



Policy Scoring Rubric

(Federal)

Suggested citation Naimi, T., Stockwell, T., Giesbrecht, N., Wettlaufer, A., Vallance, K., Farrell, F., 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) Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal). 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 (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
1. Pricing and Taxation	10	
1.1 Minimum Pricing	2	



CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
<p>1.3b. Ethanol-based volumetric excise tax by beverage category The jurisdiction was scored on the degree to which the excise tax reflects alcohol content within each major beverage category.</p>	2.5	0.00 = flat excise taxes (rate per L beverage), A maximum of 2 points for volumetric excise taxes, with no loopholes (e.g. no discounts or exemptions), for beer wine and spirits, weighted to reflect their proportion of sales based on estimated ethanol content by beverage category. In the case of excise tax exemptions or discounts, a score of zero was applied to the proportion of products that would benefit from the discount and exemption. 0.50 additional points were awarded for having the same rate per litre of ethanol applied across all beverage categories.
<p>1.3c. Indexation of excise taxes The jurisdiction was scored on whether there was indexation of excise taxes for all beverage types.</p>	0.5	0.00 = excise tax is not indexed, 0.50 = Ad valorem excise tax rate structure (automatically adjusts for changes in price) or flat rate excise tax is indexed annually to CPI within each beverage type.
<p>1.4. Proportion of ethanol-based volumetric taxation</p>	0.25	
<p>1.4a. Practice Indicator - Ethanol-based volumetric taxation The jurisdiction was scored on the proportion of all federal alcohol taxes (i.e., excise taxes and GST) that are volumetric versus not.</p>	0.25	A maximum of 0.25 points were awarded based on the proportion of federal alcohol taxes collected by volumetric excise versus sales tax or flat excise tax.

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
2. Marketing and Advertising Controls	10	
2.1. Comprehensiveness of alcohol marketing and advertising restrictions for mass media	6	
<p>2.1a. Ad bans and volume restrictions Jurisdiction scored on whether there were 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.), regardless of the advertiser (i.e. government or private).</p>	2.5	Jurisdiction awarded full points on indicators 1a-1d for a complete advertising ban. If no full ban on alcohol advertising, the following scores for volume restrictions were applied to each of the following media types: +0.50 for full ban or +0.25 for volume restrictions for broadcast media (radio and television), +0.50 for full ban or +0.25 for volume restrictions for online media services (Netflix etc.), +0.50 for full ban or +0.25 for volume restrictions for internet, +0.50 for full ban or +0.25 for volume restrictions for social media.
<p>2.1b. Content restrictions Jurisdiction scored on content restrictions that go beyond the CRTC code for all media types regardless of the advertiser (i.e. government or private).</p>	1	Jurisdiction awarded the following scores for content restrictions that applied to each of the following media types: +0.25 Broadcast media (radio and television), +0.25 Online media services (e.g. Netflix etc.), +0.25 Internet, +0.25 social media.
<p>2.1c. Placement restrictions Jurisdiction scored on restrictions on the placement of advertisements within all media types (e.g. restrictions prohibiting alcohol ads in media where the target audience is under the minimum legal age), regardless of the advertiser (i.e. government or private), in order to minimize alcohol advertisement exposure of priority populations (e.g. youth, individuals in recovery).</p>	1	Jurisdiction awarded the following scores for placement restrictions that applied to each of the following media types: +0.25 Broadcast media (radio and television), +0.25 Online media services (e.g. Netflix etc.), +0.25 Internet, +0.25 Social media.

