



APTA SS-SEM-RP-021-26

First Published: June 10, 2026

Security and Emergency Management
Working Group

After-Action Reviews and Corrective Actions for Real-World Events

Abstract: This recommended practice provides information, considerations and recommendations to help public transit agencies implement after-action reviews and corrective action plans and programs to facilitate an agency's continuous improvement, especially related to preparedness efforts.

Keywords: after-action report, after-action review, corrective action, corrective action plan, corrective action program, evaluation, improvement plan, information and data collection, preparedness, qualitative and quantitative evaluation

Summary: This recommended practice provides information, considerations and recommendations to help public transit agencies implement after-action reviews and corrective action plans and programs. After-action reviews advance improvements to agency operations, planning, equipment and other elements. This recommended practice addresses the importance of and considerations for implementing after-action reviews for real-world events. After-action reporting for exercises and training is addressed separately in APTA SS-SEM-S-004-09, "Transit Exercises."



Foreword

The American Public Transportation Association is a standards development organization in North America. The process of developing standards is managed by the APTA Standards Program's Standards Development Oversight Council (SDOC). These activities are carried out through several standards policy and planning committees that have been established to address specific transportation modes, safety and security requirements, interoperability, and other topics.

APTA used a consensus-based process to develop this document and its continued maintenance, which is detailed in the [manual for the APTA Standards Program](#). This document was drafted in accordance with the approval criteria and editorial policy as described. Any trade name used in this document is information given for the convenience of users and does not constitute an endorsement.

This document was prepared by the Security and Emergency Management Working Group as directed by the Security and Emergency Management Standards Policy and Planning Committee.

This document represents a common viewpoint of those parties concerned with its provisions, namely transit operating/planning agencies, manufacturers, consultants, engineers and general interest groups. The application of any recommended practices or guidelines contained herein is voluntary. APTA standards are mandatory to the extent incorporated by an applicable statute or regulation. In some cases, federal and/or state regulations govern portions of a transit agency's operations. In cases where there is a conflict or contradiction between an applicable law or regulation and this document, consult with a legal adviser to determine which document takes precedence.

This is a new document.



Table of Contents

Foreword	ii
Participants.....	iv
Introduction.....	iv
Scope and purpose	iv
1. Overview	5
2. After-action reviews	5
2.1 Collect information and draft the after-action report	6
2.2 Finalize the after-action report.....	11
2.3 Approve the after-action report.....	11
2.4 Disseminate the after-action report.....	12
3. Corrective actions and corrective action programs.....	12
3.1 Corrective action program	12
3.2 Corrective action identification and planning.....	12
3.3 Corrective action monitoring and tracking	13
Related APTA standards.....	14
References.....	14
Abbreviations and acronyms.....	14
Document history.....	14
Appendix A: After-action report template	15

List of Figures and Tables

Table 1 Information Collection Methods and Considerations.....	7
Table 2 Sample Corrective Action Tracker.....	13



Participants

The American Public Transportation Association greatly appreciates the contributions of the **Security and Emergency Management Working Group**, which provided the primary effort in the drafting of this document.

At the time this standard was completed, the working group included the following members:

Alex Abdun-Nabi, *CapMetro*, Chair

Jill Shaw, *Dallas Area Rapid Transit*, Vice Chair

Robyn Austin, *King County Metro*

Mark Biamonte, *Toronto Transit Commission*

Brad Blackburn, *Sound Transit*

Marla Blagg, *AC Transit*

Aldon Bordenave, *Metro*

Sherita Bradshaw-Jackson, *Bi-State Development*

Neil Crosier, *King County Metro*

Fred Damron, *TSA*

Alexa Dupigny-Samuels, *WMATA*

Tony Easterling, *TSA*

John Greet, *OCTA*

Deepika Gangwani, *Toronto Transit Commission*

Matthew Green, *King County Metro*

Richard Herrera, *Houston Metro*

Darryl Jamail, *CapMetro*

Shane Kelly, *Hampton Roads Transit*

Lawrence Mason, *Hampton Roads Transit*

Curtis Moses, *San Joaquin RTD*

Diana Rawles, *Denver RTD*

Chablis Salters, *MARTA*

Alexander Ubiadas, *WSP US*

Project team

Polly Hanson, *American Public Transportation Association*

Eric Halzel, *Eagle Hill Consulting*

Introduction

This introduction is not part of APTA SS-SEM-RP-021-26, “After-Action Reviews and Corrective Actions for Real-World Events.”

