

<p><b>1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS</b></p> <p>a. Review notes and action items from previous meeting (see attachment 2)</p>	<b>5 min</b>
<p><b>2. GLOBAL EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS</b></p> <p>a. Developing a global discussion on evidence syntheses after the pandemic, including lessons learned and what do they tell us about the evidence synthesis community post-COVID</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Created an emergency in which people can work together</li> <li>• How do we work together in the future to more efficiently create evidence synthesis?</li> <li>• Sustaining group would help collect information about what we are doing now and also to help us with these discussions in the future</li> <li>• Imminent arrival of the vaccine and the shift in mindset of people – we should start the conversation on post-pandemic synthesis now that will build on the lessons learned and how communities can work together</li> <li>• Still thinking about the model to use, but currently settled on the commission model – bring in people who are global or national decision-makers as well as citizens and people from the evidence synthesis community. We want to get a lot of buy-in from beyond the evidence synthesis world.</li> <li>• A panel of 15-20 people that hopefully can convene in April 2021 and end by the end of 2021, and they would have smaller working groups underneath them, for example a group for registration of evidence synthesis/systematic reviews</li> <li>• Other groups could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Technology enabled group</li> <li>○ Methods and standards for reviews</li> <li>○ Building capacity to generate reviews globally</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The questions post-pandemic will be similar across different global contexts which raises the importance of ‘coordination and collaboration’ internationally, and building on existing networks where necessary</li> <li>• We will need to think about the linguistic issues that this raises, but also the dimension between relative ‘generic’ and more localized knowledge (context-specific)</li> </ul>	<b>50 min</b>

- Do we intend to centralize evidence synthesis?
  - Publication models need to be thought through
  - Pandemic has brought a shift towards living reviews
  - The process of conducting reviews should not be centralized, and instead we need to decentralize and build capacity across a broad range of settings, and this will allow localized knowledge users to take up and use these reviews/evidence synthesis
  - We need to have a more open-access approach
- An argument that needs to be unpacked is ‘what proportion of research funding should go towards synthesis activities?’
- Perhaps, we need two streams of financial arrangements in which there is funding for synthesis and funding for the open-access publication model
- Who should be part of this commission?
  - Senior people with very good contextual knowledge that may have more power or leverage to raise certain priority topics (such as climate change)
  - May require a catalyst strategy and how to have people engaged, even those that are not in the health industry
- What are the 4-6 topic areas that we can cover underneath the main panel?
  - Climate change – to be potentially added as a topic area for discussion
  - Globalisation – to be potentially added as a topic area for discussion
- Why is evidence synthesis necessary and for whom?
  - There is a return for investment in research for societies, supporting policy practice and decision-makers, knowledge is a global good for global citizens
  - Powerful arguments around those areas, and get people supporting these arguments, we can start to move forward
- **ACTION:** Jeremy to bring back a two-pager document that lays out the greater details and thinking of the global commission

<b>3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b>	<b>5 min</b>
------------------------------	--------------