

2022-07-15

# Lessons from bright-spots for advancing knowledge exchange at the interface of marine science and policy

Karcher, DB

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/19143>

---

10.1016/j.jenvman.2022.114994

Journal of Environmental Management

Elsevier

---

*All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.*

1 **Lessons from bright-spots for advancing knowledge exchange at the interface of marine science**  
2 **and policy**

3  
4 Denis B. Karcher<sup>1\*</sup>, Christopher Cvitanovic<sup>1</sup>, Ingrid E. van Putten<sup>2,3</sup>, Rebecca M. Colvin<sup>4</sup>, Derek  
5 Armitage<sup>5</sup>, Shankar Aswani<sup>6</sup>, Marta Ballesteros<sup>7</sup>, Natalie C. Ban<sup>8</sup>, María José Barragán-Paladines<sup>9</sup>,  
6 Angela Bednarek<sup>10</sup>, Johann D. Bell<sup>11,12</sup>, Cassandra M. Brooks<sup>13</sup>, Tim M. Daw<sup>14</sup>, Raquel de la Cruz-  
7 Modino<sup>15</sup>, Tessa B. Francis<sup>16</sup>, Elizabeth A. Fulton<sup>2,3</sup>, Alistair J. Hobday<sup>2,3</sup>, Draško Holcer<sup>17,18</sup>, Charlotte  
8 Hudson<sup>19</sup>, Tim C. Jennerjahn<sup>20,21</sup>, Aimee Kinney<sup>16</sup>, Maaïke Knol-Kauffman<sup>22</sup>, Marie F. Löff<sup>23</sup>, Priscila  
9 F. M. Lopes<sup>24</sup>, Peter C. Mackelworth<sup>18,25</sup>, Abigail McQuatters-Gollop<sup>26</sup>, Ella-Kari Muhl<sup>5</sup>, Pita  
10 Neihapi<sup>27</sup>, José J. Pascual-Fernández<sup>15</sup>, Stephen M. Posner<sup>28</sup>, Hens Runhaar<sup>29</sup>, Keith Sainsbury<sup>3</sup>, Gunnar  
11 Sander<sup>30</sup>, Dirk J. Steenbergen<sup>12</sup>, Paul M. Tuda<sup>20</sup>, Elizabeth Whiteman<sup>31</sup>, Jialin Zhang<sup>20</sup>.

12  
13 1: Australian National Centre for the Public Awareness of Science, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

14 2: CSIRO, Oceans and Atmosphere, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

15 3: Centre for Marine Socioecology, University of Tasmania, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

16 4: Crawford School of Public Policy, Australian National University, ACT, Australia

17 5: School of Environment, Resources and Sustainability, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada

18 6: Departments of Anthropology and Ichthyology and Fisheries Science (DIFS) Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South  
19 Africa

20 7: Fisheries Socioeconomic Department, Centro Tecnológico del Mar- Fundación CETMAR, Vigo, Spain

21 8: School of Environmental Studies, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, V8P 5C2, Canada

22 9: Charles Darwin Research Station, Charles Darwin Foundation, Galápagos, Ecuador

23 10: Evidence Project, Research and Science, The Pew Charitable Trusts, Washington, DC, United States

24 11: Center for Oceans, Conservation International, Arlington, VA, USA

25 12: Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security, University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW, Australia

26 13: Department of Environmental Studies, University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, CO, United States

27 14: Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University, Kräftriket 2B, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

28 15: Instituto de Investigación Social y Turismo, Universidad de La Laguna, San Cristóbal de La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain

29 16: Puget Sound Institute, University of Washington Tacoma, Tacoma, WA, USA

30 17: Croatian Natural History Museum, Zagreb, Croatia

31 18: Blue World Institute of Marine Research and Conservation, Veli Lošinj, Croatia

32 19: Lenfest Ocean Program, The Pew Charitable Trusts, Washington, DC, United States

33 20: Leibniz Centre for Tropical Marine Research, Fahrenheitstrasse 6, Bremen, Germany

34 21: Faculty of Geoscience, University of Bremen, Klagenfurter Strasse, Bremen, Germany

35 22: Norwegian College of Fishery Science, University of Tromsø - The Arctic University of Norway, 9037, Tromsø, Norway

36 23: Baltic Sea Centre, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden

37 24: Fishing Ecology, Management and Economics Group, Department of Ecology, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do  
38 Norte, Natal, Brazil

39 25: Institute for Tourism, Zagreb, Croatia

40 26: School of Biological and Marine Sciences, University of Plymouth, Drake Circus, Plymouth PL4 8AA, UK

41 27: Vanuatu Fisheries Department, Port Vila, Vanuatu.

42 28: Gund Institute for Environment, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, 05405, USA


43 29: Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Princetonlaan 8a, CB Utrecht 3584, the Netherlands  
 44 30: Norwegian Institute for Water Research (NIVA), 0579 Oslo, Norway  
 45 31: California Ocean Science Trust, Sacramento, CA 95814, USA

46

47 \*Corresponding author: [Denis.Karcher@anu.edu.au](mailto:Denis.Karcher@anu.edu.au)

48

49 **Graphical abstract**



50

51

52 **Abstract**

53 Evidence-informed decision-making is in increasing demand given growing pressures on marine  
 54 environments. A way to facilitate this is by knowledge exchange among marine scientists and decision-  
 55 makers. While many barriers are reported in the literature, there are also examples whereby research  
 56 has successfully informed marine decision-making (i.e., 'bright-spots'). Here, we identify and analyze  
 57 25 bright-spots from a wide range of marine fields, contexts, and locations to provide insights into how  
 58 to improve knowledge exchange at the interface of marine science and policy. Through qualitative  
 59 surveys we investigate what initiated the bright-spots, their goals, and approaches to knowledge  
 60 exchange. We also seek to identify what outcomes/impacts have been achieved, the enablers of success,

61 and what lessons can be learnt to guide future knowledge exchange efforts. Results show that a diversity  
62 of approaches were used for knowledge exchange, from consultative engagement to genuine knowledge  
63 co-production. We show that diverse successes at the interface of marine science and policy are  
64 achievable and include impacts on policy, people, and governance. Such successes were enabled by  
65 factors related to the actors, processes, support, context, and timing. For example, the importance of  
66 involving diverse actors and managing positive relationships is a key lesson for success. However,  
67 enabling routine success will require: 1) transforming the ways in which we train scientists to include a  
68 greater focus on interpersonal skills, 2) institutionalizing and supporting knowledge exchange activities  
69 in organizational agendas, 3) conceptualizing and implementing broader research impact metrics, and  
70 4) transforming funding mechanisms to focus on need-based interventions, impact planning, and an  
71 acknowledgement of the required time and effort that underpin knowledge exchange activities.

72

73 **Keywords:** Research impact; Marine environmental governance; Science-policy interface; Evidence-  
74 informed decision-making; Transdisciplinary research

75

## 76 **1. Introduction**

77 Navigating the challenges facing marine social-ecological systems (*cf.* Berkes, 2017; Berkes et al.,  
78 2003) in ways that are sustainable and equitable requires the accessibility and integration of existing  
79 and newly emerging scientific knowledge into decision-making processes (Addison et al., 2018;  
80 Alexander et al., 2020; Fisher et al., 2014; Pendleton et al., 2019; Sutherland et al., 2004). The  
81 accumulation of information alone, however, is not enough to solve the complex and dynamic  
82 challenges facing marine social-ecological systems. Rather, it is crucial to improve the translation of  
83 marine scientific knowledge into action (Buxton et al., 2021), for example, through improved  
84 knowledge exchange (hereafter ‘KE’) among science and policy actors (e.g., Cvitanovic et al., 2016).

85

86 KE is a relatively new concept within marine management. In its broadest sense it implies a two- or  
87 multi-directional process of knowledge sharing with mutual benefits and learnings to both scientists  
88 and decision-makers (Fazey et al., 2013). KE therefore seeks to move beyond traditional linear models  
89 of science communication, which positioned researchers as the ‘providers’ of knowledge and decision-  
90 makers as the ‘users’ of knowledge, by recognizing the interdependencies between them (reviewed by  
91 Cvitanovic et al., 2015a). Over the past decade numerous approaches to improving KE at the interface  
92 of marine science and decision-making have been identified, including the process of knowledge co-  
93 production (Chambers et al., 2021; Norström et al., 2020) and the utilization of boundary spanning  
94 individuals (Cvitanovic et al., 2017; Lomas, 2007) or organizations (Bednarek et al., 2018; Cvitanovic  
95 et al., 2018; Meyer et al., 2015). For the purpose of this paper, and to be inclusive of all KE processes,  
96 we define KE as the interchange of knowledge between research producers and users, spanning all

97 activities and processes of knowledge generation, sharing, storage, mobilization, translation, mediation  
98 and use (Best and Holmes, 2010; Cvitanovic et al., 2015a).

99

100 Despite growing recognition for the importance of KE, many barriers remain that limit the integration  
101 of marine science into policy and practice (Addison et al., 2015; Cvitanovic et al., 2015a). For example,  
102 barriers relate to the decision-making process itself (e.g., lack of time or expertise to search for, access  
103 and interpret scientific knowledge), cultural differences between science and policy (e.g., different  
104 ‘languages’), institutional disincentives (e.g., publish or perish), and inadequate resources (time, money,  
105 capacity) (Cvitanovic et al., 2016, 2014; Rose et al., 2018; Walsh et al., 2019). Marine scientists often  
106 have the personal goal of impacting marine policy and management through their research, but few can  
107 report cases where they have achieved this (Cvitanovic et al., 2015b).

108

109 Clearly, there is still much to learn about how to effectively connect marine research with decision-  
110 makers and management. One step forward is by learning from ‘bright-spots’ - successful examples  
111 whereby marine science has informed policy and/or practice (Cvitanovic and Hobday, 2018). The  
112 importance of bright-spots as seeds of positive outcomes (cf. Bennett et al., 2016), as well as the  
113 meaning and diversity of impacts from successful KE are becoming increasingly studied and understood  
114 (Cooke et al., 2020; Cvitanovic et al., 2021a; Karcher et al., 2021). Broadly, impacts can be described  
115 as “changes in awareness, knowledge and understanding, ideas, attitudes and perceptions, and policy  
116 and practice” (Morton 2015, p.36). It can span individuals, groups, organizations, societies, and  
117 ecosystems but are a matter of the context-specific perceptions of intended beneficiaries, as well as  
118 others who might be disadvantaged (Cvitanovic et al., 2021a; Reed et al., 2021). However, what  
119 constitutes success can vary across projects and perspectives – and evaluation of KE is challenging  
120 (Jagannathan et al., 2020; Meagher et al., 2008; Pitt et al., 2018; Posner and Cvitanovic, 2019).  
121 Increasingly, there are calls to more specifically plan for and acknowledge less tangible social outcomes  
122 like changed mind-sets, strengthened relationships, or resolved conflicts (Karcher et al., 2021; Louder  
123 et al., 2021). Accordingly, for the purpose of this study we define KE success as knowledge becoming:  
124 “accessible, understandable, shared, and used, enabled by good knowledge exchange products,  
125 - processes, and social outcomes [...], with the potential to contribute to changes in policy and  
126 demonstrable societal impact” (Karcher et al., 2021, p.214).

127 However, more work is needed to understand the most promising pathways and the enabling factors to  
128 obtain such *successes*.

129

130 Learning from KE successes may help to build capacity for evidence-informed decision-making and  
131 equip scientists, decision-makers and practitioners with new ways of working together. Therefore, the  
132 aim of this study is to empirically identify, analyze and learn about improving KE from a broad range

133 of marine science-policy bright-spots across different scales and marine ecosystems. We do this by  
134 addressing the following questions:

- 135 i) What initiated the project/initiative and what were the goals?
- 136 ii) Which approaches to KE were used?
- 137 iii) What outcomes and impacts were achieved?
- 138 iv) What were the enablers of KE success?
- 139 v) What lessons can we draw from them to improve KE at the interface of marine science and  
140 policy?

141

## 142 **2. Methods**

143

### 144 *2.1 Recruitment of research participants*

145 The Human Ethics Committee (Protocol 2020/693) at the Australian National University approved this  
146 study prior to data collection. We identified international experts in the field of marine science-policy  
147 interactions from a systematic review of the academic literature (as reported in Karcher et al., 2021).  
148 There was no individual rationale for each expert or their case study, rather a systematic identification  
149 process with self-identification of policy- or context-specific success by respective case study leaders.  
150 The lead author team (DK, CC, IvP, RC) checked studies from that body of literature for relevance to  
151 the scope of the present study (i.e., marine case studies at the science-policy interface covering KE  
152 interactions). If study focus and lead author research focus/background aligned, we contacted the lead  
153 author of each study, otherwise a different author on the same publication was contacted.

154

155 We contacted identified experts and asked if they were able and willing to participate. If so, they were  
156 asked to fill out a text-based survey with open-ended questions (Supplementary Material 1) (following  
157 approaches described in Kelly et al., 2019; Norström et al., 2020). Because literature in the field of  
158 environmental science-policy connections is predominantly produced by organizations from Europe  
159 and North America (Karcher et al., 2021), we actively took steps to overcome existing publication bias  
160 (e.g., geographical). Specifically, we sought to achieve a more balanced representation of global experts  
161 by asking the initial participants to identify other experts in the field (snowballing) and stopped when  
162 case studies from all continents and oceans were identified and included in the study.

163

164 In total, we contacted 49 potential participants, 33 of whom participated in the survey (67%) and joined  
165 this paper as co-authors (for some case studies, there was more than one expert contributor). Most  
166 participants played the role of a researcher within their specified case study (n=14), followed by KE  
167 connector/organizer (n=13) (including knowledge broker, boundary organization employee), or  
168 advising expert (n=8). Some played more than one role and in five cases the identified experts were  
169 external to the KE process (e.g., involved as a policy analyst).


170

171 *2.2 Selecting bright-spots*

172 For the purpose of this study, we consider bright-spots to be situations when KE success (see  
173 *Introduction*) was achieved *and* marine research has had an impact (be it instrumental or non-  
174 instrumental) on policy and/or the practice of marine management (following Cvitanovic and Hobday,  
175 2018). The included bright-spots were self-identified by the participants to account for individual  
176 notions to the perception of success where those involved know what met their needs and ambitions  
177 (Le Heron et al., 2021). We purposefully asked for bright-spots in which any research discipline  
178 (spanning both the social and natural sciences) has had an impact on policy and/or practice. To be  
179 considered for inclusion in this study, the bright-spots had to include actors from science and policy,  
180 and some also included actors from other stakeholder groups (e.g., fishers, NGOs, civil-, or boundary  
181 organizations). This process identified 25 bright-spots that span a wide range of ecological fields,  
182 marine spaces and policy scales (Supplementary Table 1).

183

184 An information-oriented selection of maximum variation case studies was followed (Flyvbjerg, 2006).  
185 The case study contexts and scales vary to generate diverse examples and lessons in the field. Most of  
186 the bright-spots focused on coastal waters, followed by national waters/exclusive economic zones  
187 (EEZs) as well as combinations of either coastal lands and waters, or coastal and offshore waters. Their  
188 governance level was mostly national, followed by local, regional (i.e., sub-national or state-level), and  
189 international (i.e., multi-national) (Figure 1). In cases where bright-spots involved multiple levels we  
190 used the dominant level to characterize it for the purposes of further analysis. Among the 25 included  
191 bright-spots, 20 were based on completed projects, and five were ongoing. As per the criteria for  
192 inclusion in this study, projects that were still ongoing had to have already achieved some form of  
193 demonstrable impact/success related to KE. The starting points of projects date back to the 1990s, but  
194 the majority (n = 16) commenced in 2010 or after, most recently in 2019.



195

196 Figure 1: Global distribution of marine science-policy bright-spots analyzed through this study, with  
 197 international (★), national (▲), sub-national/regional (■), and local (▼) governance level. Numbers  
 198 identify the bright-spots (see Supplementary Table 1).

199

200 *2.3 Data analysis*

201 Survey responses were analyzed using the qualitative data analysis software NVIVO 12. Following a  
 202 grounded theory approach, *in vivo* inductive thematic coding was conducted for each research question  
 203 with iterating theming of codes (Charmaz, 2008, 2006; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Saldaña, 2015). The  
 204 research questions embodied the starting points (i.e., broad themes like approaches, successes, enablers,  
 205 recommendations) followed by an iterative, coding process within those themes. Hence, without  
 206 additional pre-classification, the individual codes (using the participants' words) emerged directly from  
 207 the data. As coding progressed, they were iteratively compared to existing codes to identify data-driven  
 208 descriptive key themes (Blythe and Cvitanovic, 2020; Fleming and Vanclay, 2009; Saldaña, 2015).

209

210 To ensure inter- and intra-personal coding reliability, a randomly selected subset of three surveys was  
 211 pilot-coded twice within four weeks by the lead author, as well as independently pilot-coded once by  
 212 each for the four coordinating authors. We then met to discuss our individual codes and themes to  
 213 identify overlap, and more importantly, points of divergence in our coding. Subsequently, three surveys  
 214 were coded by two authors (DK, CC) and discussed to ensure coding reliability. A second cycle of  
 215 coding was undertaken to find higher-level labels (i.e., broader categories), particularly for questions  
 216 that had a lot of data themes. The data were reanalyzed following thematic coding to unravel coherent  
 217 key themes (Saldaña, 2015). Emerging themes are reported in the results if they were raised by more  
 218 than two bright-spots.



219

#### 220 *2.4 Methodological limitations*

221 There are some methodological limitations associated with case study analysis that are important to  
222 note. Even though case-study research is well recognized for its contribution to understanding complex  
223 issues (see description of qualitative case-study research in Starman, 2013), the findings are not always  
224 directly generalizable across contexts. Thus, in presenting the results we acknowledge that the interface  
225 between marine science and decision-making varies between sectors, cultures, political systems, and  
226 governance levels. Thus, whilst the lessons we present are purposefully drawn from diverse case studies  
227 in diverse locations, settings, and levels to represent this range of contexts, they should be considered  
228 as guidelines rather than directly applicable to each context. While biases may exist in self-identification  
229 and self-reporting, this approach directly links to impact attainment in that impacts on policy or  
230 management were shown to be directly related to how ‘successful’ participatory transdisciplinary  
231 research is perceived (Steger et al., 2021). When discussing successes and their enablers within the  
232 bright-spots, we always refer to KE success, not a specific conservation success or impact.

