

Roadmap to Develop Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing Initiatives

One product of the Center's work is the *Roadmap to Develop Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing Initiatives*. The *Roadmap* describes three distinct phases of CJS initiatives, as depicted below. Each phase is further broken down into areas to explore, which contain specific questions to be answered by stakeholders in the initiative. The progression of phases should take place in the order presented. If it becomes apparent during the process that some key areas or issues from an earlier phase were overlooked, it is important to go back to that phase and resolve them before moving forward. The detailed *Roadmap*, including the areas to explore and questions to answer, can be found at PHSharing.org/roadmap.

PHASE ONE

EXPLORE

Is CJS a feasible approach to address the issue you are facing?
Who should be involved?

PHASE TWO

PREPARE AND PLAN

How exactly would it work?

PHASE THREE

IMPLEMENT AND IMPROVE

Let's do it!



A National Resource on Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing in Public Health

Visit us online at PHSharing.org



**Center for Sharing
Public Health Services**

Rethinking Boundaries for Better Health

Cross-jurisdictional sharing (CJS) is the **deliberate exercise** of public authority to **enable collaboration across jurisdictional boundaries** to deliver essential public health services and solve problems that cannot be easily solved by single organizations or jurisdictions.

Since 2012, the Center for Sharing Public Health Services has served as a national resource on cross-jurisdictional sharing, building the evidence and producing and disseminating tools, methods and models to assist public health agencies and policymakers as they consider and adopt CJS approaches.

The Center for Sharing Public Health Services is a national initiative managed by the Kansas Health Institute with support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Types of CJS Arrangements

The *Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing Spectrum* identifies four main categories of sharing arrangements, as depicted in the chart.

On the left side of the *Spectrum* there are informal arrangements, where one jurisdiction collaborates with other jurisdictions. On the right side of the *Spectrum* is formal regionalization, where multiple jurisdictions are served by a single governmental entity that delivers all services and formally assumes the risks, costs and decision-making across the jurisdictions involved.

In between there are two other *Spectrum* categories: service-related arrangements and shared functions with joint oversight. Unlike informal sharing, service-related arrangements involve regular and predictable sharing, usually formalized through contracts. If all entities contribute resources and have a formal role in decisions about how and when to deliver services, then the arrangement is a shared function with joint oversight.

The governance model, financial structure and decision-making process are different for each *Spectrum* category. Moving from left to right along the *Spectrum*, the level of service integration increases, the level of jurisdictional autonomy decreases, and the arrangements become more complex. Each model can produce gains in effectiveness and efficiency, if implemented correctly following the steps indicated in the *Roadmap to Develop Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing Initiatives*.

Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing Spectrum			
Informal and Customary Arrangements	Service-Related Arrangements	Shared Functions with Joint Oversight	Regionalization
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Handshake” • Information sharing • Equipment sharing • Coordination • Assistance for surge capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service provision agreements (e.g., contract to provide immunization services) • Purchase of staff time (e.g., environmental health specialist) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint projects addressing all jurisdictions involved (e.g., shared HIV program) • Shared capacity (e.g., joint epidemiology services) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New entity formed by merging existing local public health agencies • Consolidation of one or more local public health agencies into an existing local public health agency
Looser Integration		Tighter Integration	

Source: Center for Sharing Public Health Services. Adapted from: Kaufman, N. (2010) which in turn was adapted from Ruggini, J. (2006); Holdsworth, A. (2006).