

1 **How do local-level authorities engage in epidemic and pandemic preparedness**
2 **activities and coordinate with higher levels of government? Survey results**
3 **from 33 cities.**

4
5 Matthew R Boyce^{1*}, Melissa Cordoba Asprilla², Breanna van Loenen³, Amanda McClelland³,
6 Ariella Rojhani²

7
8 ¹ Center for Global Health Science & Security, Georgetown University Medical Center,
9 Washington, District of Columbia, USA

10
11 ² Vital Strategies, New York City, New York, USA

12
13 ³ Resolve to Save Lives, New York City, New York, USA

14
15 * Corresponding author: matt.boyce@georgetown.edu

16
17 **Keywords:**

18 Coordination, Epidemic, Global Health, Governance, Health Security, Local, Preparedness,
19 Urban Health

20
21 **Short Title:**

22 Local-level engagement in and coordination of epidemic and pandemic preparedness activities

23 **Abstract.**

24 The COVID-19 pandemic suggests that there are opportunities to improve preparedness for
25 infectious disease outbreaks. While much attention has been given to understanding national-
26 level preparedness, relatively little attention has been given to understanding preparedness at the
27 local-level. We, therefore, aim to describe (1) how local governments were engaged in epidemic
28 preparedness efforts before the COVID-19 pandemic and (2) how they were coordinating with
29 authorities at higher levels of governance before COVID-19. We developed an online survey and
30 distributed it to 50 cities around the world involved in the Partnership for Healthy Cities. The
31 survey included several question formats including free-response, matrices, and multiple-choice
32 questions. RACI matrices, a project management tool that helps explain coordination structures,
33 were used to understand the level of government responsible, accountable, consulted, and
34 informed regarding select preparedness activities. We used descriptive statistics to summarize
35 local-level engagement in epidemic preparedness. Local health authorities from 33 cities
36 completed the survey. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, 20 of the cities had completed
37 infectious disease risk assessments, 10 completed all-hazards risk assessments, 11 completed
38 simulation exercises, 10 completed after-action reviews, 19 developed preparedness and
39 response plans, three reported involvement in their country's Joint External Evaluation of the
40 International Health Regulations, and eight cities reported involvement in the development of
41 their countries' National Action Plan for Health Security. RACI matrices revealed various
42 models of epidemic preparedness, with responsibility often shared across levels, and national
43 governments accountable for the most activities, compared to other governance levels. In
44 conclusion, national governments maintain the largest role in epidemic and pandemic
45 preparedness but the role of subnational and local governments is not negligible. Local-level
46 actors engage in a variety of preparedness activities and future efforts should strive to better
47 include these actors in preparedness as a means of bolstering local, national, and global health
48 security.

49 **Introduction.**

50 Ensuring that urban settings are prepared for public health emergencies, such as infectious
51 disease outbreaks, is critically important. This is because, in addition to potentially being where
52 outbreaks originate, characteristics of urban environments can promote the spread of disease,
53 both within the city and globally [1-3]. In today's interconnected world, if urban environments
54 are not well capacitated and prepared to respond to such events, localized outbreaks can rapidly
55 escalate into those of a much larger scale, such as epidemics or pandemics. The rapid, global
56 spread of the SARS-CoV-2 virus and the ensuing COVID-19 pandemic do well to demonstrate
57 this reality, as do other notable outbreaks including the 2003 SARS epidemic, the 2009 H1N1
58 influenza pandemic, and the 2015-2016 Zika epidemic [3,4]. Thus, public health preparedness in
59 cities and urban environments is essential for ensuring local, national, and global health security.

60
61 While local authorities and public health departments in cities can play key roles in promoting
62 preparedness and preventing the spread of infectious diseases, they are not the only entities
63 involved in preparedness efforts. Much attention has been given to national-level public health
64 preparedness and health security efforts, such as the International Health Regulations Monitoring
65 and Evaluation Framework [5]. This Framework includes four core components: mandatory self-
66 assessments, voluntary external assessments (i.e., the Joint External Evaluation (JEE)), voluntary
67 after-action reviews, and voluntary simulation exercises. These components seek to improve
68 preparedness by assessing the existence (i.e., self and external assessments) and functionality
69 (i.e., after-action reviews and simulation exercises) of the capacities essential for detecting,
70 assessing, notifying and responding to public health emergencies [6].

