



Sustaining Working Group
Notes from call on 2 December 2020

<p>1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>a. Review notes and action items from previous meeting (see attachment 2)</p>	5 min
<p>2. COVID-END BASELINE PROJECT</p> <p>a. Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colours represent clusters, which are the strength of network within one group. Social network analysis algorithm divided the organizations into 4 families • The graphs do not show reciprocal information of linkages, for example, it does not show if an organization stated it has level 2 connection with one organization, while the other stated it has a level 3 connection. • The levels are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Level 0 – no interaction between 2 groups ○ Level 1 – awareness but there is complete isolation ○ Level 2 – communication, sharing of information only when it is advantageous to both organizations ○ Level 3 – cooperation, sharing information and working together on joint projects) ○ Level 4 – coordination, working side by side as separate organizations ○ Level 5 – collaboration, working closely as informal teams and actively pursuing opportunities to work together ○ Level 6 – partnership, formal relationships with specified responsibilities to achieve common goals ○ Level 7 – full integration, formal integration of organizations’ shared missions, goals and activities • The table showed stratified data based on whether the organizations reported the same level or different level of relationship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 41% of the links were the same between organizations ○ 37% had 1-unit difference ○ 11% had 2-units difference ○ 4% had 3-units difference • Observed that most of the data is the same level or 1-unit difference. Therefore, this allowed for a conservative approach, meaning that for any 2 way relationship, we will take the lower level of collaboration in order to minimize biases 	30 min

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of the member checking of responses, we will need to go back to the partners that responded at the individual organization level rather than the partner organization represented in COVID-END for member • Emerging questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the 4 clusters, can we explore and trace the key links between the families of organizations? ○ To bring more clarity on the clusters/families, could we build on the information that we have on the attributes of the organizations as generated through the website scan, so we could have the ability to describe with more granularity the nature of the family itself and facilitate the interpretation of the empirical data that emerges from the social network analysis? ○ In each of the networks, there is a large central organization that seems to be driving those clusters/families. The analysis can be approached like a factor analysis (list the order of the organizations by their weight). • Dissect these graphs further by having checkmarks on organizations in which we can uncheck/check one at a time to see links. This can be done with the social network analysis software • The data/information that emerges from the graphs could be useful to organizations for internal purposes, such as planning work, where organizations sit in the overall ecosystem and reflective practice • Need to check with ethics on whether it is appropriate making the data available to the partners and if so, what format would be most helpful for partners? • Need to be careful about the 4 clusters of families and how we have described the linkages of the organizations within each cluster. We need empirical data from the website scan to support our ideas that the linkages exist in order for these organizations to be clustered in one family. • Qualitative study phase could be helpful for the disconnect between responses from organizations and to double check responses (e.g. misperceptions of the purpose of the survey or technical errors in completing the survey?) • As next steps, we need to think about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Purpose of this study and the capacity of resources we have to do additional work ○ Prioritizing additional questions, resources and analyses 	
<p>3. FUTURE PROJECTS</p> <p>a. Discuss evidence synthesis post pandemic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we stimulate a discussion from what we have learned so far from COVID, COVID-END and the implications for the future of evidence synthesis? • How do we organize this? This should not be an internal COVID-END conversation but rather needs to involve global jurisdictional policymakers, funders, and other approaches. COVID-END can act as a knowledge broker, 	<p>20 min</p>

<p>but how do we organize this group and can we produce a resource/tool that can be helpful, such as the WHO blueprint on pandemic preparedness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ On what basis do we convene this? ○ Who do we involve? ○ Key issue in registration of systematic reviews – how do we consolidate that? Do we need minimum methodological standards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ACTION: Safa to bring this discussion topic to the next meeting agenda 	
<p>4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p>	<p>5 min</p>