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Abstract:

This report covers the dissemination activities of the project REPOPA months 2 to 60 (November 2011 to September 2016). This is the second major report of the dissemination work package (WP6) submitted to the European Commission (EC), which was aimed to provide the detailed results for dissemination and exploitation activities of the Project in accordance with its major objectives. Special emphasis is given to REPOPA umbrella platform.
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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report covers the dissemination activities of the project REPOPA months 2 to 60 (November 2011 to September 2016). This is the second report of the dissemination work package (WP6) submitted to the European Commission (EC), which was aimed to report the dissemination activities completed until Project month 60, under the WP6 major objectives:

(1) To develop a dissemination strategy with a detailed external communication plan that aims at ensuring the best visibility of the REPOPA activities and outcomes at EU level, targeting stakeholders and wider public, raising interest and awareness of REPOPA activities and results and (MS2);

(2) To establish an umbrella platform to support country evidence-informed policy making platforms created in the course of the Project, as mentioned in the Document of Work (DoW) and the Dissemination Plan, the second milestone of the project (MS2).

(3) To develop a European advocacy plan and support producing policy briefs to enhance evidence-informed physical activity policy making (D6.1 Midterm report on dissemination activities, country platforms, and repository functions January, 2015).

Considering the participation of REPOPA Consortium to developing the Project website, scientific conferences, institutional newsletters, publications and Academic Partners in other EU funded projects, initial awareness of the Project has been generated. Moreover, major dissemination activities have concentrated on communicating objectives, activities and future plans that resulted from the Project RTD work.

Starting with month two of the Project, the WP6 staff has concentrated on developing the working protocols and templates including internal and external communication guide, internal deliverables and activities guidelines, publication guidelines, and internal dissemination reporting template; which are all internal documents to guide the dissemination work of the Consortium. The Dissemination Plan (MS2) was delivered according to the DoW, on month six and was accepted by the Consortium Members. The initial stages of the second and third objectives of WP6 were finalized in March 2015 and work was ongoing until the end of the Project.

The WP6 work plan and action were described in the Dissemination Plan (MS2). Dissemination Plan delivered in month six of the Project (30 March 2012) and the first results of the REPOPA dissemination activities were laid down in the 18 months periodic reports to the EC.

This final dissemination report incorporates all dissemination activities performed from the 1 November 2011 until 30 September 2016, month 60 of the REPOPA Project. The final report is important in terms of presenting all the relevant activities (both scientific and other type) carried out by each partner institution related to the REPOPA Project, under its specific objectives and main aim. Major results from dissemination activities are presented in this document, including:

Project website and umbrella platform: the project website incorporating the umbrella platform can be accessed at www.repopa.eu;
Newsletters: twice a year the newsletter informed internal and external audiences about the project progress and outcomes;

Leaflets and posters: yearly the leaflets and posters were used as important dissemination tools at meetings, conferences, and workshops. Over 600 leaflets were disseminated;

Conference presentations: a total of 92 abstracts were presented at national, European and international conferences, out of which 35 abstracts were published in peer-reviewed international journals, as conference proceedings;

Workshops: each year, REPOPA has organized at least one workshop at the European Public Health Association Conference (EUPHA);

Publications of peer-reviewed articles and chapters: a total of 16 peer-reviewed articles and chapters were published as a result of the REPOPA research and dissemination work; there are a number of publications under revisions and the REPOPA Consortium plans to continue collaborating in publishing valuable data;

Popular journals: a total of 30 articles were published in national popular journals, institutional newsletters and international ones as well;

Networks: the REPOPA Consortium has joined networks like icSPORTS, Research to Action and also developed networks on evidence-informed policy making at national levels, e.g. The Danish interest group "Research, Practice and Policy – better collaboration and knowledge integration for Public Health”;

Evidence briefs: As a final result, evidence briefs were developed to disseminate research work of the REPOPA Project – a total of four evidence briefs were developed;

Animations: so far two animations were developed to better describe the interventions implemented in the Project REPOPA as lay summary version of the work. The animations will be used for dissemination and teaching of interventions.

In parallel to specific WP6 dissemination activities, a major role was played by the RTD work packages in disseminating and exploiting the outputs of the research work, which has a stronger impact in research knowledge and project sustainability. The results and outputs related to the dissemination work as a whole is presented in this report, with an emphasis to REPOPA umbrella platform and mapping evidence-informed policy making in the field of public health.
2. INTRODUCTION

The overall mission of the REPOPA Project is to integrate scientific research knowledge (=research evidence), expert know-how and the real world physical activity policy making processes to increase synergy and also sustainable structures and best practices for future health promoting. The work of the REPOPA Project is split among four Research and Technological Development/Innovation (RTD) work packages, two other activities (OTHER) work package and one Consortium management activities (MGT) work package, which, combined, are working towards obtaining the major objectives of this project.

The aim of this report is to provide a final overview on all the project dissemination and exploitation results of research, dissemination and management work; and communicate project results to a wide audience, fostering the adoption of project results and its impact. The activities and dissemination work timeline is below:

Dissemination Activities Timeline
3. DISSEMINATION ACTIONS AND THEIR IMPACT

3.1. Project website and umbrella platform

The REPOPA website (www.repopa.eu) was developed by SDU at the beginning of the Project. REPOPA website included information regarding the REPOPA work plan, work packages, and partners; it detailed all the REPOPA activities and contained updated information: both technical & scientific information, and user-oriented information. The REPOPA website was redesigned to integrate the evidence-informed policy making (EIPM) umbrella platform in 2015 under the lead of UBB. The umbrella platform was launched in May-June 2015 and supports all the country specific platform information and activities that were already undertaken by country partners. The umbrella platform is incorporated in the Project’s active website to facilitate online communication and dissemination, all can be found at www.repopa.eu.

The guidelines for the development of the platform were included in the dissemination plan (MS2), offering two eligible scenarios to the Consortium partners. Each partner was able to choose between a) search for an in-country work group or task force that has an interest in evidence based policy making to enhance physical activity and to join that group representing REPOPA, having at least 12 months continuity as members of the work group or task force or b) to develop an in-country work group, outside the REPOPA in-country team members, with an interest for evidence based policy making to enhance physical activity. Both above mentioned actions could be local, regional and national and should be developed during the REPOPA project duration.

The web-based platform was designed to contain a general description of all countries: a country profile, demographics, political and administrative structure and HEPA policy making and the work group activities under the button: evidence policy making which includes: a stakeholders section, HEPA working groups (with meetings & activities section, tasks and members) and guidelines, where partners and interested stakeholders can find an example for advocacy plan and policy brief development. All platform elements can be found online and available for all Consortium partners to be used. In order to have a strategy and structure when making information visible online, a Reviewer Approval Process Document (internal) was put together in order to control for the information and data uploading for public access. The document has three main sections: 1) website and platform reviewer approval process; 2) sharing information online; 3) platform regulations.

Some information on the progress of the web-based platform was detailed in the second periodic reporting and its main results where described in the periodic Report Summary 1-3, available on the cordis.europa.eu links (public available report can be found here). All country platforms are in place. These platforms were described and integrated in the REPOPA website and incorporated in the template designed to support the platforms online. The platform’s major objective is “to establish an umbrella platform to support country evidence-informed policy making platforms created in the course of the project”. This includes to:

- Share up-to-date information, documents to be discussed, and debated with different stakeholders;
Guidance for writing policy briefs and for the development of the advocacy plan to lobby nationally and internationally for increasing evidence-informed physical activity policy making (more information is available here);

Carry out an e-survey in the partner countries and in other EU countries mapping the activities and developments in evidence-informed policy making in physical activity, including other projects and networks (e.g. HEPA).