APTA recommends the use of this document by:

- individuals or organizations that operate public transit systems;
- individuals or organizations that contract with others for the operation of public transit systems; and
- individuals or organizations that influence how public transit systems are operated (including but not limited to consultants, designers and contractors).

Scope and purpose

This recommended practice provides information, considerations and recommendations to help public transit agencies implement after-action reviews and corrective action plans and programs to facilitate an agency’s continuous improvement, especially related to preparedness efforts.

After-Action Reviews and Corrective Actions for Real-World Events

1. Overview

After-action reviews and corrective actions are fundamental components of emergency preparedness that make organizations better prepared for emergencies and significant events. By integrating a structured approach for conducting after-action reviews and implementing corrective actions, transit agencies will be better organized to collect and analyze information, identify root causes, document lessons learned and develop actionable recommendations. Transit agencies can use these tools to strengthen preparedness; improve operations; and promote continuous, agency-wide improvement.

This recommended practice addresses conducting after-action review and developing corrective action plans and programs for real-world incidents. After-action reporting for exercises and training is addressed in APTA SS-SEM-S-004-09, “Transit Exercises.”

2. After-action reviews

An after-action review is a structured process to evaluate a significant incident or effort. After-action reviews typically collect and document observations; root causes that may reveal why the incident or key events occurred; and recommendations to further improve planning, organization, equipment, training, exercises, capacity and coordination (POETECC). After-action reviews are a common tool in the preparedness and emergency management community.

After an emergency, critical incident or significant planned event, transit agencies should conduct an after-action review to assess and document information, observations and recommendations to advance continuous improvement, mitigate areas for improvement, and sustain or further improve strengths. Transit agencies can also use after-action reviews to identify perceived best practices and lessons learned to share with partners to improve overall community preparedness.

Transit agencies can pursue after-action reviews at any organizational level. While some incidents or events may require a full agency after-action review, agencies may be able to address less significant incidents and efforts at a lower organizational level.

Validated recommendations arising from after-action reviews typically populate an improvement plan and/or corrective action plan.

As described in detail in this recommended practice, transit agencies should consider incorporating the following process when developing and/or refining after-action review programs:

1. **Collect information and draft the after-action report.**
 - a. Identify participants and partners.
 - b. Collect information and data.

- c. Analyze information and data.
- d. Develop and document content.
- 2. Finalize the after-action report.**
- 3. Approve the after-action report.**
- 4. Disseminate the after-action report.**

2.1 Collect information and draft the after-action report

After-action reviews are best conducted using a repeatable, structured process shortly after incidents occur. An effective process promotes individual and group continuous improvement, builds team cohesion, strengthens accountability, and encourages transparency. A straightforward approach for conducting after-action reviews includes identifying participants and partners, collecting information and data, analyzing information and data, and developing and documenting content.

2.1.1 Identify participants and partners

Collecting the right input from the right participants is a critical feature of effective after-action reviews. Transit agencies should identify and include frontline, supervisory, managerial and executive individuals who were directly involved in the incident/event. Depending on the size, scope and scale of the incident/event, agencies may seek input from a broader cross-section of employees to evaluate items such as internal communications, employee support activities or field operation impacts. As much as possible, agencies should attempt to engage all personnel involved in its response to the incident/event, but the amount of engagement and number of participants should correlate with the scope and impact of the incident/event.

In some cases, transit agencies should pursue participation and engagement with external personnel, to include partner agencies, customers, community groups or elected officials. When considering external engagement, transit agencies should consider the impact of the incident on the community, the image of the agency and partnerships leveraged during the event.

2.1.2 Collect information and data

After identifying after-action review participants, transit agencies should develop and deploy a data collection plan and procedure. Data collection plans can be very simple or extremely elaborate depending on the size, scope and scale of an incident. Transit agencies should formulate a data collection plan based on existing or contracted data analysis methods and capabilities (i.e., agencies should have a general understanding of how they are going to analyze the data before they collect it).

