



## ORIGINAL PAPER

# EU Institutional Resilience and Population Protection during COVID-19: Explaining the Social Impact of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241

Anca Parmena Olimid<sup>1)</sup>, Daniel Alin Olimid<sup>2)</sup>

### Abstract:

The aim of the study is to explore the general provisions and policy areas of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 for the establishment and implementation of the “Recovery and Resilience Facility” (RRF) and to explain why the horizontal principles and the recovery instruments make such a difference for the European Union (EU) recovery plans. The research of the nexus between the policy coordination, the resilience facilities and the population protection outcomes is mapped by designing on a legal and social account of: (1) the shared programmes and resources; (2) the harmonious implementation of the EU policies (EU p) in the context of the COVID-19 crisis; (3) the stipulation of the principle of additionality concerning the EU funding areas; (4) the goals of the intervention fields in accordance with the Annex VI of the RRF: the social policies, the social integration of the vulnerable groups of the population, the social inclusion, the employment policies, the economic policies, the digital transition, the territorial cohesion, the green transition by pointing: biodiversity and climate measures. The paper concludes with a discussion of the “institutional resilience” and the “resilience dialogue” by outlining the need for a coordinated response of the Member States (MS) to reinforce the link between EU policy areas and the economic governance.

**Keywords:** *EU; social impact; population, resilience facilities, pandemic context.*

---

<sup>1)</sup> Associate Professor, Ph.D., Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Craiova, Romania, Email: [anca.olimid@edu.ucv.ro](mailto:anca.olimid@edu.ucv.ro).

<sup>2)</sup> Lecturer, Ph.D., Biology Specialization, University of Craiova, Romania, Email: [daniel.olimid@edu.ucv.ro](mailto:daniel.olimid@edu.ucv.ro).

## Introduction

The research is structured as follows: the introduction; the literature review on: “resilience”, “resilient institutions”, “crisis management” and “urban resilience”; methodology; the definitions and criteria; the shared programmes and resources; the harmonious implementation of the European Union policies (EUp) in the context of the COVID-19 crisis; the stipulation of the principle of additionality concerning the European Union (EU) funding areas, “the recovery and resilience plan” (RRP) goals of the intervention fields in accordance with the Annex VI of the “Recovery and Resilience Facility” (RRF). This research presents strong evidence of the EU efforts and assistance provided by the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 (2021) that enables the policy coordination and the reform strategies within the context of the RRF. The research further points: (1) the principles of interoperability [Recital 12 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (2) the horizontal principles [Article 5(1) and Article 5(2) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (3) the principles of the “budgetary management” [Recital 18 Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

## Literature review: “resilience”, “resilient institutions”, “crisis management”, “community resilience” and “urban resilience”

Studies in the “institutional resilience” have examined and discussed the conceptual and the operational-level of the resilience capabilities and strategies by linking the multi-level concepts, the organizational level, the types of institutional environment, the methodological studies on systemic review by approaching: (1) the phases of the crisis management, the categories of resilient institutions and the factors influencing the institutional resilience (Hills, 2000: 109-118); (2) the influence and the role of the causal effects and the institutional engagements (Olimid & Olimid, 2016: 35-47; Olimid, Rogozea & Olimid, 2018, 631-636; Olimid, Olimid & Chen, 2018: 1305-1310; Georgescu, 2018: 196-209; Olimid & Georgescu, 2017: 42-56); (3) the organizational resilience, the construct development and “the resilience-related capabilities” (Hillmann & Guenther, 2021: 7-44); (4) the definitions of resilience and the types of capitals: human, social and natural capital (Irfanullah, 2021: 57-63); (5) the institutional resilience, the organizational activities and the role of “extreme operating environments” (Barin Cruz, Aguilar Delgado, Leca & Gond, 2016: 970-1016); (6) the role of the social institutions and the management of conflict (Aall & Crocker, 2019: 68-75); (7) the typology of the organizational resilience, the resilience resources, the resilient response, the resilient behavior and the “occupational resilience” (Brown: 2021, 103-105); (8) the conceptual approaches to “business resilience” and “community resilience” (Adekola & Clelland, 2020: 50-60). Steen and Morsut argue that the resilience management associates two other concepts in the local governance: the “crisis management” as well as the “learning and coordination challenges” (Steen & Morsut, 2020: 35-60). Bretos, Bouchard and Zevi contribute to the conceptual framework of the “institutional resilience” and organizational trajectories by investigating the ongoing researches on the organizational factors, the organizational categories, the social innovation, the collective action and the social commitments (Bretos, Bouchard & Zevi, 2020: 351-357).

