recherche sur l'usage de substances

camh

Centre for Addiction and Mental Health  
Centre de toxicomanie et de santé mentale



Canadian Institute for Health Information  
Institut canadien d'information sur la santé



DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY 1818  
2018



Institut national de santé publique  
Québec

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER UNIVERSITY

Western Law

# Strategies to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harms and Costs in Canada: A Review of Provincial and Territorial Policies SCORING RUBRIC

## Strategies to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harms and Costs in Canada: A Review of Provincial and Territorial Policies

**Tim Stockwell**, Director, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, Victoria, BC  
**Ashley Wettlaufer**, Research Coordinator, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, ON  
**Kate Vallance**, Research Associate, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, Victoria, BC  
**Clifton Chow**, Research Affiliate, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, Victoria, BC  
**Norman Giesbrecht**, Emeritus Scientist, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, ON  
**Nicole April**, Medical Consultant, Institut national de santé publique du Québec, Québec City, QC  
**Mark Asbridge**, Associate Professor, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS  
**Russell Callaghan**, Scientist, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, Victoria;  
Professor, University of Northern British Columbia, Prince George, BC  
**Samantha Cukier**, Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH  
**Parnell Davis-MacNevin**, Research Assistant, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, NS  
**Marianne Dube**, Research Technician, Institut national de santé publique du Québec, Québec City, QC  
**Geoff Hynes**, Manager, Canadian Institute for Health Information, Ottawa, ON  
**Robert Mann**, Senior Scientist, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, ON  
**Robert Solomon**, Professor Emeritus, Western University, London, ON  
**Gerald Thomas**, Collaborating Scientist, Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research;  
Director, BC Ministry of Health, Victoria, BC  
**Kara Thompson**, Assistant Professor, St. Francis Xavier University, Antigonish, NS

**Suggested citation:** Stockwell, T., Wettlaufer, A., Vallance, K., Chow, C., Giesbrecht, N., April, N., Asbridge, M., Callaghan, R.C., Cukier, S., Davis-MacNevin, P., Dube, M., Hynes, G., Mann, R., Solomon, R., Thomas, G., Thompson, K. (2019). Strategies to Reduce Alcohol-Related Harms and Costs in Canada: A Review of Provincial and Territorial Policies. Victoria, BC: Canadian Institute for Substance Use Research, University of Victoria.

## APPENDIX B: Provincial and Territorial Policy Domain and Indicator Scoring Rubric

1. PRICING AND TAXATION	Indicator Details	Indicator Point Values (out of 10)	Indicator Scoring
<p><b>1. iMUP for alcohol sold from off-premise outlets</b></p>	<p>1a. Coverage of off-premise minimum prices: jurisdictions were scored according to whether they had min prices for alcohol sold in liquor stores based on beverage category using percent of sales to assess coverage.</p> <p>1b. Level of off-premise minimum prices: jurisdictions were scored according to the level of minimum price for products of typical alcohol content and container sizes sold in government liquor stores (5%-beer, 40%-spirits, 12.5%-wine and 7%-coolers/cider). The average minimum price per standard drink for these products was compared across jurisdictions.</p> <p>1c. Automatic indexation for off-premise minimum prices: jurisdictions were scored on whether they automatically indexed minimum prices to inflation each year</p>	<p>5 (weighted by % of sales via off-premise outlets)</p>	<p>1a. Coverage of minimum prices, off-premise (0-1) 0.00= If a jurisdiction does not have any minimum prices, 0.25= Jurisdiction with less than 50% coverage, 0.50= Jurisdictions with 74%-50% coverage, 0.75=Jurisdictions with 99%-75% coverage, 1.00= Jurisdictions with 100% coverage.</p> <p>1b. Level of minimum prices, off-premise (0-1) 0.00= No minimum prices, 0.25= Jurisdictions with average minimum prices of \$1.13 or less per standard drink, 0.50= Jurisdictions with average minimum prices of \$1.14 to \$1.41 per standard drink, 0.75= Jurisdictions with average minimum prices of \$1.42 to \$1.70 per standard drink, 1.00= Jurisdictions with average minimum prices \$1.71 or higher per standard drink.</p> <p>1c. Automatic Indexation, off-premise (0-1) 0.0= No minimum prices or no documented adjustments to minimum prices, 0.5= Infrequent (e.g. less than every two years) ad hoc adjustments to minimum prices, 1.0= Automatic annual indexation of minimum prices to inflation.</p>

	<p>1d. Pricing on alcohol content for off-premise minimum prices: jurisdictions were scored on the degree to which the minimum prices for each major beverage type reflect the alcohol content of the beverage.</p> <p>1e. Loopholes for off-premise minimum pricing: jurisdictions were penalized for having any minimum pricing loopholes for off-premise sales.</p>	<p>1d. Pricing on alcohol content, off-premise (0-1)</p> <p>0.00= Minimum prices were set according to volume of beverage</p> <p>0.50= Minimum prices were set according to volume of beverage and graduated based on percentage alcohol content for broad ranges of products within a beverage category (price bands). 0.125 pts for each beverage category with 2 price bands or more.</p> <p>0.75= Minimum prices were set using a hybrid system that incorporates both graduated min pricing and volumetric pricing. 0.1875 pts for each beverage category that implements a hybrid between graduated and volumetric pricing</p> <p>1.00= Minimum prices were set according to a volumetric formula that ties the minimum price directly to the alcohol content of the beverage. 0.25 pts for each beverage category that implemented a volumetric formula.</p> <p>1e. Off-premise minimum pricing loopholes (penalty of 0.0-0.5)</p> <p>0.5 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, ferment on premise products being exempt from minimum prices etc.).</p> <p><b>Final scoring for iMUP for alcohol sold from off-premise outlets (0-5):</b></p> <p><b>The scores for a. coverage, b. level, c. automatic indexation and d. pricing on alcohol content were summed and then penalties for loopholes were subtracted to obtain a score out of 4 pts. Jurisdictions received up to an additional 1 pt</b></p>
--	--	---

			<p><b>to reflect the synergistic effect of the 4 iMUP components when implemented together. The synergy bonus was in direct proportion to the percentage of optimal score obtained on the iMUP components. The scores out of 5 pts for off-premise and on-premise minimum pricing were then weighted by the % ethanol sales through the respective channels.</b></p>
<p><b>2. iMUP for alcohol sold from on-premise establishments</b></p>	<p>2a. Coverage of on-premise minimum prices: 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> <p>2b. Level of on-premise minimum prices: jurisdictions were scored according to the level of minimum prices. The price per standard drink for on-premise minimum prices was compared across jurisdictions.</p> <p>2c. Automatic indexation for on-premise minimum prices: Jurisdictions were scored on whether they automatically indexed minimum prices to inflation each year</p> <p>2d. Pricing on alcohol content for on-premise minimum prices: jurisdictions were scored on</p>	<p>5 (weighted by % sales via on-premise outlets)</p>	<p>2a. Coverage of minimum prices, on-premise (0-1)  0.00= If a jurisdiction does not have any minimum prices,  0.25= Jurisdiction with less than 50% coverage,  0.50= Jurisdictions with 74%-50% coverage,  0.75= Jurisdictions with 99%-75% coverage,  1.00= Jurisdictions with 100% coverage.</p> <p>2b. Level of minimum prices, on-premise (0-1)  0.00= No minimum prices,  0.25= Jurisdictions with average minimum prices of \$2.27 or less per standard drink  0.50= Jurisdictions with average minimum prices of \$2.28 to \$2.84 per standard drink,  0.75= Jurisdictions with average minimum prices of \$2.85 to \$3.41 per standard drink,  1.00= Jurisdictions with average minimum prices \$3.42 or higher per standard drink.</p> <p>2c. Automatic Indexation, on-premise (0-1)  0.0= No automatic indexation,  0.5= Ad hoc increases to minimum prices,  1.0= Jurisdiction had annual automatic indexation of minimum prices to inflation.</p> <p>2d. Pricing on alcohol content, on-premise (0-1)</p>

