

Governance Framework for a National Trauma System

Robert J. Winchell, MD FACS

Professor of Surgery

Weill Cornell Medicine

Chair, Trauma Systems Evaluation and Planning Committee

American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma



AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS
*Inspiring Quality:
Highest Standards, Better Outcomes*



Current status: Civilian

- It's easy: There isn't any
- Our current national system is a patchwork
 - Some areas well served
 - Most areas underserved
 - An increasing number are likely overserved
- Very few systems built at a public policy level
 - Operating principles well established among stakeholders
 - Conflicts based on self-interested interpretations
 - Very few strong lead agencies with true authority and mandate

Current Status: Civilian

- Increasing local challenges to existing systems
 - Trauma center designation has become highly contentious
 - System stability may be dependent upon market factors
 - The gains the have been achieved may be at risk
- A choice we have faced before. Is the problem of injury:
 - A ministry?: A huge public health problem in need of a policy solution
 - An industry?: A problem in commodities, to be solved by the market

Current Status: Military

- It's easy, there isn't any
- Military trauma systems are built to care for war casualties
 - Injury care has not been a peace-time mission
 - Lessons learned in periods of conflict can be lost
 - Maintenance of training and readiness are difficult
- Responsibility for casualty care is distributed across services
 - No central command structure
 - No uniform approach
- Care in a current conflict has historically begun where the last conflict left off.

Current Status: Military

- Imminent challenges to the existing system
 - Loss of experienced personnel
 - Loss of hard-earned knowledge
 - The gains that have been achieved may be at risk
- A choice we have faced before. Is the problem of injury care:
 - A dynamic system that must be consistent and operational at all times?
 - A system activated in time of war, that stands down in time of peace?

What is new this time?

- The realization that injury is injury, regardless of circumstance
 - Military experience applies to the civilian world
 - Civilian experience applies to the military world
- A growing synergy between military and civilian providers
- An understanding that the systems are interdependent
- The NASEM committee was able to crystallize the vision
 - The need for a unified system for injury care
 - The need for strong central governance at the highest level

Governance Structure: Military

- The top-down governance structure already exists
- The report recommends:
 - Authority flows from White House via the Secretary of Defense
 - Defense Health Agency be tasked with ensuring uniformity
- There 2017 NDAA contains language that prioritizes elements of a joint trauma system
- The military is actively engaged in establishing the elements of the Defense Trauma Enterprise
 - Identifying needed capabilities
 - Identifying and closing gaps

Governance Structure: Civilian

- There is no clear structure or model for top-down governance
 - There hasn't been since 1776
 - It's not easy to develop policy solutions to anything
- The report recommends:
 - Authority flows from the White house via HHS
 - The exact locus is “a player to be named later”
- There is no clear public support for a policy level solution
- Establishing governance infrastructure is the first (and biggest) challenge

The Constitutional Convention

"I do not conceive that we can exist long as a nation [trauma system] without... a power which will pervade the whole union."

- George Washington, 1786



AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS
*Inspiring Quality:
Highest Standards, Better Outcomes*



The Civil War

“Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether this nation [trauma system], or any nation [trauma system] so conceived and so dedicated can long endure”

Abraham Lincoln - 1863



AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS
*Inspiring Quality:
Highest Standards, Better Outcomes*



Gaps/Challenges/Thoughts

- The public does not care about public health
 - **Imperative to focus on national security as the driver**
- No requirement to address injury as an issue
 - “Where you live determines whether you live”
- Maybe it’s simply a matter of “herding cats with money”
 - Financial incentives don’t align with system incentives
- What is the real “halo effect”?
 - Better patient care or better market share?
- Is the golden hour anything but a tool to gain market share
 - Trauma bocce/curling/shuffleboard

The “Player to be Named Later”

- Nobody loves us within the Federal agencies
- Not clear where/what a central authority would be
- Trauma is only a small part of any given component
 - We should seek allies in specific operational areas
- Any new structure must integrate well with existing systems, especially the higher-functioning ones
- Standards should be developed by a multi-disciplinary non-governmental body, “the trauma community”.
- Organ transplant program may provide an example

Tactical Elements

- A needs assessment tool is critical: centers and systems
- Metrics for center/system performance are necessary
- A template for basic process improvement
- Public disclosure of outcome data may be useful
- Primary aim/motivation/urgency should tie to shortcomings of current system, in the context of readiness and national security

Civilian Governance- Plan A

Unified Central Authority

- Establish White House level directive
- Lead federal/national authority
 - Establishes requirement for states to address injury
 - Mandates minimal trauma system standards
 - Standards developed by a broad multidisciplinary community of trauma system stakeholders
- Local (e.g. state, regional, county) implementation of standards
- Enforcement of standards (teeth) through tie to existing Federal funding programs, and public reporting
- Leverage existing models (e.g. transplant)

Civilian Governance- Plan B

Develop an Incremental Approach

- No unified central trauma system authority
- Multidisciplinary community of trauma system stakeholders develops minimal set of trauma system standards
- Develop incremental approach to provide incentives for specific system elements
 - Work with larger coalitions on areas of shared interest

Next steps

- Proceed with option A, go big
- Establish primary focused aim of establishing comprehensive trauma system as a key element of national security
- Seek contact/support in new White House to support this aim
- Establish a working group, including external expertise, to determine where the central authority should best be located
- Establish a broad working group to establish basic trauma system requirements; high level, small number