

Evaluation of the Mistra Council for Evidence-Based Environmental Management (EviEM)

'Without a synthesis of the most reliable findings, you get stakeholder groups using evidence to support their entrenched views.'

Mistra EviEM Executive Committee member Andrew Pullin, interview in EviEM's Annual Report 2012, p. 4.

Jari Niemelä, University of Helsinki, Finland

Rebecca Rees, University College London, UK

Måns Rosén, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden and former at Swedish Agency for Health Technology Assessment and Assessment of Social Services, Sweden

Birger Solberg, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Norway

Isabel Sousa Pinto, Centre for Marine and Environmental Research, and University of Porto, Portugal

Maria Wetterstrand, Chair of the Council for the Swedish Environmental Objectives, former member of the Parliament, Sweden

Executive summary

The Mistra council for 'Evidence-based Environmental Management' (EviEM) has performed a number of scientifically high-quality reviews which are useful for stakeholders. The transparency and the methodology of the work is in the international forefront and Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) has served as an excellent independent host organization. The panel has some recommendations for future improvements of EviEM, such as:

- developing the selection process of review topics,
- diversifying the portfolio of evaluation methods to include more social and economic aspects
- improving dissemination and communication to become a more interactive, dialogue-like process both when framing the question and in the dissemination phase
- developing a searchable database of scientific knowledge gaps
- developing measures and indicators for assessing impact, in particular societal impact.

Based on formulated criteria for a future host organization, documentation and interviews with stakeholders and others, the evaluation panel finds strong support for letting the SEI continue to be the host organization of EviEM.

1. Background and evaluation task

In public policy, there is an increasing consensus on the need to consider research evidence in decision-making. In Sweden, a government agency, the Swedish Agency for Health Technology Assessment and Assessment of Social Services (SBU), has the function of critically examining medical treatments and other working methods in the care sector. Also in environmental management, decision-making needs a stronger scientifically evaluated approach.

Acknowledging the need for an evidence-based approach in environmental management and decision-making, Mistra decided in 2010 to establish a working group to assess and propose

how to improve and organize the use of scientific evidence within the environmental sector in Sweden.

The Mistra working group on evidence-based environmental management submitted its report in 2011 (Franke et al. 2011) proposing the establishment of **Mistra Council for Evidence-Based Environmental Management (EviEM)** with the following aims:

- To identify and systematically collate research results in strategically important environmental issues according to decisions made by the council's board,
- To analyse research results and establish their value as evidence,
- To disseminate scientifically grounded research results and conclusions to end users and decision makers,
- To develop methods for the evaluation of environmental studies, particularly in social science and interdisciplinary research.

Based on the report's recommendations Mistra decided to establish EviEM in January 2012. EviEM aims at strengthening the scientific foundation of environmental policy and management in Sweden. EviEM works mainly through systematic reviews of selected environmental issues. Mistra provided funding totaling SEK 66 million for EviEM's activities in the period 2012–2017. The Mistra council is governed by an independent Executive Committee, and has a Secretariat — comprising six employees — that occupies premises at the international research institute Stockholm Environment Institute. This arrangement ensured the Council's independence, both financial and political.

At the end phase of the six-year period of EviEM's activities, Mistra decided to conduct an evaluation of EviEM. The main objective was to assess how EviEM has developed and performed since its inception in 2012, particularly with regard to the visions and goals that were originally set (for the Terms of Reference, see appendix 1). Another objective is to, in the broad sense, identify EviEM's societal impact. Furthermore, the evaluation should scrutinize the prerequisites for developed activities after Mistra's exit, especially with regard to necessary criteria for any future host organization. More specifically, the following evaluation criteria were established:

1. (a) How has Mistra EviEM performed in relation to the goals that were originally defined?
(b) In addition, how has Mistra EviEM contributed, in other ways, to the field of evidence-based environmental management?
2. What impact can be shown and expected from EviEM and the use of evidence-based methodology in the environmental arena? Including for example: i) Capacity building, ii) Awareness raising, iii) Decision making, iv) Legacy of primary research, v) Methodology
3. What have been the facilitators and barriers to EviEM's functioning to date?

In addition, the evaluation should provide recommendations for the future:

4. What should be the vision for a future EviEM, what are the crucial success factors that would maximise its value, and what limitations might affect its success?
5. What criteria should characterise any future host organisation? Candidate criteria include: intellectual independence; recognized status as a trusted and unbiased messenger; established access to scientific journals, monographs and other relevant materials for conducting evidence-based reviews; adequate space to house EviEM staff; administrative and technical structure capable of supporting EviEM's functions.