	<p>the degree to which the minimum prices for each major beverage type reflect the alcohol content of the beverage.</p> <p>2e. On-premise minimum pricing loopholes: jurisdictions were penalized for having any minimum price loophole for on-premise sales.</p>	<p>0.0= Minimum prices were set according to volume of beverage,  0.5= Minimum prices were set according to volume of beverage and graduated based on percentage alcohol content for broad ranges of products within a beverage category (price bands). 0.25 pts for each beverage category with 2 price bands or more,  1.0= Minimum prices were set according to a volumetric formula that ties the minimum price directly to the alcohol content of the beverage. 0.50 pts for each beverage category that implemented a volumetric formula.</p> <p>2e. On-premise minimum pricing loopholes (penalty of 0.0-0.5)  0.5 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 etc.).</p> <p><b>Final scoring for iMUP for alcohol sold from on-premise establishments (0-5):</b>  <b>The scores for a. coverage, b. level, c. automatic indexation and d. pricing on alcohol content were summed and then penalties for loopholes were subtracted to obtain a score out of 4 pts. Jurisdictions with all 4 iMUP components received an additional 1 pt to reflect the synergistic effect of the 4 iMUP components when implemented together. The synergy bonus was in direct proportion to the percentage of optimal score obtained on the iMUP components.</b>  <b>The scores out of 5 pts for off-premise and on-premise minimum pricing were then weighted by the % ethanol sales through the respective channels.</b></p>
--	---	---



<p><b>3. General pricing</b></p>	<p>3a. Average price levels: average price levels for both i. off-premise and ii. on-premise sales were rated using the differences between jurisdiction specific alcohol price indexes and consumer price index (CPI) from Statistics Canada for last reporting year.</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>3a.i. Average price levels for off-premise sales (0-1)  0.0= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score below &lt;-3.0,  0.2= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -3.0 and &lt;-2.0, inclusive,  0.4= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -2.0 and &lt;-1.0, inclusive,  0.6= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -1.0 and &lt;0, inclusive,  0.8= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of 0 or higher,  1.0= Jurisdictions with a differential CPI score of 0 or higher for each beverage type.</p> <p>3a.ii. Average price levels for on-premise sales (0-1)  0.0= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score below &lt;-3.0,  0.2= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -3.0 and &lt;-2.0, inclusive,  0.4= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -2.0 and &lt;-1.0, inclusive,  0.6= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -1.0 and &lt;0, inclusive,  0.8= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of 0 or higher,  1.0= Jurisdictions with a differential CPI score of 0 or higher for each beverage type.</p> <p><b>Average price level score: A weighted average based on % ethanol sales through the respective channels was used to obtain a score out of 1</b></p>
----------------------------------	--	----------	--

	<p>3b. General prices keeping pace with inflation: the differences (negative and positive) from jurisdiction specific alcohol price indices and CPI for both i. off-premise and ii. on-premise sales were examined in order to interpret degree of congruence with overall inflation. Average differences over the past 5 year were used to look at recent trends.</p>		<p>3b.i. Keeping pace with inflation, off-premise sales (0-1)  0.0= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score below &lt;-4.5,  0.2= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -4.5 and &lt;-3.0, inclusive,  0.4= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -3.0 and &lt;-1.5, inclusive,  0.6= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -1.5 and &lt;0, inclusive,  0.8= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of 0 or higher,  1.0= Jurisdictions with a differential CPI score of 0 or higher for each beverage type.</p> <p>3b.ii. Keeping pace with inflation, on-premise sales (0-1)  0.0= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score below &lt;-4.5,  0.2= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -4.5 and &lt;-3.0, inclusive,  0.4= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -3.0 and &lt;-1.5, inclusive,  0.6= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of between -1.5 and &lt;0, inclusive,  0.8= Jurisdictions with an average differential CPI score of 0 or higher,  1.0= Jurisdictions with a differential CPI score of 0 or higher for each beverage type.</p> <p><b>Keeping pace with inflation score: A weighted average based on % ethanol sales through the respective channels was used to obtain a score out of 1</b></p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>3c. Actual prices: looking at products available through off-premise sales channels, jurisdictions were scored based on prices of common low cost/high alcohol products. The average price per standard drink was calculated for a set of common low cost/high alcohol content beer, wine and spirit products sold in liquor stores.</p> <p>3d. Pricing on alcohol content: looking at products available through off-premise sales channels, common low and high alcohol content products were chosen to calculate the variation in the slope of the line that determines them from zero.</p> <p>3e. Provincial/territorial alcohol sales taxation levels: jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which alcohol was taxed higher than other goods.</p>	<p>3c. Actual Prices (0-1)  0= Average price per standard drink \$1.39 or below,  0.25= Average price per standard drink between \$1.40 and \$1.49, inclusive,  0.50= Average price per standard drink between \$1.50 and \$1.59, inclusive,  0.75= Average price per standard drink between \$1.60 and \$1.70, inclusive,  1.00= Average price \$1.71 or higher.</p> <p>3d. Pricing on alcohol content (0-1)  0.0= Jurisdictions with a slope below -1,  0.5= Jurisdictions with -1 to -0.1 for the slope measure,  1.0= Jurisdictions with 0 or higher for the slope measure.</p> <p>3e. Provincial/territorial alcohol sales taxation levels (0-1)  0.00= Jurisdiction had no additional alcohol specific sales tax,  0.25-0.50= Jurisdiction had additional alcohol specific sales tax for either on-premise or off-premise alcohol sales (0.25 pts for each additional sales tax of &lt; 5% per sales channel),  0.50-1.00= Jurisdiction had additional alcohol specific sales tax for either on-premise or off-premise alcohol sales (0.50 pts for each additional sales tax of 5% or more per sales channel).</p> <p><b>Final scoring for general pricing indicators (0-5): The scores for a. average price levels, b. keeping pace with inflation, c. actual prices, d. pricing on alcohol content and e. provincial/territorial alcohol taxation levels were summed to calculate the final indicator score out of 5 pts.</b></p>
--	--	---

2. PHYSICAL AVAILABILITY	Indicator Details	Indicator Point Values (out of 10)	Indicator Scoring
<p><b>1. Regulations pertaining to outlet placement and safety</b></p>	<p>1a. Outlet density policies: jurisdictions were scored on whether they had provincially or territorially mandated limits on outlet density or number of outlets and/or placement of outlets for i. off-premise outlets and ii. on-premise establishments, including municipal powers that allow for restrictions on placement and/or number of outlets.</p> <p>1 b. Policies to enhance outlet safety: jurisdictions were scored on whether they had policies to enhance safety in and around on and off-premise outlets.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>1ai. Off-premise outlet density policies (0-1)  0.0= No limits on population density, placement of outlets, or municipal powers to determine placement/ density of outlets,  0.5= No provincially or territorially mandated limits on population density of outlets but regulations provide power to determine number and/or placement of outlets/permits (this includes municipal powers),  1.0= Limits on population density that are set through provincial/territorial legislation/regulation.</p> <p>1aii. On-premise outlet density policies (0-0.50)  0.00= No limits on population density, placement of outlets, or municipal powers to determine placement/ density of outlets  0.25= No provincially or territorially mandated limits on population density of outlets but regulations provide power to determine number and/or placement of outlets/permits (this includes municipal powers),  0.50= Limits on population density that are set through provincial/territorial legislation/regulation.</p> <p>1b. Policies to enhance safety in/around on and off-premise outlets (0-0.5)  0.00= No policies for enhancing safety in/around on or off-premise outlets,  0.25= Policies for enhancing safety in/around either on-premise or off-premise outlets,</p>