The platform has multiple features that encourages communication on the topic of evidence into policy making:

- Opened discussions using twitter;
- Countries - information about REPOPA Countries work groups, networks;
- Discussion Box - specific for each country but also international.

Figure 1. EIPM umbrella platform
The main features of the EIPM umbrella platform are the country profile (Figure 2); the evidence-informed policy making (Figure 3) tabs and the integrated discussion box & twitter account (Figure 4).

**Figure 2. Country Profile Tab with its features**

**Denmark**

![Image of Denmark Country Profile Tab]

Danish interest group “Research into Practice and Policy in Public Health” was established during the annual Public Health Conference hosted by the Danish Association for Public Health in October 2013. The interest group is formally placed under the Danish Association for Public Health and is currently in the development phase.

The objective of the interest group is to establish a national forum for exchange of knowledge, experiences and ideas across practice, policy and research. This group aims at improving the procedures for integrating knowledge from research and other types of knowledge into practice and policy.

For more information and membership please visit the interest group website here: [http://www.danskeshalsforfaellesundhed.dk/PEP](http://www.danskeshalsforfaellesundhed.dk/PEP) (in Danish)

**Figure 3. Evidence-Informed Policy Making Tab with its features**

**Denmark**

![Image of Denmark Evidence-Informed Policy Making Tab]

Danish interest group “Research into Practice and Policy in Public Health” was established during the annual Public Health Conference hosted by the Danish Association for Public Health in October 2013. The interest group is formally placed under the Danish Association for Public Health and is currently in the development phase.

The objective of the interest group is to establish a national forum for exchange of knowledge, experiences and ideas across practice, policy and research in the public health area.

This interest group is for researchers, practitioners and policy makers aiming to improve public health practice and policy. Through meetings and webinars about e.g. cross-sector collaboration, evidence-informed decision making, organizational factors influencing knowledge use and citizens involvement. This group aims at improving the procedures for integrating knowledge from research and other types of knowledge into practice and policy.

For more information and membership please visit the interest group website here: [http://www.danskeshalsforfaellesundhed.dk/PEP](http://www.danskeshalsforfaellesundhed.dk/PEP) (in Danish)
3.1.1. **Highlights of the online umbrella platform**

TWITTER ACCOUNT. Together with the platform launch, Project REPOPA has launched its twitter account which is integrated in the platform as well. The role of the twitter account is to open discussions with other researchers, practitioners, policymakers and actors interested in the REPOPA work and outcomes. Below are some highlights of the twitter account, in the last month of the Project (September, 2016). Our September 2016 tweets had 1,475 tweet impressions and gathered 131 profile visits, adding 8 new followers to our page (Figure 5). A report of the last six months of twitter activity is represented in Table 1 – with the activity of our Consortium in sharing information on Twitter. Most of our tweets focused on evidence informed policy making, sharing our own knowledge, for example: “Policymakers can benefit from support by researchers - #SDU #nhpc2016 bit.ly/2dabE7z“ or acknowledging existing knowledge and info disseminated by others, for example: “How can we use evidence to strengthen policy? Introducing the Evidence-Based Policymaking Collaborative: urbn.is/2cDBOD9 #whatworks”. The account will remain active after the project ends, supported by BBU and SDU staff.
Figure 5. Twitter Account report for September 2016

28 day summary with change over previous period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tweets</th>
<th>Tweet impressions</th>
<th>Profile visits</th>
<th>Mentions</th>
<th>Followers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,492 ↑131.3%</td>
<td>131 ↑351.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75 ↑8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sep 2016 - 28 days so far...

TWEET HIGHLIGHTS

Top Tweet earned 167 impressions
Open discussions on #evidenceinformedpolicymaking #fp7 REPOPA final project meeting & presenting innovations pic.twitter.com/y5MbFE8Td

Top mention earned 20 engagements
@ProjectREPOPA World cafe is on now discussing findings & identifying way ahead for #EvidenceInformed #policymaking. pic.twitter.com/TeXnqB6idv

Get your Tweets in front of more people
Promoted Tweets and content appear on your Twitter to more people.

Table 1. Twitter Account activity in the last 6 months (April-September 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apr 19</th>
<th>May 07</th>
<th>Jun 03</th>
<th>Jul 01</th>
<th>Aug 00</th>
<th>Sep 09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tweets</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>5091</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New followers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table legend:
- Tweets
- New followers
- Profile visits
- Impressions
3.1.2. National level activities in partner countries

**THL, Finland, lead of WP1**, was part of national platform for health enhancing physical activity policy as part of a working group on information access to physical activity related information coordinated by the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture; they had meetings every other month until the end of 2013 to discuss the importance of having specific health enhancing physical activity policies, as well as how evidence can be translated into policies and practice.

**UBB, Romania, lead of WP6**, has joined the Work Group Public Health and Work Group Sports and Community at the end of 2013. These two work groups are organized at local level as part of the Cluj Management and Planning Group, a task force created for the development of the new Cluj-Napoca Development Strategy for 2014-2020. There were a total of 27 working groups and sub-groups, which created specific strategies based on their experience and field of experts in order to contribute to the Cluj-Napoca Development Strategy for 2014-2020. UBB has continued its work as part of the platform by joining national and international networks in 2016. The Romanian partner has applied and has received HEPA Europe temporary membership confirmation The European network for the promotion of health-enhancing physical activity, until confirmation by the network at its next annual meeting (September 2016), being the first Romanian institution member of the HEPA Europe Network. At national level, BBU has continued its networking activities building on the Delphi National Conference which took place in Romania, on February 25, 2016, in Bucharest.

**CNR, Italy, lead of WP4**, started to build the Italian National Platform in 2013, involving stakeholders, researchers and policy makers in the field of public health and cross-sector areas at a local and national level, plus a few experts from international organizations. The platform includes research managers of universities and research centres, administrators of health organizations (for instance, local hospitals and the National Health Institute) and political institutions (for instance, the Lazio Regional Council and the Ministry of Health); sector associations (some examples: Associazione italiana di epidemiologia, Associazione Italiana di Economia Sanitaria, Associazione Nazionale dei Medici delle Direzioni Ospedaliere, Cittadini Reattivi, the Italian National Olympic Committee, the European Network for Sport Science Education and Employment, the European Association of Hospital Managers); sector magazines, like Epidemiologia e Prevenzione, L'ospedale, European Journal of Sport Science. The activities of the group became more intense with the start of the Delphi Study (WP4) in 2014. To support the sustainability of the group, the CNR staff aims to strengthen the collaboration with the members from the Italian Ministry of Health in order to implement WP4 REPOPA indicators at national level.

