WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework Version 1.0: Criteria and considerations to guide evidence-informed decision-making on non-pharmacological interventions targeting COVID-19

Jan M Stratil[1,2], Laura Arnold[3]

1) Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry, and Epidemiology – IBE, LMU Munich, Marchioninistr. 17, 81377 Munich, Germany

2) Pettenkofer School of Public Health, Munich, Germany

3) Academy of Public Health Services, Kanzlerstraße 4, 40472 Düsseldorf, Germany

1 Abstract

Background: Decision-making on matters of public health requires the balancing of numerous, often conflicting factors. One approach to ensure relevancy and comprehensiveness of the criteria underpinning the decision is a broad societal discourse and participatory decision-making process. However, this often was not feasible within the time constraints imposed on by the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. While not able or intended to replace stakeholder participation, evidence-to-decision frameworks can serve as a tool to approach relevancy and comprehensiveness of the criteria considered, even if not all voices of affected stakeholders could be heard in the process.

Objective: The objective of this research project was to develop a decision-making framework adapted to the challenges decision-makers face when deliberating on national and sub-national level on non-pharmacological interventions (NPIs) measures to address the global SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

Methods: We used the WHO-INTEGRATE framework Version 1.0 as a starting point. In phase I, we adapted the framework through brainstorming exercises and application to exemplary case studies. In phase II, we used the best-fit framework synthesis technique with the output of phase I serving as *a priori* framework. We conducted a content analysis of comprehensive strategy documents intended to guide the policy makers on the phasing out of the lockdown measures in Germany. Based on factors and criteria identified in this process, we adapted previous versions into the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework (WICID framework) Version 1.0.

Results: Twelve comprehensive strategy documents were included in the content analysis. The revised WICID framework consists of eleven criteria, which are expanded on through 49 aspects contained within them, and the metacriterion quality of evidence. The criteria cover implications for the health of individuals and populations due to and beyond COVID-19, infringement on liberties and fundamental rights, acceptability considerations, societal, environmental, and economic implications, as well as resource and feasibility considerations.

Discussion: In a third phase, the decision-making framework will be expanded through a comprehensive document analysis focusing on key-stakeholder groups across the society. The WICID framework V1.0 can be a tool to support comprehensive evidence-informed decision-making processes.

2 Background

The response to the global SARS-COV-2 pandemic highlighted the challenges and complexities of evidence-informed decision-making inherent to matters of public health[1-3]. These include, among other decision-making under time constraints, under uncertainty due to limited evidence, balancing numerous conflicting factors, and the challenge of ensuring fair decision-making processes under such circumstances.

Due to exponential growth in the number of infections, the issue of timing is of crucial importance in a pandemic. A delay of decisions on the implementation of interventions (e.g. social-distancing regulations) by days and even hours can have grave consequences. For example, a modelling study concluded that had the same non-pharmacological control measures been implemented in the USA one week earlier, around 36,000 deaths (55.0%) could have been averted by the beginning of May[4].

Therefore, to receive evidence-informed guidance timely, many countries, regions, and governmental institutions set up expert committees to support guidance and recommendations to public health and health policy decision makers[5]. One challenge these expert groups face is the challenge of limited availability and often poor-quality scientific evidence with often questionable transferability and applicability to the context of decision-making[6 7]. However, even if strong scientific evidence (e.g. on the effectiveness of an intervention) was available – which in most cases, it is not – this evidence in itself is insufficient to make sound recommendations, as evidence-informed decision-making is a deeply value-laden process[8-10]. The second challenge therefore is that decision-makers must balance numerous and often conflicting normative and technical aspects for a decision-making process[11-13], posing the questions to the expert committees and decision-makers: which criteria should be considered and how should these be weighed against each other? For example, when recommending or implementing school closures, decision-makers need to balance – among others – the risk associated with COVID-19 infections for children, parents and teachers, the implications for the course of the pandemic overall, the economic implications of absent parents bound by care responsibilities, educational outcomes for children, the implications on wellbeing and mental health for all those involved, and legal ramifications[14].

The extent to which recommendations or final decisions (e.g. on not to lift the school closures at a given point of time) are considered acceptable and legitimate depends on procedural considerations (on *how* the decision was made). Various approaches on achieving legitimacy and acceptability despite the inherent challenges of evidence-based decision-making have been proposed. These approaches emphasize e.g. the importance of transparency throughout the process, the inclusion of the perspectives of relevant stakeholders, an appropriate composition of the decision-making panel, and the option of appeals and revision [8 15-20]. According to the Accountability for Reasonableness (A4R) framework by Daniels and Sabin[19], a key aspect is the condition of 'relevance': the decision or recommendation must rest on evidence, reasons, and principles that all fair-minded parties can agree on, to be relevant to deciding how to meet the diverse needs of affected stakeholders[19]. Such approaches can increase the acceptability and perceived legitimacy of a decision[21-23] even if – given varying and sometimes contradictory interests – no consensus regarding the *right* selection and weighting of criteria can be achieved[21].

Involving (representatives of) all relevant stakeholder groups in the process to identifying reasons and principles of relevance for a given decision-making process is considered ideal[8 15 24 25]. However, this ideal is often difficult if not impossible to meet under the time constraints imposed by the rapid progression of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic. While not intended to nor able to replace stakeholder participation, Evidence-to-Decision (EtD) frameworks are one approach to support decision-making processes in this balancing act[26 27]. EtD frameworks, which tend to comprise sets of criteria as well as procedural guidance, are intended to ensure that all relevant criteria are considered, the best available evidence is assessed, and the underlying rationale is made explicit and transparent[28]. When developed and applied well, these EtD frameworks can

help identify and integrate the criteria of relevance for a given decision-making process, even if not all voices of relevant stakeholders could be heard.

One of these frameworks, is the WHO-INTEGRATE framework version 1.0[29]. It was developed as part of a larger research project commissioned by the World Health Organization (WHO) to inform the development of guideline recommendations on complex public health and health system interventions[30]. It was developed with a strong conceptual and normative foundation[29] primarily based on an evaluation of WHO norms and values derived from key WHO documents (e.g. the WHO constitution) and widely used public health ethics frameworks[31-38]. To ensure the relevance and comprehensiveness of the framework, this normative approach was combined with a comprehensive literature review of decision criteria used in real world decision-making[39], an assessment of complexity features[29] as well as key-informant interviews with WHO guideline developers and focus-group discussions with public health and health policy decision-makers from low-, middle- and high income countries on four continents[40]. As with most EtDs, the WHO-INTEGRATE framework is a generic framework. To apply the framework to a decision-making process on a specific intervention and context, adapting the framework is necessary.

3 Objective

The objective of this research project is to adapt the WHO-Integrate framework to be applicable to the requirements of developing recommendation and decision-making on a national and sub-national level on non-pharmacological interventions (NPIs) intended to address the global SARS-CoV-2 pandemic; taking a plurality of viewpoints of affected stakeholders into account. The adapted WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework (WICID framework) is intended to reflect the challenges arising decision-making on matters of public health in relation to COVID-19, but to be sufficiently generic to be applicable to a wide range of NPIs, contexts, and decision topics.

While procedural criteria, norms, and principles (*how* a decision is made) beyond the principle of relevance are crucial for achieving fair processes with outcomes considered acceptable and legitime, this research project focuses on the substantive decision-making criteria (what criteria should the decision be based on?).

4 Methods

To develop a EtD framework adapted to the requirements of public health decision-making in the context of COVID-19, we used the WHO-INTEGRATE framework as a starting point and employed an approach analogous to the “best fit” framework synthesis[41]. This adaption of the WHO-INTEGRATE Framework is conducted in three phases: In phase I, we adapted the framework through brainstorming exercises and applying it to case studies, in order to develop the *a priori* framework. Phase II, intended to advance this framework based on a content analysis of purposive sample comprehensive strategy papers on phasing out lockdown measures in Germany, which were coded against the *a priori* framework. The documents were intended to inform political decision-makers on strategic decisions surrounding the phasing out of NPIs implemented in Germany in March 2020. This group of documents was chosen as a starting point, as we assumed that these documents are intended to provide a broad, differential, and multi-perspective consideration of potential benefits and harms resulting from various NPIs as well as other considerations (e.g. ethical, legal, or feasibility), rather than exclusively or primarily focusing on health implications.
Phase III, which is yet to be completed, we will advance the WICID framework version 1.0 developed in phase II, by integrating the perspectives of a diverse set of affected stakeholders across the society, in an approach analogous to the one employed in phase II. Phase III allows for an assessment of the comprehensiveness of the framework criteria and the integration of factors insufficiently covered in the expert-based strategy documents.

4.1 Phase 1: Development of preliminary adaption of the framework and a coding frame

In phase I, we adapted the WHO-INTEGRATE framework through (i) discussion within the research team, (ii) an assessment of real-world decision-making criteria derived from an comprehensive overview-of-reviews[39], and (iii) a brainstorming exercise guided by the application of the WHO INTEGRATE Framework version 1.0 on two case studies (reopening high schools and reopening small businesses such as book shops).

This preliminary version of the adapted framework was used as *a priori* framework and imported into the software MAXQDA20 (verbi, Berlin) to serve as a coding frame to be used in phase II. In this process, we added two additional codes: “evidence” to, cover considerations regarding uncertainty and the evidence to be used to inform on these considerations, and the code “TBD” (to be discussed), which was to be applied to passages where one coder was not certain about how to code the passage against the coding frame.

4.2 Phase 2: Development of preliminary adaption of the framework and a coding frame

We used the technique of "best fit" framework synthesis[41-43], which offers a mean to build on an existing framework, conceived for potentially different but relevant circumstances. “Best fit” framework synthesis begins by creating a framework of *a priori* themes (in this case: the WHO-INTEGRATE framework adapted in phase I) and coding data from included documents (in this case: the comprehensive strategy documents) against that thematic or conceptual framework. A new framework composed of *a priori* and new themes is created by performing a thematic analysis on any data that cannot be accommodated within the *a priori* framework. As the *a priori* framework, we used the adapted version of the WHO-INTEGRATE framework created in phase I, and translated this into the coding frame we used coded the strategy documents against (provided in the supplementary table TA2)[41].

4.2.1 Description of strategy documents and rationale behind the selection

We decided to focus phase II on comprehensive strategy documents by expert commissions or expert groups which were intended to inform policy and public health decision-makers in Germany. We did so, as we assumed, they would be more likely to provide broad comprehensive, multi-perspective recommendations (in contrast to e.g. scientific publications or statements by individual groups, which do not claim nor intend to reflect multiple relevant perspectives in coming to a conclusion).

We defined these as documents (a) intended to provide a comprehensive strategy or strategic suggestions for phasing out the lockdown measures, (b) not exclusively or primarily focused on mitigating the health related-consequences of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic but also on other societal, economic, or health outcomes, (c) addressing the interplay of various NPIs (e.g. not exclusively focusing on testing), and (d) focusing on multiple considerations to be considered in this process (e.g. not exclusively focused on health impact considerations). Position papers of stakeholder groups reacting or positioning themselves to a document, measure, or event without providing comprehensive strategy guidance were excluded but will be considered in phase III.

While the main discourse on implementing lockdown measures in Germany was focused on suppressing the spread of the outbreak and on averting a collapse of the health care system, the debate on the controlled phasing out of the implemented lockdown measures was more nuanced: focusing on the challenge to balance the implications of the measures e.g. on health, society, or the economy. Therefore, we concentrated on strategy documents that focused on the latter.

To focus on strategy documents with impact on real world decision-making, we focused on papers developed by expert groups or task forces implemented by federal or national governments as well as ministries of the German federal Government. As we assumed that some guidance documents are not publicly available, we expanded the sample to comprehensive strategy documents on the exit from the lockdown measures developed by non-government affiliated expert groups which were intended to guide public health and health policy decision making.

In order to ensure that the strategy documents addressed a broad range of societal and economic implications beyond the health sector, we focused on strategy documents which – directly or indirectly – addressed one of the following NPIs: (a) closure and reopening of schools, (b) closure and reopening of businesses, and (c) "shelter-in-place" regulations. We excluded strategy papers not or only marginally concerned with these three NPIs. Strategy papers primarily concerned with hygiene measures or the testing capacity were also excluded.

Table TA1 in the annex displays the inclusion and exclusion criteria for phase II. All identified borderline cases were retained to be analyzed in phase III.

