## Ex post evaluation of Cohesion Policy programmes 2014-2020 financed by the ERDF: Work Package 12 – Study on crisis response instruments

### Interview Stakeholders Health Sector

**Introduction**

1. Could you briefly present the main challenges faced by the health sector at the outbreak of the pandemic (e.g. access to medicines, communication and knowledge sharing about the pandemic, investments in products and services necessary for fostering crisis response capacities in health services, health infrastructure, purchase of medical services and equipment)? How have these evolved?

**Effectiveness and relevance of crisis response instruments**

1. Are you familiar with any specific measure implemented by ERDF/CF funding that had a positive contribution in reducing the negative impact of the pandemic? (i.e. Positive contribution to health facilities, knowledge sharing, purchase of medical equipment and products).
2. Do you believe the crisis response instruments – CRII/CRII+ and ReactEU– were/are in line with emerging needs stemming from the pandemic? Did they come fast enough for the different types of regions (more / less / in transition regions)?
3. Are you aware of any evidence on the crisis response instruments unintended (negative or positive) consequences on the health sector? Consider for example:
	1. not sustainable projects (e.g. support for unfeasible health infrastructures or unused medical equipment/products);
	2. delays/contribution to restructuring of health infrastructures;
	3. delays/contribution to long-term performance solutions (e.g. investments in R&D&I);
	4. others

**Efficiency of crisis response instruments**

1. Have health services faced obstacles/bottlenecks in accessing resources during the crisis? If so, what specific additional obstacles have been reported? (e.g. access to information, procedural requirements, other)
2. In your opinion, is there a potential for simplification in the delivery of the funds? Do you know any governance / delivery model or approach which could be considered as a benchmark?
3. In your opinion, was the support for the health sector made available fast enough (regulatory changes and reprogramming) to respond to the crisis?

**Coherence of crisis response instruments**

1. Which other national and/or regional crises response instruments were useful to mitigating the impact of the crises (i.e. besides EU Cohesion Policy)?
2. Do you have any evidence of overlap / replacement or complementarity between the national / regional crisis-response measures and the measures financed by EU Cohesion Policy?

**EU Added value of crisis response instruments**

1. What was/were the added value(s) of EU Cohesion Policy crisis-response instruments for the health sector compared to other national and regional interventions? Consider for example:
2. quantitative terms (additional necessary financial resources / possible information on the indicative ratio of EU instruments and national initiatives);
3. response time (faster);
4. qualitative added value (it could be possible to have more flexibility or more focused interventions with EU funding than national funding);
5. the EU funding instruments accelerated / amplified / replaced the decision of national instruments

**Lesson learned and additional remarks**

1. What are the key lessons learned for future programming? (success factors and pitfalls) Based on your experience, which other types of measures could be helpful as crisis responses? (if any)?
2. Are you aware of other studies on the use of crisis response instruments / use of Cohesion Policy during the crisis?