

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 (footnote 1) | 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 (footnote 2) | 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” (footnote 3) (footnote 4) (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
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->