71

72 Before the COVID-19 pandemic, many countries reported high levels of preparedness through
73 these assessments. Other assessments, such as the Global Health Security Index and the
74 Epidemic Preparedness Index, also suggested that many countries were well prepared for an
75 epidemic or pandemic, especially those in Europe and North America [7,8]. Still, initial results
76 suggest that these measures of preparedness were not highly correlated with pandemic response
77 performance [9-12]. Among the emerging hypotheses for why these preparedness assessments
78 were not correlated with pandemic response performance is that they were too reductive and did
79 not sufficiently account for specific and local-level contexts and inequalities [10,11]. The health,
80 economic, and social consequences that have resulted from the pandemic further suggest that
81 there are opportunities to improve public health preparedness [13,14].

82
83 In addition to overlooking local-level contexts in preparedness assessments, the roles of local
84 authorities in these aforementioned efforts and the coordination between different levels of
85 government remain poorly understood. This gap is notable given the widely recognized role that
86 local authorities play in implementing policy decisions and producing the outcomes associated
87 with governance processes, including the protection of public health [15]. In much of the world,
88 public health is a local, community-based endeavor that depends on trust to effectively
89 implement policies and deliver services [12]. For instance, many of the capacities measured in
90 the preparedness assessments represent essential public health functions that are often carried out
91 or supported by local authorities, such as disease surveillance, risk communication, and public
92 health workforce development and maintenance [16,17].

93

94 The actual or potential actions that may be taken by local governments are often influenced by
95 policy, guidance, and financing from higher levels of governance [18,19]. In many cities, total
96 autonomy from higher levels of government is unlikely, and coordination between these actors
97 is, therefore, an important consideration. This is especially true as inadequate coordination and
98 poor governance can lead to implementation challenges, the inefficient use of limited resources,
99 and greater health consequences [4,16,20,21].

100
101 These considerations lead to questions about not only how local governments and authorities
102 were engaging in epidemic preparedness before the COVID-19 pandemic, but also the roles they
103 played and how these efforts were coordinated with higher levels of government. The objectives
104 of this descriptive research, then, are to understand the ways in which local-level authorities were
105 engaging in preparedness efforts before the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as how they were
106 coordinating with authorities at higher levels of governance to complete key tasks and
107 preparedness activities.

108
109 **Methods.**
110 The research described in this article used a survey study design to ask local public health
111 authorities in cities around the world about their city's engagement in pandemic preparedness
112 efforts prior to the COVID-19 pandemic and how select preparedness activities were coordinated
113 with higher levels of government.

114
115 *Study Population.* This research effort involved public health authorities from cities that were a
116 part of the Partnership for Healthy Cities. The Partnership for Healthy Cities is a city network of
117 70 cities that have committed to preventing noncommunicable diseases and injuries through

118 proven, evidence-based interventions and approaches. In March of 2020, recognizing the
119 urgency of COVID-19 response, the network temporarily expanded its scope to include support
120 for pandemic response. The population involved in this study included 50 cities in the
121 Partnership for Healthy Cities that were purposively selected based on their involvement in a
122 mini-grant program that focused on bolstering the local response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

123
124 *Questionnaire Development and Distribution.* We developed a survey questionnaire based on
125 existing pandemic preparedness frameworks and guidance [22,23]. The survey contained 17
126 questions – relating to participant demographics and preparedness efforts and activities – that
127 included a variety of formats including free-response, matrices, and multiple-choice questions.
128 The survey questionnaire is available for review in the S1 Appendix.

129 Included in these questions were RACI (i.e., Responsible, Accountable, Consulted, and
130 Informed) matrices [24]. RACI matrices are project management tools that are useful for
131 explaining coordination structures and the hierarchical nature of activities. Multiple levels of
132 government can be responsible, consulted, and informed for a given activity. However, only one
133 level of government can be accountable for a given activity. These queries allowed for survey
134 responses to provide a granular look at how local preparedness activities related to and were
135 coordinated with those of higher levels of government.

136 For the purposes of this study, we defined responsibility as implementing the work
137 required to complete an activity; accountability was defined as overseeing the correct and
138 thorough completion of an activity; consulted was defined as engaging in two-way
139 communication to provide information necessary for the completion of an activity; and informed
140 was defined as being updated on progress toward or on the results from a given activity (i.e.,

141 one-way communication) [24]. Additionally, we defined the national-level as relating to the
142 efforts of the national government; the subnational-level relating to the efforts of state,
143 provincial, district, or county governments; and the local-level relating to the efforts of city or
144 municipal governments.

145 Once finalized, we translated the questionnaire and accompanying instructions into
146 French and Spanish in an effort to ensure that the materials were accessible and comprehensible
147 to potential survey participants.

148
149 *Ethics Statement.* We submitted all study materials to the Georgetown University Institutional
150 Review Board for ethical review. The Institutional Review Board granted an exemption to the
151 study (STUDY00003948) in June 2021 after determining that the research posed no more than
152 minimal risk to those who would be participating. As the study was granted exemption, informed
153 consent was not required to be obtained. However, as a best practice in research, we provided an
154 informed consent form to all study participants that emphasized the voluntary nature of their
155 participation and that they maintained the option of withdrawing from the study at any time
156 without consequence. Consent was then provided through participation.