Consider the following types of data and information when performing an after-action review:

- partner feedback
- performance data (e.g., on-time performance, services lost, vehicle maintenance issues)
- ridership data
- incident video and audio (e.g., radio communications, phone call recordings)
- Emergency Operations Center (EOC) or incident management team communications (e.g., email, texts, messages, incident management software postings, briefings)
- operational/departmental communications (e.g., emails, bulletins)
- staff communications materials (e.g., bulletins, emails, recorded phone calls, text messages, staff applications)
- external communications materials (e.g., press releases, press briefings, social media posts)
- media reports
- social media reporting (e.g., sentiment analysis, engagement information)
- customer feedback

APTA SS-SEM-RP-021-26
After-Action Reviews and Corrective Actions for Real-World Event

Transit agencies can apply the following topics and questions to collect information typically relevant in transit environments:

- **Understand intentions:**
 - What was the established plan or strategy?
 - What were the objectives or goals of the response?
- **Understand what happened:**
 - What went according to plan?
 - What deviated from the plan?
 - How was service impacted?
- **Understand root causes:**
 - What factors contributed to success or failure?
 - Did training help equip employees with the knowledge and tools to effectively respond?
 - Were there any unexpected challenges or opportunities?
 - What decisions had the most impact on the outcome?
 - Were roles and responsibilities clear?
- **Define lessons learned:**
 - What should the agency sustain or repeat?
 - What should the agency improve or change?
 - What tools, processes or resources would have helped?

Table 1 summarizes information collection methods and considerations.

TABLE 1
Information Collection Methods and Considerations

Method	Considerations	Options	Pros	Cons
Electronic survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do target staff have a way to access an electronic survey? If not, how will they get access? • Does the survey need to be in multiple languages? • Will the survey use random sampling or ask for feedback from all participants? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emails • Text messages • Staff apps • QR codes • Survey stations at facilities • Posted to website 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy to collect • Easy to analyze • Does not necessarily require on-site presence during collection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires access to an electronic device • May be challenging for those with lower levels of technology familiarity
Paper surveys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the agency disseminate and collect the survey? • How long of a paper survey are people willing to complete? • How will the results be collated and analyzed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-person dissemination and collection • Distribution and collection boxes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can reach staff who do not have email access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data has to be collated • Handwriting can be difficult to read • Requires on-site presence

TABLE 1

Information Collection Methods and Considerations

Method	Considerations	Options	Pros	Cons
Hot wash meeting (occurs immediately after the incident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who will be invited? How long should the meeting be? Will the meeting be in person, virtual or hybrid? Will there be a specific order for speaking, or will people just raise their hands? Will supervisors be in the room? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-person Virtual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Captures immediate reactions and feedback before it is stale Allows participants to build off one another's feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time-constrained feedback sessions Participants may not feel comfortable speaking about issues in front of large groups or supervisors
Feedback sessions/debriefs (scheduled after the incident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who will be invited? How long should the meeting be? Will the meeting be in person, virtual or hybrid? Will there be a specific order for speaking, or will people just raise their hands? Will supervisors be in the room? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-person Virtual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows participants and teams to process their reactions and develop recommendations Allows participants to build off one another's feedback Scheduled nature allows more people to attend 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depending on the time between the incident and the feedback session, participants may not recall all details or issues Time-constrained feedback sessions Participants may not feel comfortable speaking about issues in front of large groups or supervisors
Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who needs to be interviewed? Will interviews be done in groups or person-by-person? Will interviews be structured or free-form? If structured, what questions are going to be asked? How much time will be scheduled for interviews? Will the meeting be in person or virtual? Who will be conducting the interviews? If it is emergency management staff, will agency personnel be comfortable sharing information about the performance of emergency management staff? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In-person Virtual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allows in-depth investigation of problems and possible solutions Provides opportunities for back-and-forth conversations and allows interviewer to get clarification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time-consuming Data has to be collated Participants do not have the opportunity to interact

2.1.3 Analyze information and data

Data analysis falls into two broad categories: qualitative and quantitative. Each is important for an after-action report, though the level of importance will depend on the type of incident and the information collected. Whenever possible, personnel should conduct analysis collaboratively, involving as many partners and perspectives as feasible.

