



OASES

Promoting evidence-based reforms on medical deserts

D3.2 Interim Evaluation Report

31/08/2022



D3.2
Interim Evaluation Report

Project title	prOmoting evidence-bASed rEformS
Acronym	OASES
Number	101018341
Call identifier	HP-PJ-2020-2
Topic	PJ-01-2020-2 Support to reforms in health workforce field - Initiatives on medical deserts (Heading 1.2.1.1 of the AWP 2020)
Starting date	01/03/2021
Duration in months	36
Website	http://www.oasesproject.eu/
Work package	WP3
Lead author	Matteo Vezzosi
Contributors	David Smith, Vera Lipreri
Peer reviewers	AGENAS
Version	1.0
Due date	31 August 2022
Submission date	31 August 2022
Dissemination level of this deliverable	Public

Keywords

Medical desert, medically underserved areas, health workforce

Proprietary rights

This document contains information which is proprietary to the OASES consortium. Neither this document nor the information contained herein shall be used, duplicated or communicated by any means to any third party, in whole or parts, except with the prior written consent of the OASES consortium.

Disclaimer

The content of this document represents the views of the author only and is his/her sole responsibility; it can not be considered to reflect the views of the European Commission and/or the European Health and Digital Executive Agency or any other body of the European Union. The European Commission and the Agency do not accept any responsibility for any use that may be made of the information it contains.



Table of contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
2. INTRODUCTION	5
2.1 STRUCTURE OF THE DOCUMENT	5
3. SUBJECT OF THE EVALUATION	6
3.1 INTRODUCTION TO WP1	6
3.2 WP1 DESCRIPTION OF TASKS	6
3.2.1 CONSORTIUM OPERATING PROCEDURES DEFINITION & QUALITY ASSURANCE	7
3.2.2 COORDINATION OF THE PROJECT AND DAY-TO-DAY MANAGEMENT.....	7
3.2.3 CONSORTIUM MEETINGS	7
3.2.4 ETHICAL MANAGEMENT	8
3.2.5 LEGAL MANAGEMENT	8
4. EVALUATION TOOLS	9
4.1 FEEDBACK COLLECTION (MS11)	9
4.2 STAKEHOLDERS' ANALYSIS TO IDENTIFY EXTERNAL EXPERTS.....	10
4.3 EVALUATION SURVEYS	10
4.4 QUALITY BOARD (MS10).....	11
5. EVALUATION FINDINGS	12
6. CONCLUSIONS	14

1. Executive summary

The objective of this deliverable is to provide interim evaluation of all management activities put in place by the WP1 leaders in the M1-M18 period, in order to assess the process and methodology adopted, and the quality and relevance of the achieved milestones and completed tasks.

Beyond the basic evaluative goals, the purpose of this report is also to carry on disseminating a number of good practices underlying the proper conduct of OASES project among the consortium members, with the aim of ensuring that all partners understand the data and information that are required for the evaluation of the project, to ensure that they are collected according to a shared timeline, and that they offer a useful insight into the expected project results.

In summary, we acknowledge how the initial evaluation activities have been successful due to the amount of content produced within WP1 and especially due to the close collaboration between internal stakeholders, particularly the project managers, and those outside the consortium, such as Policy Board members, funding authorities, and members of other projects focussing on the risk of increased desertification, poor distribution, and shortages of health services and workers in the EU.

The objective and joint effort between now and the conclusion of the evaluation work is to strengthen these collaborations so as to channel any untapped potential toward achieving objectives that are as important as urgent in the current scenario.

2. Introduction

The term medical desert refers to several situations or areas where people have difficulties to access care, including not only geographical areas in which there is a lack of services or poor quality of assistance, but also those situations in which subgroups of the population struggle to access health programs or services, due to their socio-economic conditions or to any other factor that acts as a systematic barrier to healthcare utilisation.

The OASES (prOMoting evidence-bASed rEformS) project is an EU-funded project under the 3rd Health Programme aiming to represent a source of knowledge in European medical deserts, reinforcing the capacity of health authorities of EU Member States to reform their health systems and address all the important aspects to successfully tackle the challenges that the medical desert is posing, with specific regard to actions focusing on skill mix, task shifting, use of e-health and IT systems, recruitment and retention management and policies, in order to guarantee universal coverage also in rural and underserved areas.

As well as for any publicly funded initiative, the evaluation of inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and expected impact is critical to the success and sustainability of OASES project. This paper (D3.2 Interim Evaluation Report) applies the principles, methods, and tools presented within the Evaluation Plan of the OASES project (D3.1 Evaluation Plan) to assess ongoing activities, expected outcomes and potential impacts aiming at tackling medical deserts at European level.

More specifically this paper looks into the implementation of WP1 related tasks, milestones and deliverables within the M1-M18 period, whether every objective has been accomplished or not, and if any significant delays has occurred due to inefficiencies in project management.

2.1 Structure of the document

This report is organised as follows:

Section 2 defines the overall purpose and scope of the interim evaluation

Section 3 describes the subjects of the interim evaluation

Section 4 describes the evaluation tools

Section 5 describes the evaluation findings

Section 6 summarises the main conclusions of the writing.

3. Subject of the Evaluation

3.1 Introduction to WP1

Work Package 1 (project coordination) is the day-to-day management of tasks, roles and responsibilities within the project consortium, informing partners about who's in charge for each deliverable, who's supporting the action and by which deadlines. In this role, AGE.NA.S. handles administrative tasks for the consortium to keep the project running smoothly, it provides guidance on how to achieve goals, and takes care of scheduling internal and public meetings throughout the project life span.

More precisely, AGE.NA.S. is the Leading Executive Organisation (LEO) of WP1 which implies the following objectives:

1. To provide technical, scientific, financial and administrative management and support
2. To steer efforts of the partners for the achievement of milestones
3. To elaborate a project management guide defining general procedures for the project management and quality assurance
4. To monitor progress to avoid deviations
5. To ensure ethical compliance
6. To communicate with CHAFEA (now HaDEA - the European Health and Digital Executive Agency) and DG SANTE
7. To comply with the existing rules on any financial, legal & administrative issue
8. To organise and run coordination meetings on a regular basis.

3.2 WP1 Description of Tasks

In project coordination, a task is a work item or activity with a specific purpose related to a larger, long-term goal. This section considers the main tasks within WP1 including one deliverable (D1.1 Project Guide) and one key milestone for the achievement of more, cross-sectional deliverables (MS1 Kick-off Meeting).

The main WP1 tasks can be summarised as: Consortium Operating Procedures Definition & Quality Assurance; Coordination of the project and day-to-day Management; Consortium Meetings; Ethical and Legal Management.