**SDU, Denmark, lead of WP3 and Project lead**, in collaboration with **RCPH**, have coordinated the establishment of The Danish interest group "Research, Practice and Policy – better collaboration and knowledge integration for Public Health". It is formally established as a section under the National Public Health Association, effective from 2013. **Objective of the working group is to create a forum for knowledge exchange and sharing of ideas regarding integration of research, politic and practice in Denmark.** The REPOPA members have organized two informal meetings and interviews with central stakeholders to form the activities of the group. They have drafted an afternoon meeting, which will be launched in 2016. In addition, the group will meet during the National Public Health Conference in September 2016.
Tilburg University, the Netherlands, lead of WP2, in collaboration with CBO have investigated the possibility of engaging in a sustainable environment for evidence informed policy making in the Netherlands. As there are already existing networks in the Netherlands with common aims to the platform within the REPOPA project, the Dutch REPOPA team has worked to make the connection with the two existing networks. The networks are described below:

1) (Dutch) Inter sectoral Health Policy Network (in Dutch: Netwerk integraal gezondheidsbeleid), an open network with a total of 40 members, of which 12-15 persons are active members. The foundation of the network is based on the need to share the existing evidence and information on inter-sectoral health policy within a network and members meet each other in person. There is an online LinkedIn-group as well, but this group is not very active;

2) An online guide for healthy municipalities (in Dutch: ‘Handreiking Gezonde Gemeente’) within the Dutch portal for health promotion and prevention. There have been meetings with REPOPA and the coordinators of both networks. It appeared that there is no need to initiate an additional online network or platform on this moment in the Netherlands. However, there is an interest to share links and good examples. Suggested is to link to the online platform ‘Handreiking Gezonde Gemeente’ within the Dutch portal for health promotion and prevention. This portal is developed by the Centre for Healthy Living (Centrum Gezond Leven), part of RIVM. On this website no international examples are available yet. The proposal was to use REPOPA as a kick off to start with this online platform with international examples. In the last months (May – September 2016) the link between the Dutch existing national platforms and the REPOPA-project was further established.

All REPOPA partner countries that are part of RTD activities are working towards the implementation of the second objective of building or joining platforms for evidence-informed policymaking, which is an ongoing activity until the end of the project and possibly after the end of the project period.

3.1.3. **International level activities & Networks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2014 &amp; November 2015</td>
<td>REPOPA continued to collaborate with icSPORTS as an Academic Partner, in 2015. icSPORTS is a meeting point of both academics and practitioners, in order to exchange ideas and developed synergies in the support for many activities directly or indirectly related to sport sciences, including improvement of physical activities, sports medicine, biotechnology and nutrition, sports management, and all imaginable application areas in sports. REPOPA has joined the icSPORTS Group as an Academic Partner in 2014 and project members participated to two of their events: the 2nd &amp; 3rd International Congress on Sports Science Research and Technology Support, in October 2014 in Rome and in November 2015 in Lisbon:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>The REPOPA Platform was presented during the 11th Annual Meeting and 6th Conference of HEPA Europe which was held on 7-9 October 2015, in Istanbul, Turkey. Our presentation entitled “National platforms for evidence-informed physical activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
policy making” was part of the Symposium 1: Collaboration and intersectoral approaches to promote physical activity and active living – insights for policy.

October 2015

REPOPA was featured in the European Implementation Collaborative Newsletter. The European Implementation Collaborative engages broad range of individuals and organisational stakeholders in the implementation field. They also work towards building links and exchange learning about implementation science and practice within Europe. They main mission is: to improve the life of children, youth, adults, and families in Europe through effective evidence-informed implementation of evidence-informed human services. The REPOPA Project is one of the projects they consider to be implementation research and they presented it as “an interesting resource for those with an interest in the research to policy implementation chain”. The project was made visible in their October Issue:

---

January

REPOPA was featured in the Pan European Networks – HORIZON2020, Issue 9. One of points made in the article was about what we think is REPOPA’s special contributions, and
here is a piece of the answer: “REPOPA is a programmatic research and built on existing research evidence and frameworks about how policy is really made. REPOPA uses real-life policies and involves policy makers and other stakeholders to co-create new knowledge and best practice on how best to integrate research knowledge into policy processes”:

### Special Report: An umbrella network of support for policy

Research projects with short funding periods, as well as policy making in political environments, often face challenges in sustaining the continuity of development tasks. To overcome this, the REPOPA project [Research into Policy to Enhance Physical Activity](#) has initiated a networking structure with international and national levels to provide support to researchers and policy makers in their communication and networking. We have learnt from Canada, where structures such as learning networks have produced encouraging results.

### March 2016

REPOPA was part of the Public Health Research Workshop - exploring physical activity for health and fun, 10th March 2016 at the National Football Stadium of Scotland Hampden Park, UK. EC DG Research and Innovation invited five on-going research projects to share their experience with other stakeholders, to discuss how to enhance physical activity, share best practices and to draw some conclusions relevant for policy makers. The purpose of this one-day workshop raised awareness of research and spread current physical activity research results in the field of physical activity through innovative model. REPOPA was the only directly policy oriented project and contributed with valuable knowledge and experiences on how to do knowledge integration in evidence informed policy making on health enhancing physical activity policies.
**May 2016**  May 19th 2016, REPOPA team participated in the Danish Implementation Network Annual Conference. This year the conference theme was: “The role of implementation tools in implementation”. REPOPA was invited to share knowledge about how we are implementing the REPOPA interventions:

**Team REPOPA at the Danish Implementation Network Annual Conference**

May 24, 2016 - 2:08pm

May 19® 2016, REPOPA team participated in the Danish Implementation Network Annual Conference. This year the conference theme was: “The role of implementation tools in implementation”. REPOPA was invited to share knowledge about how we are implementing the REPOPA interventions.

REPOPA’s work package 3 team presented by Maja Bertram, Cathrine Juul Lau and Thomas Skovgaard held an interactive workshop. And the title of presentation was STEWARDSHIP - potentialer og udfordringer ved at anvende interventioner til evidens-informert politikudvikling (Stewardship - potentials and challenges of using interventions to evidence-informed policy development). At this workshop Maja Bertram presented the main principles of Stewardship approach in REPOPA as well as the preliminary intervention results from Denmark using this approach as a tool. During the presentation, workshop participants asked questions and good discussions took place. Participants were very interested in learning about the REPOPA project.

For more information contact us on repopa@health.sdu.dk. More about the Conference follow the link.

Tags: Conference

---

**September 2016**  “Lessons learned from the REPOPA project: Integrating research knowledge with physical activity policymaking” is a webinar organized by REPOPA in partnership with EIC – European Implementation Collaborative after the European Implementation Collaborative General Assembly Event. In this webinar REPOPA will present the methods, findings and lessons learnt from this project. What were the facilitators and barriers for research knowledge use in policymaking? How was policy gaming and Stewardship based interventions functioning as methods to increase use of evidence and intersectoral collaboration. What and how can we learn from REPOPA when working with evidence-informed policymaking in the future?. It is a good example of lessons learned and reaching out networks interested in evidence-informed policy making.

**September 2016**  On 27 September in Belfast, at the meeting of the National Physical Activity Focal Points, Thomas Skovgaard (SDU) presented the project work and results.
3.1.4. **Website statistics**

The website template was changed and launched in May-June 2015 to better accommodate the project deliverable, especially the web-based umbrella platform. The changes were made by WP6 with the support of WP7 and our project officer; after a final revision from all Project Partner.

From the beginning of the new integrated website, using the website build-in statistics, the total number of visits doubled from the first three months (August-October 2015) - 18,480 - to the last three months (February-April 2016) - 46,578. The countries with most visits in the last three months are as follows: United States (24,744), Germany (9,019), Portugal (8,787), Ukraine (3,396), and France (2,195). Access from United States and Germany being the lead at the beginning of the new improved website as well, with 7,644 hits in United States, and, respectively, 2,979 hits in Germany. We can estimate an average hits per month at: 10,843 hits, almost 10 times more hits compared to the previous website.

