1. REVIEW AGENDA AND ACTION ITEMS

a. There were no additions to the agenda
b. Ruth pointed working-group members to the notes and actions from previous meeting (see attachment 2), and John offered to carry forward the following action item given he hadn't heard back from Jeremy about the next steps that the two of them had agreed to
    i. **ACTION: John to work with Jeremy to propose an approach, including drafting an email (that can be shared with Lynn so she can approach her contacts in Scotland)**

2. LIST OF PRIORITY TOPICS

a. Working-group members who had spent a lot of time reviewing the Excel spreadsheet kicked off the discussion with the following comments:
    i. Many questions are too general and we will need a process to elicit further details from decision-makers to ensure the teams prepare syntheses that are fit for purpose
        1. Working-group members discussed potential alternatives (e.g., returning to the horizon-scanning panel; convening a separate group of decision-makers) and concluded that an optimal path may be to strongly suggest that every team identify one or more 'sponsors' who would bring decision-maker views to the further specification of the question and more generally to the design and execution of the synthesis
    ii. Some of the text is too prescriptive and we will need a process to add additional columns and adjust the text (see suggestions below from Cristian)
        1. Working-group members discussed the potential changes and agreed that Cristian should proceed with them (with the one tweak that he consider keeping examples of study designs and potential for a meta-analysis as sortable columns to allow teams to identify quickly topic/method combinations that are a good match to their skills)
        2. **ACTION: Cristian to proceed with the changes to the Excel file**
b. Working-group members also discussed how to move a 'quickly and cleanly' enough to get teams actively taking up questions and undertaking evidence syntheses
    i. **ACTION: As soon as Cristian has executed his proposed changes to the Excel file, John to work with McMaster Health Forum staff to add links to potentially relevant evidence syntheses (and recency of search, quality of synthesis, and GRADE evidence profile availability), and then Ruth to work with UNCOVER students to add any additional protocols identified through PROSPERO**
c. Identify any specific considerations related to involving people with lived experience in the evidence synthesis
    i. **ACTION: Ruth to write to Maureen Smith to ask whether she would be willing to set up a mechanism for us to elicit feedback from citizen partners about how we're prioritizing syntheses that would most benefit from significant citizen**

        partner involvement (recognizing that the ideal would be to involve citizen partners in all of them)

    d. Additionl next step

        i. **ACTION: Safa to add to the next agenda a discussion topic about how to communicate and support the take up of priority questions (e.g., communicating both to umbrella groups like Cochrane and to teams/individuals, explaining the need to move quickly, and clarifying the lack of funding but the willingness to write letters of support to funders)**

    e. Discuss framework of demand and supply of demand (as expressed through thehorizon-scanning process) and supply (primary studies, evidence syntheses of different types, guidelines, and knowledge translation)

        i. **ACTION: Safa to carry forward this item as a reminder that we may want to at some point write up the process using this framework**

3. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

    a. No other business