4.2.2 Identification and selection of strategy papers

The search was conducted through multiple approaches channels:

- Two researchers (JMS, LA) independently searched in the search engine Google™ with various versions of keyword combinations of the terms and synonyms of "strategy" or "expert commission" and "COVID-19" in German.
- Two researchers (JMS, LA) independently searched the websites of major newspaper outlets in Germany (including: Die Zeit, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Die Welt, Deutschlandfunk, Der Spiegel) outlets using the website's search engine with similar keywords
- One researcher (JMS) searched the websites of the 16 German federal states, the national government and selected national government ministries, focusing on the section of press releases.
- We contacted a sample of experts involved in public health decision making or expert groups to provide us with strategy document; either directly or through the platform of the interdisciplinary *Kompetenznetz Public Health COVID-19 (www.public-health-covid19.de)*.
- We posed freedom of information requests posed to the federal states' governments, the national government, as well as selected national government ministries to provide us with strategy documents developed by expert groups, if available.

As the documents we intended to identify are grey literature documents and most likely will be written in German, we did not conduct a literature search in scientific data bases for these types of documents.

4.2.3 Coding of documents against *a priori* framework

The coding process was conducted by two authors (JMS, LA; personal characteristics in line with the COREQ-checklist[44] reported in the supplements). First, one sample strategy document was coded by the two authors to assess the need to adapt the preliminary coding frame and to develop a coding guidance document, outlining when a specific code should be used and which text passages to code. The coding frame (translated from German) is provided as a supplement. Based on this adapted frame, one author (JMS) used the Software MAXQDA 20 (VERBI GmbH, Berlin) to code all identified strategy papers. Afterwards, all coded documents were critically reviewed by a second author (LA) who highlighted conflicts (passages where this reviewer perceived a code was missing, suggested not to code, or to code differently). Conflicts were solved through discussion between the authors.

In the processes, the researchers applied the level 1 codes (referring to the *criteria* in the framework) and level 2 codes (referring to the *aspects* in the framework) of the coding frame to passages in the document making references to criteria, considerations, or values covered within the codes. When the content of such a passage was perceived as not adequately covered by the coding frame, new level 2 or level 1 codes were created. When the researchers identified passages containing references to criteria, considerations, or values of relevance which were assumed to be covered by a specific level 1 or level 2 code, but which seemed to expand on this or provide details or nuances (e.g. a passage on the implications of an measure risking the insolvency of small enterprises within the code *economic implications*), the researchers took note of these passages for later review. Unclear passages were assigned the code TBD code for later review.

After coding all strategy documents, both authors critically reflected on content saturation and dimensions of the framework insufficiently covered within the strategy documents. As most criteria of the preliminary framework were adequately covered and there was a considerable overlap of consideration across documents, we assumed content saturation to be reached.

4.2.4 Adapting the preliminary coding frame

Next, one researcher (JMS) conducted a thematic analysis of the passages assigned to the newly created codes as well as those passages noted down for expanding on or providing nuance within existing codes. A draft of an adapted phase II framework was created by reflecting on whether there was a need to adapt the a priori framework to cover the content in the coded passages. This included whether: (a) *criteria* (reflecting level 1 codes) should be created, (b) new or preexisting *criteria* should be merged or separated, (c) new aspects (reflecting level 2 codes) should be added to the framework, (d) new or preexisting *aspects* should be merged or separated, (e) new or preexisting *aspects* should be moved to another position within the framework, (f) the wording of the *criteria* or *aspects* needs to be adapted.

This draft of the adapted framework, including the passages in the newly created codes as well as those passages noted down for expanding on or providing nuance to existing codes, were critically reviewed by a second researcher (LA). Afterwards, the results of steps (a-f) were critically discussed within the research team (JMS, LA) to solve conflicts and revise the adapted phase II framework accordingly.

Afterwards, two researchers jointly went through all passages noted down for later review (code TBD) and assessed through discussion, whether any criterion, consideration, or value within these passages was not covered within the framework. Where necessary, *criteria* or *aspects* were added, revised, reworded, moved to another position within the framework.

In a final step, two researchers (JMS, LA) went through each of the coded passages to critically reflect on whether the criteria, considerations, or values contained within these passages was adequately covered within the newly adapted phase II framework.

5 Results

5.1 Development of preliminary adaption of the framework and a coding frame (phase I)

In phase I, we used the WHO-INTEGRATE EtD Framework Version 1.0 as a starting point. Following the process outlined in the methods section, we developed a preliminary, adapted framework, which consisted of 8 *criteria* with 36 *aspects* and the metacriterion quality of evidence. The *criteria* focused on the implication of the measure(s) on the course of the pandemic and CVOID-19-related health implications from (I) a populations and system perspective and (I) for individuals, (III) health implications other than COVID-19 (e.g. wellbeing, health behavior, access to standard medical care), (IV) acceptability of the measures and implication for to individual rights and liberties, (V) equity, equality, and fair distribution of benefits and burdens, (VI) societal, economic, and environmental considerations, (VII) resource and feasibility considerations, and (VIII) implications for and interactions with other components of the health system.

The framework is provided in the supplementary table TA4. A preliminary version of this phase I framework as well as the exemplary case studies are part of a strategy document developed for the federal ministry of interior and the federal chancellery[45].

5.2 Documents identified and included for analysis for phase II

We identified four strategy papers developed by expert groups developed for federal states, the national government, or ministries of the national government. Two of the strategy documents were developed by the corona expert commission of the federal state government of North Rhine-Westphalia, which were publicly available[46]. Two strategy documents were developed by an informal expert group for the German Federal Ministry of the Interior, one of which was publicly available through a press report the other was provided to us through the *Kompetenznetz Public Health COVID-19*[45 47].

We identified additional eight comprehensive strategy documents, which were – to the best of our knowledge – not directly commissioned by federal state governments, the national government, or ministries of the national government. Four of which were published by the National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina[48-50], one by a political party in the federal city-state of Hamburg[51], one by a research institute aligned with political foundation Hans-Böckler-Stiftung[52], one by the Boston Consulting Group[53], and one developed by researchers from diverse institutions under the coordination of two researchers with affiliation at the university Wuerzburg and the IFO institut[54].

5.3 The adapted WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework

The adapted WHO-INTEGRATE COVID-framework consists of 11 substantive decision-making criteria, containing 49 decision-making aspects, and the meta-criterion quality of evidence, to be applicable across all criteria and aspects (outer circle, Figure F1). Depending on the measure at hand, the criteria and aspects are intended to be applied on and reflected for different population groups (center-most circle, figure F1). Depending on the measure and type of decision-making process, the decision-makers are intended to deliberate on the criteria and aspects taking one or multiple different perspectives (inner circle, figure F1). Analogous to the WHO-INTEGRATE framework, it aims to accommodate different features of complexity: depending on impact the measure is assumed to have on the system it is implemented in, not only direct implications but also indirect effects, not only local but also regional, national and even global implications, and not only immediate but also, short, medium and long term implications should be considered (figure F2).

Figure F1: WHO-INTEGRATE COVID Framework

5.3.1 Criteria and aspects of the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework

The eleven criteria in the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework consist of: three criteria focus on the balance of health benefits and harms: (I-III), two criteria focus on the accordance with human rights principles and socio-cultural acceptability (IV-V), one criterion focuses on equity, equality, and non-discrimination (VI), two criteria focus on the societal implications (VII-VIII), and three criteria focus on feasibility and health systems considerations (IX-XI). Table T1 contains these 11 criteria as well as the 49 associated aspects in their concise formulation. The supplementary table TA1 contains a more comprehensive version of the framework, providing more details and examples to guide users of the framework. The supplementary table TA3 contains exemplary passages from the coded strategy documents for criteria and aspects.

The criterion I. *implications for the course of the pandemic and its impact on health* covers implications of the measures for the course of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, including the number of new infections, the resulting health-related consequences (e.g. COVID-19 related mortality), the implications for the capacity of the health care system to treat COVID-19 patients, as exceeding the capacity this capacity is associated with a pronounced increase in mortality. It furthermore covers the direct SARS-CoV-2 related health risk of individuals affected by the measures (probability of infection and consequences).

II. implications for quality of life, social well-being, and mental health aims to capture the how the measures affect overall wellbeing and quality of life, which includes the degree to which the capability to shape

everyday life according to one's own wishes and needs is affected (e.g. through restricting daily habits) or the experience of self-efficacy and of sense of coherence. It furthermore covers the social wellbeing of individuals (e.g. the experience of loneliness) and the social cohesion of communities (e.g. cohesion of families or non-family communities). The criterion furthermore captures the implications for the mental health of individuals and populations (e.g. depression, anxiety disorders), including risk-factors - such as the experience of stress or fear, ability to practice coping mechanisms, receive support and, and the adverse consequences resulting from poor mental health (e.g. suicides).

III. implications for the physical health, health behavior, health risks, and health care beyond COVID-19 focuses on behavioral, environmental, and interpersonal risk factors for health (including accidents and violence) other than those directly related to COVID-19 (e.g. physical activity) and their consequences for health. It furthermore covers the implications of the measures for availability, accessibility, acceptability, and quality of medical and care services and institutions (e.g. willingness to seek emergency care in the case of myocardial infarctions).

The criterion *IV. Proportionality and accordance with individual autonomy and fundamental rights* covers whether the measure is in accordance with and how it – directly or indirectly – affects autonomy, self-determination, individual liberties, and fundamental individuals' rights (e.g. privacy and data protection implications of a contact tracing-app). It furthermore covers the intrusiveness of the intervention (with e.g. providing information being a measure with a low intrusiveness; and restricting choice one with a high intrusiveness[36]). The aspect of proportionality addresses whether intrusiveness and infringement of individual rights and liberties are proportionate to the expected benefit (or expected avoidance of harm).

V. acceptance of and willingness to implement measures focuses to the degree of acceptability of the measure and their consequences to the general population and different affected population groups. This includes the willingness to implement, adhere to, or enforce the measure (e.g. whether reopening schools without any protective measures is acceptable to teachers with a high-risk profile). While is acceptability is an end in itself, this criterion is strongly linked to feasibility and assumed effectiveness.

The criterion *VI. equity, equality and the fair distribution of benefits and burdens* covers the implications of the measure for vulnerable population groups, whether and how it affects stakeholder groups differently and thereby the risk for increasing or reducing inequalities (e.g. men benefiting less from a measure in comparison with women, exacerbating health inequities), considerations of equity (treating people differently according their need to allow them the same capability of achieving an outcome), considerations of equal treatment (e.g. not treating people differently without sufficient justification), and implications for the risk of individuals or population groups to be stigmatized or be discriminated against.

VII. societal and environmental implications and considerations aims to capture the implications for civil society, social life, and culture from an individual-level and system-level perspective, and the implications for the functioning and cohesion of the society. It furthermore covers the implications of the measures for social determinants of health, including household income, social participation, and education. A further aspect covered is the implications for the ecosystems resulting from the measures.

Analogous to criterion VII, the criterion *VIII. economic implications and consideration* address the implications for economic actors, their activities, as well as the economy as a whole. Including the implications of the measures for the work force (e.g. closing of schools forcing parents to stay at home to take care of their children).

Within the criterion *IX. resource requirements and resource implications*, the framework covers the requirements of the measures for different resources in the context of the availability of these resources as well as how the measure affect the availability and quality of these resources (e.g. how many face masks

would be required to provide every teacher with a high-risk profile with one, are these masks available, and would this lead to a shortage of masks for e.g. health service providers).

X. feasibility and implementation considerations covers the practical, technical, and political feasibility of implementing the measure as well as the legal conformity. Other aspects address feasibility related characteristics of the measures, such as the flexibility in extension, adjustment, or withdrawal of the measures and the possibility of evaluating the implications of the measure and reacting adequately to new information (e.g. ability to test those affected by the measure and conduct contact-tracing if needed).

The final substantive criterion, *XI. interaction with and implications for the health system,* addresses how the intervention will interact (synergistically or adversely) with other measures to control and contain the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic and other not-directly COVID-19 related components of the health system (within a broad understanding of health system in accordance with the WHO[55])

The meta-criterion *quality of evidence* is intended to be applied across all criteria and aspects, e.g. taking the quality of the evidence on health impacts alongside with its strength and direction into account. The metacriterion *quality of evidence*, reflects the confidence that the available evidence is appropriate and adequate to support the decision or recommendation. Evidence is interpreted in a broad sense, beyond an understanding focusing on quantitative evidence of effectiveness derived from systematic reviews. Different forms of evidence can be used and be the most appropriate type of evidence to inform on the criteria (e.g. an appropriate form to assess the accordance with selected fundamental rights can be a legal assessment). Decision-making under uncertainty – as often the case in a pandemic – can require a decision based on stakeholder experience and judgement, when stronger evidence is unavailable.