233

234

### 235 **3. Results**

236 The coding of survey responses resulted in 1,413 codes that were distributed across the main study  
237 goals and grouped together as themes. Themes are presented in order of number of sources (bright-  
238 spots, ‘n’) that mention the theme throughout the study. The frequency, which refers to the number of  
239 times each theme was mentioned by the participants (i.e., number of references), is presented in  
240 Supplementary Table 2.

241

#### 242 *3.1 Bright-spot setting (initiation, goals, approaches)*

243 Data analysis revealed that the bright-spots had three main initiators or origins: i) policy demand (i.e.,  
244 raised by policy processes or documents) (number of bright-spots (n) =12), ii) research actors (n=12),  
245 and iii) third parties (n=11). Those third parties initiating the bright-spots were mostly funding agencies  
246 (e.g., funding requirement), but also NGOs, boundary organizations, or local or Indigenous  
247 communities.

248


249 The most common goals within the bright-spots were ambitions to impact policy (n=17, particularly in  
250 national-level bright-spots) and create both scientifically and policy-relevant knowledge (n=15). Other  
251 commonly reported goals included impact on governance (n=12), social outcomes (n=12), societal well-  
252 being (n=9), and ecological well-being (n=8).

253

254 A diverse range of KE approaches was used across the 25 bright-spots, which were classified into three  
255 overarching themes (Figure 2): (i) activities (n=25, i.e., specific actions such as events, meetings,

256 collecting relevant knowledge, and connecting/facilitating/convening people and organizations); (ii)  
 257 strategies (n=24, i.e., broad concepts such as knowledge co-production, boundary work, and advisory  
 258 bodies/agencies/assessments); and (iii) products used (n=14, e.g., policy briefs or meeting papers). It is  
 259 important to highlight interactions among these three themes. Altogether, convergent, collaborative  
 260 spaces were important and one participant explained that their events (i.e., workshops) were structured  
 261 to first “open [ ] up a ‘divergence’ in terms of views and knowledge, and [then] create [ ]  
 262 ‘convergence’”. A full list of approaches, strategies, and products can be found in Supplementary Table  
 263 2.

264  
 265



266  
 267 Figure 2: Summary of the key approaches (spanning the strategies used, activities undertaken, and  
 268 products produced across the 25 analyzed case studies) to achieving successful knowledge exchange in  
 269 bright-spots at the marine science-policy interface.

270

### 271 3.2 Successes and impacts achieved in bright-spots

272 The successes most commonly identified were impacts on policy (n=22). Reported impacts on policy  
 273 included production of management/policy documents, the new formation of protected areas, and  
 274 informed decision-making processes. Impacts on people was the next most commonly identified theme  
 275 (n=17), being relatively more common in regional-level case studies (Supplementary Table 3). Impacts  
 276 on people included the expansion of social networks, relationships, trust, and mitigation of conflicts. It  
 277 also included impact on individuals, for example, decision-makers (e.g., increased awareness and

278 understanding of available and needed science), stakeholders or resource-users (e.g., increased  
 279 recognition of other perspectives and/or conflicts) and researchers (e.g., learning about opportunities  
 280 and roles of science and decision-makers). Individual impacts also reached more personal aspects as  
 281 “researchers had increased interest, confidence, and motivation to further engage with policy-makers”.

282  
 283 Other successes commonly identified were impacts on governance (n=17, e.g., changed management  
 284 processes, new monitoring/assessments, shift to ecosystem-based or community-based management)  
 285 and ‘relative’ successes (n=15). The latter include projects that went further and faster than anticipated,  
 286 hit their own goals, or achieved something for the first time (e.g., management break-through after  
 287 stagnation). For example, participants said that the project met their objective “in full but at a more  
 288 rapid rate than expected” or managed to “push the boundaries from what was initially anticipated”.

289  
 290 *3.3 Enablers, lessons, and recommendations from global bright-spots*  
 291 Participants identified five key categories of enablers (Table 1, Figure 3): actors (n=23), processes  
 292 (n=22), support (n=16), contexts (n=16), and timing and urgency (n=13). Furthermore, participants  
 293 made statements on the lessons from their project. Those referred to the importance of recognizing and  
 294 including diverse actors and knowledge types (n=11), considering time and effort (n=8), and the nature  
 295 of boundary work (n=8).

296  
 297 Table 1: Coding structure of emerging themes distributed over the research questions of enablers,  
 298 lessons, and recommendations. Listed are the number of bright-spots naming emerging themes (n) and  
 299 brief descriptions of each theme.

Enablers	n	Description
Actors	23	
Interpersonal	18	The quality of interactions between people - relationships, bonds, and trust between individuals.
Actor group and openness	18	References made to the group of people as a whole - the team, team composition, devotion, and skillsets.
Personal	15	Characteristics, roles, backgrounds, and skills of individuals – facilitating role, commitment, reputation.
Understanding expertise, differences and restrictions	3	Referring to situational awareness regarding included actors – understanding roles, differences, and limitations.
Processes	22	
Methodological	20	Factors related to strategies and approaches as well as methodological inputs to the interaction (e.g., research quality, collaborative setting).
Process characteristics	8	The quality, flexibility, transparency, and relevance of the process.
Support	16	
Financial	11	Funding, financial support and flexibility, as well as financial incentives or benefits through the project/initiative.
Political	8	Broad (political) or specific (politician) supportiveness, demand, and receptiveness.
Public attention and support	6	Media attention, storytelling, celebrity support, (public) pressure, advocacy.
Organizational	5	Referring to organizations’ institutionalized support, trainings, teaming-up and partnerships, but also their independence.

Contexts	16	
Background (e.g., governance system and level)	14	Embracing the political context, governance system, scale, location, global context, as well as research background and previous work.
Local community	7	Local leadership and support, community organization and governance culture, and homogenous cultural/religious identity.
Timing and urgency	13	
Timing and opportunity	10	Referring to both the right timing (policy window), momentum, and opportunity for achievements, as well as persistent, continuous effort and punctual delivery.
Topic, need, urgency	8	Urgency of the issue as a hot topic with high social-ecological relevance.
<b>Lessons learnt</b>		
Recognize and engage diverse actors and knowledge types	11	Legitimacy and inclusion matter, stakeholders and local people/communities should be engaged, as well as local, traditional, and experience-based knowledge.
Consider time and timing	8	Boundary work needs time, effort, resources, and the right timing.
Boundary work and context	8	Boundary work can be successful, but is often hidden, iterative, a sum of actions in a system of positive efforts and conditions.
Value people and relationships	6	References were made that it's all about relationships and bringing the right people together (i.e., human factors and investing in them).
Expect challenges along the way	5	Disruptions may occur, needs may change, research may be used for a political agenda or to delay action.
Accept that politics matters	4	Organizations have different mandates; different actors have different motivations; diplomacy and geopolitics matter.
Invest in trust and consistency	3	Trust is slow and difficult, it is individuals that build and break trust, and a clear and transparent policy process is key.
Focus beyond only science and policy	3	Focus on 'science' and 'policy' may be too narrow, society and public debate matter.
Governance context (different types of governance may work)	3	References were made that top-down approaches can or can't work (underlining context specificity).
<b>Recommendations to others</b>		
Personal	16	Recommendations to individuals, skills, roles, and behavior. For example, to be aware of perspectives and context, decision relevant, prepared, culturally & politically sensitive and supportive, humble, adaptive, flexible, and willing to compromise.
Process	12	Recommendations at process level, incl. strategies. For example, to install a truly collaborative interface with different societal actors and knowledge types & timely feedback loops among actors, empower locals, plan early, feasible, and target driven.
External	7	This includes recommendations to team-up with other organizations (incl. civil society organizations and advisory agencies) or boundary spanners, and train others.
Interpersonal	5	Relating to the interactions between individuals. This includes to facilitate trust, develop relationships, ask peers for feedback, network and socialize informally.

300

301 The recommendations from participants to others working at the marine science-policy interface fell  
302 into four distinct levels: i) personal level (n=16), ii) process level (n=12), iii) external level (n=7), and  
303 iv) interpersonal level (n=5). Key considerations for maximizing the likelihood of success at the  
304 interface of marine science and policy are summarized in Figure 4. Because both the scope and findings  
305 of enablers, lessons, and recommendations overlapped, they are combined here.



306

307 Figure 3: Summary of the factors that enabled KE success in the 25 marine science-policy bright-spots  
308 analyzed in this study.

309

### 310 3.3.1 Actors

311 The actor group (i.e., all the people who were involved in the KE project) was a commonly discussed  
312 enabler of successful KE. Recognizing and including diverse actors and knowledge sources (research-  
313 based knowledge, experience-based knowledge, local, and traditional knowledge) was an important  
314 success factor. This was particularly important in bright-spots that occurred at local governance level  
315 (Supplementary Table 3) with one participant stating: *“When they [local people] are involved in*  
316 *developing the solutions, and this solution may help improve their wellbeing, their support may*  
317 *demonstrate as the determinant factor.”*

318

319 Actor-focused enablers also included the openness of the individuals (i.e., to co-learning, to collaborate,  
320 and to try new approaches), as well as having a devoted/motivated group of people. Trust, building on  
321 pre-existing relationships, and the relationships built between actors themselves, were also found to be  
322 key enablers, as were individuals who can openly and constructively debate conflicts, or have personal  
323 bonds/friendships between actors. One participant stated: *“Often personal relationships are overlooked*  
324 *for conservation; however, this is probably what made the key connections possible.”* Study participants  
325 suggested actively and deliberately building and facilitating trust, developing relationships, and  
326 socializing informally: *“It’s about developing relationships between decision makers and researchers*  
327 *that allow them to explore and produce solutions together.”* The study participants also reflected that it  
328 takes a long time to build trust, as one participant said: *“The trust generating processes needed to be*

329 *complex to include all the interest groups involved. And in some cases the level of initial mistrust was*  
330 *high and the process of overcoming that took quite some time (i.e. years).”*

331

332 At a personal level, actors’ awareness of the diverse perspectives, roles and limitations was another  
333 enabler of successful KE. This included being aware of the motivations, goals, and restrictions (e.g.,  
334 institutional limitations) of others, particularly of decision-makers, as well as being aware of one’s own  
335 and science’s role. This was emphasized by two participants who said that “*technical research is only*  
336 *one factor among many that decision-makers must consider*” and hence the “*key lesson is to respect the*  
337 *restrictions on the policy side, which were not always transparent to [them]*”. Other personal  
338 recommendations included the need for scientists to focus on decision-relevant questions, to be prepared  
339 (e.g., for a policy window), culturally and politically sensitive, supportive, humble, adaptive, and  
340 flexible, as well as not to rush or push too much. The personal factors also referred to the involvement  
341 of key individual champions/facilitators with specific skills or backgrounds. For example, that someone  
342 “*was born and raised in a fishing community, and as a consequence had a deep understanding of the*  
343 *constraints linked to the establishment of protection measures for fishers*”. Furthermore, it included  
344 individuals’ personal drive, contribution, and reputation. One participant said that “*the most significant*  
345 *factor was the personal commitment (indeed voluntary work sometimes) of the people involved*”. This  
346 suggests that a lack of institutionalization/resources (e.g., to cover the full workload) may also occur in  
347 bright-spots, but underlines the high individual commitment, “*interest and drive*” to contribute towards  
348 a bigger change.

349

### 350 *3.3.2 Processes and support*

351 Within this theme, methodological enablers were most commonly discussed. These included the process  
352 being co-developed, the availability of clear, credible, decision-relevant research ahead of management,  
353 mandates by, or close collaboration with, authorities and policy bodies, as well as use of specific  
354 products or creative strategies (e.g., science-policy speed-dating) to support KE efforts. Such enablers  
355 were particularly relevant to bright-spots at international and regional scales (Supplementary Table 3).  
356 Recommendations relating to the process included explicitly establishing a collaborative science-policy  
357 interface (i.e., open spaces and minds where projects can be co-developed among diverse actors), and  
358 having timely and strong feedback loops among project participants to enable shared learning and local  
359 community empowerment. This is well-illustrated by one researcher’s recommendation to other  
360 researchers conducting KE projects (i.e., knowledge co-production): “*Make communities a part that is*  
361 *at least just as relevant as your own research agenda [...] keep them in the loop, but always give them*  
362 *a voice.*”

363

364 Data analysis also identified the need to ‘start early’ (acknowledging the time needed to establish  
365 collaborative research efforts with diverse stakeholders) and find the right policy windows, as well as

366 focusing on what is feasible (i.e., what policy impact is realistic). Additionally, high flexibility and  
367 adaptability were valued, as highlighted by this statement of a participant: “*We adapted as we went,*  
368 *went down new pathways and could not, on Day 1, have predicted or scoped the [...] outputs that were*  
369 *ultimately developed. This flexibility was really important.*”

370

371 Other process- and support-related enablers included the need to ‘team-up’ (e.g., with other  
372 organizations, civil society groups, or NGOs), to train others (e.g., students, stakeholders), and  
373 use/assist local authorities or advisory agencies in producing policy-relevant advice. Regarding the  
374 latter, one participant stated that “*it is essential to work through the regional technical agencies that*  
375 *national policy makers look to for advice*”. An additional layer of support referred to the political  
376 supportiveness that projects benefited from. First, it refers to political supportiveness: “*The direct*  
377 *interest and involvement of the political class in the project was a game-changer and helped navigate*  
378 *through.*” Second, this refers to organizational-level support and institutional architecture around KE,  
379 with one participant saying that it was particularly enabling to work “*in a university-based boundary*  
380 *organization, with close support from communicators and a journalist, and after a while, also policy*  
381 *analysts*”. Ultimately, participants emphasized that KE is more than a relationship between only  
382 ‘science’ and ‘policy’. This is reflected by one participant having experienced “*a reality where that line*  
383 *[between science and policy] is usually blurred and where these categories might be too narrow*”  
384 suggesting “*there may be value in downplaying the science-policy dichotomy*”. As such, a clear finding  
385 is that successful KE projects between research and *policy* (see *Methods*) also meaningfully engage  
386 *society* as a whole.

387

### 388 3.3.3 Context


389 Context was also commonly identified as having played a key role in enabling successful KE. Firstly,  
390 this refers to social and political background ranging from crises, court sentences, and the history of  
391 resource management to being “*embedded in a long-term political process*” (be it locally or  
392 internationally). Context included local preconditions to the engagement of non-academic actors, or a  
393 broader public “*tradition for appreciating knowledge-based policies*”. More broadly, one participant  
394 reflected that “*successful initiatives are built on or embedded within other successes and long-standing*  
395 *relationships, and that they are a part of a broader ‘ecosystem of positive efforts’*”. Additional lessons  
396 were articulated around the governance context and roles of politics - for example, that relationships  
397 and motivations may reflect organizational mandates. On top of that, a small spatial scale was stated  
398 supportive to KE. Within small spatial scale, a high level of local or traditional organization, leadership  
399 and governance culture supported successful KE (Supplementary Table 3).

400

### 401 3.3.4 Timing, urgency, and effort

402 Finally, time, timing, and opportunity were identified as important enablers. This is highlighted by one  
 403 participant who said that “*a policy window facilitated state legislative action*” and another who  
 404 explained “*[the project] came right at the time where poor conditions across all metrics (environment,  
 405 economic and social) saw people willing to make a change to improve things*”. The latter illustrates that  
 406 the timeliness (‘hot topic’) of projects was often explained by local, strong dependence on marine  
 407 resources threatened by poor ecological conditions. Findings also included the realization that  
 408 successful KE takes a lot of time and invisible effort: “*Our experiences within a boundary organization  
 409 suggest that the amount of time, resources and effort needed at the science-policy boundary are rarely  
 410 recognized or given due credit.*”

411



412

413 Figure 4: Lessons (left), and recommendations (right) from participants in marine science-policy bright-  
 414 spots to other researchers and practitioners conducting knowledge exchange.

415

#### 416 4. Discussion

##### 417 4.1 Bright-spot setting (initiation, goals, approaches)

418 Within the 25 marine science-policy bright-spots analyzed in this study, most were initiated by policy  
 419 demand, donors, local communities, or boundary organizations. This mirrors Steger et al. (2021, p.7)  
 420 who found that “projects initiated by practitioners [incl. policy-makers] and/or other stakeholders had  
 421 a larger proportion of high policy impact compared to projects initiated by researchers only”. While it  
 422 was beyond the scope of this study to determine the reasons for this, it could be that that academia is at  
 423 times disconnected from policy-makers’ needs, or that the non-research actors are more tightly and  
 424 more timely connected to policy, ensuring relevance (Breckwoldt et al., 2021; Goldman and Pabari,  
 425 2021; Rose et al., 2020).

426



427 Relatedly, working with established advisory bodies or governmental agencies supported successful  
428 KE. The important role of advisory bodies and assessments, meaning the mandated generation,  
429 structuring, provision and debate of knowledge to inform decision-making on policy-relevant questions  
430 in a credible and legitimate manner (Adelle and Weiland, 2012; Deelstra et al., 2003; EEA, 2001; Hugé  
431 et al., 2011; UNEP and IOC/UNESCO, 2009), has long been known (e.g., Hoppe, 2010; Jasanoff, 1998;  
432 Soomai, 2017). Walsh et al. (2019) have also found formal collaborations with management  
433 organizations to be supportive to KE, because policy-makers find research conducted or commissioned  
434 by their own agency more relevant than external scientific research (British Academy, 2008). Designing  
435 agency-led projects with iterative elements between KE actors throughout the process may help ensure  
436 that needs are incorporated in the knowledge production to make the final results more policy-relevant  
437 and account for their experience-based knowledge that Sander (2018, p.114) called “traditional  
438 managerial knowledge”.

