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ABSTRACT

Immunization is a public health area in which the intergovernmental challenges of formulating a national policy are evident. It is also an area in which harmonization of policy across Canada is particularly critical. The National Immunization Strategy was a F/P/T initiative designed to achieve this policy goal. The combination of national guidelines and flexible federal funding via a trust has, to date, been effective in improving equality of access to vaccines in provincial/territorial programmes with limited intergovernmental discord. The long-term success of the initiative will, however, largely depend on ongoing federal financial support and provincial/territorial views on national guidelines. This approach to immunization is a model that would lend itself well to other public health areas in which there is large variability in provincial/territorial programmes, where uniformity of programmes is particularly important and where there is a reluctance or inability of the federal government to legislatively mandate the harmonization of programmes.
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RÉSUMÉ

L’immunisation est un secteur où la formulation d’une politique de santé publique nationale pose clairement des difficultés de coordination intergouvernementale. C’est aussi un secteur où il est particulièrement critique d’harmoniser les politiques à l’échelle du Canada. La Stratégie nationale d’immunisation, une initiative fédérale-provinciale-tertoriale, visait une telle harmonisation des politiques. La combinaison de lignes directrices nationales et d’un financement fédéral souple (par l’entremise d’une fondation) a, jusqu’à maintenant, réussi à améliorer l’égalité d’accès aux vaccins dans les programmes provinciaux et territoriaux, en limitant les désaccords intergouvernementaux.

À long terme, l’efficacité de la stratégie dépendra cependant en grande partie d’une aide financière soutenue de la part du gouvernement fédéral et de l’opinion des provinces et des territoires à l’égard des lignes directrices nationales. La Stratégie nationale d’immunisation est un modèle qui pourrait être efficace dans d’autres secteurs de la santé publique, là où il existe une grande variabilité dans les programmes provinciaux et territoriaux, où l’uniformité des programmes est particulièrement importante et où il y a une réticence ou une incapacité, de la part du gouvernement fédéral, à harmoniser les programmes en légitérant.
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THE NATIONAL IMMUNIZATION STRATEGY

Since 1964, national recommendations for routine immunizations have been determined by the National Advisory Committee on Immunization (NACI). However, what vaccines were ultimately adopted depended on local provincial/territorial policy processes and their varying capacity to fund these programmes. Regional disparities in immunization policy that developed in the late 1990s opened a policy window for public health activists who had been lobbying for over 10 years to remedy the “patchwork” of provincial/territorial immunization policies across Canada.6,7 Between 1999 and 2002, the situation became acute when four new vaccines were added to the Canadian Immunization Guide, however
by 2003 only Alberta and Nunavut publicly funded at least three of the new vaccines for routine use. This heterogeneity in practice had an impact at the clinical level where physicians reported that the costs to purchase these new vaccines privately were prohibitively expensive for many of their patients and they felt uncomfortable recommending them. In 1999, motivated by growing concern about the variability in immunization programmes across the country, the F/P/T Deputy Ministers of Health endorsed developing a national immunization strategy. Core components of the strategy included setting national goals and objectives, ensuring collaboration on immunization programme planning, research, and evaluation, securing the vaccine supply and setting up a national vaccine registry. In 2003, the NIS was approved and the Canadian Immunization Committee (CIC) was established in 2004 to implement the NIS. The CIC, unlike NACI, is comprised of decision-makers from each province and territory and its recommendations represent joint decisions taken by all jurisdictions, encouraging national consensus and harmonization from the first. The NIS, therefore, provides a framework to bridge recommendations made by NACI with provincial/territorial priority setting and programme planning (Figure 1). It also provides a national forum to coordinate basic research, vaccine-preventable disease surveillance, and public and professional education, and to identify and target special-needs populations across the country.

**Funding the National Immunization Strategy**

In 2003, the federal government provided $45 million to develop the NIS infrastructure. In the 2004 federal budget, a per capita allocation of $400 million was made available to provinces and territories in the form of an ad hoc third party trust, the “Public Health and Immunization Trust” (Appendix 1). $300 million of this was earmarked for the four newly recommended vaccines. Within three years, all 13 jurisdictions had added all four new vaccines to their routine schedule, ending a period of significant inequity (Table I). In 2006, the federal government allocated an additional $300 million into the trust for 2007-10. This funding was explicitly earmarked for a new Papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine recommended for routine use by NACI in February 2007, although provinces/territories were not restricted from using the Trust to support other immunization priorities.

A trust fund is a financial vehicle used by the Government of Canada as an alternative way to provide funding to provinces and territories. Provinces/territories are permitted to withdraw their share of funds at any point in the three-year fiscal cycle according to their respective spending priorities and accounting practices. Funds provided to a trustee are irrevocable and once transferred, the provinces and territories are the beneficial owners of the funds. There is therefore no accountability mechanism to ensure that these federal funds are used to meet the aims of the NIS. The creation of the immunization Trust in 2004, however, exerted a strong political pressure to expand programmes to add the full complement of NACI-recommended vaccines to the provincial/territorial programmes. Bypassing potential constitutional obstacles that would limit the federal government’s role in regulating insured access to immunization, the Trust has directly financed the goals of the NIS.

