

Localized Surveillance: A Fresh Perspective for Regional Syndromic Surveillance

Mansi Agarwal¹, Nimi Idaikkadar³, José Lojo⁴, Kristen Soto² and Robert Mathes*¹

¹Bureau of Communicable Disease, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, Long Island City, NY, USA;

²Connecticut Department of Public Health, Hartford, CT, USA; ³Bureau of Epidemiology Services, New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, New York, NY, USA; ⁴Philadelphia Dept. of Public Health, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Objective

To outline successful strategies for regional data-sharing and discuss how these strategies can be applied to other regions.

Introduction

Recent efforts to share syndromic surveillance data have focused on developing national systems, namely BioSense 2.0¹. The problems with creating and implementing national systems, such as legal issues, difficulties in standardizing syndrome definitions, data quality, and different objectives, are well documented^{1,2}. In contrast, several local health departments have successfully shared data and analyses with each other, primarily during emergency events. The benefits of locally-driven data sharing include: (1) faster dissemination of data and analyses that have been created by those who understand the nuances of their own data, (2) easier process of standardizing syndrome definitions, (3) quickly designing appropriate analyses for the event, (4) smaller group of partners for consensus-building, and (5) ultimately improved timeliness in detection of public health events. The strategies used to share data and analyses between local and state health departments during planned and unplanned events may be informative to national systems.

Description

Discussion will start by highlighting a successful collaboration between health departments in New York City, New York State, New Jersey, Philadelphia, and Connecticut, including sharing of data through New York City's EpiQuery website. The roundtable will then briefly focus on factors that make this collaboration successful.

Audience Engagement

The audience will be asked to draw on their own data-sharing experiences, with the following questions:

- 1) What are successful strategies for data sharing and why did they work?
- 2) How do successful collaborations overcome general data-sharing challenges?
- 3) Can successful methods be adapted to other regions and how?
- 4) What is the best way to disseminate best practices in localized data sharing across regions?

From the discussion at the roundtable, we will create a repository of examples and general strategies that have been successful in regional data sharing to share with the larger public health community.

Keywords

Data sharing; syndromic surveillance; emergencies

References

1. Rennick, Marcus, David J. Swenson, Stacey Hoferka, Charlie Ishikawa, and Rebecca Zwickl. "Check! Explore Barriers and Solutions to Data Sharing on BioSense 2.0." *Online Journal of Public Health Informatics* 6.1 (2014).

2. Ross, Emma. "Perspectives on Data Sharing in Disease Surveillance." *Centre on Global Health Security* (2014). Chatham House.
3. Ishikawa, Charlie, comp. *Syndromic Surveillance Regional Data Sharing Workshop: HHS Region 5 Final Report*. International Society for Disease Surveillance (2013).

*Mansi Agarwal

E-mail: magarwal@health.nyc.gov