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
<p>2.1d. Price-based promotions ban Jurisdiction scored on restrictions on price-based marketing strategies/promotions, beyond policies prohibiting the advertisement of alcohol below the minimum price (e.g. policies restricting the advertisement of “cheap” drinks or specials), across all media types and regardless of the advertiser (i.e. government or private).</p>	0.5	<p>Jurisdiction awarded the following scores for price-based promotion restrictions that applied to each of the following media types: +0.125 Broadcast media (radio and television), +0.125 Online media services (e.g. Netflix etc.), +0.125 Internet, +0.125 Social media.</p>
<p>2.1e. Restrictions by advertiser type Jurisdiction scored on whether they had restrictions on alcohol advertisements by non-licensees (e.g., third parties not involved in the production, manufacturing, or sale of alcohol including food delivery services).</p>	0.5	<p>0.00 = third party permitted to advertise alcohol, 0.50 = third party not permitted to advertise alcohol.</p>
<p>2.1f. Coverage of alcohol marketing and advertising regulations across advertisers The jurisdiction was scored on whether their alcohol advertising restrictions (see 2.1 a-d) applied to all advertisers (e.g. government retailers, private retailers and licencees, FOPs, manufacturers and their agents, SOP holders).</p>	0.5	<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>2.2. Enforcement of marketing and advertising regulations</p>	3	
<p>2.2a. Mandatory pre-screening of advertising Jurisdiction was 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>	1.5	<p>+0.375 for Pre-screening for broadcast media (radio and television), +0.375 for Pre-screening for online streaming services, +0.375 for Pre-screening for internet, +0.375 for Pre-screening for social media. Note: total up to a max of 1.5 points</p>

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
<p>2.2b. Enforcement authority over alcohol advertising The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had a specific health and/or safety oriented authority, independent from industry and alcohol sales, responsible for enforcement regardless of advertiser (i.e., government or private).</p>	0.25	<p>0.00 = No independent health/safety authority responsible for enforcement, 0.125 = An independent health/safety authority responsible for enforcement, but some advertisers (e.g. government stores) are exempt, 0.25 = An independent health/safety authority, free from industry, responsible for enforcement with no exemptions. Note: total up to a max of 0.25 points</p>
<p>2.2ci. Independent online complaints system Jurisdiction was scored on whether the authority had an established an independent online system for receiving complaints geared to the lay public, independent from industry and alcohol and sales.</p>	0.25	<p>0.00 = no online formal independent complaint process, 0.25 = online formal independent complaint process.</p>
<p>2.2cii. Timelines for complaint adjudication Jurisdiction was scored on timelines for complaint adjudication Jur</p>		

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
2.3. Monitoring and public reporting of alcohol industry marketing activities	1	
2.3a. Monitoring of alcohol industry marketing activities The jurisdiction was scored on whether the authority collects information from the alcohol industry on marketing activities, including expenditures and areas of activity.	0.5	0.00 = no monitoring of alcohol industry marketing activities, 0.50 = monitoring the alcohol industry on marketing activities.
2.3b. Public reporting of alcohol industry marketing activities The jurisdiction was scored on whether, in the interest of transparency, the independent authority makes this information from the alcohol industry on marketing activities public to support evaluation and research.	0.5	0.00 = no public reporting of alcohol industry marketing activities, 0.50 = information is



CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
3.4. Evidentiary blood samples	1.5	
<p>3.4a. Evidentiary blood samples The jurisdiction was scored on whether the police are empowered under the <i>Criminal Code</i> to demand an evidentiary blood sample in any situation in which they are authorized to demand an evidentiary breath sample.</p>	1.5	<p>0.00 = The <i>Criminal Code</i> does not empower police to demand evidentiary blood samples in any situation in which they are authorized to demand an evidentiary breath sample, 0.50 = The <i>Criminal Code</i> empowers policy to demand evidentiary blood samples in some situations in which they are authorized to demand an evidentiary breath sample. 1.50 = The <i>Criminal Code</i> empowers policy to demand evidentiary blood samples in any situation in which they are authorized to demand an evidentiary breath sample.</p>
3.5. Tracking of impaired driving statistics	1	
<p>3.5a. Tracking of impaired driving statistics The jurisdiction was scored on whether it had a system for the timely, accurate, and comprehensive collection and publishing of alcohol-related transportation deaths and injuries in Canada (including data from all P/Ts).</p>	1	<p>0.00 = No tracking of impaired driving statistics or tracked data are more than four years old, 0.50 = Tracked data do not cover all P/Ts, are not publicly reported or are more than three years old, 1.00 = Comprehensive data are tracked, publicly reported and are less than three years old.</p>
4. Health & Safety Messaging	10	
4.1. Status of enhanced alcohol labelling components	3.50	
<p>4. 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.</p>	0.30	<p>0.00 = no legislation for enhanced alcohol labeling components, 0.30= legislation for enhanced alcohol labeling components.</p>

