

PERCH | PROJECT

# STAKEHOLDER MAPPING ANALYSIS



**PERCH**  
PartnERship to  
Contrast HPV



Co-funded by  
the European Union



## Work Package 2 – Dissemination

### Milestone 6

#### Stakeholder mapping analysis

##### Document Information

Authors:	Urška Ivanus (IOL-Slovenia), Tine Jerman (IOL-Slovenia), Elizabeta Radelj Pepevnik (IOL-Slovenia)
Contributors:	Hélène De Pauw (Belgium), Barthélémy Moreau de Lizoreux (Belgium), Ivana Andrijasevic (Croatia), Lenka Vostalova (Czech Republic), Kerli Reintamm (Estonia), Cobigo Alexandre (France), Miriam Gerlich (Germany), Lilla Vető (Hungary), Sara Boccalini (Italy), Edita Jegeleviciene (Lithuania), Carmen Ungurean (Romania), Maria Hlasna (Slovakia), Pilar Vidaurre Teixidó (Spain), Maria Brotons (Spain), Lina Schollin Ask (Sweden), Raffaella Bucciardini (coordinator, Italy)
Work Package:	WP2 – Dissemination
Milestone:	M S.6 – Stakeholder mapping analysis
Date of publication:	28/02/2023
Dissemination level:	Public

##### Project Information

Project Acronym:	PERCH
Project Full Title:	PartnERship to Contrast HPV
Grant Agreement N°:	101075314
Co-Funding Body:	EU4Health programme 2021-2027
Starting Date:	01/11/2022
Duration:	30 months
Coordinator:	Istituto Superiore di Sanità (Italy)

**Disclaimer:** Project PERCH is funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Health and Digital Executive Agency (HaDEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



## Contents

Contents .....	2
<b>1. BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 PERCH stakeholder definition.....	3
2.2. Timing of the mapping process .....	3
2.3 PERCH stakeholder mapping process .....	3
2.4 PERCH stakeholder mapping tool .....	4
2.4.1 Method.....	4
2.4.2 Short user guidelines for the mapping tool use.....	4
4.5 Dissemination level of mapping results and compliance to GDPR .....	5
<b>3. STAKEHOLDER MAPPING RESULTS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1.Characteristics of responders to survey.....	5
3.2. Mapped stakeholders number, contacts and categories.....	5
3.3 List of related national projects.....	6
3.4 Preferred stakeholders' communication channels (inbound).....	7
3.5. Preferred stakeholders' communication tools (inbound).....	8
3.6. Preferred messengers for stakeholders.....	8
<b>4. EVALUATION OF THE MAPPING TOOL .....</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 How would you rate your overall experience with the survey with one mark?.....	9
4.2 What did you like the most in the overall experience with survey?.....	9
4.3 What did you dislike the most in the overall experience with survey?.....	9
4.4 Were the questions and additional survey information clear?.....	11
4.5 How much time (hands-on) did the survey take? .....	11
4.6 Any comments or thought you would like to share with WP2 coordinator's team on the survey or stakeholder mapping and analysis? .....	12
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
5.1 Testing phase conclusions regarding the mapping guide and tool .....	14
5.2 Final conclusions regarding HPV vaccination stakeholders .....	15

## 1. BACKGROUND

Stakeholder identification and engagement is crucial to reaching high HPV vaccination coverage. Aim of the PERCH (PartnERship to Contrast HPV) stakeholder mapping and analysis was to identify all relevant stakeholders that make or could make impact at national and European level and to gather basic information about them. Results of the stakeholder mapping are compiled in this document, were and will be used for the preparation of other PERCH deliverables: D2.2 PERCH communication and dissemination plan (including social media plan) and D2.4 National HPV Communication Strategies. Prior to the stakeholder mapping, the mapping tool and guide were tested by PERCH partners with aim to evaluate and improve them before the final mapping.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 PERCH stakeholder definition

Prior the mapping process started, the PERCH stakeholder definition was aligned at PERCH kick-off meeting in Brussels on 5<sup>th</sup> December 2022 and later via e-mail correspondence. The final definition of a PERCH stakeholder used for the mapping was: “Any individual or organisation at EU, national or local level that can with their action or inaction influence the increase or decrease in HPV vaccination coverage in person or via media, including social media.”