Information and data analysis on events should include a root cause analysis to identify factors that contributed to the incident and response activities. In root cause analysis, personnel should differentiate between aggravating and causal factors.

EXAMPLE: A brake failure leads to a crash. The brake failure was the cause of the crash, but the ultimate causal failure traces back to poor maintenance from overworked technicians.

2.1.3.1 Qualitative analysis

Qualitative data analysis uses inputs such as interview transcripts, notes, documents or free text fields in survey forms to understand why and how something occurs or occurred. Qualitative analysis is useful for evaluating subjective events and experiences, as inputs are not statistical or numerical in nature and can typically capture a broader variety of information or experience than purely quantitative methods.

In general, a qualitative analysis encompasses five stages,¹ which can be performed multiple times as the analysis proceeds. Depending on the size, scope and scale of the analysis, this procedure can be casual or highly formal. Transit agencies should adjust their approach to meet the needs of each after-action review.

1. **Compilation:** Aggregating the data and organizing it in a way that can be used for analysis.
2. **Data breakdown:** Taking compiled data and breaking it down and organizing its components (quotes, observations, takeaways) in ways conducive to analysis. This may involve labeling or “coding” the data to identify general themes or specific takeaways. For example, an evaluator may have several statements from interviews that talk about the need to clarify emergency procurement policies. Labeling those quotes as “procurement” will allow an evaluator to group them for analysis about the procurement policy in later steps.
3. **Reassembly:** Sorting the labeled, tagged or coded data to facilitate analysis, using lists, buckets or graphics to facilitate sorting. This step may require additional data breakdown if evaluators discover themes or areas that are missing in their initial pass. For example, evaluators would gather the quotes tagged “procurement” from the previous step together in a list or graphic representation. This list may be a sub-list of a broader topic, depending on the complexity of the evaluation.
4. **Interpretation:** Evaluating the sorted data to understand the nature of the feedback. Interpretation may involve the creation of a narrative to provide a sense of what the information says. As evaluators interpret data, they may identify additional themes or trends that call for additional data breakdown and reassembly. For example, evaluators examining quotes about procurement may identify that multiple participants indicated that different steps in the procurement process were confusing. They could use this narrative to understand the challenges with procurement from an end user’s perspective.
5. **Conclusions:** Finalizing identification of strengths, areas of improvement and recommendations based on the data. For example, evaluators looking at the quotes around procurement may identify that the emergency procurement process is not well-understood and requires too many approvals from personnel who are not always available. They could also identify recommendations to change the approval process to include positions that are always filled during an emergency, such as an EOC director.

2.1.3.2 Quantitative analysis

Quantitative analysis uses numerical data inputs to understand what happened based on objective facts. For impacts and outcomes that can be quantified, agencies should evaluate the incident’s impact on selected criteria, often called a measure of performance (e.g., lost service hours, on-time performance, and

1. Adapted from Robert Yin, “Qualitative Research from Start to Finish,” 2016.

vehicle or staff availability). This may require statistical analysis, including disentangling confounding variables and attempting to discern causal relationships. Statistical analysis involves a series of tests and methodologies that are appropriate for different types of data. If unfamiliar with statistics, transit emergency management personnel should consult agency data analysis or planning personnel who have expertise in this area.

2.1.4 Develop and document content

After completing the analysis, agencies should document findings in an after-action report. Agencies should draft an after-action report outline or use a template to confirm inclusion of core reporting components. While agencies may want to customize their report to match agency branding and align with documentation needs, they can also consider using or applying existing templates like the template included in Appendix A, “After-action report template” or HSEEP’s exercise “After-Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR-IP) Template.”

Before writing the after-action report, writers should understand the document’s intended distribution and level of sensitivity. For example, if an after-action report is intended for public distribution, writers should receive instructions to not include sensitive security information or to segment SSI findings and other sensitive information in a separate annex.

An after-action report should summarize the incident, actions taken by the transit agency and other responding personnel, and outcomes. Reports should leverage the completed data analysis to highlight both strengths and specific areas for improvement, as well as general themes that underlie those areas. Transit agencies can organize areas for improvement using several methods (e.g., National Preparedness Goal mission areas and core capabilities, POETE or POETECC frameworks, agency goals, incident-specific themes) and should explore delineating emergency management–related observations and recommendations from administrative and/or operational observations and recommendations. Agencies should apply consistent organization across all after-action reports to facilitate comparing results, monitoring progress and identifying persistent challenges.

