



Information Management for More Effective Military Humanitarian Assistance Projects & Programs



Measures of Effectiveness

CDHAM Publication 02-06

#MDA 905-99-M-0726



Information Management for More Effective Military Humanitarian Assistance Projects & Programs



Measures of Effectiveness

CDHAM Publication 02-06

#MDA 905-99-M-0726

CDHAM Publication 02-06

Sponsor: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense
Stability Operations

MDA 905-99-M-0726

This program is in collaboration with the Henry M. Jackson Foundation
for the Advancement of Military Medicine.

Jeffrey E. Drifmeyer, PhD, MPH
LTC (Ret) MS USA

and

Craig H. Llewellyn, MD, MPH
COL (Ret) MC USA

A world center advancing medicine in humanitarian and disaster relief

The mission of the Center for Disaster and Humanitarian Assistance Medicine (CDHAM) is exactly what its name implies—to be the focal point for *medical* aspects of disaster relief and humanitarian assistance. Other centers—namely United States Pacific Command’s Center of Excellence in Disaster Management & Humanitarian Assistance, based in Hawaii, and the Center for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance, based at both Tulane University and the University of South Florida in support of United States Southern Command—operate within the realm of humanitarian relief. However, they are focused on the broader issue of disaster management. By specializing in medicine and health-related topics worldwide, CDHAM compliments the work of these centers, as well as many other organizations that are improving the provision of relief and international health care.

The origin of CDHAM (pronounced “SID-am”) predates the current emphasis on military medical support of operations other than war by more than a decade. The CDHAM is organized within the Department of Military and Emergency Medicine at the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences (USUHS). The Department Chair, along with the Dean, the President, and key faculty at the University, recognized early on the evolving role of military forces in shaping an uncertain world. CDHAM was formally established at USUHS by the Defense Appropriations Act of 1999 as the Department of Defense’s focal point for medicine in the non-traditional military operations and missions that have become more common in the new millennium.

The role of CDHAM extends beyond simply conducting studies. Our goal is to analyze, develop conclusions, determine lessons learned, and translate these into learning opportunities and improvement. Publications, lectures, symposia, and other media developed as a result of this work will become tools for educating graduate and medical students at USUHS, as well as advancing the broad spectrum of military medicine. CDHAM uses training, technology, and best management practices to improve military medicine capabilities and readiness for humanitarian missions, especially in partnership with the inter-Agency process, the international medical community, and the host nations’ medical infrastructure and beneficiary populations.

Comments and questions are invited.

Center for Disaster and Humanitarian Assistance Medicine (CDHAM)
Dept. of Military & Emergency Medicine (MEM, Room C-1080)
Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences
4301 Jones Bridge Rd.
Bethesda, Maryland 20814-4799 USA

COL (Ret) Craig Llewellyn, M.D., MPH,
Director

Contents

- Introduction 1
- The Need for an Information Management System 3
- Methods of Information Collection 5
- Summary 7
- References 8
- APPENDIX A: TEPMIS Activities for EUCOM 10
- APPENDIX B: A Description of the Center for Disaster and Humanitarian Assistance Medicine (CDHAM) proposed Web-Based Humanitarian Assistance After Action Reporting (AAR) System 15

Introduction

The United States Department of Defense (DoD) conducts a wide variety of overseas operations, many of which are humanitarian in nature. For example, in the Overseas Humanitarian Disaster and Civic Aid (OHDACA) program for fiscal year 2001, DoD approved 237 specific humanitarian projects in over 100 different countries under the humanitarian assistance (HA), humanitarian civic assistance (HCA), and excess property (EP) programs (see the CDHAM report, *Overview of Overseas Humanitarian Assistance, Humanitarian Civic Assistance, and Excess Property Programs*). These HA, HCA and EP projects totaled more than \$27 million in budget expenditures, not including the cost of military manpower. Despite this expense and the deployment of hundreds of DoD personnel worldwide, there is comparatively little information available on the outcome of these projects: Thus, the need for information collection and management.