3.2.1 Consortium Operating Procedures Definition & Quality Assurance

T1.1: Consortium Operating Procedures Definition & Quality Assurance

AGE.NA.S. has developed a Guide for project management and quality assurance (D1.1 Project Guide) which is a reference manual for partners to consult management procedures. The document provides an overview of the Consortium's organizational structure, decision-making processes, deliverables acceptance procedures, roles and duties, internal communication policies, and quality and risk management practices. It also provides the project plans and the project change management plan. The guide serves as the foundation for managing the project throughout its lifecycle and the key point of reference for all project members and stakeholders: it is therefore desirable for each section to be up to date at all times throughout the duration of the project.

3.2.2 Coordination of the project and Day-To-Day Management

T1.2: Coordination of the project and Day-To-Day Management

The project coordinator AGE.NA.S. is also responsible for managing and coordinating the administrative and financial matters afferent to OASES project, and for providing administrative support to the consortium members. The management structure in OASES Project is composed by the Executive Board, Policy and Quality Boards, the Coordination Team (WP1 Leader), the Work Package Leads and all Project Partners responsible for the implementation of OASES outcomes and outputs.

While this mid-term internal report looks at a few of them only, namely those pertaining to WP1, a detailed evaluation of the actions taken, and performance offered by each of the management structure members is deferred to the delivery of a Final Evaluation Report (D3.3) due by M36.

3.2.3 Consortium Meetings

T1.3: Consortium Meetings

In drafting the project proposal, due to the ongoing pandemic, it was decided that most project meetings would be held virtually, online, as much as possible. The following series of meetings is being evaluated in terms of both quantity and quality:

1. Kick-Off Meeting (MS1);
2. Consortium Meetings with EC representatives;

3. Final Conference;
4. Inter-Projects Meetings;
5. Policy Board Meetings;
6. Managerial Meetings;
7. Technical Meetings.

An overview of all past meetings and events can be found in the Annex I.

3.2.4 Ethical Management

T1.4 Ethical Management

Ethical Management involves the provision of ethical oversight, analysis, and guidance on all aspects of the OASES initiative. It deals with ethical values, moral principles and social rules, which form the basis of social life, as well as national laws, regarding the issues related to medical deserts, from a holistic point of view: patients, healthcare professionals, carers and other actors.

3.2.5 Legal Management

T1.5. Legal Management

This task deals with all contractual and legal issues related to the project, which will primarily focus on partnership management, work plan updates, and the assignment of roles and resources as needed.

4. Evaluation Tools

The prime scope of this internal evaluation is to assess the effectiveness and timeliness of all management and coordination activities put in place by the WP1 leaders from the beginning of OASES to-day.

To do so, the WP3 team has been working shoulder to shoulder with the WP2 team in tracking data for most of the internal communication generated by WP1 (e.g. meeting agenda, minutes, action plans, tasks and deadlines reminders). In addition, we've been using online evaluation surveys for target groups members to complete after attending a project meeting or a dissemination event. The results of each questionnaire have been collected and stored in a database owned by the INHWE, who has analysed the available information and translated the results of each survey into spreadsheet tables shared with the project coordinator AGE.NA.S. and all partners.

This section describes the use of each evaluation tool in order to assess the quantity and quality of actions performed within WP1. A detailed description of the adopted tools can be found on the D3.1 Evaluation Plan, chapter 4.

4.1 Feedback collection (MS11)

In the context of OASES project, all actions related to project management, ethical and legal management, and the analysis of research methods are included in the general assets subject to project evaluation. The objective of MS11 was to gather information regarding how and in what ways the coordinators were able to manage both internal processes and project work, and to assess the quality and effectiveness of these actions.

MS11 together with MS10 (Quality Board) have been preparatory to the delivery of this D3.2 Interim Evaluation Report, in which the results obtained from the above-mentioned analysis complete the evaluation of the coordination work carried out by the project leads to provide technical, scientific, financial and administrative management and support to the consortium partners throughout the first year of OASES.

Feedback provided for the completion of MS11 include evidence of the following tasks:

- Project Hub set up and management
- Action Plan management
- Time Sheets management
- Internal Communication management

- MS1 Kick-Off meeting
- D1.1 Project Guide
- Policy Board launch and management
- Organisation of 25 Internal Meetings between M1 and M18
- Survey analysis

4.2 Stakeholders' Analysis to identify external experts

A stakeholder analysis identifying relevant actors has been carried out early in the project to allow for targeted evaluation activities. The analysis has identified actors with an interest in, or the ability to influence, developments in research on medical deserts in the health care sector at a local and national level.

This was particularly beneficial to the achievement of WP1 tasks of creating and facilitating opportunities for dissemination of the project's goals and aims, e.g. the Inter-Projects meetings and the upcoming Final Conference. In addition, the analysis of key stakeholders among the members of the WP3 leader INHWE has provided a basis for gathering input from outside the project, for example by facilitating the participation of experts in the Quality Board.

4.3 Evaluation Surveys

Within the M1-M18 period, each member of the OASES initiative was asked to contribute to the creation and maintenance of communication channels so that the proposed evaluation plan can apply in full. In order to collect feedback and monitor evaluation progress, a number of evaluation surveys have been provided to each partner.

Some of these were the result of a close collaboration between WP2 and WP3 in light of the shared interest in drawing the stakeholders' attention to the ongoing research on the risk of increased desertification and shortages of health services in the EU (e.g. their level of engagement with the communication and dissemination channels, feedback before and after launching the project website).

Others are the result of evaluating the perceived quality of the many meetings and events promoted by OASES between M1 and M18 (e.g. whether the information material sent prior to the meeting has adequately prepared the audience to participate in the discussion, general satisfaction with online events hosted by the OASES consortium).

The following meetings have been evaluated while the analysis of all responses can be found in the Annex I:

- Internal Meeting
- Kick-Off Meeting
- Policy Board Meeting
- Quality Board Meeting
- Webinar Event

4.4 Quality Board (MS10)

The Quality Board is one of the components of the project's management structure. It sets out to provide feedback on general project management and ethical and legal management along with the general research methodology (all WPs) and data gathering processes. Given the assigned role and tasks, it is crucial for everyone involved in project evaluation to be able to count on the Board's input in order to ensure the greatest possible adherence between the adopted plan and the actual conduct of operations via the proper tool at the right time.

The first meeting of the Quality Board took place virtually, online on Tuesday 5th October 2021. After the welcome of the project coordinator, two milestones of WP3 were presented (the MS9 proposed evaluation strategy to be divided into three key actions areas and the MS10) followed by Q&A and discussion around any issues raised.