Some of the website analytics, reported using google analytics, from the last year (September 2015 - September 2016) are presented below. They show the website visibility, users by age and gender, and by countries:
### REPOPA website access by countries (September 2015 – September 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>% New Sessions</th>
<th>New Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>93.79%</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>51.84%</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>95.29%</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>51.31%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(not set)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60.98%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80.65%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>98.18%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62.96%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPOPA website interactions

Starting pages
2.1K sessions, 1.7K drop-offs

1st interaction
429 sessions, 130 drop-offs

Country
- Romania: 353
- United States: 353
- United Kingdom: 255
- Denmark: 191
- (not set): 80
- Others: 903

Country
- Romania: 1.2K
- United States: / 27
- United Kingdom: /contentdeographics 227
- Denmark: news/produeling-cluj 188
- (not set): contentinistrative 94
- Others: content 83

Country
- Romania: /contentpropcheckrepopa 103
- United States: /content/publications 95
- United Kingdom: /contentimedia 16
- Denmark: /content 15
- (not set): (47 more pages) 173

Country
- Romania: (80 more pages) 396
- Others: (80 more pages) 396
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### 3.2. Internal and external communication

#### 3.2.1. Guidelines, Dissemination Plan

A REPOPA Internal and External Communication Guide was designed for internal use only and it was used as a living document that changed during the Project duration. It included **A. REPOPA Project Internal Communication Guide** which guided all REPOPA members on issues like e-mail usage, update of contact details, internal WP communication, communication across WPs and the role of WP leaders and the use of SharePoint and **B. REPOPA Project External Communication Guide** which guided and informed all REPOPA members on REPOPA primary objective and dissemination scope; use of logo, Project website, acknowledgement usage, communication to the EC. Preview of the yearly Dissemination plan:

#### Annex 1 Dissemination of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable 1.1: Report: Role of evidence in policy making</td>
<td>Institutions that work on policy related to physical activity (universities, public authorities, NGOs, private institutions) and academicians and researchers</td>
<td>To facilitate</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>UBB</td>
<td>No of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report: Role of evidence in policy making</td>
<td>Upload on THL</td>
<td>SharePoint Report shared on SDU</td>
<td>REPOPA website</td>
<td>Upload on the Participant Portal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable 2.1: Interim report on the game simulation tool, feasibility and process</td>
<td>Internal audience</td>
<td>To inform</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>UBB Tilburg University</td>
<td>Report development and dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upload on SharePoint</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partners complete, at the beginning of each year, their Dissemination Plan that it’s made available on SharePoint. After each six months, all partners report their dissemination activities, based on the following categories: number and details of publications: papers in international scientific peer-reviewed journals, papers in national scientific peer-reviewed journals, papers in popular journals, and institute newsletters; conference participation: international conference posters, international conference oral presentations, international conference workshops or events, national conference posters, national conference oral presentations, national events and/or conference workshops; and media materials: media interviews,
press releases, website activities and updates and distribution of project leaflets at a meeting, conference, etc. Partners are asked to provide electronic copies of the materials; abstracts or a short description in English if the language of publication is not English; and reminded that the first author of each publication and/or presentation is responsible for the completion of the report.

### Preview of the 6 months report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papers in international scientific peer-reviewed journals: Please provide full reference in Harvard style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papers in national scientific peer-reviewed journals: Please provide full reference in Harvard style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papers in popular journals, institute newsletters: Please provide full reference in Harvard style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2. Guidelines, Publication Guideline

This document was designed for internal use only and it was a living document that changed during the Project duration. It included the general principles of the publication policy which were included in the REPOPA Grant Agreement and referred only to peer-reviewed publications. Each member of the REPOPA partner teams had equal rights to initiate and publish scientific papers using REPOPA data. This strategic guideline was meant to function as guidance and a checklist for the work packages so that the data gathered would be actively and accurately used. Guideline was designed to support the REPOPA peer-review publication process during the Project duration. It included:

- Authorship criteria,
- The design and use of the publication plans: designed for each work package,
- The regulations for the use of the funder clause,
- Publication in open access,
- Writing in the national language of partners,
- Data ownership and intellectual property rights,
- Work package leader and first-author responsibilities in publication in process.
3.3. Publications

3.3.1. Peer-reviewed articles and chapters

During the project duration, a total of 16 peer-reviewed articles and chapters were published as a result of the REPOPA research and dissemination work. The distribution of articles during the project duration can be seen in Table 2. There are a number of publications under revisions and the REPOPA Consortium plans to continue collaborating in publishing valuable data, which will lead to an increase of research results dissemination and the continuation of the REPOPA Consortium beyond the Project final year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Citation/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The peer-reviewed articles and chapters are listed below as well as the link to the full-text article or abstract. During the Project duration open-access publication was encouraged at a Consortium level, therefore the majority of articles are open source.


3.3.2. Conference abstracts (published)

A total of 92 abstracts were presented at national, European and international conferences, out of which 35 abstracts were published in peer-reviewed international journals, as conference proceedings. The distribution of published conference abstracts can be found in Table 3 while their citation is listed below. The majority of the abstracts where published in the European Journal of Public Health which publishes the European Conference of Public Health, conference proceedings.

Table 3. REPOPA Published Conference Abstracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Citation/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<p>| 2014 |
|---|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>van de Goor, LAM., Spitters, HPEM., Dorgelo, A. and Jansen, J.</td>
<td>Why is uptake of research evidence in the policy making process such a drag? The Dutch perspective. European Journal of Public Health, 23 (1), 48. <a href="#">Link to the abstract.</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Ståhl, T.</td>
<td>Dissemination and translation of research on the policy for physical activity in Finland. European Journal of Public Health, 21(14), 16. <a href="#">Link to the abstract.</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>van de Goor, LAM. and Quanjel, MMH.</td>
<td>Collaborative decision making across sectors and organizations: can gaming simulation help? European Journal of Public Health, 21(14), 16. <a href="#">Link to the abstract.</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.3.3. Conference abstracts and meetings presentations (not published)

Not all conferences where REPOPA research and dissemination work was presented publish conference proceedings. Below are listed the conference abstracts submitted and presented to national and international conferences along with presentation from meetings of the REPOPA Consortium, which adds 58 more presentations to the ones described in section 3.3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Citation/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1st International Conference on Non-communicable Diseases (ICONiC) Lessons learned from non-communicable diseases research and practice to improve population health. Cluj-Napoca, Romania. May 19-20, 2015.


van de Goor, LAM. and Spitters, HPEM. (2015). Experiencing a policy game: the development of local PA policy by collaboration, the network and use of evidence. Oral presentation as part of a workshop at National Conference NCVGZ. Rotterdam, the Netherlands. April 9, 2015.


Spitters, HPEM. and van de Goor, LAM. (2014). A policy game in local PA policy. Oral presentation at Tranzo Meeting, Tilburg University. Tilburg, the Netherlands. October 2,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Event and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Larsen, M., Koudenberg, OA. and Gulis, G.</td>
<td>Use of Scientific Evidence in a Multi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


REPOPA Symposium oral presentations at Holland FUSE Conference. Amsterdam, the Netherlands. April 22-23, 2013: Results of the policy analysis:


Valente, A., Castellani, T., Cori, L. and Bianchi, F. and REPOPA Italy. (2013). Use of Scientific Evidence in a Multi-Level Decision Making Process about Health Policy in Italy.


Spitters, HPEM. and van de Goor, LAM. (2013). Game simulation in a policy setting.