Evaluation of humanitarian projects, whether medical, engineering, or others is dependent on the collection and analysis of specific information. Much of what is needed is straightforward, but is beyond the scope of current reporting requirements. Because reporting requirements are lacking, the information that is being recorded is not consistently at the level of detail necessary for adequate analysis. In order to meet management requirements, information, ranging from project budgets to the results of specific actions, is required. For example, measuring the effectiveness of medical interventions requires monitoring changes in health status among beneficiaries. At present, there is neither a standardized nor ready means by which such information is collected. At present, when information is collected, there's no guarantee that it will be archived or analyzed. In some commands, after action reports (AARs) on humanitarian projects are received, but may not be actively reviewed. When these AARs can be accessed, they often document workload, or measures of process but not measures of effectiveness. For example, the number of patients seen, or tons of medical supplies donated are often recorded but without comment on the outcome—whether the supplies were actually utilized or the patients healed.

The shortfall of information management in these kinds of DoD humanitarian assistance projects is largely due to the lack of formal reporting requirements. Other than fiscal accountability, under current OHDACA program guidance we were not able to identify directives, guidance or other documents describing what information should be collected or how it should be reported, with the single exception of DoD Instruction 2205.3, which addresses HCA projects. This is important, as there are several factors inherent in the military that can lead to the loss of valuable information. These factors include the high turnover of military personnel, frequent rotation of deployed units performing humanitarian assistance missions, military members who are assigned to the humanitarian assistance projects as augmentees outside their normal units (as commonly occurs), and military members who are assigned to humanitarian assistance staff positions without the benefit of prior training or experience (see the CDHAM report *US Participants Perspectives on Military Medical Humanitarian Assistance*.)

Although innovative information management techniques are utilized in some commands, such as the Theater Engagement Plan Management Information System, (TEPMIS, see Appendix A), we were unable to identify, at present, a systematic approach within the DoD where information from previous humanitarian projects is used to plan or otherwise influence current or future humanitarian projects. Where novel approaches have been developed and proven successful, or where important lessons are learned, such information is often lost to the broader military and civilian humanitarian assistance communities. Information shortfalls occur even in cases where humanitarian assistance has been provided year after year in the same country within a single program. For example, some 23 HCA projects were conducted in Honduras in a single year, (Blanchette, personal communication), many as part of long-term medical humanitarian assistance program of Joint Task Force Bravo (JTF-B). Despite the program's existence for nearly two decades, we did not find discussions of the effectiveness of such projects. Similarly, dozens of medical humanitarian assistance projects have been conducted throughout Africa in a program known as "MEDFLAG" but after action reports on these projects do not discuss effectiveness. In many cases, when information that could be incorporated into evaluating past projects or planning future ones is available; it is not routinely utilized. In some of the offices tasked with managing

these programs, there appeared to be less than adequate staffs regularly assigned to conduct such analysis and to apply findings to the planning process. However, manpower and staffing issues were beyond the scope of our study.

Presently, sharing of information on humanitarian assistance projects such as HA, HCA, or EP is quite limited, often to the individual initiative of project officers. In the military medical community this often occurs through personal contacts among colleagues. Ideally, staff officers and military planners should have ready and regular access to essential elements of information for the planning and management of projects. The information management system should be a tool that helps accomplish these tasks. It should not be another reporting requirement imposed by higher headquarters. Self-defined, self-reported project 'success,' often without either measurable criteria or documentation, does not allow the promulgation of effective programs.

Without mandatory reporting requirements and absent standardized information collection such as in project AARs, there is no regular means of capturing lessons learned measuring performance or effectiveness. Project outcome information is also needed to compare results to international consensus standards for minimum performance in humanitarian assistance such as the Sphere standards (<http://www.SPHEREproject.org>) Otherwise, participants themselves may be the only testament to the success of a project, without the benefit of an objective, evidentiary basis. While participants' comments, such as "*We touched their lives,*" reflect the genuine altruism with which DoD personnel approach humanitarian assistance, they hardly provide a sound basis for management decisions regarding project approvals, funding priorities, or effectiveness (see the CDHAM report *US Participants Perspectives on Military Medical Humanitarian Assistance*).

