



UK Health Security Agency

Public views on how UKHSA and the vaccines industry work together | Oversight Group Meeting 02 - Minutes and actions

Date: 22.07.2026

Time: 13:30-15:30 BST

Location: MS Teams

Chair: Sarah Cunningham-Burley

Attendance

Oversight Group members

- Sarah Cunningham-Burley, Professor of Medical and Family Sociology and Co-Head of Centre for Biomedicine, Self and Society, The University of Edinburgh
- Atiya Kamal, Professor in Health Psychology, Birmingham City University
- Brian Davies, Head of Health Insights and Policy, Meningitis Research Foundation
- Emma Wills, Researcher, The King's Fund
- Helen Stewart, Officer for Health Improvement, Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, The Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health
- Helen Llewellyn, Health policy and public affairs consultant, ABPI
- Nick Mackie, Investment, Office of Life Sciences
- Helen Bedford, Professor of Children's Health, University College London
- Christina Ogunbote, Head of national partnerships, Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency
- Jess Turner, Professional Lead for Public Health, Royal College of Nursing
- Rini Jones, Assistant Director of Policy, NHS Race & Health Observatory

UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)

- Lewis Wooding, Head of Insight, Behavioural Science and Insights Unit
- Julie Yates, Deputy Director Immunisation Programmes, Design, Implementation and Clinical Guidance
- Jamie Turner, Deputy Director, Vaccines & Countermeasures Enablement
- Clare Deahl, Insight Lead, Behavioural Science and Insights Unit, (Secretariat)
- Virginia Bertelli, Senior Insight Manager, Behavioural Science and Insights Unit (Secretariat)
- Lee Chan, Insight Lead, Behavioural Science and Insights Unit

Sciencewise

- Trupti Patel, Programme Lead
- Lucy Evans, Advisor

Thinks Insight & Strategy

- Anna McKeon, Managing Director, Dialogue
- Allie Jennings, Director

The Social Agency

- Dan Clay, Managing Partner

Independent evaluator

- Sophie Reid

Apologies

- Jacob Lant, Chief Executive, National Voices

Oversight Group 02 Action log

No.	Action	Responsible	Timing
1.1	Review and return Declaration of Interest forms	All OG members	By 30 July 2026
1.2	Provide feedback on meeting minutes	All OG members	By 4 August 2026
1.3	Establish 'Role of industry' working group	Sciencewise, UKHSA	By 18 August 2026
1.4	Contact the Secretariat if interested in being part of the 'Role of industry' working group	Interested OG members	By 31 July 2026
1.5	Establish 'Equity' and 'Public benefit' working groups	Sciencewise, UKHSA, interested OG members	Autumn/Winter 2026
1.6	Share further reflections or comments on dialogue design materials, including scenarios and specialist speakers' suggestions via email	All OG members	By 31 July 2026

Oversight Group 02 Meeting minutes

1. Welcome

1.1 Chair welcomed members to the meeting and apologies were noted. Members were informed that the meeting would focus on reviewing progress since the previous Oversight Group meeting and gathering feedback on draft dialogue materials.

2. Oversight Group 01 actions review

2.1 The Chair reviewed actions from the previous meeting and confirmed that the Terms of Reference had been finalised following feedback from members.

2.2 Members were reminded to return any outstanding Declaration of Interest forms and to confirm whether their contact details could be shared with other Oversight Group members.

2.3 The Chair noted that reflections shared following the previous meeting had been considered by the project team and informed the ongoing design of the project.

2.4 Members were informed that working groups would be established following the meeting and would be discussed later in the agenda.

3. Project update

3.1 Thinks and The Social Agency provided an update on overall project progress, including dialogue design, participant recruitment and engagement with the Lived Experience Advisory and Research Panel (LEAP).

3.2 Members were reminded of the project objectives and the intention to develop practical outputs that enable consideration of public views to inform collaboration between UKHSA and the vaccines industry.

3.3 The project team outlined progress made through scoping, co-design activities and stakeholder engagement, including workshops with LEAP members, stakeholders, UKHSA, Sciencewise and the Oversight Group.

3.4 Members heard how LEAP feedback had informed the dialogue design. Insights highlighted the importance of explaining why the dialogue is taking place, the need for plain English materials, the role of historical factors in shaping trust in the communities represented by the LEAP, and the importance of inclusion and accessibility throughout the dialogue process.