Mistra invited the following persons to conduct the evaluation (hereafter referred to as the evaluation panel):

Jari Niemelä, University of Helsinki, Finland (chairman)
 Rebecca Rees, University College London, UK
 Måns Rosén, Karolinska Institutet, Sweden and former at Swedish Agency for Health
 Technology Assessment and Assessment of Social Services, Sweden
 Birger Solberg, Norwegian University of Life Sciences, Norway
 Isabel Sousa Pinto, Centre for Marine and Environmental Research, and University of Porto,
 Portugal
 Maria Wetterstrand, Chair of the Council for the Swedish Environmental Objectives, former
 member of the Parliament, Sweden

2. Evaluation of EviEM's activities

As evaluation methods, the evaluation panel used document analysis and interviews. Documents were provided by EviEM and Mistra (also material on EviEM's website was used). In addition, the panel interviewed several stakeholders and others involved in or familiar with EviEM (for persons interviewed, see appendix 2). Here, the evaluation panel assesses EviEM's activities based on the 5 evaluation criteria specified by Mistra.

2.1. Evaluation criterion 1a. How has Mistra EviEM performed in relation to the goals that were originally defined?

Evaluation of the original goal to identify and systematically collate research results in strategically important environmental issues according to decisions made by the council's board (Franke et al. 2011)

EviEM's Executive Committee comprises environmental scientists, expert reviewers and central Swedish stakeholders in environmental affairs. The Committee's members are appointed by the Board of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, in consultation with Mistra. The Executive Committee bears overall responsibility for EviEM's work and determines which subjects are reviewed.

EviEM's main mode of operation is to conduct systematic reviews on topics agreed with stakeholders. The review process of EviEM is presented in the document 'The Mistra EviEM review process' (<http://www.eviem.se/Documents/arbetar/Process%20for%20conducting%20Mistra%20EviEM%20systematic%20reviews.pdf>) and in the document 'Guidelines for Systematic Review and Evidence Synthesis in Environmental Management', which has been produced as part of the work of the Collaboration for Environmental Evidence (CEE) (<http://www.eviem.se/Documents/arbetar/Review%20guidelines%20version%204.2%20final.pdf>). Also the documentation entitled 'EviEM Routines' (approved by EviEM Executive Committee in March 2017) describes all the relevant procedures from initial stakeholder engagement to publishing the reviews and communication.

EviEM's process of conducting a systematic review can be summarised as follows. To select a review topic, EviEM invites ministries, public agencies, interest organisations, research funders and other organisations associated with environmental affairs to discuss and propose issues where systematic reviews may be needed. According to the EviEM secretariat, primarily those organisations that are responsible for Sweden's Environmental Objectives are invited, and asked to suggest the most urgent topics that also fulfil EviEM's criteria. The aim is that the proposers of a particular topic should be able to benefit from the results and turn

them into practical environmental measures. The selection procedure for each review is presented in the review reports. For instance, in the case of SR1 (impacts of reindeer/caribou on arctic and alpine vegetation) the review was proposed by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. Prior to completion of the review protocol, a meeting was arranged with stakeholders with an interest in reindeer husbandry and environmental aspects of reindeer herbivory in Sweden. Several suggestions made by the stakeholders were adopted by the review team.

After a set of relevant topics has been collected, the topics are presented to the ExComm. At this stage the main criterion for the topics was that it seemed realistic in terms of available literature. According to the secretariat, in the starting phase of EviEM the review topics were spread among the different environmental objectives of Sweden, i.e. to different agencies and different stakeholder groups. The ExComm then decides on which topics the secretariate should conduct a scoping study. The scoping study is a summary of the volume of evidence that exists on a specific topic. The scoping report acts as a background document for the EviEM Executive Committee to use when considering approval of a review question for a systematic review or map. Scoping studies introduce the review topic in general. They also investigate whether or not literature reviews of the particular question have already been carried out and if sufficient scientific literature on that topic exists for a systematic review. Scoping studies contain useful information about the current scientific literature on the respective topic, even if the publication record is not adequate to support further work at present.