439

440 The activities to achieve KE goals mirrored those commonly associated with boundary spanning and  
441 knowledge brokering (Bednarek et al., 2018; Lomas, 2007; Michaels, 2009). The most described  
442 strategy was knowledge co-production, an approach with a range of theoretical lenses (Bremer and  
443 Meisch, 2017) and practical modes (Chambers et al., 2021). The diversity of bright-spot approaches  
444 included many different co-production components at different points in time (co-designing, co-  
445 creating, co-writing, co-evaluating). What co-production processes have in common is helping political  
446 receptiveness and research uptake by being context-based, pluralistic, goal-orientated, interactive and  
447 benefiting from iterations among actors (Lemos and Morehouse, 2005; Norström et al., 2020).

448

#### 449 *4.2 Successes of KE*

450 Results show that success at the interface of science and policy-making can be achieved, and that  
451 success comes in diverse forms and can be defined more broadly than traditionally conceptualized  
452 (supporting recent work by Cooke et al., 2020; Cvitanovic et al., 2021a; Karcher et al., 2021). Leaving  
453 bias from study selection criteria towards impact on policy/governance and comparison considerations  
454 aside, nearly 200 out of 326 references were made to other types of success. Among them were impacts  
455 on people (i.e., researchers and non-academic partners). For example, individual changes in knowledge  
456 or job satisfaction can occur (Cvitanovic et al., 2018; 2021a; Xavier et al., 2018) as well as individual  
457 learning and understanding of issues and uncertainties, or changes in attitude and practice of KE actors  
458 (Knapp et al., 2017; O’Connor et al., 2019). As a result, individuals may also have improved individual  
459 networks and reputation (Cvitanovic et al., 2021a), and ultimately gain more career opportunities  
460 (Hegger and Dieperink, 2015).

461

#### 462 *4.3 Enablers, lessons, and recommendations*

463 Cvitanovic et al. (2016) identified three core capacities to enable KE, which are individual, institutional  
464 and financial capacities. In our study, factors related to people (i.e., interpersonal factors, actor group,  
465 individual enablers) were the most recurring enablers (throughout both individual and organizational  
466 KE endeavors). This refers to the actor group, its diversity, skillset, and devotion, corroborating findings  
467 by Cvitanovic et al. (2018) and Reed et al. (2014). Beyond that, understanding the expertise,  
468 motivations, and limitations of all actors was paramount, mirroring the literature (Brugger et al., 2016;  
469 Cvitanovic et al., 2016; Evans and Cvitanovic, 2018; Marshall et al., 2017). Our findings underline the  
470 pivotal roles of building and maintaining trust and long-term relationships (Balvanera et al., 2017;  
471 Cvitanovic et al., 2021b; Lacey et al., 2018; Newig et al., 2019; Tinch et al., 2018) suggesting that their  
472 attainment is of inherent value for KE. Hence, the findings suggest that trust is critical as both an input  
473 and an outcome of successful KE. This relates to the notion of social capital as a “set of values and  
474 relationships created by individuals in the past that can be drawn on in the present and future to facilitate  
475 overcoming social dilemmas” (Ahn and Ostrom, 2002, p.3). Our study participants indicated that KE  
476 particularly benefited from pre-existing relationships, which corroborates the value of history (e.g.,  
477 individual experiences, social capital and trust) around KE (Hakkarainen et al., 2020; Karcher et al., in  
478 review).

479

480 A clear finding was that, even when (by study-selection) focusing on marine science-*policy* interfaces,  
481 many other *societal* actors and knowledge types, beyond the domains of ‘science’ and ‘policy’ were  
482 engaged in the bright-spots, mirroring a new knowledge-governance interface recently proposed by  
483 Turnhout et al. (2021). This highlights the value and need for strong collaboration between natural and  
484 social sciences and humanities for KE and marine management (Mazé et al., 2017; Nogueira et al.,  
485 2021; Singh et al., 2021). Social sciences, including anthropology, law, and economics, have important  
486 contributions, for example in giving advice on what type of policy instruments may affect people -  
487 whose activities affect the oceans (Lascoumes and Le Gales, 2007; Sander, 2018; van Putten et al.,  
488 2021). In that regard, experience-based knowledge by both decision-makers and stakeholders also needs  
489 to be considered (Fazey et al., 2006; Stephenson et al., 2016). Practically, this leads to recommendations  
490 to early and meaningfully involve diverse actors and knowledge systems (Hegger et al., 2012; Tengö et  
491 al., 2014; UNEP and IOC/UNESCO, 2009; Weichselgartner and Kasperson, 2010). It is well-known  
492 that participation and integration of local or traditional knowledge are beneficial to research, knowledge  
493 use in decision-making and management, and conservation success (Dawson et al., 2021; Loch and  
494 Riechers, 2021; McKenzie et al., 2014; Raymond et al., 2010). Particularly on a local level, participants  
495 often made the recommendation to meaningfully include diverse knowledge types and empower local  
496 communities. This also requires making local and traditional knowledge more visible and usable and  
497 pursuing social equity in and through marine conservation (Bennett et al., 2021).

498

499 Although not directly interrogated by the survey, the governance level of KE projects emerged in the  
500 analysis as an enabler and point of differentiation between projects (Supplementary Table 3). Despite  
501 the fact that particularly the national and sub-national levels are favorable for science-policy work (i.e.,  
502 for public awareness and shaping the implementation of legislation, Jensen-Ryan and German, 2019),  
503 we showed successful KE projects at different levels. Regional bright-spots exhibited the most diverse  
504 success categories, although we acknowledge the non-representative sample. On the other hand, an  
505 international level may facilitate dealing with overarching issues that take longer to enter in the national  
506 policy agendas. Overall, the time and timing were important success factors, referring to the  
507 recommendation to proactively analyze and tackle emerging issues early-on (UNEP and  
508 IOC/UNESCO, 2009). Our findings corroborate Rose et al. (2020) in that KE is facilitated when  
509 evidence is synthesized and interpreted in a management-relevant way before a policy window opens,  
510 and that effectiveness increases when solutions are prepared ahead of time.

511

#### 512 *4.4 Limitations and future research opportunities*

513 The study of bright-spots has high potential to inform how KE at the interface of marine science and  
514 decision-making can become more successful, but it also comes with methodological limitations.  
515 Firstly, as indicated in the *Methods* section, this case study cannot easily be generalized. It has to be  
516 considered that culture and openness are key to research use in policy-making (Court and Young, 2003;  
517 Goldman and Pabari, 2021), and that interactive engagement is a matter of cultures of participation  
518 (Reed et al., 2018). For project settings (e.g., initiation, strategies), we are unable to discern whether  
519 these co-exist with success or contribute to it. Therefore, in this study, we intended to look across very  
520 diverse case studies (i.e., breadth of data) to show commonalities despite the diversity of approaches  
521 and not to deep-dive into a specific case. Secondly, approaching bright-spots brings forth the limitations  
522 of binary approaches (success/not success) in that projects with other ambitions could be easily  
523 disregarded as a failure (*cf.* Giakoumi et al., 2018). To address this, we have transparently described the  
524 full study selection process including its ambition and have based it on participant-identified success

525

526 A track for future research on marine science-policy bright-spots could be analyzing the perceptions of  
527 more actors. Here, we mainly targeted well-connected, frequently-publishing researchers potentially  
528 missing out on experts immersed in a limited number of projects, but more deeply (many KE  
529 practitioners do not publish in academia). It also refers to non-academic actors involved in KE.  
530 Including them would ensure a more holistic presentation of perspectives beyond individual experiences  
531 of researchers, given that success, as well as the paths towards it, are a matter of perspective (Jacobs et  
532 al., 2005; Parker and Crona, 2012; Reed et al., 2021). KE work is only one of the contributors to  
533 changing policy, but there are many other actors and factors affecting it, making it hard to establish  
534 causality from KE initiatives (Ferguson et al., 2016). Moving forward also requires combining empirical  
535 bottom-up approaches and theoretical developments to understand how the factors for a successful

536 implementation of KE causally relate to each other. What are the critical factors, how can they be  
537 measured, what trade-offs may exist and how do they affect success? Ultimately, a better – more causal  
538 – understanding is needed on which success factors can be traced back to the institutional architecture  
539 supporting KE activities. Future studies should both consider the diversity of approaches in individual  
540 cases to engage more with specific contexts, but also develop broad indicator frameworks that allow  
541 achieving and assessing KE success across different cases and contexts.

542

#### 543 *5. Conclusions: Mainstreaming marine science-policy bright-spots*

544 Having shown that diverse successes at the interface of marine science and decision-making can be  
545 achieved and enabled by the right people, methods, levels of funding, and timing, we would like to  
546 reflect on some of those themes, and what they mean in terms of making bright-spots the norm, not the  
547 outlier. First, we emphasize that positive examples of KE success exist across diverse governance levels  
548 and marine ecosystems. Accordingly, this work might motivate others to take the path of interactive  
549 KE, or as one participant phrased it: *“Do not be afraid of politicians; they do not bite. When they do,  
550 please direct them to bite the right place and remove barriers.”*

551

552 Second, our findings suggest that there is a need to diversify training opportunities to conduct KE well.  
553 Although society-relevant research is important and often appreciated, we acknowledge that interactive  
554 KE may not be everyone’s ambition and is often not considered in research planning. It is also apparent  
555 that those interested need help to develop a broader set of ‘soft’ skills to engage in KE (Bednarek et al.,  
556 2018; Pietri et al., 2013). Different components have been described to improve capabilities and  
557 capacities for KE via organizations (e.g., universities). At a small scale, they include the formalization  
558 of transdisciplinary working groups (including real-life labs, Bergmann et al., 2021), supportive  
559 supervision, and KE mentorship (Andrews et al., 2020; Cvitanovic et al., 2015b; Lyall and Meagher,  
560 2012). Such mentorship and supervision should not end with theoretical advice, but also include the  
561 introduction to existing networks and collaborations to both form the skills needed and some of the  
562 ‘pre-existing relationships’ supportive to future KE success. This also includes guidance for early and  
563 mid-career scientists to be connected to those with more established careers and networks. Furthermore,  
564 good communication skills can be cultivated by organizations and university programs. On a larger  
565 scale, this challenge can be addressed by courses (e.g., mainstreaming 'human dimensions' into  
566 biology/conservation courses), fellowships, internships, student-led activities, and partnerships between  
567 universities (Duchelle et al., 2009; Lyall and Meagher, 2012; Rozance et al., 2020).

568

569 There is also a need for the institutionalization of KE within organizations. Our data does not allow  
570 statements on how innovative research solutions and KE processes were for organizational or non-  
571 research-initiated KE compared to ‘only’ science pushing. However, our research has shown that  
572 working at the science-policy interface in an organized manner – through advisory bodies, boundary

573 organizations, or NGOs – is conducive to KE success. This may require clearer institutional  
574 arrangements, relationships, and responsibilities (UNEP and IOC/UNESCO, 2009). To that end,  
575 resourcing, and institutional/cultural commitment to support relationship building and offering the time  
576 this takes are critical. Such resourcing and organizational support may need organizational re-  
577 examination of agendas, norms and constraints (Pearman and Cravens, 2022). The importance of  
578 human factors, people’s skills and drive towards achieving success not only shows the role of  
579 interpersonal relationships but suggests that there is a shortage of formal, institutionalized KE  
580 arrangements. Research and funding organizations should consider KE as part of their mission, allocate  
581 required resources, positions, and recognize the value of KE work. From an organization’s lens, this  
582 may include ‘cross-learning’ initiatives (e.g., workshops and/or residence type arrangements between  
583 academic and non-academic institutions to increase the understanding of each other’s operating  
584 contexts) or transdisciplinary programs (e.g., EU COST program, <https://www.cost.eu/>). Currently, not  
585 only researchers but also practitioners in, for example, NGOs or boundary organizations, have to  
586 explicitly promote KE and justify its budgeting.

587

588 Trust and existing relationships are also key but the time and skills to build them are not usually captured  
589 by traditional metrics of research impact (i.e., publish or perish culture, citations, etc.). This is  
590 exemplified by institutional incentive structures and funding being the major barriers to KE, likely  
591 creating trade-offs between KE success and academic success (Shanley and López, 2009). We therefore  
592 call for a shift in the measures of science impact and institutional innovation (Cvitanovic et al., 2015b;  
593 Sellberg et al., 2021). Given the role of flexible and supportive funding, one pathway for change lies in  
594 the hands of funding bodies that can affect research, its planning, conduct, and impact (Arnott et al.,  
595 2020; Lyall et al., 2013; Trueblood et al., 2019). Accordingly, we encourage institutional changes in  
596 both research institutions (e.g., institutionalization of KE, training, science-society connections) and  
597 funders (e.g., through targeted impact planning, acknowledgement of time and resources needed for  
598 KE) to remove KE barriers, and create the conditions (including the right people, skills, and processes)  
599 required for bright-spots to become more common.

600

601

## 602 **Acknowledgement**

603 We would like to thank Rebecca Shellock for her support with the sampling method, and Aislinn Dunne  
604 for the fruitful discussions. We thank Gun Rudquist for her contribution regarding bright-spot 15. PFML  
605 thanks CNPq for a productivity grant (301515/2019-0). DJS has funding support from the Australian  
606 Government through project ACIAR FIS-2016-300. TJ and JZ gratefully acknowledge financial support  
607 by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Grant No. 01DO17018) is gratefully  
608 acknowledged. AMG is supported by the UK Natural Environment Research Council (NE/R002738/1)  
609 Knowledge Exchange fellowship scheme and the EMFF-funded NEA PANACEA project

610 (110661/2020/839628/SUB/ENV.C.2.RWS). DA and EKM are supported by the Social Sciences and  
611 Humanities Research Council of Canada. NCB was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering  
612 Research Council of Canada. PCM was funded by the EU LIFE Euroturtles project (LIFE15  
613 NAT/HR/000997). RCM was funded by the Fundación CajaCanarias and Fundación Bancaria “La  
614 Caixa” [grant number 2017REC23], as well as the Ramón Areces Foundation for their support via their  
615 Social Research Grants [grant number CISP17A5887].

616

617 **Author statement:**

618 *Conceptualization:* DK, CC. *Methodology:* DK, CC, IvP, RC. *Formal analysis:* DK, CC, IvP, RC.  
619 *Investigation / data:* DA, SA, MB, NB, MBP, AB, JB, CB, TD, RCM, TF, EF, AH, DH, CH, TJ, AK,  
620 MKK, ML, PL, PM, AMG, EKM, PN, JPF, SP, HR, KS, GS, DS, PT, EW, JZ. *Writing - Original Draft:*  
621 DK, CC. *Writing - Review & Editing:* all authors. *Project administration:* DK. *Supervision:* CC, IvP,  
622 RC.

623

624

625 **References**

- 626 Addison, P.F.E., Collins, D.J., Trebilco, R., Howe, S., Bax, N., Hedge, P., Jones, G., Miloslavich, P.,  
627 Roelfsema, C., Sams, M., Stuart-Smith, R.D., Scanes, P., von Baumgarten, P., McQuatters-  
628 Gollop, A., 2018. A new wave of marine evidence-based management: emerging challenges  
629 and solutions to transform monitoring, evaluating, and reporting. *ICES Journal of Marine*  
630 *Science* 75, 941–952. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsx216>
- 631 Addison, P.F.E., Flander, L.B., Cook, C.N., 2015. Are we missing the boat? Current uses of long-term  
632 biological monitoring data in the evaluation and management of marine protected areas.  
633 *JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT* 149, 148–156.  
634 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.10.023>
- 635 Adelle, C., Weiland, S., 2012. Policy assessment: the state of the art. *Impact Assessment and Project*  
636 *Appraisal* 30, 25–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14615517.2012.663256>
- 637 Ahn, T.K., Ostrom, E., 2002. Social capital and the second-generation theories of collective action: an  
638 analytical approach to the forms of social capital. Presented at the 2002 Annual Meeting of  
639 the American Political Science Association, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 640 Alexander, S.M., Jones, K., Bennett, N.J., Budden, A., Cox, M., Crosas, M., Game, E.T., Geary, J.,  
641 Hardy, R.D., Johnson, J.T., Karcher, S., Motzer, N., Pittman, J., Randell, H., Silva, J.A., da Silva,  
642 P.P., Strasser, C., Strawhacker, C., Stuhl, A., Weber, N., 2020. Qualitative data sharing and  
643 synthesis for sustainability science. *Nat Sustain* 3, 81–88. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0434-8)  
644 [019-0434-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0434-8)
- 645 Andrews, E.J., Harper, S., Cashion, T., Palacios-Abrantes, J., Blythe, J., Daly, J., Eger, S., Hoover, C.,  
646 Talloni-Alvarez, N., Teh, L., Bennett, N., Epstein, G., Knott, C., Newell, S.L., Whitney, C.K.,  
647 2020. Supporting early career researchers: insights from interdisciplinary marine scientists.  
648 *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 77, 476–485. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsz247>
- 649 Arnott, J.C., Neuenfeldt, R.J., Lemos, M.C., 2020. Co-producing science for sustainability: Can funding  
650 change knowledge use? *GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE-HUMAN AND POLICY*  
651 *DIMENSIONS* 60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.101979>
- 652 Balvanera, P., Daw, T.M., Gardner, T.A., Martín-López, B., Norström, A.V., Speranza, C.I.,  
653 Spierenburg, M., Bennett, E.M., Farfan, M., Hamann, M., Kittinger, J.N., Luthe, T., Maass, M.,  
654 Peterson, G.D., Perez-Verdin, G., 2017. Key features for more successful place-based  
655 sustainability research on social-ecological systems. *Ecology and Society* 22, 46.
- 656 Bednarek, A.T., Wyborn, C., Cvitanovic, C., Meyer, R., Colvin, R.M., Addison, P.F.E., Close, S.L.,  
657 Curran, K., Farooque, M., Goldman, E., Hart, D., Mannix, H., McGreavy, B., Parris, A., Posner,  
658 S., Robinson, C., Ryan, M., Leith, P., 2018. Boundary spanning at the science-policy interface:  
659 the practitioners' perspectives. *Sustainability Science* 13, 1175–1183.  
660 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0550-9>
- 661 Bennett, E.M., Solan, M., Biggs, R., McPhearson, T., Norström, A.V., Olsson, P., Pereira, L., Peterson,  
662 G.D., Raudsepp-Hearne, C., Biermann, F., Carpenter, S.R., Ellis, E.C., Hichert, T., Galaz, V.,  
663 Lahsen, M., Milkoreit, M., Martín López, B., Nicholas, K.A., Preiser, R., Vince, G., Vervoort,  
664 J.M., Xu, J., 2016. Bright spots: seeds of a good Anthropocene. *Front Ecol Environ* 14, 441–  
665 448. <https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1309>
- 666 Bennett, N.J., Katz, L., Yadao-Evans, W., Ahmadi, G.N., Atkinson, S., Ban, N.C., Dawson, N.M., de  
667 Vos, A., Fitzpatrick, J., Gill, D., Imirizaldu, M., Lewis, N., Mangubhai, S., Meth, L., Muhl, E.-K.,  
668 Obura, D., Spalding, A.K., Villagomez, A., Wagner, D., White, A., Wilhelm, A., 2021. Advancing  
669 Social Equity in and Through Marine Conservation. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 8, 711538.  
670 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.711538>
- 671 Bergmann, M., Schöpke, N., Marg, O., Stelzer, F., Lang, D.J., Bossert, M., Gantert, M., Häußler, E.,  
672 Marquardt, E., Piontek, F.M., Potthast, T., Rhodius, R., Rudolph, M., Ruddat, M., Seebacher,  
673 A., Sußmann, N., 2021. Transdisciplinary sustainability research in real-world labs: success  
674 factors and methods for change. *Sustain Sci* 16, 541–564. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00886-8)  
675 [020-00886-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00886-8)

676 Berkes, F., 2017. Environmental Governance for the Anthropocene? Social-Ecological Systems,  
677 Resilience, and Collaborative Learning. SUSTAINABILITY 9.  
678 <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9071232>

679 Berkes, F., Colding, J., Folke, C., 2003. Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for  
680 Complexity and Change. Cambridge University Press.