By exploring the “urban resilience” and the role of governance, Therrien, Usher and Matyas individualize the role of the “supportive governance”, the management risk and the consequences of the “resilience actions” (Therrien, Usher & Matyas, 2020: 83-102). A systematic review of the organizational resilience, the resilience practices and the role of information is investigated by Cotta and Salvador (Cotta & Salvador, 2020:

1531-1559). The authors identify the factors of the organizational resilience, the determinants of behavior and the “individual information” (Cotta & Salvador, 2020: 1531-1559). Furthermore, Duchek shows the necessity to investigate the three levels of the resilience stages namely: “anticipation, coping and adaption” by highlighting new conceptualizations and definitions of the resilience processes, capabilities and “anticipation capabilities” (Duchek, 2020: 215-246). In this direction, Duchek is motivated to develop and share the role of the implementing actions, capabilities and the organizational change by focusing the interactions between: (i) the potential risks and the realized organizational resilience; (ii) the cognitive and behavior insights and the conceptualization of resources or social factors and (iii) the resilience stages and the resources availability (Duchek, 2020: 215-246). Moreover, Kim investigates the links between the organizational resilience, the internal communication outcomes and the effects on productivity (Kim, 2020: 47-75). Therefore, Kim extends the area of research of the “organizational resilience” from the attributes of the resilient systems to the factors by focusing the “normal functioning” after a crisis situation (Kim, 2020: 47-75).

### Methodology

Furthermore, the methodology part of the research presents how we apply the legal analysis for the case of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 by setting four questions: (Q1) How are described and implemented the shared programmes and resources within the Regulation (EU) 2021/241? (Q2) How is supported the harmonious implementation of the Eup in the context of the COVID-19 crisis? (Q3) How is stipulated the principle of additionality concerning the EU funding areas? (Q4) Which are the main goals of the intervention fields in accordance with the Annex VI of the RRF? Moreover, we use a three options approach to advance our understanding on the: (1) the population protection, namely, “the living standards” of the EU citizens [Recital 4 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (2) the social protection, namely the protection of the “vulnerable groups” citizens [Recital 4 and Recital 14 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (3) the social impact of the COVID-19 pandemic context [Recital 39 and Article 18(4)(c) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. To do this, we propose and research a process framework in accordance with the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 that is based on: (1) the concepts, the criteria and the harmonious implementation of the EUp in the context of the COVID-19 crisis; (2) the contextual approaches that are: (i) mapping and conceptualizing the human capital and the social protection approaches; (ii) addressing the shared programmes and the use of resources, the “institutional resilience” and the “resilience dialogue”; (iii) the stipulation of the principle of additionality and the policy coordination and Goals of the intervention fields in accordance with the Annex VI of the RRF.