Once the scoping study has been approved by the ExComm, a team will be invited to perform the review. The team consists of international experts with a chair active in Sweden and familiar with the national conditions related to the review topic. In addition, an EviEM staff member is included in each team.

The team conducting the review defines and refines the review question, while developing a review protocol. A review protocol is a detailed plan on how the review will be carried out: what questions should be answered, what criteria should be applied in order to include or exclude studies, and how the literature search should be conducted. Policymakers and other stakeholders have the opportunity to comment on the protocol before it is approved and published. There is also a public review of the draft review protocol. The review is thereafter performed according to the protocol and guidelines. The review-specific group of stakeholders is invited to comment again at end of the review process on the draft of the review report. As soon as a review is finished and approved by the Executive Committee, a report will be published on EviEM's website and also by the open access journal *Environmental Evidence* published by the Collaboration for Environmental Evidence (CEE) in which EviEM is a member. To make the content available to different stakeholder groups, key findings are published in a summary and a fact sheet. Furthermore, the results are presented to stakeholders at a specific event.

A systematic review will aim to synthesise the findings of relevant and high quality studies. Alternatively, a systematic map may be produced either as a product in its own right or as an initial step before decision are taken about completing one or more syntheses. A systematic map uses systematic searches and descriptive coding so as to report on the extent and nature of existing research that addresses a specific (often quite broadly specified) research question.

In addition to systematic reviews and maps, EviEM produces commentaries and evidence overviews. Commentaries summarise and comment on systematic reviews not conducted by EviEM but which are considered to be relevant for Swedish environmental management. Overviews address an environmental question, based on a more limited search of the literature than a systematic review. No general conclusions are drawn.

Six systematic reviews have been completed by EviEM so far:

SR1: What are the impacts of reindeer/caribou (*Rangifer tarandus* L.) on arctic and alpine vegetation? A systematic review (2015). This review was proposed by the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. The aim was to clarify how grazing, browsing and trampling by reindeer (or caribou) affect the vegetation of arctic, subarctic, alpine and subalpine areas, including the forest-tundra ecotone.

SR2: How effective are created or restored freshwater wetlands for nitrogen and phosphorus removal? A systematic review (2016): This review was proposed by Swedish Board of Agriculture and the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management. The objective was to quantify observed removal rates of nutrients in created or restored wetlands, and to examine the distribution of these rates and quantify the variation between different studies.

SR3. What is the influence of a reduction of planktivorous and benthivorous fish on water quality in temperate eutrophic lakes? A systematic review (2015). The purpose of this review is to clarify whether reduction of planktivorous and benthivorous fish may prevent eutrophication problems in lakes. It appears that the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management proposed this review, although this is not entirely clear from the protocol.

SR4. What are the effects of agricultural management on soil organic carbon in boreo-temperate systems? A systematic map (2015). This systematic map (i.e. a systematic inventory of the available evidence) is intended to provide a catalogue of academic and grey literature on the impacts of cropland management interventions on soil organic carbon across temperate regions. The topic was originally proposed as a systematic review, but once searches were underway it was recognised that a systematic map would better suit the scope of the question and needs of the stakeholders, since the subject was broad and knowledge of the state of evidence across the subject was limited. The topic was proposed by the Swedish Board of Agriculture.

SR5. What is the effect of phasing out long-chain per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances on the concentrations of perfluoroalkyl acids and their precursors in the environment? A systematic review (2017). The objective was to find out whether the concentrations of these substances in the environment are changing in any particular direction, and whether any spatial differences or changes in temporal concentration trends can be related to the implemented phase-outs. This review topic was proposed by the Swedish Chemicals Agency.

SR6. What is the impact of active management on biodiversity in boreal and temperate forests set aside for conservation or restoration? A systematic map (2015). The aim of this systematic map is to provide an overview of available evidence on how biodiversity in forest set-asides may be affected by various forms of active management. The review was proposed by Swedish stakeholders but in the protocol there is no specific information about who these stakeholders were and how they were involved.

In the following the evaluation panel assesses the fulfillment of the first original goal of EviEM to 'identify and systematically collate research results in strategically important environmental issues according to decisions made by the council's board.' Below the assessment is divided into several sub-headings.