681 Best, A., Holmes, B., 2010. Systems thinking, knowledge and action: Towards better models and  
682 methods. Evidence and Policy 6, 145–159. <https://doi.org/10.1332/174426410X502284>

683 Blythe, J., Cvitanovic, C., 2020. Five Organizational Features That Enable Successful Interdisciplinary  
684 Marine Research. Front. Mar. Sci. 7, 539111. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.539111>

685 Breckwoldt, A., Lopes, P.F.M., Selim, S.A., 2021. Look Who’s Asking—Reflections on Participatory and  
686 Transdisciplinary Marine Research Approaches. Front. Mar. Sci. 8, 627502.  
687 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.627502>

688 Bremer, S., Meisch, S., 2017. Co-production in climate change research: reviewing different  
689 perspectives. WIREs Clim Change 8. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.482>

690 British Academy, 2008. Punching our weight: the humanities and social sciences in public policy  
691 making.

692 Brugger, J., Meadow, A., Horangic, A., 2016. Lessons from First-Generation Climate Science  
693 Integrators. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society 97.  
694 <https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-14-00289.1>

695 Buxton, R.T., Bennett, J.R., Reid, A.J., Shulman, C., Cooke, S.J., Francis, C.M., Nyboer, E.A., Pritchard,  
696 G., Binley, A.D., Avery-Gomm, S., Ban, N.C., Beazley, K.F., Bennett, E., Blight, L.K., Bortolotti,  
697 L.E., Camfield, A.F., Gadallah, F., Jacob, A.L., Naujokaitis-Lewis, I., Raudsepp-Hearne, C.,  
698 Roche, D.G., Soulard, F., Stralberg, D., Sadler, K.D., Solarik, K.A., Ziter, C.D., Brandt, J.,  
699 McKindsey, C.W., Greenwood, D.A., Boxall, P.C., Ngolah, C.F., Chan, K.M.A., Lapen, D., Poser,  
700 S., Girard, J., DiBacco, C., Hayne, S., Orihel, D., Lewis, D., Littlechild, D., Marshall, S.J.,  
701 McDermott, L., Whitlow, R., Browne, D., Sunday, J., Smith, P.A., 2021. Key information needs  
702 to move from knowledge to action for biodiversity conservation in Canada. Biological  
703 Conservation 256, 108983. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2021.108983>

704 Chambers, J.M., Wyborn, C., Ryan, M.E., Reid, R.S., Riechers, M., Serban, A., Bennett, N.J.,  
705 Cvitanovic, C., Fernández-Giménez, M.E., Galvin, K.A., Goldstein, B.E., Klenk, N.L., Tengö, M.,  
706 Brennan, R., Cockburn, J.J., Hill, R., Munera, C., Nel, J.L., Österblom, H., Bednarek, A.T.,  
707 Bennett, E.M., Brandeis, A., Charli-Joseph, L., Chatterton, P., Curran, K.,  
708 Dumrongrojwathana, P., Durán, A.P., Fada, S.J., Gerber, J.-D., Green, J.M.H., Guerrero, A.M.,  
709 Haller, T., Horcea-Milcu, A.-I., Leimona, B., Montana, J., Rondeau, R., Spierenburg, M.,  
710 Steyaert, P., Zaehring, J.G., Gruby, R., Hutton, J., Pickering, T., 2021. Six modes of co-  
711 production for sustainability. Nat Sustain. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-021-00755-x>

712 Charmaz, K., 2008. Grounded theory as an emergent method, in: Handbook of Emergent Methods.  
713 Guilford Publications, New York, UNITED STATES, pp. 155–172.

714 Charmaz, K., 2006. Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis.  
715 SAGE.

716 Cooke, S.J., Rytwinski, T., Taylor, J.J., Nyboer, E.A., Nguyen, V.M., Bennett, J.R., Young, N., Aitken, S.,  
717 Auld, G., Lane, J.-F., Prior, K.A., Smokorowski, K.E., Smith, P.A., Jacob, A.L., Browne, D.R.,  
718 Blais, J.M., Kerr, J.T., Ormeci, B., Alexander, S.M., Burn, C.R., Buxton, R.T., Orihel, D.M.,  
719 Vermaire, J.C., Murray, D.L., Simon, P., Edwards, K.A., Clarke, J., Xenopoulos, M.A., Gregory-  
720 Eaves, I., Bennett, E.M., Smol, J.P., 2020. On “success” in applied environmental research —  
721 What is it, how can it be achieved, and how does one know when it has been achieved?  
722 Environ. Rev. 28, 357–372. <https://doi.org/10.1139/er-2020-0045>

723 Court, J., Young, J., 2003. Bridging Research and Policy: Insights from 50 Case Studies, Working  
724 Paper 213. Overseas Development Institute, London, UK.

725 Cvitanovic, C., Cunningham, R., Dowd, A.-M., Howden, S.M., van Putten, E.I., 2017. Using Social  
726 Network Analysis to Monitor and Assess the Effectiveness of Knowledge Brokers at



727 Connecting Scientists and Decision-Makers: An Australian case study. ENVIRONMENTAL  
728 POLICY AND GOVERNANCE 27, 256–269. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1752>

729 Cvitanovic, C., Fulton, C.J., Wilson, S.K., van Kerkhoff, L., Cripps, I.L., Muthiga, N., 2014. Utility of  
730 primary scientific literature to environmental managers: An international case study on  
731 coral-dominated marine protected areas. OCEAN & COASTAL MANAGEMENT 102, 72–78.  
732 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2014.09.003>

733 Cvitanovic, C., Hobday, A.J., 2018. Building optimism at the environmental science-policy-practice  
734 interface through the study of bright spots. NATURE COMMUNICATIONS 9.  
735 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05977-w>

736 Cvitanovic, C., Hobday, A.J., Van Kerkhoff, L., Marshall, N.A., 2015. Overcoming barriers to knowledge  
737 exchange for adaptive resource management; the perspectives of Australian marine  
738 scientists. MARINE POLICY 52, 38–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.10.026>

739 Cvitanovic, C., Hobday, A.J., van Kerkhoff, L., Wilson, S.K., Dobbs, K., Marshall, N.A., 2015. Improving  
740 knowledge exchange among scientists and decision-makers to facilitate the adaptive  
741 governance of marine resources: A review of knowledge and research needs. Ocean &  
742 Coastal Management 112, 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2015.05.002>

743 Cvitanovic, C., Lof, M.F., Norstrom, A.V., Reed, M.S., 2018. Building university-based boundary  
744 organisations that facilitate impacts on environmental policy and practice. PLOS ONE 13.  
745 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0203752>

746 Cvitanovic, C., Mackay, M., Shellock, R.J., van Putten, E.I., Karcher, D.B., Dickey-Collas, M., 2021a.  
747 Understanding and evidencing a broader range of ‘successes’ that can occur at the interface  
748 of marine science and policy. Marine Policy 134, 104802.  
749 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2021.104802>

750 Cvitanovic, C., McDonald, J., Hobday, A.J., 2016. From science to action: Principles for undertaking  
751 environmental research that enables knowledge exchange and evidence-based decision-  
752 making. JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT 183, 864–874.  
753 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.09.038>

754 Cvitanovic, C., Christopher, Shellock, R.J., Mackay, M., van Putten, E.I., Karcher, D.B., Dickey-Collas, M.,  
755 Ballesteros, M., 2021b. Strategies for building and managing ‘trust’ to enable knowledge  
756 exchange at the interface of environmental science and policy. Environmental Science and  
757 Policy 123, 179–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.05.020>

758 Dawson, N.M., Coolsaet, B., Sterling, E.J., Loveridge, R., Gross-Camp, N.D., Wongbusarakum, S.,  
759 Sangha, K.K., Scherl, L.M., Phan, H.P., Zafra-Calvo, N., Lavey, W.G., Byakagaba, P., Idrobo,  
760 C.J., Chenet, A., Bennett, N.J., Mansourian, S., Rosado-May, F.J., 2021. The role of Indigenous  
761 peoples and local communities in effective and equitable conservation. E&S 26, art19.  
762 <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-12625-260319>

763 Deelstra, Y., Nootboom, S.G., Kohlmann, H.R., Van Den Berg, J., Innanen, S., 2003. Using knowledge  
764 for decision-making purposes in the context of large projects in The Netherlands.  
765 Environmental Impact Assessment Review 23, 517–541. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255\(03\)00070-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0195-9255(03)00070-2)

767 Duchelle, A.E., Biedenweg, K., Lucas, C., Virapongse, A., Radachowsky, J., Wojcik, D.J., Londres, M.,  
768 Bartels, W.-L., Alvira, D., Kainer, K.A., 2009. Graduate Students and Knowledge Exchange  
769 with Local Stakeholders: Possibilities and Preparation. Biotropica 41, 578–585.  
770 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00563.x>

771 EEA, 2001. Designing effective assessments: The role of participation, science and governance, and  
772 focus (Report of a workshop co-organised by the European Environment Agency and the  
773 Global Environmental Assessment Project), Environmental issue report No 26. Copenhagen,  
774 Denmark.

775 Evans, M.C., Cvitanovic, C., 2018. An introduction to achieving policy impact for early career  
776 researchers. PALGRAVE COMMUNICATIONS 4. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0144-2>

777 Fazey, I., Evely, A.C., Reed, M.S., Stringer, L.C., Kruijssen, J., White, P.C.L., Newsham, A., Jin, L.,  
778 Cortazzi, M., Phillipson, J., Blackstock, K., Entwistle, N., Sheate, W., Armstrong, F.,  
779 Blackmore, C., Fazey, J., Ingram, J., Gregson, J., Lowe, P., Morton, S., Trevitt, C., 2013.  
780 Knowledge exchange: a review and research agenda for environmental management. *Envir.*  
781 *Conserv.* 40, 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S037689291200029X>

782 Fazey, I., Fazey, J.A., Salisbury, J.G., Lindenmayer, D.B., Dovers, S., 2006. The nature and role of  
783 experiential knowledge for environmental conservation. *Environmental Conservation* 33, 1–  
784 10. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S037689290600275X>

785 Ferguson, D.B., Finucane, M.L., Keener, V.W., Owen, G., 2016. Evaluation to advance science policy:  
786 lessons from Pacific RISA and CLIMAS, in: *Climate in Context*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, pp.  
787 215–234. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118474785.ch10>

788 Fisher, B., Balmford, A., Ferraro, P.J., Glew, L., Mascia, M., Naidoo, R., Ricketts, T.H., 2014. Moving  
789 Rio Forward and Avoiding 10 More Years with Little Evidence for Effective Conservation  
790 Policy. *Conservation Biology* 28, 880–882. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12221>

791 Fleming, A., Vanclay, F., 2009. Using discourse analysis to better inform the practice of extension.  
792 *Extension Farming Systems Journal* 5.

793 Flyvbjerg, B., 2006. Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 12, 219–  
794 245. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>

795 Giakoumi, S., McGowan, J., Mills, M., Beger, M., Bustamante, R.H., Charles, A., Christie, P., Fox, M.,  
796 Garcia-Borboroglu, P., Gelcich, S., Guidetti, P., Mackelworth, P., Maina, J.M., McCook, L.,  
797 Micheli, F., Morgan, L.E., Mumby, P.J., Reyes, L.M., White, A., Grorud-Colvert, K.,  
798 Possingham, H.P., 2018. Revisiting “Success” and “Failure” of Marine Protected Areas: A  
799 Conservation Scientist Perspective. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 5, 223.  
800 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2018.00223>

801 Glaser, B.G., Strauss, A.L., 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative*  
802 *Research*. AldineTransaction, Chicago.

803 Goldman, I., Pabari, M. (Eds.), 2021. *Using Evidence in Policy and Practice: Lessons from Africa*.  
804 Routledge, The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

805 Hakkarainen, V., Daw, T.M., Tengo, M., 2020. On the other end of research: exploring community-  
806 level knowledge exchanges in small-scale fisheries in Zanzibar. *SUSTAINABILITY SCIENCE* 15,  
807 281–295. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00750-4>

808 Hegger, D., Dieperink, C., 2015. Joint knowledge production for climate change adaptation: what is  
809 in it for science? *Ecology and Society* 20, 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-07929-200401>

810 Hegger, D., Lamers, M., Van Zeijl-Rozema, A., Dieperink, C., 2012. Conceptualising joint knowledge  
811 production in regional climate change adaptation projects: success conditions and levers for  
812 action. *ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & POLICY* 18, 52–65.  
813 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2012.01.002>

814 Hoppe, R., 2010. From “knowledge use” towards “boundary work”: sketch of an emerging new  
815 agenda for inquiry into science-policy interaction, in: in ‘t Veld, R.J. (Ed.), *Knowledge*  
816 *Democracy: Consequences for Science, Politics, and Media*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp.  
817 169–186. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11381-9\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-11381-9_13)

818 Hugé, J., Waas, T., Eggermont, G., Verbruggen, A., 2011. Impact assessment for a sustainable energy  
819 future—Reflections and practical experiences. *Energy Policy, Sustainability of biofuels* 39,  
820 6243–6253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.07.023>

821 Jacobs, K., Garfin, G., Lenart, M., 2005. More than just talk: Connecting science and decision making.  
822 *Environment* 47, 6–21. <https://doi.org/10.3200/ENVT.47.9.6-21>

823 Jagannathan, K., Arnott, J.C., Wyborn, C., Klenk, N., Mach, K.J., Moss, R.H., Sjoström, K.D., 2020.  
824 Great expectations? Reconciling the aspiration, outcome, and possibility of co-production.  
825 *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 42, 22–29.  
826 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.11.010>

827 Jasanoff, S., 1998. *The Fifth Branch: Science Advisers as Policymakers*. Harvard University Press.

828 Jensen-Ryan, D.K., German, L.A., 2019. Environmental science and policy: A meta-synthesis of case  
829 studies on boundary organizations and spanning processes. *SCIENCE AND PUBLIC POLICY* 46,  
830 13–27. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scy032>

831 Karcher, D.B., Cvitanovic, C., Colvin, R.M., van Putten, I.E., Reed, M.S., 2021. Is this what success  
832 looks like? Mismatches between the aims, claims, and evidence used to demonstrate impact  
833 from knowledge exchange processes at the interface of environmental science and policy.  
834 *Environmental Science & Policy* 125, 202–218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.08.012>

835 Karcher, D.B., Cvitanovic, C., Shellock, R., Hobday, A., Stephenson, R., Dickey-Collas, M., van Putten,  
836 I., in review. More than money - the true costs of knowledge exchange at the interface of  
837 science and policy.