Aro, AR., Valente, A., Hämäläinen, R-M., van de Goor, LAM., Fredsgaard, MW. (2013). Implications to improve the use of research evidence in health enhancing physical activity policies – workshop on results of the policy analysis.

### 3.3.4. Lay publications, media coverage

Besides scientific publications, the REPOPA Consortium focused on dissemination to policymakers, practitioners, citizen stakeholders, public authorities, as well. Below it’s a list of lay publications and summaries of REPOPA work as well as some articles published online or print in different magazines and newsletters. Some of the articles are in national languages. All papers are available online with the link to the article below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Citation/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Physical Activity Promotion. Viata Medicala (Medical Life), 20 (1374). <a href="#">Link to the article</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final symposium of the Repopa project. Published in EUPHA Newsletter, Issue 8, page 6. August 2016. <a href="#">Link to the article</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Southern Denmark (SDU). (2016). Policymakers can benefit from support by researchers. <a href="#">Link to the article</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Observatoire of Sports and Employment (EOSE). (2016). Researchers can support policymakers in their work. <a href="#">Link to the article</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research into policy making. Published in Pan-European Networks HORIZON 2020, ISSN 2054-2631, Issue 9, page 120. January 2016. <a href="#">Link to the article</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An umbrella network of support for policy. Published in HORIZON2020 Special Reports. January 2016. <a href="#">Link to the article</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fare attività fisica: dalla evidence alla policy. Scienza in rete, website of scientific news. March 21, 2016. (Published in Italian).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>REPOPA consortium meeting. Published in Health Promotion Research News, ISBN: 978-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ricerca e politica, binomio possibile (Research and politics, the twinning is possible),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Dalla ricerca alla politica nell’attività fisica (From research to politics in physical activity),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Liikuntaan liittyvä tutkimustieto vahvemmin päätöksenteon tueksi (Strengthening the use of research evidence for decision making in health enhancing physical activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>University (science) has an ear for Varde health policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Research as part of physical activity policy in the City of Lahti (Tutkimus osana Lahden liikuntastrategiaa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>REPOPA - A European Project focused on Implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4. REPOPA Research Reports

Final project reports are available online. So far, the RTD work pages have ended and final summaries of the deliverable reports are made available online on the repopa.eu website and EC portal. Below are the citation of each report with direct link to the document:


3.5. Newsletters

Newsletters are used as an electronic dissemination tool, which is sent to all contacts and partners development during the project period or before. The newsletter has a two times a year periodicity, during spring and fall period.

Currently, stakeholders from different countries have subscribed for the newsletter, which increased from one period reporting to other. The affiliations of the stakeholders include universities and centers of education (from REPOPA countries and other EU and non-EU countries: Croatia, Germany, Korea, Sweden, USA), EC affiliations (EuroHealthNet, Polis Network), National and regional centers of health (promotion) and sports documentation from Italy, Denmark, and The Netherlands, NGO’s (from Denmark) and one private company (from UK).

The news and reports disseminated with the newsletter are brief (200-300 words) they are keeping the audience informed of the Project progress and continues to stimulate the readers’ interest. In the later versions newsletters includes Coordinator Corner where REPOPA Coordinator gives an overview on the Project main findings and activities as well as a brief overview of the challenges and opportunities REPOPA has/had. The newsletter is distributed twice a year through e-mail, using a REPOPA Consortium mailing list: stakeholders’ database and newsletter subscription email list, until December 2014, afterwards the newsletter was distributed electronically, using a feature of the website. The newsletters directed readers to our website for further details or access to other dissemination deliverables, as well, e.g. leaflets, posters, and final reports. The newsletter is also disseminated through twitter and website. The preview of the latest issue of the REPOPA Newsletter (September 2015) can be found below. The last REPOPA Newsletter will be distributed after the Project official end date (September 30, 2016):

And all REPOPA Newsletters are available on the website and can be checked on the links below:

On behalf of the REPOPA staff we are pleased to announce the release of our REPOPA Newsletter, September 2015 edition.

In this issue you will find updated news section and most recent research activities. Also, you will find a section with upcoming conferences where REPOPA work will be presented. If attending, we will be happy to meet you there and share with you our latest work.

Please access the Newsletter at the following link: http://reppoa.eu/newsletter/reppoa-newsletter

If you’d like to subscribe to our Newsletter please use the subscribe button on the first page of the website.

Tags: newsletter

REPOPA has reached its two major milestones related to the intervention work packages of WP2 (policy gaming) and WP3 (behavioral-based tailored interventions). These work packages were both resource-heavy with intervention protocol development, evaluation tools development, intervention implementation with several measurement points. Final reports of the intervention WP1 (submitted June and September, 2015) reveal the main results and lessons learned. Overall, the interventions succeeded very well as we received the new scientific knowledge we aimed at. Please see the WP1 and WP2 sections for more details. It looks as if the topics and good work done in the two sets of interventions were well received by the European Public Health Conference (EPhC) organization, as workshops on both sets of interventions were accepted for the highly competitive conference program. The EPhC will be arranged mid-October in Milan, Italy (www.ephcconference.eu).

need to do this by respecting the priority of scientific publishing of the results through. The Romanian team, together with the coordinating team, has worked the last half of a year to establish a new and interactive website for REPOPA with more advanced search and discussion options. The central part of the new website is the umbrella platform for national platforms of evidence-informed policy making. This structure is one of the central expectations of EC, since the idea is to establish structures and networks which are sustainable, which are not dependent on individuals, any particular institution or project. The REPOPA partner countries have started their platform developments in different ways and with different progress; the Finnish team have built its work on the existing ministry working group and they can thus already tell about their success stories on using research knowledge to influence physical activity policy making.

The target group at the conference was health researchers and policy advisors. The workshop was an opportunity to have researchers and policy advisors experience the potential of a policy game towards evidence-based policy making. The REPOPA game simulation workshop aims to involve

The workshop was a great success and the participants were extremely interested, especially because of the game’s interactive character, the participants during the workshop. Participants acknowledged that they would like to learn more about the policy game and some of the policy which varies a game as an opportunity for future use in the policy they work.
3.6. Leaflets and posters

The REPOPA leaflets and posters had as objective to increase the visibility of the Project aims and activities using an attractive design. For each new leaflet and poster developed, information were updated, to include new and appealing data to the reader. Depending on the identified needs, there was the possibility of having leaflets in the national language of all partners. The leaflets include information on the background, aims, progress, and updates/progress for each WP: country partner logos, and contact information as well as the main message of the Project: “towards evidence-informed policy making”. The preview of the leaflets can be found below and the latest version is available for download on the REPOPA website, along with the poster: http://www.repopa.eu/content/poster-flyer
D6.2. Report: Dissemination, monitoring and research into policy repository

Page 2. REPOPA Flyer Version September 2016

BACKGROUND

Research into POLicy to enhance Physical Activity (REPOPA) is a seven-country, five-year project.

AIMS

Integrate research knowledge, expert know-how and real-world policy-making to increase synergy and sustainability in promoting health and preventing disease.

Promote physical activity theme in structural policy making.

Establish structures and best practices for future health promotion.

SOME OF REPOPA’S PUBLISHED WORK


For more publications go to http://www.repopa.eu/content/publications

Most of our recent work has focused on follow-up measures of the WP2 and WP3 interventions and is implementing WP4, as well as publishing methods and results from all work packages (WP).