In sum, despite ample historic precedent, and an extensive and growing involvement of DoD assets, particularly medical units and personnel, the record on HA, HCA, and EP project outcomes is not complete. In this regard, DoD is not unlike the myriad private volunteer, non-governmental, and international organizations that also provide humanitarian assistance worldwide. Many of these organizations are also focused on how to best collect key project management information, often under austere and/or crisis conditions and how to translate this information, often under severe time constraints, into good management decisions that result in more effective humanitarian assistance. (see *Humanitarian Action: Learning from Evaluation, ALNAP Annual Review Series 2001*). The effectiveness of humanitarian assistance projects, medical and otherwise, under the HA, HCA, and EP programs depends, in part, on information collection, analysis, and management. Diverse kinds of information, from cost and budget data, to patient outcomes, or other indices of performance must be collected and is essential to more effective humanitarian assistance projects and programs. A prototype information management system to implement such improvements in the HA, HCA, and EP programs is included in this report (Appendix B).

The Need for a System

Ideally, a standardized information management system would benefit humanitarian assistance efforts through all project stages, from initial planning, through execution, to final report writing. Another important benefit of a standardized information management system would be the formulation of humanitarian projects in a more consistent manner over time and between commands. While allowing for innovation as well as geographic differences this would aid in the overall implementation of DoD and subordinate command policies, programs, objectives, and measures of effectiveness. Specific performance indicators and outcome measures could be clearly defined at the outset of projects and consistently reported through execution. These benefits would extend across all commands, types of humanitarian projects, and countries. While there are several excellent examples of guides, or “how to” directories from both military and civilian organizations (McClusky, 1999; Gruppo, 1999, Norton, 1999, Littrell, 2000), these remain within the limited scope of particular commands or organizations in which they were developed. There is an important opportunity to adapt and improve upon what has already been developed, and promulgate guidance for much wider applications, such as DoD-wide.

The first step in establishing an information management system is simply to require that information be collected and reported. By having the wide variety of DoD personnel and units that execute humanitarian assistance follow a consistent information collection and management plan, comparable data will be consistently collected, over time and space. This will aid in documenting progress towards defined objectives, maintain records that can be cross-referenced, and allow comparisons for funding priorities, analyses, and management decisions.

In addition to recording or documenting key data on humanitarian assistance projects, the information that is collected should also be readily available to authorized users. These might include DoD organizations, commands and leaders. To the extent practicable for security and sensitivity considerations, it should be shared with host nation health and political authorities as well. Where applicable, some information should also be shared, (subject to the same security constraints) with other providers of humanitarian assistance as DoD personnel often find themselves working side-by-side with civilian providers from a variety of organizations in international humanitarian assistance operations.

Ideally, both military and civilian providers of humanitarian assistance would share information on various aspects of humanitarian assistance, as is often done during operational humanitarian deployments in the process known as Civil-Military Operations Center (CMOC) (Anon, 1994, Siegel, 1995, Sharp et.al. 1994, Burkle et.al. 1995, Davis et.al. 1996, PAHO, 1996, Seiple, 1996.) This is essential for effective projects and programs as humanitarian assistance at a given location or point in time will impact subsequent or nearby efforts. For example, both the civilian and military humanitarian relief sectors cite multiple reports where an immunization program was planned (or conducted) for a village, only to later learn that immunization rates among the populace were more than adequate due to similar efforts in the past. While issues of military security and proprietary data complicate information sharing, implementation of an information management plan for humanitarian assistance projects should not be delayed by the decision of what information can be shared with others, and when such sharing is appropriate. The effectiveness of humanitarian assistance will benefit from including, rather than excluding, information from all providers of humanitarian assistance.

Despite challenges such as information security, DoD should assume a leadership role in furthering information management in humanitarian assistance operations. The experiential base of military personnel in humanitarian missions is considerable and extremely valuable. DoD also has state of the art communications and information management technologies, hardware and software, the organizational structure, trained personnel, and experience to routinely collect and analyze information. Obviously, this is already being accomplished in other subject areas. Expanding existing DoD information collection and management capabilities into the area of humanitarian assistance will improve the effectiveness of projects in this area, and may surface information applicable to other national interests

Considerable DoD assets and expertise is regularly applied to humanitarian assistance projects and programs worldwide. Clearly, such investments of time, talent, and other resources warrant sound and comprehensive information on which to base decisions. This is already well appreciated by many DoD elements, of course. For example, in the humanitarian assistance area The U.S. European Command's Theater Engagement Planning Information Management System (TEPMIS) is noteworthy. Broader applications of such comprehensive information management approaches are recommended. The common information needs in humanitarian assistance, in organizations as diverse as military and civilian, presents important leadership opportunities in the development of prototype information management systems. As the number of organizations participating in a project or country increases, the quantity and quality of humanitarian information will continue to grow, with benefits to all participants and recipients.