Selection of review topics

While the identification and selection of 'strategically important environmental issues' for systematic reviews appears to be thorough and stakeholders are consulted prior to the review as explained on the EviEM website (<http://www.eviem.se/en/how-we-work/how-subjects-are-chosen/>), in the EviEM Routines and in the review reports and protocols, there are some unclear issues related to the selection procedure which became apparent to the evaluation panel based on documentation and interviews. For instance, it is not clear who is allowed to propose review topics and if these proposals are actively solicited by EviEM. For instance, in the case of SR6 the stakeholder who proposed the review was not specified. Moreover, it is not evident how the proposed topics are weighed against each other and how the final selection is done. Since the ExComm has the final say in selection of review topics, there is a need for a clearer justification of this final decision. Therefore, the evaluation panel recommends EviEM to further clarify and develop the process of selection of review topics. There are existing models to consider, for example, the James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnerships that are set up in the UK for prioritising research uncertainties around specific health conditions (<http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/about-the-james-lind-alliance/about-psps.htm>) and other initiatives identified by the Cochrane Collaboration's Priority Setting Methods group (<http://methods.cochrane.org/prioritysetting/welcome>).

EviEM's work is expected to help in securing progress towards fulfilling Sweden's environmental objectives and to make efforts to achieve them more effectively (<http://www.eviem.se/en/about-us/Working-towards-Swedens-environmental-objectives/>). This goal could be considered fulfilled as all the review projects EviEM is engaged in are linked to one or more of the environmental quality objectives (<http://www.eviem.se/en/about-us/Working-towards-Swedens-environmental-objectives/EviEMs-projects-linked-to-the-objectives/>). On the other hand, it is not clear whether or not the topics selected for review are the most relevant for the environmental objectives.

Selection of expert teams

Each review is conducted by a team appointed specifically for that review. The team comprises internationally renowned researchers in the topic area concerned, a Team Chair who should be a researcher who is or has been active in Sweden and is well acquainted with the Swedish society and language. In addition, the team includes a project manager from the EviEM Secretariat. The team composition and selection procedure is explained in detail in the CEE 'Guidelines for systematic review in environmental management', EviEM Routines and 'The Mistra EviEM review process'. However, it may be appropriate to consider including one or two more practice or policy-oriented experts into the team. They could be helpful both in formulating questions and in work with others to interpret the evidence.

Literature review

The process of reviewing literature by the review teams appears well functional and it is based on detailed and comprehensive guidelines (see above). In order not to waste resources

on topics that are not feasible for this specific methodology, a scoping study is performed to find out whether or not sufficient scientific literature exists for conducting a full systematic review. If sufficient literature exists, EviEM's Executive Committee's makes a decision to perform a full review. There is also sufficient flexibility in the process as a systematic review can be turned into a systematic map (e.g. SR4) if it turns out during the review work that the state of evidence of the subject is limited.

Collating research results

Based on documentation and interviews, the evaluation panel concludes that EviEM has fulfilled the goal of collating research results very well. Six systematic reviews have been performed and 11 are underway. The six review reports produced are comprehensive and of very high scientific quality. The results of the reviews are based on extensive and quality-checked literature collected using a wide range of search terms in several languages. Several publication databases and search engines in addition to websites of specialist organisations are used to find as much as possible of the relevant literature. In addition to the full report, summaries, fact sheets and the review protocol including aims and methods of the review are published on EviEM's website. The review protocol includes a thorough and credible description of the material and methods used in the review. Furthermore, the full report and the review protocol is published in the peer-reviewed, open access journal *Environmental Evidence* published by the Collaboration for Environmental Evidence (CEE) in which EviEM is a member. This means that the report is thoroughly reviewed before publication in the journal. Furthermore, the journal facilitates rapid publication of evidence syntheses, in the form of CEE-registered Systematic Reviews and Maps.

Evaluation of the original goal to analyse research results and establish their value as evidence (Franke et al. 2011)

The six review reports and other reports by EviEM provide information about the state-of-the-art knowledge in the reviewed field. Systematic review reports and protocols are published on EviEM's website and in the journal *Environmental Evidence*. Thus, it can be concluded that EviEM fulfills the original goal of analysing research results and establishing their value as evidence, for instance, by publishing results in peer-reviewed journals.

Evaluation of the original goal to disseminate scientifically grounded research results and conclusions to end users and decision makers (Franke et al. 2011)

Before a systematic review is published, decision-makers and other stakeholders are engaged by giving them a possibility to familiarize themselves with the draft report and to submit their views. Especially stakeholders who have shown an active interest in the review during earlier stages of the project are invited to comment. The focus of the stakeholder feedback is especially on how results are summarised and presented.