### 2.2. Timing of the mapping process

All WP2 working group members were invited to test the stakeholders’ mapping tool and guide in the period from 25<sup>th</sup> January to 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2023. Results of the testing phase lead to the improvements of the tool and guide as described in Chapter 5. On 13<sup>th</sup> February, the final tool and guide were developed and full stakeholder mapping started. Data were extracted from the tool for this report on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2023.

### 2.3 PERCH stakeholder mapping process

PERCH stakeholder mapping process has three steps:

1. *List of relevant stakeholders by types:* (A) organisations (formal and informal, national); (B) individuals (national), (C) projects (national), (D) organisations (international) and (E) individuals (international).
2. *Additional information about listed stakeholders* regarding the webpage, inclusion in PERCH CD activities and similar. In case of organisation, also organisation categories (see Table 2).
3. *Additional information about the stakeholders* that will be included in PERCH communication and dissemination activities regarding the partnership within the PERCH consortium, contact for PERCH-related communication and dissemination, preferred communication channels, tools and messengers.



## 2.4 PERCH stakeholder mapping tool

### 2.4.1 Method

The mapping tool was made in 1KA – an online survey tool that allows respondents to participate in surveys created by researchers or organizations. The surveys can be accessed through a unique link and can be completed on any device with internet access.

### 2.4.2 Short user guidelines for the mapping tool use

The four steps used are shown below.

- In the first step, you will list all the relevant stakeholders (as many as possible) by the categories (A-E) listed in chapter 2.3.1. You can add a new stakeholder any time by clicking on the “List of all relevant stakeholders” on **navigation bar** at the top of each page. For each stakeholder added, you will need to enter additional information in the second step.
- In the second step, you will enter additional information for each listed stakeholder as described in chapters 2.3.2 and 2.3.3. Use the navigation bar at the top of each page to switch between the stakeholder categories (A-E). Use the **button “Next page”** at the bottom of each page to switch between the subpages within one category.
- In the third step, you will give your feedback about the e-survey as described in chapter 5. You can access the evaluation section at any time; by clicking on the “Evaluation survey” on the navigation bar at the top of each page.
- By clicking the button “Last page” at the bottom of the “Survey feedback” page you can get feedback about your progress in the survey using **“PDF report”** function. By selecting this function, you will download a report where you will be able to see what you have entered in the survey so far. You can use this function to check the correctness and completeness of your survey as many times as you need to.

Special features:

- The survey has an **“automatic save”** function. All the information you will enter will save automatically and you will be able to continue to work on the survey the next day.
- There is **no “finish” button** in the survey. The survey will be open until the end of the PERCH project and available for further mapping. The closing date will be communicated on time.
- You can change the stakeholder’s name on the stakeholder’s list page (1<sup>st</sup> point) and its additional information (2<sup>nd</sup> point) will stay the same. If you completely delete the stakeholder name and move to another page or tab, additional information will be deleted.

Important notes:

- When mapping the stakeholders please refer to the PERCH definition of a stakeholder.
- Please include supportive as well as opposing stakeholders.
- Please note that this is the first phase in the stakeholder mapping and analysis process. In the next phase you will decide who are key stakeholders in communicating HPV vaccination in your country and assess their level of possible influence, activity and attitude towards HPV vaccination) (supportive, opposing, neutral). This information will be used in the third phase to prepare a stakeholder engagement strategy, which will already be a part of your country’s national HPV communication plan.



## 4.5 Dissemination level of mapping results and compliance to GDPR

- Country mapping results will be shared within PERCH consortium only (sensitive). All personal information gathered by the tool (including e-mail address) will be handled as sensitive information and kept within the PERCH consortium. It will be stored on 1ka servers and can be accessed via the personalised link in the mapping tool, by the PERCH WP2 analytic team and PERCH Steering Committee.
- Only results from which it is not possible to identify stakeholders' identity will be used in PERCH public documents such as PERCH communication and dissemination plan and Stakeholder mapping analysis report (public).
- In the mapping tool, respondents were asked to decide for each stakeholder, if it will be included in PERCH communication and dissemination activities. If yes, they were asked to decide if it will be included in the PERCH communication and dissemination mailing list, or their organisation will disseminate PERCH messages to them – in this case, they will report the dissemination activities via *PERCH Reporting Tool for Communication and Dissemination activities*.
- If a stakeholder will be included in the direct PERCH dissemination performed by WP2, the e-mail address should be either publicly available or the stakeholder should give the permission to include him/her in direct communication with the PERCH project.
- Registration for the e-newsletter will be freely available via the PERCH webpage and all partners will be encouraged to disseminate this information via their communication channels. GDPR compliant, including all GDPR-related features (privacy consent for all forms, consent for cookies on a first visit to the PERCH webpage, etc.) will be included.

