

Original Research

The experiences of 33 national COVID-19 dashboard teams during the first year of the pandemic in the WHO European Region: a qualitative study

Authors

Erica Barbazza^{1*} MSc, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7621-1638>
 Damir Ivanković^{1*} MD MBA^{1*}, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3501-5515>
 Karapet Davtyan² MD, MPH, MBA, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1583-2590>
 Mircha Poldrugovac¹ MSc, MD, <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9872-7950>
 Zhamin Yelgezekova¹ MDP, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1006-3270>
 Claire Willmington³ MSc, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6610-7634>
 Bernardo Meza-Torres^{4,5} MD, MSc, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6551-5484>
 Véronique L.L.C. Bos¹ BSc, MA, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7447-9662>
 Óscar Brito Fernandes^{1,6} MSc, MEd, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3212-373X>
 Alexandru Rotar¹ MSc, PhD, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1382-7093>
 Sabina Nuti³ MBA, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2093-1828>
 Milena Vainieri³ MBA, PhD, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0914-4487>
 Fabrizio Carinci^{7,8} MSc, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7524-227X>
 Natasha Azzopardi-Muscat² MD, MSc, PhD, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9771-2770>
 Oliver Groene⁹ PhD, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1099-2950>
 David Novillo-Ortiz² MSc, MLIS, PhD, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9756-0984>
 Niek Klazinga¹ MD, PhD, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3937-8014>
 Dionne Kringos¹ MSc, PhD, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2711-4713>

¹Department of Public and Occupational Health, Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam Public Health research institute, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

²Division of Country Health Policies and Systems, WHO Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen, Denmark

³Laboratorio Management e Sanità, Institute of Management and Department EMbeDS, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Pisa, Italy

⁴Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, University of Surrey, Surrey, United Kingdom

⁵Nuffield Department of Primary Care and Health Services, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

⁶Department of Health Economics, Corvinus University of Budapest, Budapest, Hungary

⁷Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

⁸National Agency for Regional Health Services (AGENAS), Rome, Italy

⁹OptiMedis AG, Hamburg, Germany

*These authors contributed equally

Manuscript word count: 5,635 (excluding figures and tables)

Abstract word count: 243

Number of Tables: 4

Number of Figures: 1

Appendices

Appendix 1: Study overview

Appendix 2: Brief interview topic guide

Appendix 3: Sample details

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract (250 words)

Background: Governments across the WHO European Region prioritized dashboards for reporting COVID-19 data. The ubiquitous use of dashboards for public reporting is novel. This study explores the development of COVID-19 dashboards during the pandemic's first year and common barriers, enablers and lessons from the experiences of teams responsible for their development.

Methods: Multiple methods were applied to identify and recruit COVID-19 dashboard teams using a purposive, quota sampling approach. Semi-structured group interviews were conducted between April–June 2021. Using elaborative coding and thematic analysis, descriptive and explanatory themes were derived from interview data. A validation workshop with study participants was held in June 2021.

Results: Eighty informants, representing 33 national COVID-19 dashboard teams across the WHO European Region participated. Most dashboards were launched swiftly in the first months of the pandemic, between February–May 2020. The urgency, intense workload, limited human resources, data and privacy constraints, and public scrutiny were common to the initial development stage. Themes related to barriers or enablers were identified pertaining to the pre-pandemic context, pandemic itself, people and processes, software, data, and users. Lessons emerged around the themes of simplicity, trust, partnership, software and data, and change.

Conclusions: COVID-19 dashboards were developed in a learning-by-doing approach. The experiences of teams signal initial under-preparedness was compensated by high-level political endorsement, the professionalism of teams, accelerated data improvements, and immediate support of commercial software solutions. To leverage the full potential of dashboards, investments are needed at team-, national- and pan-European-level.

Keywords

COVID-19; public reporting of healthcare data; public health surveillance; health information management; WHO European Region; dashboard

Introduction

Governments, as the stewards of healthcare systems, have the chief responsibility to protect and promote the health and well-being of the population [1]. The stewardship role includes collecting and reporting relevant information and supporting its use as (performance) intelligence by all healthcare system actors, including the general public [2,3]. This task takes on new pertinence in the context of a public health emergency such as the COVID-19 pandemic [4-7]. Governments worldwide prioritized tools for delivering pandemic-related information, most often through the development of public web-based dashboards [8,9].

Dashboards can be characterized as a dynamic, visual display of key performance indicators, arranged on a single screen for viewing at-a-glance [10-12]. The ubiquitous use of dashboards as a public reporting tool during a pandemic is novel [13,14]. Nonetheless, the use-case for dashboards in a pandemic is clear. Contrary to static reporting, their dynamic nature iterates content and its display daily, evolving with the pandemic's stages [15]. By design, dashboards can manage large data sets, which together with their near-real-time reporting capabilities, is conducive to a pandemic's information urgency [8]. And, when paired with geographic information systems (GIS) and interactive drill downs, dashboards are critical for local monitoring, reporting and decision-making [12].

In the health sector, dashboards have traditionally been used for internal purposes, assisting managers in strategic and operational decision-making, particularly in hospitals [16], and supporting clinicians in clinical care and quality improvement [11]. There are also notable examples of public web-based dashboards for international health system benchmarking [17-22]. In contrast to COVID-19 dashboards, these have traditionally not been updated in near-real-time. Previous studies have explored optimizing the design of dashboards in healthcare [10], their effects on quality in clinical practice [11], and their development and implementation cycles [15,23]. In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, scientific accounts have documented the technical development of dashboards [9,24-28] and their applications in clinical practice [29,30]. From a healthcare performance intelligence perspective, our research group *HealthPros* [31], has conducted international comparative research on COVID-19 dashboards, exploring features common to highly actionable dashboards [32] and their evolution over time [33,34].

In the European region, several actors (e.g. World Health Organization (WHO), European Centre for Disease Control, and Eurostat) have led initiatives for multi-country COVID-19 surveillance, setting new methodological standards for data collection and comparative reporting (e.g., [6,35]). To-date, describing the processes of developing COVID-19 dashboards has predominately focused on individual country accounts, typically reported by the media (e.g., [36-39]). Studying the development process is critical to ensure that first-hand experiences of developing COVID-19 dashboard will not be lost. Several systematic approaches to capture pandemic experiences have already been published, offering important insights from the perspective of healthcare providers [40-42], patients [43,44], and the general public [45-47].

To support governments during the current pandemic and to better prepare for future health threats as well as other potential uses of dashboards, our research group set out to conduct a multi-country study on the process of developing COVID-19 dashboards across Europe and central Asia. To do so, we partnered with the WHO Regional Office for Europe, as a key convening actor in the region and counterpart of our target healthcare system stewards. With this aim, the study was guided by two research questions: (1) How can the development process of COVID-19 dashboards during the first year of the pandemic be described from the perspective of the teams responsible for development? And (2) what common barriers, enablers and lessons can be derived from their experiences?

Methods

Design

The study adheres to the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research [48]. To retrospectively examine the development process, a series of semi-structured group interviews were undertaken with COVID-19 dashboard developer teams across the WHO European Region. We used multiple methods to identify and recruit dashboard teams using a purposive, quota sampling approach. Group interviews in the local language of teams, to the extent possible, provided rich, collective team reflections on experiences with the process [49]. To answer our research questions, we adapted an approach previously developed by the study team to describe and assess the actionability of COVID-19 dashboards [32]. We also drew on the findings of prior COVID-19 dashboard research to inform the characteristics/features explored [32] (Table 1).

The study team included researchers from *HealthPros* and WHO European experts on health data. The multi-national nature of the study team ensured broad and complementary contextual, research, policy, and subject matter expertise. Team members conducting interviews (four women, six men) had previously researched COVID-19 dashboards [32,50,51]. They were trained in health services research and had prior research and professional experience in countries of the WHO European Region. Interviewers were collectively proficient in 13 languages used in the WHO European Region.

The research protocol was developed in accordance with the ethical requirements of the primary research affiliation to Amsterdam University Medical Centers of the University of Amsterdam. Participants provided written consent during the recruitment stage and verbally restated their consent at the start of their interview. Confidentiality was assured by assigning each participating dashboard team a random code (e.g., D1) and removing identifying information from verbatim quotes used throughout the paper.

Table 1. Overview of characteristics and features explored

Focus by research question	Characteristics and features explored
Development process	Responsible organizations, teams and launch
	Aims, users and content
	Data sources and breakdowns (geographic, population)
	Data display, interpretation and visualization
	Future plans
Reflections on process	Barriers
	Enablers
	Lessons learned

Sample of dashboards and informant recruitment

We defined our target sample of COVID-19 dashboard based on five criteria: (1) reporting of key performance indicators related to the pandemic; (2) use of some form of visualization; (3) publicly available in a web-based format; (4) reporting on the WHO European Region at national-level; and (5) development by a governmental organization or appointed authority. To increase the generalizability of our findings, we set out to recruit a geographically representative sample of COVID-19 dashboards from the region's 53 Member States. We applied WHO's European Health for All database [52] country subgroups and set a target of 50% representation from each: Members of the European Union (EU) before May 2004 (EU15) (n=15); Members of the EU after May 2004 (EU13) (n=13); the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) (n=12); and other European Region countries not included in these groups (n=13).

To identify COVID-19 dashboards, we consulted the affiliated country data sources of the international “WHO European Region COVID-19 Situation Dashboard” [53] and the sample from our previous COVID-19 dashboard work [32]. Additionally, we manually web-searched national, governmental COVID-19 webpages. Our target informants were referred to as “dashboard teams,” specified as members of core dashboard teams directly involved in developing and managing national COVID-19 dashboards, ideally from their inception.

Following identification of applicable dashboards, multiple methods were used to recruit dashboard teams for interviews. In case where contact details were listed, teams were reached directly via email and/or through social media (Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn). Alternatively, where a direct contact was not publicly available, we applied a snowballing approach, soliciting the advice of existing networks on health information systems across Europe, including country focal points of the European Health Information Initiative (EHII) [54] and the Population Health Information Research Infrastructure (PHIRI) Project [55], among other experts known to the study team. To further the recruitment process, a public webinar, convening EHII and PHIRI focal points, was organized and hosted by WHO, in March 2021, during which the study protocol was presented. Approximately 45 participants attended and were promptly followed-up with bilaterally where applicable by the study team. For countries where these methods did not result in direct contact with dashboard teams, support from WHO Country Offices was obtained to contact their respective ministries of health, informing them of the study and soliciting their participation. In contacting all prospective informants, an overview of the study was provided in English or Russian (see Appendix 1). When possible, correspondence took place in the local language.