3.5 The independent evaluator provided an update on plans to involve LEAP members in elements of the evaluation process. Members were informed that this may include interviews with LEAP members about their experiences of participating in the co-design process, opportunities to review and respond to evaluation findings, input into the evaluation approach, and potential involvement in evaluation activities during workshops. The evaluator noted that there had already been some interest from LEAP members in participating.

3.6 UKHSA provided an update on pathways to impact, including engagement with internal stakeholders, the UKHSA Vaccines Board, government networks and wider partners. Members were informed about plans to test and refine outputs with both decision-makers and dialogue participants.

3.7 Members discussed the role of enclave workshops within the dialogue design and the importance of creating safe spaces for participants while avoiding unintended feelings of exclusion or separation. The project team outlined how enclave participants would be prepared for the dialogue and supported throughout the process.

4. Research materials review

4.1 Dialogue structure and participant engagement

4.1.1 Thinks presented the proposed structure and objectives of the dialogue workshops, including enclave workshops, core dialogue workshops and the online community.

4.1.2 Members welcomed the range of engagement methods and discussed how different facilitation techniques would support meaningful participation from people with varying levels of confidence and prior knowledge.

4.1.3 Members discussed the nature of deliberative dialogue and reflected on the distinction between participants' initial views and views developed through exposure to information, discussion and reflection. It was noted that building participants' understanding of the subject matter and the spectrum of perspectives on it to reach considered viewpoints was an important feature of the dialogue methodology.

4.1.4 Members emphasised the importance of ensuring materials are accessible and understandable, so participants are able to contribute meaningfully regardless of technical knowledge or prior familiarity with the subject matter, particularly given the technical nature of some aspects of vaccine policy, regulation and industry collaboration. Members suggested that visual and interactive approaches, including infographic-style presentation of information, may help participants engage with complex concepts and scenarios.

4.1.5 Members highlighted the importance of creating opportunities for participants to contribute individually, particularly where they may feel less comfortable sharing views in a group setting. Consideration was also given to literacy levels, English language requirements and wider accessibility needs, including the use of appropriately accessible materials.

4.1.6 The project team outlined plans to use plain language, varied engagement methods and opportunities for participants to revisit information through the online community. It was also explained that participants would be able to contribute individually, for example, via tasks in the online community and individual written tasks in the core dialogue workshops. This will provide space for participants to share views that they may not feel comfortable raising in a group setting, while ensuring responses remain visible only to the research team and not to other participants.

4.1.7. Members highlighted the importance of clearly explaining UKHSA's role, responsibilities and purpose within the dialogue materials. It was noted that participants may be unfamiliar with the organisation and that careful explanation of its functions, including the meaning of 'health security', may help support understanding and engagement with the scenarios.

4.2 Collaboration scenarios

4.2.1 Thinks presented six draft collaboration scenarios developed to support dialogue discussions, covering vaccine procurement, strategic partnerships, disease awareness campaigns, data sharing, industry support for vaccine uptake activities and UKHSA's scientific support for vaccine development.

4.2.2 Members welcomed the breadth of the scenarios and the effort made to capture different forms of collaboration across the vaccine lifecycle.

4.2.3 Members discussed the importance of distinguishing between activities that already occur, activities that occur intermittently and those that would represent new forms of collaboration. It was suggested that this information should be more clearly signposted within the materials.

4.2.4 Members reflected on the value of practical examples and vignettes to help participants engage with complex concepts and scenarios, while avoiding excessive technical detail or reliance on abstract descriptions.

4.2.5 Members highlighted the importance of ensuring stimulus materials reflect the global nature of vaccine research, development, manufacture and supply chains. It was noted that vaccine companies often operate across multiple countries and that information on where companies are based should be presented carefully and accurately. Members suggested that dialogue materials should help participants understand the international nature of the vaccines industry, including that different stages of vaccine development and production may take place in different countries even where a company is UK-based. This context may be particularly important where participants express differing views about collaboration with UK and non-UK industry partners.

4.2.6 Members discussed transparency and governance regarding funding arrangements and partnership structures as factors likely to influence public perceptions of trust and acceptability. Members emphasised the importance of clearly explaining how different forms of industry collaboration operate in practice, including the governance frameworks that apply and the distinction between funding arrangements and collaborative partnerships. It was noted that accurate and consistent terminology will be important to support participant

understanding. Members suggested that greater consideration be given to how these issues are explored within the dialogue materials and “what if” questions.