## 3. STAKEHOLDER MAPPING RESULTS

### 3.1. Characteristics of responders to survey

All WP2 working group members (17 partner countries and Ireland as an associated partner), 51 persons) were invited to participate in stakeholder mapping and have received individual links with request to perform one mapping per country or to align, if there will be more than one link used per country. Six individual links were sent additionally on request.

All together 15 individuals responded for 14 countries *Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden*. Three countries did not respond: *Greece, Norway, Poland*.

### 3.2. Mapped stakeholders number, contacts and categories

Table 1 shows the final mapping results per type of the stakeholder. All together 281 stakeholders were mapped, ranging from 2 to 58 stakeholders per country. Majority of stakeholders were national organisations (64%, 181/281) or national individuals (30%, 84/281). Responding PERCH partners indicated that 68 % (192/281) of stakeholders should be included in the PERCH CD activities and that for the majority of those stakeholders they will be in contact with the stakeholders (60%, 115/192) or they will provide other solution (13%, 25/192). Only minority of stakeholders should be directly contacted by the WP2 coordinating team (27%, 51/192). Most of the stakeholders that should be included in the PERCH CD activities are not yet members of PERCH consortium (78%, 150/192).

Table 2 shows the final mapping results by category of the national organisations. Around half of the identified PERCH stakeholders belongs to professional and scientific societies and bodies (27%, 48/181) or authorities (24%, 44/181), also health sector (18%, 33/181) and non-governmental organisations and organised societies (13%, 24/181) were recognised as important.

**Table 1.** Final mapping results per the type of the stakeholder.

Type of stakeholder	All (N)	Should stakeholder be included in PERCH communication and dissemination activities?			If YES								
		yes	no	NA	Who will be in contact with the stakeholder?				Is stakeholder already a member of PERCH consortium?				
					WP2 team	National team	Other	NA	yes	no	I don't know	NA	
(A) ORGANISATIONS – national	181	125	24	32	14	85	25	1	13	111	0	1	
(B) INDIVIDUALS – national	84	60	13	11	35	25	0	0	24	32	4	0	
(C) PROJECTS – national	8	4	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	
(D) ORGANISATIONS – international	8	3	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	
(E) INDIVIDUALS – international	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SUM	281	192	40	49	51	115	25	1	37	150	4	1	

**Table 2.** Final mapping results by the categories of the organisations.

A - Categories for ORGANISATIONS – national	n
A) Authorities, management and staff	44
B) Health sector	33
C) Education sector	2
D) Local community formal and informal organisations other than health and educational	2
E) Professional and scientific societies and bodies	48
F) Non-governmental organisations and organised societies	24
G) Other formal and informal interest groups	2
H) Media	3
I) Industry	0
J) Any innovative/unique formal or informal organisations in your country not mentioned above?	0
K) Other (specify)	5
NA	18
SUM	181

### 3.3 List of related national projects

All together eight HPV vaccination related national or regional project were identified, among those two were national cervical cancer screening programmes:

- National
  - ABC about HPV (Slovenia)
  - Cervical cancer screening programme (Czech Republic)
  - National cervical cancer Screening Programme (Romania)
  - Project VIRUS (Slovenia)
  - Utrotning av HPV i Sverige (Elimination of HPV in Sweden)
- Regional
  - Project Love and Sex (Slovenia)
  - Project ONKO (Slovenia)
- Not categorised

- PrevHPV

### 3.4 Preferred stakeholders' communication channels (inbound)

Table 3 shows the preferred stakeholders' inbound communication channels. For more than half of the mapped stakeholders, four preferred communication channels were identified: the PERCH e-newsletter (96% mapped stakeholders), webpage (89%), invitations to national live events (66%) or virtual workshops (61%).