Data collection

A detailed interview guide was developed by the first authors (EB,DI) and reviewed by the study team. Once finalized, a training session for interviewers was organised, with the aim to calibrate the interview process. Interviews consistently explored two main themes: 1) the dashboard’s development and 2) reflections on the process over the course of the first year of the pandemic (see Table 1). A brief version of the interview guide was prepared in English and Russian and provided to informants in advance of interviews (see Appendix 2). A structured pre-interview process was developed for interviewers to familiarize with the corresponding dashboard. For this, we adapted our descriptive COVID-19 dashboard assessment tool [32] and approach to scoring a dashboard’s actionability [56].

Between April and June 2021, 60-minute semi-structured group interviews were conducted with participating dashboard teams, either virtually or in-person. Dashboard teams were assigned to interviewers based on their language and context expertise. Interviews were conducted in pairs (a lead interviewer and second team member), where language competencies allowed for this and when the lead interviewer was not a first author (see Appendix 3 for the distribution of interviewers and languages used). With the agreement of informants, interviews were recorded, transcribed verbatim and, where applicable, translated to English. Transcripts were made available to informants upon request. Interview data were stored by the first authors. Fortnightly meetings were organized for interviewers to exchange impressions on the process and update on themes.

Data analysis

The first authors analysed the translated interview transcripts to identify descriptive and explanatory themes using elaborative coding [57] and thematic analysis [58] in an Excel tool developed in the approach of Meyer and Avery [59]. The analysis process included familiarization with the data, development and piloting of a coding framework, independent coding, peer review, mapping and interpretation of results. The coding framework was aligned with the research questions and was developed based on the characteristics and features (Table 1) of the semi-structured interviews (level 1). Additional themes (level 2) were generated through open (unrestricted) coding. The first authors independently coded three test transcripts each, then collaboratively reconciled and revised their coding. The approach was reviewed and discussed with two team members (NK,DK) and an external qualitative

researcher during the piloting phase. The transcripts were divided between the first authors for independent coding.

Once coding had been peer reviewed by the second coder, and reconciled by the first, a master dataset for analysis was developed. To analyse the dataset, the characteristics/features explored were equally divided among the first authors for re-reading, mapping and interpretation. In this process, we iteratively noted recurrent themes, as well as outliers. In reporting on the results by research question, verbatim quotes were extracted from the transcripts. To ensure validity of the findings, we employed different techniques, including researcher reflexivity, debriefing with all interviewers and reviews by the full study team. Additionally, validating findings with informants was organized through a virtual workshop, again hosted by WHO and attended by 55 study participations in June 2021.

Results

Sample of participating COVID-19 dashboards

Five WHO European Region Member States (5/53, 9%) did not have an applicable dashboard at the time of sampling. Three COVID-19 dashboards from non-Member States, yet representing territories within the WHO European Region, were identified through our sampling and included during the recruitment stage (Fig 1).

In total, 33 dashboard teams participated in the study. See Appendix 3 for direct links to each dashboard. The dashboards represented 31 out of 53 WHO European Region Member States; 65% (33/48) of total Member States with eligible dashboards (Fig. 1). Seventeen Member States (17/48, 35%) were unreachable, unavailable or uninterested to participate. We met our target for representation in all but one regional subgroup, CIS countries, where a quarter of Member States did not have an applicable dashboard (3/12, 25%). Overall, participation rates of *eligible* dashboards by subgroups ranged 83% (10/12) of EU13 countries, 73% (11/15) of EU15 countries, 57% (8/14) of other countries/territories and 44% (4/9) of CIS countries.

Interviews engaged a total of 80 informants (45 men and 35 women). On average, two informants per dashboard were interviewed (range 1–8), with three or more informants contributing for 42% (14/33) of dashboard teams. Two dashboard teams provided written responses and two others required a second interview to finalize data collection. In one instance, an informant was directly involved in the development of two dashboards. Interviews were conducted in eleven languages (see Appendix 3).

Fig. 1. Geographic representation of participating COVID-19 dashboard teams



Note: Azerbaijan, Cyprus, Georgia, North Macedonia, and Turkmenistan did not have a dashboard meeting the inclusion criteria at the time of sampling. Non-WHO European Region Member States included in the sample Kosovo, Scotland and Liechtenstein. Liechtenstein is reported jointly on Switzerland's dashboard.

Description of the development process

Responsible organizations, teams and launch. The development of dashboards was predominately initiated by high-level officials, namely a country's health minister, prime minister or president. Units of government or ministries of health (16/33, 48%), or national public health institutes (12/33, 36%) were most often appointed to lead their development (Table 2). In few instances, governments appointed other organizations (5/33, 15%) such as NGOs, private companies or academic institutions to develop the national dashboard, typically due to resource constraints. An awareness of the Johns Hopkins' COVID-19 dashboard [60] and other national COVID-19 dashboards was often cited in connection with the initial request.

The launch dates of participating dashboards ranged three main time periods: February–May 2020 in the first months of the pandemic (24/33, 73%); late-2020 in parallel to the pandemic's second wave across Europe (6/33, 18%); and early-2021 in connection with vaccinations (3/33, 9%) (Table 2). Dashboards that launched after the first months of the pandemic shared similar challenges, often data constraints or issues to identify a responsible organization. The unprecedented speed and workload involved in launching dashboards was a recurrent theme across teams. Many could vividly recount the initial days, recalling the level of uncertainty that characterized the process. As one informant described: "We were flying the plane as we were building it" (D31).

While some teams had prior experience with developing dashboards for internal use, most had never worked on dashboards intended for public reporting. Where possible, internal teams of data management units were re-purposed or new internal teams formed. Often, non-COVID activities were paused. For a quarter of dashboards (8/33, 25%), external teams were contracted to develop the dashboard. In two instances these teams were on a volunteer basis. Most teams started small, typically as one or two persons, though grew with time to about three to five core persons, and in some contexts, to more than twenty. The importance of multidisciplinary teams was emphasized, involving epidemiologists, public health specialists, information technology professionals, data analysts, policy experts and administrative staff. As teams expanded, additional expertise engaged included business intelligence and analytics experts, GIS specialists, user experience researchers and communication professionals. Support received from private front-end dashboard software suppliers was described as a critical addition to teams, especially in the early stages following their launch.

Aims, users and content. The dashboards were depicted as a vehicle for *informing*, but also as a tool for *partnering* with the public to "achieve greater participation of people in fighting the pandemic" (D9). Specific aims and target users were often implied rather than explicitly defined, with many citing the "chaotic" (D2) period that characterized the initial phase as a cause for this. Above all, the dashboards targeted the general public, though no dashboard team described having direct or formal contact with the public in the early development stage. Time constraints were consistently cited as the cause for this: "We would normally have done some user engagement and understand user needs, but the pace and expectation and demand to get the information out was so high" (D31). Other target users included national, regional and municipal officials, healthcare professionals, and the media.

In the early stages, following the dashboard's launch, monitoring user analytics was not pursued for the common reason: "there wasn't time for deep analysis of user behaviour" (D1). The intensity of the dashboard's use was described to bring high expectations and "insatiable demands [for data]" (D8), new requests, and questions. While internal feedback mechanisms to dashboard teams were well-established, with dedicated pandemic crisis management teams or committees meeting daily, a structured process to manage the general public's feedback was largely absent. Communication teams were described to play an important role in triaging these comments, predominately received via email and social media. However, the core dashboard team was typically tasked with providing technical replies; a demanding task given the magnitude and working pace.

Most dashboards (27/33, 82%) reported two or more types of content, most often spread/death and/or health systems or vaccination data (Table 2). More than half (21/33, 64%) had added vaccination data

in late-2020 or early-2021, either as new tabs or separate dashboards. The latter was typically due to one of three reasons, or a combination thereof: a different organisation was mandated to coordinate and report on vaccinations; existing or new data collection infrastructure for vaccinations differed from the epidemiological system; and/or a different software solution was used. Beyond the addition of vaccination data, significant changes were avoided due to lack of time or concerns regarding the public's reaction as they became accustomed to the dashboard and trusted the "original" version.

Data sources and breakdowns. "In the beginning, there were Excel spreadsheets" (D24). Many recounted similar intense manual data processing, especially countries/territories with more decentralized, less digitalized information systems. The availability, completeness, and quality of data ultimately played an important role in determining what indicators could be reported on, especially in the initial stages. Many described the trade-off between speed and quality, facing intense demands to publish data in near-real-time. This challenge intensified as the volume of data points increased with time. As one informant recounted: "Our data are usually ready for deployment 15–25 minutes before 4:00 pm, which is the time at which we usually deploy the data. So, we have that much time to curate 40 million records" (D10). Choosing to report open data was a political decision, typically made with view to ensure full transparency. More than half of the dashboards reported open data (21/33, 64%), meaning full data sets could be directly downloaded from the webpage (Table 2). Some went as far as to completely democratize their reporting: "The prime minister [country] sees the data at the same time as the guy down the road" (D10).

Data protection rules influenced a number of dashboard features including what indicators were reported on, data sources used, and geographic and population breakdowns applied. Clearances around what could be published were described to cause delays, as one dashboard team noted in reference to vaccination data: "We have had it ready for months, but right now the lawyers are debating, writing back and forth with the ministry" (D16). Fear of exposing personal health data was a repeat issue, with different interpretations of the lowest level of granularity when reporting cases locally, such as groups "larger than 20" (D16), "lower than 10" (D2) or "no less than 5" (D19).

Many described there was greatest interest to breakdown data to the local, municipal-level. This became increasingly relevant with the progression of the pandemic as infection control measures were introduced sub-nationally. The possibility to report data more locally also improved with time, as data collection processes became increasingly automated and of better quality. Persisting challenges included protecting privacy and ensuring smaller numbers were not misinterpreted by the public as low levels of risk. Resolving issues of incomplete denominators was also faced by some, describing outdated census data and challenges to record migrants, undocumented persons and seasonal workers. Beyond geographic breakdowns, age and sex disaggregation were common, though use of ethnicity and race-related, or socioeconomic status breakdowns were generally not pursued. This was in some instances due to lack of data, but more often, was a political decision. Specifically, some described uncertainty regarding its relevance for decision-making among the general public and fears of provoking discrimination.