			0.50= Policies for enhancing safety in/around both on-premise and off-premise outlets.
<b>2. Outlet density: off-premise (Practice indicator)</b>	2. Data were collected on the density of all off-premise outlets, including private, government run and ferment on premise outlets. Jurisdictions were scored according to the density of their outlets. A greater emphasis was placed on off-premise outlet density due to the greater potential for harm.	3	2. Off-premise outlet density (all retail stores) (0-3) 0= Density per 10,000 age 15+ was 15.0 or above, 1= Density per 10,000 age 15+ was between 8.0 and 14.9, 2= Density per 10,000 age 15+ was between 2.0 and 7.9, 3= Density per 10,000 was below 2.0.
<b>3. Outlet density: on-premise (Practice indicator)</b>	3. Data were collected on the density of all licensed establishments where alcohol is served on-premise. Jurisdictions were scored according to the density of their outlets.	2	3. On-premise outlet density (all licensed establishments) (0-2) 0= density per 10,000 aged 15+ was 25.0 and above, 1= density per 10,000 aged 15+ was between 15.0 and 25.0, 2= density per 10,000 aged 15+ was 15.0 or below.
<b>4. Hours of operation</b>	4a-b. Hours of Operation: Jurisdictions were scored based on the maximum hours of operation their policies allowed for as stated in legislation or regulation for both a. off-premise outlets and b. on-premise establishments.	2	4a. Hours of operation off-premise (0-1) Hours of operation for off-premise outlets were scored against an ideal of no more than 9 business hours per day and limited availability early in the morning and late at night; 11 am to 8 pm was used as an achievable policy benchmark. 0.0= Business hours extend more than a total of 2 hours before 11 am or after 8 pm, 0.5= Business hours extend no more than a total of 2 hours before 11 am or after 8 pm, 1.0= Hours of operation do not extend before 11 am or after 8 pm (9 hours or less).  4b. Hours of operation on-premise (0-1) Hours of operation for on-premise outlets were scored against an ideal of no more than 14 business hours per day and limited availability early in the morning and late at

	4c. Availability- exceptions and extensions: Jurisdictions were penalized for having loopholes that allow for exceptions to policies restricting availability (hours and days of sale) e.g. extending the hours of operation for community events.		<p>night; 11 am to 1 am was used as an achievable policy benchmark.</p> <p>0.0= Business hours extend more than a total of 2 hours before 11 am or after 1 am,  0.5= Business hours extend no more than a total of 2 hours before 11 am or past 1 am,  1.0= Hours of operation do not extend before 11 am and past 1 am (14 hours or less).</p> <p>4c. Availability- exceptions and extensions (penalty 0.0-0.5)  Up to 0.5 points were deducted from the total score if there were exceptions and extensions to the hours and/or days of sale, such as sporting (e.g. World Cup) or cultural events (e.g. film festivals).  0.25= Exception for on or off-premise outlets (not both),  0.50= Exceptions for on and off-premise outlets.</p>
<b>5. Regulations pertaining to on-premise availability</b>	5a-b. Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had the following regulations for on-premise alcohol purchases (includes tasting and sampling): a. recorking of unfinished wine b. limits on the number of drinks served	1	5a-b. Regulations pertaining to on-premise availability (0-1) 0.0= Neither re-corking or maximum drink limit, 0.5=Recorking of unfinished wine or maximum drink limit, 1.0=Recorking and maximum limits on the number of drinks served.
<b>3. IMPAIRED DRIVING COUNTER-MEASURES<sup>1</sup></b> (formerly Drinking and Driving)	<b>Indicator Details</b>	<b>Indicator Point Values (out of 10)</b>	<b>Indicator Scoring</b>

<sup>1</sup>These indicators are part of a comprehensive program as outlined by MADD Canada. Please see the 2017 MADD Canada Provincial and Territorial Legislative Review (2017) for detailed information on the implementation of drinking and driving countermeasures across the provinces.

<p><b>1. Graduated licensing program (GLP)</b></p>	<p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a comprehensive GLP for all new drivers that included:</p> <p>1a. Minimum age of 16 to start the GLP, regardless of whether the applicant is enrolled in a driver education course.</p> <p>1b. Stage 1: Minimum duration of 12-months for Stage 1 of the GLP, regardless of whether the applicant is enrolled in a driver education course.</p> <p>1c. Stage 2: Minimum duration of 24-month for Stage 2 to the completion of the GLP.</p> <p>1d. Night-time driving ban for Stage-2 drivers, subject to exceptions for drivers who are 21 or older, supervised or are driving for employment purposes.</p>	<p>2.5</p>	<p>1a. GLP Minimum age (0-0.5) 0.0= Minimum age of below 16 for GLP, 0.5= Minimum age of 16 or higher for GLP.</p> <p>1b. GLP duration, stage 1 (0-0.5) 0.00= Stage 1 of GLP is less than 8 months or exceptions allow for it to be shortened to less than 8 months, 0.25= Stage 1 of GLP is a minimum of 8 months, 0.50= Stage 1 of GLP is a minimum of 12 months, no exceptions</p> <p>1c. GLP duration, stage 2 (0-1) 0.0= From stage 2 to completion of GLP is less than 12 month, 0.5= From stage 2 to completion is between 12 and 23 months, 1.0= From stage 2 to completion is a minimum of 24 months.</p> <p>1d. GLP Night time driving ban, stage 2 (0-0.5) 0.0= Not subject to night driving ban, 0.5= Subject to night time driving ban.</p>
<p><b>2. Extended .00% Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) Limits for GLP drivers</b></p>	<p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had extended 0.00% BAC limits that included:</p> <p>2a. Prohibition on being positive for any illicit drug for all GLP drivers, regardless of</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>2a. Prohibition on being positive for any illicit drug for all GLP drivers (0-0.5)</p>

	<p>whether their driving ability is impaired or affected by drugs.</p> <p>2b. A 0.00% BAC limit on drivers for a minimum of 3 years beyond the GLP.</p>		<p>0.0= Prohibition of GLP drivers from driving while affected by drugs, 0.5= Prohibition of GLP drivers from testing positive for drug use while under the GLP, regardless of level of impairment.</p> <p>2b. 0.00% BAC limits beyond GLP (0-0.5) 0.00= No 0.00% BAC limit beyond GLP or .00% BAC limit extends beyond the GLP for less than 2 years, 0.25= A 0.00% BAC limit on drivers for a minimum of 2 years beyond the GLP, 0.50= A 0.00% BAC limit of drivers for a minimum of 3 years beyond the GLP.</p>
<p><b>3. Licensing suspensions and revocations</b></p>	<p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether their impaired driving laws included Short-Term Roadside 0.05% BAC administrative license suspension (ALS) programs with:</p> <p>3a. Minimum 3-day ALS for first occurrence.</p> <p>3b. Mandatory or discretionary vehicle impoundment for first occurrence.</p> <p>3c. ALS recorded on the driver abstract or record for at least 3 years.</p>	3.5	<p>3a. Minimum ALS for first occurrence (0-1) 0= No minimum ALS or minimum ALS less than 3 days, 1= Minimum 3-day ALS.</p> <p>3b. Vehicle impoundment for first occurrence (0-0.5) 0.00= No impoundment, 0.25= Discretionary vehicle impoundment, 0.50= Mandatory vehicle impoundment.</p> <p>3c. ALS recording for first offence (0-0.5) 0.0= ALS is not recorded on driver abstract or record or is recorded for less than 3 years, 0.5= ALS is recorded on driver abstract or record for 3 years or more.</p>