**Table 3.** Preferred stakeholders' communication channels (inbound).

Preferred communication channels	Selected	Not selected	% selected
PERCH periodic e-mails (e-newsletter)	177	7	96,2
PERCH webpage	164	20	89,1
Invite him/her to live events – national	122	62	66,3
Invite him/her to virtual workshops/webinars	113	71	61,4
Video Conference Meeting	91	93	49,5
Invite him/her to live events – international	82	102	44,6
Via national media, press release	77	107	41,8
Invite him/her in a virtual, multidisciplinary, interactive group of people with common interest in increasing HPV vaccination	76	108	41,3
Face-to-face meetings	71	113	38,6
PERCH Twitter account	52	132	28,3
Via international media, press release	48	136	26,1
PERCH FB account	39	145	21,2
PERCH Instagram account	30	154	16,3
PERCH YouTube channel	28	156	15,2
PERCH LinkedIn account	27	157	14,7
Relevant contents at Wikipedia	16	168	8,7
PERCH TikTok account	5	179	2,7
Other – please explain	2	182	1,1

Data was not available for 8 stakeholders out of 192 stakeholders. Multiple communication channels could be selected for each stakeholder.

Selection of a single most relevant PERCH communication channel for reaching stakeholders, number of answers:

- 59x e-mailing/e-newsletter
- 11x Face-to-face meetings
- 8x Invitation to events/webinars/interactive groups
- 5x Scientific communications
- 2x FB account
- 2x webpage
- 1x Video Conference Meeting
- 1x Live events-national
- Other: Evidence based information and prevention strategies, Press release



### 3.5. Preferred stakeholders' communication tools (inbound)

Table 4 shows the preferred stakeholders' inbound communication tools. For more than half of the mapped stakeholders, seven preferred communication tools were identified: short reads 1-3 minutes (90%), link to detailed information included in short written documentation (69%), short reads 3-5 minutes (68%), long reads more than 5 minutes (62%), infographics (62%), pictures (photos, diagrams) included in written communication (60%) and scientific information translated in lay language (57%).

**Table 4.** Preferred stakeholders' communication tools (inbound).

Preferred communication tools	Selected	Not selected	% selected
Short reads (1-3 minutes)	156	17	90,2
Link to detailed information included in short written communication	120	53	69,4
Short reads (3-5 minutes)	117	56	67,6
Longer reads (+5 minutes)	111	62	64,2
Infographics	107	66	61,8
Pictures (photos, diagrams) included in written communication	104	69	60,1
Scientific information translated in lay language	98	75	56,6
Short videos with people talking	60	113	34,7
Short animation videos	59	114	34,1
Animated GIFs	31	142	17,9
Podcasts	20	153	11,6
Blogs	15	158	8,7
Vlogs	10	163	5,8
Other	1	172	0,6

Data was not available for 19 stakeholders out of 192 stakeholders. Multiple communication tools could be selected for each stakeholder.

### 3.6. Preferred messengers for stakeholders

Table 5 shows the preferred messenger to address the stakeholders. For more than half of the mapped stakeholders, four preferred messengers were identified: national experts (94%), international experts/stakeholders (93%), international peers (59%) and national peers (54%).

**Table 5.** Preferred messenger for the stakeholder (inbound)

Preferred messengers	Selected	Not selected	% selected
Messages from national experts/stakeholders	162	11	93,6
Messages from international experts/stakeholders	160	13	92,5
Messages from international peers	102	71	59,0
Messages from national peers	93	80	53,8
Personal stories	54	119	31,2
Messages from celebrity, influencer	44	129	25,4
Messages from other people or groups – please explain, please include also good practices and lessons learned	2	171	1,2
Other – please explain	1	172	0,6

Data was not available for 19 stakeholders out of 192 stakeholders. Multiple messengers could be selected for each stakeholder.

## 4. EVALUATION OF THE MAPPING TOOL

Participants evaluated the mapping tool in the testing phase and then again after the final data entry. Evaluation results after both phases are presented below, as well as responses by the WP2 coordinators.

