1. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS	**50 min**

a. Review terms of reference (see attachment 2)
   i.   Goal/purpose statement
   ii. Item 5

- WG co-chairs have shared request for other WGs to consider developing purpose/goal statements at co-chairs meeting on 26-May

-

- David and Heather have taken stab at draf

b. Baseline study
   i.   Design
   ii.   Research questions
   iii. Methods (e.g. social network analysis, interviews, survey of members)
   iv.   Team (who would like to be involved and in what role/capacity)
   v.   Timeline
   vi.   Ottawa REB for ethics approval *[Jeremy]*

- Jeremy shared baseline study draft for discussion (attachment)

Discussion on draft:
- Sampling frame - is it groups that are participating in COVID-END or beyond?
- Cochrane is doing some evaluation work related to their activities around COVID-19 and this could be complimentary. This wider evaluation could also be helpful for other strategic planning processes
- Distinguish between evaluation response to COVID-19 and how COVID-19 has affected strategy/work (e.g. decreased time frame for systematic review)
- NCCMT is looking at risk assessment and opportunity-cost - what are we giving up by pivoting to COVID-19 and how does that affect things like autonomy from funder
- If the focus of the sample is the network, then could we reach all organizations in the network (instead of sub-set) because it is a much stronger Need to consider what is the evidence claim
- Partners could volunteer to do part of the work e.g. partners could describe local arrangements in terms of how they are working with decision-makers.

Understanding local dynamic is helpful and assists in understanding why they would want to participate in COVID-END • Looking at blind spots - what was done and what was not done (e.g. in Quebec, we did not consider the long-term care and get it on the agenda). Could we have proactively got • Responsiveness vs proactive horizon-scanning • Sample - if we could come up with a taxonomy of organizations that are part of COVID-END and then we can slot them into categories and sample • Could there be a small quantitative section where we ask them about their relationships with other organizations (did they know about them, active relationship, collaboration on projects) • Organizations could do some work to identify pre-existing relationships • Groups could expand the organizations they are working with but also with receptors within organizations • Is Objective 1 outside the scope? It requires commitment in each of the partner organizations. Maybe add "that belong to COVID-END" • Maybe we start to think about this is phases - start with COVID-END, but if we choose to go with broader evidence ecosystem later, we could scope that and consider how to accomplish that (resources, different methods such as survey). Having other groups outside of COVID-END will give us a comparator group • Initial thoughts about value of this to the network members is that structured work like this will be useful and could inform strategic planning processes within jurisdictions • When approaching organizations to participate, we can offer to give them back their own data (raw and analyzed) so that they can use it for their own purposes **Action:** Sylvia to share with evaluation group at Cochrane and will probe interest from a member of that group **Action:** Jeremy to work with Heather B, David and Elie on a new draft by Monday **Action:** Heather H will send Jeremy an email re: SNA expert **Action:** Denis to connect with Jean-Louis Denis to make him aware of COVID-END	
2. ANY OTHER BUSINESS a. Work that can be done by student support • Students could be involved as research team members Question from other working group • Burnout/fatigue - is there a spot to explore this in this project? Could be about organizational HR policies (as part of interview with members)	**10 min**