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
<p>4.1aii. Status of alcohol warning labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) evidence-based alcohol warning labels, developed independently from the alcohol industry, across a range of topics as a requirement of manufacturer labelling.</p>	0.95	<p>+0.20 warning on alcohol use and cancer risk, +0.15 warning on alcohol use and health risks, +0.15 warning on alcohol use by youth and young adults (e.g. MLA laws and health impacts), +0.15 alcohol use and violence, +0.15 warning on alcohol use and impaired driving, +0.15 warning on alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks (e.g.FASD/FAS).</p>
<p>4.1aiii. Status of standard drink labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) standard drink information on labels as a requirement of manufacturer labelling.</p>	0.95	<p>0.00 = no standard drink information on alcohol containers, 0.95 = legislated standard drink information on alcohol containers.</p>
<p>4.1aiv. Status of national alcohol guidance labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) national alcohol guidance information on labels as a requirement of manufacturer labelling.</p>	0.95	<p>0.00 = no guidance information on alcohol containers, 0.95 = guidance information on alcohol containers.</p>
<p>4.1av. Status of calorie labels The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had mandatory (i.e. legislated) calorie information on labels as a requirement of manufacturer labelling.</p>	0.35	<p>0.00 = no calorie information on alcohol containers, 0.35 = calorie information on alcohol containers.</p>
<p>4.2. Quality of enhanced alcohol labelling components 3.5</p>		
<p>4.2a. Adequacy of label messages The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had at least one enhanced alcohol labeling component that contained an adequate message that would support consumers in making an informed health decision regarding use of the product.</p>	1.25	<p>0.00 = label messaging is inadequate in supporting individuals to make an informed choice,</p>

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
--------------------------------	-------------	-------------------

4.2b. Rotation of warning messages

The jurisdiction was scored on



CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
<p>4.3a.ii. Comprehensiveness of the Health Canada health and safety campaign Jurisdiction was scored on the variation in health and safety topics included in the health and safety campaign.</p>	0.6	+0.15 warning on alcohol use and cancer risk, +0.09 warning on alcohol use and health risks, +0.09 warning on alcohol use by youth and young adults (e.g. MLA laws and health impacts), +0.09 warning on alcohol use and violence, +0.09 warning on alcohol use and impaired driving, +0.09 warning on alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks (e.g. FASD/FAS).
<p>4.3b. Health Canada alcohol-specific website content The jurisdiction was scored on whether the primary Health Canada website (e.g., Canada.ca) including a range of evidence-based information related to risks of alcohol use</p>	1	+ 0.195 alcohol use and cancer risk, + 0.115 alcohol use and health risks, + 0.115 alcohol use among youth and young adults (MLA laws and health impacts), +0.115 alcohol use and violence, + 0.115 alcohol use and impaired driving, + 0.115 alcohol use and pregnancy-related risks (FASD/FAS). +0.115 treatment resources +0.115 national alcohol guidance
<p>5. Physical Availability</p>	10	
<p>5.1. Government controls on commercial alcohol imports</p>	7	
<p>5.1a. Controls on commercial imports Jurisdiction was scored on whether commercial alcohol products from outside Canada are required by law to be imported by a government authority.</p>	7	0.00 = no legislation requiring all commercially imported alcohol be imported exclusively via government authority, 3.50 = commercial alcohol must be imported via government authority as inscribed in legislation but with exceptions, 7.00 = all commercial alcohol must be imported exclusively via government authority as inscribed in legislation.