As part of WP4, the Delphi study was implemented in all six of the European countries involved in REPOPA (Denmark, Romania, Italy, the Netherlands, Finland, United Kingdom). Using two round online questionnaires and national conferences, Delphi panels were asked to evaluate the relevance and feasibility of the indicators for evidence-informed policy making.

The indicators, still not published, refer to measurable elements that allow to understand if scientific evidence was taken into account, or not, in a specific policy. They concern several aspects, from direct involvement of researchers in policy development to citation of scientific literature in policy documents, to the presence of budget available for communication initiatives or gather knowledge from specific target groups.

WEBSITE PREVIEW WHERE ALL PROJECT REPOPA DISSEMINATION MATERIALS CAN BE DOWNLOADED

REPOPA Dissemination Materials:

- Power Point Presentation Template
- Poster Presentation Template

Flyer 1 - Status October, 2012 (CRO)

Flyer 2 - Status August, 2013 (CRO)

Flyer 2 - Status August, 2013 (DK)

Flyer 2 - Status August, 2013 (IT)

Flyer 2 - Status August, 2013 (HUN)

Flyer 3 - Status October, 2014 (ENG)

Flyer 3 - Status October, 2014 (DK)

Flyer 4 - Status October, 2015 (CRO)

Flyer 4 - Status October, 2015 (IT)

Flyer 4 - Status September, 2016

WP1 – Assessment is completed. Publishing of the results is ongoing.

WP2 – Policy game sessions are completed in the Netherlands, Denmark and Romania. Publishing of results is ongoing.

WP3 – Six Stewardship-based interventions are completed in Denmark, Italy and the Netherlands. Publishing of results is ongoing.

WP4 – The Delphi study is completed involving 76 researchers and policy makers from six of the REPOPA countries and international organizations. Preliminary REPOPA indicators for evidence informed decision making were identified. Publishing is ongoing.

WP5 – The third of four annual rounds of consortium process evaluation is completed. Evaluation is ongoing until September 2016.

WP6 – National platform activities on evidence-informed policy making are ongoing on www.repopa.eu. Currently developing a methodology for the roll-out of mapping e-survey in partner and other EU countries.

60 out of 60 months

30 SEP 2016
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4. EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

4.1. Evidence briefs

Guidelines for both policy brief, and advocacy plan were designed as part of the dissemination work, and reported as part of the D6.1. Midterm Report. Policy briefs and advocacy plan have the purpose to enhance evidence-informed physical activity policy making and where disseminated among the Consortium Partners to be used and adapted to serve the purpose of disseminating RTD results. The templates are made available on the Project's web-based platform and have the purpose of guide REPOPA members in developing local and national level policy and advocacy strategies.

WP4 leader, CNR, has coordinated the development of evidence briefs and fact sheets, specific to each partner country who has implemented the Delphi Study. One evidence brief and one fact were developed in each partner country, as REPOPA guidance resources. The materials were reported and included in the WP4 final report (Delphi-based implementation and guidance development: WP4 final report of the REsearch into POlicy to enhance Physical Activity (REPOPA) project (in press)).

Continuing in this line of work, four evidence briefs where developed to disseminate and inform policymakers and researchers about the REPOPA interventions and research, print and online versions:

Evidence Brief no. 1: Evidence Informed Policy through Simulation Games – A practice in collaboration; based on the WP2 simulation game work. REPOPA investigated if a policy game intervention - based on needs, context and systems analysis – could be used to improve communication and collaboration between stakeholders in a cross- and multi-sector health policy making process. In which way does a policy game enhance the level of evidence-informed HEPA policy making and lead to a more efficient and successful policy? Some results are presented in the evidence brief along with the steps we used in simulation game.

Evidence Brief no. 2: Recommendations for Locally Tailored Interventions – Knowledge integration in physical activity policy making; based on the WP3 stewardship-approach work. Policymakers often have a hard time to find and apply research evidence in their real life contexts, which are loaded with different stakeholders, priorities and values. So far there has been rather little research on interventions to support policymaking in balancing these different kinds of evidence and information. REPOPA took this challenge and developed and implemented locally tailored interventions. The evidence brief goes through the steps of the tailored-stewardship intervention.

Evidence Brief no. 3: Recommendations for Using Evidence in Real World Physical Activity Policy Making; based on the WP4 Delphi Study work. Evidence-informed policies take into account both research evidence and contextual resources, priorities and values. There is a need for tools to assess how well policies are evidence-informed. Based on our Delphi study we developed and validated indicators to do this and to offer guidance for the integration of evidence in policymaking. Recommendations are detailed in the evidence brief.

Evidence Brief no. 4: Recommendations for Identifying Optimal Evaluation Processes for Funded Research Projects; based on the WP5 internal and external evaluation research work. Research funding agencies
need to demonstrate the health and policy impact of their research funds using optimally-designed evaluation processes. Some controversy and debate exist about the value of external project evaluations, and expectations and requirements for project teams for process evaluations. Our experience evaluating a multi-country research project offers one effective approach and is presented in the evidence brief.

Evidence Brief no. 1: Evidence Informed Policy through Simulation Games – A practice in collaboration
3 SIMULATION GAME

A designated leader keeps the group on task and helps them begin with materials which

- Outlined the game process
- Described the stakeholders and regulations
- Defined a multi-sector policy process

Each city developed stakeholders within the game that were present in the real world.

Examples of stakeholder roles included in simulation:
- Local Representatives (e.g., neighbourhood councils)
- Local industry representatives
- Health professionals
- Sectoral stakeholders (e.g., sport sector)
- Health Administration
- Representatives of organisations and NGOs

Once the team was organized, they began the game process. They used their multi-sector model to complete a full cycle of roles and developing session twice.

4 GAME ADAPTATIONS

Roosendaal, NL
Used simulation game to integrate capacity within regional health policy
Aim: to deliver interactions between stakeholders by defining benefits for collaborating organizations
Focused on developing skills and awareness for youth or deprived neighborhoods

Esinore, DK
Used simulation game to test first steps of implementing a newly developed policy
Aim: to enable awareness of recent reorganization creating Health and Care sectors
Aim: to engage multiple actors to promote physical activity by defining benefits for collaborating organizations
Focused on education, health and social care, focus on youth, disability and special needs citizens

Cluj Napoca, RO
Used simulation game to establish collaborative relationships in municipality and beyond
Aim: to develop framework to engage local stakeholders under decentralised system
Aim: to promote physical activity by improving infrastructure and access to sport resources
Focused on improving local project by expanding resources and involving collaboration between stakeholders

5 OUTCOMES

During the simulation game, team members shared knowledge and built relationships. Participants were able to identify similarities, differences, and potential barriers to applying evidence into policy in the context of their regions and municipalities.

The simulation game laid the groundwork for collaboratively integrating evidence into policies for health promotion.

The participants gained insights on the importance of leadership aspects such as taking initiative, giving clear directions and sharing responsibility in cross-sector collaboration.

What is REPPOA?

REPPOA is a project funded by the European Commission that brings together scientists, researchers, policy makers, and citizens stakeholders. REPPOA incorporates evidence and expert insight to inform policies that promote public health.

WANT TO KNOW MORE?