Using EUR-lex legislative metadata base, we identified the main legal framework governing the institutional resilience during COVID-19: (1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241; (2) Regulation (EU) 2020/852 (2020); (3) Council Regulation (EU) 2020/2094 (2020); (4) Regulation (EU) 2018/1999 (2018); (5) Regulation (EU) No 472/2013 (2013) and (6) Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011 (2011). However, these EU legal provisions reflect both social and economic needs, the use of resources, the major policy trends and the legislative measures and instruments. Furthermore, the provisions of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 are researched by grouping the following four categories: (i) the concepts and purposes [Article 2 and Article 3 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (ii) the financial support for the Member States (MS) [Recital 8, Recital 17, Recital 18, Recital 30, Recital 37, Recital 46, Recital 5 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (iii)

the requirements for the MS [Recital 63, Recital 64, Article 7, Article 17 and Article 29 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (iv) the promotion of the “harmonious development” and “monitoring and evaluation” [Recital 63, Recital 64, Article 7, Article 17 and Article 29 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (v) the measures and initiatives within the economic governance [Recital 29 and Article 10 Regulation (EU) 2021/241];

### **Definitions and criteria of the RRF**

This study aims to evaluate the social impact of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241, advancing knowledge and analysis of the definitions detailed in Article 2. Moreover, Article 2 focuses the definitions of: the “Union funds”, the “financial contribution”, the “European Semester”, the “milestone and targets”, the “resilience”, the relationship between plans, measures and the “quantitative achievements” [Article 2(1)(2)(3)(4)(5) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Furthermore, Article 2(5) defines “resilience” as “the ability to face” the mixed “economic and social” outcomes by advancing new perspectives of the structural approaches [Article 2(5) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. The legal dispositions of the Article 2 also focus the EU financial plan, the qualitative determinants, the structural necessities and the economic approaches of the RRF. Nevertheless, Article 2(2)(4) clarifies the relationship between reforms and investments by considering the roles of measures and “the allocation” provided for a MS.

The framework of the Chapter I also addresses the understanding of the means and objectives of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 by identifying the funding forms and the funding rules [Article 1 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. The effectiveness of the RRF is also enhanced by highlighting a multi-level approach to the: (i) the crisis response management and capacity [Recital 10 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (ii) the “crisis preparedness” [Recital 15 Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and (iii) the “asymmetrical effects” at the level of the MS [Recital 6 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. In the context of the RRF, the “qualitative” approaches to the RRP [Article 18(4)(e) Regulation (EU) 2021/241] individualize different levels, namely: the biodiversity and the green transition, the climate settings and the support for the “implementation of reforms and investment projects” [Article 18(4)(d) Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

Our findings highlight also how the criteria of the RRF, namely: “relevance”, “effectiveness”, “efficiency” and “coherence” [Recital 41 and Article 18(3) Regulation (EU) 2021/241] have an impact on the EU response within the RRP. Therefore, we shall examine the effects in the context of RRP, using the legal analysis and the case description of the RRP. In this context, we will also explore the conceptual approach to the principle of “do no significant harm” [Article 2(6) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Moreover, following the definitions and scope asking MS to promote the six pillars [Article 3 and Article 4 Regulation (EU) 2021/241], article 17 further considers the legal framework to prepare the “national recovery and resilience plans” [Article 17(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Thus, this provision provides two types of measures in accordance with the RRF principles and measures: (i) the establishment of the “reform and investment agenda” at the MS level [Article 17(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (ii) the establishment of “a comprehensive and coherent package” [Article 17(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. While the Article 22 addresses the issue of the EU financial interests, Article 24 focuses on: (i) the payments and the financial contributions [Article 24(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (ii) the loans provided to the MS [Article 14(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (iii) the legal provisions for the MS in accordance with the timetable and indicators stipulated in Article 20(6) and Article 24(2)(3) of the Regulation (EU)

2021/241]; (iv) the legal conditions for the “positive preliminary assessment” provided by the Commission [Article 17(4)(5)(6) Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

### **Mapping and conceptualizing human capital and social protection approaches**

The RRF also highlights how the MS organize and implement the “reform and investment agenda” [Article 17(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Based on a multi-level research of the RRP, the RRF presents the eligibility measures and design for the MS by addressing the national challenges, the reform priorities and the EUp settings by considering the policy and the legislation at the EU and MS level, namely: (1) Regulation (EU) 2020/852 (2020) on the framework of the sustainable investment; (2) Council Regulation (EU) 2020/2094 (2020) on the EU response within the COVID-19 crisis and the facility of recovery measures and instruments; (3) Regulation (EU) 2018/1999 (2018) on the EU governance in the field of energy; (4) Regulation (EU) No 472/2013 (2013) on the EU measures for euro zone; (5) Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011 (2011) for the area of “macroeconomic imbalances”.

