

<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. COVID-END BASELINE PROJECT</p> <p>a. Discuss updates and next steps (see attachment 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amena has scheduled 5 more interviews for a total of 20. • As next steps, it will be important to start writing up the background and methods for the first paper, which Amena said that she has started • Some key insights from interviews were that most of the responses were reactive and addressing emerging needs. • Will be important to view it as developing a more comprehensive understanding of functions, complementarities, redundancies and limitations of the ecosystem, rather than just the relationships and connections between groups. This will provide a thorough understanding of the synthesis ecosystem. The next step could then be to reflect on how the ecosystem could evolve and using an evidence-informed way. This thinking is covered under paper 2 as the SNA doesn't cover the whole ecosystem, which is better captured through the qualitative study. • Paper 1 (survey, SNA and qualitative interviews) is focused and is ready to get out soon so that we can contribute, but study will allow us to use the in-depth qualitative data and to conceptualize to advance the thinking and strategizing for evidence synthesis ecosystems more broadly. With that said, the data (e.g., the survey) needs to be fully used to generate as many insights in the first paper as possible. • Another key question is how much of the ecosystem does COVID-END cover? Are we talking about a quarter, a third or perhaps more of the evidence ecosystem. This will impact how we interpret our findings (i.e., as a small part of the evidence synthesis ecosystem or as representing a large portion of this). Will be important to draw on the work being done for the living hub of hubs to get a better sense of the ecosystem. • We don't want to do a study of the ecosystem, but rather our study within the context of the ecosystem. We have looked at one piece of it, analyzed it really closely and draw implications in relation to the broader ecosystem. • 2nd paper is about how evidence synthesis organizations, members of the COVID-END network initially responded to the COVID-19 pandemic. Will form a small group (Amena, Ian, Jean-Louis and Tiago, others?) for qualitative analysis that will meet in early January to help with planning before conducting some of the interviews in the southern hemisphere which are likely to start later in January when back from holiday break 	<p>30 min</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many organizations still feel that COVID was a lost opportunity for reducing duplication and enhancing collaboration. • For the third phase, idea is to conduct a more in-depth SNA which other members are invited to lead and/or contribute to the analysis if interested 	
<p>3. FUTURE PROJECTS</p> <p>a. Discuss organization of evidence synthesis commission post pandemic (see 3.a. below)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an increasingly sense of urgency for this work given need to find a way to build a conversation about this. • Second, if you look at areas where research response has worked you see some important examples such the work on the virus to support vaccine-development process and the development protocol templates to get trials going. Other invested in building research infrastructure that will allow it to better respond to future emergencies. Some similar thinking is required for the evidence synthesis ecosystem. • Want to have a dialogue with a diverse range of stakeholders with the aim of making the system more responsive, efficient and to have the capacity to switch if another pandemic or crisis emerges • Thinking about using language such as a global commission that is comprised partially of evidence synthesis leaders, but also funders, etc. • Early stages of planning and thinking of convening a commission of ~20 people that would meet between March and December with aim of producing some sort of document that could be used to take around to different groups. The focus would be high level, including the types of areas Jeremy listed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mechanisms to improve methodological quality of evidence syntheses (including rapid reviews and living systematic reviews) ○ Building global capacity for conducting and using of evidence syntheses (with a strong emphasis on equity) ○ Better linking between demand and supply side ○ Co-ordination mechanisms for key global priority areas ○ Funding and infrastructure ○ (e.g., getting registration of reviews to be the norm and ensuring sufficient infrastructure for doing it). • This will require engagement of the secretariat for steering and for finding funding • Views about the initiative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General consensus that it is good that we are not waiting to pursue ○ The structure was viewed as positive (not just evidence synthesis stakeholders, but others such as funders) ○ Need to ensure that the framing doesn't sound self-serving – need to prioritize for the evidence synthesis community why it will be helpful for them, but lead with why it's important for other stakeholders 	<p>20 min</p>

○ Need to emphasize how little evidence synthesis is funded despite its importance to supporting informed decision-making	
4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	5 min
No other business was raised	

3.a. Convening a global dialogue on the future evidence synthesis ecosystem

We will work with partners to convene a global dialogue on the future evidence synthesis ecosystem to begin in Q2 of 2021. We envision a high-level steering committee including representatives from global and jurisdictional level decision makers, citizens, research funders and evidence synthesis, recommendation and support mechanisms which will be supported by a series of working groups producing white papers on key topics including:

- Mechanisms to avoid inappropriate duplication of effort (including synthesis registration)
- Mechanisms to improve methodological quality of evidence syntheses (including rapid reviews and living systematic reviews)
- Building global capacity for conducting and using of evidence syntheses (with a strong emphasis on equity)
- Better linking between demand and supply side
- Co-ordination mechanisms for key global priority areas
- Funding and infrastructure

Proposed output: (WHO) Blueprint for global evidence synthesis

Proposed timeline

Jan – Mar 21 – detailed planning, identification of Steering Group Co-chairs and members, identification of initial working groups (3)

Mar 21-Mar 22 –

Apr 22 Final report released