



**Engaging Working Group**  
 Agenda for the Webex call on 5 May 2020  
<https://mcmaster.webex.com/meet/rise>

<p><b>1. INTRODUCTIONS</b></p> <p>a. Welcoming new working group members (if applicable)</p>	<p><b>5 min</b></p>
<p><b>2. FOLLOW-UP ON ACTION ITEMS</b></p> <p>a. Mapping groups and dissemination vehicles for communications to groups already supporting decision-makers (outward facing) – <b>All to review the following and offer feedback so the co-chairs can incorporate the input into the agenda for the next call</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Short-term strategic communications with WHO and Cochrane about coordination might best be handled by the Secretariat over the next week and thereafter we hope to have WHO representatives on key working groups like this one</li> <li>ii. Communication with groups supporting decision-makers might best work through existing networks and their communication channels, and a near-term priority for the working group could be to flesh out the following list further (in part by reviewing the longer list from ACE before they narrowed it to groups that provide online COVID-19 hubs)           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Africa Evidence Network, many members of which focus on supporting a range of decision-makers in their respective African countries</li> <li>2. Cochrane geographic groups, many of whom focus on supporting a range of decision-makers in their home countries</li> <li>3. EVIPNet teams that focus on supporting policymakers in their respective LMICs</li> </ul> </li> <li>iii. A moderated listserv could complement the above by enabling us to reach individuals and groups that are not part of existing networks and/or are willing to actively share and learn from each other (and this could be a new listserv or an existing one like the HIFA list if its contributors overlap with our target audiences)</li> <li>iv. Outreach to the groups identified in ii above could also help to identify any other viable platforms</li> <li>v. Other alternatives were discussed but not as broadly supported           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An email list might be very labour-intensive to set up and may run afoul of anti-spam rules (such as Europe’s General Data Protection Regulation)</li> <li>2. LinkedIn hasn’t been found to work well for this purpose by some on the call</li> <li>3. ResearchGate is focused on researchers but may not be an efficient way to reach those groups supporting decision-making</li> </ul> </li> <li>vi. Developing messages for these groups</li> </ul>	<p><b>45 min</b></p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We could start to adapt the messages from the terms of reference, from the communications document prepared for the partners call, and from points raised during the call (and encourage groups to adapt the language, etc. to their context)</li> <li>2. e.g., start your response to any evidence request by reviewing the <a href="#">guide to COVID-19 evidence sources</a> to determine whether you can use a robustly developed product that already exists (and focus on contextualizing it to your jurisdiction) or build on an existing product (e.g., by updating the search) or whether you need to fill a gap in what already exists</li> <li>3. e.g., if you're being asked to respond to evidence requests in a day or less, take a look at <a href="#">one example of an evidence-service model</a> that you may want to adapt to your setting</li> <li>4. e.g., register all titles and protocols with PROSPERO (and possibly select other sites that follow similar 'open synthesis' principles and accept protocols outside the scope of PROSPERO)</li> <li>5. e.g., share an anticipated delivery date and update the date if conditions change</li> <li>6. e.g., describe your methods in sufficient detail that users can judge its rigour and not rely on terms (like rapid review) that mean different things to different people</li> <li>7. e.g., upload completed reviews and guidelines to any of a small group of select sites that follow principles around transparency, etc.</li> <li>8. e.g., (for future) consider the following tools to support decision-making</li> </ol> <p><b>b. All to identify any global or regional groups who 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)</b></p>	
<p><b>3. DISCUSSION ON MEMBERSHIP</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Any other nominees to help achieve geographic, linguistic and target audience diversity</li> </ol>	<p><b>5 min</b></p>
<p><b>4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Confirming plan for future meetings</li> </ol>	<p><b>5 min</b></p>