Data display, interpretation and visualization. Dashboard teams relied on front-end dashboard display solutions developed either in-house (14/33, 42%) or commercially available (19/33, 58%). Most started with commercial solutions (21/33, 64%), typically Esri's ArcGIS™ (11/33, 33%) which had a "COVID-dashboards module" by early-March 2020 (Table 2). Selecting a commercial solution was determined by a range of considerations: a team members' previous experience with the software thus easing the learning curve; its availability for free (often for a limited period), meaning public procurement processes could be avoided; the proactive outreach and support of vendors; comparing the solutions used by other countries; and technical considerations, such as the degree of automation. Despite the speed-to-launch advantages of commercial solutions, they often faced limitations in terms of available templates and customisation. Most notably, the software selected was described to limit the range and types of visualisations and multi-language capabilities. Additionally, most commercial solutions were cloud-based, which was described by some as suboptimal, predominately due to data security concerns. For these reasons, four dashboard teams (12%) switched software with time.

Many described the task of visualizing data in a clear and understandable way as a challenge. Incorporating policy measures to explain data trends was seen by some as beyond their function of reporting *facts*. Providing detailed explanations and interpretations of the data were rather left to the media or what was described as “data enthusiasts” (D24) among the public. The dashboard was often part of a larger COVID-19 data and reporting ecosystem. Supplementary reporting efforts, mostly through static weekly situation reports, typically included additional indicators and more sophisticated analytics. These reports accommodated more text than the dashboard, making detailed explanations of data possible.

The dashboard teams described the importance put to preparing simple, easy to understand and interactive visualizations. In the early stages, visualizations were often not prioritized, as one developer described: “I can imagine maybe hundreds of other ways to visualize data describing the COVID situation. Unfortunately, because of lack of time, we decided to implement only the simple versions” (D1). Maps were consistently used to present local information, though privacy considerations also influenced visualizations, with some describing the challenge to avoid the suggestion that specific addresses were sites of cases and outbreaks.

Future plans. Discussing what is next for COVID-19 dashboards, four non-mutually exclusive scenarios were identified: (1) continuing to update existing dashboards, though less frequently with time; (2) further developing content (e.g., vaccines, wastewater studies), data management (e.g., automatization, quality, open data), design (e.g., visuals, organization) and user elements (e.g., low literacy levels, user behavior studies); (3) exploring non-COVID uses of dashboards for monitoring other communicable diseases (e.g., influenza) and registry data (e.g., cancers); and (4) preparedness planning, including investing in centralized data warehouses, in-house dashboard teams, coordinating across European countries and exploring alternative server and software options.

Table 2. Overview of development characteristics by participating dashboard team

Country/ territory	Appointed developing organization type	Launch date	Typology of content ^a				Open Data ^c	Software
			Spread/death	Health system	Vaccination	Other ^b		
Albania	Gov/ministry	March 2020	X	X			Yes	In-house solution
Andorra	Gov/ministry	October 2020	X	X			No	In-house solution
Armenia	Other	May 2020	X				No	In-house solution
Belgium	Public health	March 2020	X	X	X		Yes	Google Data Studio
Croatia	Other	March 2020	X	X			Yes	In-house solution
Czechia	Other	February 2020	X	X	X		Yes	Google Data Studio
Denmark	Public health	April 2020	X	X	X ^d		Yes	Esri ArcGIS
Estonia	Gov/ministry	March 2020	X	X	X	X	Yes	Tableau
Finland	Public health	March 2020	X		X ^d		Yes	Esri ArcGIS
Germany	Public health	March 2020	X				Yes	Esri ArcGIS
Iceland	Gov/ministry	March 2020	X	X	X		Yes	Infogram
Ireland	Gov/ministry	March 2020	X	X	X		Yes	Esri ArcGIS
Italy	Gov/ministry	October 2020	X	X			No	In-house solution
Kazakhstan	Public health	April 2020	X				No	Qlik Sense
Kosovo	Public health	Early 2021	X	X			No	Google Data Studio
Latvia	Public health	March 2020	X	X			Yes	Infogram; Esri ArcGIS
Lithuania	Gov/ministry	November 2020	X		X		Yes	Esri ArcGIS
Luxembourg	Gov/ministry	March 2020	X	X	X		No	Qlik Sense
Malta	Gov/ministry	August 2020	X		X		Yes	Infogram
Montenegro	Public health	March 2020	X				No	Infogram
Netherlands	Gov/ministry	May 2020	X	X	X	X	Yes	In-house solution
Poland	Gov/ministry	Early 2021	X		X ^d		Yes	Esri ArcGIS
Portugal	Gov/ministry	March 2020	X	X	X		No	Esri ArcGIS
Republic of Moldova	Gov/ministry	March 2020	X				No	Esri ArcGIS
Romania	Other	March 2020	X		X		Yes	In-house solution
Slovakia	Gov/ministry	March 2020	X	X	X		Yes	In-house solution
Slovenia	Public health	Early 2021			X		No	Microsoft Power BI
Spain	Public health	February 2020	X		X		Yes	In-house solution
Switzerland	Other	November 2020	X	X	X		Yes	In-house solution
Turkey	Gov/ministry	March 2020	X	X			No	In-house solution
Ukraine	Gov/ministry	October 2020	X	X	X		No	In-house solution
UK	Public health	March 2020	X		X		Yes	In-house solution
UK–Scotland	Public health	April 2020	X	X	X		Yes	Tableau

Note: all data is according to the date of interview. Gov: government. UK: United Kingdom. ^aRefers to complete, anonymized datasets available directly from the dashboard, without additional permissions or requests. ^bSpread/death: cases, deaths, testing, reproduction rates, self-quarantine, etc. Health system: hospitalized, admitted to intensive care unit (ICU), hospital, ICU, ventilator capacity, personal protective equipment, etc. Vaccination: vaccination first and second dose. ^cOther: behavioural insights and social and economic impact. ^dDedicated dashboard.

Barriers and enablers

Six main themes and fifteen subthemes were identified as recurrent barriers for some dashboard teams, yet enablers for others. These are briefly described below and listed in Table 3a–b.

Pre-pandemic context. The existing data infrastructure was a major challenge facing some dashboard teams, describing the limitations of traditional data collection and processing for near-real-time dashboard reporting. In contrast, teams working in settings with more advanced data systems and a culture of data (re)use, credited this as a contributor to their success. Similarly, some described the challenge resulting from highly decentralized data structures and processes, contributing to a lack of clarity around data ownership and custodianship. The limited level of preparedness for handling privacy regulations was a key barrier for some, whereas prior experience with interpreting privacy and security legislation in the context of public reporting, was an enabler for others.

Pandemic context. For most teams, chronic lack of time caused by the pandemic’s urgency and the demand to publish near-real-time data, meant analysing user behaviour, managing feedback, improving visualisations and engaging across stakeholders, became secondary. However, some teams did describe the constant urgency of the pandemic as a reason for streamlined processes and an end-goal orientation contributing to committed teams and focused efforts. The political context, including changes in leadership positions and the content demands of high-level decision-makers, was underscored as a barrier for some. So was the lack of a common understanding on the purpose and audience of dashboards and their position in the COVID-19 data ecosystem. Contrary to this experience, some teams credited high-level political endorsements for the development of national COVID-19 dashboards as a key enabler, providing ample resources and direction, yet autonomy, to the teams developing them.

People and processes. Seven-day workweeks, an immense workload and shortages of competent specialists hindered the development of dashboards in the experience of some teams. So did bureaucratic processes, including those for partnering with stakeholders, accessing and linking data, and engaging with public procurement. Conversely, having experienced data dashboards and business analytics teams in place, working across departments and organizations, and engaging new team members with necessary competencies were attributed as enabling factors in the experience of others. Flattening hierarchical structures and streamlining processes to facilitate decision-making, also were described to play a supporting role.

Software. Front-end dashboard software solutions occasionally impaired the development of dashboards, according to some teams, through limited visualisations, lack of multi-language functionality and other customization options as well as prohibitive pricing. For others, re-using existing in-house developed data analytics and dashboard tools (where available) provided more flexibility. When in-house options were not available, some teams described commercial software as an aid to accelerate the launch of dashboards. Waving initial fees and direct support from software vendors were cited as a key enabling factor at the outset.

Data. Publishing reliable, accurate, consistent and timely data proved challenging for many dashboard teams. Agreeing on data standards, including daily cut-off times, and the absence of granular data needed for reporting “close to home” and by different population sub-groups, were described as key hindrances. Conversely, the availability of (interoperable) data, coordination across data custodians, existing data (methodology) standards and cultures of secondary data use and open data publishing were described to benefit others.

Users. Managing users was described by some teams as a critical challenge, recounting intense scrutiny over the content of dashboards, issues of misinterpretation of data by users and negative reactions to mistakes as well as changes introduced. Some teams also detailed the high expectations of users (for real-time reporting), challenges in explaining methodologies (to lay audience) and lack of systemized processes to handle user feedback. For others, having clearly defined target audiences, knowing their information needs, engaging with media outlets, systematically improving user experience, and

- 1 handling feedback was a way of partnering with users and overall, an advantage to the process.
- 2 Transparency on methods and admitting mistakes, which inevitably happen at this volume and speed
- 3 of work, were perceived as enablers.