As after-action reports are typically nonpunitive and focus on agency and team continuous improvement, transit agency after-action reports should document processes, roles, systems and decisions, not individuals.

Transit agencies should identify at least one recommendation for each area for improvement. They can also identify recommendations to further strengthen strengths. Depending on the size, scope, scale or complexity of the area for improvement, agencies may include multiple recommendations, which can be related, sequential or independent of one another.

Collaborating with internal and external partners to document after-action findings is critical. Agencies should codevelop observations and recommendations to ensure accuracy, include alternative perspectives, strengthen relationships and increase buy-in for positive change. In collective bargaining environments, transit agencies should engage unions to address findings and recommendations for the workforce. Ultimately, transit agencies may need to negotiate with multiple partners to develop acceptable recommendations. Compromise or negotiation may not always be possible, in which case emergency managers should make recommendations they believe are feasible and will solve the identified problems. This may involve engagement with senior leaders.

Transit agency after-action reports should include the following sections:

- **Overview of Event** (name, location, date, description)
- **Report Details** (date, report lead, review participants, intended audience)

- **Insights and Observations** (qualitative and quantitative data points from staff interviews, surveys, observations)
- **Findings and Next Steps** (demonstrated strengths/best practices, areas for improvement/lessons learned and associated recommendations, improvement plans/corrective action plans)
- **Supporting Documentation** (supplemental information including charts, data, meeting notes)

2.2 Finalize the after-action report

Before finalizing an after-action report, transit agencies should review the product with individuals and organizations that responded to or were affected by the incident.

Transit agencies should consider the following activities when developing their after-action report review process:

- Meet to discuss and confirm the after-action report.
- Distribute a draft after-action report to participants within a specified number of days before the after-action meeting.
- Provide an appropriate, specified period and instructions for partners to provide feedback.
- Document and adjudicate received feedback, noting feedback that was and was not incorporated and justifications.
- Meet to review changes, collect additional feedback and approve the after-action report.

NOTE: In some cases, transit agencies may need to conduct additional meetings to resolve complex issues or disagreements.

Once transit agencies confirm and validate recommendations, personnel should consolidate all recommendations into an improvement plan to clearly communicate actionable measures to address areas for improvement and strengthen strengths. Improvement plans typically include detailed corrective actions, responsible parties, timelines and resources needed to implement the action. Most often, transit agencies can develop and/or confirm improvement plans during after-action meetings.

2.3 Approve the after-action report

Once a transit agency confirms findings, an assigned individual should approve the after-action report. Approving authorities may vary based on the scope and scale of the incident; organizations, departments or groups involved; and the potential impacts of the identified recommendations. Example approving authorities for different events:

- **Department- or team-level incidents:** Manager/director/vice president
- **Agency-wide incidents:** Executive director/executive vice president/chief executive officer
- **Multiagency incidents:** Designated officials from each participating agency

Approving authorities may explore the following legal and documentation considerations before approving the after-action report:

- Conduct a legal and risk-management review to identify potential liability concerns, especially for incidents resulting in injury, property damage or significant operational impacts.
- Address Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) concerns and clearly mark SSI in accordance with regulations. See APTA SS-ISS-RP-003-23, “Sensitive Security Information Policy,” for information about minimum standards for handling SSI.
- Determine distribution limitations.
- Document the approval process with dates and signatures from all determined appropriate authorities.

2.4 Disseminate the after-action report

Once complete and fully approved, transit agencies should distribute the after-action report in accordance with distribution limitations. However, depending on the severity and profile of the incident undergoing evaluation, transit agencies should have general counsel review the document before distribution. Additionally, agencies may consider public release. While public release may introduce risks, a properly vetted after-action report may strengthen transparency and overall community preparedness efforts.

3. Corrective actions and corrective action programs

Corrective actions and corrective action programs are valuable tools transit agencies can use to realize insights, observations, lessons learned and recommendations gleaned from real-world incidents and exercises. Most often, transit agencies will capture corrective actions in an after-action report's improvement plan.