	<p>3d. Drivers subject to a licence reinstatement fee.</p> <p>3e. Minimum 3-year, look-back period for repeat occurrences.</p> <p>3f. Minimum 7-day ALS for second occurrence.</p>		<p>3d. License reinstatement fee (0-0.5) 0.0= No fee, 0.5= License reinstatement fee.</p> <p>3e. Look back period for repeat occurrences (0-0.5) 0.0= No look-back period, or look back period less than 3 years, 0.5= Minimum 3 year look-back period.</p> <p>3f. Minimum ALS for second occurrence (0-0.5) 0.0= No ALS or ALS of less than 7 days for second occurrence, 0.5= Minimum 7 day ALS for second occurrence.</p>
<b>4. Modified penalties</b>	Jurisdictions were score on whether they had modified or increased penalties when the presence of a drug is detected in addition to alcohol.	0.5	4. Penalties for poly-substance detection (0-0.5) 0.0= no modified or increased penalties for the presence of other drugs in addition to alcohol, 0.5= modified or increased penalties for the presence of other drugs in addition to alcohol.
<b>5. Interlock Programs for Federal Impaired Driving Offenders</b>	<p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether their interlock programs included:</p> <p>5a. Successful completion of the provincial/territorial interlock program prior to relicensing for all alcohol-related Criminal Code impaired driving offenders.</p>	2.5	<p>5a. Interlock as a condition of relicensing for Criminal Code impaired offenders (0-1) 0.0= if completion of the program was not mandatory for any federal impaired driving offenders, 0.5= if completion of the program is mandatory for only some categories of federal impaired driving offenders, 1.0= completion of the program is mandatory for all federal impaired driving offenders.</p>

	<p>5b. Reduced “hard” provincial/territorial licence suspension (i.e. the fixed period of no driving) for all alcohol related Criminal Code impaired driving offenders enrolled in the interlock program. Credit was also given if offenders convicted of impaired driving causing death or bodily harm were ineligible for a reduced “hard” suspension.</p> <p>5c. Relicensing based on performance criteria.</p> <p>5d. Minimum 3-year interlock order for a second Criminal Code impaired driving offence.</p>		<p>5b. Reduced “hard” provincial/territorial licence suspension (0-0.5)  0.00= no reduced hard suspensions for alcohol related Criminal Code impaired driving offenders enrolled in the interlock program,  0.25= Reduced “hard” suspension period for all alcohol related Criminal Code impaired driving offenders enrolled in the interlock program, including those offenders convicted of impaired driving causing death or bodily harm,  0.50= Reduced “hard” suspension period for all alcohol related Criminal Code impaired driving offenders enrolled in the interlock program, except offenders convicted of impaired driving causing death or bodily harm.  5c. Relicensing based on performance criteria (0-0.5)  0.0= Relicensing not based on performance,  0.5= Relicensing based on performance criteria.</p> <p>5d. Duration of interlock order for a second Criminal Code impaired driving offence (0-0.5)  0.0= no interlock or less than 3 year interlock order,  0.5= minimum 3 year interlock order.</p>
<b>4.MARKETING AND ADVERTISING CONTROLS</b>	<b>Indicator details</b>	<b>Indicator point values (out of 10)</b>	<b>Indicator scoring</b>
<b>1. Comprehensive-ness of alcohol marketing and advertising regulations</b>	<p>1a. Jurisdictions were scored on the comprehensiveness of alcohol marketing and advertising regulations and whether they had:</p> <p>i. Content restrictions beyond Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) regulations, including</p>	6	<p>1a. Comprehensiveness of alcohol marketing and advertising regulations (0-6)  0= No regulations beyond CRTC regulations,  2= Regulated restrictions on any 1-2 criteria of those listed in column B,  4= Regulated restrictions on any 3-4 criteria of those listed in column B,</p>

	<p>content restrictions specific to priority populations such as women and girls and minority groups,</p> <p>ii. Placement restrictions on the physical location of ads,</p> <p>iii. Quantity restrictions (e.g. advertising bans or volume restrictions),</p> <p>iv. Restrictions on the advertisement of price beyond restrictions on advertising below min. price (e.g. policies restricting the advertisement of drink specials or cheap alcohol),</p> <p>v. Restrictions on alcohol sponsorship that prevent exposure to youth and do not allow for direct targeting of youth and/or young adults.</p> <p>1b. Jurisdictions were scored on the coverage of their alcohol marketing and advertising regulations and whether they pertained to alcohol marketing across the following media types:</p> <p>i) Web/Mobile phone (SMS/app),</p> <p>ii) Print media,</p> <p>iii) Signage,</p> <p>iv) Promotional items (e.g. alcohol branded merchandise).</p>		<p>6= Regulated restrictions on all 5 criteria of those listed in column B.</p> <p>1b. Coverage of alcohol marketing and advertising regulations (0-6)</p> <p>0.0= Alcohol marketing and advertising regulations apply to broadcast advertising only (CRTC),</p> <p>1.5= Alcohol marketing and advertising regulations extend to any 1 media type (listed in column B) beyond broadcast advertising,</p> <p>3.0= Alcohol marketing and advertising regulations extend to any 2 media types (listed in column B) beyond broadcast advertising,</p> <p>4.5= Alcohol marketing and advertising regulations extend to any 3 media types (listed in column B) beyond broadcast advertising,</p>
--	---	--	--

	<p>1c. Jurisdictions were scored on the coverage of their alcohol marketing and advertising regulations and whether they applied to the following potential alcohol advertisers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Government owned off-premise outlets</li> <li>ii) private off-premise outlets</li> <li>iii) Ferment on Premise (FOP) outlets</li> <li>iv) manufacturers</li> <li>v) On-premise licensees</li> <li>vi) Special occasion permit (SOP) holders</li> </ul>		<p>6.0= Alcohol marketing and advertising regulations extend to all 4 media types (listed in column B) beyond broadcast advertising.</p> <p>1c. Coverage of alcohol marketing and advertising regulations across advertisers (0-6)</p> <p>0= No marketing restrictions,  1= Marketing restrictions apply to 1 type of advertiser listed in column B,  2= Marketing restrictions apply to 2 types of advertiser listed in column B,  3= Marketing restrictions apply to 3 types of advertiser listed in column B,  4= Marketing restrictions apply to 4 types of advertiser listed in column B,  5= Marketing restrictions apply to 5 types of advertiser listed in column B,  6= Provincial/territorial marketing restrictions apply to all potential alcohol advertisers.</p> <p><b>Final scoring for alcohol marketing and advertising regulations (0-6): Scores for a. comprehensiveness, b. coverage across media types and c. coverage across advertisers were averaged to obtain a final indicator score out of 6.</b></p>
<p><b>2. Enforcement of advertising and marketing regulations</b></p>	<p>2a. Advertising enforcement authority: jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a specific authority, independent from industry and alcohol sales, responsible for enforcement.</p> <p>2b. Pre-screening: jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a pre-screening</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>2a. Advertising enforcement authority (0-1)</p> <p>0.0= No independent authority responsible for enforcement,  0.5= An independent authority responsible for enforcement, but some advertisers are exempt (e.g. government stores),  1.0= An independent authority responsible for enforcement.</p>