The second meeting of the Quality Board is to be held in a date between October and December 2022, depending on the availability of those involved and with the approval of the project coordinators at AGE.NA.S.

5. Evaluation Findings

For each of the main WP1 tasks described in chapter 3, the main findings are listed in this section. Detailed evidence of completed tasks is also provided in the Annex I, together with the results of the evaluation conducted in preparation of this deliverable.

T1.1: Consortium Operating Procedures Definition & Quality Assurance

The vast majority of the operating procedures and quality assurance measures are included in the Project Guide (D1.1 Project Guide) delivered by the WP1 leader AGE.NA.S. in the early stage of OASES. The guide was produced independently and within the prescribed time limit. In terms of content, it provides a comprehensive overview of the different areas of intervention, the tools in place and the objectives to be achieved.

One obvious recommendation for the future is to keep updating the guide so that all partners will have access to reliable and recent information about the project.

T1.2: Coordination of the project and Day-To-Day Management

From an evaluative point of view, the number and quality of actions implemented by the leader of WP1 AGE.NA.S. for the coordination and practical management of the project appear to be relevant and effective, even greater in quantitative terms than in a standard scenario.

For instance, a total of 25 coordination meetings (virtual, online format) were held between M1 and M18 which has ensured frequent exchanges of information between partners and conspicuously reduced the risk of misunderstandings and delays in the production of deliverables. We also got to see how the WP1 leader AGE.NA.S. has allocated time and resources to one-to-one meetings with one or more project partner(s), e.g. in conjunction with the production of milestones.

The project coordinator AGE.NA.S. has also made efforts in supporting the production of timesheets, which are a direct responsibility of each project partner, through the practice of monitoring and reviewing tasks for each member of the project team.

The role of the Policy Board was also enhanced in this regard. A number of concept papers and questionnaires were developed and then used before and after the first meeting of the Board. An overview of collected feedback and provided inputs can be found in the Annex I.

T1.3: Consortium Meetings

Kick-Off Meeting: The official start of OASES Project took place virtually, online on 25 March 2021 from 10:30 to 17:00, with the morning session being led by representatives of the funding authorities which have presented the operational and financial aspects of the grant management, followed by an overview of each WP.

Launch of the Health Workforce Projects Cluster: The official launch of the cluster took place virtually, online on 20 September 2021 on the Webex platform of the EU Health Policy Platform.

Policy Board Meeting: The first meeting of the OASES Policy Board took place virtually, online on 23 September 2021.

Inter-Projects Meeting: The first EU wide conference run by the OASES team took place virtually, online on 10 December 2021 with the aim of describing the medical desert phenomenon through the use of specific indicators. To do so, the WP1 leader AGE.NA.S. together with other WP leaders have identified and invited experts in the field from some of the other actions that are co-funded by the 3rd Health Programme of the EU.

Webinar event: The first OASES webinar took place virtually, online on 1 March 2022, under the title "The role of health workforce data in identifying medical deserts".

Meeting with EC representatives: The five projects (Health Workforce Project Cluster) held a mid-term event hosted by the EU Health Policy Platform on 29 March 2022, focussing on the fight against health inequalities through the improvement and implementation of national policies for the retention of health workers.

T1.4, T1.5: Ethical and Legal Management

At the time of writing this report, there is no evidence of any particular actions or initiatives taken by the WP1 leader AGE.NA.S. to counter the risk of deviance or divergence in terms of either ethical or legal management of OASES project. We reserve the right to complete this section with new data in preparation of the D3.3 Final Evaluation Report.

6. Conclusions

Within the M1-M18 period, the implementation of WP1 tasks has accomplished all of the main objectives in that all the intended outputs were produced, with no exception. No significant delays occurred because of inefficiencies in project administration. No other sort of weaknesses has affected the effectiveness of the action.

The number of project meetings run by the WP1 leader AGE.NA.S. and the timeliness in circulating the generated action plans are one of the added values of this project. Same goes with the efforts perpetrated to obtain a solid and reliable dissemination plan in collaboration with the WP2 leaders from Semmelweis University.

Critical to the project's success is the maintenance of a critical mass to coordinate the project both substantively and administratively. The collaboration between AGE.NA.S. and the funding authorities can be underlined as a best practice that generated positive outcomes for both parties.

For the future, we would recommend continued coordination between OASES and the other four members of the Health Workforce Project Cluster (five projects focussing on three key topics - medical deserts, task shifting and retention policies - are co-funded under the umbrella of the 3rd Health Programme of the EU) in order to maximise the results of the ongoing outreach and stakeholder engagement actions.

The next update, as per the D3.3 Final Evaluation Report, is to be released by M36.



OASES

Promoting evidence-based reforms on medical deserts

ANNEX I

D3.2 Interim Evaluation Report

31/08/2022



Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union

ANNEX I

D3.1

Evaluation Plan

Project title	prOmoting evidence-bASed rEformS
Acronym	OASES
Number	101018341
Call identifier	HP-PJ-2020-2
Topic	PJ-01-2020-2 Support to reforms in health workforce field - Initiatives on medical deserts (Heading 1.2.1.1 of the AWP 2020)
Starting date	01/03/2021
Duration in months	36
Website	http://www.oasesproject.eu/
Work package	WP3
Lead author	Matteo Vezzosi
Contributors	David Smith, Vera Lipreri
Peer reviewers	AGENAS
Version	1.0
Due date	31 August 2022
Submission date	31 August 2022
Dissemination level of this deliverable	Public

Keywords

Medical desert, medically underserved areas, health workforce

Proprietary rights

This document contains information which is proprietary to the OASES consortium. Neither this document nor the information contained herein shall be used, duplicated or communicated by any means to any third party, in whole or parts, except with the prior written consent of the OASES consortium.

Disclaimer

The content of this document represents the views of the author only and is his/her sole responsibility; it can not be considered to reflect the views of the European Commission and/or the European Health and Digital Executive Agency or any other body of the European Union. The European Commission and the Agency do not accept any responsibility for any use that may be made of the information it contains.