The case study also investigates the determinants of the EUp in the field of the coordination and implementation of the measures and actions stipulated by the European Pillar of Social Rights Action Plan (EPSRAP) (2021), here including: the human capital, the population consultation, the “citizens’ prosperity” and the “innovative workforce” (EPSRAP, 2021: 9). This encompasses the following issues: (i) the policy decision in the field of the social protection (EPSRAP, 2021: 5); (ii) fostering social responsibility (EPSRAP, 2021: 16); (iii) establishing a “social rulebook” (EPSRAP, 2021: 6) and targeting inequality and the living conditions (EPSRAP, 2021: 18). Moreover, the RRF considers the notions of the: “social justice”, “social protection” and “living standards” under the new EPSRAP framework (EPSRAP, 2021) by showing how the EU coordinated response is displayed within the reform actions and programmes.

These legal and social perspectives of the European Pillar of Social Rights (EPSR) are addressed more explicitly by using a multi-level approach of the: EUp coordination, the implementation of measures, the reform at the national level, the monitoring of the reform priorities, the protection of the vulnerable categories of the EU population and the focus on the living standards of the EU population [Recital 4 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. The human capital and the EU population protection, as integral aspects of the intervention field, are focused by the Annex VII [Annex VII Regulation (EU) 2021/241] by enabling the role of the EPSR and the institutional resilience of the MS during COVID-19. Therefore, this study aims to examine the role of the RRF to provide assistance and financial support to MS, here including: (1) the innovative measures, tools and actions to sustainable growth [Recital 7, Recital 11, Recital 23 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (2) the focus on the green transition and the biodiversity measures [Recital 23, Recital 24, Recital 39, Article 18(4)(e), Article 19(3) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (3) the social cohesion based on the EUp focusing the “next generation, children and the youth” [Recital 10 Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

### **Shared programmes and use of resources: “institutional resilience” and “resilience dialogue”**

Following the introduction of the general provisions and policy areas, we focus the economic policies, the coordination and the implementation of the common objectives of the EUp, namely: (1) “the resilience economies” [Recital 6 Regulation

(EU) 2021/241]; (2) “the institutional resilience” [Recital 10 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (3) the “economic, social and institutional resilience” [Recital 15 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (4) the “recovery and resilience plans” (RRP) [Chapter III Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (5) the “resilience measures” [Recital 19 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (6) the “resilience dialogue” [Recital 61 and Article 26 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (7) the “recovery and resilience scoreboard” [Article 30 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. In this context, the research design we make is threefold. First, we focus the outcome results by using the multi-dimensional analysis and the observation of the legal provisions in the field of the financial contributions and the “institutional provisions”. Second, we observe the differences in the establishment of the RRF and how the plans are displayed by exploring how the reforms and investments are concentrated. Third, we investigate the “digital targets” [Recital 27 Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and the “environmental standards and priorities” [Recital 32 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. The outcome evaluation of the RRF is presented using the analysis and the observation of the legal provisions in the field of the financial contributions [Chapter II Regulation (EU) 2021/241], the RRP [Chapter III Regulation (EU) 2021/241], the financial provisions [Chapter IV Regulation (EU) 2021/241], the institutional provisions [Chapter V Regulation (EU) 2021/241], the reporting procedure provided by the MS [Chapter VI Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and the activities of monitoring and coordination [Chapter VII Regulation (EU) 2021/24]. In this context, the paper also engages an in-depth analysis of the relevance of the concept of “resilience” by investigating: (1) the definition of the concept [Article 2(6) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (2) the resilience plans and measures [Recitals 6-70 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (3) the patterns of the resilience plans [Chapter III, Articles 17-21 Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