Table T1: Concise version of the criteria and aspects of the WHO-INTEGRATE-COVID framework (WICID framework)

criterion	aspect	
I. implications for the course of the pandemic and its impact on health	implications for the **course of the pandemic**	*quality of evidence*
	implications of the measure for **COVID-19-related health consequences at population level**	
	implications for the **capacity of the health care system** to treat (severe) COVID-19-cases	
	implications for the **health risk of COVID-19 for individuals**	
II. implications for **quality of life, social well-being, and mental health**	implications for the capability to **shape everyday life according to one's own wishes and needs**	
	implications for the **quality of life, self-efficacy, and sense of coherence**	
	implications of the measures for **social wellbeing**	
	implications for **social cohesion of communities**	
	implications for the **experience of fear and insecurity**	
	implications for **stress, stressors, the feeling of being overwhelmed and overloaded**	
	implications for **mental health and its consequences**	
III. implications for the physical health, health behavior, health risks, and health care beyond COVID-19	implications for **health-related behavior**	
	implications for **medical emergency and standard care beyond COVID-19**	
	implications for **care and other health and social support services**	
	implications for the **exposure to environments that affect health**	
	implications for the **risk of suffering accidents or being affected by violence**	
IV. Proportionality and accordance with	implications for and accordance with **autonomy and individual self-determination**	

individual autonomy and **fundamental rights**	implications for and accordance with **individual liberties and fundamental rights**	
	extent of **intrusiveness** and **proportionality** regarding the expected benefit	
V. acceptance of and willingness to implement measures	**acceptability** of the measures	
	implications for **willingness to implement the measures**	
VI. equity, equality and the fair distribution of benefits and burdens	implications for **health, social and economic inequalities**	
	implications for affected social groups, in particular **vulnerable and disadvantaged populations**	
	degree of **fair distribution of benefits and burdens** between population groups	
	accordance of the measures with the principle of equal treatment	
	implications for the risk of **stigmatization and discrimination**	
VII. societal and environmental implications and considerations	**implications for actors and institutions of civil society, social life, and culture**	
	implications for the civil society, social life, and culture	
	implications for **social cohesion, solidarity, and the risk of social and political division**	
	implications for **the economic situation of individuals and capability of social participation**	
	implications for **education and psychosocial development**	
	implications for other **social determinants of health**	
	implications for **ecosystem, planetary boundaries,** and environmental sustainability	
VIII. economic implications and consideration	**consequences** of the measures **for individual economic actors** and their economic activities	
	implications for the economy including resilience and ability to recover	
	implications for innovation and economic development opportunities	
	implications of the measures on the retention and release of labor forces	
IX. resource requirements and resource implications	**financial costs, available financial resources, and budgetary implications for different actors**	
	requirements of, availability of, and implications for human resources	
	requirements of, availability of, and implications for protective equipment, hygiene products and medical devices	
	requirements of, availability of, and implications for infrastructure to implement, enforce and monitor measures	
	requirements of, availability of, and implications for further resources and infrastructures	
X. feasibility and implementation considerations	**political feasibility and legal conformity**	
	practical and technical feasibility	
	flexibility in implementation, extension, adjustment and withdrawal of measures	
	possibility of evaluation and adequate reaction to new information	
XI. interaction with and implications for the health system	**interaction with other measures to control and contain the sars-cov-2 pandemic**	
	interaction with components of the health care system	
	implications for the **capability** and willingness **to develop alternative**, local **solutions**	

5.3.2 Considering criteria for different populations

Depending on the measure and decision-making context, criteria and aspects within the framework should be considered for different population groups to adequately assume relevant implications. The stakeholder groups to be considered will depend on the type of measure (e.g. closing schools vs. closing nursing homes to the public). Building on the WHO-INTEGRATE framework and the strategy documents, we suggest to consider the implications for (a) the general population, (b) those intended to benefit from the intervention (e.g. young school children in the case of school reopening), (c) those intended to implement the measures (e.g. teachers), populations with a (d) high risk and (e) low risk in regard to COVID-19 (e.g. young and healthy parents; senior citizens with preexisting conditions living in the same household), and (f) other affected stakeholder groups (e.g. employers), with an emphasis on vulnerable and marginalized populations (e.g. school children with a family with a low socio-economic status). Depending on focus, further disaggregation of affected populations can be considered here (e.g. disaggregating the implications of the measure for different genders).

5.3.3 Decision-making from different perspective

Depending on the measure and decision-making process, decision-makers need to reflect on the different criteria from different perspectives to inform their deliberations (center-most ring in figure F1). For example, the health implications of a measure on the SARS-CoV-2 related health risk (e.g. reopening of schools) can be approached from a population perspective (e.g. incidence rate of infections and associated mortality rates), a systems perspective (e.g. the implications for the capacity of the health system), or the individual perspective (e.g. the risk for individual teachers working in these schools).

5.3.4 Following a complex systems perspective

The implications of the NPIs can be far reaching. For example, school closures cause children to stay at home, resulting in the possible need of parents to reduce working hours to engage in childcare. Without childcare facilities for essential workers, this can lead to shortages in staff, for example in the health care sector, limiting its ability to provide medical services and care.

In line with the WHO-INTEGRATE framework, this framework approaches decision-making from a complexity perspective[2]: the measures are regarded as an “events in a system”[56], with the (intended and unintended) implications of the measure resulting from the interaction of the measures’ components with each other and components of the larger system. Within this perspective, disentangling the effects *caused by* the measure itself from the interplay of context and measure can be challenging if not impossible to do[57]; posing challenges for transferability and generalizability of evidence.

Analogous to the ripple effects caused by dropping an object in a pool of water, the effects initiated by the introduction of the measure to the system can be followed outwards incrementally. The more profound the impact of the measure to the system, the further way the effects of the measure throughout the system can be observed. For example, the shutdown of a few companies in a region for a short time can lead to locally felt adverse economic consequences. However, a marginally more impactful event of closing the same companies for a marginally longer time and thereby exceeding an economic threshold can lead to the insolvency of these companies, causing – depending on the companies – a disruption of globalized production chains with economic consequences that can have regional, national, and even global effects. Therefore, depending on how profound the impact of the measure is assumed, decision makers need to consider whether the measure is likely to lead not only to immediate and local, but also regional, national, or global consequences over the short, medium, and long term. When reflecting on the measures, decision-makers should not only focus on the direct effects along the intended causal pathway, but also anticipate implications caused across several degrees of indirectness (figure F2).



Figure F2: Complex system perspective on the implications caused by a measure being introduced into a system

6 Discussion

Within this research project, we adapted the WHO-INTEGRATE framework to decision-making processes on non-pharmaceutical interventions intended to suppress or mitigate the effects of the SARS-CoV 2 pandemic. We used brain storming exercises and content analysis of comprehensive strategy papers aimed at informing political decision making in Germany on the phasing out the implemented lockdown measures. The resulting WHO-INTEGRATE COVID-framework version 1.0 consists of 11 substantive decision-making criteria, containing 49 decision-making aspects, and the meta-criterion quality of evidence. Depending on the needs of the decision-making processes, these are intended to be applied on different affected stakeholder groups and to be used from different perspectives. In line with the underlying complexity perspective, rather than only focusing on direct, immediate, and local effects of the measure, the ripple effects caused by the introduction of the measure to a given system should be followed to adequately capture the implications a measure might have.

6.1 Advancing the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework version 1.0 in phase III

The current version of the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework is intended as a version 1.0, intended to be expanded in a third phase. The limited diversity of expert groups established to inform policy makers on the handling of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, including their disciplinary background, has faced criticism[5]. While intended to provide comprehensive guidance taking multiple relevant considerations into account, our approach of adapting the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework based on strategy documents comes with the risk of criteria considered as relevant by stakeholder groups not represented in experts groups to be overlooked. The third phase of the research project aims to address this issue by including the perspectives of various stakeholder groups across the society and expanding the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework version 1.0 with considerations previously not adequately covered.

This will be done in an approach similar to phase II: conducting a content analysis of key-documents representing the opinions and perspectives of stakeholder representatives across the society and using the results to validate and – where needed – expand the framework version 1.0. Using a sample of NPIs with broad societal implication as a starting point (closure and reopening of schools, closure and reopening of businesses, and “shelter-in-place” regulations), we will include opinion pieces, position papers, or press statements aimed at informing political decision-making during the ongoing debate of phasing out the

lockdown measures. A first set of stakeholder group clusters (e.g. social and welfare organizations) will be selected based on an initial brainstorming phase and expanded in an iterative process based on the findings of the content analysis following a snowballing approach. While it will be not feasible within the scope of this project to cover all relevant organizations and institutions within a given stakeholder group clusters, we will analyze documents put forward by a heterogeneous sample which will be expanded in an iterative process depending on whether content saturation is assumed to be reached within a given cluster.

While this approach is not able to capture the voices of all affected stakeholders nor to identify all considerations regarded of relevance by these stakeholder groups, this approach allows for a broad representation of societal values in decision-making across the society and can be dynamically expanded should the need arise.

6.2 Short guidance on how to apply adapted COVID Framework

There are several approaches to using evidence-to-decision frameworks. While some are tailored to specific decision-making processes (e.g. on vaccination policies[58]) and provide a fixed set of "ready-to-use" decision-making criteria[25], others are more generic and require some form of adaption. The WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework was adapted to inform decision-making on COVID-19 focused NPIs and the challenges arising from this. However, it was intended to be adequately generic to be applicable across a broad range of NPIs and decision-making contexts. While the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework with its eleven plus one criteria can be used as a "ready-to-use" evidence-to-decision framework, we believe the framework to be most useful as a guide to systematically reflecting on the measure in the given context and adapting it based on the specific needs of the decision-making process, using the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework as guidance and frame in the process.

Within the latter approach, the decision-makers are intended to develop a comprehensive logic model[59 60] or systems map of the measure as well as the context they are implemented in. This is done in order to identify how different components of the measure and of the system might interact with each other and thereby to identify relevant pathways through which intended and unintended consequences could arise. After creating this initial logic model, the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework can be used to expand on dimensions not adequately covered, e.g. by exploring the causal pathways from different perspectives, assessing the implications for different affected population groups, or using the criteria and aspects to assess its comprehensiveness. Using the criteria and aspects of the framework as a starting point and building on the expanded logic model, those involved in the decision-making process are now intended to develop and select criteria they assume to be of relevance for deliberating on the measure and adapting them to the context at hand. Using the example of school reopening, this could – a among others – include the risk of new outbreaks, health implications for teachers, for students, for parents, and other family members with an elevated risk profile (e.g. the students grandparents), the implications for the wellbeing of these groups, educational implications, etc. Given the complexity of the decisions at hand, it is likely not all criteria considered to be relevant can be covered in depth in the deliberation process. However, the rational for selecting a subset should be provided. Next, efforts should be made to acquire appropriate sources of evidence to inform on the criteria. Taking the direction a criterion points the decision to (e.g. implications for reducing educational inequalities pointing towards reopening the schools), along side the quality of evidence for this effect and the weight assigned to the criterion into account, the group of decision-makers are now intended to engage in the deliberation on which measures to take and how these should be adapted.

6.3 Relation to public health ethics framework

Public health ethics frameworks are intended to guide public health and health policy decision-makers on principles and values to consider. Various public health ethics frameworks have been published[38 61-63], some

of which aimed to support decision-making on matters of public health more generally[32 33 36 64 65] and others developed for decision-making on public health emergencies and pandemics[66-70]. Building on these foundations, institutions such as the German ethics council[71] or the ethics working group of the German Network Public Health COVID-19[72 73] have put forward documents outlining relevant values and principles for decision-making in the current public health crisis. These include the duty to provide care, health, non-discrimination, security, equity, individual liberty, privacy, proportionality, protection of the public from harm, reciprocity, and solidarity, among others[72].