1
2

Table 3a. Summary of themes and illustrative quotes describing barriers

Theme	Sub-theme	Barrier	Illustrative quote
Pre-pandemic context	Data infrastructure	Lack of data infrastructure. Outdated, slow processes of data collection and processing. Data ownership and custodianship challenges. Highly decentralized data platforms.	“The epidemiological surveillance systems were not effectively prepared for a pandemic of this scale, either by the volume of information analyzed or by the usability of the information systems themselves.” (D9)
	Privacy regulations	Undefined rules and/or lack of practical experience in publishing health data and conditions for ensuring anonymity.	
Pandemic context	Urgency	Lack of time to analyze user behavior, manage feedback, improve visualizations, and engage across stakeholders.	“There was quite a lot of shuffling about who was responsible, which institution should be responsible for announcing and disseminating aggregated data.” (D4)
	Leadership	Political instability and influence on dashboard’s content.	
	Mandate	Lack of common understanding on the purpose of a dashboard, with different interpretations on its use (to inform, communicate, educate and/or incite fear) and target users. Unclear responsibilities.	
People and processes	Human resources	Huge daily workload. Lack of human resources and competencies working with dashboards. Requirement to work on other tasks in parallel.	“At the resource level, we are quite limited. It’s complicated to find the right people with the required expertise. It’s difficult to recruit, and the team has changed quite a bit over time.” (D17)
	Partnerships	Lack of time and possibility to engage users and other key stakeholders in “traditional” processes of engagement.	
	Processes	Slow and convoluted public procurement processes. No or under-prepared plans for pandemic situations. Issues with prioritizing resources.	
Software	Availability	Prohibitive pricing on licensing fees in immediate and longer-term. Slow speed of data processing and publishing.	“We needed a Venn diagram. Like really need it...But we just can’t use it because ArcGIS doesn’t have one. They only have bar charts, maps and pie charts.” (D4)
	Functionality	Software dictating look and feel of dashboard. Limitations of visualization options.	
Data	Availability and quality	Data unavailable and/or not of sufficient timeliness, completeness, structure, consistency and granularity across geographies. Issues to link data from various sources. Labor-intensive data processing, also increasing the risks of errors. Outdated citizen registration data.	“One primary point that was a large problem was the exact place where some someone lives, which is taken from the national census. And they didn’t want to share it with us because we were not legally able to get them...We have information about [approximately half the population]. The rest of them, we are not sure where they live now.” (D27)
	Data culture	Data siloed by different data custodians. Different data standards among sources. Lack of open data culture.	
	Automation	Challenges to set update times and cut-offs across data sources and custodians. Demand for real-time data compromising quality.	
Users	Target groups	Not having a defined target audience. Broad definition of user group (e.g., public, regional public health authorities, national policy makers and media).	“The biggest thing was the reactions of the media. Kind of, a lot of negativity online about

Theme	Sub-theme	Barrier	Illustrative quote
	Information needs, user experience and expectations	No or limited knowledge of users' information needs. No systemic way of dealing with user feedback. Oversimplifying content posing risk of misinterpretation. Users with high expectations and low data literacy. Negative reactions to changes to content and visualizations.	everything you do and not enough positivity.” (D2)

Table 3b. Summary of themes and illustrative quotes describing enablers

Theme	Sub-theme	Enablers	Illustrative quote
Pre-pandemic context	Data infrastructure	Electronic, centralized data flows (including hospital and laboratory data systems and infectious disease registries) with automatized data management. Ability to link data sources.	“The existing infrastructure, the central health information system and so on, those were definitely enabling factors. If we didn’t have them, or integration with the labs, with the hospitals, we would have been in the Stone Age.” (D24)
	Privacy regulations	Supportive privacy and security legislation and practice. Enabling state of emergency conditions.	
Pandemic context	Urgency	End-goal orientation contributing to committed and focused efforts. Not being perfectionist. “Once in a lifetime experience” as a motivator.	“[The] ‘chain of command’ was clear. That was an enabler, for sure. We all knew [the dashboard] was the official communication channel. It was practically considered and extended arm of the government.” (D15)
	Leadership	Political and upper-management support and endorsement providing access to sufficient resources. High-level directives.	
	Mandate	Clear purpose and mandate. High degree of autonomy to dashboard teams. Easy access to data as well as to skills needed in-house and possibility to outsource for additional capacity.	
People and processes	Human resources	Committed, competent, multi-disciplinary and proactive team. Prior experience with public reporting, dashboards and visualisations.	“This then led with an agile development to also change the relationships between people, who have become much less structured and hierarchical and have become much more intellectual and free.” (D12)
	Partnerships	Improvements to intra- and inter-organisational communication and collaboration. Need-based stakeholder collaboration and engagement including communication specialists and decision-makers.	
	Processes	Flattened hierarchy. Streamlined and agile internal organization. Change of mentality towards a more operational one.	
Software	Availability	Supportive technological solutions. Commercial software offered free-of-charge, for a period. Reusing existing solutions.	“There is no doubt that ten years ago the management of this pandemic would have been much more difficult, and now we have technology that has enabled us to fight the pandemic much more effectively.” (D9)
	Functionality	Easy to build and automate. Flexible and easy to maintain once set up. Extensive vendor support.	

Theme	Sub-theme	Enablers	Illustrative quote
Data	Availability and quality	Available, accurate and timely data of sufficient granularity. Ability to link data across sources and organizations.	“Because we are a data department...it’s very easy for us as we are data managers, all of us, and we have access to all the data. So, when we’re asked to do something, we don’t have to ask anybody. “Can you get me this data?” This access is very important for quick results.” (D16)
	Data culture	Aligned data standards and methodologies. Culture of data interoperability, open data and secondary data use.	
	Automation	Streamlined data processes including automation of collection, processing and reporting.	
Users	Target groups	Clearer definition of target audience. Separate dashboards or modules for different user groups with different information needs. Curious, rather than malicious, users. Partnership with media. Support and readiness for data-driven decision-making at all levels. Dissemination aids including social media platforms, high-level officials, transitional media, and data champions.	“We’ve had a good relationship with the media and there’s a short communication way from the public to us. So, if there’s something the public is insecure about or wants to know more about or wants [they can easily reach us], and that’s good.” (D26)
	Information needs, user experience and expectations	Systemic approaches to researching user experience, implementing improvements and managing user feedback. Tradition of public using data for decision-making.	

1
2

Lessons learned

When asked to consider, with the benefit of hindsight, what dashboard teams would do differently or what advice they would offer others to best prepare for public reporting in the context of a crisis, five themes emerged. One theme was on the importance of simplicity, reporting only essential information, prioritizing content that can be easily interpreted and supported by explanations. A second was the importance of trust. Teams described the inevitability of errors, given the urgency and volume of data, and in effect, the importance of disclosing errors as they happen. Using open data and prioritizing data security and privacy were also important lessons for building user trust. Third, the necessity of working in partnerships, in agile and collaborative ways with system leaders but also across in-house units, other stakeholders and the target audience, was emphasized. A fourth theme was the importance of software and data. While intuitive and recognized at the outset, teams were continuously confronted with the parameters set by the software chosen and reminded of the importance to automate processes and invest in quality data. A last theme was about confronting the truly dynamic nature of dashboards, finding ways to learn from others to improve, adapt to the stages of the pandemic and embed dashboards within other reporting. Recurrent themes, lessons learned, and representative quotes are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Summary of lessons learned, recurrent themes and representative quotes

Theme	Lesson	Representative quote
Simplicity	Report essential information only	“From the beginning one of the main aims was to make it as simple as possible to understand. I avoided providing additional information, so it is as simple as possible.” (D7)
	Ensure interpretation is straightforward	“I mean, that's not to say there aren't a lot of other types of users, but our primary focus is always that this is for the public and therefore anything that is there for the public should be able to understand.” (D10)
	Include explanations	“We learned it is super extra important to describe all the measures as soon as possible...the first-time people see a number, [that is] the way they understand it and they will continue misinterpreting it forever.” (D4)
Trust	Report errors	“Be brave enough to try it out, to put stuff out and also be transparent while doing it. And, if you have mistakes, also be transparent about it.” (D24)
	Use open data	“Publishing open data took a lot of work from our hands and made it a lot easier, more transparent and yeah, that's one of the lessons from the crisis, definitely.” (D24)
	Prioritize data security and privacy	“I also noticed issues in terms of data protection...I think that's another lesson learned, integrating data protection right from the get-go to make it easier later on.” (D17)
Partnership	Involve the right people	“It was a kind of multidisciplinary team who met to design the needs for the dashboard, the functionalities, the data that is necessary to be communicated, the functions of the dashboard.” (D29)
	Ensure high-level endorsement	“And then with the support and the initiation of minister's office, it was decided to come together in collaboration between my agency and the ministry. It was decided to add transparency and to be more efficient in ensuring that we have a dedicated website for coronavirus data.” (D20)
	Listen to your audience	“We also take into account the needs of politicians: what do they need to make their decision? So, there is the public health side and the political side that have to be taken into account.” (D17)
Software and data	Choose software wisely	“The tooling influences a lot how the dashboard looks in the end and what is feasible.” (D2)
	Automate when possible	“Unlike other diseases, we are talking about a very large volume of data...using more basic tools that at this point no longer work. So, everything we want to represent must be represented in an automatic way with a great capacity to go ‘drinking at the source’, we are talking about a lot of data, millions of millions of data.” (D9)
	Quality data is essential	“If the data is not collected in a way they can utilize, they will not be able to produce dashboards...Try to predict how they are going to grow their data warehouses because it is one of the problems as pandemic progresses, you need to respond quickly.” (D7)
Change	Learn from others	“We looked at many of the versions [from countries] to see which one will be more appropriate for [us] and how we can design it better for the country. So, examples from other countries I think helped a lot.” (D29)
	Adapt with the situation	“I would say they (indicators) evolved very organically as the pandemic evolved and the data became available in ways which were meaningful to visualize to the public and to the media.” (D32)
	Embed in reporting ecosystem	We never saw the website as a separate entity but as a central place from which we disseminate info to other communication platforms.” (D15)

Discussion

In this study, we retrospectively explored the development of COVID-19 dashboards over the first year of the pandemic across the WHO European Region. The region itself is geographically vast, with countries/territories of wide ranging population sizes, health information systems at varied stages of development [61,62], diverse data and administrative cultures and traditions [4], among other key differences. Nonetheless, we found there were more similarities than differences in the development stories described by the 33 national COVID-19 dashboard teams we met with. The factors that hindered or facilitated the development process and resulting lessons learned also shared a number of commonalities.

The overall speed with which governments requested the development of public-facing COVID-19 reporting reflects the WHO European Region's tradition of prioritizing good governance [63]. However, the ubiquitous use of dashboards for delivering COVID-19 data is found to be an international ripple effect, rather than the activation of pre-existing emergency response plans. The uptake of dashboards appears triggered by early adopters (e.g., [9]) and sustained by a proactive commercial software vendor market. As such, the statement of Boukaert et al. [4], "coping with the crisis has been first and foremost an issue of the national states, whereas the European voice has been weak," holds true also with regards to COVID-19 public reporting tools, including dashboards. To stimulate pan-European collaboration, the convening role of international actors should be leveraged to advance a common approach to public reporting using dashboards and sharing of lessons across contexts.