Table of contents

1. MEETINGS EVALUATION	5
1.1 FIRST INTERNAL MEETING.....	5
1.2 KICK-OFF MEETING (MS1).....	5
1.3 POLICY BOARD MEETING.....	5
1.4 OASES WEBINAR	5
1.5 COMMUNICATION SURVEYS	6
2. CONSORTIUM OPERATING PROCEDURES DEFINITION & QUALITY ASSURANCE	6
3.1 D1.1 PROJECT GUIDE	6
3. COORDINATION OF THE PROJECT, DAY-TO-DAY MANAGEMENT, AND CONSORTIUM MEETINGS	6
4. QUALITY BOARD	7
5. STAKEHOLDERS' ANALYSIS TO IDENTIFY EXTERNAL EXPERTS	7
5.1 INTEREST AND INFLUENCE RATES	7
6. TABLES AND FIGURES	7

List of figures

Figure 1: 01_OASES_evaluation_survey

Figure 2: 02_OASES_evaluation_survey_KOM

Figure 3: 03_OASES_Evaluation_Policy_Board

Figure 4: 04_OASES_Webinar_Anniversary

Figure 5: 05_OASES_Evaluation_Quality_Board

Figure 6: Consortium Meetings

1. Meetings Evaluation

Within the M1-M18 period, a number of meetings and dissemination events have been evaluated through multiple choice questionnaires, open questions, statements and comments/remarks.

1.1 First Internal Meeting

The first meeting with the OASES project team took place virtually, online on 5 March 2021. On the day, nine individuals have provided their feedback on various technical and operative issue related to their participation in the project. These include comments on the quality of the platform in use (Microsoft Meets), the clarity of topics for discussion, usefulness in understanding each role in the project, usefulness in creating a strong team to deliver the project to its quality standard. The survey results are reported on Table 1.

1.2 Kick-Off Meeting (MS1)

The official start of OASES Project took place virtually, online on 25 March 2021. On the day, seven participants have provided their feedback on various aspects of the event e.g. quality of info received before the meeting, clarity and appropriateness of meeting agenda, quantity of tasks assigned before the meeting, appropriateness of deadlines, clarity and appropriateness of meeting minutes. The survey results are summarised on Table 2.

1.3 Policy Board Meeting

The first meeting of the OASES Policy Board took place virtually, online on 23 September 2021. Following the meeting each member of the Board was inquired about their experience. Questions focussed on the Policy Board's scope and role, and the overall satisfaction with the meeting. The survey results are reported on Table 3.

1.4 OASES Webinar

The first OASES webinar took place virtually, online on 1 March 2022, under the title "The role of health workforce data in identifying medical deserts". One set of questions focussed on the understanding of the medical desert phenomenon e.g. whether attending the online event has increased their understanding of the role of health workforce data in identifying medical deserts. The survey results are reported on Table 4.

1.5 Communication Surveys

In the initial phase of the initiative, a representative of WP1, WP2 and WP3 have worked together to produce a series of evaluation questionnaire to assess the impact of the communication strategy. A detailed analysis of surveys' results can be found in the D2.4 Mid-term Dissemination Report.

2. Consortium Operating Procedures Definition & Quality Assurance

3.1 D1.1 Project Guide

The vast majority of the operating procedures and quality assurance measures are included in the Project Guide (D1.1 Project Guide) delivered by the WP1 leader AGE.NA.S. in the early stage of OASES. The Guide is the main point of reference for everything concerning OASES project management and monitoring throughout its life, including a description of the consortium structure, the procedures for internal communication, management of risks, and the decision-making procedures.

The WP3 assessment of the quality of the D1.1 Project Guide is certainly positive in light of the topics covered and the timeliness with which it was delivered.

3. Coordination of the project, Day-To-Day Management, and Consortium Meetings

A detailed evaluation of the actions taken, and performance offered by each actor sitting in the management structure is deferred to the delivery of a Final Evaluation Report (D3.3). In terms of project coordination, the project leader AGE.NA.S. has been promoting and facilitating internal discussion among the parties through the organisation and management of frequent and well-organised online, virtual meetings which are presented in the summary tables below.

Given the frequency of meetings and the quality of the documentation produced, WP3 evaluates positively and without further recommendation the action performed by AGE.NA.S. within this set of tasks.

4. Quality Board

The first meeting of the Quality Board took place virtually, online on Tuesday 5th October 2021. In a similar way to what happened after the first meeting of the Policy Board, participants have been inquired about their initial experience as members of the OASES Quality Board, if the amount of meeting time was adequate to discuss the items on the proposed agenda, and whether they felt the meeting was a good use of their time or not. The survey results are reported on Table 5.

5. Stakeholders' Analysis to identify external experts

In early 2021, the INHWE has conducted an analysis of its European based members resulting in the identification of +350 actors with an interest in, or the ability to influence developments in the existing knowledge of the medical desert phenomenon, as per the following criteria:

5.1 Interest and Influence rates

Interest rate (5 = high interest)

- 5: Educator involved with practical training and development of educational material
- 4: Policy maker involved in health professional education
- 3: Other educator of health professionals
- 2: Researcher interested in health professional education
- 1: Researcher, Policy Maker, Educator not involved with health professional education

Influence rate (5 = high ability)

- 5: Policy maker or educator involved with planning educational approaches and policy actions
- 4: Researcher involved in health professional education
- 3: Policy Maker not involved with health professional education
- 2: Educator of specific skills not directly involved with practical training
- 1: Researcher not involved health professional education

6. Tables and Figures

01_Online Meeting 5th March 2021

Serial	Preparation: quality of info received before the meeting, clarity and appropriateness of meeting agenda	Technical: quality of the platform in use (Microsoft Meets)	Organisation: clarity of topics for discussion, time available, quality of technical aspects	Team Building: usefulness in creating a strong team to deliver this project to its quality standard	Your Role: usefulness in improving your understanding of your own role in the project	Role of Partners: usefulness in improving your understanding of the role of other partners in the project	Follow Up: quality of info received after the meeting, clarity and appropriateness of meeting minutes	Overall experience: quality of the meeting
1	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Good	Excellent	Excellent
2	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
3	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
4	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Good	Excellent	Excellent
5	Excellent	Excellent	Fair	Good	Fair	Excellent	Excellent	Good
6	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Good
7	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Good	Good	Good	Good	Good
8	Excellent	Good	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Fair	Excellent
9	Excellent	Fair	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Good	Good	Excellent