Rather than being an alternative to them, the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework was developed to be in line with these documents. The WHO-INTEGRATE framework, on which the adapted framework was built, was developed to have a firm foundation in WHO norms and values and informed by key public health ethics frameworks[29]. The intention of this adapted framework was to translate these principles and values into criteria better applicable for real-world decision making processes (e.g. by translating the general moral considerations of producing benefits and avoiding, preventing, and removing harms[32] into – among others – the criteria I,II,III,VII, and VIII on the different positive and negatives social, economic, or health-related effect a NPI might for individuals and populations). Furthermore, our framework aims to place criteria derived from these values and principles alongside with other considerations of relevance for real-world decision-making often not covered in depth in public health ethics frameworks, such as considerations of feasibility or the wider implications for the (health) system. While some values and principles have a direct representation in the framework criteria (e.g. individual liberty, privacy, or proportionality) others are introduced on the level of the perspectives or the populations the criteria should be applied to (e.g. reciprocity being reflected in the consideration of *those intended to implement the interventions*).

Furthermore, the framework is not intended as an alternative to these guidance documents, as whether a decision or recommendation is in line with these values or principles not only depends on which criteria are selected, considered, and weighted against each other in the deliberation process.

6.4 Need for fair transparent processes

While the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework can be one tool to support decision-makers in selecting decision-making criteria of relevance, this in itself is insufficient to achieve fair decision-making processes with results considered acceptable and legitimate[19 20]. It is important that not only the final decision, but also the underlying rationale – including the criteria and evidence – is made transparent. Other important values and principles underlying fair decision-making processes include accountability, inclusiveness, openness and transparency, reasonableness, and responsiveness[72 73]. While a comprehensive approach of stakeholder engagement is likely not possible with a pandemic, efforts to including the voices of affected stakeholders, for example through rapid reaction statements from stakeholder representation organizations, can not only improve acceptability and legitimacy but also lead to better outcomes. Especially, the needs of affected marginalized and vulnerable population groups without strong political capital (e.g. people affected by homelessness) are at risk of being overlooked. Furthermore, special attention needs to be placed to the composition of the stakeholder groups[5].

6.5 Strengths and Limitations

The WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework was developed by building on the WHO-INTEGRATE framework[29] which was developed in principles-based approach to ensure a solid, comprehensive normative foundation and on previous research such as the result of an overview of systematic reviews on real-world public health and health system decision-making criteria[39], and expanding this foundational framework through a broad set of comprehensive strategy documents informing real-world decision-making processes in Germany.

However, the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework is only concerned with substantive criteria and does *not* comprise procedural criteria. We recognize that that a decision-making process guided by procedural norms, values, and principles is essential to come to decisions which are considered acceptable and legitimate by those (negatively) affected. While beyond the scope of the current publication, we plan to address this in an upcoming publication.

The WHO-INTEGRATE framework was developed to be applicable on national and sub-national levels throughout the world. However, to adapt the framework we focused on strategy documents intended to inform the German government. While be believe the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID frameworks to be useful and applicable to other regions within and outside Europe, the need for adapting the framework to the respective decision-making contexts should be considered.

The framework in its current version 1.0 was develop based primarily on comprehensive strategy documents developed by expert groups. The composition and the intention of the expert groups is likely to have had an effect on the criteria, consideration, values, and principles covered within them. While we believe possible shortcomings and blind spots are in part compensated by the use of the WHO-INTEGRATE framework as a basis for the adaption, there is a risk of relevant considerations and criteria missing from the current framework. We will address this issue in phase III of this research project, in which we aim to integrate views and perspectives from key stakeholder groups across the society.

Despite multiple approaches to identify the comprehensive strategy documents, which was done through independent searches by two authors and further informed by external input, we acknowledge the possibility of having missed on individual documents. Due to the rapid cycle of publishing on COVID-19-related issues, we see a risk of having missed strategy documents published from mid-June 2020 onwards. Furthermore, likely other relevant strategy documents exist, but were not disclosed by the governments or leaked to the public and therefore are not captured in our analysis. We will add an update of the phase II searches for comprehensive strategy documents as first task within phase III of the project.

Another limitation is the distinction between comprehensive strategy documents and position papers by affected stakeholder groups, which was not always clear cut. However, we believe this only to be a minor limitation, as all borderline documents were retained and will be included in the phase III of the project.

7 Conclusion

The WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework represents a comprehensive COVID-19 focused EtD framework intended to guide policy and public-health decision-makers on NPIs. It is rooted in WHO norms and values, criteria and considerations used to inform real-world decision-making, and a complexity perspective. It offers a set of 11+1 decision-making criteria which are expanded on through 49 aspects assigned to them. While adapted to COVID-19 related challenges, it is intended to be generic in a way to be applicable across a broad range of decisions-making processes, contexts, and on a diverse set of measures.

Acknowledgements: [To be adapted]
Author's contribution: JMS and LA conceived the study. JMS, EAR and LA engaged in the activities of phase I to develop the a priori framework. JMS and LA conducted the literature search for strategy documents. JMS and LA conducted the coding and analysis of the strategy documents and revised the a priori framework. JMS drafted the manuscript with support from LA.
Funding: No external funding source was used to fund the project.
Competing interests: JMS and EAR are authors of the WHO-INTEGRATE framework.
Patient consent Not required.
Ethics approval: The research was undertaken in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki in their respective current versions. As it is a document analysis, no review by an ethics committee was deemed necessary.

8 References

1. Sanderson I. Intelligent Policy Making for a Complex World: Pragmatism, Evidence and Learning. *Political Studies* 2009;57(4):699-719. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.2009.00791.x
2. Petticrew M, Knai C, Thomas J, et al. Implications of a complexity perspective for systematic reviews and guideline development in health decision making. *BMJ Glob Health* 2019;4(Suppl 1):e000899. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000899 [published Online First: 2019/02/19]
3. Rutter H, Savona N, Glonti K, et al. The need for a complex systems model of evidence for public health. *The Lancet* 2017;390(10112):2602-04. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(17)31267-9
4. Pei S, Kandula S, Shaman J. Differential Effects of Intervention Timing on COVID-19 Spread in the United States. *medRxiv* 2020:2020.05.15.20103655. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.15.20103655
5. Rajan D, Koch K, Rohrer K, et al. Governance of the Covid-19 response: a call for more inclusive and transparent decision-making. *BMJ Global Health* 2020;5(5):e002655. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002655
6. Ioannidis JP. A fiasco in the making? As the coronavirus pandemic takes hold, we are making decisions without reliable data. *STAT* 2020
7. Ioannidis JPA. Coronavirus disease 2019: The harms of exaggerated information and non-evidence-based measures. *European Journal of Clinical Investigation* 2020;50(4):e13222. doi: 10.1111/eci.13222
8. Baltussen R, Jansen MP, Mikkelsen E, et al. Priority Setting for Universal Health Coverage: We Need Evidence-Informed Deliberative Processes, Not Just More Evidence on Cost-Effectiveness. *International journal of health policy and management* 2016;5(11):615-18. doi: 10.15171/ijhpm.2016.83
9. Baltussen R, Mikkelsen E, Tromp N, et al. Balancing efficiency, equity and feasibility of HIV treatment in South Africa – development of programmatic guidance. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation* 2013;11(1):26. doi: 10.1186/1478-7547-11-26
10. Kapiriri L, Lee N-M, Wallace LJ, et al. Beyond cost-effectiveness, morbidity and mortality: a comprehensive evaluation of priority setting for HIV programming in Uganda. *BMC public health* 2019;19(1):359. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-6690-8
11. Guindo LA, Wagner M, Baltussen R, et al. From efficacy to equity: Literature review of decision criteria for resource allocation and healthcare decisionmaking. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation* 2012;10
12. Youngkong S, Kapiriri L, Baltussen R. Setting priorities for health interventions in developing countries: A review of empirical studies. *Tropical Medicine and International Health* 2009;14:930-39.
13. UN UN. Transforming our world: the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. A/RES/70/1. . New York: UN 2015.
14. Kneale D, O'Mara-Eves A, Rees R, et al. School closure in response to epidemic outbreaks: Systems-based logic model of downstream impacts [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]. *F1000Research* 2020;9(352) doi: 10.12688/f1000research.23631.1
15. Baltussen R, Jansen MPM, Bijlmakers L, et al. Value Assessment Frameworks for HTA Agencies: The Organization of Evidence-Informed Deliberative Processes. *Value in Health* 2017;20(2):256-60. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jval.2016.11.019
16. Daniels N. Accountability for reasonableness. . *BMJ Global Health* 2000;321(7272):1300-01. doi: 10.1136/bmj.321.7272.1300
17. Daniels N, Porteny T, Urritia J. Expanded HTA: Enhancing Fairness and Legitimacy. *International journal of health policy and management* 2015;5(1):1-3. doi: 10.15171/ijhpm.2015.187 [published Online First: 2015/12/18]
18. Singer PA, Martin DK, Giacomini M, et al. Priority setting for new technologies in medicine: qualitative case study. *Bmj* 2000;321(7272):1316-8. doi: 10.1136/bmj.321.7272.1316 [published Online First: 2000/11/25]
19. Daniels N, Sabin J. The Ethics Of Accountability In Managed Care Reform. *Health Affairs* 1998;17(5):50-64. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.17.5.50
20. Friedman A. Beyond accountability for reasonableness. *Bioethics* 2008;22(2):101-12. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8519.2007.00605.x [published Online First: 2008/02/07]
21. Daniels N. Accountability for reasonableness. *BMJ* 2000;7272(321):1300-01.
22. Tyler TR. Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy and Legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology* 2005;57(1):375-400. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190038
23. Greenberg J, Folger R. Procedural Justice, Participation, and the Fair Process Effect in Groups and Organizations. In: Paulus P, ed. In Basic Group Processes. New York: Springer 1983:235-56.
24. Saltelli A, Giampietro M. What is wrong with evidence based policy, and how can it be improved? *Futures* 2017;91:62-71. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2016.11.012
25. WHO WHO. WHO Handbook for Guideline Development 2nd edition ed. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization 2014.
26. Ham C. Priority setting in health care: learning from international experience. *Health policy (Amsterdam, Netherlands)* 1997;42(1):49-66. [published Online First: 1997/09/04]
27. Niessen LW, Bridges J, Lau BD, et al. ssessing the Impact of Economic Evidence on Policymakers in Health Care—A Systematic Review. Methods Research Report (Prepared by the Johns Hopkins University Evidence-based Practice Center under contract No. 290-2007-10061-I). AHRQ Publication No. 12(13)-EHC133-EF. Rockville: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality 2012.
28. Alonso-Coello P, Schünemann HJ, Moberg J, et al. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks: a systematic and transparent approach to making well informed healthcare choices. 1: Introduction. *BMJ* 2016;353:i2016.