Dashboards feed on relevant, quality data. In the literature, data sources are cited as an essential aspect for dashboard development [15,64,65]. Initially, national health information systems struggled to provide accurate, timely data for COVID-19 dashboards, a key challenge also reported by others [14,66,67]. Our findings signal the need for continued investment in national-level data sources that are integrated and interoperable, and digital infrastructure that spans secondary, primary and social care systems [14]. Preparedness to tackle data privacy and security issues, including practical applications of GDPR in the EU, needs further prioritization and should be guided by the aim to report data in a proportionate, ethical and privacy-preserving manner [14]. Cross-country efforts like the European Health Data Space [68] may serve to advance the development of common data standards, indicator sets, and methodologies to the betterment of national but also pan-European reporting.

While dashboards are an important communication tool, though like other digital technologies [14] they are not a silver bullet. Previous research has emphasized the features of dashboards must fit with its intended purposes [15]. The actionability of data for end users relies on the extent to which the information is communicated clearly and understood [69-71]. However, we observe differences in the extent to which teams explore, discuss and define dashboard's purpose. Some saw it as presenting solely data (raw numbers) for the public to interpret themselves, versus others that endeavoured to provide explanations using narratives or visual methods. As reported in other studies, the way in which information is presented may change not only the subjective comprehension but also the objective understanding of the information [11,72,73]. Systematic approaches to explore user needs and use patterns are necessary, helping dashboards bridge the gap between being a managerial tool and a public reporting device.

The teams agreed that dashboards, and other near-real-time, web-based, interactive and visual reporting tools, are the likely future of public reporting. COVID-19 dashboards served as a proof-of-concept, including how much can be achieved with limited resources and high urgency. They have also served to flag imminent areas for improvement and new challenges like potentially harmful misinformation [74] Running dashboards in the longer-term and expanding their use into areas like resilience and recovery plans, and non-COVID monitoring, like on cancer, seasonal flu and patient safety, will have implementation and management costs which past studies have underscored as possibly prohibiting [15,16]. These were managed (or evaded) during the pandemic through mobilisation of emergency resources. However, the continued and expanded use of dashboards will require more intentional resource planning and investments.

Study strengths and limitations

Working in partnership with WHO offered unique access to our target national governmental COVID-19 dashboard teams. The composition of the research team allowed for the use of an extensive range of languages during data collection, aiding recruitment and the richness of exchanges during interviews. The study captured COVID-19 dashboards at a critical point in their development, as teams were actively improving and making adjustments at the time of interviews. It means teams were still deeply immersed in the dashboards, making for little strain to recall processes of the prior year.

We acknowledge the following potential limitations. First, the size and composition of core dashboard teams varied across countries/territories and brought some variability to the profile and number of persons met with per dashboard, and ultimately, the nature of their experience. Second, group interviews stimulated joint reflections across teams, enriching data collection, though this approach could also induce group pressure resulting in socially desirable responses. Third, the findings are a snapshot of the first year of the COVID-19 pandemic and may not reflect the current state of implementation. Lastly, the study included national, government COVID-19 dashboards of the WHO European Region and may not be generalizable to the experiences of subnational dashboards, other types of developers, such as academia, independent initiatives, media outlets, or industry, and of other regions globally, in particular low-income countries.

Conclusion

The study revealed more similarities than differences among the 33 participating COVID-19 dashboard teams from across the WHO European Region. A learning-by-doing approach described by the teams reflects the novelty of using dashboards as a tool for public reporting during a pandemic. The experiences of COVID-19 dashboard teams signal that initial under-preparedness was compensated by high-level political endorsement, teams' own professionalism, accelerated data improvements and commercial software solutions. Recurrent barriers and enablers related to the pre-pandemic and pandemic context, people and processes, software, data, and users should inform investments at all levels—dashboard teams, national and pan-European—level. Lessons around the themes of simplicity, trust, partnership, software and data, and change indicate areas for taking action to fully realize a data-informed approach to stewardship using dashboards.

Declarations

Conflicting interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests. DNO, KD and NAM are staff members of the WHO. The authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this article and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy or views of the WHO.

Funding

This work was carried out by the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Innovative Training Network (HealthPros – Healthcare Performance Intelligence Professionals) that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement Nr. 765141.

Ethical approval

Ethical requirements of the primary research affiliation to Amsterdam University Medical Centers of the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands, for which an exception applies.

Guarantor

EB, DI

Contributorship

EB and DI contributed equally as co-first authors. EB, DI, KD, OG, DNO, NK, DK designed the study. All authors contributed to the tool development, sampling and/or recruitment of dashboards. EB, DI, OBF, MP, CW, BMT, VB, ZY, OG, NK conducted interviews, transcribed and translated interview data. EB, DI, NK, DK analyzed interview data. EB and DI prepared the manuscript. All authors reviewed drafts of the manuscript and approved the final version.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Jeanine Suurmond for methodological advice, and all the interviewees who generously shared their time to participate in the study: Assel Abakova; Anna Artsruni; Georgi Asatryan; Jonas Bačelis; Simon Bak; Senad Begić; Tania Boa; Lovro Bucić; Stefan Buttigieg; Alan Cahill; Fabrizio Carinci; Gianfranco Costabile; Phillip Couser; Igor Crnčić; Olgeta Dhono; Michaela Diercke; Mykola Dobysh; Marjolein Don; Anna Fumačová; Aram Ghulijanyan; Clare Griffiths; Veaceslav Gutu; Pouria Hadjibagheri; Luc Hagenars; Scott Heald; Jonas Kähler; Kristjan Kolde; Martin Komenda; Kristina Kovačikova; Tanja Kustec; Terje Lasn; Sonia Leite; Renata Lenhardcziková; Pedro Licínio Pinto Leite; Jana Lepiksone; Mathias Leroy; Avet Manukyan; Elena Martinez; Graham McGowan; Emma McNair; Lorraine McNerney; Matej Mišik; Susana Monge; Teemu Möttönen; Maja Mrzel; Gints Muraševs; Hugo Agius Muscat; Martina Nagyová; Valentin Neevel; Aleksandar Obradović; André Peralta-Santos; Natalia Plugaru; Ane Radović; Anders Rasmussen; Raul Ritea; Leonardo Rocchi; Josep Romagosa; Giulio Siccardi; Fernando Simon; Margita Štāle; Alexandra Ștefănescu; Kristian Sufliarsky; Patrick Suter; Marianna Þórðardóttir; Nataša Terzić; Vitaliy Trenkenshu; Alexander Ullrich; Zuzana Vallová; Jeroen van Leuken; Jana Vanagè; Giordano Veltro; Olivia Vereha; Solange Vogt; Liina Voutilainen; Martina Vrbíková; Marjana Vrh; Pauline White; Piotr Włodarczyk; Kıvanç Yilmaz; Tatiana Zvonnikova.

Availability of data and material

All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary information. The data generated and/or analysed in the study are not publicly available due to participant anonymity.

References

1. World Health Organization, *The World Health Report 2000: Health Systems: Improving Performance*. 2000, World Health Organization Geneva
2. Barbazza, E. and J. Tello, *A review of health governance: Definitions, dimensions and tools to govern Health Policy* 2014. **116**: p. 1-11.
3. Travis, P., et al., *Towards better stewardship: concepts and critical issues*. 2002, World Health Organization: Geneva.
4. Bouckaert, G., et al., *European Coronationalism? A Hot Spot Governing a Pandemic Crisis*. Public administration review, 2020: p. 10.1111/puar.13242.
5. World Health Organization, *Global surveillance during an influenza pandemic*. 2009, World Health Organization: Geneva.
6. WHO Regional Office for Europe, *Strengthening and adjusting public health measures throughout the COVID-19 transition phases*. 2020, WHO Regional Office for Europe: Copenhagen.
7. Boin, A. and A. McConnell, *Preparing for Critical Infrastructure Breakdowns: The Limits of Crisis Management and the Need for Resilience*. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 2007. **15**(1): p. 50-59.
8. Kamel Boulos, M.N. and E.M. Geraghty, *Geographical tracking and mapping of coronavirus disease COVID-19/severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) epidemic and associated events around the world: how 21st century GIS technologies are supporting the global fight against outbreaks and epidemics*. International Journal of Health Geographics, 2020. **19**(1): p. 8.
9. Dong, E., H. Du, and L. Gardner, *An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-19 in real time*. The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 2020. **20**(5): p. 533-534.
10. Yigitbasoglu, O.M. and O. Velcu, *A review of dashboards in performance management: Implications for design and research*. International Journal of Accounting Information Systems, 2012. **13**(1): p. 41-59.
11. Dowding, D., et al., *Dashboards for improving patient care: review of the literature*. Int J Med Inform, 2015. **84**(2): p. 87-100.
12. Kamel Boulos, M.N. and E.M. Geraghty, *Geographical tracking and mapping of coronavirus disease COVID-19/severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) epidemic and associated events around the world: how 21st century GIS technologies are supporting the global fight against outbreaks and epidemics*. Int J Health Geogr, 2020. **19**(1): p. 8.
13. Zhang, Y., et al., *Mapping the Landscape of COVID-19 Crisis Visualizations*, in *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. 2021, Association for Computing Machinery: Yokohama, Japan. p. Article 608.
14. Budd, J., et al., *Digital technologies in the public-health response to COVID-19*. Nature Medicine, 2020. **26**(8): p. 1183-1192.
15. Ghazisaeidi, M., et al., *Development of Performance Dashboards in Healthcare Sector: Key Practical Issues*. Acta informatica medica : AIM : journal of the Society for Medical Informatics of Bosnia & Herzegovina : casopis Drustva za medicinsku informatiku BiH, 2015. **23**(5): p. 317-321.
16. Weggelaar-Jansen, A.M.J.W.M., D.S.E. Broekharst, and M. de Bruijne, *Developing a hospital-wide quality and safety dashboard: a qualitative research study*. BMJ Quality & Safety, 2018. **27**(12): p. 1000.
17. Primary Health Care Performance Initiative. *Country data*. 2021; Available from: <https://improvingphc.org/explore-country-data>.
18. World Health Organization. *Global Health Expenditure Database*. 2021 [cited 2021; Available from: https://apps.who.int/nha/database/country_profile/Index/en.
19. Eurostat. *Eurostat regional yearbook 2021*. 2021 [cited 2021; Available from: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistical-atlas/gis/viewer/?config=config.json&mids=BKGCNT,BKGNT22016,C01M01,CNTOVL&o=1,1,1,0.7&ch=PEO,C01¢er=50.00754,19.98211,3&>.

20. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. *Data visualizations*. 2021 [cited 2021; Available from: <http://www.healthdata.org/results/data-visualizations>.
21. Gapminder. *Resources*. 2021; Available from: <https://www.gapminder.org/resources/>.
22. Our World in Data. *Health*. 2021 [cited 2021; Available from: <https://ourworldindata.org/#entries>.
23. Pauwels, K., et al., *Dashboards as a Service: Why, What, How, and What Research Is Needed?* Journal of Service Research, 2009. **12**(2): p. 175-189.
24. Florez, H. and S. Singh, *Online dashboard and data analysis approach for assessing COVID-19 case and death data [version 1; peer review: 2 approved, 1 approved with reservations]*. F1000Research, 2020. **9**(570).
25. Komenda, M., et al., *Complex Reporting of the COVID-19 Epidemic in the Czech Republic: Use of an Interactive Web-Based App in Practice*. J Med Internet Res, 2020. **22**(5): p. e19367.
26. Ulahannan, J.P., et al., *A citizen science initiative for open data and visualization of COVID-19 outbreak in Kerala, India*. J Am Med Inform Assoc, 2020. **27**(12): p. 1913-1920.
27. Berry, I., et al., *Open access epidemiologic data and an interactive dashboard to monitor the COVID-19 outbreak in Canada*. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 2020. **192**(15): p. E420.
28. Dixon, B.E., et al., *Leveraging data visualization and a statewide health information exchange to support COVID-19 surveillance and response: Application of public health informatics*. J Am Med Inform Assoc, 2021. **28**(7): p. 1363-1373.
29. de Lusignan, S., et al., *COVID-19 Surveillance in a Primary Care Sentinel Network: In-Pandemic Development of an Application Ontology*. JMIR public health and surveillance, 2020. **6**(4): p. e21434-e21434.
30. Ibrahim, H., et al., *Rapid Development and Utilization of a Clinical Intelligence Dashboard for Frontline Clinicians to Optimize Critical Resources During Covid-19*. Acta informatica medica : AIM : journal of the Society for Medical Informatics of Bosnia & Herzegovina : casopis Drustva za medicinsku informatiku BiH, 2020. **28**(3): p. 209-213.
31. HealthPros. *International Training Network for Healthcare Performance Intelligence Professionals*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.healthpros-h2020.eu/>.
32. Ivanković, D., et al., *Features Constituting Actionable COVID-19 Dashboards: Descriptive Assessment and Expert Appraisal of 158 Public Web-Based COVID-19 Dashboards*. J Med Internet Res, 2021. **23**(2): p. e25682.
33. Bos, V., et al., *Development and Actionability of the Dutch COVID-19 Dashboard: Descriptive Assessment and Expert Appraisal Study*. JMIR Public Health Surveill, 2021. **7**(10): p. e31161.
34. Barbazza, E., et al., *Exploring Changes to the Actionability of COVID-19 Dashboards Over the Course of 2020 in the Canadian Context: Descriptive Assessment and Expert Appraisal Study*. J Med Internet Res, 2021. **23**(8): p. e30200.
35. ECDC, *Methodology for estimating point prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection by pooled RT-PCR testing: technical report*. 2020, ECDC: Stockholm.
36. Tindemans, M., *COVID dashboard: 'Good conversations about data have started'*, in *DeCrisismanager*. 2021, Maaik Tindemans and Pieter Jongkind: Arnhem, the Netherlands.
37. Jensen, S. *What we can learn from open data: COVID-19 in the Netherlands*. 2021 [cited 2021; Available from: <https://www.tableau.com/about/blog/2021/4/what-we-can-learn-open-data-covid-19-netherlands>.
38. Perkel, J. *Behind the Johns Hopkins University coronavirus dashboard*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.natureindex.com/news-blog/behind-the-johns-hopkins-university-coronavirus-dashboard>.
39. Merrick, J., *Behind the scenes of the coronavirus dashboard: a record 76.5m views, 2bn rows of data and 100 computers*, in *iNews*. 2021: UK.
40. Liu, Q., et al., *The experiences of health-care providers during the COVID-19 crisis in China: a qualitative study*. Lancet Glob Health, 2020. **8**(6): p. e790-e798.
41. Bennett, P., et al., *COVID-19 confessions: a qualitative exploration of healthcare workers experiences of working with COVID-19*. BMJ Open, 2020. **10**(12): p. e043949.

42. Eftekhari Ardebili, M., et al., *Healthcare providers experience of working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study*. Am J Infect Control, 2021. **49**(5): p. 547-554.
43. Zomerdijs, N., et al., *Experiences and needs of people with haematological cancers during the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study*. Psychooncology, 2021.
44. Drury, A., M. Eicher, and M. Dowling, *Experiences of cancer care during COVID-19: Phase 1 results of a longitudinal qualitative study*. Int J Nurs Stud Adv, 2021. **3**: p. 100030.
45. Williams, S.N., et al., *Public perceptions and experiences of social distancing and social isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic: a UK-based focus group study*. BMJ Open, 2020. **10**(7): p. e039334.
46. Mondino, E., et al., *Public perceptions of multiple risks during the COVID-19 pandemic in Italy and Sweden*. Scientific Data, 2020. **7**(1): p. 434.
47. Branquinho, C., et al., *"Hey, we also have something to say": A qualitative study of Portuguese adolescents' and young people's experiences under COVID-19*. J Community Psychol, 2020. **48**(8): p. 2740-2752.
48. Tong, A., P. Sainsbury, and J. Craig, *Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups*. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 2007. **19**(6): p. 349-357.
49. Frey, J.H. and A. Fontana, *The group interview in social research*. The Social Science Journal, 1991. **28**(2): p. 175-187.
50. Barbazza, E., et al., *Supplementary files: The current and potential uses of Electronic Medical Record (EMR) data for primary health care performance measurement in the Canadian context: a qualitative analysis* 2021.
51. Bos VLLC, et al., *Development of the Dutch COVID-19 Dashboard: Descriptive Assessment and Expert Appraisal of its Fitness for Purpose and Use*. JMIR, 2021.
52. WHO Regional Office for Europe. *European health for all database*. 2021 [cited 2021; Available from: <https://gateway.euro.who.int/en/datasets/european-health-for-all-database/>].
53. WHO Regional Office for Europe. *COVID-19 situation in the WHO European Region* 2021 [cited 2021 18 July]; Available from: <https://who.maps.arcgis.com/apps/dashboards/ead3c6475654481ca51c248d52ab9c61>.
54. WHO Regional Office for Europe. *European Health Information Initiative (EHII)* 2021 [cited 2021 18 July]; Available from: <https://www.euro.who.int/en/data-and-evidence/european-health-information-initiative-ehii>.
55. PHIRI. *The PHIRI project*. 2021.
56. Barbazza, E., et al., *Exploring Changes to the Actionability of COVID-19 Dashboards Over the Course of 2020: Descriptive Assessment and Expert Appraisal in the Canadian Context*. JMIR, 2021. **To be added**.
57. Auerbach CF and Silverstein LB, *Analyzing your next study using elaborative coding, in Qualitative data: an introduction to coding and analysis*. 2003, New York University: New York.
58. Braun, V. and V. Clarke, *Using thematic analysis in psychology*. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 2006. **3**(2): p. 77-101.
59. Meyer, D.Z. and L.M. Avery, *Excel as a Qualitative Data Analysis Tool*. Field Methods, 2008. **21**(1): p. 91-112.
60. Engineering, J.H.C.f.S.S.a. *COVID-19 Dashboard by the Center for Systems Science and Engineering (CSSE) at Johns Hopkins University* 2020 Available from: <https://www.arcgis.com/apps/opsdashboard/index.html#/bda7594740fd40299423467b48e9ecf6>.
61. Saigí-Rubió, F., et al., *Routine Health Information Systems in the European Context: A Systematic Review of Systematic Reviews*. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 2021. **18**(9): p. 4622.
62. Bogaert, P., et al., *Identifying common enablers and barriers in European health information systems*. Health Policy, 2021.
63. WHO Regional Office for Europe, *Implementation of the Tallinn Charter: Final report*. 2015, WHO Regional Office for Europe: Copenhagen.

64. McAvey, K., *Investing in the data systems we need to create the health system we deserve*, in *Health Affairs*. 2021.
65. Barnum, T., et al., *Your data looks good on a dashboard*. Online Journal of Nursing Informatics, 2019.
66. Dagliati, A., et al., *Health informatics and EHR to support clinical research in the COVID-19 pandemic: an overview*. Briefings in bioinformatics, 2021. **22**(2): p. 812-822.
67. Rutter, H., M. Wolpert, and T. Greenhalgh, *Managing uncertainty in the covid-19 era*. BMJ, 2020. **370**: p. m3349.
68. European Union. *European Health Data Space*. 2021 [cited 2021; Available from: https://ec.europa.eu/health/ehealth/dataspace_en].
69. Damman, O.C., et al., *An International Comparison of Web-based Reporting About Health Care Quality: Content Analysis*. J Med Internet Res, 2010. **12**(2): p. e8.
70. Kurtzman, E.T. and J. Greene, *Effective presentation of health care performance information for consumer decision making: A systematic review*. Patient Education and Counseling, 2016. **99**(1): p. 36-43.
71. Hibbard, J.G., H. Supporting people to manage their health: An introduction to patient activation. 2014, The King's Fund: London.
72. Belle, N., et al., *Factoring in the human factor: experimental evidence on how public managers make sense of performance information*. International Public Management Journal, 2021: p. 1-14.
73. Karami, M., M. Langarizadeh, and M. Fatehi, *Evaluation of Effective Dashboards: Key Concepts and Criteria*. The open medical informatics journal, 2017. **11**: p. 52-57.
74. The Lancet Infectious, D., *The COVID-19 infodemic*. The Lancet Infectious Diseases, 2020. **20**(8): p. 875.

Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) Checklist^a

#	Item	Question/description	Answer	Section
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity				
Personal Characteristics				
1	Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Team members conducted interviews: EB, DI, OBF, MP, CW, BMT, VB, ZY, OG, NK.	Methods
2	Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials?	EB, MSc* DI, MD, MBA* OBF, MSc MEd* MP, MSc MD* CW, MSc* BMT, MSc, MD* VB, MA* ZY, MDP OG, MSc, PhD NK, MD, PhD *were all PhD students	Methods
3	Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	All interviewers were members of an existing international network of healthcare performance intelligence professionals. Interviewers included researchers, doctoral students in their final year of training and principal investigators of the training network.	Methods
4	Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	Four women Six men	Methods
5	Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	All interviewers had training in health services research, COVID-19 dashboard assessments and prior professional experience in WHO European Region countries.	Methods
Relationship with participants				
6	Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	Informants were contacted via email prior to interviews in the local language as far as possible. All were provided a study overview. A virtual information session (webinar) was organized to inform on the study and address questions of prospective participants.	Methods

#	Item	Question/description	Answer	Section
7	Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research.	Informants all received a written overview of the study aims and objectives (Appendix 1) in English or Russian. The reasons for conducting the research were restated at the start of all interviews.	Methods
8	Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	At the outset of interviews, each interviewer present introduced themselves by their areas of research and affiliations.	Methods
Domain 2: study design				
Theoretical framework				
9	Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	Characteristics/features explored were derived from an approach to describe and assess the actionability of COVID-19 dashboards previously identified by the study team and reported in detail elsewhere. Elaborative coding and thematic analysis were applied to analyze data.	Methods
Participant selection				
10	Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Purposive sampling according to 5 inclusion criteria	Methods
11	Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Multiple methods via email including direct contact, advice of experts (existing networks), snowballing of recommendations, WHO Country Office support.	Methods
12	Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	76 informants 33 COVID-19 dashboards	Results
13	Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	17 target countries were unreachable, unavailable or uninterested to participate.	Results
Setting				
14	Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Online via Zoom or Teams One in-person interview	Findings
15	Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers	No	Methods
16	Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the	Geographic mix, type of organization and number of team members are reported in	Results

#	Item	Question/description	Answer	Section
		sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Appendix 3 together with direct links to the dashboard discussed.	
Data collection				
17	Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, and guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	A detailed (scripted) interview guide was prepared for interviews. A training workshop was organized.	Methods
18	Repeat interviews	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many	Yes, two.	Methods
19	Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Interviews were audiorecorded with the agreement of participants.	Methods
20	Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	No. All interviews were transcribed verbatim to follow and translated to English as needed.	Methods
21	Duration	What was the duration of the interviews or focus groups?	60 minutes.	Methods
22	Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Regular team meetings of interviewers were organized to discuss progress in connecting with developers and recurrent themes.	Methods
23	Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	No. Transcripts were provided when requested by participants for their recordkeeping purposes.	Methods
Domain 3: analysis and findings				
Data analysis				
24	Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Two (EB, DI).	Methods
25	Description of the coding tree	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	Yes, 1 (Table 1) and 2 level coding was applied.	Methods
26	Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Level-1 codes drew from characteristics/features explored in interviews (Table 1).	Methods
27	Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	An Excel tool was developed.	Methods
28	Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings	Preliminary results were presented at a workshop in June 2021 attended by 55 informants.	Methods
Reporting				
29	Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to	Confidentiality has been assured by assigning each participating	Results

#	Item	Question/description	Answer	Section
		illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	dashboard developer team a random code D# (ranging 1 through to 33) and removing identifying information from the transcripts.	
30	Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Findings are presented in the approach of the research questions and features/characteristics investigated (table 1)	Results
31	Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Tables are used to present major themes (Table 2, 3, 4). Subheadings are used to improve clarity.	Results
32	Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Tables are used to supplement in-text descriptions of sub-themes (e.g., Table 3 and 4)	Results

^a Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2007;19:349–57.

Appendix 1: Study overview

Pandemic public reporting that is fit for purpose and use: A qualitative study of COVID-19 dashboards in the WHO European Region from the perspective of their developers

Background

Public reporting in the context of a pandemic is a core government function and critical to foster accountability, trust and transparency, and to support individuals to make informed, risk-minimizing behaviour changes. Since the outbreak of COVID-19, activity has surged worldwide to develop dashboards as dynamic, visual tools for communicating COVID-19 data. However, without careful selection of indicators and data collection, analysis and visualization, dashboards have the potential to mislead, misinform, and incite panic, or simply to be ignored.

In the first half of 2020, our international research network of Healthcare Performance Intelligence Professionals (HealthPros)¹, launched a global study of COVID-19 dashboards. The study assessed 158 dashboards from 53 countries in July 2020. It also explored what makes a dashboard actionable, where actionability refers to a dashboards potential to inform decision-making. Seven features common to highly actionable dashboards were identified².

To date, the experiences of dashboard developers (teams)—the actors responsible for a dashboard's development—have predominately been captured through anecdotal descriptions, rather than structured evaluations of their development process. Recognizing the sustained importance of COVID-19 dashboards as a tool for pandemic reporting, opportunities for learning, exchanging experiences and co-designing recommendations for better preparedness in future public health crises is of critical importance.

Aims

To describe the development of actionable COVID-19 dashboards from the perspective of their developers, including facilitating and hindering factors faced, and jointly identify lessons learned and recommendations for strengthening actionable public reporting in the context of a pandemic.

Research questions

1. How can the development process of COVID-19 dashboards be described? Where this description includes decisions taken around the aim and audience, indicators selected, data sources used, links to policy measures, geographic breakdowns, population disaggregation, and use of visualizations³.
2. What facilitating and/or hindering factors were faced in the development of COVID-19 dashboards?

¹ Marie Skłodowska-Curie Innovative Training Network for Healthcare Performance Intelligence Professionals running 2018-2022. The network sets out to train a cohort of 14 HealthPros Fellows. The network's consortium spans partners in Canada, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, and United Kingdom. For more information on the HealthPros network, visit: <https://www.healthpros-h2020.eu/>.

² Ivanković D, Barbazza E, Bos V, Fernandes OB, Gilmore KJ, Jansen T, Kara P, Larrain N, Lu S, Torres BM, Mulyanto J, Poldrugovac M, Rotar A, Wang S, Willmington C, Yang Y, Yelgezekova Z, Allin S, Klazinga NS, Kringos DS. Features Constituting Actionable COVID-19 Dashboards: Descriptive assessment and expert appraisal of 158 public, web-based COVID-19 dashboards. JMIR; 2021. <https://www.jmir.org/2021/2/e25682/>.

³ This description reflects the seven features of highly actionable dashboards: (1) know the audience and their information needs; (2) manage the type, volume and flow of displayed information; (3) report data sources and methods clearly; (4) link time trends to policy decisions; (5) provide data 'close to home'; (6) breakdown the population into relevant sub-groups; and (7) use story-telling and visual cues. Refer to the article for the description in full: <https://www.jmir.org/2021/2/e25682/>.

Scope

To scope our investigation, we have put focus on *COVID-19 dashboards* that meet the following criteria: (i) reporting of key performance indicators related to COVID-19; (ii) use of some form of visualization (tables, maps, graphs); (iii) availability in an online, web-based format; (iv) reporting on COVID-19 in the scope of the 53 countries of the WHO European Region at the national level; and (v) developed by a government or appointed public authority with the responsibility to report pandemic-related information. See Annex 1 for the list of target dashboards identified.

Approach

A qualitative study designed in two phases: (i) descriptive evaluation using semi-structured interviews with dashboard developers (individuals and/or their teams); and (ii) co-design of lessons learned and recommendations using workshop(s) with participants from phase (i).

Study phases and timing

Phase one: Semi-structured interviews with dashboard developers (April and May 2021)

At-distance interviews will be conducted by a member(s) of the study team in the preferred language of informants based on the working languages of the study team. Interviews are expected to last 60 minutes and will be structured around the two research questions to describe the dashboard's development process and enabling and hindering factors faced. A detailed interview topic guide will be provided in advance.

Phase two: Co-design workshop(s) with dashboard developers (June 2021)

Workshop(s) with participating dashboard developers will be convened in June 2021 to validate the analysis of findings resulting from phase one and to explore lessons learned for strengthening pandemic-related public reporting moving forward. The workshops are also an opportunity for developers to directly exchange with one another, making this phase both a learning and networking opportunity.

Working languages

All study materials will be available in English and Russian. Interviews can be conducted in the preferred language of the interviewee, limited to the working languages of the study team: English, Russian, German, French, Bosnian, Croatian, Dutch, Italian, Montenegrin, Portuguese, Serbian, Slovenian, Spanish.

Profile of key informants

Target key informants include individuals in senior strategic, operational, analytical or technical positions related to the development and running of COVID-19 dashboards in the WHO European Region (see Table enclosed). Informants ideally have involvement with the dashboard from its inception and have had oversight or influence over decisions related to its aim, content, data sources, display and dissemination. Interviews can be conducted jointly with one or more member of a dashboard's team at the informant's discretion.

Dissemination and policy implications of results

It is the intention of the study team to submit the findings for peer-reviewed publication. Key informants will be noted in the acknowledgements unless requested otherwise. Dissemination is also foreseen to include a public webinar in fall 2021. Further details will follow. The study's findings are expected to inform jointly developed lessons learned for actionable reporting using dashboards in the context of a public health crisis.

Funding

This study is funded through the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 765141.

Study team and contact details

This study is developed by HealthPros in collaboration with the WHO Regional Office for Europe. The full study team includes HealthPros consortium members from the University of Amsterdam, OptiMedis AG, Corvinus University of Budapest, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, University of Oxford and University of Surrey. Contact details for the core study team are provided below.

Are you interested to participate?

Are you involved in the strategic development and/or operations a public, web-based COVID-19 dashboard and interested to participate in this study? Alternatively, are you aware of the experts in your country that are? If so, please get in touch using this link to connect with the study team.

Join our Launch Event 30th March 2021

COVID-19 public reporting from the perspective of dashboard developers

Tuesday March 30th | 12:00–13:00 (Copenhagen) | Zoom | English and Russian

Please also join a public webinar where we will launch this study and present results from recent COVID-19 dashboard and health information system studies.

Target COVID-19 national dashboards in WHO European Region Member States

The following lists COVID-19 dashboards identified in WHO European Region Member States that meet the study's inclusion criteria of a public, web-based COVID-19 dashboard, reporting on the national level and developed by the government, ministry of health or a delegated public authority with the responsibility of publicly reporting COVID-19 dashboard. In some countries, more than one dashboard may meet these criteria. This list is not exhaustive nor definitive of the dashboards sought and can be adjusted based on the advice and expertise of country-specific informants.