157
158 *Data Collection & Analysis.* We uploaded the survey to Qualtrics (Seattle, WA) and distributed
159 it with instructions to local-level authorities, before closing the survey in August 2021. We then
160 collected the data from survey responses and compiled them in a spreadsheet created with
161 Microsoft Excel (Redmond, WA). Prior to beginning data analysis, we reviewed data for
162 consistency and validity. We used Microsoft Excel and STATA v.17BE (College Station, TX) to
163 perform basic descriptive statistical analyses to summarize local-level engagement in

164 preparedness efforts and how they coordinated with higher levels of government to complete
165 preparedness activities.

166
167 **Results.**
168 Local-level health authorities from 33 cities – Abidjan, Accra, Addis Ababa, Amman, Athens,
169 Bandung, Bangkok, Barcelona, Bengaluru, Buenos Aires, Cali, Chicago, Colombo, Fortaleza,
170 Guadalajara, Harare, Kampala, Kigali, Kumasi, León, Lima, London, Lusaka, Melbourne,
171 Medellín, Montevideo, Ouagadougou, Quezon City, Rio de Janeiro, Santiago, Santo Domingo,
172 Vancouver, and Yangon – completed surveys. Eight (24.2%) of these cities are located in
173 countries that are classified as high-income countries, 12 (36.4%) are located in countries that are
174 classified as upper-middle income countries, nine (27.3%) are located in countries that are
175 classified as lower-middle income countries, and four (12.1%) are located in countries that are
176 classified as low income countries (Table 1). A majority of survey participants were female and
177 had worked in their current professional role for 1 to 4 years.

178
179 **Table 1.** Characteristics of survey participants and cities (n = 33).

Characteristic	n (%)
Gender of Survey Participant	
<i>Male</i>	13 (39.4)
<i>Female</i>	20 (60.6)
<i>Other/Prefer not to say</i>	0 (0)
Number of Years Served in Current Role	
<i>Less than 1 year</i>	7 (21.2)
<i>1 to 4 years</i>	16 (48.5)
<i>5 to 9 years</i>	7 (21.2)
<i>10 years or more</i>	3 (9.1)
Economy Income Level	
<i>High income</i>	8 (24.2)
<i>Upper-middle income</i>	12 (36.4)
<i>Lower-middle income</i>	9 (27.3)
<i>Low income</i>	4 (12.1)

180

181 *Local-Level Epidemic and Pandemic Preparedness Efforts*. The preparedness experiences of
182 cities varied across the world, reflecting the heterogeneity in the geographic, epidemiologic,
183 political, and development contexts in which the cities exist. No city reported that they had
184 completed or participated in all seven of the preparedness efforts. The greatest number of
185 preparedness efforts reported was five of the seven, which was reported by Chicago, Colombo,
186 and Melbourne.

187 Twenty of the cities (60.6%) reported that they had completed an infectious disease risk
188 assessment prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, 10 (30.3%) reported the completion of an all-
189 hazards risk assessment prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, 11 (33.3%) reported the completion of
190 a simulation or table-top exercise, and 10 (30.3%) reported the completion of an after-action
191 review prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (Fig 1). Nineteen (57.6%) of the cities also reported
192 that they had developed a city-specific preparedness and response plan before the COVID-19
193 pandemic, often for other infectious diseases that represent epidemic or pandemic threats, such
194 as cholera, influenza, or Zika.

195
196 *[INSERT FIG 1 HERE]*

197 **Fig 1.** The number of cities that had completed or engaged in pandemic preparedness efforts prior to the COVID-19
198 pandemic; JEE – Joint External Evaluation of the International Health Regulations; NAPHS – National Action Plan
199 for Health Security.

200
201 Three cities – Abidjan, Accra, Kumasi – reported that they had been involved in their
202 country’s JEE, while eight cities – Abidjan, Accra, Addis Ababa, Amman, Bandung, Colombo,
203 Kigali, and Kumasi – reported that they were included in the development of their countries’
204 respective National Action Plan for Health Security. Survey results are available for review in
205 the S2 Appendix.