PERCH stakeholder mapping guide and tool were tested from January 25 to February 3 2023 by 12 countries. Five countries did not respond. Altogether 89 stakeholders were mapped, 3-17 per country.

### 4.1 How would you rate your overall experience with the survey with one mark?

Scale: from 1 (worst) to 5 (best)

*Results – after testing phase:*

- Overall experience average: **4,1**
- Number of answers per scale: 1 (0), 2 (0), 3 (2), 4 (3), 5 (3)

*Results – final phase:*

- Overall experience average: **4,3**
- Number of answers per scale: 1 (0), 2 (0), 3 (2), 4 (2), 5 (4)

### 4.2 What did you like the most in the overall experience with survey?

*Results – testing phase:*

- Using the questionnaire is very simple and understandable.
- I like to be able to fill out the form without restriction/mandatory fields and the automatic save function.
- The survey is directed and targeted to the specific information you require. Narrowing the questions and possible answers guides the responder in what is asked from them and facilitate the answering of the questionnaire.
- I especially liked how it felt very user-friendly, I liked the link that better explains the categorization of stakeholders and that the questions were short, simple and straightforward. That it is very detailed.
- Logical, easy to follow, convenient to use.
- Many details and good comparability between stakeholders.

*Results – final phase:*

- Easy to use.
- Very thoroughly thought, comprehensive and innovative. Congratulations.

### 4.3 What did you dislike the most in the overall experience with survey?

*Results – testing phase:*

- a. It is not entirely clear the difference between the categories A) and E), we would appreciate some examples or more detailed explanations.
- b. Nothing in particular.



- c. In a few questions I was not sure if I understood the question right.
- d. It is quite comprehensive and time-consuming.
- e. I think many answers will be similar for the same category of stakeholders (for example, professional associations of dermatologists, GP, and gynaecologists will probably share communications channels). Some questions could be asked of a specific category of stakeholder, not individually, to reduce the time to complete the survey.
- f. There is a lot of emphasis on the channels and tools of communication, but we think it might be interesting to allow for more feedback on what the contents of the communication should be. For example, adding a question to ask: what kind of content would the stakeholder be more interested in: news about the PERCH project, news about participants of PERCH, scientific news, training of professionals, raising awareness on HPV vaccination, etc.
- g. The lines at the beginning of the survey are not linked to the details filled in. If I change the order of stakeholders f.e. in category a, the filled-in information stays at the same line. It would be nice if the stakeholders could be sorted with drag and drop.
- h. Also: if I want to edit one stakeholder at the end of the list I have to click through all details of stakeholders listed before. Maybe you can make an overview to click on each stakeholder for faster editing like the line above with the categories?

*Results – final phase:*

- a. *The time needed and the amount of information to provide.*

*Answers – after testing phase:*

- *Ad3.a:* Stakeholders category A includes bodies that represent part of the government and/or are financed by the government, such as MoH, National Vaccination Committee, National institute for public health (if part of the government), National Institute for education... Category E includes professional societies that are not part of the government and are not financed by the government, such as the National society of gynaecology, National society of field nurses, Medical students association...
- *Ad3.e:* We agree that this might be the case, but we would like to gather this information per each stakeholder entered because identifying communication channels is one of the main objectives of stakeholder mapping. We also planned the analysis of this multiple-choice question in the way that the prediction that “similar” stakeholders use “similar” communication channels might actually be an outcome of the analysis. Also, there is no easy and convenient technical solution available and we might risk that the mapping tool will become more difficult to navigate.
- *Ad3.g:* the observation is correct; however, the tool platform we use do not allow for such a technical solution.
- *Ad3.h:* the observation is correct; however, the tool platform we use does not allow for a such technical solution.

*Action points – after testing phase:*

- *Ad3.f:* The question assessing the contents of interest for each stakeholder is very relevant and will be added in phase 2 of the mapping exercise. We have discussed whether to include this information already in Phase 1, but have decided to postpone it to phase 2, in order not to prolong the mapping exercise in phase 1. Also, at the beginning of the project lifetime, we need to quickly decide how the communication and dissemination process will be set in this project and which communication channels and tools to use, in order to start the



dissemination process as soon as possible. However, in the first half year, we will mostly aim to increase the visibility of the project, its aims and its position in international and national space, due to later dates of deliverables. Later, the contents disseminated will be limited by the scope of the project, its activities and deliverables.