29. Rehfuess EA, Stratil JM, Scheel IB, et al. The WHO-INTEGRATE evidence to decision framework version 1.0: integrating WHO norms and values and a complexity perspective. *BMJ Glob Health* 2019;4(Suppl 1):e000844. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000844 [published Online First: 2019/02/19]

30. Norris SL, Rehfuess EA, Smith H, et al. Complex health interventions in complex systems: improving the process and methods for evidence-informed health decisions. *BMJ Global Health* 2019;4(Suppl 1):e000963. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000963

31. Assasi N, Schwartz L, Tarride JE, et al. Methodological guidance documents for evaluation of ethical considerations in health technology assessment: a systematic review. *Expert review of pharmacoeconomics & outcomes research* 2014;14(2):203-20. doi: 10.1586/14737167.2014.894464 [published Online First: 2014/03/15]

32. Childress JF, Faden RR, Gaare RD, et al. Public health ethics: mapping the terrain. *The Journal of law, medicine & ethics : a journal of the American Society of Law, Medicine & Ethics* 2002;30(2):170-8. [published Online First: 2002/06/18]

33. Marckmann G, Schmidt H, Sofaer N, et al. Putting public health ethics into practice: a systematic framework. *Frontiers in public health* 2015;3:23. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2015.00023 [published Online First: 2015/02/24]

34. Tannahill A. Beyond evidence--to ethics: a decision-making framework for health promotion, public health and health improvement. *Health promotion international* 2008;23(4):380-90. doi: 10.1093/heapro/dan032 [published Online First: 2008/10/31]

35. Coughlin SS. Ethical issues in epidemiologic research and public health practice. *Emerging themes in epidemiology* 2006;3:16. doi: 10.1186/1742-7622-3-16 [published Online First: 2006/10/05]

36. Krebs K, Unwin J. Public health: ethical issues. London: Nuffield Council on Bioethics, 2007.

37. Liverani M, Hawkins B, Parkhurst JO. Political and institutional influences on the use of evidence in public health policy. A systematic review. *PloS one* 2013;8(10):e77404-e04. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0077404

38. ten Have M, de Beaufort ID, Mackenbach JP, et al. An overview of ethical frameworks in public health: can they be supportive in the evaluation of programs to prevent overweight? *BMC public health* 2010;10:638. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-10-638 [published Online First: 2010/10/26]

39. Stratil J, Baltussen R, Scheel I, et al. Development of the WHO-INTEGRATE evidence-to-decision framework: An overview of systematic reviews of decision criteria for health decision-making. *Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation* 2020;8(18)

40. Stratil J, Paudel D, Setty K, et al. The WHO-INTEGRATE framework as a tool for evidence-informed, deliberative decision-making processes. A qualitative study exploring the views of those developing and using WHO guidelines. *International Journal for Health Policy and Management* forthcoming

41. Carroll C, Booth A, Leaviss J, et al. “Best fit” framework synthesis: refining the method. *BMC medical research methodology* 2013;13(1):37. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-13-37

42. Carroll C, Booth A, Cooper K. A worked example of "best fit" framework synthesis: a systematic review of views concerning the taking of some potential chemopreventive agents. *BMC medical research methodology* 2011;11:29. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-11-29 [published Online First: 2011/03/18]

43. Dixon-Woods M. Using framework-based synthesis for conducting reviews of qualitative studies. *BMC medicine* 2011;9:39. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-9-39 [published Online First: 2011/04/16]

44. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. 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):349-57. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042

45. Bude H, von Donat C, Feldner D, et al. Kreativität – Verantwortung – Transformation. Grundlegende Voraussetzungen für die progressive Lockerung des COVID--19 Lockdown (17. April 2020) 2020

46. Expertenrat Corona der Landesregierung Nordrhein-Westfalen, Di fabio U, Grünewald S, et al. Weg in eine verantwortungsvolle Normalität (11.04.2020). Expertenrat Corona der Landesregierung Nordrhein-Westfalen, : Düsseldorf 2020.

47. Anonym. COVID-19-Eindämmung: Übergang von Verlangsamung zu Viruskontrollphase. Politische Handlungsfähigkeit erlangen Erwartungshorizonte für Gesundheit, Gesellschaft und Wirtschaft schaffen (04.04.2020) 2020

48. Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften Leopoldina (Hrsg.). Erste Ad-hoc-Stellungnahme: Coronavirus-Pandemie in Deutschland: Herausforderungen und Interventionsmöglichkeiten (21. März 2020) Halle (Saale): Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften Leopoldina 2020.

49. Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften Leopoldina (Hrsg.). Zweite Ad-hoc-Stellungnahme: Coronavirus-Pandemie in Deutschland: Coronavirus-Pandemie – Gesundheitsrelevante Maßnahmen (03. April 2020) Halle (Saale): Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften Leopoldina 2020.

50. Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften Leopoldina (Hrsg.). Dritte Ad-hoc-Stellungnahme: Coronavirus-Pandemie in Deutschland: Herausforderungen und Interventionsmöglichkeiten (21. März 2020) Halle (Saale): Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften Leopoldina 2020.

51. Bündnis 90 Die Grünen Hamburg (Ed.). Autorenpapier unter Federführung von Katharina Fegebank. Corona-Pandemie - Voraussetzungen für eine Exit-Strategie in Hamburg. 09. April 2020. Hamburg: Bündnis 90 Die Grünen 2020.

52. Institut für Makroökonomie und Konjunkturforschung IE, S D, Herzog-Stein A, et al. Schneller Ausstieg oder bedachte Lockerung? - Zur Zukunft von Kontaktbeschränkungen in der Covid-19-Krise. IMK Policy Brief Nr. 88 · April 2020. Düsseldorf: Institut für Makroökonomie und Konjunkturforschung (IMK) der Hans-Böckler-Stiftung 2020.

53. Boston Consulting Group (Ed.), Türpitz A, Felden F, et al. BCG Perspektive zum Restart-Management in der Corona-Krise Munich: Boston Consulting Group (BCG) 2020.

54. Abele-Brehm A, Dreier H, Fuest C, et al. Die Bekämpfung der Coronavirus-Pandemie tragfähig gestalten. Empfehlungen für eine flexible, risikoadaptierte Strategie. Koordination C Fuest und M Lohse. 2. Arpil 20202020.

55. WHO WHO. Everybody's business. Strengthening health systems to improve health outcomes : WHO's framework for action. Geneva: WHO 2007.

56. Hawe P, Shiell A, Riley T. Theorising interventions as events in systems. *American journal of community psychology* 2009;43(3-4):267-76. doi: 10.1007/s10464-009-9229-9 [published Online First: 2009/04/25]

57. Rhodes T, Lancaster K. Evidence-making interventions in health: A conceptual framing. *Social Science & Medicine* 2019;238:112488. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112488

58. Piso B, Wild C. Decision support in vaccination policies. *Vaccine* 2009;27(43):5923-8. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2009.07.105 [published Online First: 2009/08/25]

59. Rehfuess EA, Booth A, Brereton L, et al. Towards a taxonomy of logic models in systematic reviews and health technology assessments: A priori, staged, and iterative approaches. *Research synthesis methods* 2018;9(1):13-24. doi: 10.1002/jrsm.1254 [published Online First: 2017/07/06]

60. Rohwer A, Pfadenhauer L, Burns J, et al. Series: Clinical Epidemiology in South Africa. Paper 3: Logic models help make sense of complexity in systematic reviews and health technology assessments. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2017;83:37-47. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.06.012

61. Abbasi M, Majdzadeh R, Zali A, et al. The evolution of public health ethics frameworks: systematic review of moral values and norms in public health policy. *Medicine, health care, and philosophy* 2018;21(3):387-402. doi: 10.1007/s11019-017-9813-y [published Online First: 2017/11/11]

62. Petrini C. Theoretical models and operational frameworks in public health ethics. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2010;7(1):189-202. doi: 10.3390/ijerph7010189 [published Online First: 2010/03/03]

63. Lee LM. Public health ethics theory: review and path to convergence. *The Journal of law, medicine & ethics : a journal of the American Society of Law, Medicine & Ethics* 2012;40(1):85-98. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-720X.2012.00648.x [published Online First: 2012/03/31]

64. Baum N, Gollust S, Goold S, et al. Looking Ahead: Addressing Ethical Challenges in Public Health Practice. *global health law, ethics, and policy* 2007;4(35):657-67.

65. Kass NE. An ethics framework for public health. *American journal of public health* 2001;91(11):1776-82. [published Online First: 2001/10/31]

66. Thompson AK, Faith K, Gibson JL, et al. Pandemic influenza preparedness: an ethical framework to guide decision-making. *BMC medical ethics* 2006;7:E12. doi: 10.1186/1472-6939-7-12

67. Austin W. Ethics in a time of contagion: a relational perspective. *The Canadian journal of nursing research = Revue canadienne de recherche en sciences infirmieres* 2008;40(4):10-24. [published Online First: 2009/02/04]

68. Gostin LO. Influenza pandemic preparedness: legal and ethical dimensions. *The Hastings Center report* 2004;34(5):10-1. [published Online First: 2004/11/24]

69. Torda A. Ethical issues in pandemic planning. *The Medical journal of Australia* 2006;185(10 Suppl):S73-6. [published Online First: 2006/11/23]

70. Schroder P, Brand H, Schroter M, et al. [Ethical discussion on criteria for policy makers in public health authorities for preventative measures against a pandemic caused by a novel influenza A virus]. *Gesundheitswesen (Bundesverband der Arzte des Offentlichen Gesundheitsdienstes (Germany))* 2007;69(6):371-6. doi: 10.1055/s-2007-981675 [published Online First: 2007/07/21]

71. Ethikrat. D. [Solidarity and responsibility in the Corona-Crisis. Ad Hoc recommendation]. Publication in German. Berlin: Deutscher Ethikrat 2020.

72. Heilinger J, Thompson A, Wild V, et al. Public Health Ethics and Covid-19 - The ethical dimensions of public health decision-making during a pandemic German Network Public Health COVID-19 2020.

73. Venkatapuram S, Heilinger J-C, Voss M, et al. Ethical principles for the Coronavirus Global Response: Ethical guidance for the development of fast and equitable access to safe, quality, effective and affordable diagnostics, therapeutics and vaccines against COVID-19. : German Network Public Health COVID-19 2020.

9 Annex

9.1 WHO-INTEGRATE COVID Framework – comprehensive Version 1.0

Table A1: Criteria and aspects within (comprehensive form).

criterion	Aspect
implications of the measures for the course of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic and the health consequences of COVID-19	**Implications of the measures for the number of new infections and the course of the pandemic**; including the currently existing risk of infection and the effects of the measures on COVID-19-related risk behavior (e.g. compliance with individual protective measures)
	Implications of the measure for COVID-19-related health consequences at population level (including number of severe disease courses, long-term health impairments, and COVID-19-related deaths)
	Impact of the measure on the relationship between the need and availability of resources of the health care system for the medical care of severe COVID-19 cases (e.g. hospital capacities, respiratory care places) with regard to the consequences of **overburdening the health care system** (including pandemic development with the risk of reaching the exposure limit, level of exposure limit and consequences of exceeding the exposure limit)
	Implications of the measures for the **direct health risk** (probability of illness & consequences) **of individuals**
Restrictions imposed on individuals and implications for **quality of life, social well-being, and mental health**	**Restrictions imposed** by the measures **on individuals** and the effects of the measures on the capability of shaping life and everyday life according to one's own wishes and needs
	Implications of the measures for the **quality of life, self-efficacy and sense of coherence** (including the experience of comprehensibility, controllability and meaningfulness)
	Implications of the measures for the **social well-being of individuals** (e.g. with regard to social isolation, the experience of loneliness, the possibility of social interaction and exchange or the experience of social embedding and one's own role in the social community)
	Implications of the measures for **social cohesion of communities** (including partnerships, families, social communities)
	Implications of the measures for the **experience of fear and insecurity** (e.g. fear of unemployment, existential fears, fear of infection, concern for relatives)
	Implications of the measures for **stress, stressors, the feeling of being overwhelmed and overloaded** (including the effects on resilience factors and coping mechanisms)
	Implications of the measures for **mental health and its consequences** (e.g. depression, anxiety disorder, suicides)
Implications of the measures **for the physical health beyond the burden of disease from COVID-19**	Implications of the measures for **health-related behavior** (e.g. physical activity, nutrition, alcohol abuse, tobacco consumption, use of other illicit drugs) and its consequences for health
	Implications of the measures for the **availability, accessibility, acceptability, and quality of medical care in emergency and standard care beyond COVID-19**; including the health consequences resulting from the absence, delay and poorer quality of medical treatment
	Implications of the measures for the **availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality of care and other health and social support services**; including the consequences of any lack of care, delays and poorer quality
	Implications of the measures for the **exposure to environments that affect health** (e.g. exposure to unhygienic conditions, air pollution)
	Implications of the measures for the **risk of suffering accidents** (including accidents or poisoning in the domestic environment) **or being affected by violence** (including domestic violence)
Proportionality, and implications of the measures for **individual**	Implications of the measures for and accordance of the measures with **autonomy and individual self-determination;** including privacy and informational self-determination
	Implications of the measures for and consistency of the measures with the capability of exercising **individual liberties and fundamental rights**