Methods of Information Collection

Data collection and analysis need not necessarily be dependent on electronic hardware or software. Given the contingency nature of many operations, with attendant security, force protection, and other considerations, the use of a simple and standardized hard copy data form is certainly acceptable. This approach has proven very successful and has been refined in multiple disaster response humanitarian relief efforts by civilian and military units alike (Oxfam, undated, Littrell, 2000, ALNAP 2001). Whether data is recorded on clipboards or laptops is far less important than ensuring that essential information is collected (Boss et.al. 1994). Although an electronic format may be the ideal, (Selanikio et.al., in press) deploying personnel should not forgo collecting information, manually if need be. Data collection should not overlook information already collected or potentially available from local or regional sources such as networked public health laboratories (Drifmeyer et.al., 1999). While standardization of data collection facilitates interoperability, different commands will likely adopt different approaches. The unique requirements of different commands or missions can be accommodated by an information management system, as long as essential elements of information are regularly and routinely collected.

We reviewed several examples of data collection instruments used during humanitarian contingency operations by organizations ranging from the U.S. Army civil affairs experts from Fort Bragg (Gruppo, 1995, Littrell, 2000, to other U.S. government agencies (U.S. AID) to the British non-governmental international relief organization, Oxfam (McCluskey, 1999; Oxfam, undated). In these cases forms and procedures had been repeatedly field tested in humanitarian operations and refined with successive applications. They were far from abstract or hypothetical studies, but in fact, pragmatic tools, honed and proven in the field in a wide range of disaster response and humanitarian assistance scenarios. Our comparison of these instruments showed that the key information needed to manage effective humanitarian assistance is remarkably consistent. Regardless of who collects the information, military or civilian, or how it is gathered, clip boards or palm pilots, the information requirements are similar. Data should be gathered as consistently and accurately as possible, reported and evaluated, and used to support evidence-based planning, actions, and evaluations.

Our analysis of different data collection instruments and approaches suggests that it is perhaps impossible to design a survey form that is universally applicable to every possible humanitarian assistance or disaster response scenario. Nevertheless, one can focus, particularly in a non-emergency situation in which the vast majority of HA, HCA, and EP projects are conducted, on eight elements of information as listed below. All elements are required to document the outcome of a humanitarian assistance project. Simple and straightforward, these represent the minimum information that should be collected and reported for every humanitarian assistance project. They do not preclude the collection of additional information based on unique requirements of a scenario or command, but the minimum should always be collected and reported:

- 1 Country, including specific locale.
- 2 Type of project.
- 3 Funding information.
- 4 Points of contact and project personnel (names, addresses, phone numbers, e-mails).
- 5 Brief mission statement or purpose.
- 6 Planning criteria, goals, or objectives.
- 7 Desired end state.
- 8 Measures of effectiveness, performance, or results, compared over time, pre and post project and compared to international performance standards.

In simplest terms, these essential elements of information equate to the *who, what, when, where, how, why*, and most importantly, “*so what?*” of an operation. Despite the importance of such information, our review of over 100 AARs from recent DoD humanitarian projects failed to identify even a single report that included all of these elements of information (see the CDHAM report titled *Humanitarian and Civic Assistance Projects and Military Training*).

A suggestion for effectively implementing information reporting would be make this a requirement for project approval and funding. For example, a proposed project might be approved after definition of the mission, purpose and goals. This project might then be funded based on command review and approval of project objectives, measures of effectiveness and desired end-state. During project execution a careful record should be kept of all the significant details. When the project is completed, the information recently stored, supports the ready completion of an after action report to document the extent to which the project was effective according to comparison of pre and post-project conditions. It can also compare accomplishments to internationally recognized performance standards for humanitarian assistance, such as the SPHERE¹ standards (<http://www.Sphereproject.org>).