838 Kelly, R., Mackay, M., Nash, K.L., Cvitanovic, C., Allison, E.H., Armitage, D., Bonn, A., Cooke, S.J.,  
839 Frusher, S., Fulton, E.A., Halpern, B.S., Lopes, P.F.M., Milner-Gulland, E.J., Peck, M.A., Pecl,  
840 G.T., Stephenson, R.L., Werner, F., 2019. Ten tips for developing interdisciplinary socio-  
841 ecological researchers. *Socio Ecol Pract Res* 1, 149–161. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s42532-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s42532-019-00018-2)  
842 [019-00018-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s42532-019-00018-2)

843 Knapp, C.N., Fresco, N., Krutikov, L., 2017. Managing Alaska’s National Parks in an era of uncertainty:  
844 an evaluation of scenario planning workshops. *REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE* 17,  
845 1541–1552. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-017-1126-4>

846 Lacey, J., Howden, M., Cvitanovic, C., Colvin, R.M., 2018. Understanding and managing trust at the  
847 climate science-policy interface. *Nature Climate Change* 8, 22–28.  
848 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-017-0010-z>

849 Lascoumes, P., Le Gales, P., 2007. Introduction: Understanding Public Policy through Its  
850 Instruments? From the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy  
851 Instrumentation. *Governance* 20, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2007.00342.x>

852 Le Heron, E., Allen, W., Le Heron, R., Logie, M.J., Glavovic, B., Greenaway, A., Hikuroa, D., Davies,  
853 K.K., Blackett, P., 2021. What does success look like? An indicative rubric to assess and guide  
854 the performance of marine participatory processes. *E&S* 26, art29.  
855 <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-12211-260129>

856 Lemos, M.C., Morehouse, B.J., 2005. The co-production of science and policy in integrated climate  
857 assessments. *Global Environmental Change-Human and Policy Dimensions* 15, 57–68.  
858 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2004.09.004>

859 Loch, T.K., Riechers, M., 2021. Integrating indigenous and local knowledge in management and  
860 research on coastal ecosystems in the Global South: A literature review. *Ocean & Coastal*  
861 *Management* 212, 105821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2021.105821>

862 Lomas, J., 2007. The in-between world of knowledge brokering. *British Medical Journal* 334, 129–  
863 132. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39038.593380.AE>

864 Louder, E., Wyborn, C., Cvitanovic, C., Bednarek, A.T., 2021. A synthesis of the frameworks available  
865 to guide evaluations of research impact at the interface of environmental science, policy and  
866 practice. *Environmental Science & Policy* 116, 258–265.  
867 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2020.12.006>

868 Lyall, C., Bruce, A., Marsden, W., Meagher, L., 2013. The role of funding agencies in creating  
869 interdisciplinary knowledge. *Science and Public Policy* 40, 62–71.  
870 <https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scs121>

871 Lyall, C., Meagher, L.R., 2012. A Masterclass in interdisciplinarity: Research into practice in training  
872 the next generation of interdisciplinary researchers. *Futures* 44, 608–617.  
873 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.futures.2012.03.011>

874 Marshall, N., Adger, N., Attwood, S., Brown, K., Crissman, C., Cvitanovic, C., De Young, C., Gooch, M.,  
875 James, C., Jessen, S., Johnson, D., Marshall, P., Park, S., Wachenfeld, D., Wrigley, D., 2017.  
876 Empirically derived guidance for social scientists to influence environmental policy. *PLOS*  
877 *ONE* 12. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0171950>

878 Mazé, C., Dahou, T., Ragueneau, O., Danto, A., Mariat-Roy, E., Raimonet, M., Weisbein, J., 2017.  
879 Knowledge and power in integrated coastal management. For a political anthropology of the  
880 sea combined with the sciences of the marine environment. *Comptes Rendus Geoscience*  
881 349, 359–368. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crte.2017.09.008>

882 McKenzie, E., Posner, S., Tillmann, P., Bernhardt, J.R., Howard, K., Rosenthal, A., 2014.  
883 Understanding the use of ecosystem service knowledge in decision making: lessons from  
884 international experiences of spatial planning. *Environment and Planning C-Government and*  
885 *Policy* 32, 320–340. <https://doi.org/10.1068/c12292j>

886 Meagher, L., Lyall, C., Nutley, S., 2008. Flows of knowledge, expertise and influence: A method for  
887 assessing policy and practice impacts from social science research. *Research Evaluation* 17,  
888 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.3152/095820208X331720>

889 Meyer, R., McAfee, S., Whiteman, E., 2015. How California is mobilizing boundary chains to integrate  
890 science, policy and management for changing ocean chemistry. *Climate Risk Management* 9,  
891 50–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2015.04.002>

892 Michaels, S., 2009. Matching knowledge brokering strategies to environmental policy problems and  
893 settings. *Environmental Science and Policy* 12, 994–1011.  
894 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2009.05.002>

895 Morton, S., 2015. Creating research impact: the roles of research users in interactive research  
896 mobilisation. *evid policy* 11, 35–55. <https://doi.org/10.1332/174426514X13976529631798>

897 Newig, J., Jahn, S., Lang, D.J., Kahle, J., Bergmann, M., 2019. Linking modes of research to their  
898 scientific and societal outcomes. Evidence from 81 sustainability-oriented research projects.  
899 *ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE & POLICY* 101, 147–155.  
900 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2019.08.008>

901 Nogueira, L.A., Bjørkan, M., Dale, B., 2021. Conducting Research in a Post-normal Paradigm: Practical  
902 Guidance for Applying Co-production of Knowledge. *Front. Environ. Sci.* 9, 699397.  
903 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2021.699397>

904 Norström, A.V., Cvitanovic, C., Löf, M.F., West, S., Wyborn, C., Balvanera, P., Bednarek, A.T., Bennett,  
905 E.M., Biggs, R., de Bremond, A., Campbell, B.M., Canadell, J.G., Carpenter, S.R., Folke, C.,  
906 Fulton, E.A., Gaffney, O., Gelcich, S., Jouffray, J.-B., Leach, M., Le Tissier, M., Martín-López,  
907 B., Louder, E., Loutre, M.-F., Meadow, A.M., Nagendra, H., Payne, D., Peterson, G.D., Reyers,  
908 B., Scholes, R., Speranza, C.I., Spierenburg, M., Stafford-Smith, M., Tengö, M., van der Hel, S.,  
909 van Putten, I., Österblom, H., 2020. Principles for knowledge co-production in sustainability  
910 research. *Nature Sustainability* 3, 182–190. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0448-2>

911 O’Connor, R.A., Nel, J.L., Roux, D.J., Lim-Camacho, L., van Kerkhoff, L., Leach, J., 2019. Principles for  
912 evaluating knowledge co-production in natural resource management: Incorporating  
913 decision-maker values. *JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT* 249.  
914 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109392>

915 Parker, J., Crona, B., 2012. On being all things to all people: Boundary organizations and the  
916 contemporary research university. *Social Studies of Science* 42, 262–289.  
917 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312711435833>

918 Pearman, O., Cravens, A.E., 2022. Institutional barriers to actionable science: Perspectives from  
919 decision support tool creators. *Environmental Science & Policy* 128, 317–325.  
920 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.12.004>

921 Pendleton, L.H., Beyer, H., Estradivari, Grose, S.O., Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Karcher, D.B., Kennedy, E.,  
922 Llewellyn, L., Nys, C., Shapiro, A., Jain, R., Kuc, K., Leatherland, T., O’Hainnin, K., Olmedo, G.,  
923 Seow, L., Tarsel, M., 2019. Disrupting data sharing for a healthier ocean. *ICES Journal of*  
924 *Marine Science* 76, 1415–1423. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsz068>

925 Pietri, D.M., Gurney, G.G., Benitez-Vina, N., Kuklok, A., Maxwell, S.M., Whiting, L., Vina, M.A.,  
926 Jenkins, L.D., 2013. Practical Recommendations to Help Students Bridge the Research-  
927 Implementation Gap and Promote Conservation: Graduate Students and the Research-

928 Implementation Gap. *Conservation Biology* 27, 958–967.  
929 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12089>

930 Pitt, R., Wyborn, C., Page, G., Hutton, J., Sawmy, M.V., Ryan, M., Gallagher, L., 2018. Wrestling with  
931 the complexity of evaluation for organizations at the boundary of science, policy, and  
932 practice. *CONSERVATION BIOLOGY* 32, 998–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13118>

933 Posner, S.M., Cvitanovic, C., 2019. Evaluating the impacts of boundary-spanning activities at the  
934 interface of environmental science and policy: A review of progress and future research  
935 needs. *Environmental Science & Policy* 92, 141–151.  
936 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2018.11.006>

937 Raymond, C.M., Fazey, I., Reed, M.S., Stringer, L.C., Robinson, G.M., Evely, A.C., 2010. Integrating  
938 local and scientific knowledge for environmental management. *Journal of Environmental*  
939 *Management* 91, 1766–1777. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.03.023>

940 Reed, M.S., Ferré, M., Martin-Ortega, J., Blanche, R., Lawford-Rolfe, R., Dallimer, M., Holden, J.,  
941 2021. Evaluating impact from research: A methodological framework. *Research Policy* 50,  
942 104147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.104147>

943 Reed, M.S., Stringer, L.C., Fazey, I., Evely, A.C., Kruijsen, J.H.J., 2014. Five principles for the practice of  
944 knowledge exchange in environmental management. *Journal of Environmental Management*  
945 146, 337–345. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2014.07.021>

946 Reed, M.S., Vella, S., Challies, E., de Vente, J., Frewer, L., Hohenwallner-Ries, D., Huber, T., Neumann,  
947 R.K., Oughton, E.A., del Ceno, J.S., van Delden, H., 2018. A theory of participation: what  
948 makes stakeholder and public engagement in environmental management work?  
949 *RESTORATION ECOLOGY* 26, S7–S17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12541>

950 Rose, D.C., Mukherjee, N., Simmons, B.I., Tew, E.R., Robertson, R.J., Vadrot, A.B.M., Doubleday, R.,  
951 Sutherland, W.J., 2020. Policy windows for the environment: Tips for improving the uptake  
952 of scientific knowledge. *Environmental Science & Policy* 113, 47–54.  
953 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2017.07.013>

954 Rose, D.C., Sutherland, W.J., Amano, T., Gonzalez-Varo, J.P., Robertson, R.J., Simmons, B.I.,  
955 Wauchope, H.S., Kovacs, E., Duran, A.P., Vadrot, A.B.M., Wu, W., Dias, M.P., Di Fonzo,  
956 M.M.I., Ivory, S., Norris, L., Nunes, M.H., Nyumba, T.O., Steiner, N., Vickery, J., Mukherjee,  
957 N., 2018. The major barriers to evidence-informed conservation policy and possible  
958 solutions. *CONSERVATION LETTERS* 11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12564>

959 Rozance, M.A., Krosby, M., Meadow, A.M., Snover, A., Ferguson, D.B., Owen, G., 2020. Building  
960 capacity for societally engaged climate science by transforming science training. *Environ.*  
961 *Res. Lett.* 15, 125008. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abc27a>

962 Saldaña, J., 2015. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*, 2nd Edition. ed. SAGE Publications.

963 Sander, G., 2018. Against all odds? Implementing a policy for ecosystem-based management of the  
964 Barents Sea. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 157, 111–123.  
965 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.01.020>

966 Sellberg, M.M., Cockburn, J., Holden, P.B., Lam, D.P.M., 2021. Towards a caring transdisciplinary  
967 research practice: navigating science, society and self. *Ecosystems and People* 17, 292–305.  
968 <https://doi.org/10.1080/26395916.2021.1931452>

969 Shanley, P., López, C., 2009. Out of the loop: Why research rarely reaches policy makers and the  
970 public and what can be done. *Biotropica* 41, 535–544. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00561.x>

971

972 Singh, G.G., Harden-Davies, H., Allison, E.H., Cisneros-Montemayor, A.M., Swartz, W., Crosman, K.M.,  
973 Ota, Y., 2021. Opinion: Will understanding the ocean lead to “the ocean we want”? *Proc Natl*  
974 *Acad Sci USA* 118, e2100205118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2100205118>

975 Soomai, S.S., 2017. The science-policy interface in fisheries management: Insights about the  
976 influence of organizational structure and culture on information pathways. *Marine Policy* 81,  
977 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.03.016>

978 Starman, A.B., 2013. The case study as a type of qualitative research. *JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY*  
979 *EDUCATIONAL STUDIES* 28–43.

980 Steger, C., Klein, J.A., Reid, R.S., Lavorel, S., Tucker, C., Hopping, K.A., Marchant, R., Teel, T., Cuni-  
981 Sanchez, A., Dorji, T., Greenwood, G., Huber, R., Kassam, K.-A., Kreuer, D., Nolin, A., Russell,  
982 A., Sharp, J.L., Šmid Hribar, M., Thorn, J.P.R., Grant, G., Mahdi, M., Moreno, M., Waiswa, D.,  
983 2021. Science with society: Evidence-based guidance for best practices in environmental  
984 transdisciplinary work. *Global Environmental Change* 68, 102240.  
985 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2021.102240>

986 Stephenson, R.L., Paul, S., Pastoors, M.A., Kraan, M., Holm, P., Wiber, M., Mackinson, S., Dankel, D.J.,  
987 Brooks, K., Benson, A., 2016. Integrating fishers' knowledge research in science and  
988 management. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 73, 1459–1465.  
989 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw025>

990 Sutherland, W.J., Pullin, A.S., Dolman, P.M., Knight, T.M., 2004. The need for evidence-based  
991 conservation. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 19, 305–308.  
992 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2004.03.018>

993 Tengö, M., Brondizio, E.S., Elmqvist, T., Malmer, P., Spierenburg, M., Tengö, M., Brondizio, E.S.,  
994 Elmqvist, T., Malmer, P., Spierenburg, M., 2014. Connecting diverse knowledge systems for  
995 enhanced ecosystem governance: The multiple evidence base approach. *Ambio* 43, 579–  
996 591. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-014-0501-3>

997 Tinch, R., Balian, E., Carss, D., de Blas, D.E., Geamana, N.A., Heink, U., Keune, H., Nesshoever, C.,  
998 Niemela, J., Sarkki, S., Thibon, M., Timaeus, J., Vadineanu, A., van den Hove, S., Watt, A.,  
999 Waylen, K.A., Wittmer, H., Young, J.C., 2018. Science-policy interfaces for biodiversity:  
1000 dynamic learning environments for successful impact. *BIODIVERSITY AND CONSERVATION*  
1001 27, 1679–1702. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-016-1155-1>

1002 Trueblood, D., Almazán-Casali, S., Arnott, J., Brass, M., Lemos, M.C., Matso, K., Read, J., Vaccaro, L.,  
1003 Wondolleck, J., 2019. Advancing Knowledge for Use in Coastal and Estuarine Management:  
1004 Competitive Research in the National Estuarine Research Reserve System. *Coastal*  
1005 *Management* 47, 337–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08920753.2019.1598221>

1006 Turnhout, E., Duncan, J., Candel, J., Maas, T.Y., Roodhof, A.M., DeClerck, F., Lenz, R.T., 2021. Do we  
1007 need a new science-policy interface for food systems? *Science* 373, 1093–1095.  
1008 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abj5263>

1009 UNEP, IOC/UNESCO, 2009. An Assessment Of Assessments: Findings Of The Group Of Experts -  
1010 Summary For Decision Makers (Pursuant to UNGA Resolution 60/30).

1011 van Putten, I., Kelly, R., Cavanagh, R.D., Murphy, E.J., Breckwoldt, A., Brodie, S., Cvitanovic, C.,  
1012 Dickey-Collas, M., Maddison, L., Melbourne-Thomas, J., Arrizabalaga, H., Azetsu-Scott, K.,  
1013 Beckley, L.E., Bellerby, R., Constable, A.J., Cowie, G., Evans, K., Glaser, M., Hall, J., Hobday,  
1014 A.J., Johnston, N.M., Llopiz, J.K., Mueter, F., Muller-Karger, F.E., Weng, K.C., Wolf-Gladrow,  
1015 D., Xavier, J.C., 2021. A Decade of Incorporating Social Sciences in the Integrated Marine  
1016 Biosphere Research Project (IMBeR): Much Done, Much to Do? *Front. Mar. Sci.* 8, 662350.  
1017 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.662350>

1018 Walsh, J.C., Dicks, L.V., Raymond, C.M., Sutherland, W.J., 2019. A typology of barriers and enablers of  
1019 scientific evidence use in conservation practice. *JOURNAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL*  
1020 *MANAGEMENT* 250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.109481>

1021 Weichselgartner, J., Kasperson, R., 2010. Barriers in the science-policy-practice interface: Toward a  
1022 knowledge-action-system in global environmental change research. *Global Environmental*  
1023 *Change* 20, 266–277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2009.11.006>

1024 Xavier, L.Y., Jacobi, P.R., Turra, A., 2018. On the advantages of working together: Social Learning and  
1025 knowledge integration in the management of marine areas. *MARINE POLICY* 88, 139–150.  
1026 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.11.026>

1027

1028

1029 Supplementary Material 1: Survey questions for data generation.

1030

1031 1. Please describe an example of a successful marine science-policy interaction (success defined  
1032 as broadly as possible) that you have been involved in. Please include specific information on  
1033 the location/ocean area, scope of the example [coastal land, territorial/ coastal waters, EEZ,  
1034 high seas], topic/ecosystem, threat/problem, science bodies [university researchers, consultants,  
1035 NGOs], policy bodies [local community-based managers, local policy makers, state agencies,  
1036 national government, multinational treaty/organization, international], other actors [NGOs,  
1037 stakeholders]).

1038 2. What was your role in the example outlined above, and how did you come to be in this role?

1039 3. What (and when) initiated the interaction between science and policy (policy demand, funding  
1040 requirement, science outreach, joint knowledge production, personal motivations, etc.), and  
1041 why?

1042 4. What were the specific goal(s) of the science-policy interaction (i.e., what was the project  
1043 hoping to achieve)? Did this goal change over time?

1044 5. What strategies/approaches/process (or combination thereof) were used to connect and  
1045 facilitate science-policy interactions in your case study (e.g., knowledge brokers, advisory  
1046 board, boundary organization, co-production, events/meetings, co-management, etc.)? Why  
1047 was this the selected approach?

1048 6. In your example and your opinion, what constituted success(es) (please think as broadly as  
1049 possible, e.g., impacts on policy, people, processes, ecosystems, species, society, etc.). Which  
1050 of these were achieved?

1051 7. What data/evidence did you collect (or in hindsight could you have collected) to demonstrate  
1052 that success had been achieved in your example?

1053 8. Of the success achieved, what conditions (i.e., the individual, organizational, social, political,  
1054 material, technical, practical and financial elements required to reach the outcome) led to this  
1055 project being a success? That is, what was in place that made it successful and which  
1056 facilitating factors emerged spontaneously/unexpectedly?

1057 9. Is there something that was special/unusual about this science-policy interaction that you have  
1058 not previously experienced during your work at the interface of marine science and policy that  
1059 you think made this example successful?

1060 10. What are the key lessons (i.e., suggestions to other researchers) that you learnt through your  
1061 example for attaining success at the interface of marine science and policy?

1062 11. Considering the above questions and topic of this study, is there anything additional that you  
1063 would like to tell us about your case study that is not covered above?