**Evaluating the immunization governance strategy**

The strategy utilized by the federal government to ensure equity in access to vaccines...
The implementation of the NIS ties the continuation of national standards to essentially unconditional federal funding. In doing so, it strikes a balance between intergovernmental collaboration and federal leadership. Relying solely on national guidelines leaves provincial/territorial programmes without federal funding yet publicly accountable, and exposes those that do not conform to national standards to legal liability. Utilization of a Trust mitigates this to an extent by providing funds to provinces, with some flexibility as to how they can utilize these funds. While there is no mechanism for Ottawa to govern how the funds will be spent, the provinces/territories are aware that the public can hold them accountable if national standards are not met. While this approach imposes a certain degree of national direction or coercion (using federal spending power to bring provinces and territories in line with national standards), the major policy alternative – a legislative strategy – is unlikely to be politically wise or successful due to constitutional ambiguities over jurisdiction.

While the Trust has had an important contribution to unifying access to NACI-recommended immunizations, it is unclear whether or not the NIS will prevent heterogeneity in uptake as new vaccines are introduced. Because the Trust fund is time limited, provinces/territories are vulnerable to unilateral federal discontinuation of the programme. In particular, it would be politically difficult for a province to remove a programme targeted at protecting the health of children after it has been initiated, even if continued federal funds needed to sustain the programme are removed. A salient example of this is the recent Trust allocation that is tied to an additional expansion of the programmes to include routine HPV immunization. It is unclear how directives like this will continue to accelerate the uptake of new vaccines. In the case of HPV vaccine, it appears to have been successful as many provinces have introduced HPV vaccine programmes, however the federal government’s budget recommendations were made before the CIC made its final recommendations for national guidelines. In future, provinces and territories will have to anticipate taking over the costs of immunization programme expansions in a relatively short period of time, creating a scenario analogous to the problems with reduced federal transfers for hospital and medical care.

Another potential drawback of this approach is that the lure of federal spending may distort long-term provincial/territorial priority setting. By committing future dollars into meeting national guidelines, provinces/territories may not be able to focus on what they perceive are, while perhaps lower profile, equally if not more important priorities for immunization.

While the NIS has been successful in reducing disparity in access to vaccines, less progress has been made in the other elements of the strategy. In particular, frustration has been expressed about the delays in the development of an immunization registry. Multiple explanations exist for the disparity in success of the various elements of the programme, however, it is important to recognize that recommendations for the uptake of vaccines are currently the only component of the NIS accompanied by national guidelines.

**CONCLUSION**

Despite not having met all of its objectives, the NIS has to be viewed at this point as a successful federally-funded initiative. It rapidly resolved the issue of equal access to new vaccines across the country with minimal intergovernmental discord. The strategy of combining national guidelines with flexible start-up funding could be a model for intergovernmental cooperation in other public health areas. The trust fund mechanism would be particularly effective in areas in which the start-up costs of developing a programme are a major obstacle, for example health surveillance.

The long-term success of the NIS will ultimately depend on multiple factors including provincial/territorial perspectives on NACI recommendations and its alignment with CIC recommendations, and the effectiveness of the CIC itself. Most importantly, the NIS is dependent on the availability of ongoing federal funds, and the provinces/territories’ ability to maintain programmes in the absence of ongoing federal funding. Given both the importance of immunization as a public health intervention and the particular need to
develop coordination of policies in this area, it is in the best interests of all orders of government to ensure the long-term viability of the NIS.
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L’ACSP entend conserver sa réputation d’excellence en matière de politiques, de programmes et de défense des droits en santé publique. Par divers moyens, notamment dans la Revue canadienne de santé publique, elle rendra compte auprès des intervenants de la santé publique du pays des résultats de ses efforts de revendication.

La chef de direction,
Debra Lynkowski
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public health infrastructure and called for the establishment of a funding mechanism dedicated to supporting the implementation of a social determinants of health approach to reducing health inequity in Canada.

And finally, at the Closing Session of CPHA’s Annual Conference, CPHA issued a Call to Action, informed by the public health community and proceedings of the Conference, emphasizing the need to move forward on specific actions to address health inequity in Canada. The Call, posted on our website, outlines some of our specific commitments as an organization. One of CPHA’s first commitments is to promote the much-anticipated report of the WHO Commission on the Social Determinants of Health. By the time this Journal goes to press, I am hopeful that the Report and CPHA’s response will have already been widely publicized. The ongoing challenge will be to sustain the momentum for a ‘social movement’ to eliminate health inequity in Canada.

CPHA will continue its history of excellence in public health advocacy. Stay tuned to the Association’s website for new postings on policy and advocacy development.
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