01_Online Meeting 5th March 2021

Serial	What do you see as the biggest challenge for you in contributing to the quality of the project?	How do you think you will try to overcome this?	What do you see as the biggest challenge for the project as a whole in delivering the level of quality expected by the EC?	How do you think the project team can overcome this challenge?
1	Partners might perceive our (main) WP as less relevant than the others	Meeting on a regular basis is key	No comment	No comment
2			Having another consortium focusing on addressing Medical Deserts can be a challenge.	Create a discussion platform for coordinators of the consortium to discuss between them is an option. This can clarify the objectives and target between the teams focusing on the
3				
4	The fact that, in our WP, we are depending on the work developed in WPs 4 and 5	Through close collaboration with all the other WPs and WP leaders	The fact that, in my assessment, it is not clear how the EC is envisioning the synergies between all the projects funded under this call for proposals	Through close collaboration between all project leaders and EC people
5	To find a way to deal with the medical desert which is useful, easy and clear for all the country			
6	Not clear definition of the Medical Desert domain, which means that it's not easy to fix the "boundaries" of the project domain. The greatest risk is that everything is in scope	By the first 3 months to agree on the project domain, then to review it at least 2 times during the project timeframe	The involvement of the external stakeholders, taking into account also the limitations to have interaction in person	1) to select appropriately the right stakeholders 2) to engage them from the beginning, showing them the added value to contribute to our
7				
8	To monitor all emails sent by the coordination team and meet the short deadlines.	Will make a dedicated folder for all OASES emails and mark urgent mails with priority note.	The 3 medical desert projects' overlaps, overloading the target audience, and non-clarity of parallel workplans.	Continuous exchange of project leads, identification of parallel WP activities and link WP leads. Some coordination from the EC side should be a must
9				

01_Online Meeting 5th March 2021

Serial	Please comment on any aspect of the organisation of the meeting which you felt was particularly good or which we can improve for future meetings?	What do you think about the online format as an alternative to meeting face-to-face?	Do you have any other comments (on this survey, the project in general, etc)
1	It was a long teleconference - some breaks would be appreciated	Useful tool still not as productive as face-to-face	No more comments for now
2	Maybe having a 5 minutes window every meeting for mobility breaks is a good idea.	Although online format is an option to use during the pandemic, it cannot substitute the face-to-face meeting's unique atmosphere and emotion. Having a round table with the participants is an opportunity to share thoughts, propose	It is a start. Comments will follow later on.
3	We mention the fact that the team is in open talks regarding all aspects related to the project and that every meeting is scheduled in accordance with all partners' requests.	We do not see a problem in online meetings.	Will follow later
4	(1) The agenda of the meeting was sent quite late; (2) We could better at following the agenda and dedicated time amount to each agenda items.	I am perfectly fine with the online format, I believe it does not make a big difference as compared to the face-to-face version. Of course, when the epidemiological conditions will allow it, I am all in favour of meeting face to face regularly.	I am sure we will do great in implementing the project!
5	Maybe prevent domains of discussion for future meetings clearer	Good	No thank you
6	There was a good feeling of already belonging to a team	It would have been better to meet in person, at least the first time, for a more effective interaction, but the online format let us to meet more frequently and easier	I like the survey!
7	Clear way of going through things. Discussion where needed, otherwise nothing unnecessary	Face-to-face of course includes more possibilities getting to know each other but online meeting efficient	None
8	The internal kick-off was very well organized and prepared by the coordinators.	The online format is an external and mandatory feature we cannot really change at this point. Obviously, it would be important for the sake of team building the meet at one point. Work can be performed online with no risks	I would suggest keeping the meeting minutes simple with a very clear dedicated to do list, adding feasible deadlines to the action points based on partners agreement.
9	The meeting was well organised, all partners had the opportunity to contribute, the online platform worked pretty well.	I think online meetings can be as effective as personal meetings.	I find the meeting minutes a little bit too detailed. Maybe it is worth to consider to focus more on the statements made and the action points and next steps for the partners.

02_Kick Off Meeting 25th March 2021

Serial	Preparation: quality of info received before the meeting, clarity and appropriateness of meeting agenda	Workload: quantity of tasks assigned (to you) before the meeting, appropriateness of deadlines	Communication: suitability and clarity of emails received in preparation of the meeting	Organisation: clarity of topics for discussion, time available, quality of technical aspects	Team Building: usefulness in creating a strong team to deliver this project to its quality standard	Follow Up: quality of info received after the meeting, clarity and appropriateness of meeting minutes	Overall experience: quality of the meeting
1	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Good	Good	Good
2	Excellent	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Excellent	Good
3	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent
4	Excellent	Fair	Fair	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good
5	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Good	Good	Excellent	Good
6	Fair	Good	Good	Fair	Good	Fair	Fair
7	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Excellent

02_Kick Off Meeting 25th March 2021

Serial	Please comment on any aspect of the organisation of the meeting which you felt was particularly good or which we can improve for future meetings?	Do you have any other comments (on this survey, the project in general, etc)
1	It would be better to have the relevant links in the calendar calls. So many mails are coming and it's difficult to find the right mail, date and time in one mail, agenda in another and the link in another. This also makes a risk of double booking. Only the	
2	I was not lucky I had a problem with Teams this day so I can't assist to the meeting. It's partly my fault because we are moving to Microsoft 365.	
3	Structure of the meeting, the discussions with EC experts and the communication platform used were of great quality. The deadlines used for preparing the presentation and final approval of it were pretty tight. Although it was performed in	Using the SharePoint Online platform will allow the partners to access the final version of the documents used and will enable us to clear the older folder with preparation documents (were available in Drive). The launching of the website of the
4	The lack of a common platform for file sharing during month 1 caused email overload and tight deadlines in the days prior to the Kick Off	Thank you AGENAS team for setting up the project hub on SharePoint
5	The length of some presentations	
6	There was a lack of information on the criteria for preparing the presentations.	It's a good start, I hope for valuable results
7	All is OK	

03_Policy Board Meeting 23rd September 2021

Serial	The issues covered at the meeting met my expectations.	The materials I received prior to the meeting adequately prepared me to participate in the discussion.	The amount of meeting time was adequate to discuss agenda items.	Participating in this meeting has increased my understand of project's aim and goals.	Participating in this meeting has increased my understand of the PB's scope and role.	I feel as if today's meeting was a good use of my time.	Rate your overall satisfaction with the meeting
1	Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
2	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
3	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
4	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
5	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
6	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
7	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
8	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	3

03_Policy Board Meeting 23rd September 2021

Serial	Is there anything that we can do to improve future meetings or your experience? e.g. Something we should include on the agenda of a future meeting?	What is something we should no longer do at meetings?	What is something we should keep on doing at meetings?
1			
2			
3			
4			
5	I do listened carefully all the presentations and discussions, in addition I also sent in writing the answers to your questionnaire. In my answers regarding other possible causes	The way of working and organizing the meeting was optimal, keep on going!	Please continue to pass on the results of other studies. The material of Veronique Lucasis was very interesting. Yes, it is very important to take into account the normative choices
6			
7			
8			