1064

1065 Supplementary Table 1: Project information on the 25 included marine science policy bright-spots.

ID	Title	Location/ scope	Dates	Some key achievements	References, further reading
1	Fish for food security in the Pacific Island region	Coastal and oceanic fisheries for domestic consumption in Pacific Island countries and territories  Governance level: International	2008 - 2019	Regional Roadmap for Sustainable Pacific Fisheries endorsed by all Pacific Island Presidents and Prime Ministers.  Implementation of adaptations and supporting policies.  Strategy to sustain coastal fish habitats and coastal fish stocks.  Awareness, realization of the issue.	Bell, J.D. et al. (2008). Importance of household income and expenditure surveys and censuses for management of coastal and freshwater fisheries. SPC Fisheries Newsletter 127, 34-39.  SPC Policy Brief 1/2008, Fish and Food Security.  Bell, J.D. et al. (2009). Planning the use of fish for food security in the Pacific. Marine Policy 33, 64-76.  Bell, J.D. et al. (2015) Diversifying the use of tuna to improve food security and public health in Pacific Island countries and territories. Marine Policy 51, 584-591.  Bell, J.D. et al. (2018). Adaptations to maintain the contributions of small-scale fisheries to food security in the Pacific Islands. Marine Policy 88, 303-314.  Bell, J.D. et al. (2019). Realising the food security benefits of canned fish for Pacific Island countries. Marine Policy 100, 183-191  Regional Roadmap for Sustainable Pacific Fisheries ( <a href="https://www.ffa.int/node/1569">https://www.ffa.int/node/1569</a> ). <a href="https://pacificdata.org/data/dataset/oai-www-spc-int-ccd24e95-7e0a-401a-9f0b-d79316c49cb0">https://pacificdata.org/data/dataset/oai-www-spc-int-ccd24e95-7e0a-401a-9f0b-d79316c49cb0</a>  A New Song for Coastal Fisheries – pathways to change. The Noumea Strategy ( <a href="https://pacificdata.org/data/dataset/oai-www-spc-int-861e6395-7b00-4453-8b5a-b25923694cb9">https://pacificdata.org/data/dataset/oai-www-spc-int-861e6395-7b00-4453-8b5a-b25923694cb9</a> ).
2	US fisheries management responses to interconnected ecological, social, and economic challenges of climate impacts	East coast USA  Governance level: Regional, national	2017 - 2019	Elevated awareness and explored opportunities for policy/ management solutions.  Mutual understanding, changes of minds.  Built trust.  Broader understanding of available expertise  Understandings about specific decision contexts.  Ability and confidence for further engagement with policy.  Citation in NOAA federal technical memo.	The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council (MAFMC). 2014. East coast climate change and fisheries governance workshop report. May 19-21. Washington, D.C.  The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC). 2018. Management, Policy and Science Strategies for Adapting Fisheries Management to Changes in Species Abundance and Distribution Resulting from Climate Change. Arlington, VA.  Karp, M. A., J. Peterson, P. D. Lynch, and R. Griffis (editors). Accounting for Shifting Distributions and Changing Productivity in the Fishery Management Process: From Detection to Management Action. 2018. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-F/SPO-188, 37p.  Pinsky, M.L., Reygondeau, G., Cadell, R., et al. 2018. Preparing ocean governance for species on the move. Science 360 (6394): 1189-1191.  Lauren A. Rogers, Robert Griffin, Talia Young, Emma Fuller, Kevin St. Martin, Malin L. Pinsky. Shifting habitats expose fishing communities to risk under climate change. Nature Climate Change, 2019.
3	Pelagic plankton indicators for biodiversity and food webs	Pelagic waters of the North-Eastern Atlantic Ocean  Governance level: National, international	2011 - ongoing	Impacts on policy.  Indicators used in UK and OSPAR level policy assessments.  Corroborating letter from OSPAR.  Marine Strategy Part 3 Programme of Measures.  Draft UK monitoring options proposal.	Capuzzo, E., Lynam, C.P., Barry, J., Stephens, D., Forster, R.M., Greenwood, N., McQuatters-Gollop, A., Silva, T., Sonja M. van Leeuwen and Engelhard, G.H., (2017). A decline in primary production in the North Sea over 25 years, associated with reductions in zooplankton abundance and fish stock recruitment. Global Change Biology, 24: e352-e364.  OSPAR 2017 Intermediate Assessment  Dickey-Collas, M., McQuatters-Gollop, A., Bresnan, E., Kraberg, A.C., Manderson, J.P., Nash, R.D.M., Otto, S.A., Sell, A.F., Tweddle, J.F. and Trenkel, V.M., (2017). Pelagic habitat: exploring the concept of good environmental status. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 74: 2333-2341.  Bedford, J., Johns, D., Greenstreet, S. and McQuatters-Gollop, A., (2018). Plankton as prevailing conditions: a surveillance role for plankton indicators within the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. Marine Policy 89:109-115.  McQuatters-Gollop, A., Atkinson, A., Aubert, A., Bedford, J., Best, M., Bresnan, E., Cook, K., Devlin, M., Gowen, R., Johns, D.G., Machairopoulou, M., Mellor, A., Ostle, C., Scherer, C. and Tett, P., (2019). Plankton lifeforms as a biodiversity indicator for regional-scale assessment of pelagic habitats for policy Ecological Indicators, 101: 913-925.  Rombouts, I., Simon, N., Aubert, A., Cariou, T., Feunteun, E., Guérin, L., Hoebeke, M., McQuatters-Gollop, A., Rigaut-Jalabert, F. and Artigas, L.F., (2019). Changes in marine phytoplankton diversity: Assessment under the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. Ecological Indicators, 102: 265-277.  Bedford, J., Ostle, C., Johns, D.G., Atkinson, A., Best, M., Bresnan, E., Machairopoulou, M., Graves, C.A., Devlin, M., Milligan, A., Pitois, S., Mellor, A., Tett, P. and McQuatters-Gollop, A., (2020). Lifeform indicators reveal large-scale shifts in plankton across the North-West European shelf. Global Change Biology.  UK MSFD Assessment for pelagic habitats biodiversity indicators <a href="https://moat.cefas.co.uk/biodiversity-food-webs-and-marine-protected-areas/pelagic-habitats/">https://moat.cefas.co.uk/biodiversity-food-webs-and-marine-protected-areas/pelagic-habitats/</a>



					Corroborating letter from OSPAR (LoS Emily Corcoran OSPAR.pdf) Marine Strategy Part 3 Programme of Measures
4	By-catch management guidelines in Australian national sea's fisheries	Australian national waters  Governance level: National	Until 2019	Guidelines being accepted by the policy side of government.  Published and released without delay.  Used for subsequent initiatives within the Commonwealth fisheries management agency.	<a href="https://www.agriculture.gov.au/fisheries/environment/bycatch/review">https://www.agriculture.gov.au/fisheries/environment/bycatch/review</a>  Smith, A. D. M., S. D. C., M. Haddon, I. Knuckey, K. J. Sainsbury and S. Sloan (2014). Implementing harvest strategies in Australia: 5 years on. ICES Journal of Marine Science 71: 195–203.  Punt, A. E., D. S. Butterworth, C. L. d. Moor, J. A. A. D. Oliveira and M. Haddon (2016). Management strategy evaluation: best practices. Fish and Fisheries 17: 303-334.
5	Science-based local octopus management under socio-economic well-being	Brazilian coastal waters and local fishing communities  Governance level: Local	Over the last 4 – 5 years	Necessary conditions (trust, reliable partnerships, understanding of science) achieved to then achieve ecological and social impact.  Fishers believed in success of their joint project.	Lopes, P. F., Andrade, L. C., Pennino, M. G., & Leite, T. S. (2021). The inter-annual fishing variability in Octopus insularis (Leite & Haimovici 2008) as a result of oceanographic factors. Fisheries Oceanography.
6	Ocean Acidification and Hypoxia at the US West coast	Nearshore waters West coast USA  Governance level: Regional	2013-2016	Significant investment, policy action and new legislative mandates – particularly in California but also in Oregon and Washington.  State agencies better equipped.  Impact on the processes of ocean governance.	<a href="http://www.westcoastcoah.org">www.westcoastcoah.org</a> <a href="https://www.oceansciencetrust.org/impact-report/">https://www.oceansciencetrust.org/impact-report/</a> <a href="https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212096315000133">https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212096315000133</a> <a href="https://www.oceansciencetrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/2020-OA-Progress-Report-to-OPC-.pdf">https://www.oceansciencetrust.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/2020-OA-Progress-Report-to-OPC-.pdf</a>
7	Ecosystem-based Atlantic menhaden management at the East coast USA based upon their role in the ecosystem	Coastal waters East coast USA  Governance level: Regional	2013-2020	Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) voted to adopt “ecological reference points” for Atlantic menhaden, based upon science supported by the Lenfest Ocean Program.  Managers now able to set ecosystem-based catch limits for the menhaden fishery.  Managers and stakeholders with greater confidence in how the models were performing.	<a href="https://www.lenfestocean.org/en/news-and-publications/cross-currents/2020/funding-the-research-to-jumpstart-ecosystem-approaches-in-fisheries-management">https://www.lenfestocean.org/en/news-and-publications/cross-currents/2020/funding-the-research-to-jumpstart-ecosystem-approaches-in-fisheries-management</a> <a href="https://www.lenfestocean.org/en/news-and-publications/cross-currents/2021/researchers-and-the-asfmc-cooperate-to-make-ecosystem-modeling-more-practical">https://www.lenfestocean.org/en/news-and-publications/cross-currents/2021/researchers-and-the-asfmc-cooperate-to-make-ecosystem-modeling-more-practical</a>  Chagaris, D., Drew, K., Schueller, A., Cieri, M., Brito, J., Buchheister, A. (2020) Ecological Reference Points for Atlantic Menhaden Established Using an Ecosystem Model of Intermediate Complexity. Frontiers in Marine Science. <a href="https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.606417">https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.606417</a>  Drew, K., Cieri, M., Schueller, A.M., Buchheister, A., Chagaris, D., Nesslage, G., McNamee, J.E., Uphoff, J.H. (2021) Balancing Model Complexity, Data Requirements, and Management Objectives in Developing Ecological Reference Points for Atlantic Menhaden. Frontiers in Marine Science. <a href="https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.608059">https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.608059</a>  Howell, D., Schueller, A.M., Bentley, J.W., Buchheister, A., Chagaris, D., Cieri, M., Drew, K., Lundy, M.G., Pedreschi, D., Reid, D.G., Townsend, H. (2021) Combining Ecosystem and Single-Species Modeling to Provide Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Advice Within Current Management Systems. Frontiers in Marine Science. <a href="https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.607831">https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.607831</a>  Anstead, K., Drew, K., Chagaris, D., Cieri, M., Schueller, A.M., McNamee, J., Buchheister, A., Nesslage, G., Uphoff, J.H., Wilberg, M., Sharov, A., Dean, M., Brust, J., Celestino, M., Madsen, S., Murray, S., Appelman, M., Ballenger, J., Brito, J., Cosby, E., Craig, C., Flora, C., Gottschall, K., Latour, R.J., Leonard, E., Mroch, R., Newhard, J., Orner, D., Swanson, C., Tinsman, J., Houde, E.D., Miller, T.J., Townsend, H. (2021) The Path to an Ecosystem Approach for Forage Fish Management: a Case Study of Atlantic Menhaden. Frontiers in Marine Science. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2021.607657
8	Toward ecosystem-based management and governance of marine resources and Nation-to-	Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve, a Haida Heritage Site on Canada's West coast	Ongoing	Enduring relationships.  Enable the CHN (and Haida) to assess outcomes of fisheries that may be commercially and culturally important.	<a href="https://haidamarineplanning.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Gina_Waadluxan_Kilguhlga_Land_Sea_People_Plan.pdf">https://haidamarineplanning.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Gina_Waadluxan_Kilguhlga_Land_Sea_People_Plan.pdf</a>  Muhl, E. K., Esteves Dias, A. C., & Armitage, D. (2020). Experiences with governance in three marine conservation zoning initiatives: Parameters for assessment and pathways forward. Frontiers in Marine Science, 7, 629. <a href="https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00629">https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00629</a>

	Nation relationships at Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve, a Haida Heritage Site	Governance level: Local		Continuation of that co-production orientation.	
9	The initiation, adoption and implementation of the Ross Sea region marine protected area (MPA)	Ross Sea, high seas in the Southern Ocean, Antarctica  Governance level: International	Overall MPA process: late 2001 - 2016	The Ross Sea MPA was adopted, it was immediately a source of pride for CCAMLR Member States.  Diplomatic win.  CCAMLR States have learned from the experience.	'The Convention on the Conservation of Marine Living Resources'. 1980.  Ainley, David. 2002. 'The Ross Sea, Antarctica, where all ecosystem processes still remain for study', CCAMLR WG-EMM-02/60.  Ainley, David. 2004. 'Acquiring a "Base Datum of Normality" for a marine ecosystem: The Ross Sea, Antarctica.' WG-EMM-04/20.  ASOC. 2009. "The Case for Special Protection of the Ross Sea." CCAMLR-XXVIII/BG/28  Ainley, David, Grant Ballard, and John B. Weller. 2010. 'Ross Sea Bioregionalization Part I', CCAMLR WG-EMM-10/11.  ASOC. 2010. "Scientists' Consensus Statement on Protection of the Ross Sea." In. Washington, D.C.: Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition.  Ballard, Grant, Dennis Jongsomjit, and David Ainley. 2010. 'Ross Sea Bioregionalization Part II: Patterns of Co-occurrence of mesopredators in an intact Polar ocean ecosystem.' WG-EMM-10/12.  Miller, D. 2011. 'Sustainable Management in the Southern Ocean: CCAMLR Science.' in PA Berkman, MA Lang, WH Walton and OR Young (eds.), Science Diplomacy: Antarctica Science, and the Governance of International Spaces (Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press).  Sharp, Ben R., and George M. Watters. 2011. "Marine Protected Area planning by New Zealand and the United States in the Ross Sea region. CCAMLR WS-MPA-11/25." AOA.  2012. "Antarctic Ocean Legacy: A Marine Reserve for the Ross Sea." In.: Antarctic Ocean Alliance.  Young, Peter. 2012. "The Last Ocean." Documentary Film. FishEye Films.  Weller, John. 2013. "The Last Ocean." Rizzoli Publishing.  Brooks, Cassandra, L.B. Crowder, Lisa Curran, Robert Dunbar, David Ainley, Klaus Dodds, Kristina M. Gjerde, and Rashid Sumaila. 2016. 'Science-based management in decline in the Southern Ocean', Science, 354: 185-87.  CCAMLR. 2016a. 'Conservation Measure 91-05, Ross Sea Region Marine Protected Area'. ———. 2016b. 'Report of the XXXV Meeting of the Commission'.  Bloom, Evan. 2017. "Two key developments in Polar law and diplomacy: A new Arctic science agreement and establishment of the World's largest marine protected area in Antarctica's Ross Sea." In 10th Polar Law Symposium. Rovaniemi, Finland.  Brooks, Cassandra. 2017. 'Policies for Managing the Global Commons: The case of marine protected areas in Antarctica', Stanford University.  Brooks, C. M., L.B. Crowder, H. Osterblom, and Aaron L. Strong. 2019. 'Reaching consensus for conserving the global commons: The case of the Ross Sea, Antarctica', Conservation Letters.
10	Mediating multiple human uses of the Dutch Wadden Sea using social science	Dutch Wadden Sea  Governance level: National	2008 - 2018	First time social scientists were invited to the table.  Guide with action perspectives for policy makers and stakeholders.  Direct use of scientific insights in decision-making.  Building trust and relationships.	Runhaar, H. (2009), Putting SEA in context: A discourse perspective on how SEA contributes to decision-making, Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 29 (3), pp. 200-209.  Runhaar, H. and K. van Nieuwaal (2010), Understanding the use of science in decision-making on cockle fisheries and gas mining in the Dutch Wadden Sea: putting the science-policy interface in a wider perspective, Environmental Science and Policy, 13 (3), pp. 239-248.  2016 special issue in Environmental Science and Policy ( <a href="https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/environmental-science-and-policy/vol/55/part/P3">https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/environmental-science-and-policy/vol/55/part/P3</a> )  Enst, W. van, H. Runhaar and P.P.J. Driessen (2016), Boundary organisations and their strategies: Three cases in the Wadden Sea, Environmental Science and Policy, 55 (1), pp. 416-423.  Van Enst, W.I. (2018), Science-policy interfaces for enriched environmental decision-making: a research into the strategies of boundary work, illustrated by case-studies in the Dutch Wadden sea, PhD thesis, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands. ( <a href="https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/358671">https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/358671</a> )  Runhaar, H., H.J. van der Windt and J.P.M. van Tatenhove (2016), Conclusions from the Environmental Science and Policy special issue on Organising productive science-policy interactions for sustainable coastal management. Lessons from the Wadden Sea, Environmental Science and Policy, 55 (1), pp. 467-471

