



COVID-END co-chairs meeting

Notes from May 11 2020

<https://zoom.us/j/6163788736>

1. WELCOME AND REVIEW OF NOTES FROM LAST MEETING

- a. Jeremy reviewed the notes from the last co-chair meeting (attachment 2)
- b. Jeremy pointed the co-chairs to Friday's email to the partners about the importance of recognizing COVID-END as time-limited network that is meant to identify opportunities for and achieve both quick wins and longer-term solutions that both advance the evidence ecosystem and help to strengthen partners' own organizations and processes
- c. Elie asked for some brief reflections about two issues that have come up in the work to date
 - i. Opportunities – Jeremy noted that it has been great to see groups come together, which has in many cases included individuals putting past tensions aside
 - ii. Challenges – Jeremy also noted the importance of continuing to find win-wins for both the initiative and the participating partners

2. UPDATES FROM WORKING GROUP MEETINGS

- a. Scoping
 - i. Didn't meet last week
- b. Engaging
 - i. Met last week and will meet again tomorrow
 - ii. Identified around 12 organizations supporting decision-makers, and the focus this week will be to identify who is best positioned to approach which contacts in these organizations
 - iii. **ACTION: Anna to circulate the list again to the co-chairs and ask them for additions and contacts**
- c. Digitizing
 - i. Met last week and the meeting went well, albeit with a few less people
 - ii. Pre-circulated a Google Doc to begin a conversation with working group members and then revise the terms of reference (and make them 'bigger picture')
 - iii. Gave examples of some of the additional information needed from the available portals (e.g., API available) to identify possibilities for digital solutions
 - iv. Also noted that the group wanted broader-based input to understand needs rather than just having digital experts discussing digital solutions that may not address an urgent need
 - v. **ACTION: All co-chairs to ask their respective working groups whether there are urgent needs that the Digitizing working groups can address, and Anna to add this to the agenda for the partners on Thursday**
 - vi. Linn noted that taxonomy on the COVID-END website could be enriched by adding corresponding standardized terminologies (SNO-MED, ICD-10, codes for medication, etc.)

- vii. **ACTION: Chris and Linn to share standardized terminologies with John for him to review how this can be done**
- viii. **ACTION: John to share the series of ‘interpretation decisions’ to be facilitated by COKA’s effort (in case it’s helpful to other ‘non-digital’ people like him) – see below**
 1. “A report (document, article, presentation in any form of media) is potentially relevant to be considered – this can lead to creation of Citation Resources to uniquely identify such reports
 2. A report is classified as any of a number of “simple classifiers” (such as type of report [original research, systematic review, guideline, protocol], type of research method [RCT, nonrandomized controlled trial, comparative cohort, case series, etc.], clinical domain [treatment, prevention, diagnosis, prediction], and specificity to COVID-19 [specific, relevant, not relevant]). The community can determine if other classifiers are desired. The goal is to support classifiers that would be re-usable across many in the community.
 3. An evidence report is classified regarding the evidence variables (such as PICO elements of population, interventions/exposures/comparators, and outcomes) in detailed specifications
 4. An evidence report is classified regarding “reasons for less certainty” or “risk of bias” or “threats to validity”
 5. Evidence results (statistics and certainty) are expressed in computable (precise, unambiguous) forms” (excerpted from an email by Brian Alper from 7 May 2020)
- d. Synthesizing
 - i. Finalized the terms of reference and agreed that the short-term focus should be reviewing and revising the list of resources on the guide to COVID-19 evidence sources (with a view to seeing where there are opportunities to avoid duplication, to find ways to categorize types of reviews and especially types of rapid reviews, and to optimize search work being done)
 - ii. Discussed how to achieve a balance between inclusivity (and possibly even comprehensiveness, which is growing increasingly difficult with 41 portals of HTAs / studies) and profiling a small number of optimal sources
 - iii. Began a discussion about how to serve the needs of low-income countries
 - iv. Also noted the importance of connecting with the Digitizing working group
- e. Recommending
 - i. Reviewed and suggested edits to the terms of reference
 - ii. Discussed potential additional members, particularly from the HTA community (addendum from Jeremy: HTAi has agreed to send someone and INAHTA discussed this at their last board meeting and will get back to us)
 - iii. Identified the need to find a place to house the available guidelines (just as the Synthesizing working group is considering something similar for evidence syntheses)
- f. Packaging
 - i. Prioritized the listing of tips and tools for packagers (e.g., innovative examples of combatting mis-information, such as WHO’s Myth Busters) as well as principles for packaging research evidence
 - ii. Considering whether to transition – after the above prioritized work has been completed – to drafting position statements for consideration by the broader partnership

- g. Sustaining
 - i. Had one meeting where they discussed the terms of reference and the broader purpose of the working group, and have another meeting this week

3. SECRETARIAT SUPPORT TO CO-CHAIRS

- a. Supporting communication within and across working group communication roles (see attachment 3)
 - i. Heather reminded the co-chairs that the first page of the document was discussed on the partners call
 - ii. Heather walked the co-chairs through the draft communication plan by working group
 - iii. David suggested the addition of the website and social media as communication tools for each of the working groups in their respective domains
 - iv. **ACTION: Co-chairs to send any edits to Heather for their respective 'column' (and any observations about other columns)**
- b. Supporting cross-group collaborations
 - i. Handled as part of the previous agenda item
- c. Task-based support from graduate students
 - i. Jeremy mentioned that there are five Memorial University Masters of Public Health students who have 16 weeks each to contribute to the work of COVID-END
 - ii. **ACTION: Co-chairs to let Jeremy know whether their working group has work that could be delegated to students working under the supervision of a faculty member**

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

No other business brought forward