Moreover, the differences in the establishment of the recovery plans and facilities are displayed by providing: (1) the “sustainable reforms” [Recital 8 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (2) the “public investments” [Recitals 8, 17, 32, Article 17(1), Article 19(3)(k) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (3) the “digital targets” [Recital 27 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (4) the “environmental standards and priorities” [Recital 32 Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and (5) the national legal provisions [Recitals 34 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Furthermore, Article 7 concentrates on showing the conditions of the resources provided and more recently on exploring the implementation of these resources in accordance with the financial settings “used exclusively” for a MS [Article 7(1)(2) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. In this direction, the research identifies a major topic of the RRP within the Regulation (EU) 2021/240, namely: the budget [Article 6 Regulation (EU) 2021/240] (2021). A second focus is identified for the “additional technical support” as an orientation towards fostering the benefits for the MS. Moreover, a set of practices constituting the measures and resources regulated by the Regulation (EU) 2020/2094 is presented and explained under the RRF by stipulating: the activities, the objectives, the priorities, the expenses, the management of the RRF, the evaluation, control and monitoring activities and the legal settings on reforms and investments [Article 6(2) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Therefore, the current study then argues the harmonious implementation of the EU<sub>p</sub> by drawing out some implications and measures for how the “social circumstances” [Recitals 15, 17, 39, 42 and Article 3(e) Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and the “social and institutional resilience” progress [Recital 10, Recital 15 and Recital 17 Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and how the “social exclusion” [Article 10(4) Regulation (EU) 2021/241] impacts the economy of a MS [Recital 28 Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

**Harmonious implementation of the EUp in the context of the COVID-19 crisis**

With regard the harmonious implementation of the EUp, we identify four categories of EUp and initiatives under the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 in the context of the COVID-19 crisis: (i) the implementation of the EPSR [Article 4(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Moreover, the monitoring of the “implementation” as a conceptual notion is used to highlight other specific topics namely: the “progress of the implementation” [Recital 66 Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and “the implementation of the activities” [Article 29(2) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (ii) as an empirical item associated with the research and evaluation of the “reform priorities” [Recital 4 Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and the “implementation of reforms” [Article 6(2) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (iii) as a conceptual notion associated to the implementation of the EUp, here including: the harmonious implementation of the EUp [Recital 3 Regulation (EU) 2021/241], the patterns and the “methods of implementation” [Recital 18 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. In accordance with the legal provisions of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 [Recital 23], the RRF associates the benefits for MS and for the EU, which provides experience and tools to detect “the adverse effects” of the COVID-19 crisis [Recital 8 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. This may generate social and financial implications, for example for the mechanisms of public investments associated with other schemas of support aimed to provide “the strategic autonomy” of the EU [Recital 9 and Article 4(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Several articles of the Regulation refer to the converge criteria at the EU level. In addition, Recital 6 stipulates the negative effects of “shocks” between the MS or at EU level [Recital 6 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. So, Recital 39 requires RRF to establish the measures for its implementation and evaluation of the social impact in accordance with the principles of the EPSR [Recital 39 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. In accordance with the legal provisions of the Article 4, the RRF requires MS to endeavor: (i) to promote and improves the resilience framework [Article 4(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (ii) to establish measures to contribute to growth and digital transition [Article 4(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (iii) to adopt new initiatives for the “economic and social convergence” [Article 4(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (iv) to enable the “strategic autonomy” and the “open economy” [Article 4(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (v) to take into account the targets for reforms and “transparent cooperation” [Article 4(2) Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