#	Country (dashboard link)	Organization (Developer)
1	Albania	Ministry of Health and Social Protection
2	Andorra	Government of Andorra
3	Armenia	Ministry of Health of the Republic of Armenia
4	Austria	Bundesministerium für Soziales, Gesundheit, Pflege und Konsumentenschutz
5	Azerbaijan	Ministry of Health
6	Belarus	Ministry of Health of Belarus
7	Belgium	Sciensano
8	Bosnia and Herzegovina	Government of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bosnia and Herzegovina
9	Bulgaria	Ministry of Health
10	Croatia	Government of the Republic of Croatia
11	Cyprus	<i>No applicable dashboard identified</i>
12	Czechia	Ministry of Health

#	Country (dashboard link)	Organization (Developer)
13	Denmark	State Serum Institute
14	Estonia	Social Ministry
15	Finland	Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare (THL)
	France	Government of France
16	France	Santé Publique France (Public Health France)
17	Georgia	<i>No applicable dashboard identified</i>
18	Germany	Robert Koch-Institut
19	Greece	<i>No applicable dashboard identified</i>
20	Hungary	Government of Hungary
21	Iceland	Directorate of Health
22	Ireland	Government of Ireland
23	Israel	Ministry of Health
24	Italy	Department of Civil Protection
	Italy	National Agency for Regional Health Services (AGENA S)
25	Kazakhstan	Ministry of Health
	Kazakhstan	National Center for Public Health
26	Kyrgyzstan	Ministry of Health of Kyrgyz Republic
27	Latvia	Center for Disease Prevention and Control
28	Lithuania	State Enterprise Centre of Registers (Registru Centras)
29	Luxembourg	The Luxembourg Government
30	Malta	Ministry of Health of Malta
31	Monaco	<i>No applicable dashboard identified</i>
32	Montenegro	Public Health Institute of Montenegro
33	Netherlands	National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM)
	Netherlands	Rijksoverheid
34	North Macedonia	<i>No applicable dashboard identified</i>
35	Norway	Norwegian Directorate of Health
	Norway	Norwegian Institute of Public Health
36	Poland	Government of Poland
37	Portugal	Directorate-General of Health
38	Republic of Moldova	Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Protection
39	Romania	National Institute for Public Health
	Romania	Romanian Ministry of Interior
40	Russian Federation	Ministry of Health of Russian Federation
41	San Marino	Institute for Social Security
42	Serbia	Serbian Ministry of Health and the Institute of Public Health of Serbia
43	Slovakia	Ministry of Health of the Slovak Republic
44	Slovenia	National Institute of Public Health
	Slovenia	Government Communication Office
45	Spain	Ministry of Health
	Spain	National Center of Epidemiology
46	Sweden	Swedish Intensive Care Registry (SIR)
	Sweden	Public Health Agency of Sweden (Folkhälsomyndigheten)
47	Switzerland	Bundesamt für Gesundheit BAG
48	Tajikistan	Ministry of Health and Social Protection of the Republic of Tajikistan
49	Turkey	Ministry of Health of Turkey

#	Country (dashboard link)	Organization (Developer)
50	Turkmenistan	<i>No applicable dashboard identified</i>
51	Ukraine	Ministry of Health
52	United Kingdom	Public Health England
53	Uzbekistan	Ministry of Health

1

Appendix 2: Brief interview topic guide

1. Development process and team

- Briefly, please describe the development process of your dashboard, specifically key milestones from its inception to its launch as well as any main changes that have taken place over the course of 2020 to present-day.
- Describe the members of the team that work on the dashboard on a regular basis, specifically, the competencies (profile) of these individuals, key experts, organizations or stakeholders collaborated with and any significant changes to the team over time.

2. Description of the dashboard's key features¹

- **Purpose and users.** Was the purpose of the dashboard defined from the start? Who was considered the intended user? Have any measures to track the use of the dashboard been taken?
- **Information (indicators).** What was the process for deciding which indicators to report on? Who was involved in that process? How was the ordering and clustering of indicators decided on?
- **Data sources and methods.** How were the sources of data selected? What permissions to gain access were involved? What data would you have liked to have had access to?
- **Reporting data over time.** To what extent were infection control policy measures (e.g., mandatory use of masks) reported on the dashboard to show their effect over time? Why or why not was this done?
- **Geographic breakdowns.** How has the geographic breakdown of data (e.g., national, regional, municipal, post code-level) changed over time? Did more granular data become available? In your opinion, what breakdowns are missed and why?
- **Population breakdowns.** What population breakdowns were applied (e.g., sex, age, ethnicity)? How did these change over time? In your opinion, what breakdowns are missed? Why?
- **Visualizations and explanations.** How were displays decided upon (e.g., charts, tables, graphs)? How have you used visual cues and explanations on the data and trends to improve readability? Have you tested the readability/user experience of the dashboard?

3. Summary of key barriers and enabling factors and lessons learned

- In your opinion, what has been the most advantageous factor supporting the development and running of the dashboard? What was the most challenging factor and/or greatest barrier faced in the development and running of the dashboard?
- With the benefit of hindsight, what would you do differently? What advice would you offer to other countries to best prepare for public reporting in the context of a public health crisis?
- What are your plans for the dashboard for the remainder of 2021?

¹ The features highlighted for discussion draw from our previous study on a global sample of COVID-19 dashboards. Find the full article here: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33577467/>.

Appendix 3: Sample details

#	Country (link)	Archive	Organization	Group	Interview language	Interviewer(s)	Informants		
							#	M	F
1	Albania	https://archive.vn/i4S1W	National Agency for Information Society	Other	English	EB, DI	1		1
2	Andorra	https://archive.ph/vPeLT	Government of Andorra	Other	English	Written	1	1	
3	Armenia	https://archive.vn/3g3Qx	Armed—e-Health Unified Information System	CIS	English	EB, ZY	4	3	1
4	Belgium	https://archive.vn/wip/3WRK6	Sciensano	EU15	English	DI	1 ^a	1	
5	Croatia	https://archive.vn/huMXy	MediaVal	EU13	Croatian	DI	3	2	1
6	Czechia	https://archive.vn/yQjKA	Masaryk University	EU13	English	DI	1	1	
7	Denmark	https://archive.ph/XVna1	Statens Serum Institute	EU15	English	EB, DI	3	3	
8	Estonia	https://archive.ph/RKunh	Health and Welfare Information Systems Centre (TEHIK)	EU13	English	EB, DI	2	1	1
9	Finland	https://archive.ph/EqoyQ	Finish Institute for Health and Welfare (THL)	EU15	English	EB, DI	2	1	1
10	Germany	https://archive.ph/hrRd2	Robert Koch-Institut	EU15	German	VB, OG	2	1	1
11	Iceland	https://archive.vn/144Xg	Directorate of Health	Other	English	EB, DI	1		1
12	Ireland	http://archive.today/JAjrL	Government of Ireland and Ordnance Survey Ireland	EU15	English	OBF, EB, DI	3	1	2
13	Italy	https://archive.ph/u8tz	Agenzia Nazionale per i Servizi Sanitari Regionali (AGENAS)	EU15	Italian/English	MP, EB, DI, NK	5	5	
14	Kazakhstan	https://archive.vn/8WpFu	National Public Health Center and Datanomix	CIS	Russian	ZY	2	1	1
15	Kosovo	https://archive.vn/wip/twFeg	National Institute of Public Health	Other	English	DI	1 ^a	1	
16	Latvia	https://archive.vn/Bluro	Centre for Disease Prevention and Control of Latvia (CDPC, SPKC)	EU13	English	Written	3	1	2
17	Lithuania	https://archive.ph/90EEv	Statistics Lithuania	EU13	English	EB, DI	2	1	1
18	Luxembourg	https://archive.vn/Bascs	Government of Luxembourg	EU15	French	CW	1		1
19	Malta	https://archive.vn/gltow	Ministry of Health	EU13	English	EB, DI	2	2	
20	Montenegro	https://archive.vn/r8wd4	Institute of Public Health	Other	Montenegrin	MP, DI	3	2	1

#	Country (link)	Archive	Organization	Group	Interview language	Interviewer(s)	Informants		
							#	M	F
21	Netherlands	https://archive.vn/6wj kz	Rijksoverheid; the National Government of the Netherlands	EU15	English/Dutch	VB, EB, DI, NK	4	3	1
22	Poland	https://archive.ph/O89Hr	Ministry of Health	EU13	English	EB, ZY	1	1	
23	Portugal	http://archive.today/uZfSO	Ministry of Health/ Directorate General of Health	EU15	Portuguese	OBF	2	2	
24	Republic of Moldova	https://archive.vn/Gr5f3	Ministry of Health, the National Agency for Public Health	CIS	English	ZY	2	1	1
25	Romania	https://archive.vn/FuQz3	Code for Romania	EU13	English	DI, ZY	3	1	2
26	Slovakia	https://archive.vn/6CELh	National Health Information Center, Ministry of Health	EU13	English	DI	8	2	6
27	Slovenia	https://archive.vn/npXDO	National Institute of Public Health (NIJZ)	EU13	Slovenian	MP	3		3
28	Spain	https://archive.ph/KUoWX	Ministry of Health, Consumption and Social Welfare	EU15	English	EB, BM	3	1	2
29	Switzerland	https://archive.vn/GzzvU	Federal Office of Public Health (FOPH)	Other	English/French	CW	3	1	2
30	Turkey	https://archive.ph/gdPFO	Ministry of Health	Other	English	EB, MP	1	1	
31	Ukraine	https://archive.ph/ugzj6	National Security and Defense Council	CIS	English	EB, ZY	2	1	1
32	United Kingdom	https://archive.ph/Md5lD	Public Health England	EU15	English	DI, BM	2	1	1
33	United Kingdom—Scotland	https://archive.ph/K4hIF	Data and Intelligence Network, Public Health Scotland	EU15	English	EB, DI	4	3	1
Totals							80	45	35

Notes: M: male; F: female; EU15: Members of the European Union before May 2004; EU13: Members of the EU after May 2004; CIS: Commonwealth of Independent States; Other: other WHO European Region member states and/or territories not captured by other groups. ^aSame informant.