The full report can be found on the REPPOA website at www.repopa.eu

The project has received funding from the European Union’s Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 291333.
Evidence Brief no. 2: Recommendations for Locally Tailored Interventions – Knowledge integration in physical activity policy making

**Recommendations for Locally Tailored Interventions**

**Knowledge Integration in Physical Activity Policy Making**

**REPOPA Project Evidence Brief no. 2**

**A Document for Policymakers & Researchers**

**Statement**

Policymakers often have a hard time to find and apply research evidence in their real-life contexts, which are dealt with inconsistent values, priorities and available resources. There has been a gap in the research on interventions to impact policymaking in addressing these different types of evidence and information. REPOPA, a tool to change old developed and implemented locally tailored interventions.

**Working in Local Context**

The EU funded REPOPA project operates in 6 European Union countries and Canada, and aims to incorporate evidence and expert insight into the development of health promoting policies.

From the literature, we know that the integration of evidence and knowledge in policy-making is crucial. We also know that context plays an important role. When finding out how to do this integration, the context is of importance. The working in local contexts is important to face needs when planning to facilitate knowledge integration in physical activity policy making.

**Stewardship Approach**

The Stewardship Approach is an effective approach to policy making in the public health. It emphasizes the importance of:

- Needs and values
- Cross-sectoral action
- Structural changes
- Attention to vulnerable groups
- Equal and participatory approach

**Needs Assessment**

Start by performing a needs assessment.

Interviewing the policy stakeholders on current priorities and identified needs and barriers in relation to knowledge use is one way to do this. This can be demonstrated through the facilitation of a consensus-forming process, aimed to knowledge dynamics, and facilitation of cross-sectoral approach.

This can be demonstrated through the facilitation of a consensus-forming process, aimed to knowledge dynamics, and facilitation of a cross-sectoral approach.

**Context Analysis**

Interventions work differently in different contexts.

Pre-test is important to understand the knowledge integration intervention will be implemented. Do a context analysis based on relevant documents and interviews with stakeholders.

**Collaboration**

A close collaboration between policymakers and researchers will give the opportunity for knowledge integration on a daily basis.

This can be achieved through discussions to develop knowledge synthesis.

**Change**

The intervention can increase the awareness, request, and use of research knowledge and decrease the barriers for using research knowledge in policy making.

Stakeholder groups can become more aware, more active in searching for knowledge and in rephrasing, and more open to values of others. It can be a challenge to balance the account of the interventions with other limited time resources among the participants.

**What is REPOPA?**

REPOPA is a project funded by the European Commission that brings together scientists, researchers, policy makers, and other stakeholders. REPOPA encompasses evidence and expert insight to inform policies that promote public health.

**Want to Know More?**

The full report can be found on the REPOPA website at www.repopa.eu

This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 261352.
4.2. Videos and Animations

As final project outputs we have developed two different video animations for our main intervention work packages (WP2 and WP3). For WP3, a Danish version was also created, therefore totalling a total of three animations. The animations have as purpose to inform larger audiences about what a policy game is about, and what a stewardship-approach intervention is. The animations will be used as end-products to inform, disseminate, and teach beyond project REPOPA. The videos will be available on our videos section on the REPOPA website: [http://www.repopa.eu/content/video-](http://www.repopa.eu/content/video-)
records. The scenes are included below as part of the report and where first presented at the REPOPA Project Final Symposium, September 8, Brussels. The animations were also disseminated at Danish Public Health Association meeting end of September. The biteable app was used to create the animations.

**WP2. Policy Game**  
(Scenes 1 - 20)

**WP3. Stewardship Interventions**  
(Scenes 1 - 23)

First eight scenes are similar in layout and text.
This project is called REPOPA

REPOPA
RESEARCH INTO POLICY TO ENHANCE PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Some health interventions focus on some families or communities

Because REPOPA uses policy, the focus is the health of populations as a whole!
Different texts, relevant to each of the interventions:

**TO STRENGTHEN NETWORKING AND CROSS-SECTOR COLLABORATION**

**REPOPA TEAM ORGANIZED A REAL LIFE SIMULATION GAME IN THREE DIFFERENT COUNTRIES**

**THE GAME INCORPORATED EVIDENCE AND THEORIES**

**IT STARTED WITH A SYSTEMS ANALYSIS**

**TO FIND OUT HOW TO INTEGRATE KNOWLEDGE IN PA POLICY MAKING**

**EVIDENCE FROM RESEARCH, KNOWLEDGE FROM STAKEHOLDERS AND ON TARGET GROUPS**

**REPOPA team developed tailored interventions in real life settings**

And implemented them in six settings across three different countries
To identify key players and organizations in health policy making

Like the larger Repopa project, the approach incorporated evidence and theories

The players had diverse expertise and experiences,

And was build on a stewardship approach to emphasize

Like researchers, local representatives, policymakers and citizen stakeholders

Needs assessments, context analysis and close collaboration between

They worked together during a one day simulation game event,

Policymakers and researchers
To develop policy-action in a fictitious municipality

Lessons from the tailored interventions were

Learnings from the game can be further used in real life policy-actions

Collaboration between policy makers and researchers will give opportunity

To improve group functioning.

For knowledge integration on a daily basis

And the use of evidence in policymaking

Through discussions and knowledge synthesis
TAILORED INTERVENTIONS CAN INCREASE THE ACCESS, REQUESTS & USE OF RESEARCH EVIDENCE

And decrease barriers for using research evidence in policy making

THE FUTURE CHALLENGE IS TO BUILD SUSTAINABLE COLLABORATION AND CHANGES

WANT TO KNOW MORE? VISIT WWW.REPOPA.EU FOR THE FULL REPORT

WANT TO KNOW MORE? VISIT WWW.REPOPA.EU FOR THE FULL REPORT
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4.3. E-survey

The e-survey was developed together with the partners in the last year of the project. The e-survey aims to:

- test the developed of evidence-informed policymaking indicators as well as
- synthesize information provided from the whole project period, including the invitational final symposium from 2016 September 8th from Brussels, Belgium and the 7th conference of HEPA Europe, 28-30 September 2016, Belfast, Northern Ireland,
- to improve validity and reliability of the indicators, to indicate if items in the survey are clear/understandable, relevant/pertinent to their organization

In order to collect all the relevant and required information, the actual carrying out the survey (data collection) was postponed to late October 2016. The central results will be reported in the final report of the project by 30 November 2016. The actual carrying out the survey was postponed to October 2016. The central results will be reported in the final report of the project by 30 Nov 2016. The development of the e-survey is covered by the ethics exemption approval nr. 31/62 from 16.10.2012 of the Ethics Committee of Babes-Bolyai University from Cluj-Napoca, Romania – the coordinator of WP6 – Dissemination. The application of the final version of the e-survey will include an informed consent, as well. The e-survey will include

A. Cover letter:
   - Purpose of the survey,
   - Developers of the survey (REPOPA),
   - The source of the contact information,
   - The use of the data (purpose, anonymous etc), contact person,
   - A statement of informed consent etc.

B. Respondents demographic information

C. General information on the respondents background
   (Tentative questions before piloting)
   - How do you best describe your agency/organization? Health department/ City or county health department/ Advocacy group/ University/ Community-based organization/ Voluntary health organization/Other
   - Though you may work in several capacities, which do you consider your primary position?
     Program manager/administrator/coordinator)/ Health educator/ Epidemiologist/ Statistician/
     Program planner/ Program evaluator/ Department head/ Researcher/ PhD student/Other
   - Do you specialize in a single program area or do you manage multiple areas?
   - In what program areas do you specialize?

D. Evidence-informed decision making information
   - Based on your experience and best judgment, in the last 4 years, where you involved in any programs that used evidence-informed?
     - If yes, what was your role in these programs?