**Stipulation of the principle of additionality and EUp coordination**

The principle of additionality is reflected by the Article 5 in accordance with other principles such as: the principle of “do no significant harm” [Article 5(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Furthermore, drawing on horizontal principles, the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 uses the notion of “support” to show how the RRF is engaging the measures which relies on the acknowledgment and the respect of the horizontal principles. Therefore, Article 9 specifies the additional support provided by EU programmes and actions. The Regulation (EU) 2021/241 therefore develops a multi-level perspective of the RRF implementation and funding, namely: (i) the measures aimed to connect the RRF and the economic governance [Recital 29 and Article 10 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (ii) the proposals to suspension of payments [Article 10(2) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (iii) the financial contribution and the allocation governance [Article 12 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (iv) the pre-financing procedure [Article 13

Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (v) the loans provided to the MS for the implementation of the RRF [Article 14 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (vi) the loans agreement with the MS [Article 16 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. The detailed description of the RRP is developed within the Articles 17-21 and it includes the EU Commission assessment by pointing the relevance and promotion of the EUp in the fields of: (i) the implementation of the EPSR [Article 19(3)(c) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (ii) the EUp “for children and the youth” [Article 19(3)(c) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (iii) the “economic, social and territorial cohesion and convergence” [Article 19(3)(c) Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

The results of the analysis of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 focus also the principle of transparency and the effectiveness outcomes of the RRP at different levels of the organization, the implementation, the establishment and the assessment [Recital 42, Recital 60, Article 4(2), Article 25, Article 26(1) and Annex V(1) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Therefore, the requirements for the growth approach, the employment sector, and the multi-level resilience help to determine the specific recommendations for a MS, by identifying the important factors influencing this relationship, namely: (i) the implementation of the EPSR [Recital 42 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]; (ii) the approach to digital transition [Recital 42, Recital 48, Article 18(4)(f) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. In this context, the principle of interoperability broadens the understanding of the initiatives, reforms, actions and investments in green technologies [Recital 11 Regulation (EU) 2021/241], here including: the biodiversity and environmental measures and plans [Recital 23, Recital 24, Recital 39 Article 18(4)(e) Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

Reflecting on the principles of social dialogue, the legal provisions develop a common framework to address: the social protection, the integration of the vulnerable population and the performance of the health and care standards, priorities and systems. Moreover, the Regulation advances the importance of the “economic, social and territorial cohesion” by synthesizing four approaches in order to: (1) to guarantee the convergence of the EUp; (2) to provide support for the coordination for the EUp at the regional level; (3) to improve support for the social structures and the social dialogue; (4) to strengthen the social protection and the social rights. Drawing on the “additional reforms”, the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 stipulates the relations between the financial needs and the investment sector [Recital 48, Article 14(3)(a), Article 15(1)(b), Article 19(4), Article 20 Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Moreover, the Regulation addresses the “harmonious development”, the competitiveness and the “quality employment” by considering the sustainable growth approach and the focus on the EUp coordination, the regional particularities and the levels of development.

### **Goals of the intervention fields in accordance with the Annex VI of the RRF**

The broad context of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 also includes the: the assessment measures and criteria for the RRF [Annex V Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and the categories for the intervention fields [Annex VII Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Moreover, the Annex VII details the intervention field and the category of the intervention, here including: the human capital, the digital public services and the digitalization of the following sectors: healthcare, education, transport etc. Furthermore, the Regulation proposes the “assessment guidelines” in order to establish the financial contribution, the scope and the objectives proposed. Moreover, the “assessment guidelines” focuses: (i) the “assessment process” of the initiative for the RRP launched by the MS [Annex V point 1(a) Regulation (EU) 2021/241] and (ii) the “assessment



