Methods Expert Group

----

1) What is the Methods Expert Group (MEG)?

The MEG is a group of selected experts on Knowledge Synthesis Methods. It was formed as an EKLIPSE group in September 2016 and was initially appointed until March 2017. The group membership was extended to a 2 year appointment, with possibility to extend for a further 2 years. The task of the MEG is to provide and share knowledge about the different available methods for knowledge collation, appraisal and synthesis. These methods are used to identify and characterise robust evidence and knowledge gaps, in response to requests made to EKLIPSE by policy makers and societal actors. 'Knowledge' here refers to scientific knowledge, technical practitioner knowledge and/or Indigenous and local knowledge ('ILK'). The work of the expert group informs those addressing EKLIPSE requests about the knowledge synthesis methods available, including their pros and cons, costs, and requirements in terms of human capital and technical tools.

Participation in the MEG is voluntary (although travel and accommodation to take part in face to face meetings is covered by EKLIPSE) and the experts are asked to be active only for the duration of a request. The members of the MEG are expected to devote some time to their EKLIPSE contribution (~10% of their time when appointed as the MEG following a request) over the duration of their appointment, including attending relevant face to face meetings.

2) The role of the MEG in scoping

The KCB Chair will inform the MEG of all requests going through scoping and will ask the MEG to volunteer to each request, based on their expertise and interests. Each request going through scoping is expected to have 1-2 MEG members assigned to it. They will be added to the mailing list developed for that request, will have access to the OwnCloud for the request, and will be kept informed of each step in the scoping phase – specifically when and how input will be sought from the MEG appointed experts.

The role of each MEG appointed expert for each request in the scoping phase will be to:

- Provide information to the KCB focal point on relevant, timely and cost-appropriate methods or approaches, and discuss these options and their implications on what to expect as outputs with the requester. It is the role of the KCB focal point to decide when and how such information provision should be carried out, and to communicate this to the MEG appointed expert at the beginning of the scoping phase. In addition, the KCB focal point should provide the MEG appointed expert sufficient guidance on what input is required, and sufficient preparation time for this input.

06/02/2017

- It is expected that the input from the MEG appointed expert will be received within 2 months of scoping starting.
- Should the requester have expressed an interest for a specific method in his/her request, this will be examined by the MEG appointed expert and the KCB to see whether it is the most appropriate and relevant given expectations and resources. Other alternative methods may be proposed if needed, including their benefits and trade-offs.
- The MEG is responsible for their internal organization if appointed experts feel it would be useful to have input from the whole or part of the MEG prior to submitting their input to the KCB focal point.

3) The role of the MEG in supporting the Expert Working Group

Once the scoping phase is over, and if the request goes through to the selection of an Expert Working Group, the MEG appointed experts have a number of tasks, including:
- Attending the EWG kick-off meeting, to provide information on the selection of methods in the Document of Work, and providing any additional information at the meeting, as needed.
- Following the progress of the EWG during protocol development.
- Encourage peer-review of the protocol and final report and suggestions for appropriate experts (non-MEG) who could participate in the methodological review.
- MEG experts may be peer-reviewers for the protocol or report processes, but will need to sign a declaration of conflict of interest in this case.