#### 4.4 Were the questions and additional survey information clear?

*Results – testing phase:*

- Number of answers: yes (5), no (3)

*Results – final phase:*

- Number of answers: yes (5), no (0)

**If not, please explain where you missed clarity:**

*Results – testing phase:*

- a. Whose e-mail do I enter in a-organisation stakeholders?
- b. Questions regarding good practices and lessons learned: we did not understand what you were referring to.
- c. Question: in your opinion, what would be most relevant PERCH communication channel for this stakeholder? Unclear on the objective of this question. Should the responder simply choose one from the list above that they believe is the preferred one?
- d. "Already a member of PERCH..." suggests it is open for organizations to join PERCH, but it is a closed consortium. So we suggest cutting out the word "already".

*Action points – after testing phase:*

- *Ad4.1a:* We will supplement the guidelines with more details on this topic. You should enter the e-mail address of the most relevant contact in the organisation in the field of HPV vaccination, based on your (expert) opinion. If a stakeholder will be included in direct PERCH dissemination performed by WP2, the e-mail address should be either publicly available or the stakeholder should give you permission to include him/her in direct communication with the PERCH project. Please note, that all personal information gathered by the tool (including e-mail address) will be handled as sensitive information and kept within the PERCH consortium. It will be stored on 1ka servers and can be accessed via the personalised link in the mapping tool, by the PERCH WP2 analytic team and PERCH Steering Committee. See the guide section "Dissemination level" for more information.
- *Ad4.1.b:* We will omit the "good practices and lessons learned" text from the mapping tool.
- *Ad 4.1.c:* We will supplement the guidelines with more details on this topic. We would like that responder select the one communication channel that is in his/her opinion the most relevant for that stakeholder, from the list above. If the list is incomplete, supplement the list in the last bullet point.
- *Ad4.1.d:* We will omit the word "already".

#### 4.5 How much time (hands-on) did the survey take?

*Results – testing phase (How much time (hands on) did the survey take?):*



- Average 1 hour for testing the survey
- Min-max 0-2 hours for testing the survey

*Results – final phase (How much time approximately (hands on) did you use on average to map one stakeholder?):*

- **Average 20 minutes per stakeholder**
- Min-max 5-40 minutes per stakeholder

*Action points – after testing phase:*

- *Ad6.i:* We will delete this question and add a new one: “How much time approximately (hands on) did you use on average to map one stakeholder? The answer will be in minutes.

#### 4.6 Any comments or thought you would like to share with WP2 coordinator’s team on the survey or stakeholder mapping and analysis?

*Results – testing phase:*

- a. Can you please explain how the PERCH project will be linked to other projects in terms of communication or otherwise? Chapter 2.2 c
- b. Keep on the good work!
- c. The survey took around 20-30 min per stakeholder (quite time-consuming). Regarding sections ‘projects international’, ‘organisations international’ and ‘individuals international I would suggest creating a shared excel file between partners of PERCH project where all suggestions can be added. This will prevent receiving duplicate information so I think it will ease your work for the reports. For international projects, for example, I would suggest including cervical cancer prevention projects already included in the perch proposal (page 116 of the grant agreement) and then sending the list to the partners.
- d. 20 is quite a limiting number of stakeholders. In the case of Spain, we have a decentralized health system, with 17 autonomous communities and 2 autonomous cities, that counts 20 stakeholders only with the ministry of health and the regional departments of health! If I am not wrong, the mapping tool limit is 20 organisations. Furthermore, we also have 11 regional departments of education that we want to involve, from regions with a school program, plus other professionals and patient organisations.
- e. At the same time, the questions with regards to preferred channels, social media accounts of the organizations, and preferred tools. etc., seem only relevant for the WP2 in the case in which the PERCH team will be taking charge of the communication. Eliminating these questions in the cases where “we will” or “others will”, could be a way to ease the workload.
- f. Stakeholder’s social media accounts and the language used. Section of name of the account, could it be name of the account/url of account?
- g. Question: in your opinion, which communication tools are preferred by the stakeholder when receiving perch information related to HPV vaccination (multiple choice)? We will appreciate your help with making the list more comprehensive by adding new ideas! Potential ideas: podcast, webinars, courses/training?
- h. It is very clear and easy to understand and fill out.
- i. Thinking about each stakeholder’s preferences, it takes us about 30 minutes to complete the survey for each stakeholder.
- j. How do you handle sensitive data like email addresses concerning data protection?