criteria” and the “rating system” in accordance with the principles of transparency Annex V point 1(b) Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. To address the fields of intervention, the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 illustrates five directions by focusing: connectivity, digitalization, digital inclusion, digital technologies and the “socio-economic integration of young people” [Annex VII Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. These intervention fields are to be pursued through a range of actions, measures and initiatives outlining the following sectors: the “industrial research”, the “socio-economic drivers”, the “experimental development”, the “smart specialisations”, e-government, e-services, e-Care, e-Health, e-Commerce, e-Business [Annex VII Regulation (EU) 2021/241]. Annex VII of the Regulation also illustrates the “coefficient for the calculation of support to digital transition” ranging from 40% to 100%. Under the Annex VII, the fields of intervention enable coordinated activities and measures by requiring the establishment of the “territorial coverage”, the “adaptability of enterprises” and the “integration of digital technologies” [Annex VII Regulation (EU) 2021/241].

### Conclusions

We conclude the study on the institutional resilience and the population protection within the framework of the Regulation (EU) 2021/241 and related EU documents by pointing: the field of the recovery measures and mechanisms, the need for a harmonious implementation of the EUP and a common agenda focusing the “resilience dialogue”. To conclude, the research highlighted the implementation of the EUP by focusing the support for the social structures and the social dialogue. In doing so, it was our focus to investigate how the social protection and social rights have been approached and how the implications of the EU policy coordination are developed within the RRF.

### References:

- Aall, P. & Crocker, C.A. (2019). Building Resilience and Social Cohesion in Conflict. *Glob Policy*, 10(S2), 68-75. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12681>.
- Adekola, J. & Clelland, D. (2020). Two sides of the same coin: Business resilience and community resilience. *J Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 28, 50–60. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12275>.
- Barin Cruz, L., Aguilar Delgado, N., Leca, B. & Gond, J.-P. (2016). Institutional Resilience in Extreme Operating Environments: The Role of Institutional Work. *Business & Society*, 55(7), 970-1016. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650314567438>.
- Bretos, I., Bouchard, M.J. & Zevi, A. (2020). Institutional and organizational trajectories in social economy enterprises: Resilience, transformation and regeneration. *Ann Public Coop Econ*, 91, 351-357. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/apce.12279>.
- Brown, T. (2021). The response to COVID-19: Occupational resilience and the resilience of daily occupations in action. *Aust Occup Ther J*, 68, 103-105. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1440-1630.12721>
- Cotta, D. & Salvador, F. (2020). Exploring the antecedents of organizational resilience practices – A transactive memory systems approach. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 40(9), 1531-1559. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOPM-12-2019-0827>.
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: a capability-based conceptualization. *Bus Res*, 13, 215-246. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>.