	<p>system, independent from industry and alcohol sales, for ensuring alcohol advertising and marketing adhere to the regulations.</p> <p>2c. Complaint system: jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a complaint system, independent from industry and alcohol sales, for ensuring alcohol advertising and marketing violations and complaints are effectively addressed.</p> <p>2d. Penalties: jurisdictions were scored on whether their penalties for violations of the alcohol advertising and marketing regulations are commensurate with the violation and escalate with the frequency and severity of the violation.</p>		<p>2b. Pre-screening system (0-0.5) 0.0= no mandatory pre-screening or voluntary pre-screening only, 0.5= mandatory pre-screening.</p> <p>2c. Complaint system (0-0.5) 0.00= No formal complaint process or complaint process is not independent from industry, 0.25= Formal complaint process, independent from industry, but does not apply to all advertisers (e.g. government stores exempt), 0.50= A formal complaint process that applies to all alcohol advertisers.</p> <p>2d. Penalties for violation (0-1) 0.0= Nonexistent penalties, 0.5= Penalties commensurate with the violations or escalate with repeat violations, 1.0= Penalties are both commensurate with violations and escalate for repeat violations.</p>
<b>3. Focus of the liquor boards' social media presence</b> (Practice indicator)	3. Based on a sample of the 25 most recent social media posts from each liquor board's main Facebook and Twitter accounts during the last week of June and last week of January 2017, jurisdictions were scored based on the proportion of social media posts dedicated to promotion vs. health and safety messaging.	1	3. Focus on the liquor boards' social media presence (0-1) 0.0= 0% of social media posts had a healthy or safety focus or no social media accounts, 0.5= At least 25% of social media posts had a health and safety focus, 1.0= At least 50% of social media posts had a health and safety focus.
<b>5. MINIMUM LEGAL DRINKING AGE (MLDA)</b>	<b>Indicator Details</b>	<b>Indicator Point Values</b>	<b>Indicator Scoring</b>

		(out of 10)	
<p><b>1. Level of legal drinking age and supportive policies</b></p>	<p>1a. Level of legal drinking age: jurisdictions were scored on the level of legal drinking age.</p> <p>1b. Supportive legislation: jurisdictions were scored on whether they had legislation supporting the legal drinking age that included:</p> <p>1bi. a law that prohibits the sale of alcohol to minors</p> <p>1bii. a law that prohibits minors from purchasing alcohol</p> <p>1c. Loopholes to minimum drinking age: jurisdictions were penalized for having any practices that undermine the MLDA (e.g. social hosting laws that extend beyond the home). This indicator focused on policies pertaining to serving minors in specific</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>1a. Level of legal drinking age (0-8)  0= No MLDA or an MLDA of 17 or younger  2= 18*  4= 19*  6= 20*  8= 21  * 1 bonus point was given if a jurisdiction had strengthened their MLDA policy 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>1bi. Law prohibiting serving/selling alcohol to minors (0-1.5)  0= no policy against serving/selling to minors  1.5= policy against serving/selling to minors</p> <p>1bii. Law prohibiting the purchase of alcohol by a minor (0-0.5)  0= no policy against minors purchasing alcohol  0.5= policy against minors purchasing alcohol</p> <p>1c. Loopholes to minimum drinking age (penalty 0-1)  A maximum of 1 point was deducted from the total MLDA score for policies that permit, parents/guardians, spouses or other adults to serve alcohol to individuals below the legal drinking age in environments that extend beyond private residences. Policies permitting the administering of alcohol for medicinal or religious purposes were not penalized.</p>

	environments beyond private residences such as licensed establishments.		
<b>6. SCREENING, BRIEF INTERVENTIONS AND REFERRALS (SBIR)</b>	<b>Indicator Details</b>	<b>Indicator Point Values (out of 10)</b>	<b>Indicator Scoring</b>
<b>1. SBIR practice guidelines</b>	1. Jurisdictions were scored on whether SBIR practice guidelines had been issued or the College of Family Physicians of Canada SBIR tool had been endorsed by government or a credible provincial/territorial professional association (e.g. MD, nurses, psychologists) for implementation in the province/territory.	3	1. SBIR practice guidelines (0-3) 0= No guidelines, 3= Provincial/territorial guidelines or College of Family Physicians of Canada SBIR tool endorsed by government or a credible provincial/territorial associations and thus is the practice norm.
<b>2. Access to SBIR tools or services</b>	2. Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had provincial/territorial SBIR services available online or in health care settings for people to assess their drinking and receive brief intervention.	3	2. Access to SBIR tools or services (0-3) 0.0= No SBIR tools or services available, 1.5= Some components of SBIR offered online or in a health care setting (e.g. self-guided online tools, screening and referral services but no brief intervention), 3.0= SBIR tool(s) or program(s) offered either online or in a health care setting.

<p><b>3. Implementation of SBIR (Practice indicator)</b></p>	<p>3a. SBIR activities (Practice indicator): Data were collected from the Commonwealth survey and jurisdictions were scored based on the proportion of adults 18 years and older who had been asked by their doctor or other clinical staff at the place they regularly seek care, about their alcohol use.</p> <p>3b. SBIR monitoring: jurisdictions were scored on whether they tracked or supported the tracking of SBIR implementation through surveys.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>3a. SBIR activities (0-2) The score for this indicator is proportional to the percentage of adult Commonwealth survey respondents who have indicated they have been asked by their doctor about their alcohol use with the gold standard being equivalent to tobacco screening, which was on average 71% in Canada. <b>Note: Commonwealth survey data for the territories was not available so this indicator was not factored into the SBIR Implementation score for the territories.</b></p> <p>3b. SBIR Monitoring (0-2) 0.0= no tracking or monitoring of SBIR implementation, 2.0= tracking of SBIR implementation via surveys or other tracking mechanisms.</p> <p><b>Note: The Territories were scored out of 4 pts for this indicator since Commonwealth survey data were not available.</b></p>
<p><b>7. LIQUOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS</b> (formerly Server Training &amp; Challenge and Refusal Programs)</p>	<p><b>Indicator Details</b></p>	<p><b>Indicator Point Values (out of 10)</b></p>	<p><b>Indicator Scoring</b></p>
<p><b>1. Status of Risk-based Licensing and Enforcement (RBLE) Programs</b></p>	<p>1a. Risk-based licensing and enforcement program status: Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a risk-based enforcement program to inform inspection and enforcement activities for: i. off-premise outlets and ii. on-premise establishments.</p>	<p>2.5</p>	<p><b>Note: Jurisdictions where serving an intoxicated person or a minor is not prohibited by legislation received a score of zero for all enforcement indicators.</b></p> <p>1ai. Risk-based licensing and enforcement for off-premise outlets (0-0.75) 0.00= No elements of RBLE program in place,</p>

	<p>1b. Police inspection program: jurisdictions were scored on whether they have a police inspection program for on-premise establishments.</p> <p>1c. Mystery shopper programs: jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mystery shopper programs (MLDA laws only) for off-premise outlets.</p>		<p>0.25= risk-based criteria applied to licensing only,  0.50= risk criteria only for enforcement,  0.75= risk-based criteria formally applied to licensing and enforcement (formal risk criteria identified).</p> <p>1aii. Risk-based licensing and enforcement for on-premise outlets (0-0.75)  0.00= No elements of RBLE program in place,  0.25= Risk-based criteria applied to licensing only,  0.50= Risk criteria only for enforcement,  0.75= Risk-based criteria formally applied to licensing and enforcement (formal risk criteria identified).</p> <p>1b. Police inspection program, on-premise (0-0.5)  0.00= No dedicated police inspection program for on-premise alcohol outlets or shows no evidence of having police do inspections or walk-throughs,  0.25= Informal police inspections (walk-throughs), police have power to do inspections,  0.50= Has a dedicated inspection program for on-premise alcohol outlets.</p> <p>1c. Mystery shopper program, off-premise (0-0.5)  0.0= does not have a mystery shopper program for off-premise alcohol outlets,  0.5= Has a mystery shopper program for off-premise alcohol outlets.</p>
<p><b>2. Quality of RBLE programs</b></p>	<p>2. Jurisdictions were scored on the quality of their risk-based licensing and enforcement program which aims to identify establishments that pose increased risks to public safety in order to inform licence conditions and enforcement activities.</p>	<p>3.5</p>	