206

207 *Coordination of Epidemic and Pandemic Activities*. Responses to the RACI matrices revealed a
208 heterogeneous landscape of authorities, responsibilities, and communication networks. Some
209 cities, such as Abidjan, Bangkok, and Montevideo reported that the national government
210 maintained primary authority and was accountable for virtually all pandemic preparedness
211 activities in the city; other cities, such as Bengaluru, Buenos Aires, and Vancouver reported that
212 subnational governments were primarily accountable for pandemic preparedness activities; and
213 other cities, such as Bandung, Chicago, and Kampala, reported that the local government was
214 primarily accountable for pandemic preparedness activities. However, most often, the
215 accountability and responsibility for pandemic preparedness activities were shared across the
216 various levels of government. Reported RACI matrices are available for review in the S3
217 Appendix.

218 The activities national authorities were most often responsible for include developing
219 pandemic preparedness and response policy (n=32), financing routine public health activities
220 (n=28), and identifying and mapping resources required for the response to public health
221 emergencies (n=25) (Fig 2); the activities subnational authorities were most often responsible for
222 include operationalizing pandemic preparedness and response policy (n=28), developing and
223 maintaining pandemic preparedness and response plans (n=27), and developing mechanisms for
224 coordination between levels of government (n=26); the activities local authorities were most
225 often responsible for include operationalizing pandemic preparedness and response policy
226 (n=28), developing mechanisms for coordination between levels of government (n=25), and
227 developing and maintaining pandemic preparedness and response plans (n=25). Relative to other
228 the other levels of government, national authorities were most frequently reported to be
229 responsible for three of the 11 pandemic preparedness activities (i.e., developing pandemic

230 preparedness and response policy financing routine public health activities, and identifying and
231 mapping resources required for the response to public health emergencies), subnational
232 authorities for six of the 11 activities, and subnational authorities and local authorities for two of
233 the 11 activities.

234
235 *[INSERT FIG 2 HERE]*

236 **Fig 2.** Heat map summarizing the responsibility for select preparedness activities for different levels of government
237 according to survey responses from thirty-three cities; N – National, S – Subnational, L – Local.

238
239 Relative to the other levels of government, national authorities were reported to most
240 often accountable for seven of the 11 pandemic preparedness activities, national and subnational
241 authorities for one of the activities, subnational and local authorities for one of the activities, and
242 local-level authorities for two of the activities (Fig 3). Yangon reported that no level of
243 government was accountable for financing routine public health activities, conducting routine
244 infectious disease surveillance activities, developing and maintaining pandemic preparedness and
245 response plans, identifying and mapping resources required for the response to public health
246 emergencies, and conducting simulation or table-top exercises to test capacities. Similarly,
247 Athens reported that no level of government was accountable for conducting simulation or table-
248 top exercises to test capacities and conducting after-action reviews following public health
249 emergencies or events.

250
251 *[INSERT FIG 3 HERE]*

252 **Fig 3.** Heat map summarizing the accountability for select preparedness activities for different levels of government
253 according to survey responses from thirty-three cities; N – National, S – Subnational, L – Local.

254
255 Survey responses indicated a relatively high degree of consultation for pandemic
256 preparedness activities. National authorities were most often engaged in consultation for
257 operationalizing pandemic preparedness and response policy (n=20), developing pandemic
258 preparedness and response policy (n=14), and developing mechanisms for coordination between

259 levels of government (n=14) (Fig 4); subnational authorities were most often engaged in
260 consultation for developing pandemic preparedness and response policy (n=24), operationalizing
261 pandemic preparedness and response policy (n=19), developing and maintaining pandemic
262 preparedness and response plans (n=19), and conducting after-action reviews following public
263 health emergencies or events (n=19); local authorities most often engaged in consultation for
264 developing mechanisms for coordination between levels of government (n=15), developing and
265 maintaining pandemic preparedness and response plans (n=14), and identifying and mapping
266 resources required for the response to public health emergencies (n=13).

267
268 *[INSERT FIG 4 HERE]*

269 **Fig 4.** Heat map summarizing consultation for select preparedness activities for different levels of government
270 according to survey responses from thirty-three cities; N – National, S – Subnational, L – Local.

271
272 Survey responses indicated a relatively low degree of one-way communication for
273 preparedness activities. National authorities were most often informed regarding conducting
274 routine infectious disease surveillance activities (n=6), conducting the initial investigation of
275 infectious disease outbreaks (n=5), and conducting simulation or table-top exercises to test
276 capacities (n=4) (Fig 5); subnational authorities were most often informed about conducting
277 simulation or table-top exercises to test capacities (n=5), conducting after-action reviews
278 following public health emergencies or events (n=4), financing routine public health activities
279 (n=3), and conducting the initial investigation of infectious disease outbreaks (n=3); local
280 authorities were most often informed regarding conducting simulation or table-top exercises to
281 test capacities (n=4), financing routine public health activities (n=3), conducting the initial
282 investigation of infectious disease outbreaks (n=3), conducting emergency risk assessments and
283 developing risk profiles (n=3), and conducting after-action reviews following public health
284 emergencies or events (n=3).