4.2.7 Members discussed who may benefit from collaboration arrangements and noted that collaborations may involve a wider range of organisations than UKHSA and vaccine companies alone, including healthcare providers, community organisations and patient advocacy groups. Members suggested that materials should more clearly explain who is involved in different forms of collaboration, as well as how benefits, particularly financial benefits, may be distributed. Members also noted that factors such as whether collaboration involves a single company or multiple organisations may influence perceptions of acceptability, trust and who is seen to benefit from the arrangement.

4.2.8 Members highlighted the importance of using accessible language throughout the scenario materials and noted that participants may be unfamiliar with organisations involved in the vaccine system. Members suggested that acronyms and organisation names should be clearly explained within the materials themselves, rather than relying solely on a glossary, to support understanding and informed discussion. Examples raised included UKHSA, MHRA and ABPI. The project team noted that explanations of relevant organisations and their roles within the wider health system would be provided as part of the dialogue process.

4.2.9 Members discussed the proposed data-sharing scenario and noted the need to provide greater specificity while ensuring the scenario remained focused on the objectives of the dialogue. Members also highlighted the importance of recognising broader concerns relating to personal data and trust, without allowing wider debates about data sharing to dominate the discussion.

4.2.10 Members highlighted potential areas for further exploration within the scenarios, including transparency, competition between companies, benefit sharing, continued public involvement and approaches to managing conflicts of interest.

4.3 Specialist speakers

4.3.1 Thinks presented a proposed list of specialist speakers intended to provide dialogue participants with a range of perspectives on the potential benefits and risks associated with collaboration between UKHSA and the vaccines industry.

4.3.2 Members welcomed the breadth of expertise represented and suggested the inclusion of perspectives from patient organisations, healthcare charities and organisations with experience of working in partnership with industry.

4.3.3 Members highlighted the potential value of additional perspectives on health inequalities, community-led approaches to improving vaccine uptake and practical examples of partnership working involving communities, patient organisations and the health system.

4.3.4 Members also suggested the inclusion of speakers able to explain governance arrangements, transparency requirements and safeguards used to manage conflicts of interest in collaborations involving industry including established industry frameworks and codes of practice.

4.3.5 Members queried whether a risk assessment had been undertaken for the project and whether relevant information could be shared with the Oversight Group to inform discussion and contributions. The project team confirmed that a risk register is maintained as part of internal project governance arrangements and noted the importance of keeping the Oversight Group informed of any significant issues relevant to its role. One member asked whether the

risk register could be shared. The project team took away an action to consider this and provide an update to the Oversight Group in due course.

4.3.6 Members discussed the potential value of specialist speakers drawing on examples of collaboration from outside the immunisation context where appropriate. It was suggested that examples from outside the immunisation context may help illustrate how collaboration between public bodies and industry can operate in practice, particularly where equivalent vaccine-related examples are limited. Members noted, however, the importance of maintaining a clear focus on immunisation and highlighting any differences between vaccines and other areas of healthcare, including the role of public trust, informed consent and wider population benefit.

4.3.7 Members noted that a LEAP member perspective may add value through sharing insights on lived and living experience and community engagement. This suggestion was noted by the project team who also flagged that the LEAP will attend the second core dialogue workshop, where they will have a role in helping the core dialogue participants engage with issues, and they will reflect relevant views and interests of people from outside of the core dialogue who they have engaged through their community outreach.

5. Working groups

5.1 UKHSA provided an update on the proposed Oversight Group working groups.

5.2 Members were informed that the immediate priority is the 'Role of Industry' Working Group, which will focus on providing advice on the collaboration scenarios, including whether they are realistic from an industry perspective and whether there is any essential detail missing. Members were invited to express interest in participating. The group is expected to meet on 18 August 2026.

5.3 Members were informed that 'Equity' and 'Public Benefit' working groups will be established later in the project and will focus primarily on analysis, reporting and impact.

6. Next steps

6.1 Members were invited to provide any additional comments on dialogue materials, including scenarios or specialist speakers following the meeting.

6.2 The Secretariat confirmed that draft minutes would be circulated for review.

6.3 Members were reminded to return any outstanding Declaration of Interest forms and approvals to share contact details.

6.4 Members were invited to indicate to the Secretariat if they would be interested in joining any of the Oversight Group working groups, with particular interest in identifying members for the 'Role of industry' working group.

6.5 The next Oversight Group meeting is expected to take place in early 2027.

7. Close

7.1 The Chair thanked members for their contributions and reflected on the value of the discussion in strengthening the dialogue design and materials.

7.2 The Chair thanked Thinks, The Social Agency, UKHSA, Sciencewise and the independent evaluator for their presentations and ongoing work and closed the meeting.