	<p>Elements of the enforcement component of RBLE programs had to be in place (see indicator 1a) in order for jurisdictions to be scored on indicators 2a and 2b. These programs were scored on:</p> <p>2ai-ii. the criteria that informed the risk-based licensing and inspections for: i. off-premise outlets and ii. on-premise establishments</p> <p>2bi-ii. the breadth of the risk-based licensing and enforcement programs for: i. off-</p>		<p>2ai. Risk-based licensing and enforcement criteria off-premise outlets (0-0.75)  A maximum of 0.25 for each of the following criteria that are formally applied to determine the risk level that informs licensing conditions and enforcement schedules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outlet characteristics (e.g. licence type, hours of operation, location),</li> <li>- Licence holder characteristic (past violations e.g. service to minors or intoxicated patrons, experience as a licence holder),</li> <li>- Incident data (outlet level police data on violence).</li> </ul> <p>2aii. Risk-based licensing and enforcement criteria on-premise establishments (0-0.75)  A maximum of 0.25 for each of the following criteria that are formally applied to determine the risk level that informs licensing conditions and enforcement schedules:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outlet characteristics (e.g. licence type, hours of operation, capacity, location)</li> <li>- Licence holder characteristic (past violations e.g. service to minors or intoxicated patrons, or overcrowding and experience as a licence holder)</li> <li>- Incident data (outlet level police data on violence and impaired driving e.g. place of last drink data)</li> </ul> <p>2bi. Breadth of RBLE, off-premise (0-0.25)  0.00= RBLE does not apply to all outlets,</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>premise outlets and ii. on-premise establishments</p> <p>2ci-ii. the frequency of compliance checks for liquor law violations (e.g. service to minors and/or intoxicated patrons) for: i. off-premise outlets and ii. on-premise establishments</p> <p>2di-ii. follow-up checks for failed compliance for: i. off-premise outlets and ii. on-premise establishments</p>	<p>0.25= RBLE does apply to all outlets.</p> <p>2bii. Breadth of RBLE, on-premise (0-0.25) 0.00= RBLE does not apply to all establishments and SOPs, 0.20= RBLE applies to all establishments except SOPs, 0.25= RBLE does apply to all establishments and SOPs.</p> <p>2ci. Frequency of compliancy checks, off-premise (0-0.25) 0.000= less than once per year, 0.125= at least once yearly or frequency of checks based on risk assessment (even informally), 0.250= once yearly or more often with more frequent checks based on risk level.</p> <p>2cii. Frequency of compliancy checks, on-premise (0-0.25) 0= less than once per year 0.125= once yearly or more often 0.25= once yearly or more often with more frequent checks based on risk level</p> <p>2di. Follow-up checks, off-premise (0-0.25) 0.000= longer than 6 months or no follow-up 0.125= within 3-6 months or based on severity of violation 0.250= within 3 months</p> <p>2dii. Follow-up checks, on-premise (0-0.25) 0.000= longer than 6 months or no follow-up 0.125= within 3-6 months or based on severity with no defined period 0.250= within 3 months</p> <p>2ei. Ratio of inspectors to outlets, off-premise (0-0.25) 0.00= fewer than .33 inspector per 100 outlets, 0.25= .33 or more inspectors per 100 outlets (ratio <math>\geq 0.01</math>).</p>
--	--	---

	2ei-ii. the number of alcohol inspectors per 100 outlets for: i. off-premise outlets and ii. on-premise establishments		2eii. Ratio of inspectors to outlets, off-premise (0-0.25) 0.00= fewer than .33 inspector per 100 outlets, 0.25= .33 or more inspectors per 100 outlets (ratio $\geq 0.01$ ).
<b>3. Penalties</b>	<p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether the penalties for service to minors and intoxicated patrons were:</p> <p>3a. commensurate with the violation,</p> <p>3b. escalated with the frequency and severity of the violation and</p> <p>3c. were tracked and publicly reported</p>	2	<p>3a. Commensurate penalties for violation (0-0.75) 0.00= Non-existent penalties or are not commensurate with violations, 0.75= Penalties commensurate with the violations.</p> <p>3b. Escalating penalties for repeat violations (0-0.75) 0.00= Non-existent or non-escalating penalties, 0.75= Penalties escalate with repeat violations.</p> <p>3c. Violations are tracked and publicly reported (0-0.5) 0.000= Violations not tracked, 0.167= Violations tracked but not reported, 0.330= Violations are tracked and reported in aggregate form, 0.500= Violations are tracked and publicly reported, identifying the violation and licensee.</p>
<b>4. Training program policy status</b>	<p>Jurisdictions were scored on whether their responsible beverage service training program:</p> <p>4a. was mandatory (as stated in legislation or regulations) for all licensed events (e.g. SOPs), venues and outlets</p>	2	<p>4a. Status of the on-premise server and management training program (mandatory vs. voluntary) (0-1). 0.0= No training program or program is voluntary, 0.5= Training program is mandatory with some exceptions e.g. special occasion permits or off-premise outlets,</p>

	<p>4b. was required for all levels of staff, including volunteers</p> <p>4c. had a recertification period (e.g. every 2 years)</p>		<p>1.0= Training program is mandatory for all licensed events, venues and outlets, including special occasion permits.</p> <p>4b. Reach of the on-premise server and management training program (0-0.5)  0.00= no training program or voluntary program,  0.25= training is required for some staff (e.g. not required for managers or volunteers),  0.50= training is required for all staff, managers and volunteers.</p> <p>4c. Training recertification period (0-0.5)  0.00= no training program or no recertification period,  0.25= recertification period greater than 2 years,  0.50= recertification period of 2 years or less.</p>	
<b>8. CONTROL SYSTEM</b>	<b>Indicator details</b>	<b>Indicator point values (out of 10)</b>	<b>Indicator scoring</b>	
<b>1. Type of off-premise retailing system</b>	1. Jurisdictions were scored on the proportion of outlets that are public (government run vs. privately owned). Note that agency stores and ferment on premise outlets were considered as private outlets.	4	1. Type of retail system (0-4) 0= no public off-premise outlets (all private), 1= 1%-33% of off-premise outlets are public, 2= 34%-66% of off-premise outlets are public, 3= 67%-99% of off-premise outlets are public, 4= all (100%) of off-premise outlets are public (no private).	
<b>2. Alcohol sales beyond on-premise and off-premise outlets</b>	2a-d. Jurisdictions were scored on whether regulations allowed for a. on-line sales, b. delivery purchases, c. ferment on premise outlets or d. ferment at home kits. Note that QR code buying is considered on-line sales.	1	2a. On-line sales (0-0.25) 0.00= on-line sales permitted, 0.25= on-line sales not permitted.	2b. Liquor delivery (0-0.25) 0.00= liquor delivery permitted, 0.25= liquor delivery not permitted.