- European Pillar of Social Rights Action Plan (2021). Retrieved from: [https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/european-pillar-social-rights-action-plan\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/european-pillar-social-rights-action-plan_en).
- Georgescu, C. M. (2018). The Postmodernity of European Integration: Affirming EU Core Values, Identities and Principles in the Mass Media. *Postmodern Openings*, 9(2), 196-209. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/28>.
- Hills, A. (2000). Revisiting Institutional Resilience as a Tool in Crisis Management. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 8, 109-118. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.00130>.
- Hillmann, J. & Guenther, E. (2021). Organizational Resilience: A Valuable Construct for Management Research?. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 23, 7-44. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12239>
- Irfanullah, H. M. (2021). So, what does resilience mean for scholarly publishing? *Learned Publishing*, 34(1), 57-63. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1351>.
- Kim, Y. (2020). Organizational resilience and employee work-role performance after a crisis situation: exploring the effects of organizational resilience on internal crisis communication. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 32:1-2, 47-75. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2020.1765368>.
- Olimid, A. P. & Olimid, D. A. (2016). Accuracy of Health, Population and Development Counting Vectors: Evidences from the UN Resolutions Markings and Policies (2012-2016). *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques*, (52), 35-47. Retrieved from: [https://cis01.ucv.ro/revistadestiintepolitice/files/numarul52\\_2016/4.pdf](https://cis01.ucv.ro/revistadestiintepolitice/files/numarul52_2016/4.pdf)
- Olimid, A. P. & Georgescu, C. M. (2017). Social Agenda and Civic Participation within the European Union Multilevel Governance: A Content Analysis of the EU Legal Documentation (2016). *Revista de Științe Politice. Revue des Sciences Politiques*, 55, 42-56. Retrieved from: [https://cis01.ucv.ro/revistadestiintepolitice/files/numarul55\\_2017/RSP%2055.pdf#page=42](https://cis01.ucv.ro/revistadestiintepolitice/files/numarul55_2017/RSP%2055.pdf#page=42)
- Olimid, A. P., Rogozea, L. M. & Olimid, D. A. (2018). Ethical approach to the genetic, biometric and health data protection and processing in the new EU General Data Protection Regulation (2018). *Rom J Morphol Embryol* 2018, 59(2), 631-636. Retrieved from: <https://rjme.ro/RJME/resources/files/590218631636.pdf>.
- Olimid, D. A., Olimid, A. P. & Chen, F. I. (2018). Ethical governance of the medical research: clinical investigation and informed consent under the new EU Medical Devices Regulation (2017/745). *Rom J Morphol Embryol*, 59(4), 1305-1310. Retrieved from: <https://rjme.ro/RJME/resources/files/59041813051310.pdf>.
- Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 November 2011 on the prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances. *OJ L 306*, 23.11.2011, 25-32. Retrieved from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A32011R1176>.
- Regulation (EU) No 472/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2013 on the strengthening of economic and budgetary surveillance of Member States in the euro area experiencing or threatened with serious difficulties with respect to their financial stability. *OJ L 140*, 27.5.2013, 1-10. Retrieved from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX%3A32013R0472>.
- Regulation (EU) 2018/1999 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2018 on the Governance of the Energy Union and Climate Action, amending Regulations (EC) No 663/2009 and (EC) No 715/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council, Directives 94/22/EC, 98/70/EC, 2009/31/EC, 2009/73/EC, 2010/31/EU, 2012/27/EU and 2013/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council, Council Directives 2009/119/EC and (EU) 2015/652 and repealing

## EU Institutional Resilience and Population Protection during COVID-19: Explaining...

- Regulation (EU) No 525/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council. *OJ L* 328, 21.12.2018, 1-77. Retrieved from: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3AOJ.L\\_.2018.328.01.0001.01.ENG](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3AOJ.L_.2018.328.01.0001.01.ENG).
- Regulation (EU) 2020/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2020 on the establishment of a framework to facilitate sustainable investment, and amending Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 (Text with EEA relevance) PE/20/2020/INIT. *OJ L* 198, 22.6.2020, 13-43. Retrieved from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:32020R0852>.
- Council Regulation (EU) 2020/2094 of 14 December 2020 establishing a European Union Recovery Instrument to support the recovery in the aftermath of the COVID-19 crisis. *OJ L* 433I, 22.12.2020, 23-27. Retrieved from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32020R2094>
- Regulation (EU) 2021/240 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 10 February 2021 establishing a Technical Support Instrument. *OJ L* 57, 18.2.2021, 1-16. Retrieved from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2021/240>.
- Regulation (EU) 2021/241 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 February 2021 establishing the Recovery and Resilience Facility. *OJ L* 57, 18.2.2021, 17-75. Retrieved from: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32021R0241>.
- Steen, R. & Morsut, C. (2020). Resilience in Crisis Management at the Municipal Level: The Synne Storm in Norway. *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*, 11(1), 35-60. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1002/rhc3.12178>.
- Therrien, M-C, Ushaer, S. & Matyas, D. (2020). Enabling strategies and impeding factors to urban resilience implementation: A scoping review. *J Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 28(1), 83-102. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12283>.

---

### Article Info

*Received:* March 25 2021

*Accepted:* April 04 2021

---