285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310

[INSERT FIG 5 HERE]

Fig 5. Heat map summarizing which levels of government are informed about select preparedness activities according to survey responses from thirty-three cities; N – National, S – Subnational, L – Local.

Discussion.

This study examined the ways in which local-level authorities were engaging in epidemic and pandemic preparedness efforts before the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as how they coordinated with higher levels of government for select preparedness activities. Answering these questions and better understanding the roles of local authorities in health security will be important as the world reflects on the experiences of COVID-19 and looks to prepare for future public health emergencies.

The results of this work highlight that, according to local governments and public health authorities, before the COVID-19 pandemic, epidemic and pandemic preparedness in cities was largely left to higher levels of government. Of the activities included in our survey, national governments were both responsible for implementing and accountable for overseeing a majority of the activities, when compared to subnational and local governments. Still, the role of local governments was not insignificant, as they were the level of government most often accountable for overseeing and responsible for operationalizing pandemic preparedness and response policy, and for overseeing routine infectious disease surveillance activities and conducting the initial investigation of outbreaks. They were also frequently consulted by higher levels of government as they developed mechanisms for coordination between levels of government, developed and maintained pandemic preparedness and response plans, and identified and mapped resources required for the response to public health emergencies.

311 These results corroborate the widely held view that local governments are often at the frontline
312 of epidemic preparedness efforts – especially as they relate to infectious disease surveillance
313 activities [25]. They also highlight that there are opportunities to better integrate local authorities
314 into epidemic and pandemic preparedness efforts. While the specifics of how a health crisis is
315 managed and who is involved will vary between cities and according to the governance context
316 [20], at least 20 of the 33 participating cities reported that they were responsible for each of the
317 preparedness activities considered in this study. The World Health Organization has implicitly
318 acknowledged this responsibility and the vital role local governments play through their
319 development of interim guidance for local authorities for strengthening preparedness for
320 COVID-19 in urban environments [26].

321
322 Still, others have argued that the future success of global health interventions, may depend on the
323 ability of local governments, especially those in cities, to promote health [18]. To this end,
324 ensuring that cities are better prepared for future public health emergencies will require a
325 renewed emphasis on strengthening local capacities [3]. Results from this study demonstrate that
326 while local authorities do engage in proactive planning and risk assessment, they do not
327 frequently participate in other efforts that are meant to measure preparedness or the functionality
328 of existing capacities. This is, perhaps, unsurprising given that the current iterations of the
329 assessment tools do not provide specific measures or guidance for subnational or local
330 governments [27], and the view that national-level actors are primarily responsible for epidemic
331 and pandemic response, which may include assessing the functionality of capacities.

332

333 To this end, should the COVID-19 pandemic prove impetus enough to reexamine how the world
334 approaches measuring public health preparedness, one practical and impactful opportunity that
335 exists for better including local governments in preparedness efforts would be to formally or
336 informally incorporate them into existing preparedness assessment activities and tools.

337 Alternatively, local governments could take it upon themselves to conduct preparedness
338 assessments by using resources specifically designed for them [23], or by conducting voluntary
339 local reviews – similar to how some have done for the Sustainable Development Goals [28].
340 These results, in addition to being an asset to local authorities, could also be used to help inform
341 efforts at higher governance levels and provide context that is currently lacking [10,11].

342

343 Also of importance is that local governments, while frequently responsible or accountable for
344 many of the preparedness activities, are not as frequently consulted or informed. This suggests
345 that there are opportunities to improve governance, planning processes, financing, collaborative
346 networks, and communication – all of which are essential elements of public health emergency
347 preparedness [29]. Previous research investigating the effects of national-level government
348 effectiveness, a key dimension of good governance, found that greater government effectiveness
349 was associated with lower COVID-19 mortality rates [30]. Following the COVID-19 pandemic,
350 national and subnational governments may wish to examine the ways in which they collaborate
351 with local governments to complete key preparedness activities as a means of improving
352 governance and effectiveness. These mechanisms for collaboration and communication should
353 also be tested using robust simulation exercises that could help identify weaknesses, ambiguities,
354 and bottlenecks [31].

355

356 This study and its results suffer from several limitations. First, and most significantly, the results
357 relied on the completion of a survey by one individual. While we attempted to distribute the
358 survey to the local authority who would be most knowledgeable about epidemic and pandemic
359 preparedness in the city, we cannot guarantee that the data captured by responses are completely
360 valid or factual. One person's knowledge regarding all of the preparedness efforts, activities, and
361 arrangements in their city may be limited. For instance, a majority of survey participants had
362 served in their current professional role for one to four years and may not have been aware of
363 preparedness efforts in their city before this time. Future research may wish to more deeply
364 examine preparedness efforts in specific cities or to validate the results of this study by
365 reviewing the legislation, regulations, and other legal frameworks that provide the foundation for
366 public health preparedness and coordination between levels of government.