			<p>2c. Ferment on premise outlets (0-0.25) 0.00= FOP permitted, 0.25= FOP not permitted.</p> <p>2d. Ferment at home kits (0-0.25) 0.00= Home brew kits permitted, 0.25= Home brew kits not permitted.</p>
<b>3. Relative emphasis on product promotion vs. health &amp; safety</b>	<p>3a. Policy on legislated health &amp; safety funds: jurisdictions were scored on whether they have legislation that ensures there are dedicated/earmarked funds to support prevention and health &amp; safety messaging.</p> <p>3b. Promoting public health and safety: Jurisdictions were scored on whether protecting public health and safety is stated as explicit objectives of the alcohol control system (e.g. both the retailer and regulator)</p>	3	<p>3a. Policy on dedicated prevention/ health &amp; safety funds (0-1.5) 0.0= No dedicated social responsibility funding 0.5= Dedicated social responsibility funding, but not inscribed in legislation 1.5= Dedicated social responsibility funding inscribed in legislation.</p> <p>3b. Mandate of retailer and regulator refers to health and safety (0-1.5) 0.000= Mandate(s) only reference to ‘social responsibility’ 0.375 for each of the following components: - Retailer mandate refers to health, - Retailer mandate refers to safety, - Regulator mandate refers to health, - Regulator mandate refers to safety</p>
<b>4. Ministries overseeing alcohol retail and control</b>	4ai-ii. The jurisdictions were scored based on whether the ministry to which the i. alcohol retailer/distributor and ii. alcohol regulator report to have a focus on health and/or safety.	2	<p>4a.i Ministry overseeing the alcohol retailer/distributor (0-0.5) 0.0= Alcohol retail/distribution is overseen by a ministry for which health and/or safety is not a primary focus (e.g. Ministry of Finance), 0.5= Alcohol retail/distribution is overseen by a ministry that primarily focuses on health and/or safety (e.g. Ministry of Health)</p>

	4b. Jurisdictions were scored on whether there was separation of the alcohol retailer/distributor and regulator (i.e. policy, licensing and control).		<p>4a.ii Ministry overseeing the alcohol regulator (0-0.5)  0.0= Alcohol regulation is overseen by a ministry for which health and/or safety is not a primary focus (e.g. Ministry of Finance),  0.5= Alcohol regulation is overseen by a ministry that primarily focuses on health and/or safety (e.g. Ministry of Health)</p> <p>4b. Separation of retailer and regulator (0-1)  0.0=Retailer and regulator are not separate,  0.5= Retailer and regulator are partially separate (e.g. some part of liquor control and/or licensing acts overseen by different ministries)  1=Full separation of the retailer and regulator</p>
<b>9. PROVINCIAL OR TERRITORIAL ALCOHOL STRATEGY</b>	<b>Indicator Details</b>	<b>Indicator Point Values (out of 10)</b>	<b>Indicator Scoring</b>
<b>1. Main focus of the provincial or territorial strategy</b>	1. Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had a provincial or territorial alcohol strategy or whether alcohol was captured under the umbrella of a more broad strategy such as an addictions strategy, mental health strategy or other strategy.	2	1. Provincial/Territorial Strategy Focus (0-2) 0= No provincial/territorial strategy that includes alcohol, 1= A provincial/territorial addictions, mental health, public health or other strategy that includes an alcohol policy focus, 2= standalone provincial/territorial alcohol strategy.
<b>2. Range of evidence-based alcohol policy recommendations within the strategy</b>	2. Jurisdictions were scored on whether the above mentioned strategy included a wide range of evidence-based alcohol policy interventions. E.g. a. pricing and taxation, b. physical availability, c. impaired driving countermeasures, d. marketing and advertising controls, e. minimum legal	4	2. Evidence based strategy recommendations (0-4) 0= No strategy that includes alcohol, 1= Strategy includes recommendations from 1-2 evidence-based alcohol policy areas listed in column B, 2= Strategy includes recommendations from 3-4 evidence-based alcohol policy areas listed in column B, 3= Strategy includes recommendations from 5-6 evidence-based alcohol policy areas listed in column B,

	drinking age, f. screening brief intervention and referral, and g. enforcement.		4= Strategy includes recommendations from all 7 evidenced-based alcohol policy areas listed in column B.
<b>3. Implementation of the provincial or territorial strategy</b>	<p>3a. Provincial/territorial strategy funding: jurisdictions were scored on whether they had dedicated funding to support the strategy.</p> <p>3b. Provincial/territorial strategy leadership: jurisdictions were scored on whether they had an identified leader (individual position or working group) to implement the strategy.</p> <p>3c. Assessment of the implementation process for the provincial/territorial strategy: jurisdictions were scored based on the rigor with which they monitor the implementation of the provincial or territorial alcohol strategy.</p>	4	<p><b>Note: If the strategy did not include evidence-based alcohol recommendations (e.g. score 0 on indicator 2) the jurisdiction was not eligible for points under indicator 3 for implementation.</b></p> <p>3a. Dedicated Funding (0-1.5)  0 = no dedicated funding  0.5 = Partial funding or funding is part of a larger addictions, mental health, or other strategy funding portfolio  1.5 = Has dedicated strategy funding to support the provincial or territorial alcohol strategy</p> <p>3b. Strategy leadership (0-1.5)  0.0 = No identified strategy leader,  1.5 = Has an identified leader to implement the provincial or territorial strategy.</p> <p>3c. Implementation Assessment (0-1)  0.0= Provincial or territorial strategy does not have an implementation assessment or an assessment plan of the alcohol strategy components,  0.5= Provincial or territorial strategy has an one-time implementation assessment or assessment plan for the alcohol strategy components,  1.0= Provincial or territorial strategy has regular implementation assessments of the alcohol strategy components (e.g. every 3 or 5 years) or has a reoccurring assessment plan for the strategy.</p>

	<p>3d. Industry involvement: jurisdictions were scored on whether their provincial/territorial strategy was developed independently from the alcohol industry.</p> <p>3e. Recency of the provincial/territorial strategy: jurisdictions were scored on how recently their strategy had been developed or updated.</p>	<p>Penalty</p> <p>Penalty</p>	<p>3d. Industry involvement (penalty of 0-2) 2 pts were deducted from the overall strategy domain score if industry was involved in the development or the provincial strategy.</p> <p>3e. Recency of the strategy (penalty of 0-1) 0 points were deducted from the overall strategy score if the strategy was created or updated in the past 5 years. 0.5 points were deducted from the overall strategy score if the strategy was developed or last updated 6- 9 years ago. 1.0 points were deducted from the overall strategy score if the strategy was developed or last updated 10 or more years ago.</p>
<b>10. MONITORING AND REPORTING</b>	<b>Indicator Details</b>	<b>Indicator Point Values (out of 10)</b>	<b>Indicator Scoring</b>
<b>1. Comprehensiveness of reporting mechanisms</b>	<p>1. Jurisdictions were assessed on whether they conducted or supported (e.g. provided funding or other resources) provincial/territorial level systematic tracking of the following alcohol related indicators:</p> <p>1i. Per capita alcohol consumption 1ii. Alcohol related hospitalizations (admissions and ER visits) 1iii. Alcohol related deaths 1iv. Alcohol related crime</p>	4	<p>1. Comprehensiveness of reporting mechanisms (0-4) Max. of 1 pt for each alcohol indicator: 0= No tracking, 1= Tracking of 1 indicator, 2= Tracking of 2 indicator, 3= Tracking of 3 indicator, 4= Tracking of 4 indicator,</p>
<b>2. Accessibility of reporting</b>	<p>2a. Transparency of reporting: for each of the four alcohol indicators (consumption, hospitalizations, deaths, and crime) jurisdictions were scored on the degree to</p>	4	<p>2a. Transparency of reporting (0-1) 0= no reporting, 0.125 pts per alcohol indicator for internal reporting, 0.250 pts per alcohol indicator for public reporting.</p>