autonomy, liberties, and fundamental rights	(including e.g. freedom of assembly, freedom of occupation and property, freedom of movement and general freedom of movement, freedom of religion)
	Extent of **intrusiveness** and **proportionality** with regard to the expected benefits (e.g. possibility to achieve similar benefits with less intrusive measures or to reduce the number of people affected by them through greater differentiation)
Acceptance of and willingness to implement the measures	**Acceptability** of the measures (incl. acceptance of the expected balance of benefits and burdens and their distribution for oneself and with regard to society)
	Implications of the measures for the **comprehension of and willingness to implement, comply with, and enforce the measures**
Implications for equity, equality and the fair distribution of benefits and burdens	Implications of the measures for **health, social and economic inequalities**
	Health, social and **economic implications of the measures for individual social groups**, in particular **vulnerable and socially disadvantaged populations**, including the effects on relief facilities and institutions
	Degree to which benefits and burdens resulting from the measures (health, social, economic) are distributed **fairly between different actors and population groups;** including those with high or low expected benefits and those with high or negligible burdens from the measures
	Accordance of the measures with the principle of equal treatment; in the sense of avoiding and reducing unjustified unequal treatment
	Implications of the measures for the occurrence, spread and consequences of **stigmatization**; including the risk that persons, groups of persons or other actors face **discrimination** or are otherwise socially disadvantaged by the measures (including their compliance and non-compliance)
Societal and environmental implications and considerations	**Implications** of the measures **for actors and institutions of civil society, social life, and culture** (e.g. restriction of the activities of associations, youth clubs, or place of worship etc. and the resulting consequences resulting from this for the affected actors and institutions)
	Implications of the measures for the civil society, social life and culture (including availability, accessibility, participation, acceptability, quality of offers and activities) including the reversibility of the consequences
	Implications of the of the measures for **social cohesion, solidarity and the risk of social and political division**
	Implications of the measure for **the economic situation of individuals and the resulting effects on social participation**; both on the side of available income and assets (consequences of short-time work, unemployment, loss of savings and pension provision) and on the side of expenditures (additional expenditure and additional financial burdens, e.g. through protective measures, mobility, etc.)
	implications of the measures for **education and psychosocial development;** including aspects of availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality of educational opportunities, and irreversibility caused by the lack thereof
	implications of the measures of other **social determinants of health**
	implications of the measures for the **ecosystem and planetary boundaries** and compatibility of the measures with the principle of environmental sustainability
Economic implications and consideration	**Consequences** of the measures **for individual companies, sectors of the economy and other economic actors** and their capability for economic activities (e.g. through restrictions on the economic activity itself, the interruption of production chains, the availability of personnel, or sales opportunities at home and abroad) including the reversibility of the consequences (e.g. avoidance of insolvencies)
	Implications of the measure for the national and regional economy, its resilience, the risk of recession and the possibility of recovery after the crisis (including planning security, willingness to invest, confidence in the future or the risk of hostile takeovers)
	implications of the measures **for innovation and economic development opportunities**

	Implications of the measures on the retention and release of labor forces; including the restriction or enabling of economic activity and its predictability
Requirements of, availability of, and implications for the availability and quality of resources	**Financial costs, available financial resources, and budgetary implications** of the measure **for different actors**
	Requirements of, availability of, and implications for availability and qualification of **human resources**
	Requirements of, availability of, and implications for availability and quality of **protective equipment, hygiene products and medical devices** needed for the medical care of COVID-19 patients
	Requirements of, availability of, and implications for availability and quality of **infrastructure (physical and institutional) to implement, enforce and monitor measures**
	Requirements of, availability of, and implications for availability and quality of **further infrastructures, technical devices, and resources** (e.g. logistics infrastructure, premises, technical equipment)
Feasibility implications and considerations	**Political feasibility and legal conformity** of the measures
	Practical and technical feasibility of the measures (including the possibility of implementing and adhering to protective measures)
	Flexibility in implementation, extension, adjustment and withdrawal of measures
	Possibility of evaluation & continuous monitoring of the implications of the measures, including the possibility to **react adequately** to new information (e.g. possibility of contact tracing, etc.)
Interaction with and implications for components of the health system	**Interaction, collision & synergies of the measures with other measures to control and contain the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic**
	Interaction, collision & synergies of the measures with other measures or components of the health care system without direct relation to control and containment of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic
	Implications of the measures **for** the **capability** and **willingness** to **develop alternative**, local **solutions** and strategies to handle the risk of SARS-CoV-2 (e.g. for the safe re-opening of restaurants)

9.2 Profile of the researchers involved in the content analysis and framework development

Table TA2: characteristics of researchers involved in the content analysis

	JMS	LA
Credentials	MD, BSc (Geography)	
Occupation	Research scientists and PhD Student Epidemiology and public health at LMU Munich	
Gender	Male	
Experience and training	Has received training on qualitative content research at the University of Tübingen (Germany); Multiple completed research project employing qualitative content analysis.	

9.3 Inclusion and exclusion criteria for phase II documents

Table TA3: Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the search of eligible documents for phase II

Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
• The document addresses measures related to the handling of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic in Germany • The document is intended to inform real-world policy and public health decision-makers in Germany • The document is intended to provide a comprehensive strategy or strategic suggestions for phasing out the lockdown measures • The document addresses societal, economic, or health considerations beyond health considerations associated with SARS-CoV-2 (e.g. number of infections) • The document focuses addresses multiple considerations to be considered in this process (e.g. not exclusively focused on health impact considerations). • The document addresses considerations for multiple NPI or considerations of relevance for multiple NPIs on a more abstract level • Position papers of stakeholder groups reacting or positioning themselves to a document, measure, or event without providing comprehensive strategy guidance are considered in phase III. • To document was developed by an expert group or task forces implemented by or commissioned to write the document by the federal or national governments as well as ministries of the German federal Government OR by non-government affiliated expert groups intended to guide public health and health policy decision making on the federal or national level.	• The document is not primarily targeted to inform policy or public health decision makers • The document does not provide a comprehensive strategy to phase out the lockdown, but is rather a reaction or positioning paper to an event, decision, or measure or provides general statements on aspects to consider (e.g. statement not to forget migrant workers) • The document is only or primarily concerned with direct health consequences of COVID-19 and/or the mitigation of these effects (e.g. the right number of tests to be performed), without discussing broader considerations (e.g. regarding societal implications, economic implications, feasibility and resource considerations) • The document is exclusively focused on the effectiveness of a measure (e.g. impact of school closures on COVID-19 transmission), without taking broader considerations (e.g. societal, economic, feasibility, or ethical considerations) into account. • The document is providing general information on COVID-19, the pandemic, or NPIs; not intended to guide decision-making (e.g. what is allowed in a federal state) • The document is a scientific study, guidance documents and guidelines to inform patients or health care providers on treatment and therapeutic approaches of COVID-19 (e.g. guidelines on the safety of ibuprofen) • The document is focused on health care system and medical care planning without relation to the selected

• The document addresses – directly or indirectly – addressed one of the following NPIs: (a) closure and reopening of schools, (b) closure and reopening of businesses, and (c) “shelter-in-place” regulations.	NPIs (e.g. on triage-procedures, necessity of intubation therapy, relation of intensive vs. palliative treatment, number of ICU-beds necessary)

9.4 *a priori* framework adapted in phase I and coding frame

Table TA4: a priori framework adapted in phase I and coding frame
The right column presents the preliminary adapted framework of the WHO-INTEGRATE framework, which was developed in phase I. It was used as the a priori framework for the “best fit” framework synthesis of phase II and translated into a coding frame (left two coluns)

coding frame (short title was used in maxqda20 due to the word count restriction)		**preliminary framework adapted in phase i** (*a priori* framework)
level 1 code ("criterion")	level 2 code ("aspect")	criteria (**bold**) and aspects
course of the sars-cov-2 pandemic		**implications of the measure(s) on the course of the pandemic**
	new infections	• short, medium and long-term effects on the number of new infections with sars-cov-2
	people suffering from COVID-19	• short, medium and long-term effects on number of people suffering from COVID-19
	severe disease progressions	• short-, medium- and long-term effects on the number of severe disease progressions
	deaths caused by COVID-19	• short, medium and long-term effects on the number of deaths caused by COVID-19
	capacity of the health care system	• short, medium and long-term effects on the ratio of available capacity to medical care (e.g. icu beds, staff) and COVID-19-related demand for these resources
individual level COVID-19-related health risk		**implications of the measure(s) on the direct health risk (COVID-19 likelihood of illness and possible consequences) for individuals**
	direct health risk for high-risk individuals	• effect of the measure(s) on the direct health risk (probability of illness & consequences) of persons at risk
	direct health risk for general population	• implications of the measure(s) on the direct health risk (probability of illness & consequences) of the general population
health effects (beyond COVID-19)		**health effects of the measure(s) not directly caused by COVID-19**
	quality of life	• implications of the measure(s) on quality of life (both for risk groups and the general population)
	social well-being and social coherence	• implications of the measure(s) on social well-being and social coherence (loneliness, stigma; with regard to both risk groups and the general population)
	mental health and consequences	• implications of the measure(s) on mental health and its (their) consequences (e.g. depression, anxiety disorder, suicide; with regard to both risk groups and the general population)
	other health effects beyond COVID-19	• health effects beyond COVID-19 and effects on the health system
	health-related behavior	• implications of the measure(s) on health-related behaviour (physical activity, nutrition, alcohol abuse, tobacco consumption, use of other drugs)
	health- environment (incl. violence)	• the implications of the measures on exposure to living environments and environments that affect health (e.g. domestic violence, unhygienic conditions)

	implications for health care system (non COVID-19 related)	• implications of the measure(s) on availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality of emergency and mainstream health care (beyond COVID-19)
	general and other implications for population health	• general and other effects of the measure(s) on public health (morbidity, mortality, etc.) beyond the burden of disease from COVID-19
acceptability, individual rights and liberties		**acceptability of the measures and relation to individual liberty rights**
	autonomy, individual freedoms, fundamental rights	• implications of the measures on autonomy and the ability to exercise individual freedom and fundamental rights
	acceptability - those implementing	• acceptability of the measures among the groups of persons responsible for the implementation of the measures
	acceptability - beneficiaries	• acceptability of the measures among the groups of persons who are to benefit from the measures
	acceptability - general population	• acceptability of the measures to other groups of people affected by the measure, the general population and other stakeholder groups
equity, equality, distribution of benefits and burdens		**equity, equal opportunities and distribution of the health and social burden of the measure(s)**
	distribution of benefits & burdens - high risk vs. low risk groups	• distribution and relationship of the health, social and economic implications of the measure(s) between groups at lower COVID-19 risk (e.g. younger workers) and groups at higher COVID-19 risk (e.g. older people with pre-existing conditions)?
	distribution of benefits and burdens - high vs. low ses [populations]	• distribution and relationship of the health, social and economic effects of the measure(s) between socially and economically disadvantaged groups and economically or socially better off parts of the population
	equity and implications for vulnerable populations	• implications of the measure(s) on social, health and economic equality of opportunity; in particular with regard to socially and economically disadvantaged groups (e.g. single parents, persons below the poverty line, persons in precarious employment)
	potential for discrimination	• potential for discrimination of population groups through (non-respect of) the measure(s)
social, economic & environmental implications		**social, economic and environmental implications of the measure(s)**
	poverty, unemployment and social participation	• implications of the measures on poverty, unemployment and social participation
	economic performance and development	• effects of the measures on economic performance and development
	(financial) means for governments and society	• the implications of the measures on the (financial) resources available to governments and governmental institutions (e.g. tax revenue)
	social life and culture	• the implications of the measures on social life and culture (including availability, accessibility, participation, acceptability, quality)
	education	• implications of the measures on education (e.g. availability, accessibility, participation, acceptability, quality, educational opportunities)
	natural environment	• implications of the measures on the natural environment
feasibility & resources		**feasibility/feasibility of the action(s) and availability of, need for and implications on availability of financial, human and other resources**
	political and legal feasibility	• political and legal feasibility of the measure(s)
	financial costs and benefits	• financial costs and benefits of the action(s)

	resources - infrstructure and other	• availability of, demand for and implications on availability of infrastructure other resources and (e.g. premises)
	resources - protective equipment and hygiene products	• availability of, need for and impact on availability of protective equipment and hygiene products
	resources - human resources	• availability of, demand for and impact on availability of human resources (e.g. professionals, teaching staff)
interaction with health system		**interaction with other measures or components of the health care system***
	interaction with COVID-19 related measures	• positive (synergistic) or negative interaction with other COVID-19 containment measure(s)
	interaction with health system (non covid)	• positive (synergistic) or negative interaction with other components of the health care system* *(broad understanding of health care system, beyond medical care)
	capacity of health care system (COVID-19)	• impact of the measure(s) on availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality of emergency and mainstream health care (beyond COVID-19)
Evidence		
TBD [to be discussed]		

9.5 *Table with exemplary passages for the criteria and aspects of the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework*

