# Canadian Alcohol Policy Evaluation (CAPE) 3.0

# Results from British Columbia

The Canadian Alcohol Policy Evaluation (CAPE) provides rigorous assessments of how well each level of government in Canada is implementing policies proven to reduce harm from alcohol use. This is the third edition of the CAPE project; a project which has a track record of strengthening Canada's response

CAPE 3.0 results: how does BC compare?

BC: 36%AB: 34%

•

Where BC needs work: Selected						

### Steps BC can take to improve their CAPE policy scores

The policy domains below are listed in order of impact based on their effectiveness and scope.

Note: Grade ranges: A + = 90-100%; A = 85-89%; A - = 80-84%; B + = 77-79%; B = 73-76%; B - = 70-72%; C + = 67-69%; C = 63-66%; C - = 60-62%; D + = 57-59%; D = 53-56%; D - = 50-52%; F = 0-49%.

BC's overall CAPE 3.0 Score: 36% (F)

Policy domain 1: Pricing & Taxation

Score: 28% (F)

#### Recommendations

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where possible.

 Increase legislated minimum prices to a rate per standard drink (e.g. 17.05mL ethanol) of at least \$2.04\* for alcohol sold at off-premise retail outlets and \$4.07\* for alcohol sold at onper s 83.4 (i)10le.7n oet{II2 (d)2.10.6 (e) Tc 0 Tw)- (s)-1Td(-)Tjl .p

- Appoint a health and/or safety-focused ministry to oversee alcohol distribution and retail.
- Increase the current 7.5% proportion of government-owned and operated off-premise retail outlets and move towards a full government monopoly. Prohibit alcohol sales beyond traditional channels such as in convenience and grocery stores, in other establishments such as spas and sporting facilities, and via online sales; phase out ferment-on-premise outlets and home-brew kits.
- Include protection of public health and safety as explicit mandate objectives for alcohol distribution and retail; legislate earmarked funds for harm prevention, research, and treatment; require public health involvement in decision-making and legislative changes; require targeted health-focused public engagement.

Policy domain 4: Impaired Driving Countermeasures

Score: 55% (D)

#### Recommendations

All recommended policies should be developed and implemented without alcohol industry involvement, without incorporating exceptions, and enacted in legislation or regulation where poss (i)7A/MCID 15 \( \frac{4}{8}.8 \) ( .9 (h)2.6(i)10.6



To learn more about the Canadian Alcohol Policy Evaluation or to join our Community of Practice, visit alcoholpolicy.cisur.ca or email cisur@uvic.ca

#### 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 3.0: Findings from British Columbia. 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 ol()13 (a)2.t jrt2.lm, n ju5.3 (ed)5.3 (e)-422 ( 6 T-4. P10.6 (ME)2.27)