04_OASES Webinar 1st March 2022

Serial	The subjects covered at the Webinar met my expectations.	The information made available before the Webinar adequately prepared me to attend	The event duration (60 min) was adequate to allow the Speakers to present and comment.	Usability: how would you rate the ease at which you have registered to the Webinar?	Navigation: how would you rate the platform in terms of "user friendliness"?	Overall: how would you rate your overall experience on the platform?
1	Agree	Agree	Agree	5	5	5
2	Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	4	4	4
3	Agree	Agree	Agree	5	5	5
4	Agree	Agree	Agree	5	5	5
5	Agree	Agree	Agree	5	4	4
6	Agree	Agree	Agree	5	5	5
7	Agree	Agree	Disagree	5	4	4

04_OASES Webinar 1st March 2022

Serial	Attending this Webinar has increased my understanding of the medical desert phenomenon.	Attending this Webinar has increased my understanding of the role of health workforce data in identifying medical deserts.	I feel as if attending the Webinar was a good use of my time.	Rate your overall satisfaction with the Webinar
1	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
2	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Agree	4
3	Agree	Agree	Agree	4
4	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
5	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
6	Agree	Agree	Agree	5
7	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Agree	4

04_OASES Webinar 1st March 2022

Serial	How did you hear about this Webinar?	What is something we should keep on doing at Webinars?	What is something we should no longer do at Webinars?
1	from the Oases project website		
2	My colleagues told me about it	Report different national experiences	Maybe show less theoretical models and more practical examples
3	I am a member of INHWE and was invited by Matteo Vezzosi	The webinar was very interesting sharing knowledge from different point of views. However it would have been interesting to have time for questions and sharing thoughts.	Not too many presentations in a row and not having time for questions.
4			
5			
6	From the project coordinators	Invite speakers with diverse backgrounds, professional expertise and institutional membership	
7			

05_Quality Board Meeting 5 October 2021

Serial	Is there anything that we can do to improve future meetings or your experience? e.g. Something we should include on the agenda of a future meeting?	What is something we should no longer do at meetings?	What is something we should keep on doing at meetings?
1			
2			
3			
4	Introduce some tasks, online surveys, more interaction using maybe mentimeter tool		Ask questions to each other, keep the interest of all participants during the meeting
5			

Coordination of the project: Consortium Meetings

DATE	PARTICIPANTS	ACTIVITIES
5 th March 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Stella Lanzi, Lisa Baldini, Mariarita Cafulli</p> <p>SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai</p> <p>UBB: Marius Ungureanu, Monica Brinzac, Rus Andrei</p> <p>NPHA: Liliana Buzdugan, Sergiu Otgon</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Guillaume Chevillard, Véronique Luca-Gabrielli</p> <p>THL: Timo Sinervo</p> <p>INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi, Vera Lipreri, Natalie Papanastasiou</p>	<p>Overview of EU-approved projects on medical deserts</p> <p>Overview of the OASES project</p> <p>Kick Off Meeting agenda</p> <p>Administrative activities</p>
1 st April 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Stella Lanzi, Lisa Baldini, Giacomo Giolo</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Guillaume Chevillard, Cindy Padilla</p> <p>INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi, Vera Lipreri</p> <p>NPHA: Liliana Buzdugan, Sergiu Otgon</p> <p>SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai</p> <p>THL: Timo Sinervo</p> <p>UBB: Monica Brinzac</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 3</p> <p>WP 4</p> <p>WP 5</p> <p>WP 6</p>
16 th April 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Mariarita Cafulli</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Lucas Véronique</p> <p>INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi, Vera Lipreri</p> <p>NPHA: Liliana Buzdugan, Sergiu Otgon</p> <p>SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai</p> <p>THL: Timo Sinervo</p> <p>UBB: Monica Brinzac</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 3</p> <p>WP 4</p> <p>WP 5</p> <p>WP 6</p>
30 th April 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Mariarita Cafulli, Stella Lanzi</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Absent with apologies</p> <p>INHWE: Absent</p> <p>NPHA: Sergiu Otgon</p> <p>SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai</p> <p>THL: Timo Sinervo</p> <p>UBB: Monica Brinzac</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 4</p> <p>WP 5</p>
14 th May 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Mariarita Cafulli, Stella Lanzi</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Absent with apologies</p> <p>INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 3</p>

	<p>NPHA: Sergiu Otgon</p> <p>SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai, Tamas Varga</p> <p>THL: Timo Sinervo</p> <p>UBB: Monica Brinzac</p>	<p>WP 4</p> <p>WP 5</p>
28 th May 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Stella Lanzi</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Veronique Lucas, Cindy Padilla</p> <p>INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi</p> <p>NPHA: Sergiu Otgon</p> <p>SU: Eszter Kovacs, Tamas Varga</p> <p>THL: Timo Sinervo</p> <p>UBB: Monica Brinzac</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 3</p> <p>WP 4</p> <p>WP 5</p> <p>WP6</p>
11 th June 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Stella Lanzi, Mariarita Cafulli</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Veronique Lucas, Cindy Padilla</p> <p>INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi</p> <p>NPHA: Sergiu Otgon</p> <p>SU: Eszter Kovacs, Tamas Varga, Marta Sziklai</p> <p>THL: Timo Sinervo, Keskimäki Ilmo, Huhtakangas Moona, Lindell Elsi</p> <p>UBB: Monica Brinzac</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 4</p>
25 th June 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Stella Lanzi</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Guillaume Chevillard, Fei Gao</p> <p>INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi</p> <p>NPHA: Sergiu Otgon , Liliana Buzdugan,</p> <p>SU: Eszter Kovacs, Tamas Varga, Marta Sziklai</p> <p>THL: Absent with apologies</p> <p>UBB: Monica Brinzac</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 3</p> <p>WP 4</p>
3 rd September 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Stella Lanzi, Lisa Baldini</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Guillaume Chevillard, Véronique Lucas</p> <p>INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi</p> <p>NPHA: Sergiu Otgon</p> <p>SU: Eszter Kovacs</p> <p>THL: Moona Huhtakangas</p> <p>UBB: Monica Brinzac</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 3</p> <p>WP 4</p> <p>WP 5</p> <p>WP6</p>
17 th September 2021	<p>AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Mariarita Cafulli, Stella Lanzi, Lisa Baldini, Federica Vitello</p> <p>EHESP-IRDES: Véronique Lucas</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 3</p>

	INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi NPHA: Sergiu Otgon SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Monica Brinzac, Marius Ungureanu	WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
15 th October 2021	AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Mariarita Cafulli, Stella Lanzi, Federica Vitello EHESP-IRDES: Guillaume Chevillard INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi NPHA: Sergiu Otgon SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Marius Ungureanu	WP 1 WP 2 WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
29 th October 2021	AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Mariarita Cafulli EHESP-IRDES: Véronique Lucas NPHA: Sergiu Otgon SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Monica Brinzac	WP 1 WP 2 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
12 th November 2021	AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Lisa Baldini, Stella Lanzi EHESP-IRDES: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi NPHA: Sergiu Otgon SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Monica Brinzac	WP 1 WP 2 WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
26 th November 2021	AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Lisa Baldini, Stella Lanzi, Mariarita Cafulli SU: Marta Sziklai INHWE: - Absent with apologies EHESP-IRDES: - Absent with apologies THL: Moona Huhtakangas UBB: Monica Brinzac NPHA: Liliana BUZDUGAN	WP 1 WP 2 WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
17 th December 2021	AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti EHESP-IRDES: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal, Cindy Padilla	WP 1 WP 2

	INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi NPHA: Sergiu Otgon SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Monica Brinzac, Marius Ungureanu	WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
14 th January 2022	AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti (PM – Project Manager), Federica Vitello, Stella Lanzi, Giacomo Giolo EHESP: Cindy Padilla IRDES: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi NPHA: Sergiu Otgon SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Monica Brinzac	WP 1 WP 2 WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
28 th January 2022	AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti (PM – Project Manager), Lisa Baldini EHESP: Cindy Padilla IRDES: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: absent NPHA: Liliana Buzdugan	WP 1 WP 2 WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
18 th February 2022	AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti (PM – Project Manager), Federica Vitello EHESP: Absent IRDES: Marie Bonal INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Monica Brinzac NPHA: Sergiu Otgon	WP 1 WP 2 WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
11 th March 2022	AGENAS: Federica Vitello, Lanzi Stella EHESP: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal IRDES: absent INHWE: absent SU: Marta Sziklai, László Galambos	WP 1 WP 2 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6

	THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Monica Brinzac NPHA: Sergiu Otgon	
25 th March 2022	AGENAS: Federica Vitello, Paolo Michelutti EHESP: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal IRDES: absent INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi SU: Marta Sziklai, Estzer Kovacs THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Monica Brinzac NPHA: Sergiu Otgon, Liliana Buzdugan	WP 1 WP 2 WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
22 nd April 2022	AGENAS: Federica Vitello, Paolo Michelutti, Stella Lanzi EHESP: absent IRDES: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi SU: Marta Sziklai THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: absent NPHA: absent	WP 1 WP 2 WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6
20 th May 2022	AGENAS: Federica Vitello, Paolo Michelutti EHESP: absent IRDES: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi SU: Marta Sziklai THL: Moona Huhtakangas UBB: Monica Brinzac NPHA: Sergiu Otgon	WP 1 WP 2 WP 4 WP 6
3 rd June 2022	AGENAS: Federica Vitello, Paolo Michelutti, Giacomo Giolo EHESP: Lazslos Gambalos IRDES: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi SU: absent THL: Timo Sinervo UBB: Sergiu Otgon NPHA: Monica Brinzac	WP 1 WP 3 WP 4 WP 5 WP 6

23 rd June 2022	<p>AGENAS: Federica Vitello, Paolo Michelutti, Giacomo Giolo, Stella Lanzi</p> <p>EHESP: Guillame Chevillard</p> <p>IRDES: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal, Cindy Padilla</p> <p>INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi</p> <p>SU: Marta Sziklai, Laszlo Galambos</p> <p>THL: Timo Sinervo</p> <p>UBB: Monica Brinzac</p> <p>NPHA: Sergiu Otgon, Liliana Buzdugan</p>	<p>WP 1</p> <p>WP 2</p> <p>WP 4</p> <p>WP 5</p> <p>WP 6</p>
24 th August 2022	To be released	To be released

OASES: prOmoting evidence-bASed rEforms on medical desert

KICK OFF MEETING

25th March 2021, 10.30-12.30 / 14.30-16.40 CET

MS TEAMS

AGENDA

Morning session, h. 10.30-12.30 CET

10.30-10.40 <i>All participants</i>	Brief introduction of the participants (10 minutes)
10.40-10.50 CHAFAEA	Opening of the meeting (10 minutes) <i>Donata Meroni</i>
10.50-11.05 DG SANTE	Political priorities and objectives of the call (15 minutes) <i>Constantin-Ovidiu Dumitrescu</i>
11.05-11.50 CHAFAEA	Operational aspects of the grant management (45 minutes) Presentation and Q&A <i>Massimo Fagnini - Marilena Di Stasi</i>
11.50-12.30 CHAFAEA	Financial aspects of the grant management (40 minutes) Presentation and Q&A <i>Klara Kosyik - Diana Georgieva</i>

OASES: prOmoting evidence-bASed rEforms

1st POLICY BOARD MEETING

23rd September 2021, 10.00-12.00 CEST

Microsoft Teams – link: [Click here to join the meeting](#)

Agenda

10.00-10.05 Paolo Michelutti	Welcome and <u>introduction</u> (5 minutes)
10.05-10.15 Giovanni Baglio	<u>Accessibility to health services: the dimensions at stake and the challenges to be faced.</u> (10 minutes)
10.15-10.30 Paolo Michelutti	<u>OASES project and OASES policy board</u> (15 minutes)
10.35-10.55 Véronique Lucas	<u>How to identify the medical deserts: the case of France</u> (20 minutes)
10.55-11.55 All participants	<u>Facilitated discussion</u> (60 minutes)
11.55-12.00 Paolo Michelutti and Eszter Kovacs	<u>Conclusions and next steps</u> (5 minutes)



**OASES POLICY BOARD
MEETING
September 23, 2021
CONCEPT PAPER**



Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union

OASES interim meeting

4 October 2022 h. 9:30 -17.30 CEST

University Babes-Bolyai - Cluj-Napoca

Agenda Morning Session

9.30-9.45 <i>AGENAS</i>	Welcome and introduction (5 minutes)
9.45-10.15 <i>WP1</i>	Results and Next steps – Focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interim reporting - Policy Board
10.15-10.45 <i>WP2</i>	Results: D2.4 - Mid-term Dissemination Report Next steps – Focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D2.5 - Report on Dissemination, Sustainability and Fostering Scalability and Uptake
10.45-11.15 <i>WP3</i>	Results: D3.2 - Interim Evaluation Report Next Steps – Focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D3.3 - Final Evaluation Report
11.15-11.45 <i>WP4</i>	Results: D4.1 - A potential spatial access measure tool package D4.2 - Report on a Scenario Building exercise based on data available in countries: Input parameters Next steps – Focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D4.3 - Output results analysis
11.45-12.15 <i>WP5</i>	Results: D5.2 - Draft report of the state of art of desertification in Europe and ways to mitigate desertification Next steps – Focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D5.3 - Report of the state of art of desertification in Europe and ways to mitigate desertification
12.15-12.45 <i>WP6</i>	Results: D6.2 - Overview of the 7 pilot site profiles as regards medical deserts Next steps – Focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D6.3 - Reports on pilot studies - Description of the afternoon session – Workshop on pilot studies
12.45-13.15 <i>All partners</i>	Open discussion