- k. Especially concerning the newsletter, do stakeholders actively register for the newsletter (as usual) or would you send them newsletters without asking?
- l. There are a few spelling mistakes in the introduction :)
- m. Full name of the stakeholder: Do you want the name in the national language, the translation into English or both?
- n. Will you also appreciate the translation of the name of the organization into the English language?
- o. Would stakeholders be asked to share this information through their communication channels?
- p. What would be expected from stakeholders to do at the "effective" task level?

*Results – final phase:*

- a. *An excel file would perhaps have been easier. The question about the preferred channel of the stakeholder is too difficult to answer.*
- b. *Congrats:))*

*Answers – after testing phase:*

- *Ad6.a:* We plan to discuss this topic with PERCH Steering Committee and contact international project working on HPV vaccination or cervical screening after we complete the list of the international projects. Some activities are already ongoing, for example, the coordinator of WP2 is already invited to attend the next meeting of the working group on communication and engagement in EU Vaccination Projects collaboration (VAX-EU) initiative, to explore possibilities for collaboration. Also we had a short call regarding this topic with PROTECT-EUROPE project, which is focusing on HPV vaccination and was just launched. We will not contact local projects, we want to map them however and if there will be some projects that might be interesting for other partners we might invite you to share your experience with others. All suggestions are welcome!
- *Ad6.d:* For now, the maximum number of stakeholders that could be mapped is 20 per categories A to E, however, we can increase it, if needed. Before that we first suggest you try to join the stakeholders in groups where they are very similarly organised and the only, for example, input 17 autonomous communities in one field, same for the 11 regional departments of education. If your organisation will be responsible to communicate with them within the PERCH project, you will not need to input contact information for this group of stakeholder (see Action point Ad6.e), the general information can be provided for the stakeholder as a group. Please get back to us if this will not solve the problem. We cannot increase the limit of stakeholders only for one country; we need to do that for all the countries.
- *Ad6.f:* We will provide a separate template for social media accounts (see Action point Ad.6.e) with instructions.
- *Ad6.o and Ad6.p:* Consortium members will be asked to engage in communication and dissemination activities at the national level and to invite other stakeholders to register to e-newsletter, via which all the relevant information will be shared. Stakeholders whose e-mail address will be entered in the mapping tool (only required if the PERCH WP2 team will be responsible for disseminating information to the stakeholder) will be subscribed to the e-newsletter by PERCH WP2 team.

*Action points – after testing phase:*



- *Ad6.c:* We will omit the international projects from the online mapping tool and will prepare the table with international projects and will ask partners for adding only projects that are not already listed.
- *Ad6.e:* Based on the preliminary analysis of testing phase results the majority of the identified stakeholders operate social media in the national language (see social media section in the Preliminary mapping results, testing phase below). Despite social media accounts in the national language being important for the engagement of stakeholders at the national level and will be taken into the account in national HPV communication strategies (deliverable 2.4), they are of less importance for PERCH general communication and dissemination activities and will be omitted from the tool. This will also lower the burden of work for PERCH partners. However, there might be some national stakeholders active in English and interested in PERCH, we will gather this information in a separate form, similarly as we will do with international projects (see Action Ad6.c). We will also rearrange the order of questions: the contact information of a stakeholder will only need to be entered for stakeholders that PERCH will contact them directly, for other stakeholders' e-mail address of PERCH partner responsible for communication and dissemination will be requested. Please check answers Ad3.e regarding the communication channels and tools.
- *Ad6.g:* We will add podcasts to the tool and ask respondents to supplement their answers that are already entered in the tool. Webinars and courses/training are already covered in the communication channels section; however, we will make this clearer.
- *Ad6.j:* Please see Action points Ad4.1a.
- *Ad6.k:* We will use the GDPR-compliant tool for the e-newsletter (probably MailChimp). Registration will be freely available via the PERCH webpage and we will encourage all partners to disseminate this information via their communication channels. Only e-mail addresses of PERCH consortium members and e-mail addresses provided via the mapping tool that you will give permission can be contacted by PERCH directly, will be included in the mailing.
- *Ad6.l:* We will correct them 😊
- *Ad6.m-n:* Full name of the stakeholder in the English language is enough, we will add this information in the tool.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

