

# Appendix A: Generation Mechanisms table

Rows are marked to signify effective, non-effective, partially-effective or undetermined (based on available literature).

**Table 7 Mechanisms for Evidence Generation**

| Mechanism                                | Generation type/Description  | Challenges   | Benefits  | Target audience                                 |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| Calls for evidence (partially effective) | Pull: public call for evidence, often by a government entity, on a particular salient topic/issue <a href="#">(footnote 1)</a>   | Clarity; relevance to terms of reference   | Formal, direct engagement with policymakers   | Policymakers; decision maker practitioners      |
| Deliberation platforms (effective)       | Co-creation: “a mechanism through which stakeholders with diverse perspectives can both discuss problems and explore potential solutions” for a political issue <a href="#">(footnote 2)</a> | Scale and context; Participant diversity and representation; Bias (participants and facilitator); Clarity and transparency; Engagement | Fosters mutual understanding; Crosses sectors and disciplines; Encourages social learning; Collaborative engagement | Policymakers; researchers, practitioners        |
| Funded Commissions (effective)           | Pull: research funded directly by government bodies or other funders, focused on a specific topic or need  | Navigating politics, Time capacity, Coverage, Credibility, Scale and context   | Funded; Direct engagement with policymakers/practitioners   | Government bodies, Industry, Third sector, NGOs |

| Mechanism                               | Generation type/Description  | Challenges   | Benefits  | Target audience                   |
|---|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Professional Partnerships (effective)   | Co-creation: “policy/ practice-research collaborations, usually with a limited lifespan” <a href="#">(footnote 3)</a> <a href="#">(footnote 4)</a> (i.e. expert elicitation, committees, networks, Areas of Research Interest, etc.) | Scale and context, Navigating politics, Long-term impact         | Often funded; Direct engagement with policymakers/practitioners; Fosters mutual understanding | Researchers and policymakers/prac |
| Training and fellowships (undetermined) | Co-creation: formal skills development scheme, often funded (i.e. skills training), secondments, internships, fellowships.   | Engagement, Unpredictable knowledge base, Clarity, Comprehension | Direct engagement, Capacity-building, Potentially funded                                      | Researchers and policymakers/prac |

Source: Authors informed by Warira et al. (2017), Ferrari, M. (2017) and Gerard, Koch & Kowarsch (2018)

1. Breckon, J. and Dodson, J. (2016) ‘Using evidence: What works? A discussion paper,’ Alliance for Useful Evidence. Available at: [https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/using\\_evidence\\_what\\_works.pdf](https://media.nesta.org.uk/documents/using_evidence_what_works.pdf)
2. Garard, J., Koch, L. and Kowarsch, M. (2018) ‘Elements of success in multi-stakeholder deliberation platforms,’ Palgrave Communications, 4(129). Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-018-0183-8>
3. Sources: Parsons, K. and Barling, D. (2021). Food Systems Transformation - What’s in the Policy Toolbox?. A Report for the UKRI Transforming UK Food Systems Programme. Available at: <https://www.foodsecurity.ac.uk/research/foodsystems-spf/outputs/>; OECD (2021a) ‘Making better policies for food systems: Executive summary,’ OECD iLibrary, Available at: <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/ddfba4de-en/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/ddfba4de-en>
4. Sasse, T. and Haddon, C. (2018) ‘How government can work with academia,’ Institute for Government. Available at: <https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2018-06/apo->