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
5.2 Government controls on personal alcohol imports	3	
5.2a. Controls on personal imports		
The jurisdiction was scored on whether they set maximum duty exempt personal alcohol import volumes for absences greater than 48 hours that effectively discourage cross border shopping (E.g. no duty free alcohol for absence less than 48 hours and a maximum of 1.14L of spirits, 1.5L wine and 8.5L beer for absences exceeding 48 hours)	3	0.00 = No restrictions on duty free personal alcohol import volumes or import volumes set to a level that could encourage cross-border shopping, 3.00 = Duty free personal import volumes are set to effectively discourage cross-border shopping.
6. Alcohol Control System	10	
6.1. Federal Alcohol Act	1	
6.1a. Intent/mandate of the Federal Alcohol Act		
Jurisdiction was scored on whether the intent of Federal Alcohol Act includes explicit mandate/intent related to protection of public health.	1	0.00 = no stated public health mandate in Alcohol Act, 1.00 = stated public health mandate in Alcohol Act.
6.2. Comprehensiveness of Federal Alcohol Act	3.5	
6.2a1-a10. Components of Federal Alcohol Act		
The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had an Alcohol Act that included evidenced based policy areas:		
a1. pricing and taxation		
a2. marketing and advertising controls		
a3. impaired driving countermeasures		
a4. health and safety messaging		
a4. physical availability		
a6. alcohol control system		
a7. minimum legal age		
a8. national alcohol strategy		
a9. screening and treatment interventions		
a10. monitoring and reporting	3.5	Federal Alcohol Act that includes the following policy areas: +0.77 for Pricing and taxation, +0.51 for Marketing and advertising controls, +0.35 for Impaired driving countermeasures, +0.34 for Health and safety messaging, +0.32 for Physical availability, +0.31 for Control system, +0.27 for Minimum legal age, +0.23 for National alcohol strategy, +0.22 for Screening and treatment interventions, +0.19 for Monitoring and reporting.

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
--------------------------------	-------------	-------------------

6.3. Federal government control over alcohol	3.5	
--	-----	--

6.3a. Preserving P/T government alcohol monopolies (e.g. financial incentives or tax breaks)



CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
6.4c. Transparency of lobbying by alcohol industry Jurisdiction was scored on whether they had a legislated centralized online public reporting system for industry lobbying activities at the federal level that is geared to the lay public.	0.4	0.00 = no centralized, user-friendly public reporting of industry lobbying, 0.40 = industry lobbying activities are accessible and transparently reported in centralized online platform.
7. Minimum Legal Age (MLA)	10	



CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
8. National Alcohol Strategy	10	
8.1 Status of the national alcohol strategy	3	
8.1a. Status of national alcohol strategy The jurisdiction was scored on whether they had an alcohol focused public facing strategy or action plan that addresses alcohol as a public health issue. The jurisdiction was scored against an ideal of a standalone national alcohol strategy/action plan that was developed independently from the alcohol industry.	3	0.00 = No national strategy that includes alcohol or the strategy was drafted by/with industry, 1.50 = A national addictions, mental health, public health or other strategy that includes alcohol that was not drafted by/with industry, 3.00 = A standalone national alcohol strategy or action plan that was not drafted by/with industry.
8.2. Comprehensiveness of the alcohol strategy	4	
8.2a1-a10. Components of alcohol strategy The jurisdiction was scored on whether the above-mentioned strategy included a wide range of evidence-based alcohol policy interventions and recommendations (i.e., CAPE P/T policy domains) 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 recommendations, + 0.18 for monitoring and reporting recommendations. Note: Scores reflect the CAPE P/T domain weights; total points up to a max of 4
8.3. Implementation of national alcohol strategy	3	
8.3a. Federal strategy funding The jurisdiction was scored on whether there are dedicated federal funds to develop a fully funded national alcohol strategy.	0.75	0.00 = No national alcohol strategy, funding from industry, or strategy is not funded, 0.375 = Partial federal funding or funding is part of a larger addictions, mental health, or other strategy funding portfolio (e.g. no project/activity funding), 0.75 = Strategy is fully federally funded.