11	Marine ecosystem governance in Barents Sea management	Barents Sea – Lofoten area in Norway  Governance level: National	2002 - 2011	<p>(Temporary) stabilization of a persistent conflict.</p> <p>Translation of ecological values (science) into planning regulations (policy), including the identification of valuable and vulnerable areas as a basis for spatial management</p> <p>Different agencies and institutions (ministries, directorates, and scientific bodies) were brought together in a new way.</p> <p>Trust-building between organizations.</p>	<p>Ministry of the Environment. (2006). Report No. 8 to the Storting (2005-2006) Integrated Management of the Marine Environment of the Barents Sea and the Sea Areas off the Lofoten Islands. (8). Oslo.</p> <p>Knol, M. (2010a). Constructing knowledge gaps in Barents Sea management: how uncertainties become objects of risk. <i>MAST</i>, 9(1), 61-79.</p> <p>Knol, M. (2010b). Marine ecosystem governance in the making: Planning for petroleum activity in the Barents Sea-Lofoten area. (PhD Thesis), University of Tromsø, Tromsø.</p> <p>Knol, M. (2010c). Scientific advice in integrated ocean management: The process towards the Barents Sea plan. <i>Marine Policy</i>, 34(2), 252-260. doi:10.1016/j.marpol.2009.07.009</p> <p>Knol, M. (2011). Mapping ocean governance: from ecological values to policy instrumentation. <i>Journal of Environmental Planning and Management</i>, 54(7), 979-995. doi:10.1080/09640568.2010.547686</p> <p>Ministry of the Environment (2011). White Paper No. 10 (2010-2011): Update of the management plan for the marine environment of the Barents Sea-Lofoten area (in Norwegian).</p> <p>Blanchard, A., Hauge, K. H., Andersen, G., Fosså, J. H., Grøsvik, B. E., Handegard, N. O., . . . Vikebø, F. (2014). Harmful routines? Uncertainty in science and conflicting views on routine petroleum operations in Norway. <i>Marine Policy</i>, 43(0), 313-320.</p> <p>Hauge, K. H., Blanchard, A., Andersen, G., Boland, R., Grøsvik, B. E., Howell, D., . . . Vikebø, F. (2014). Inadequate risk assessments—A study on worst-case scenarios related to petroleum exploitation in the Lofoten area. <i>Marine Policy</i>, 44, 82-89.</p> <p>Kristoffersen, B., &amp; Dale, B. (2017). Post Petroleum Security in Lofoten: How identity matters. <i>Arctic Review</i>, 5(2).</p> <p>Irish, O. (2018). Identifying ecological hotspots in the United States and Norway: Turning ecosystem-based management into practice? <i>Marine Policy</i>, 98, 65-76.</p> <p>Sander, G. (2018a). Against all odds? Implementing a policy for ecosystem-based management of the Barents Sea. <i>Ocean &amp; Coastal Management</i>, 157, 111-123.</p> <p>Sander, G. (2018b). Ecosystem-based management in Canada and Norway: The importance of political leadership and effective decision-making for implementation. <i>Ocean &amp; Coastal Management</i>, 163, 485-497.</p>
12	Co-creating Ecosystem-based Fisheries Management Solutions	European Sea basins with different scopes  Governance level: International	2014 - 2017	<p>Reassessment of the utility of decision support tools for implementing an EBFM.</p> <p>Tensions made explicit for policy-makers.</p> <p>Policy advice based on better available science.</p> <p>Impacts on researchers.</p> <p>Impact on stakeholders.</p> <p>Awareness of the benefits and limitations.</p> <p>Generating a “safe space” for dialogue.</p> <p>Collaboration beyond the project remits.</p>	<p>Rincón, M. M., Mumford, J. D., Levontin, P., Leach, A. W., &amp; Ruiz, J. (2016). The economic value of environmental data: a notional insurance scheme for the European anchovy. <i>ICES Journal of Marine Science</i>, 73(4), 1033-1041. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsv268">https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsv268</a></p> <p>Ruiz, J., Rincón, M. M., Castilla, D., Ramos, F., &amp; del Hoyo, J. J. G. (2017). Biological and economic vulnerabilities of fixed TACs in small pelagics: An analysis of the European anchovy (<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i>) in the Gulf of Cádiz. <i>Marine Policy</i>, 78, 171-180. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.01.022">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.01.022</a></p> <p>Roadmap for exploitation of MareFrame outputs within ICES, 2017. GFCM RoadMap, 2017.</p> <p>MareFrame North Sea Case Study Fact Sheet.</p> <p>Colloca, F., Scarcella, G., &amp; Libralato, S. (2017). Recent trends and impacts of fisheries exploitation on Mediterranean stocks and ecosystems. <i>Frontiers in Marine Science</i>, 4, 244. <a href="https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmars.2017.00244/full">https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmars.2017.00244/full</a></p> <p>Sturludottir, E., Desjardins, C., Elvarsson, B., Fulton, E. A., Gorton, R., Logemann, K., &amp; Stefansson, G. (2018). End-to-end model of Icelandic waters using the Atlantis framework: exploring system dynamics and model reliability. <i>Fisheries Research</i>, 207, 9-24. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2018.05.026">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2018.05.026</a></p> <p>Bauer, B., Horbowy, J., Rahikainen, M., Kulatska, N., Müller-Karulis, B., Tomczak, M. T., &amp; Bartolino, V. (2019). Model uncertainty and simulated multispecies fisheries management advice in the Baltic Sea. <i>PloS one</i>, 14(1), e0211320. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0211320">https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0211320</a></p> <p>Pope, J. G., Hegland, T. J., Ballesteros, M., Nielsen, K. N., &amp; Rahikainen, M. (2019). Steps to unlocking ecosystem based fisheries management: Towards displaying the N dimensional potato. <i>Fisheries research</i>, 209, 117-128. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2018.07.023">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2018.07.023</a></p> <p>T-ONS a swift transportable and user friendly integrative model of the North Sea for decision support <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2019.02.012">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2019.02.012</a></p> <p>Nielsen, K. N., Baudron, A. R., Fallon, N. G., Fernandes, P. G., Rahikainen, M., &amp; Aschan, M. (2019). Participatory planning and decision support for ecosystem based fisheries management of the west coast of Scotland. <i>Fisheries Research</i>, 211, 59-68. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2018.10.020">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2018.10.020</a> <a href="https://digital.csic.es/bitstream/10261/176706/3/co_creation.pdf">https://digital.csic.es/bitstream/10261/176706/3/co_creation.pdf</a></p> <p>Advancing Ecosystem Based Fisheries Management. <i>Journal Special Issue. Fisheries Research</i>. <a href="https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/fisheries-research/special-issue/103CX9S3P53">https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/fisheries-research/special-issue/103CX9S3P53</a></p>

					Pope, J. G., Hegland, T. J., Ballesteros, M., Nielsen, K. N., & Rahikainen, M. (2019). Steps to unlocking ecosystem based fisheries management: Towards displaying the N dimensional potato. <i>Fisheries research</i> , 209, 117-128. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2018.07.023">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2018.07.023</a>
13	Future options for the Australian federally managed fisheries, particularly the Southern and Eastern Scalefish and Shark Fishery (SESSF)	Across south eastern Australia  Governance level: National	2007	National buy-back of fishing vessels/licenses.  Policy process to elaborate and expand the use of harvest strategies.  Change in policy.  Change in management approaches.  More sustainable footing in terms of improved biomasses for species and habitats in the ecosystem.  Fishery was reduced.  More profitable basis.	Smith, A. D. M. et al. Experience in implementing harvest strategies in Australia's south-eastern fisheries. <i>Fisheries Research</i> 94, 373–379 (2008). Fulton, E. A., Smith, A. D. M., Smith, D. C. & Johnson, P. An Integrated Approach Is Needed for Ecosystem Based Fisheries Management: Insights from Ecosystem-Level Management Strategy Evaluation. <i>PLoS ONE</i> 9, e84242 (2014). Smith, A. D. M. et al. Implementing harvest strategies in Australia: 5 years on. <i>ICES Journal of Marine Science</i> 71, 195–203 (2014).
14	Limiting microplastic pollution in the marine environment	Mainly Sweden, partly EU  Governance level: National, international	2014-2019	The organization's work contributed to the following achievements:  National ban for microplastics in rinse-off personal care products.  European Chemicals Agency proposed a wide-ranging restriction on microplastics in products placed on the EU/EEA market.  Increased awareness about microplastics pollution in Sweden and at the EU level.  Changes in formulas in personal care products where microplastics were excluded.	<a href="https://www.su.se/ostersjocentrum/english/baltic-eye/great-media-interest-in-baltic-eyes-new-data-on-microplastic-1.233461">https://www.su.se/ostersjocentrum/english/baltic-eye/great-media-interest-in-baltic-eyes-new-data-on-microplastic-1.233461</a> <a href="https://balticeye.org/en/pollutants/swedish-ban-on-microplastics-in-cosmetics/">https://balticeye.org/en/pollutants/swedish-ban-on-microplastics-in-cosmetics/</a> <a href="https://www.su.se/ostersjocentrum/english/about-us">https://www.su.se/ostersjocentrum/english/about-us</a> <a href="https://balticeye.org/en/search/?query=microplastics">https://balticeye.org/en/search/?query=microplastics</a>
15	Eutrophication in the Baltic Sea	Sweden and Baltic Sea  Governance level: National, international	2016-2020	Politicians agreed to meet with scientists and listen to their research and arguments.  Politicians changed their opinions and adjusted party politics.  National agency (Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management) more nuanced in this matter.  Members of the European Parliament were updated on latest science on eutrophication in relation to the reform of the regulation for trade with organic fertilisers and the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy.	<a href="https://balticeye.org/en/eutrophication/policy-brief-internal-load/">https://balticeye.org/en/eutrophication/policy-brief-internal-load/</a> <a href="https://balticeye.org/en/eutrophication/faq-internal-load/">https://balticeye.org/en/eutrophication/faq-internal-load/</a>

16	Mediation between wildlife tourism and humpback whale well-being	Machalilla National Park, Ecuador  Governance level: Local	1998-2006	Served for local authorities to take informed decisions.  Capacity building. 'Whale Watching' Reglamento for Machalilla was signed by three Ministries at the time: Environment, Tourism and Defense.  Legitimate interaction between scientists and local community members.	Alava, J.J., M.J. Barragán, C. Castro, R. Carvajal. (2005). A Note on Stranding and Entanglements of Humpback Whales ( <i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i> ) in Ecuador. <i>Journal of Cetacean Research and Management</i> , 7(2):163-168.  Alava, J.J., M.J. Barragán and J. Denkinger (2012). Humpback Whales ( <i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i> ) and the bycatch problem in a breeding ground off coastal Ecuador: A Critical Overview and Recommendations. <i>Ocean and Coastal Management</i> , 57:34-43.  Alava, J.J., Tatar, B., Barragan-Paladines, M.J., Castro, C., Rosero, P., Denkinger, J., Jiménez, P., Carvajal, R., Samaniego, J. (2017) Mitigating Cetacean Bycatch in Coastal Ecuador: Governance Challenges of Small-scale Fisheries. <i>Marine Policy</i> . DOI 10.1016/j.marpol.2017.05.025  Barragán-Paladines, M.J. (2017) Small-Scale Fisheries versus Whale-watching Tourism: The Story of Puerto López. <i>Environment &amp; Society Portal</i> , Arcadia. Spring 2017, no. 3. Rachel Carson Center for Environment and Society. <a href="http://www.environmentandsociety.org/arcadia/small-scale-fisheries-versus-whale-watching-tourism-story-puertolopez">http://www.environmentandsociety.org/arcadia/small-scale-fisheries-versus-whale-watching-tourism-story-puertolopez</a>
17	Tackling environmental change Issues of China's coastal Aquatic Systems at the Science-Society Interface	Hainan Island, China. South China Sea  Governance level: Regional	Since 2017, ongoing	Achieved its own goals.  Built new networks.  Engaged different stakeholder groups.  It seems some of the regulations the Hainan provincial environment agency is facing have been influenced by previous policy recommendations.	<a href="http://ecolocol.leibniz-zmt.de/">http://ecolocol.leibniz-zmt.de/</a> <a href="http://ecolocol.leibniz-zmt.de/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_03_Sustaining-Chinas-Coastal-Resources_Policy-Brief_English.pdf">http://ecolocol.leibniz-zmt.de/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/2020_03_Sustaining-Chinas-Coastal-Resources_Policy-Brief_English.pdf</a> <a href="http://ecolocol.leibniz-zmt.de/outcome/fact-sheets/">http://ecolocol.leibniz-zmt.de/outcome/fact-sheets/</a>  Zhang, J., Wang, D. R., Jennerjahn, T., & Dsikowitzky, L. (2013). Land–sea interactions at the east coast of Hainan Island, South China Sea: a synthesis. <i>Continental Shelf Research</i> , 57, 132-142.
18	Bottlenose dolphin conservation in the Cres-Lošinj SCI	Cres-Lošinj. Croatian Waters  Governance level: National	1999-2013	Partial policy success. Sites are in place.  Increased awareness.  Increased support of local communities to engage with the idea of conservation and nature-based tourism.	Mackelworth, P. & Carić, H. (2010). Gatekeepers of Island Communities - Exploring the Pillars of Sustainable Development. <i>Environment, Development and Sustainability</i> , 12(4): 463-480; <a href="http://www.springerlink.com/content/t846616r15n36rk2/">http://www.springerlink.com/content/t846616r15n36rk2/</a>  Mackelworth, P., Holcer, D., Jovanović, J. & Fortuna, C. (2011). Marine conservation and accession, the future for the Croatian Adriatic. <i>Environmental Management</i> , 47(4): 644-655; <a href="http://www.springerlink.com/content/15037u55746738w6/">http://www.springerlink.com/content/15037u55746738w6/</a>  Mackelworth, P. & Holcer, D. (2011). The Cres-Lošinj Special Marine Reserve – governance analysis. Pages 206- 222 in PJS Jones, W Qiu and EM De Santo (Eds) <i>Governing Marine Protected Areas: getting the balance right – Volume 2. Technical Report to Marine &amp; Coastal Ecosystems Branch, UNEP, Nairobi</i> . ISBN: 978-92-807-3159-0; <a href="http://www.mpag.info/mpag-final-technical-report-vol2.pdf">http://www.mpag.info/mpag-final-technical-report-vol2.pdf</a>  Becker, E., Pavlovic, A., Nemet, S. & Mackelworth, P. (2013). Legal Issues Concerning the Cres-Lošinj Marine Habitat and Protected Area Legislation in Croatia. <i>Environ. UC Davis, Environmental Law and Policy Journal</i> 37(1): 1-24. <a href="http://www.environs.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/37/1/Becker.pdf">www.environs.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/37/1/Becker.pdf</a>  Mackelworth, P., Holcer, D. & Fortuna, C.M. (2013). Unbalanced governance: the Cres-Lošinj Special Marine Reserve, a missed conservation opportunity. <i>Marine Policy</i> , 41: 126–133: <a href="http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X12002588">http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308597X12002588</a>  Pleslić, G., Rako, N., Mackelworth, P., Wiemann, A., Holcer, D. & Fortuna, C. (2013). The abundance of common bottlenose dolphins ( <i>Tursiops truncatus</i> ) in the former marine protected area of the Cres-Lošinj Archipelago. <i>Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems</i> : DOI: 10.1002/aqc.2416. <a href="http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/aqc.2416/abstract">http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/aqc.2416/abstract</a>  Rako, N., Picciulin, M., Fortuna, C.M., Nimak-Wood, M., Mackelworth, P., Pleslić, G., Holcer, D., Wiemann, A., Sebastianutto, L. & Vilibić, I. (2013). Leisure boating noise as a trigger for the displacement of the bottlenose dolphins of the Cres-Lošinj archipelago (northern Adriatic Sea, Croatia). <i>Marine Pollution Bulletin</i> , 68(1–2): 77–84. <a href="http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0025326X12006030">http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0025326X12006030</a>  Batel, A., Basta, J. & Mackelworth, P. (2014). Valuing visitor willingness to pay for marine conservation – the case of the proposed Cres-Lošinj Marine Protected Area, Croatia. <i>Ocean and Coastal Management</i> , 95: 72-80. <a href="http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S096456911400091X">http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S096456911400091X</a>  Gaspari, S., Holcer, D., Mackelworth, P., Fortuna, C., Frantzi, A., Genov, T., Vighi, M., Natali, C., Rako, N., Banchi, E., Chelazzi, G. and Ciofi, C. (2015). Population genetic structure of common bottlenose dolphins ( <i>Tursiops truncatus</i> ) in the Adriatic Sea and contiguous regions: implications for international conservation. <i>Aquatic Conserv: Mar. Freshw. Ecosyst.</i> , 25: 212–222. doi: 10.1002/aqc.2415.