E. Scenario for applying/testing indicators so that respondents will answer more generally across all types of policies they have worked in the last 4 years

F. Testing the REPOPA evidence-informed decision making indicators (preview of the template below)
D6.2. Report: Dissemination, monitoring and research into policy repository

Preview of the tool to be tested using the e-survey:

### REPOPA e-survey - Evidence-Informed Policy Self-Assessment

*A self-assessment tool for decision/policy makers – diagnose how evidence-informed is your policy-making process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Set 1: Human Resources</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Give a reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>We have staff with research experience related to the PA policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We involve relevant stakeholders in the policy formulation and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>We have partnerships with research institutions that gives easy access to the latest research evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We provide training courses on research methods and EPM for staff on continuous basis</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We involve researchers with policy making experience in the policy making process</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>We provide training courses on media literacy for staff on continuous basis</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>We have defined procedures for ensuring a review of relevant scientific literature</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We cite peer-reviewed research articles in policy documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>We cite reports and other documents containing evidence in policy documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>We have available evidence briefs related to the policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There are available reports on policy results from policy making organizations of different municipalities/regions/countries available</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Feedback received in the stakeholders’ hearings is documented and published in an open manner (e.g. on the website)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SET 2: Use & production of documentation

- We use engagement and consultation methodologies to gather knowledge from target groups (including vulnerable groups)
- We inform target groups on the policy process
- We have communication methods tailored for target groups (including vulnerable groups)
- We have a budget for engagement and consultation
- Our staff who interacts with stakeholders has adequate communication competences
- We foster knowledge sharing between different relevant target groups

### SET 3: Communication & participation

- We have criteria to assess whether the policy is evidence informed when evaluating the policy
- We have defined procedures to monitor and evaluate the use of research evidence
- We involve researchers in the policy evaluation

### Accomplished: ___ out of 21

- SET 1: ___ out of 6
- SET 2: ___ out of 6
- SET 3: ___ out of 6
- SET 4: ___ out of 3

### To improve: ___ out of 21

- SET 1: ___ out of 6
- SET 2: ___ out of 6
- SET 3: ___ out of 6
- SET 4: ___ out of 3
4.4. Mapping evidence-informed policy making

Using evidence to inform public health decision making processes has been proven effective; however, it is not clear how research is applied in practice. As part of the REPOPA Project various activities that mapped the used of evidence-informed policy making were conducted as part of the RTD work packages, evaluation and dissemination work packages. As part of objective 2 of the WP6 – dissemination, a systematic literature review was conducted to assess the extent to which evidence is used in public health decision-making process, while highlighting differences (if any) between public health domains (Rus et al, work in progress). Preliminary results of the systematic review are presented at HEPA Europe Conference in Belfast Northern Ireland, 28th - 30th September 2016. The accepted abstract for oral presentation is available below as well as the presentation.

**Title:** A Systematic Review of Evidence Informed Policy Making in Public Health in Europe

**Authors:** D. Rus¹, E.A. Baragan¹, M. E. Bozdog¹, R. M. Cherecheș¹, A. Syed², A. R. Aro³

¹Babes-Bolyai University, College of Political, Administrative and Communication Sciences, Department of Public Health, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

²NHS England, London, UK

³University of Southern Denmark, Unit for Health Promotion Research, Esbjerg, Denmark

**Background:** The importance of research evidence in public health decision making processes is widely recognized. However how it is utilized in real world practice is unclear. This study analyses the extent to which evidence is used in public health decision-making process, highlighting differences (if any) between various domains of public health.

**Methods:** To identify eligible studies, 7 bibliographic databases (PubMed, Scopus, Cochrane Library, Science Direct, Web of Science, ClinicalKey, Health and Safety Science Abstract) were screened (search dates: 1990 – September 2015). In addition, general internet searches were also conducted. Studies were included if they were primary research or systematic review reporting on the use of research evidence in public health policy in Europe. Studies considered for inclusion were assessed by two reviewers using extracted data on objective, methods, population, and results. Studies were grouped into the following categories - qualitative research, quantitative research, and systematic review. Data were synthetized as a narrative review.

**Results:** Of a total of 2564 publications initially identified, 2525 titles and abstracts were screened. A total of 30 articles describing how or why research evidence was used/not used in public health policy met the inclusion criteria - majority involved interviews and/or surveys (N=17). One study was longitudinal while the rest were cross-sectional. Eight systematic reviews and five case studies were included. Excepting systematic reviews, most studies examined the use of evidence in public health policies in one country, although 9 studies included multiple countries. The type of evidence used was identified in 22 studies, with 13 using primary research, 11 using systematic reviews and the other looking at the use of a combination between formal and non-formal research (personal experience,
surveillance data, local data, needs and impact assessments etc.).

**Discussion and implications:** The key focus of publications is on barriers and facilitators on the use of research evidence rather on the process of actually using evidence and its impact on policy. Studies did not describe the use of evidence well and the types of evidence were rarely explicitly stated. There is an urgent need for research to support implementation of research evidence in public health decision making.

Keywords: evidence, public health, policy

---

**HEPA Presentation (preview)**

**Methods and Data Analysis (1)**

**Inclusive approach**

1) explain how evidence is used during the policy-making process;
2) describe the type of evidence used and
3) discuss the barriers/facilitators to the use of evidence in public health decision-making process.

**Aim**

To assess the extent to which evidence is used in public health decision-making process, and identify differences (if any) between domains of public health.

**The focus**

- The use of evidence in public health decision making
Results. Differences between public health domains

While few studies (n=3) explicitly examined differences between perceptions of evidence across public health domains, it can be postulated that professionals with direct care experience (e.g. mental health practitioners and medical doctors) are more reserved in using evidence than professionals who work in a macro environment.
Results. Several common themes facilitators/barriers

1) Interdisciplinary and multi-sector collaboration
2) Lack of skills and familiarity with research (14 studies)
3) Shortcomings in the body of available research (15 studies)

Conclusions

Communication between stakeholders was found to be critical - institutional structures can either inhibit or facilitate communication across disciplines and sectors

System level interventions that improve collaborative efforts should be a topics for further research and funding allocation

Collaborating across public health disciplines facilitates the development of comprehensive solutions to population health problems
5. CONCLUSIONS

This Dissemination Report provides the complete overview of the dissemination activities implemented in the scope of the REPOPA project, in accordance with the provisions of the Dissemination Plan issued at the beginning of the project, in accordance with D6.1. Midterm report on dissemination activities, country platforms, and repository functions (Submitted January, 2015) and 18 months Project reports.

The effectiveness of dissemination activities has been ensured by defining appropriate target groups, allowing the most relevant audience to be reached with the most appropriate dissemination tools. The main aim has been to keep them constantly updated about project findings and most relevant results. The most important dissemination tools developed during project lifetime included:

- A public website: [www.repopa.eu](http://www.repopa.eu) developed at the beginning of the project, regularly updated and re-launched in May-June 2015 to include the web-based platform and to disseminate the most recent news and provide information concerning the project results and activities;
- Twitter account: #ProjectREPOPA, which hosts related discussions and reaches out other existing networks and professionals;
- Specific guidance resources: templates on how to develop an evidence brief and advocacy plan for project partners to advance their work in the field of evidence-informed policy making;
- Specific dissemination tools: newsletters, leaflet, poster, evidence briefs and videos to provide information and results on the project; adapted for specific target groups and wider audiences as well.