### 5.1 Testing phase conclusions regarding the mapping guide and tool

PERCH stakeholder mapping guide and tool were tested from January 25 to February 3 2023 by 12 countries. Five countries did not respond. The overall experience with the tool was rated with an average of 4.1 in the scale from 1 (worst) to 5 (best). Altogether 89 stakeholders were mapped, 3-17 per country.

Based on the comments that were given during the testing, the **following changes to the guidelines and the tool were made:**

- To increase the clarity, we have:
  - Supplemented the guidelines with more details on whose e-mail to enter in an A-organisation stakeholder and on how to select one communication channel that is the most relevant for that stakeholder in the opinion of the respondent.





- Omitted the »good practices and lessons learned« questions from the mapping tool and the word »already« (»Already a member of PERCH ...«).
- Added explanation that the full name of the stakeholder English only is requested.
- Other adjustments due to the testing results:
  - We omitted the **international projects** from the online mapping tool. We will provide a separate table with international projects and will ask partners for adding only projects that are not already listed. We also removed questions regarding the project coordinator and contact e-mail address.
  - **Social media** template was omitted from the mapping tool, since all mapped social media accounts were in national languages and are thus less relevant for PERCH communication and dissemination activities. However, they will be very important in the mobilisation of national stakeholders in the latter phases of the project. We will provide a separate template for social media accounts with instructions.
  - We added **podcasts** to the tool as a possibility of communication tool. We made the answer regarding virtual workshops/webinars clearer.
  - The order of questions for the contact information (e-mail) of the stakeholders was rearranged and is only needed if PERCH will contact them directly.
  - In the evaluation part we changed a question regarding how time consuming is the mapping tool, we will focus on time used per one stakeholder instead on time used per the whole survey and unit of time is now minutes instead of hours.

## 5.2 Final conclusions regarding HPV vaccination stakeholders

- The following **PERCH stakeholder definition** was aligned among PERCH partners: “Any individual or organisation at EU, national or local level that can with their action or inaction influence the increase or decrease in HPV vaccination coverage in person or via media, including social media.”
- HPV vaccination **stakeholders mapping was performed between February 13<sup>th</sup> to 23<sup>rd</sup> 2023 in 14 European countries** joined together in the PERCH consortium: *Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden.*
- All together **281 stakeholders were mapped**, majority of them were **organisations (64%) or individuals (30%) active at national level**. In organisations, around half of the identified PERCH stakeholders belongs to **professional and scientific societies and bodies (27%) or authorities (24%)**, also health sector (18%) and non-governmental organisations (13%) were recognised as important stakeholders.
- According to the preferences of the respondents, 192 of the mapped stakeholders will be included in PERCH communication and dissemination activities, however, **most of them will be contacted by the PERCH project national partners (60%)** or they will provide other solutions (13%). Only the minority (27%) of stakeholders will be contacted directly by the PERCH communication and dissemination team at WP.
- According to the mapping results, at least half of the stakeholders can be reached by **each of the four different communication channels**:
  1. PERCH e-newsletter (96% mapped stakeholders)
  2. webpage (89%)
  3. invitations to national live events (66%)
  4. virtual workshops (61%)





and via **each of the seven communication tools**:

1. short reads 1-3 minutes (90%)
  2. link to detailed information included in short written documentation (69%)
  3. short reads 3-5 minutes (68%)
  4. long reads more than 5 minutes (64%)
  5. infographics (62%)
  6. pictures (photos, diagrams) included in written communication (60%)
  7. scientific information translated in lay language (57%)
- For more than half of the mapped stakeholders, the **preferred messengers** were national experts (94%), international experts/stakeholders (93%), international peers (59%) and national peers (54%).
  - The overall experience with the stakeholder mapping tool improved after the adjustments of the tool according to the results from the testing phase from 4.1 to 4.3 on the scale from 1 (worst) to 5 (best).