Information management is so critical to the effectiveness of humanitarian assistance that we undertook the initial development of a prototype information management system for humanitarian assistance projects. (see Appendix B). This prototype system provides, a format for AARs that is consistent with both military correspondence and program requirements. The proposed system documents project details, and supports the planning process for future projects or contingency missions. It also prompts the treasuring and evaluating of project and program effectiveness. By working through measurable goals and objectives during project planning, the stage can be set for applying the logical framework approach² (see Appendix A), the SPHERE international consensus standards, or any other instruction or requirement that DoD policy and oversight offices may mandate. The information management system thus becomes not only a reporting tool, but also a planning and management process that facilitates progress toward specific end states and more effective projects and programs.

¹ The Sphere Project, Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response, Oxfam Publishing, 244 Banbury Road, Oxford, OX2 7DZ, UK ISBN 0-85598-445-7

² For more information reference the following:
European Commission. 1993. Manual on Project Cycle Management: Integrated Approach and Logical Framework. p 22-24
<http://www.usaid.gov/ausguide/ausguidelines/1.html>. AusGuidelines: The logical framework approach.

Summary

The single most important means of improving the effectiveness of DoD humanitarian assistance projects and programs is to routinely and systematically collect and record critical information, analyze it in evaluating projects, and use it to plan future projects and manage programs.

Measuring and improving the effectiveness of humanitarian assistance projects, such as those conducted by DoD under its HA, HCA and EP programs, cannot be accomplished without a comprehensive information management system. Information management for humanitarian assistance requires the routine collection of essential elements of information in a standardized, easy-to-report, easy-to-retrieve format. Electronic reporting DoD-wide is supportable given the technology currently and widely available. For example, in support of medical humanitarian assistance projects, healthcare providers could readily employ the advanced communications and information management technologies already in wide-spread and regular use in both civilian and military health care. These tools can be used from the most remote locations.

A wide range of information collection strategies have been employed to date. For instance, both DoD and civilian providers of humanitarian assistance have successfully applied methods ranging from standard hard copy 'clipboard' assessment forms to electronic formats utilizing hand held computers and state of the art communications technology. While different methods of data collection can be debated, this is not as important as actually obtaining the information by whatever means, then organizing it within an accessible data base, and utilizing it to plan and manage projects and programs.

Although DoD has already developed sophisticated information management systems for specific situations, such as EUCOM's TEPMIS software, the application of such tools remains limited. For example, although we conservatively estimate that between one-third and one-half of DoD humanitarian assistance projects under the HA, HCA, and EP programs are 'medical' in nature; TEPMIS inexplicably excludes health information from the analysis.

A prototype software system to archive then retrieve information on humanitarian assistance projects has been developed by CDHAM (see Appendix B). With several commands having expressed a strong interest in using this tool to address their current information requirements, initial field trials and beta testing are anticipated subject to approval and support. Whether this CDHAM prototype, TEPMIS, or another system is ultimately adopted, information collection, analysis and storage are critical to improving the effectiveness of these DoD humanitarian assistance projects and programs.