Table TA3: Criteria and aspects of the WHO-INTEGRATE COVID framework with exemplary codes from the trategy documents

criterion	aspect	Exemplary passage from the strategy documents
I. implications for the course of the pandemic and its impact on health	implications for the **course of the pandemic**	*Um der schnellen Ausbreitung der Corona-Pandemie entgegenzutreten, die Entwicklung des Infektionsgeschehens zu verlangsamen und das Gesundheitssystem vor den Gefahren einer Überforderung zu schützen, sind von Bund und Ländern eine Reihe tiefgreifender Maßnahen der Allgemeinprävention ergriffen worden, die drastische Auswirkungen auf das öffentliche Leben in Deutschland haben und den Bürgerinnen und Bürgern schwerwiegende Einschränkungen abverlangen. (Grüne, p1)*
	implications of the measure for **COVID-19-related health consequences at population level**	*Wegen der hohen Ansteckungszahlen erhöhen sich die Mutationsmöglichkeiten des Virus. Studien und Berichte deuten an, dass eine Infektion mit SARS-CoV-2 langfristige Nebenwirkungen und Langzeitfolgen nach sich ziehen kann (ein Phänomen, das auch von der Spanischen Grippe und SARS bekannt ist) […] (Osterpapier, p9)*
	implications for the **capacity of the health care system** to treat (severe) COVID-19-cases	*Ziel dieser Maßnahmen ist ein Abflachen der bisher steil ansteigenden Kurve der Infektionszahlen, die Vermeidung einer Überlastung des Gesundheitssystems und damit eine Reduktion von schweren Erkrankungen und Todesfällen. (IFO, p2)*
	implications for the **health risk of COVID-19 for individuals**	*Ein weiteres unbedingt zu erreichendes Ziel – selbst bei einem Beibehalten des gegenwärtigen Shutdowns – ist ein ausreichender Schutz von (COVID-19-) Risikogruppen wie Alten und Behinderten. (IFO, p26)*
II. implications for **quality of life, social well-being, and mental health**	implications for the capability to **shape everyday life according to one's own wishes and needs**	*Insgesamt ziehen drei Viertel der Bevölkerung die Bilanz, dass sich ihr Leben stark oder sogar sehr stark verändert hat. 71 Prozent empfinden diese Veränderungen als große Einschränkung. Speziell die weitgehende Kontaktbeschränkung empfinden sogar 78 Prozent als gravierende Einschränkung, 72 Prozent fehlen die gewohnten Kontakte sehr. (NRW-1; p4)*
	implications for the **quality of life, self-efficacy, and sense of coherence**	*Wenn eine Isolierung unausweichlich ist, muss mit dem erhöhten Risiko verringerten seelischen Wohlbefindens gerechnet werden, das seinerseits Einfluss auf die körperliche und seelische Gesundheit ausübt. Aus diesem Grunde müssen gemeinsam mit der betreffenden Person Strategien entwickelt werden, die zur Erhaltung ihrer Lebensqualität, Kompetenz und Teilhabe beitragen. (Strategiepapiere Regierung\Öffnung des Lockdown Voraussetzungen 17Apr FINAL: p15)* *Die Krankheitswirkung von belastenden Ereignissen hängt wesentlich davon ab, ob ein Individuum sie als vorhersagbar und kontrollierbar erlebt oder nicht. Entscheidend ist dabei die subjektive (daher „wahrgenommene") Einschätzung. Alles, was Menschen selbst aktiv tun können, steigert ihr Kontrollgefühl. […] (Leopoldina, p18)*
	implications of the measures for **social wellbeing**	*Der Shutdown hat massive Auswirkungen auf die Psyche und das soziale Leben aller Menschen. Derzeit erleben wir, dass viele Menschen durchaus kreativ und altruistisch mit der Situation umgehen und dass das „physical distancing" nicht zu einem „social distancing" führt. Manche erleben das Zurückgeworfensein auf sich selbst und die Familie sogar als wohltuend und als Chance für eine Besinnung auf das, was ihnen wichtig ist. Es ist jedoch zu erwarten, dass die*

		psychischen und sozialen Auswirkungen des Shutdown umso negativer werden, je länger dieser Zustand anhält. Darüber hinaus sind bestimmte Gruppen besonders belastet, z.B. Familien mit Kindern, Personen in beengten Wohnverhältnissen, Alleinlebende, Kranke und psychisch labile Personen. (IFO, p13)
	implications for **social cohesion of communities**	*Angesichts der derzeit geltenden Maßnahmen kommt Familien und anderen Formen von Partnerschaften und Gemeinschaften eine zentrale Rolle zu. Sie verbleiben oft als einziger Ort, an dem dringliche Lebensvollzüge einschließlich Ernährung und Konsum, Face-to-Face-Kommunikation und Geselligkeit, Kindererziehung, Bildung und Unterhaltung, aber auch Spannungsabbau und das Austragen von Konflikten noch stattfinden. (Leopoldina, p19)*
	implications for the **experience of fear and insecurity**	*Allgemeine Konsequenzen von Kontakt- und Ausgangsbeschränkungen können negative Emotionen wie Ärger, Angst/Furcht oder Einsamkeitsgefühle sein, die sich je nach Persönlichkeit unterschiedlich auswirken. (IFO, p13)*
	implications for **stress, stressors, the feeling of being overwhelmed and overloaded**	*Gerade in Familien können Konsequenzen auch Stress und Überforderungserleben sein, wenn gleichzeitig zum Homeoffice z.B. die Schulaufgaben der Kinder beaufsichtigt und kleine Kinder „bespielt" werden müssen. Diese Erfahrungen können wiederum Konflikte, Aggression und Gewalt befördern. (IFO, p13)*
	implications for **mental health and its consequences**	*Ängste und Einsamkeitsgefühle können zu Depressionen bis hin zu suizidalen Gedanken führen. (IFO, p13)*
III. implications for the physical health, health behavior, health risks, and health care beyond COVID-19	implications for **health-related behavior**	*Abhängigkeiten von Alkohol und Drogen können sich verstärken. (IFO, p13)*
	implications for **medical emergency and standard care beyond COVID-19**	*Mit der Aussetzung zahlreicher wichtiger medizinischer Behandlungen, Vorsorgeuntersuchungen und Reha-Maßnahmen entstehen unerwünschte gesundheitliche Folgewirkungen. (NRW, p3)*
	implications for **care and other health and social support services**	*Da insbesondere ältere multimorbide Personen stationär behandlungsbedürftig werden,* *muss gewährleistet werden, dass die zeitige Weiterverlegung in Pflegeeinrichtungen oder benannte Krankenhäuser niedrigerer Versorgungsstufe unter Wahrung hygienischer Maßgaben stattfinden kann, um die Zentren zuverlässig zu entlasten. (IFO, p19)*
	implications for the **exposure to environments that affect health**	*Hinzu kommen die wegfallende Essensversorgung in Kitas und Schulen für Kinder aus armen Familien, Wohnungslosigkeit, eine Zunahme häuslicher Gewalt und Kindeswohlgefährdung, die sehr unterschiedliche Beschulung zu Hause während des Lockdowns und nicht zuletzt auch psychosoziale Folgewirkungen der wirtschaftlich extrem schwierigen Situation. (NRW-I; p3)*
	implications for the **risk of suffering accidents or being affected by violence**	*Ziel eines Übergangs in eine neue Strategie ist das Verhindern potentieller Kollateralschäden besonders eines zu langen Shutdown: Der Anstieg häuslicher Gewalt muss verhindert warden […]. (IFO, p29)*
IV. Proportionality and accordance	implications for and accordance with **autonomy and individual self-determination**	*Eine Quarantäne (Isolierung) darf nicht einfach „verordnet" werden. Vielmehr ist die betreffende Person über die gegebenen Risiken ausführlich und sensibel zu* *(Osterpapier, p15)*

with **individual autonomy** and **fundamental rights**	implications for and accordance with **individual liberties and fundamental rights**	*In der Phase des Übergangs von der Eindämmung zur Viruskontrolle müssen die Grund- und Menschenrechte so weit wie möglich garantiert werden. (Osterpapier, p14)*
	extent of **intrusiveness** and **proportionality** regarding the expected benefit	*Ein Gebot für alle, in der Öffentlichkeit Masken zu tragen und (u.a.) die Hände zu desinfizieren, ist ein Eingriff in die individuellen Freiheiten. Gemessen an den geltenden Maßnahmen, wie dem Verbot auf die Straße zu gehen, ist dieser aber weniger eingriffsintensiv und wäre daher bei gleicher Wirksamkeit aus rechtlicher Sicht zwingend stärkeren Beschränkungen vorzuziehen. (Osterpapier, p14)*
V. acceptance of and willingness to implement measures	**acceptability** of the measures	*Für die Akzeptanz und Umsetzung getroffener Maßnahmen ist eine auf Selbstschutz und Solidarität basierende intrinsische Motivation wichtiger als die Androhung von Sanktionen. Die Vermittlung eines realistischen Zeitplans und eines klaren Maßnahmenpakets zur schrittweisen Normalisierung erhöhen die Kontrollier- und Planbarkeit für alle. (Leopoldina, p11)*
	implications for **willingness to implement the measures**	*Voraussetzung für eine solche allmähliche Lockerung ist dabei, dass die Neuinfektionen sich auf niedrigem Niveau stabilisieren, das Gesundheitssystem nicht überlastet wird, Infizierte zunehmend identifiziert werden und die Schutzmaßnahmen (Hygienemaßnahmen, Mund-Nasen-Schutz, Distanzregeln) diszipliniert eingehalten werden. (Leopoldina, p13)*
VI. equity, equality and the fair distribution of benefits and burdens	implications for **health, social and economic inequalities**	*Zu befürchten ist auch, dass die Krise die in Deutschland ohnehin stark ausgeprägte soziale Ungleichheit in Bezug auf Zugänge zu Betreuung und Unterricht sowie in Bezug auf Lernleistungen und Bildungserfolge verstärkt. (Leopoldina, p22)*
	implications for affected social groups, in particular **vulnerable and disadvantaged populations**	*Bei den psychischen Folgen und gravierenden Überlastungen müssen sozioökonomische Aspekte und der Mangel an sozialer Einbettung dringend berücksichtigt werden. Zu den besonderen Risikogruppen gehören Alleinerziehende, Migrantinnen und Migranten ohne Sprachkenntnisse, alleinlebende Ältere, psychisch Erkrankte, Pflegefälle und Arbeitslose. In ärmeren und eher bildungsfernen Schichten fehlen tendenziell materielle, psychische und soziale Ressourcen. (Leopoldina, p19)*
	degree of **fair distribution of benefits and burdens** between population groups	*Ältere und vorerkrankte Menschen gehören zur Hochrisikogruppe für eine COVID-19-Erkrankung. Zwar können auch junge und gesunde Menschen durch eine Infektion schwer erkranken und versterben, aber die meisten halten sich nicht für hochgefährdet. Der Eindruck, einen hohen persönlichen „Preis" für die ältere Generation zu zahlen, kann die Bereitschaft, bei der zunehmenden Alterung der Gesellschaft für die Älteren einzustehen, untergraben und das gesellschaftliche Miteinander destablisieren. (IFO, p14)*
	accordance of the measures with the principle of equal treatment	*Die bislang ergriffenen Maßnahmen sind überwiegend eher pauschal, undifferenziert und wenig unktgenau ausgefallen. So stellt sich die Frage, ob die in diesem Papier vorgeschlagene Differenzierung nach Sektoren, Personen und Regionen womöglich eine unzulässige Ungleichbehandlung und damit einen Verstoß gegen das Gleichheitsgebot des Art. 3 Abs. 1 Grundgesetz darstellt. […] Im Kern fordert das Gleichheitsgebot des Grundgesetzes, um eine traditionsreiche rechtliche Formel zu gebrauchen: „Gleiches ist gleich, Ungleiches ist ungleich zu behandeln." Diese Maxime ist etwa der tiefere Grund für die Steuerprogression, gemäß der der Steuersatz proportional zum Einkommen ansteigt. (IFO, p27)*
	implications for the risk of **stigmatization and discrimination**	*Die großen Unterschiede zwischen Personen sind bei allen Empfehlungen zu berücksichtigen: Verallgemeinerungen über Personengruppen sind ausdrücklich zu vermeiden; solche Verallgemeinerungen sind mit der Gefahr der Stereotypenbildung und Diskriminierung verbunden. (Osterpapier, p15)*

