

Minutes  
**Research Subgroup of Expert Advisory Group**  
**5<sup>th</sup> 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, Teresa Maguire.

Apologies: Mairéad O’Driscoll, Siobhán O’Sullivan.

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>ACTIONS</b>
1.	<b>Draft Minutes from 28<sup>th</sup> April 2020</b> -Reviewed and approved	
2.	<b>Conflict of Interest Declarations</b> - None declared	COI to remain an active agenda item on all meetings
3.	<b>Research Document update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The group discussed updates to the document and thanked all who contributed</li> <li>- The group noted that the thematic areas should be the focus, rather than individual projects</li> <li>- The draft paper has been circulated to Government Departments</li> <li>- The purpose of the table containing thematic areas and examples of thematic sub-areas that reflect Cross-departmental areas was discussed</li> <li>- One member suggested that the next steps could be added to the conclusion</li> <li>- One member outlined that the next steps could reflect what has been achieved already with existing funding and provide examples of what other EU countries have done with additional funding, and what could be done in Ireland with additional funding.</li> <li>- The diversion of Horizon 2020 funding to COVID-19 research was noted by a member</li> <li>- Funding pledges to the international arena from other Departments were discussed</li> <li>- European funding was discussed in terms of international engagement</li> <li>- The group discussed the request for NPHE – to endorse the spirit of the proposal and to then raise this at the Senior Officials Group and D/Taoiseach</li> <li>- One member noted that the final paragraph should acknowledge the green agenda and climate change challenge</li> </ul>	The Chairs will include these points in the conclusion

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- One member noted that employment agenda should be reflected in the document as well as a European dimension.</li> </ul>	
4.	<p><b>Self-assessment review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Group effectiveness was discussed</li> <li>- One member suggested that a view from EAG on the usefulness of the group could be sought</li> <li>- The terms of reference were discussed</li> <li>- One member suggested that there would be value in reviewing different research areas presented in the paper (item 3)</li> <li>- Membership was discussed</li> <li>- One member noted that further activity would depend on the availability of funding and the group discussed what could be done in the absence of funding</li> <li>- The group discussed a period of abeyance following completion of strategic research paper and submission to EAG and NPHE</li> <li>- The role of cross-governmental groups and structures in taking group proposals forward was noted</li> <li>- Mechanism under which the group was established was discussed</li> <li>- The impact of the group ceasing was discussed</li> <li>- Clarity on priorities could now be requested from EAG</li> <li>- The role of Communication around next steps was noted as important</li> <li>- Recommendations and implementation across government going forward were discussed with reference to NPHE.</li> </ul>	
5.	<p><b>Communications</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- External perceptions of the group in the absence of published minutes were noted.</li> </ul>	To be discussed at the next meeting.
6.	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A briefing paper circulated to the group on the seroprevalence study (SCOPI) was discussed.</li> <li>- The group wished to note that they were grateful to receive the document. The group recommended that an immunology researcher be added to the study group. The group suggested that consideration be given to biobanking of samples as part of the study and this would be important to future research. The nature of the study protocol was discussed as a longitudinal study, and</li> </ul>	The group will provide feedback through EAG.

	<p>the group suggested that the study group membership should reflect this. The group noted that a study protocol may be available in line with the WHO approach, and that the protocol should be published to peer-review standards in due course, as is the norm for this research field</p> <p>- Weekly updates to NPHEt were discussed.</p>	<p>Updates for NPHEt to be discussed each Friday.</p>
--	---	---