367
368 Additionally, the specific results from each city are unlikely to hold great amounts of external
369 validity. The governance contexts in which participating cities exist vary widely, and it would be
370 inappropriate to generalize results across contexts without examining the specific authorities of
371 local-level authorities. Indeed, the powers of local governments can differ significantly between
372 cities within the same country, let alone between cities in different countries. It is for this reason
373 that our study provides descriptive statistics to summarize broad trends in urban health security
374 in cities around the world, instead of attempting to overstate our results and risk inappropriately
375 generalizing across contexts.

376
377 In conclusion, the results of this research suggest that, according to local-level authorities, their
378 involvement in epidemic and public health preparedness before the COVID-9 pandemic was

379 relatively limited. While many had completed risk assessments and developed some form of
380 response plan, fewer had been involved in capacity assessments or tested the functionality of
381 existing capacities through simulation exercises or after-action reviews. Further, while national
382 governments seemingly represent the level of government that is primarily responsible and
383 accountable for preparedness, local governments still maintained much responsibility and a large
384 role in operationalizing policy and implementing activities. Opportunities for improving public
385 health preparedness in the future may include improving coordination between levels of
386 government, involving local-level authorities in capacity assessments, and examining the
387 functionality of capacities at the local-level.

388
389 **Acknowledgements.**

390 Our thanks to Mariana Espinosa Estrada, Charity Hung, Ramya Kancharla, Sherissa Ng, Joseph
391 Ngamije, Grace Pickens, and Tara O'Rourke of Vital Strategies for their assistance in the
392 distribution of survey and study materials. Thanks also to Rebecca Katz of the Georgetown
393 Center for Global Health Science & Security for her review of early drafts and comments that
394 helped to improve this manuscript.

395
396 **References.**

- 397 1. Alirol E, Getaz L, Stoll B, Chappuis F, Loutan L. Urbanisation and infectious diseases in a
398 globalised world. *Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2011;11(2):131-41. doi:10.1016/S1473-
399 3099(10)70223-1.
- 400 2. Ezzati M, Webster CJ, Doyle YG, Rashid S, Owusu G, Leung GM. Cities for global health.
401 *British Medical Journal*. 2018;363:k3794. doi:10.1136/bmj.k3794.
- 402 3. Lee VJ, Ho M, Kai CW, Aguilera X, Heymann D, Wilder-Smith A. Epidemic preparedness
403 in urban settings: new challenges and opportunities. *Lancet Infectious Diseases*.
404 2020;20(5):527-29. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30249-8.
- 405 4. Bell DM, Weisfuse IB, Hernandez-Avila M, Del Rio C, Bustamante X, Rodier G. Pandemic
406 influenza as 21st century urban public health crisis. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*.
407 2009;15(12):1963-69. doi:10.3201/eid1512.091232.
- 408 5. World Health Organization. International Health Regulations (2005) Monitoring &
409 Evaluation Framework. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018.

