



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

**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

**Tim Stockwell**, Director, 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

**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



## APPENDIX B: Federal Alcohol Policy Domain and Indicator Scoring Rubric and Scores

1. PRICING AND TAXATION	INDICATOR DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND
-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------

---

products that would benefit from the discount and exemption.

1.5 additional points were awarded for having the same rate per litre of ethanol applied across all beverage types.



2. Coverage of alcohol  
marketing and









9. NATIONAL ALCOHOL STRATEGY	INDICATORS DETAILS	INDICATOR POINT VALUES AND SCORES	INDICATOR SCORING
1. Implementation of a national alcohol strategy (NAS)	<p>1. The national alcohol strategy was scored on:</p> <p>1a. Whether the National Alcohol Strategy is funded</p> <p>1b. Whether the National Alcohol Strategy has an identified leader</p> <p>1c. Whether the National Alcohol Strategy leadership and committee does not include private industry (e.g. manufacturers, and private retailers)</p> <p>1d. Recency of the National Alcohol Strategy</p>	0/4	<p>1a. National alcohol strategy funding (0-2) 0= No national alcohol strategy or strategy is not funded 1.0= Strategy is partially funded (e.g. no project/activity funding) 2.0= Strategy is fully funded</p> <p>1b. National Alcohol Strategy Leadership (0-2) 0= No national alcohol strategy or strategy exists but has no leadership 1.0= Clearly identified leadership 2.0= Clearly identified leader that includes formal multisector partnerships</p> <p>1c. Independence of the national alcohol strategy (penalty of 0-2) 0= No involvement of industry in the NAS development 2= Involvement of industry in the NAS development</p> <p>1d. Recency of the strategy (penalty of 0-1) 0 points were deducted from the total score for implementation of the strategy if the strategy was</p>

		<p>created or updated in the past 5 years  0.5 points were deducted from the total score for implementation of the strategy if the strategy was developed or last updated 6-9 years ago.  1.0 point was deducted from the total score for implementation of the strategy if the strategy was developed or last updated 10 or more years ago.</p>
<p>2. Evidence-based NAS recommendations</p>	<p>2. Jurisdictions were scored on whether the above mentioned strategy included a wide range of evidence-based alcohol policy interventions.  E.g. (a.) Pricing &amp; taxation, (b.) physical availability, (c.) impaired driving countermeasures, (d.) marketing and advertising controls, (e.) minimum legal drinking age, (f.) screening brief</p>	





<p>2. Health and Safety Messaging</p>	<p>2. Scored on the comprehensiveness of health messaging, including:</p> <p>2a. Federal endorsement and promotion of the LRDGs</p> <p>2b. Comprehensiveness of current evidence-based alcohol messaging on Health Canada website with regards to: pregnancy/FASD; impaired driving/injury; underage drinking; acute effects; chronic disease; treatment resources</p> <p>2c. Federal requirement for the inclusion of a clear evidenced based standardised health and safety message in all alcohol advertising and marketing activities</p>	<p>1/7</p>	<p>2a. Federal endorsement and promotion of the LRDGs (0-1)  0= No national LRDGs  0.5= LRDGs developed by a credible organisation but have not been federally endorsed or promoted  0.75= federal endorsement of LRDGs, but no promotion  1= LRDGs have been federally endorsed and widely promoted at the federal level</p> <p>2b. Comprehensiveness of alcohol messaging on Health Canada website (0-0.5)  0= fewer than half the topics covered  0.25= between 4-5 topics covered  0.5= all topics covered</p> <p>2c. Mandatory health and safety messages (0-0.5)  0= no mandatory or voluntary suggested health and safety message(s)  0.25= suggested voluntary health and safety message(s)  0.5= mandatory health and safety message to be included in all alcohol advertising and marketing</p>
---------------------------------------	---	------------	---