References

- Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP). 2001. Annual Review Series, Humanitarian Actions: Learning from Evaluation. Wayne Macdonald, Chairman, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Anonymous. 31 Oct 1994. Multi-Service Procedures for Humanitarian Assistance Operations.
- Anonymous. 6-8 March 1996. Unpublished report. Workshop on joint Civilian-Military Public Health Humanitarian Interventions, PAHO-sponsored meeting, Arn Prior, Canada
- Auf der Heide E. 1996. Disaster Problems, Issues and Challenges identified in the Research Literature. *Disaster Medicine* 14(2):453-480.
- Boss L, Toole MJ, Yip R. 1994. Assessments of mortality, morbidity, and nutritional status in Somalia during the 1991-1992 famine: recommendations for standardization of methods. *JAMA* 272:371-376.
- Burkle FM Jr., McGrady KAW, Newett SL, Nelson JJ, Dworken JT, Lyerly WH, Jr, Natsios AS, Lillibridge SR. 1995. Complex, Humanitarian Emergencies, III Measures of Effectiveness. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine* 10(1):48-68.
- Davis LM, Hosek SD, Tate MG, Perry M, Heplar G, Steinberg PS. 1996. Army Medical Support for Peace Operations and Humanitarian Assistance. The Rand Corp, Arroyo Center, Santa Monica, CA.
- Drifmeyer JE, Kelley P, Hospedales J, Boisson EL, Ali C. 1999. Poster presentation, Information Technology Improves Global Emerging Infections Surveillance: A Case Study from the Caribbean Epidemiology Center, (CAREC)*, Trinidad & Tobago. Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences, Bethesda, Maryland.
- Gruppo LQ Jr. (Editor). 1999. Unpublished manuscript, The 5th Special Forces Group (Airborne) Medical Civic Action Program (Humanitarian and Civic Assistance) Planning Guide. Ft Bragg, NC.
- Littrell A. Undated briefing. Planning for a Humanitarian Assistance Operation, 96th Civil Affairs Battalion, Ft. Bragg, NC.
- McCluskey J. 1999. Impact Assessment Study Draft Report, Impact Assessment in Emergencies: A Practical Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation of Emergency Projects. Oxfam Emergency Dept.
- Nelson JJ, Newett SL, Dworken JT, McGrady KAW, LaMon K. 1996. (CRM 95- 166.10) Measures of Effectiveness for Humanitarian Assistance Operations. Center for Naval Analyses.
- Newett S, Geis M, Keefer L, LaMon L, Siegel A, Smith K. 1996. (CRM 95- 155.10) Summary of Requirements for Humanitarian Assistance Operations. Center for Naval Analyses.
- Norton SA. 1999. The Dermatologist Baedeker, Preparations for Medical Assistance Missions. *Dermatologic Clinics* 17(1):187-208.
- Novak DM. 16 June 1995. Unpublished manuscript. The role of the joint mission essential task list (JMETL) in the future of military medicine. Naval War College, Newport, RI.
- Oxfam. Undated. Impact Assessment in Emergencies: A Practical Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation of Emergency Projects.
- Seiple C. 1996. The U.S. Military/ NGO Relationship in Humanitarian Interventions Peacekeeping Institute Center for Strategic Leadership U.S. Army War College.
- Selaniko JD, Kemmer TM, Bovill M, Geisler K. In press. Mobile computing in the Humanitarian Assistance Setting: An introduction and some first steps.

Sharp TW, Yip R, Malone JD. 1994. U.S. Military Forces and Emergency International Humanitarian Assistance. *JAMA* 272(5):386-390.

Siegal AB. 1995. (CRM 94-74) Requirements for Humanitarian Assistance and Peace Operations: Insights From Seven Case Studies. Center for Naval Analyses.

Sphere Project. 1997. Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Disaster Response. In: <http://www.Sphereproject.org>.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Relief Web. Undated. In: <http://www.reliefweb.int/w/rwb/nsf>

U.S. Agency for International Development Bureau for Humanitarian Response Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance. Undated. Field Operations Guide for Disaster Assessment and Response. Version 3.0.

United States Marine Corps. 2000. Foreign Humanitarian Assistance and Consequence Management Operations. Marine Corps Reference Publication 3-33B.

WHO Technical Report Series 845. 1994. Information Support for a new Public Health Action at District Level. WHO, Geneva.

World Health Organization. 1999. Rapid health assessment protocols for emergencies. World Health Organization Publications, Geneva. 97 pp.

While the senior author was meeting with the Headquarters, U.S. European Command Humanitarian Assistance, Command Surgeon and Civil Affairs staff personnel, the development and application of the prototype TEPMIS software system was briefly discussed. Included here is an example to demonstrate one current approach to information management and decision making in planning humanitarian assistance projects and theatre security cooperation.

Appendix A: TEPMIS Activities for EUCOM

Purpose: This survey is used to identify and describe EUCOM engagement activities. The TEPMIS Development Agency will use the results of the survey to prepare a series of Background Papers on EUCOM activities.

Table 1.