- 410 6. Talisuna A, Yahaya AA, Rajatonirina SC, Stephen M, Oke A, Mpairwe A, et al. Joint
411 external evaluation of the International Health Regulation (2005) capacities: current status
412 and lessons learnt in the WHO African region. *BMJ Global Health*. 2019;4(6):e001312.
413 doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001312.
- 414 7. Nuclear Threat Index, Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, The Economist Intelligence
415 Unit. The Global Health Security Index. Washington: NTI; 2019.
- 416 8. Oppenheim B, Gallivan M, Madhav NK, Brown N, Serhiyenko V, Wolfe ND, et al.
417 Assessing global preparedness for the next pandemic: development and application of an
418 Epidemic Preparedness Index. *BMJ Global Health* 2019;4:e001157. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-
419 2018-001157.
- 420 9. Haider N, Yavlinsky A, Chang YM, Hasan MN, Benfield C, Osman AY, et al. The Global
421 Health Security index and Joint External Evaluation score for health preparedness are not
422 correlated with countries' COVID-19 detection response time and mortality outcome.
423 *Epidemiology & Infection*. 2020;148:e210. doi:10.1017/S0950268820002046.
- 424 10. Nguyen L, Brown MS, Couture A, Krishnan S, Shamout M, Hernandez L, et al. Global
425 Health Security Preparedness and Response: An Analysis of the Relationship between Joint
426 External Evaluation Scores and COVID-19 Response Performance. *BMJ Open*.
427 2021;11(12):e050052. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-050052.
- 428 11. Baum F, Freeman T, Musolino C, Abramovitz M, De Ceukelaire W, Flavel F, et al.
429 Explaining covid-19 performance: what factors might predict national responses? *British*
430 *Medical Journal*. 2021;372:n91. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n91.
- 431 12. Bollyky TJ, Hulland EN, Barber RM, Collins JK, Kiernan S, Moses M, et al. Pandemic
432 preparedness and COVID-19: an exploratory analysis of infection and fatality rates, and
433 contextual factors associated with preparedness in 177 countries, from Jan 1, 2020, to Sept
434 30, 2021. *Lancet*. 2022; 399:1489-512. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(22)00172-6.
- 435 13. Frieden TR, Buissonnière M, McClelland A. The world must prepare now for the next
436 pandemic. *BMJ Global Health*. 2021;6(3):e005184. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2021-005184.
- 437 14. Singh S, McNab C, Olson RM, Bristol N, Nolan C, Bergström E, Bartos M, Mabuchi S,
438 Panjabi R, Karan A, Abdalla SM, Bonk M, Jamieson M, Werner GK, Nordström A, Legido-
439 Quigley H, Phelan A. How an outbreak became a pandemic: a chronological analysis of
440 crucial junctures and international obligations in the early months of the COVID-19
441 pandemic. *Lancet*. 2021;398(10316):2109-24. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01897-3.
- 442 15. Farazmand A. Sound governance in the age of globalization: A conceptual framework. In:
443 Ali F (Ed.), *Sound governance: Policy and administrative innovations*. Westport: Greenwood
444 Publishing Group; 2004.
- 445 16. Bashir Z, Lafronza V, Fraser MR, Brown CK, Cope JR. Local and state collaboration for
446 effective preparedness planning. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*.
447 2003;9(5):344-51. doi:10.1097/00124784-200309000-00003.
- 448 17. Gupta V, Kraemer JD, Katz R, Jha AK, Kerry VB, Sane J, et al. Analysis of results from the
449 Joint External Evaluation: examining its strength and assessing for trends among
450 participating countries. *Journal of Global Health*. 2018;8(2):020416. doi:
451 10.7189/jogh.08.020416.
- 452 18. Katz R, Mookherji S, Kaminski M, Haté V, Fischer JE. Urban governance of disease.
453 *Administrative Sciences*. 2012;2:135-47. doi:10.3390/admsci2020135.

- 454 19. Talabis DAS, Babierra AL, H Buhat CA, Lutero DS, Quindala III KM, Rabajante JF. Local
455 government responses for COVID-19 management in the Philippines. *BMC Public Health*.
456 2021;21(1):1711. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-11746-0.
- 457 20. World Health Organization. Cities and public health crises: report of the international
458 consultation, 29-30 October 2008, Lyon, France. Lyon: World Health Organization; 2009.
- 459 21. Vlahov D. Urban Health in the Context of Twenty-First-Century Megatrends. In: Khan O.
460 (Ed), *Megacities and Global Health*. Washington, DC: American Public Health Association;
461 2011.
- 462 22. World Health Organization. International Health Regulations (2005) Joint External
463 Evaluation Tool, 2nd eds. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018.
- 464 23. Boyce MR, Katz R. Rapid urban health security assessment tool: a new resource for
465 evaluating local-level public health preparedness. *BMJ Global Health*. 2020;5(6):e002606.
466 doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002606.
- 467 24. Morgan R. How to Do RACI Charting and Analysis: A Practical Guide. Project Smart. 2008
468 Dec 22 [Accessed 2021 Apr 13]. Available from:
469 [https://www.projectsmart.co.uk/recommended-reads/how-to-do-raci-charting-and-](https://www.projectsmart.co.uk/recommended-reads/how-to-do-raci-charting-and-analysis.php)
470 [analysis.php](https://www.projectsmart.co.uk/recommended-reads/how-to-do-raci-charting-and-analysis.php).
- 471 25. Stoto MA, Kang M, Song T, Bouey J, Boyce MR, Katz R. At the frontier of the global battle
472 against emerging infections: surveillance and management of avian influenza A(H7N9) in
473 Guangdong Province, China. *Journal of Global Health Reports*. 2019;3:e2019017.
- 474 26. World Health Organization – Health Emergencies Programme. Strengthening preparedness
475 for COVID-19 in cities and other urban settings: interim guidance for local authorities.
476 Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020.
- 477 27. Norwegian Institute of Public Health. Urbanization and preparedness for outbreaks with
478 high-impact respiratory pathogens – Commissioned Report for the Global Preparedness
479 Monitoring Board. Oslo: Norwegian Institute of Public Health; 2020.
- 480 28. Deininger N, Lu Y, Griess J, Santamaria R. Cities Taking the Lead on the Sustainable
481 Development Goals: A Voluntary Local Review Handbook for Cities. Washington, DC:
482 Brookings Institute; 2019.
- 483 29. Khan Y, O'Sullivan T, Brown A, Tracey S, Gibson J, Génèreux M, Henry B, Schwartz B.
484 Public health emergency preparedness: a framework to promote resilience. *BMC Public*
485 *Health*. 2018;18(1):1344. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-6250-7.
- 486 30. Liang LL, Tseng CH, Ho HJ, Wu CY. Covid-19 mortality is negatively associated with test
487 number and government effectiveness. *Nature Research Scientific Reports*.
488 2020;10(1):12567. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-68862-x.
- 489 31. Shahpar C, Lee CT, Wilkason C, Buissonnière M, McClelland A, Frieden TR. Protecting the
490 world from infectious disease threats: now or never. *BMJ Global Health*. 2019;4(4):e001885.
491 doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001885.

