



Sustaining Working Group  
 Notes from MS Teams call on 26 August 2020  
Microsoft Teams

|  |        |
|--|--------|
| <p><b>1. INTRODUCTIONS</b></p> <p><i>a. Jean-Frederic Levesque, Agency for Clinical Innovation – New South Wales, Australia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Jean-Frederic introduced himself and the group welcomed him – he will be replacing Kim on the working group</i></li> </ul>   | 5 min  |
| <p><b>2. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS</b></p> <p><i>a. Review notes and action items from August 12<sup>th</sup> meeting (see attachment 2)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Notes and action items were reviewed and discussed</i></li> </ul>   | 5 min  |
| <p><b>3. COVID-END LOGIC MODEL</b></p> <p><i>a. Logic model updates</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Heather has sent the logic model back to designer with suggestions based on the feedback from the working group and will update the group when she hears back</i></li> </ul>   | 10 min |
| <p><b>4. COVID-END BASELINE PROJECT</b></p> <p><i>a. Updates</i></p> <p><i>b. Operationalization (see attachments 3 and 4)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Website scan is complete</i></li> <li>• <i>Next step is verification of scan with partners</i></li> <li>• <i>Section 2 on collaborators – will be time consuming and will be repeated in survey and Amena suggested skipping the verification of this section</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>The group agreed with this approach</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Section 3 on COVID-19, there are some interesting findings that can shape the interview</i></li> <li>• <i>Timeline update: Hoping that IRB approval later this week; send email to verify website scan at the end of this week; survey to go live next week; followed by interviews</i></li> <li>• <i>Need to be aware of the COVID-19 outbreak situation and the progress of the pandemic of each country and be mindful and flexible with ability to respond</i></li> <li>• <i>Also need to be mindful that outbreak numbers may not directly map to the amount of activity that COVID-END partners are engaged with (as has been the case in Australia)</i></li> </ul> | 15 min |

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| <p><i>c. Planning for follow-up study</i></p>  |                      |
| <p><b>5. IDENTIFYING NEXT PRIORITIES FROM TERMS OF REFERENCE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>i. Retrospectively study how well the systems and methods of the pre-existing evidence ecosystem responded to the ‘stress test’ presented by COVID-19 (how effective and efficient were these and how could these be developed and strengthened?)</i></li> <li><i>ii. Prospectively study how the evidence synthesis community’s newly developed systems and methods (including COVID-END as a time-limited network) are being put in place and will contribute to the evidence ecosystem’s ability to respond to any future pandemics</i></li> <li><b>iii. Propose ways to ‘mainstream’ and enable sustainability over time of emergent systems and methods within existing institutions and processes</b></li> <li><i>iv. Use this opportunity of heightened public awareness to build a more fit-for-purpose evidence ecosystem</i></li> <li><b>v. Liaise with funders to explore how to best position COVID-END as a ‘case’ that demonstrates the value of a more joined-up, collaborative evidence ecosystem and what evidence they would find valuable to help make the case for investment</b></li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Safa provided an update from secretariat and said they are still working on how to proceed with access to the other working groups</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The group had a general and far reaching discussion about the terms of reference but also thinking about what is needed more generally in an evidence ecosystem; points included:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• If we want to achieve a more comprehensive approach to synthesis activities, we may need to extend the network and considering who are the influential actors to those who have not traditionally been involved in COVID-END and the evidence synthesis scientists and instead, extend out to the knowledge translation communities and those closer to the end-users</i></li> <li><i>• We will need some time to integrate the learning of the baseline project and understanding of the ecosystem dynamics of COVID-END and how we can facilitate the update of this understanding – part of change management scheme</i></li> <li><i>• We have the evidence synthesis researcher community and the practitioners - both are key but we are currently heavily weighted to the evidence synthesis research community</i></li> <li><i>• Will this project identify the nodes of activity and the next layer of groups (currently not linking through COVID-END) that we rely on to do the translation of synthesis for specific audiences</i></li> </ul> | <p><b>20 min</b></p> |

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What are the human dynamics and world views of the actors in the ecosystem and how do we move the ecosystem dynamics so they are more convergent, especially as we move to the endemic phase of the pandemic</i></li> <li>• <i>What is our vision about what needs to be sustained? → at the moment, it is easy to focus on what needs to be done and that makes collaboration easier but as the pandemic wanes there may be a retrenchment of the organizations where they resort to their traditional ecosystem dynamics</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Need the group to decide what they want to sustain and yet provide some vision and direction and that balance is hard to achieve</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>• <i>Could the interviews for the baseline study address the question about what the organizations would like to sustain? Going to the will to collaborate and the unmet needs and what they want to address</i></li> <li>• <i>The idea of waste is an interesting one in this field and there is a likely a need to continue to tailor evidence for different contexts and what is the end-state output for one group may just be an input for another</i></li> <li>• <i>One member flagged that these questions and discussion are critical, but cautioned about just trying to just shoehorn this into the baseline study as the focus there is retrospective and this is more about the future and relates to TOR item 3</i></li> <li>• <i>Group agreed that more discussion in this area is needed and those discussions can begin when we visit the other working groups to start discussion</i></li> </ul> <p><b>ACTION</b> – discussion to be revisited at future meetings and next step explored</p> |              |
| <p><b>5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <i>Working Group updates and reminders:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <i>Shifting Sustaining WG meetings to a biweekly schedule (next meeting is Wednesday September 9<sup>th</sup>)</i></li> <li>ii. <i>No regularly scheduled COVID-END meetings next week (August 31<sup>st</sup> – September 4<sup>th</sup>)</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>  | <p>5 min</p> |