

**Gaps and Overlaps in Level 1 and 2 Capabilities
Breakout Session
July 22, 2009**

Summary of Key Points

Note: Comments from participants indicated that in terms of duplicate reporting, information gaps, and streamlining, the differences between level 1 and level 2 capabilities were not significant. Therefore, participant comments for both levels are combined in the following text. See the feedback table for detailed comments broken out by capability levels.

Question 1: Considering the capabilities, is there information that your organization reports to the HPP that is also reported elsewhere?

Data reported to HPP are also reported to numerous other entities, most notably as follows:

- Federal: CDC's Public Health Emergency Preparedness (PHEP) program, DHS first responder programs, and FEMA's Metropolitan Medical Response System (MMRS)
- Regional: Regional catastrophic planning teams (RCPTs)
- State: State health departments and homeland security departments
- Local: CDC grantees and local emergency management and public health agencies

In general, HPP data reporting overlaps with Joint Commission data reporting.

Question 2: Considering the capabilities, are there gaps in HPP capabilities (information that should be included but is not)?

Specific gaps were identified, but the persistent themes were the failure to collect data that are relevant to operations; the failure to link local, State, and Federal data and reporting requirements; and the lack of clarity/definitions/guidance to facilitate reporting. More data are needed on how HPP-funded systems were used during actual events. Participants felt strongly that data should be useful for demonstrating preparedness and the ability to respond to emergencies.

Question 3: How could we streamline to make information (data) collection and dissemination better?

Measures should be better defined, and benchmarks and performance targets should be provided. The funding opportunity application should describe what data will be requested from awardees, and the reporting templates and guidance should go out to awardees earlier. There was strong support for use of a web-based platform and simpler templates. Guidance should describe how the information will be used (in what context and to answer what specific question[s]), and the data collected should be relevant to assessing actual response capabilities. Data definitions should be standardized. Federal agencies should collaborate to develop common templates, standard performance measures, and integrated reporting requirements and should consider either a central repository for data collection or interoperable databases. Working groups that include grantees should be

*2009 National Healthcare Preparedness Evaluation and Improvement Conference:
Breakout Session 2*

formed to streamline reporting and refine data definitions. Once-a-year reporting should be considered. Best practices and other results/feedback should be shared, and reporting systems should allow organizations to compare data from year-to-year.

Question 3a: Who are the key players who would be involved in streamlining information sharing?

Numerous Federal agencies involved in preparedness and response were cited, but the foremost players identified were as follows:

- Funding agencies
- State and local public health departments
- State HPPs
- ASPR
- ASTHO program directors
- Awardees and sub-awardees
- Hospitals and hospital associations
- Regional coordinators
- Emergency management representatives
- DHS

Question 3b: What resources or systems would be involved in streamlining information?

Streamlining should involve a web-based, user-friendly, centralized system that can generate reports for local and State use. Other technology should be used, such as webinars, email, websites, etc. Existing State systems and mid-year and year-end reports to ASPR should be involved.

Other Important Points

Participants felt strongly that Federal agencies should critically evaluate what data are needed to answer questions about how programs are meeting their goals and fulfilling their purposes. They called for eliminating duplicate reporting and suggested numerous mechanisms for streamlining—most of which involve cooperation and collaboration among Federal agencies and with entities at all levels. Participants repeatedly stressed their desire for feedback; information should be shared more widely and more frequently. They asked for an after-action report from this conference that includes information on how their input will be used and the overall rankings of issues identified.