	<p>which the monitoring results were made public.</p> <p>2b. Frequency of reporting: for each of the four alcohol indicators (consumption, hospitalizations, deaths, and crime) jurisdictions were scored on the frequency of reporting.</p> <p>2c. Central reporting: jurisdictions were assessed on whether they implemented centralized reporting for alcohol-related consumption and harms (see i-iv above).</p>		<p>2b. Frequency of reporting (0-2)  0= no reporting,  0.125 pts per alcohol indicator for reporting every 6 years or longer,  0.250 pts per alcohol indicator for reporting every 4-5 years,  0.375 pts per alcohol indicator for reporting every 2-3 years,  0.500 pts per alcohol indicator reported annually.</p> <p>2c. Centralized reporting (0-1)  0= No centralized system or report,  1= Central database or reporting system.</p>
<b>3. Leadership and support</b>	<p>3a. Leadership: jurisdictions were scored based on whether they had an identifiable leader responsible for monitoring alcohol-related harm and consumption.</p> <p>3b. Funding: jurisdictions were scored based on whether they provided funding or staff resources to support monitoring of alcohol-related harm and consumption.</p>	2	<p>3a. Leadership for alcohol monitoring (0-1)  0.0= No agency, committee or individual identified,  0.5= Readily identifiable leadership, but only 1 or 2 sectors represented,  1.0= Readily identifiable leadership with intersectoral representation (e.g. 3 or more sectors).</p> <p>3b. Funding and resources for alcohol monitoring (0-1)  0= No resources for alcohol monitoring,  1= Specific resources (FTEs, funds) for alcohol monitoring.</p>
<b>11. HEALTH AND SAFETY MESSAGING</b> (formerly Warning Labels and Signs)	<b>Indicator Details</b>	<b>Indicator Point Values (out of 10)</b>	<b>Indicator Scoring</b>

<b>1. The status of enhanced alcohol labelling</b>	1a-c. Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) enhanced labelling components that were a requirement of manufacturer labelling (vs. post production labelling) that included: a. warning messages, b. standard drink information, c. low-risk drinking guidelines.	2	1a-c. Mandatory status of enhanced labelling components (0-2) 0.25 pts for each enhanced labelling component applied post production as a matter of jurisdictional policy, 0.33 pts for each enhanced labelling component incorporated into manufacturer labels as a matter of jurisdictional policy, 0.50 pts for each legislated enhanced labeling component applied post production, 0.66 pts for each legislated enhanced labeling component incorporated into manufacturer labels.
<b>2. The quality of the enhanced label components</b>	2a-d. Jurisdictions were scored on the quality of their alcohol labels, based on: a. the content of the label (clear and concise messaging) b. whether there was a set of rotating messages c. whether the labels included graphics in addition to text d. whether the label components were prominent (front of packaging, contrasting colours).	1	2 a-d. Quality of labels (mandatory and voluntary) (0-1) 0.00= does not have any of the enhanced labelling components listed in column B, 0.25= a minimum of 1 quality indicator listed in column B, 0.50= a minimum of 2 quality indicators listed in column B, 0.75= a minimum of 3 quality indicators listed in column B, 1.00= labels incorporated all 4 of the quality indicators listed in column B.
<b>3. The status of alcohol health and safety messaging — Off-premise</b>	3. Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mandatory (as stated in regulations) alcohol health and safety messaging in off-premise outlets.	1	3. Mandatory vs. voluntary alcohol health and safety messaging—off-premise (0-1) 0= Messaging is voluntary, 1= Messaging is mandatory.
<b>4. The status of alcohol health and safety messaging — On-premise</b>	4. Jurisdictions were scored on whether they had mandatory (as stated in regulations) alcohol health and safety messaging in on-premise outlets.	1	4. Mandatory vs. voluntary alcohol health and safety messaging—on-premise (0-1) 0= Messaging is voluntary, 1= Messaging is mandatory.
<b>5. The quality of the off-premise</b>	5a. Messaging variation: jurisdictions’ health and safety messages were scored based on whether a jurisdiction had messaging	2	5a. Variation in off-premise messaging (0-1) 0.15 pts for the following messaging categories - Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD)/pregnancy,

<p><b>alcohol health and safety messaging</b></p>	<p>around a variety of alcohol related health and/or safety topics.</p> <p>5b. Messaging quality: jurisdictions' health and safety messages were scored based on whether they contained a clear health and/or safety messages and was accompanied by graphics.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drinking and driving or acute injury,</li> <li>- Minors (ID checks or health impacts),</li> <li>- Moderate consumption (quantitative Low Risk Drinking Guidelines information),</li> </ul> <p>0.4 pts for the following messaging categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chronic disease, cancer or health impacts.</li> </ul> <p>5b. Quality of off-premise messages (0-1) Quality is assessed by the precision of the message, the health focus, accompanying graphics etc.</p> <p>0.15 pts for the following messaging categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD)/pregnancy,</li> <li>- Drinking and driving or acute injury,</li> <li>- Minors (ID checks or health impacts),</li> <li>- Moderate consumption (quantitative Low Risk Drinking Guidelines information),</li> </ul> <p>0.4 pts for the following messaging categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chronic disease, cancer or health impacts.</li> </ul>
<p><b>6. Quality of the on-premise alcohol health and safety messaging</b></p>	<p>6a. Messaging variation: jurisdictions' health and safety messages were scored based on whether a jurisdiction had messaging around a variety of alcohol related health and/or safety topics.</p> <p>6b. Messaging quality: jurisdictions' health and safety messages were scored based on whether they contained a clear health and/or safety messages and was accompanied by graphics.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>6a. Variation in on-premise messaging (0-1) 0.15 pts for the following messaging categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD)/pregnancy,</li> <li>- Drinking and driving or acute injury,</li> <li>- Minors (ID checks or health impacts),</li> <li>- Moderate consumption (quantitative Low Risk Drinking Guidelines information),</li> </ul> <p>0.4 pts for the following messaging categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chronic disease, cancer or health impacts.</li> </ul> <p>6b. Quality of on-premise messages (0-1) Quality is assessed by the precision of the message, the health focus, accompanying graphics etc.</p> <p>0.15 pts for the following messaging categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD)/pregnancy,</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Drinking and driving or acute injury,</li><li>- Minors (ID checks or health impacts),</li><li>- Moderate consumption (quantitative Low Risk Drinking Guidelines information),</li></ul> 0.4 pts for the following messaging categories <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Chronic disease, cancer or health impacts.</li></ul>
--	--	--	---

<p><b>7. Main media for health &amp; safety messaging by the liquor boards:</b></p>	<p>7. Jurisdictions were scored based on the media types through which the liquor boards (i.e. government retailers/distributors) disseminate health and safety messaging, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Posters</li> <li>b) Pamphlets</li> <li>c) Billboards</li> <li>d) Online content (websites)</li> <li>e) Print Advertising</li> <li>f) TV/Radio advertisements</li> <li>g) Social media (Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, etc.)</li> <li>h) Other</li> </ul>	<p>1</p>	<p>7. Main media for health &amp; safety (HS) messaging (0-1)</p> <p>0.00= no HS messaging,  0.25= HS messaging using 1-2 media,  0.50= HS messaging using 3-4 media,  0.75= HS messaging using 5-6 media,  1.00= HS messaging using 7 or more media.</p>
---	---	----------	---