					<p>Picciulin, M., Sebastianutto, L., Fortuna, C.M., Mackelworth, P., Holcer, D. &amp; Rako Gospić, N. (2016). Are the 1/3-Octave Band 63-and 125-Hz Noise Levels Predictive of Vessel Activity? The Case in the Cres–Lošinj Archipelago (Northern Adriatic Sea, Croatia). <i>The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II</i>, pp 821-828.</p> <p>Gissi, E; McGowan, J; Venier, C; Di Carlo, D; Musco, F; Menegon, S; Mackelworth, P; Agardy, T; Possingham, H (2018). Addressing transboundary conservation challenges through marine spatial prioritization. <i>Conservation Biology</i>.  <a href="https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13134">https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13134</a>.</p> <p>La Manna, G., Melis, G., Rako-Gospić, N., Basta, J., Mackelworth, P., Holcer, D., Atzeni, M. and Leeb, K., 2019. Sustainable dolphin watching tours as a tool to increase public awareness of marine conservation. A comparative analysis between two Mediterranean destinations and implications for management. <i>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</i>.</p>
19	Use of and impacts on a coral reef and seagrass ecosystem: Participatory modelling of wellbeing trade-offs in a coastal fisheries system	Coastal Kenya  Governance level: Local	2010-2012	<p>Changed mindsets.</p> <p>Broader systems understanding amongst participants.</p> <p>New understanding of long-standing conflicts and social dynamics.</p> <p>Impact on their work activities.</p> <p>Developed trust.</p> <p>Collaborative beach management unit.</p>	<p><a href="http://www.tinyurl.com/pmowtick">www.tinyurl.com/pmowtick</a></p> <p>Daw, T.M., Coulthard, S., Cheung, W.W.L., Brown, K., Abunge, C., Galafassi, D., Peterson, G.D., McClanahan, T.R., Omukoto, J.O., Munyi, L., 2015. Evaluating taboo trade-offs in ecosystems services and human well-being. <i>PNAS</i> 112, 6949–6954.  <a href="https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1414900112">https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1414900112</a></p> <p>Galafassi, D., Daw, T., Munyi, L., Brown, K., Barnaud, C., Fazey, I., 2017. Learning about social-ecological trade-offs. <i>Ecology and Society</i> 22. <a href="https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08920-220102">https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08920-220102</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.espa.ac.uk/files/espa/Participatory%20tools%20and%20processes%20from%20Pmowtick.pdf">http://www.espa.ac.uk/files/espa/Participatory%20tools%20and%20processes%20from%20Pmowtick.pdf</a></p>
20	CBFM development in Vanuatu	Coastal fisheries Vanuatu  Governance level: National	Since 2014	<p>Active adaptive management practices in communities, e.g. increased number in recognized Tabu areas across Vanuatu's coastal zone, community monitoring.</p> <p>Institutional collaborations/linkages.</p> <p>Policy changes.</p>	<p>Tavue, R. B., Neihapi, P., Cohen, P. J., Raubani, J. and Bertram, I. (2016). What influences the form that community-based fisheries management takes in Vanuatu? <i>SPC Traditional Marine Resource Management and Knowledge Information Bulletin</i> 37(November2016): 22-34.</p> <p>Raubani, J., Eriksson, H., Neihapi, P. T., Baereleo, R. T., Amos, M., Pakoa, K., Gereva, S., Nimoho, G. and Andrew, N. (2017). Past experiences and the refinement of Vanuatu's model for supporting community-based fisheries management. <i>SPC Traditional Marine Resource Management and Knowledge Information Bulletin</i> 38(June 2017): 3-13.</p> <p>Kleiber, D., Cohen, P. J., Teioli, H., Siota, F., Delisle, A., Lawless, S., Steenbergen, D. J., Gomese, C., Tavue, R. B., Vachette, A., Neihapi, P., Sokach, A., Li, O., Wraith, L., Koran, D., Campbell, B. T., Rooti, Vanguna, T., Wate, J. T., Boso, D., Duarte, A., Batalofo, M., Andrew, N., Sukulu, M., Saeni-Oeta, J., Sutcliffe, S., Eriksson, H., Newton, J. and McDougall, C. (2019). Gender-inclusive facilitation for community-based marine resource management. <i>SPC Women in Fisheries Information Bulletin</i> 30(September): 34-39.</p> <p>Neihapi et al. 2019 'Twisting and spinning' theatre into coastal fisheries management: Informing and engaging communities to address challenges Raising awareness Vanuatu Department of Fisheries, 2019, Vanuatu National Roadmap for Coastal Fisheries: 2019–2030, Port Vila Vanuatu</p> <p>Andrew et al. 2020 Developing participatory monitoring of community fisheries in Kiribati and Vanuatu</p> <p>Eriksson et al. 2020 A new angle on coastal fisheries development in the Pacific</p> <p>Sami, A., Neihapi, P., Koran, D., Ephraim, R., Malverus, V., Sokach, A., Joy, L., Li, O. and Steenbergen, D. J. (2020). A novel participatory catch monitoring approach: The Vanuatu experience. <i>SPC Fisheries Newsletter</i> May-August(162).</p> <p>Gereva, S., D. J. Steenbergen, P. Neihapi, R. Ephraim, V. Malverus, A. Sami and D. Koran (2021). "Reflecting on four years of community-based fisheries management development in Vanuatu " <i>SPC Fisheries Newsletter</i> 165(May-August): 55-67.</p> <p>Steenbergen, D. J., A. M. Song and N. Andrew (2021). "A theory of scaling for community-based fisheries management." <i>Ambio</i>, 10.1007/s13280-021-01563-5.</p>
21	Protecting bays of high importance to coastal Indigenous peoples, and the Dungeness crabs therein	Central coast of British Columbia, Canada  Governance level: National.	2007-2021	<p>Bays closed under Canadian law.</p> <p>Started co-managing the fishery with the First Nations.</p>	<p>Ban, N. C., L. Eckert, M. Mcgreer, and A. Frid. 2017. Indigenous knowledge as data for modern fishery management: a case study of Dungeness crab in Pacific Canada. <i>Ecosystem Health and Sustainability</i> 3:1379887.  <a href="https://thenarwhal.ca/bc-first-nations-dfo-dungeness-crab-decision/">https://thenarwhal.ca/bc-first-nations-dfo-dungeness-crab-decision/</a>  <a href="https://coastalfirstnations.ca/protecting-dungeness-crab-on-bcs-central-coast/">https://coastalfirstnations.ca/protecting-dungeness-crab-on-bcs-central-coast/</a>  <a href="https://www.ccira.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/CCIRA-newsletter-10-v01.60-web.pdf">https://www.ccira.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/CCIRA-newsletter-10-v01.60-web.pdf</a></p>
22	Roviana Conservation	Coastal Western	1997-2012	<p>Kozou MPA sustained crises.</p>	<p>Aswani, S., and Ruddle, K. 2013. The design of realistic hybrid marine resource management programs in Oceania. <i>Pacific Science</i> 67:461–476.</p>



	Foundation on Kozou multiple zones MPA to protect mangrove related invertebrates	Solomon Islands  Governance level: Local.		The Ministry of the Environment considered MPA legislation which was later enacted.  Direct economic benefit from the MPA.  Almost total compliance by local stakeholders.	Aswani, S., S. Albert, and M. Love. 2017. One size does not fit all: Critical insights for effective community-based resource management in Melanesia. <i>Marine Policy</i> 81:381-391. DOI: 10.1016/j.marpol.2017.03.041  Aswani, S. 2017. Customary management as TURFs: social challenges and opportunities. Mote Symposium invited paper in <i>Bulletin of Marine Science</i> 93(1): 3–12. <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.5343/bms.2015.1084">http://dx.doi.org/10.5343/bms.2015.1084</a>  Aswani, S. 2019. Indigenous polycentric and nested customary sea tenure (CST) institutions: A Solomon Islands case study. In <i>Governing Renewable Natural Resources: Theories and Frameworks</i> , ed. Nunan, F. Abingdon: Routledge. pp 129-144. ISBN number is 9780367146702.
23	Puget Sound coastal protection and armour	Coasts of Washington state, USA  Governance level: Regional	2011-2019	Continuous and ongoing work.  Policy changes.  Incentive programs.  Changed homeowner perceptions of shoreline management.  Deficiencies in the regulatory review and approval process were addressed.  Informed development of a regional recovery plan.	Whitman, T. and S. Hawkins. 2014. <i>The Impacts of Shoreline Armoring on Beach Spawning Forage Fish Habitat in San Juan County</i> . Friends of the San Juans. Friday Harbor, WA.  Whitman, T., D. Penttila, K. Krueger, P. Dionne, K. Pierce, Jr. and T. Quinn. 2014. <i>Tidal Elevation of Surf Smelt Spawn Habitat Study for San Juan County, Washington</i> . Friends of the San Juans, Salish Sea Biological, and WDFW. Friday Harbor, WA.  Dionne, P.E., H. Faulkner, W. Dezan, K. Barnhart, S. Key, and T. Quinn. 2015. <i>Tracking and Monitoring of Marine Shoreline Stabilization Permits Final Report</i> . Habitat Program, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA.  Kinney, A., T. Francis, and J. Rice. 2015. Analysis of Effective Regulation and Stewardship Findings: A Review of Puget Sound Marine and Nearshore Grant Program Results, Part 1. Puget Sound Institute. Tacoma, WA. <a href="https://www.eopugetsound.org/articles/review-puget-sound-marine-and-nearshore-grant-program-results-part-1">https://www.eopugetsound.org/articles/review-puget-sound-marine-and-nearshore-grant-program-results-part-1</a>  Kinney, A., T. Francis, and J. Rice. 2016. Synthesis of 2011-2014 Results and Key Recommendations for Future Recovery Efforts: Final Analysis Report for the Puget Sound Marine and Nearshore Grant Program. Puget Sound Institute. Tacoma, WA. <a href="https://www.eopugetsound.org/articles/puget-sound-marine-and-nearshore-grant-program-results-final-analysis-report">https://www.eopugetsound.org/articles/puget-sound-marine-and-nearshore-grant-program-results-final-analysis-report</a>  Dethier, M.N., W.W. Raymond, A.N. McBride, J.D. Toft, J.R. Cordell, A.S. Ogston, S.M. Heerhartz, and H.D. Barry. 2016. Multiscale impacts of armoring on Salish Sea shorelines: Evidence for cumulative and threshold effects. <i>Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science</i> 175:106-117. <a href="https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272771416301007">https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0272771416301007</a>  Habitat Strategic Initiative. 2018. Narrative. Shoreline Armoring Implementation Strategy. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and Washington Department of Natural Resources. <a href="https://pspwa.box.com/v/PublicIS-ShoreArmoring">https://pspwa.box.com/v/PublicIS-ShoreArmoring</a>  Kinney, A., A. Sweetser, and T. Francis. 2019. Analysis of 2016-2019 Regulatory Effectiveness Investments: Addendum to the Part 1 Report. Puget Sound Institute. Tacoma, WA. <a href="https://www.pugetsoundinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2019_Part-1-Addendum.pdf">https://www.pugetsoundinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2019_Part-1-Addendum.pdf</a>  Kinney, A. and T. Francis. 2019. Analysis of 2016-2019 Shoreline Armoring Investments: A Review of Marine and Nearshore Grant Program Results, Part 4. Puget Sound Institute. Tacoma, WA. <a href="https://www.pugetsoundinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2019_Part-4-Analysis-Report_shoreline-armoring.pdf">https://www.pugetsoundinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/2019_Part-4-Analysis-Report_shoreline-armoring.pdf</a>
24	FIDEA, fishing data East Africa and practical fisheries management decisions	Tanzania, Zanzibar, and Mozambique  Governance level: National.	Since 2019	Support the capacity of the fisheries management institutions.  Bringing together both managers and researchers involved in fisheries research and management.  Impact on the processes.  Harmonising fisheries data collection.	Tuda, P. Strong participation from wio scientists in stock assessment training. Workshop report. <a href="https://meerwissen.org/fileadmin/content/images/partnership-projects/fidea/FIDEA_WIOMSA_article.pdf">https://meerwissen.org/fileadmin/content/images/partnership-projects/fidea/FIDEA_WIOMSA_article.pdf</a>
25	Governance analysis applied to the process of creating marine protected areas (GOBAMP)  Challenges for the governance of sustainable artisanal	Coastal waters of El Hierro, Canary Islands, Spain  Governance level: Local.	2010-2020	Traditional uses maintained with different levels of regulation.  Improving sea-based economic activities.  Fishing activity better than in most of the fishing communities.  Assessments of the state of conservation of the ecosystem are positive.	Galván Tudela, A. (1990). 'Pescar en grupo': De los azares ambientales a los factores institucionales (La Restinga, El Hierro). <i>Eres (Serie de Antropología)</i> , 2:-39-60.  Pascual Fernández, J. J., Batista Medina, J. A., & De la Cruz Modino, R. (2005). Reservas marinas, participación y desarrollo sostenible: ejemplos desde Canarias. In J. Pascual Fernández & D. Florido del Corral (Eds.), <i>¿Protegiendo los recursos? Áreas protegidas, poblaciones locales y sostenibilidad</i> (Vol. VIII, pp. 45-62). Sevilla: Fundación El Monte, FAAEE, Asociación Andaluza de Antropología.  Pascual-Fernández, J. J., & De la Cruz Modino, R. (2005). Mujeres, reservas marinas y estrategias de diversificación en las poblaciones litorales: el caso de los restaurantes de pescado. In K. Frangoudes & J. J. Pascual-Fernández (Eds.), <i>AKTEA Conference: Women in Fisheries and aquaculture: lessons from the past, current actions and ambitions for the future</i> (pp. 247-262). La Laguna, Tenerife: Asociación Canaria de Antropología.

	<p>fisheries: creating synergies with marine conservation and tourism (GOBAMP II).</p>			<p>Recovery of the ecosystem after unforeseen disturbance.</p>	<p>Jentoft, S., Chuenpagdee, R., &amp; Pascual-Fernandez, J. J. (2011). What are MPAs for: On goal formation and displacement. <i>Ocean &amp; Coastal Management</i>, 54, 75-83. doi:10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2010.10.024</p> <p>De la Cruz Modino, R. (2012). Turismo, pesca y gestión de recursos. Aportaciones desde La Restinga y L'Estartit. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte.</p> <p>Jentoft, S., Pascual-Fernandez, J., De la Cruz Modino, R., Gonzalez-Ramallal, M., &amp; Chuenpagdee, R. (2012). What Stakeholders Think About Marine Protected Areas: Case Studies from Spain. <i>Human Ecology</i>, 40(2), 185-197. doi:10.1007/s10745-012-9459-6</p> <p>De la Cruz Modino R., Pascual-Fernández J.J. (2013) Marine Protected Areas in the Canary Islands – Improving Their Governability. In: Bavinck M., Chuenpagdee R., Jentoft S., Kooiman J. (eds) Governability of Fisheries and Aquaculture. MARE Publication Series, vol 7. Springer, Dordrecht. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6107-0_12">https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6107-0_12</a></p> <p>Ordoñez García, P. (2015). El buceo en el entorno de La Restinga (El Hierro): elementos ambientales, socioeconómicos y de gobernanza. La Laguna, Tenerife: Universidad de La Laguna, Master Thesis in Marine Biology, supervisors Jose Pascual-Fernández y Raquel de la Cruz Modino.</p> <p>Pascual Fernández, J. J., China Mederos, I., &amp; De la Cruz Modino, R. (2015). Marine Protected Areas, Small-Scale Commercial Versus Recreational Fishers: Governability Challenges in the Canary Islands, Spain. In S. Jentoft &amp; R. Chuenpagdee (Eds.), <i>Interactive governance for small-scale fisheries: Global reflections</i> (pp. 397-412). Dordrecht: Springer.</p> <p>Pascual-Fernández, J. J., De la Cruz Modino, R., Chuenpagdee, R., &amp; Jentoft, S. (2018). Synergy as strategy: learning from La Restinga, Canary Islands. <i>Maritime studies</i>, 17, 85-99. doi:10.1007/s40152-018-0091-y</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--

1066

1067



1068 Supplementary Table 2: Themes emerging from inductive coding to the research questions of the  
 1069 initiation, goals, approaches, successes, enablers, lessons, and recommendations of the bright-spot  
 1070 examples (via survey participants, respectively).

<b>Initiation (Agency, starting point)</b>	<b>Bright-spots</b>	<b>References</b>
Policy pull	12	18
Research push	12	16
Third party	11	16
<b>Goals</b>		
Impact on policy	17	33
Create relevant knowledge	15	34
Impact on governance (-process or management)	12	26
Social outcomes	12	25
Societal well-being	9	12
Ecological	8	12
Provide knowledge to actors	4	5
<b>Approaches</b>		
Activities, actions	25	220
Connect diverse actors	19	52
Events	17	42
Meetings	17	33
Collate relevant knowledge	14	17
Conversations and dialogue	11	16
Public-facing efforts	10	19
Disseminate, communicate	10	18
Translate, synthesize	6	7
Weigh alternatives and priorities	5	8
Pre-engagement	3	5
Strategies, concepts	24	109
Co-production	18	44
Boundary work	17	30
Advisory boards, working groups or agencies	16	31
Products	14	30
<b>Successes/Impacts on</b>		
Policy	22	78
People	17	73
Governance (management, processes)	17	31
Reflective or comparative	15	24
Process quality	12	16
Research, knowledge base	11	25
Society	9	27
Organizations or agencies	9	15
Creation of new products	7	12
Environment	7	10
Financial	3	7

<b>Enablers</b>		
Actors	23	129
Interpersonal	18	51
Actor group and openness	18	38
Personal	15	35
Understanding expertise, differences and restrictions	3	5
Processes	22	60
Methodological	20	48
Process characteristics	8	12
Support	16	68
Financial	11	15
Political	8	19
Public	6	24
Organizational	5	10
Contexts	16	61
Background	14	36
Local community	7	24
Timing and urgency	13	32
Timing and opportunity	10	18
Topic, need, urgency	8	14
<b>Lessons learnt</b>		
Recognize and engage those to be involved	11	16
Consider time and timing	8	10
Boundary work and context	8	8
Value people and relationships	6	9
Expect challenges along the way	5	5
Accept that politics matters	4	6
Invest in trust and consistency	3	6
Focus beyond only science and policy	3	4
Governance context	3	3
<b>Recommendations to others</b>		
Personal	16	34
Process	12	35
External	7	13
Interpersonal	5	13

1071

1072

1073

1074 Supplementary Table 3: Emerging goals, successes, and enablers. Total number of sources (i.e., bright-  
 1075 spots) and number of references are given (grey), as well as the fractions of sources referencing the  
 1076 themes within the 4 international, 10 national, 5 regional, and 6 local marine science-policy bright-  
 1077 spots.

	Total #sources	(N=25) #ref	International N=4	National N=10	Regional N=5	Local N=6
<b>Goals</b>						
Impact on policy	17	33	50%	90%	40%	67%
Create relevant knowledge	15	34	75%	40%	80%	67%
Impact on governance (process, management)	12	26	50%	40%	60%	50%
Social outcomes	12	25	50%	50%	60%	33%
Societal well-being	9	12	50%	30%	0%	67%
Ecological	8	12	0%	30%	40%	50%
Provide knowledge to actors	4	5	0%	30%	20%	0%
<b>Successes/Impacts on</b>						
Policy	22	78	100%	90%	100%	67%
People	17	73	50%	60%	100%	67%
Governance (management, process, approach)	17	31	50%	70%	60%	83%
Reflexive or comparative	15	24	75%	50%	80%	50%
Process	12	16	50%	40%	80%	33%
Research, knowledge	11	25	50%	40%	80%	17%
Society	9	27	0%	40%	20%	67%
Organizations or agencies	9	15	50%	50%	40%	0%
Products	7	12	75%	10%	40%	17%
Environment	7	10	50%	10%	20%	50%
Financial	3	7	0%	0%	60%	0%
Impact on industry	1	2	0%	10%	0%	0%
<b>Enablers</b>						
Actors	23	129	75%	100%	80%	100%
Interpersonal	18	51	50%	80%	40%	100%
Actor group and openness	18	38	75%	100%	60%	33%
Personal	15	35	50%	70%	20%	83%
Understand differences/restrictions	3	5	25%	10%	0%	17%
Processes	19	44	100%	80%	100%	83%
Methodological	15	32	100%	70%	100%	67%
Process characteristics	8	12	25%	30%	40%	33%
Support	15	44	50%	60%	100%	50%
Financial	11	15	25%	50%	60%	33%
Political	8	19	25%	40%	40%	17%
Public attention and support	6	24	25%	20%	40%	17%
Organizational	5	10	0%	40%	0%	17%
Contexts	19	77	25%	70%	60%	83%
Background	14	36	25%	60%	60%	67%
Local community	7	24	0%	20%	0%	83%
Timing and urgency	15	56	75%	70%	40%	17%
Timing and opportunity	10	18	25%	70%	40%	0%

1078	Topic, need, urgency	8	14	50%	30%	40%	17%
------	----------------------	---	----	-----	-----	-----	-----