VII. societal and environmental implications and considerations	**implications for actors and institutions of civil society, social life, and culture**	*Die Aktivitäten der Vereine – von den Sport- und Kulturvereinen über Freundes- und Fördervereine bis zu den Basisorganisationen des politischen und kirchlichen Lebens – sind größtenteils eingestellt. Große Bereiche der organisierten Zivilgesellschaft existieren aktuell lediglich in digital geknüpften Netzwerken in geschrumpfter Form. Auch im Hinblick auf die Zukunft der Zivilgesellschaft spricht daher alles für die schrittweise Lockerung der aktuellen Maßnahmen – sobald irgend möglich. (Leopoldina, p18)*
	implications for the civil society, social life, and culture	*Die aktuellen Maßnahmen zur Verlangsamung der Ansteckungen führen jedoch gleichzeitig zu einer empfindlichen Schwächung der Zivilgesellschaft. Deren Dynamik, die sich bürgerschaftlichem Engagement verdankt, Demokratie lebendig erhält und die Gemeinwohlorientierung verstärkt, findet immer auch in der Öffentlichkeit statt. Das öffentliche Leben ist jedoch durch die geltenden Einschränkungen tiefgreifend gestört und weitgehend stillgestellt. […]Auch im Hinblick auf die Zukunft der Zivilgesellschaft spricht daher alles für die schrittweise Lockerung der aktuellen Maßnahmen – sobald irgend möglich. (Leopoldina, p18)*
	implications for **social cohesion, solidarity, and the risk of social and political division**	*Schließlich können in solchen Situationen ideologische Radikalisierungen („die" sind schuld) stattfinden und Gruppengrenzen können sich verstärken. Zum Beispiel kann sich ein verschärfter Konflikt zwischen den Generationen herausbilden. Ältere und vorerkrankte Menschen gehören zur Hochrisikogruppe für eine COVID-19-Erkrankung. Zwar können auch junge und gesunde Menschen durch eine Infektion schwer erkranken und versterben, aber die meisten halten sich nicht für hochgefährdet. Der Eindruck, einen hohen persönlichen „Preis" für die ältere Generation zu zahlen, kann die Bereitschaft, bei der zunehmenden Alterung der Gesellschaft für die Älteren einzustehen, untergraben und das gesellschaftliche Miteinander destablisieren. (IFO, p14)*
	implications for **the economic situation of individuals and capability of social participation**	*Vermögensverluste treffen breite Schichten, soweit sie Ersparnisse insbesondere für die Altersversorgung gebildet haben. Viele Solo-Selbständige und kleine Familienunternehmen haben ihre Umsätze teilweise vollständig eingebüßt. Viele Betroffene haben nur geringe Rücklagen. (Leopoldina, p24)*
	implications for **education and psychosocial development**	*Das Lernen zu Hause ist für viele Kinder, Schülerinnen und Schüler weniger effektiv als das Lernen in Schulen. Mit dem „Shutdown" werden drei wesentliche Funktionen der Schule außer Kraft gesetzt: a) die auf das Lernen bezogenen Strukturierung des Alltags, b) der das Lernen unterstützende und die gesellschaftliche Teilhabe einübende soziale Austausch mit Gleichaltrigen und Lehrkräften, c) die professionelle Rückmeldung auf Lernfortschritte. Die Krise führt somit insgesamt zu einem Rückgang der Betreuungs-, Lehr- und Lernleistungen. (Leopoldina, p22)*
	implications for other **social determinants of health**	*Für obdachlose Menschen verschärft sich ihre Notlage durch die Schließung von Hilfseinrichtungen ohne dass adäquate Alternativen zur Verfügung stünden. Es trifft diejenigen, die ohnehin zu den sozial Schwächsten gehören. Gleiches gilt für Personen mit hohem Betreuungsbedarf, zum Beispiel für behinderte und chronisch kranke Menschen. Sie alle gehören nicht nur zur medizinischen sondern auch zur psychosozialen Risikogruppe im Kontext von COVID-19. (IFO, p14)*
	implications for **ecosystem, planetary boundaries,** and environmental sustainability	*Alle politischen Maßnahmen, die nicht der unmittelbaren Rettung von Unternehmen dienen, müssen sich auf nationaler wie internationaler Ebene an dem Prinzip der Nachhaltigkeit orientieren. (Leopoldina, p26)*
VIII. economic implications and consideration	**consequences** of the measures **for individual economic actors** and their economic activities	*Sektoren, in denen gut mit Homeoffice und digitalen Techniken gearbeitet werden kann, haben weniger Priorität als Sektoren, in denen das nicht geht. (IFO, p5)*

	implications for the economy including resilience and ability to recover	*Man kann davon ausgehen, dass die wirtschaftlichen Kosten in Form verlorener Wertschöpfung mit der Dauer des Shutdown nicht nur linear steigen, sondern überproportional. Mit wachsender Dauer nehmen Insolvenzen und Stellenabbau zu, wodurch die Erholung nach dem Ende des Shutdowns zunehmend belastet wird. Es liegen derzeit keine belastbaren Erkenntnisse über eine kritische Shutdown-Dauer vor, bei der es zu einem sprunghaften Anstieg der Kosten kommt (z.B. Destabilisierung des Finanzsystems) kommt. Mit wachsender Dauer steigt aber das Risiko solcher Kostensprünge. (IFO, 28)*
	implications for innovation and economic development opportunities	*Alle politischen Maßnahmen, die nicht der unmittelbaren Rettung von Unternehmen dienen, müssen sich auf nationaler wie internationaler Ebene an dem Prinzip der Nachhaltigkeit orientieren. […] Der Aufbau einer klimafreundlichen Wirtschaft und eine konsequente Mobilitäts- und Landwirtschaftswende setzen wesentliche Impulse für Innovation und Wachstum. (Leopoldina, p25)*
	implications of the measures on the retention and release of labor forces	*Umgekehrt würde eine Wiederöffnung dieser Einrichtungen positive Wirkungen hinsichtlich der psychischen und sozialen Gesundheit von Kindern und Eltern sowie der Teilhabe von aktuellen in der Kinderbetreuung gebundenen Elternteilen an Arbeitsleben und Wirtschaft erzielen. (Osterpapier, p12)*
IX. resource requirements and resource implications	**financial costs, available financial resources, and budgetary implications for different actors**	*[…] wie schnell die Kontaktbeschränkungen aufgehoben werden sollten, folgt aus den [.] Überlegungen, dass die aktuellen Beschränkungen ökonomisch zwar sehr teuer sind, aber die (langfristigen) Kosten einer zu frühzeitigen Aufhebung noch größer wären. (IMK, p8)*
	requirements of, availability of, and implications for human resources	*Es bedarf im ambulanten wie auch im stationären Bereich grundsätzlich einer ausreichenden Anzahl an Gesundheits- und Pflegekräften; diese sind ebenfalls körperlich und psychisch zu schützen (Masken, Schutzkleidung, Testung, ggf. psychologische Beratung und Unterstützung). (Osterpapier, p15)*
	requirements of, availability of, and implications for protective equipment, hygiene products and medical devices	*Ein obligatorisches Tragen von Gesichtsmasken wäre unter diesem Gesichtspunkt sinnvoll, muss aber auch Aspekte wie Ressourcenknappheit (immer vor dem Hintergrund, dass genügend Gesichtsmasken für das Betreuungspersonal in Alten- und Pflegeheime und in der häuslichen Pflege zur Verfügung stehen) […] berücksichtigen. (Osterpapier, p9)*
	requirements of, availability of, and implications for infrastructure to implement, enforce and monitor measures	*Voraussetzungen für die schrittweise Öffnung: Wenn das Gesundheitssystem mit dem Infektionsgeschehen absehbar nicht überfordert ist und die entsprechenden Voraussetzungen zum besseren Monitoring der Krise geschaffen worden sind, kann die Rückkehr in die Normalität auf den jeweiligen Feldern des gesellschaftlichen Lebens schrittweise forciert werden. (NRW-1, p6)*
	requirements of, availability of, and implications for further resources and infrastructures	*Für den Bereich der Schulen und Kitas sollte – soweit möglich – durch Separation und Kohortierung bestimmter Gruppen zumindest ein teilweiser Betrieb wieder aufgenommen werden […]. Soweit dem Wiederhochfahren der Schulen und Kinderbetreuung mangelnde Infrastruktur (wie knappe sanitäre Einrichtungen, die die Separierung verhindern) im Wege stehen, sollten schnell und unbürokratisch Provisorien geschaffen werden. (IMK, p10)*
X. feasibility and implementation considerations	**political feasibility and legal conformity**	*Angewandt auf die Frage, ob Teile des Einzelhandels, wie z. B. Bücher-, Blumen oder Modegeschäfte, wieder geöffnet werden können, zeigt sich ein komplexes aber generell positives Bild. […] Insbesondere ist auf die besonderen Bedürfnisse von Personen mit hohem gesundheitlichem Risiko (z. B. gesonderte Einkaufszeiten für Personen mit Risikoprofil) und ausreichende sozialrechtliche und den Arbeitsschutz betreffende Maßnahmen zum Schutz von im Einzelhandel tätigen Personen mit besonderem Risikoprofil zu achten. (Osterpapier, p12)*

	practical and technical feasibility	*Wie gut lassen sich im jeweiligen Bereich Schutzmaßnahmen umsetzen? Können z.B. bei der Arbeit Abstände eingehalten und/oder Schutzkleidung getragen werden? (NRW-1, p8)*
	flexibility in implementation, extension, adjustment and withdrawal of measures	*Die von Expert*innen vorgeschlagene „risikoadaptierte Strategie“ erfordert weiterhin eine schlanke, maßgeschneiderte Governance und maximale Flexibilität der handelnden Personen. Umstiegsszenarien (flexibles Reagieren auf erneuten Anstieg des Infektionsgeschehens) müssen aus verschiedensten Blickwinkeln kontinuierlich auf ihre Umsetzbarkeit hin eingeschätzt werden. (Gruene, p4)*
	possibility of evaluation and adequate reaction to new information	*Voraussetzungen für die schrittweise Öffnung: Wenn das Gesundheitssystem mit dem Infektionsgeschehen absehbar nicht überfordert ist und die entsprechenden Voraussetzungen zum besseren Monitoring der Krise geschaffen worden sind, kann die Rückkehr in die Normalität auf den jeweiligen Feldern des gesellschaftlichen Lebens schrittweise forciert werden. (NRW-1, p6)*
XI. interaction with and implications for the health system	**interaction with other measures to control and contain the sars-cov-2 pandemic**	*Insbesondere beim Tracking und dem Nachverfolgen von Infektionsketten sollte besonders die EU-Perspektive mitbedacht und vorangetrieben werden. Wichtig ist hier, die nationalen Systeme kompatibel zueinander zu halten, um möglichst bald wieder den möglichst ungehinderten Grenzverkehr von Arbeitskräften zu ermöglichen, ohne neue, unentdeckte Infektionsketten zu riskieren. (IMK, p9)*
	interaction with components of the health care system	*Die Funktionsfähigkeit und Leistungsfähigkeit der öffentlichen Verwaltung muss uneingeschränkt sichergestellt sein, um Verzögerungen zu vermeiden (z.B. in den Planungsbehörden, Grundbuchämtern, Umweltbehörden, KfZ-Zulassungsstellen). Auch sollte die Verwaltung so weit wie möglich auf unbürokratische Verfahren setzen, um das wirtschaftliche Erstarken so einfach wie möglich zu machen. (NRW-1, p11)*
	implications for the **capability** and willingness **to develop alternative**, local **solutions**	*Improvisieren und kreative Lösungen führen zu Mikro-Strategien, die lokal die Verbreitungsrate des Virus verringern können und damit eine schrittweise Öffnung ermöglichen. Familien nähen sich eigene Gesichtsmasken. Das Kleingewerbe macht sich von sich aus Gedanken darüber, wie es unter den fortbestehenden Notwendigkeiten des Infektionsschutzes seine Tätigkeit wiederaufnehmen kann. Betriebe bieten ihren Mitarbeiterinnen Covid-19 Tests an. Das Hotel- und Gaststättengewerbe entwickelt ein Konzept für „Safe Spaces“, welche die Menschen wieder einladen, sich zu treffen und sich zu vergnügen. Fitnessstudios und Sportstätten entwerfen Nutzungspläne, die Abstände und Dauer für die Nutzung der Einrichtungen regeln. Private und öffentliche Verwaltungen machen Vorschläge für Wechsel von Home Office- und Präsenzphasen. Das verarbeitende Gewerbe arbeitet an neuen Kombinationen von Herstellung, Auslieferung und Verkauf. (Osterpapier, p4)*