OASES coordination meeting

30 April 2021 h.10:30 -12.00 CET

Agenda

1. Approval of the meeting agenda
2. WP1:
 - a. 3-monthly action plan reporting:
 - i. Policy board set up: draft and contributions from partners
 - b. ~~Sharepoint~~: information on the use
 - c. Consortium Agreement: issues with digital signature
 - d. Coordination with other EC funded projects on HWF: reporting
 - e. Deliverable template
 - f. Next steps
3. WP2:
 - a. 3-monthly action plan reporting:
 - i. Initial leaflet: state of the art
 - ii. Website: state of the art
 - iii. Stakeholder and target group analysis, Lewin force field analysis: state of the art
 - b. Next steps
4. WP3:
 - a. Terms of Reference for Quality Board: State of the art
 - b. Quality board survey: state of the art
 - c. Next steps
5. WP4:
 - a. 3-monthly action plan reporting
6. WP5:
 - a. Framework for literature data collection: state of the art
7. WP6:
 - a. 3-monthly action plan reporting
8. AOB

OASES coordination meeting

23 June 2022 h. 10:30 -11.30 CEST

Agenda

1. Approval of the meeting agenda
2. WP1:
 - a. Interim meeting
 - b. NPHA situation
 - c. Amendment
 - d. Deliverables and milestones to be completed over the summer:
 - i. June à **WP4**: M15, M16;
 - ii. July à **WP3**: M11;
 - iii. August à **WP2**: D2.4; **WP3**: D3.2; **WP4**: D4.1, D4.2, M18
 - e. Summer coordination meetings
3. WP2:
 - a. Update on the communication and dissemination activities
4. WP3:
 - a. Milestone 11 *“Collect feedbacks for interim evaluation”* – by the end of July
 - b. Update, if any



OASES coordination meeting

12 November 2021 h. 10:30 -11.30 CEST

Minutes

Participants:

AGENAS: Paolo Michelutti, Lisa Baldini, Stella Lanzi
EHESP-IRDES: Véronique Lucas, Marie Bonal
INHWE: Matteo Vezzosi
NPHA: Sergiu Otgon
SU: Eszter Kovacs, Marta Sziklai
THL: Timo Sinervo
UBB: Monica Brinzac

At the start, the group approved the [agenda](#) of the ongoing meeting. No item under AOB was proposed. Then the agenda items were discussed as follows.

Activities reported from WP1

Preparation of the first EU-wide conference – The agenda is supposed to be finalized by today 12 November, but WP2 will ask about the very final deadline to see if there could be some additional time. The [draft agenda](#) was presented to the meeting participants: all speakers/moderators/guests have confirmed their participation, except Vytenis Andriukaitis, whose invitation is still pending. Timo Sinervo (WP5) suggested an alternative speaker from Finland and it was agreed that – since the speaker’s experience would be more focused on the local level rather than the global - he could be invited to the webinar that is planned in January or to one of the following events. As David Smith/Matteo Vezzosi (INHWE) are not sure about their ability to participate in the conference, Guillaume Chevillard from WP4 agreed to be the moderator in the co-creation session “How to measure medical deserts”. At the end of November, there will be a meeting with all speakers to provide the information that are needed; a doodle will be circulated to agree on date and time.

Activities reported from WP2

Preparation of the first EU-wide conference – The conference is already in the event plan of the EU Health Policy Platform. All partners are invited to communicate the event through their channels.

Activities reported from WP3

Evaluation plan (Deliverable 3.1, Month 9): current status - Most of the evaluation plan is being finalised based on the initial draft. Work is still ongoing on two out of five chapters. No draft is available at the moment, but it will soon be made available for comments.

16/04/2021

TO-DO-LIST:

1. FOR EACH BENEFICIARY in turn: digitally sign the CA you will receive from AGENAS and send back to AGENAS
2. FOR ALL: Quality board (WP4) - check Draft Terms of Reference in the folder at this [link](#)
3. EHESP send to Matteo ~~Vezosi~~ the members for Quality Board
4. WP5 MEETING 19 April 2021 at 1 p.m. to discuss the draft framework for literature review among involved WP leaders, as sent by Timo on 16 April
5. Coordinator: MEETING 26 April with other EC funded projects on HWF
6. WP2 reviews Deliverable template and [send](#) back to WP1

30/04/2021

TO-DO-LIST:

1. FOR EACH BENEFICIARY: for the handwritten signature of the Consortium Agreement, you will receive information from AGENAS next week
2. FOR ALL: comments or green light on Deliverable Template draft
3. FOR ALL: comments [to](#) the WP5 draft deliverable by 5 May at noon at this [link](#).
4. FOR ALL: comments [to](#) the leaflet (WP2 deliverable) by 3 May at noon at this [link](#)
5. EHESP sends to AGENAS the members for Policy Board or fills in the excel file at this [link](#)

28/05/2021

TO-DO-LIST:

- ALL: providing comments and suggestions to WP3 and WP5 milestones (see OASES Project Hub) if any.
- SU, INHWE and THL send their draft deliverables and/or the brief descriptions of their milestones to AGENAS for submission (by 31st May).
- AGENAS contacts ~~HaDEA~~ about the deliverables and the format of the website delivery.
- FOR EACH BENEFICIARY WHO HAS NOT DONE IT YET: handwritten signature of the Consortium Agreement and sending the signed page to AGENAS.
- EHESP and UBB send to AGENAS the members for Policy Board or fill in the excel file at this [link](#).
- AGENAS, SU: meeting with ~~HaDEA~~ and other medical desert projects coordinators, week 7-11 June.
- EHESP sends doodle links and shares the survey with partners.



OASES

Promoting evidence-based reforms on medical deserts

The content of this report represents the views of the author only and is his/her sole responsibility; it cannot be considered to reflect the views of the European Commission and/or the European Health and Digital Executive Agency (HaDEA) or any other body of the European Union. The European Commission and the Agency do not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.



Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union