



## 1. INTRODUCTIONS

- a. Welcoming new working group members (if applicable)
  - i. No new members joined today's call

## 2. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS

- a. Working group members identified organizations that already have established communication channels with groups supporting decision-makers (which could then be the focus of the working group's communications)
  - 1. 3IE
  - 2. Africa Evidence Network, which reaches many groups such as
    - a. Centre for Rapid Evidence Syntheses, Makerere University
  - 3. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Evidence-based Practice Centers (EPCs)
  - 4. Centre for Learning and Evaluation Results (global)
  - 5. Cochrane
    - a. Geographic Groups, which reaches many groups such as
      - i. Cochrane US Network (4 EPCs are members)
  - 6. Collaboration for Environmental Evidence
  - 7. Evidence Aid (UK)
  - 8. EVIPNet (many LMICs)
  - 9. National Collaborating Centres (Canada) +/- SPOR Support Units
  - 10. What Works Centres (UK), which includes many relevant groups such as
    - a. Education Endowment Initiative

The working group distinguished these 'networks' from individual organizations that work in the space (e.g., Centre for Evidence-based Medicine, Oxford University; EPPI Centre, University of London; Knowledge for Development Program, Sussex University; and Sax Institute) and from other types of networks (e.g., funders like CIHR and DFID; networks of basic scientists).

**ACTION: Secretariat to include the list in the next partners' call agenda to ask for additional suggestions and for the names of the best contact in each organization**

- b. Working group members discussed whether an additional communication vehicle (e.g. listserv) could complement the above

**ACTION: Secretariat to share its draft table about which communication vehicle matches best to which group**

- c. Working group members discussed the need to be careful about what we communicate (and what if anything we offer)

**ACTION: Secretariat to include draft messages in the re-write of the text on the website (which will distinguish messages for those who support decision-makers from messages for researchers) and ensure that the wording doesn't imply that COVID-END provides rapid-evidence profiles or other services itself – Addendum: see the former [here](#) and the latter [here](#)**

- d. Working group members discussed protocol registration
- i. Applicants that have already prepared a protocol can complete the PROSPERO registration form in around 15 minutes, and approvals are typically given within one business day
  - ii. One challenge is for researchers working on very short timelines who may have started data extraction by the time they attempt to register, but this is not permitted by PROSPERO given the importance of the message about having a completed and registered protocol before starting data extraction
  - iii. A second challenge is for researchers working outside PROSPERO's scope

**ACTION: Secretariat to add to the next agenda a discussion item about where to register reviews that aren't within PROSPERO's scope**

- e. Working group didn't have time to discuss global or regional groups that are identifying alternative scenarios, etc. for the pandemic that could inform future priority setting for questions (e.g., hunger-related riots, not being able to hold elections that require in-person participation), but John noted that Heather Bullock has offered to identify such groups as part of an effort to design a horizon-scanning initiative that can inform the work of COVID-END and others

**ACTION: Secretariat to add to a future agenda a description of Heather's plans for horizon scanning (once she has a draft prepared)**

### **3. DISCUSSION ON MEMBERSHIP**

- a. **ACTION: All to continue to identify potential nominees to help achieve geographic, linguistic and target audience diversity**

### **4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. Safa confirmed that future meetings have been booked on Tuesday mornings at 8 am EST