Corrective actions are activities transit agencies take to rectify an area for improvement and address validated recommendations. One or more corrective actions form a corrective action plan, and an agency's approach for managing corrective actions and a corrective action plan is a corrective action program.

Corrective actions provide clear, actionable remedial steps, often with measures of success, to help agencies avoid future challenges and prompt continuous improvement.

3.1 Corrective action program

Transit agencies should develop a corrective action program to standardize corrective action reporting, validation, decision-making, tracking, implementation and reporting. Successful corrective action programs leverage replicable processes tailored to each agency's organizational structure, governance, partners, technology and culture. An agency's approach to corrective actions should be simple, replicable and easily understood by all staff.

Transit agencies should identify standards for evaluating incidents as part of their corrective action program. Not every incident requires an after-action report and improvement plan, and there is no one-size-fits-all approach to determining when an incident rises to the threshold of requiring identifying corrective actions. Some factors agencies should consider in determining corrective action thresholds include the following:

- severity of the incident and/or recommendation
- potential recurrence of the incident or replicability of the lesson learned
- agency size, equipment and staffing
- regulatory, state safety oversight or other governance requirements
- partner processes and requirements
- past incidents

Transit agencies should create an adaptable program that accepts the agency's evolution and change. For instance, if an agency opens a new light rail line, it could explore lowering the threshold for what rises to a corrective action to respond to new, unforeseen incidents brought on by the opening of the new line.

3.2 Corrective action identification and planning

Transit agencies should closely link corrective action and after-action reporting processes. The following process highlights key planning steps:

After-Action Reviews and Corrective Actions for Real-World Event

1. After a qualifying incident, an agency collects observations and conducts an after-action review.
2. Agency staff develop an after-action report, which includes recommendations based on observations and analysis.
3. Agency staff validate and convert an after-action report’s recommendations to corrective actions, prioritizing, resourcing and assigning actions to individuals or teams.
4. Agency leadership approves the assignment and timeline for corrective actions.

3.3 Corrective action monitoring and tracking

Transit agencies should develop an agency-wide standard for monitoring, tracking and reporting corrective actions. They should track corrective actions until the action is fully implemented.

Agencies should leverage existing systems and processes (e.g., risk registers) to monitor and track corrective actions. Systems and processes should be simple, easy to update and understood by all relevant staff. Corrective action monitoring and tracking systems should adhere to all applicable agency, local, state and federal rules and regulations governing data management. **Table 2** depicts a sample table that agencies may use to track corrective actions.

TABLE 2

Sample Corrective Action Tracker

#	Incident Name	Corrective Action	Assigned To	Start Date	Completion Date	Current Status	Quality Assurance Review
1							
2							

Related APTA standards

APTA SS-SEM-S-004-09, “Transit Exercises”

APTA SS-ISS-RP-003-23, “Sensitive Security Information Policy”

References

Department of Homeland Security, “Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program,” February 2020. <https://www.fema.gov/hseep>

FEMA, “After-Action Report/Improvement Plan (AAR-IP) Template,” 2020.

<https://preptoolkit.fema.gov/web/hseep-resources/improvement-planning>

FEMA, “Developing and Maintaining Emergency Operations Plans,” November 2010.

https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/2020-05/CPG_101_V2_30NOV2010_FINAL_508.pdf

FEMA Emergency Management Institute, “Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program.”

<https://training.fema.gov/programs/hseep/>

FEMA, “National Preparedness Goal,” September 2015. [https://www.fema.gov/emergency-](https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/national-preparedness/goal)

[managers/national-preparedness/goal](https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/national-preparedness/goal)

FEMA, “National Response Framework,” October 2019.

https://www.fema.gov/sites/default/files/documents/NRF_FINALApproved_2011028.pdf

Abbreviations and acronyms

EOC Emergency Operations Center

HSEEP Homeland Security Exercise Evaluation Program

POETE planning, organization, equipment, training and exercises

POETECC planning, organization, equipment, training, exercises, capacity and coordination

SSI sensitive security information

Document history

Document Version	Working Group Vote	Public Comment/ Technical Oversight	CEO Approval	Policy & Planning Approval	Publish Date
First published	Aug. 22, 2025	Oct. 2, 2025	April 19, 2026	May 15, 2026	June 10, 2026