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)



CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
--------------------------------	-------------	-------------------

9.5. Federal treatment initiatives	1.4	
---	-----	--

9.5ai. Treatment services for corrections populations
 The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide treatment services within populations under federal administration, such as corrections populations (beyond 12-step peer-to-peer model).

0.7
 0.00 = no treatment services,



CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
10.1aiv. Crime indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that tracks alcohol-related crime indicators.	0.5	0.00 = no funding for reporting activities, 0.25 = partially funded, 0.50 = comprehensively funded.
10.1av. Cost indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that tracks alcohol-related cost indicators.	0.5	0.00 = no funding for reporting activities, 0.25 = partially funded, 0.50 = comprehensively funded.
10.1avi. Policy change indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide federal funding for a national alcohol monitoring program that tracks policy change indicators and the health impacts of these changes.	0.5	0.00 = no funding for reporting activities, 0.25 = partially funded, 0.50 = comprehensively funded.
Bonus: comprehensiveness synergy	1	Synergy points: An additional 1.0 points for a comprehensive monitoring program that captures all 6 alcohol indicators. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the number of indicators that they fund.
10.2. Accessibility of reporting	3	
10.2ai. Transparency of reporting - alcohol consumption indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.
10.2aaii. Transparency of reporting - morbidity indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.
10.2aiii. Transparency of reporting - mortality indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.
10.2aiv. Transparency of reporting - crime indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
10.2av. Transparency of reporting - cost indicators Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.
10.2avi. Transparency of reporting - policy change Jurisdictions were scored based on the degree to which the results were made public	0.25	0.00 = no reporting, 0.25 = public reporting.
Bonus: comprehensiveness synergy	0.5	An additional 0.50 points awarded for a comprehensive monitoring program that captures all 6 alcohol indicators. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the number of indicators that they publicly report.
10.2bi. Frequency of reporting - alcohol consumption indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol consumption by sales and survey data.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.
10.2bii. Frequency of reporting - morbidity indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol-related morbidity indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.
10.2biii. Frequency of reporting - mortality indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol-related mortality indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.
10.2biv. Frequency of reporting - crime indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol-related crime indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.
10.2bv. Frequency of reporting - cost indicators The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on alcohol-related cost indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.
10.2bvi. Frequency of reporting - policy change The jurisdiction was scored on whether they provide reporting at regular intervals on policy change indicators.	0.125	0.00 = no reporting or reporting every 5 years+, 0.10 = reporting every 2-4 years, 0.125 = reported annually.

CAPE 3.0 Policy Scoring Rubric (Federal)

INDICATOR/SUBINDICATOR DETAILS	POINT VALUE	SCORING BREAKDOWN
Bonus: comprehensiveness synergy	0.25	An additional 0.25 points awarded for a comprehensive monitoring program that captures all 6 alcohol indicators. The synergy score was in direct proportion to the number of indicators that they report on annually.
10.3. Leadership for Alcohol Monitoring and Reporting	3	
10.3ai. Central reporting The Jurisdiction was scored on whether they implemented public centralized reporting 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.
10.3aii. Leadership for alcohol monitoring and reporting The Jurisdiction was scored on whether there was an identifiable leader responsible for monitoring and reporting alcohol-related harm and consumption.	1	0.00 = No organization, committee or individual leader identified, 1.00 = Readily identifiable leadership.
10.3aiii. Knowledge translation in past two years The Jurisdiction was scored on whether there have been any active KT activities on alcohol indicators.	1	0.00 = No knowledge products or activities in the past two years, 1.00 = Active knowledge translation in the past two years.