RESPONSIBILITY - PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITY	N	S	L
<i>Developing pandemic preparedness and response policy</i>	32	22	20
<i>Operationalizing pandemic preparedness and response policy</i>	21	28	28
<i>Financing routine public health activities</i>	28	22	24
<i>Developing mechanisms for coordination between levels of government</i>	24	26	25
<i>Conducting routine infectious disease surveillance activities</i>	18	25	21
<i>Conducting the initial investigation of infectious disease outbreaks</i>	13	22	20
<i>Conducting emergency risk assessments and developing risk profiles</i>	18	25	20
<i>Developing and maintaining pandemic preparedness and response plans</i>	24	27	25
<i>Identifying and mapping resources required for the response to public health emergencies</i>	25	24	24
<i>Conducting simulation or table-top exercises to test capacities</i>	18	20	20
<i>Conducting after-action reviews following public health emergencies or events</i>	22	23	20

Fig 2

ACCOUNTABILITY - PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITY	N	S	L
<i>Developing pandemic preparedness and response policy</i>	17	5	11
<i>Operationalizing pandemic preparedness and response policy</i>	7	9	17
<i>Financing routine public health activities</i>	15	5	12
<i>Developing mechanisms for coordination between levels of government</i>	14	13	6
<i>Conducting routine infectious disease surveillance activities</i>	8	12	12
<i>Conducting the initial investigation of infectious disease outbreaks</i>	11	10	12
<i>Conducting emergency risk assessments and developing risk profiles</i>	12	12	9
<i>Developing and maintaining pandemic preparedness and response plans</i>	17	7	8
<i>Identifying and mapping resources required for the response to public health emergencies</i>	12	11	9
<i>Conducting simulation or table-top exercises to test capacities</i>	13	9	9
<i>Conducting after-action reviews following public health emergencies or events</i>	18	6	8

Fig 3

CONSULTED - PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITY	N	S	L
<i>Developing pandemic preparedness and response policy</i>	14	24	12
<i>Operationalizing pandemic preparedness and response policy</i>	20	21	10
<i>Financing routine public health activities</i>	11	18	9
<i>Developing mechanisms for coordination between levels of government</i>	14	13	15
<i>Conducting routine infectious disease surveillance activities</i>	9	13	10
<i>Conducting the initial investigation of infectious disease outbreaks</i>	11	14	7
<i>Conducting emergency risk assessments and developing risk profiles</i>	9	13	10
<i>Developing and maintaining pandemic preparedness and response plans</i>	6	19	14
<i>Identifying and mapping resources required for the response to public health emergencies</i>	11	14	13
<i>Conducting simulation or table-top exercises to test capacities</i>	7	14	8
<i>Conducting after-action reviews following public health emergencies or events</i>	7	19	10

Fig 4

INFORMED - PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITY	N	S	L
<i>Developing pandemic preparedness and response policy</i>	0	0	1
<i>Operationalizing pandemic preparedness and response policy</i>	1	0	1
<i>Financing routine public health activities</i>	0	3	3
<i>Developing mechanisms for coordination between levels of government</i>	1	2	2
<i>Conducting routine infectious disease surveillance activities</i>	6	2	2
<i>Conducting the initial investigation of infectious disease outbreaks</i>	5	3	3
<i>Conducting emergency risk assessments and developing risk profiles</i>	2	2	3
<i>Developing and maintaining pandemic preparedness and response plans</i>	1	2	2
<i>Identifying and mapping resources required for the response to public health emergencies</i>	1	2	2
<i>Conducting simulation or table-top exercises to test capacities</i>	4	5	4
<i>Conducting after-action reviews following public health emergencies or events</i>	2	4	3

Fig 5




Fig 1