<p>Activity Name Recognized title for activity</p>	
<p>Engagement Category One of 8 TEPMIS categories to which this activity belongs</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Operational Activities <input type="checkbox"/> Combined Exercises <input type="checkbox"/> Security Assistance <input type="checkbox"/> Humanitarian Assistance <input type="checkbox"/> Combined Training <input type="checkbox"/> Combined Education <input type="checkbox"/> Military Contacts <input type="checkbox"/> Other </p>
<p>Engagement Utility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the “payoff” from an engagement perspective? • What is the benefit to the country involved? How is the impact measured? • Why should the US participate? • What are performance MOEs, what indicators does this engagement activity support? 	
<p>Readiness Benefit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does this activity contribute to readiness from a U.S. perspective? • How is the benefit measured? What are the MOEs? 	
<p>Activity Description Please provide a paragraph describing the Activity Include all activity objectives, and planning horizon</p>	
<p>Activity Manager(s) Please identify the organizations or staff elements within your command, which have management responsibilities for this activity (OPR/OSR). Briefly describe the role of these organizations or elements.</p>	
<p>Management Method: Program Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source of Requirements? Who is the enabling authority? Who provides command guidance? How does CINCEUR influence conduct, planning or resourcing of the event/activity? • What are prevailing legal constraints? How are eligible countries designated? What are the governing regulations and publishing guidance? • Is optempo a constraint? What are typical limits? • Planning Cycle (milestones, main events) • Is this part of a “higher-level program?” If so, provide details (who manages, cycle, etc.) • Language Requirement: e.g. man-years, dollars, exercise days, school seats, number of exercises; what is the unit of measure (measure entities) • How much of activity management is country-driven? 	

Table 1: Identification of Necessary Activity Data

<p>Supporting Events Does this Activity include 'supporting events' which are part of the total Activity Management scope; e.g. site surveys conducted prior to an event, or a pre-event planning conference? Identify recognized activity subcategories</p>	
<p>Milestones Does this Activity include typical milestones or checkpoints that you monitor or employ in the course of activity planning and execution? Examples may be notification requirements, approvals, required report due dates, etc., relative to a single event.</p>	
<p>Recurring Reporting Requirements Excluding TEP reporting, are there additional recurring US Agency, DoD, Joint Staff, or parent Service reports which you are required to satisfy with information about this Activity? If so, please identify the report requirement(s) and its source.</p>	
<p>Event Assessments or After-Action Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are pre-event MOEs established? • Are AARs required? <p>Where is the assessment data captured? How is this data used?</p>	
<p>Preferred Reports or Displays (optional)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you have ideas or preferences for user input screens, standard reports, displays, or briefing charts derived from data managed for this activity, please attach copies. 	
<p>Supporting Management Information Systems (MIS) Please identify information systems currently being used (if any) to manage this activity. Of particular interest are automated information systems, which contain historic information about past events.</p>	<p>System: _____</p> <p>Description: Status: This system is... <input type="checkbox"/> a DoD/Joint/ or Service standard system <input type="checkbox"/> a command unique, standard throughout this command <input type="checkbox"/> an adhoc system without formal MIS support manual <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)</p>
<p>Future MIS Intentions For each information system identified above, please comment on your future plans. Check all the statements that apply for each, and add comment as necessary.</p>	<p>System: _____</p> <p>Intentions: <input type="checkbox"/> We will continue to use this system as the primary management tool. <input type="checkbox"/> We would like an automated interface between this system and TEPMIS. <input type="checkbox"/> This system fully satisfies our activity management interests. <input type="checkbox"/> This system does not fully satisfy our activity management interests <input type="checkbox"/> This system should ideally be replaced with Activity Management module directly linked to the TEPMIS database. <input type="checkbox"/> We will continue to use this system as our primary management tool, but will manually enter data into TEPMIS to meet TEP reporting requirements</p> <p>Comment:</p>
<p>US Forces Does this Activity involve the assignment of US Forces? If yes, who is responsible for identifying the force requirement (units or individuals); Who is the provider and who is responsible for tasking?</p>	

Table 1: Identification of Necessary Activity Data (continued)

<p>Host Nation Involvement What type and what level of assets does the host nation provide?</p>	
<p>Foreign Nation Participation Are forces of one or more foreign nations involved?</p>	
<p>Other US Agency Involvement e.g. DOS, DOJ</p>	
<p>Non-US International Organizations (NGO's, PVO's, Alliances...) e.g. Doctors Without Borders</p>	
<p>Fiscal Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What US fiscal resource types are allocated to execute this event and how are these funds allocated? Identify all potential funding sources. • What are the limitations on use? • Which organization(s) have visibility on planned/actual costs 	
<p>Distinguished Foreign Nationals Is there a requirement to preserve a record of distinguished foreign nationals (individuals) who participate in this activity? For example, certain conference attendees, distinguished visitors, VIP's, students in combined educational events, etc.</p>	
<p>Sample Data (optional) The Development Agency is interested in reviewing sample data in any convenient format (spreadsheet, printed report, graphic) that provides information on typical activity representation.</p>	
<p>Logo (optional) Does this Activity category have a distinctive logo, symbol, or other graphic image that might be useful in forms or reports? If so, provide a copy of the graphic.</p>	

