

<p>1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>a. Review notes and action items from previous meeting (see attachment 2)</p>	<p>5 min</p>
<p>2. GLOBAL EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS</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"> • Created an emergency in which people can work together • How do we work together in the future to more efficiently create evidence synthesis? • Sustaining group would help collect information about what we are doing now and also to help us with these discussions in the future • 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 • 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. • 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 • Other groups could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Technology enabled group ○ Methods and standards for reviews ○ Building capacity to generate reviews globally • 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 • 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) 	<p>50 min</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we intend to centralize evidence synthesis? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 arugment 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Climate change – to be potentially added as a topic area for discussion ○ Globalisaton – to be potentially added as a topic area for discussion • Why is evidence synthesis necessary and for whom? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is a return for investment in research for societies, supporting policy practice and decision-makers, knwoeldge 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 	
<p>3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</p>	<p>5 min</p>