Appendix A: After-action report template

[Event Name]

After-Action Report

[Date]

Event Overview

Name	[Add a name for the event, which should match the name on the front page]
Location	[Indicate where the event occurred]
Date	[Indicate the date and time of the event]

Report Details

Date	[Insert the date the report was finalized]
AAR Lead/Author	[Insert the name, role, and contact information for the person responsible for developing the report]
Participants	[Insert the names of individuals who participated in the after-action report development and review process]
Approval Authority	[Insert the name and role of the person who approved the report]
Intended Audience	[Indicate who the intended audience is for the final report (e.g., internal to agency, external partners)]
Distribution Limitations	[Indicate any distribution limitations for the report (e.g., for internal distribution only, for public release)]
Data/Information Collected	[Indicate the types of data and information collected and analyzed as part of the after-action development process (e.g., performance data, emails, staff surveys, interviews, APTA standards)]

Description of Event

[Insert a detailed summary, descriptive details, and timeline associated with the event (e.g., who was there, what were the impacts, how the event began, how the event unfolded, how the event was resolved)]

Observations and Recommendations

The following sections document strengths, areas for improvement, and recommendations associated with [agency name]'s response to [event name].

Strengths

1. [Insert a brief sentence statement that describes an identified strength that indicates the team(s) or position(s) of personnel, their activities, and impact]
2. [Insert a brief sentence statement that describes an identified strength that indicates the team(s) or position(s) of personnel, their activities, and impact]

Areas for Improvement

1. [Insert a brief descriptive statement that clearly states the problem or gap]
 - **References:** [List applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations or laws]
 - **Root Cause Analysis:** [Indicate why the problem or gap occurred according to the analysis conducted during the after-action review process]
 - **Recommendation(s):**
 - a. [Indicate an action the agency can implement to address the identified area for improvement, providing as much specificity as possible]
 - b. [Indicate an action the agency can implement to address the identified area for improvement, providing as much specificity as possible]

2. [Insert a brief, descriptive statement that clearly states the problem or gap]
 - **References:** [List applicable plans, policies, procedures, regulations, or laws]
 - **Root Cause Analysis:** [Indicate why the problem or gap occurred according to the analysis conducted during the after-action review process]
 - **Recommendation(s):**
 - a. [Indicate an action the agency can implement to address the identified area for improvement, providing as much specificity as possible]
 - b. [Indicate an action the agency can implement to address the identified area for improvement, providing as much specificity as possible]

Improvement Plan

This improvement plan describes corrective actions [transit agency] should implement to address areas for improvement associated with [event name].

Recommendation Number	Corrective Action	Assigned To	Start Date	Completion Date
[Insert the recommendation number from the report to serve as reference]	[Insert an actionable description of the corrective action the transit agency should undertake to address the recommendation and associated area(s) for improvement]	[Indicate the role or organizational unit assigned to the corrective action]	[Insert the date the corrective action should begin to be implemented]	[Insert the date the corrective action should be completely implemented]
[Insert the recommendation number from the report to serve as reference]	[Insert an actionable description of the corrective action the transit agency should undertake to address the recommendation and associated area(s) for improvement]	[Indicate the role or organizational unit assigned to the corrective action]	[Insert the date the corrective action should begin to be implemented]	[Insert the date the corrective action should be completely implemented]

Recommendation Number	Corrective Action	Assigned To	Start Date	Completion Date
[Insert the recommendation number from the report to serve as reference]	[Insert an actionable description of the corrective action the transit agency should undertake to address the recommendation and associated area(s) for improvement]	[Indicate the role or organizational unit assigned to the corrective action]	[Insert the date the corrective action should begin to be implemented]	[Insert the date the corrective action should be completely implemented]
	[Insert an actionable description of the corrective action the transit agency should undertake to address the recommendation and associated area(s) for improvement]	[Indicate the role or organizational unit assigned to the corrective action]	[Insert the date the corrective action should begin to be implemented]	[Insert the date the corrective action should be completely implemented]

Appendix: Supporting Documentation

This section includes supplemental information associated with [event name] and the after-action review.

[Insert supplemental resources as needed]