Table 1: Identification of Necessary Activity Data (continued)

TEPMIS Activities for EUCOM

Activity Name	
Engagement Category	
Engagement Utility	
Readiness Benefit	
Activity Description	
Activity Manager(s)	
Management Method; Program Management	
Supporting Events	
Milestones	
Recurring Reporting Requirements	
Event Assessments or After-Action Reports	
Preferred Reports or Displays (optional)	
Supporting Management Information Systems (MIS)	System: _____ Description: Status: This system is... <input type="checkbox"/> a DoD/Joint/ or Service standard system <input type="checkbox"/> a command unique, standard throughout this command <input type="checkbox"/> an adhoc system without formal MIS support manual <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)

Table 1: Identification of Necessary Activity Data (continued)

TEPMIS Activities for EUCOM (continued)

<p>Future MIS Intentions</p>	<p>System: _____</p> <p>Intentions:</p> <p>_____ We will continue to use this system as the primary management tool.</p> <p>_____ We would like an automated interface between this system and TEPMIS.</p> <p>_____ This system fully satisfies our activity management interests.</p> <p>_____ This system does not fully satisfy our activity management interests</p> <p>_____ This system should ideally be replaced with Activity Management module directly linked to the TEPMIS database.</p> <p>_____ We will continue to use this system as our primary management tool, but will manually enter data into TEPMIS to meet TEP reporting requirements</p> <p>Comment:</p>
<p>US Forces</p>	
<p>Host Nation Involvement</p>	
<p>Foreign Nation Participation</p>	
<p>Other US Agency Involvement</p>	
<p>US Non-Government Organizations (NGOs, PVO's, Alliances...)</p>	
<p>Non-US International Organizations (NGOs, PVO's, Alliances...)</p>	
<p>Fiscal Resources</p>	
<p>Infrastructure Resources</p>	
<p>Distinguished Foreign Nationals</p>	
<p>Sample Data (optional)</p>	
<p>Logo (optional)</p>	

Appendix B

A Description of the Center for Disaster and Humanitarian Assistance Medicine (CDHAM) Proposed Web-Based After Action Reporting (AAR) System

CAPT (Ret) Douglas A. Ehrhardt, PhD, MBA

February 1, 2002

CDHAM has developed a systematic approach to the collection of AARs, based on another scientific data report collection system used by the Office of Naval Research and the widely-available software Microsoft Access. The development of field-specific information based on reporting requirements, data mining capabilities, and procedures for report output has been targeted to achieve the greatest flexibility to meet anticipated reporting requirements.

The proposed AAR reporting system is accessed via the Internet at which point the user is prompted to input basic demographic and administrative information (names, addresses, etc.) numerical information (dates, costs, or numbers of events, what, why, where and how.) By organizing information in required fields, information is collected in a standardized format. That facilitates rapid interpretation of stored data through statistical analyses of numerical information, or simple searches by keywords (country, name of program, provider, command, medical condition etc.)

The user is prompted by the system for additional information such as mission, purpose, stated measures of effectiveness, sites visited, team members, lessons learned, problems encountered, recommendations, and applicable references. The software is designed to input original data into specified fields. However, since the program is Windows based, previously drafted narratives concerning mission activities can be copied and “pasted” directly into the appropriate fields as desired.

Information can be added as it becomes available or whenever the user accesses the system. The continuous editing, addition or deletion of data, can occur repeatedly until such time as a report is “finalized.” Upon completion of the “minimum, required” fields of information, the initial report can be copied to a text file for other applications such as using a word processing program. This enables flexibility to add other documents such as personnel or equipment lists, electronic images, and formal presentations (e.g., PowerPoint files). These can readily generate reports required by the chain of command. For archiving, information can also be sent using Windows’ file transfer protocol (FTP) capabilities.

The prototype CDHAM after action reporting system is recommended as an introductory platform to demonstrate the utility of a web-based, Windows-driven process for generating standardized reports, as well as storing, retrieving and analyzing information for future planning, training, or other DoD requirements. A beta test of at least a year’s duration in several different commands could demonstrate the system’s utility and improve system capabilities prior to long term implementation.

