

Minutes
Research Subgroup of Expert Advisory Group
19th May 2020, 4pm (by telecall)

Present: Colm Bergin (Co-Chair), Cliona O’Farrelly (Co-Chair), Mark Ferguson, Ana Terres, Ivan Perry, Stephen Kinsella, Ivan Perry, Orla Feely, Sarah Gibney, Mairéad O’Driscoll, Siobhán O’Sullivan, Teresa Maguire.

| ITEM | Discussion | ACTIONS |
|-------------|---|--|
| 1. | Draft Minutes from 15th May 2020 Noted an amendment to be included in the discussion on the biorepository paper to make clear that the REAG is not convening a subgroup on this issue | |
| 2. | Conflict of Interest Declarations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CB declared his interest in healthcare worker-related studies. | COI to remain an active agenda item on all meetings |
| 3. | Research paper <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The collated feedback from the NPHE sub-groups was reviewed by the group and the group noted areas for amendment - The group discussed that it should be made clear at the beginning of the document that the proposal is to use existing structures and processes for funding - The group noted that the proposal is time-sensitive and cannot wait on the annual estimates processes to secure additional funding - the written feedback from Government Departments has not been provided yet - the paper will circulate the paper to EAG once the feedback has been received. | The group will reflect on all feedback and submit the paper to EAG next week |
| 4. | COVID-19 biorepository paper <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members discussed the papers circulated - The additional investment required for this to build on the current infrastructure was noted - The approach and the case, including the opportunity costs of not pursuing this, was noted - The establishment and operations of other patient registries was noted - Linking the approach to a planned study involving healthcare workers as an occupational cohort was discussed as a practical application - The time-bounded nature of repositories was discussed | Revise the paper for the next group meeting |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Leadership and a commitment to sharing as part of a national repository was noted - A member noted that it was important to communicate clearly that in terms of a national repository funded by the State for the common good that the samples are owned by State - The group discussed sending this paper as separate paper to the research paper (item 4) - The paper will encompass both a registry and a biobank | |
| 5. | Group self-evaluation plan | The group will complete a reflection process and discuss at the end of the month |
| 6. | Communications | |
| 7. | AOB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A second version of the clinical trials paper was circulated to the group for review and discussion. It was noted that the paper takes into account the prior feedback from the Medicines Criticality Group, further feedback from Medicines Unit in DoH and feedback from HPRA, views expressed from HSE, and learning from ongoing work to advance the WHO Solidarity trial. - A member provided update on the status of the Solidarity trial. | The group will review the paper and submit comments prior to the next meeting. |