After the Executive Committee has approved the review, EviEM makes the final report available online as well as publishes and disseminates summaries and factsheets in English and Swedish. The full report and the review protocol are published in the journal *Environmental Evidence*. Findings from the review may also be published separately by the review team in other scientific journals. Furthermore, the final review is published on the EviEM website and information is released via social media. Videos may be produced for systematic reviews.

The explicit aim of the dissemination activities – according to the review guidelines – is to inform decision-makers of the implications of the best available evidence relating to a question of concern, and enable them to place this evidence in context, in order to make a decision on the best course of action. It is stated on the EviEM website (<http://www.eviem.se/en/about-us/>) that reviews give no recommendations as to how the results should be turned into environmental improvement measures. Instead, it is the task of the stakeholders to ensure that the reviews are used. These guidelines, in addition to interviews performed by the evaluation panel, indicate that there is mainly a one-way dissemination of the review results from EviEM to the stakeholders but no active dialogue between EviEM and stakeholders to enhance the use of the review results. In fact, the guidelines caution that ‘When reporting implications, the emphasis should be on objective information and not on subjective advocacy.’ (page 61). While this piece of advice is understandable and acceptable, such instructions do not encourage active dialogue in the science-policy interface between EviEM and the stakeholders who have proposed the topic and who could therefore benefit from the results. There is an evidence base for the value of different types of dialogue and other mechanisms for encouraging research use. The findings of a recent systematic review on the topic can be accessed here: <http://www.alliance4usefulevidence.org/evidence-exchange/the-science-of-using-science-evidence/>

The importance of the link between the review question and the decisions stakeholders need to take was highlighted by the chairman of the first systematic review in an interview (<http://www.eviem.se/en/how-we-work/Experience-from-the-reindeer-review/>). Furthermore, Kjell Asplund, member of EviEM’s ExComm states that ‘*written material and one-off lectures have proved to have a limited impact. Seminars and other interactive methods are more effective than one-way information in getting your message across.*’ (interview in EviEM Annual Report 2014, p. 5). Moreover, according to stakeholder interviews performed by the evaluation panel, a more interactive, dialogue-like communication process from the side of EviEM was suggested for a more efficient uptake of the results of the review reports. The evaluation panel therefore recommends that EviEM finds a way to continue the dialogue started with the stakeholders at the initiation phase of the review while making sure that such a dialogue is not ‘advocacy’ from EviEM’s side. Such a balanced and carefully conducted dialogue in the science-policy interface to disseminate review results could shape the form of the deliverables without changing their content and would ensure maximum impact of the extensive, costly and high-quality reviews. In fact, the EviEM Executive Committee has made a decision (meeting 10, item 13) ‘to develop a dialogue between the stakeholders and scientists to identify policy-relevant questions where more scientific knowledge is needed.’ We urge EviEM to explore how such a dialogue could be continued during dissemination of the completed review.

Evaluation of the original goal to develop methods for the evaluation of environmental studies, particularly in social science and interdisciplinary research (Franke et al. 2011):

Mistra EviEM is part of the network *Collaboration for Environmental Evidence* (CEE). Along with institutions in France, South Africa, Australia, the UK and Canada, EviEM is a CEE centre. This ensures international collaboration and quality assurance of EviEM’s activities.

In order to conduct systematic reviews, EviEM uses ‘Guidelines for Systematic Review and Evidence Synthesis in Environmental Management’ (2013) by the international Collaboration for Environmental Evidence (CEE). EviEM has actively developed the methodology within the CEE network. Using these guidelines ensures comparability between different reviews done

by EviEM and also between EviEM's reviews and those done by other members of CEE. The Guidelines are very detailed and provide a comprehensive basis for conducting the review. In addition, EviEM has prepared a process description of their reviews ('The Mistra EviEM review process'). Furthermore, each review report includes a description of the methods and a separate review protocol is prepared and published.

EviEM – as evidenced by its hosting of the First International CEE Conference in 2016 – is internationally highly active, for example, in bringing together methodological experts in not only an interdisciplinary, but even a transdisciplinary way. Thus, EviEM's international links are plentiful and deep, and EviEM is a forerunner in the development of the methodology of systematic reviews. Overall, it can be concluded that EviEM has contributed in a significant way to development of methods for the evaluation of environmental studies.

The reviews conducted are usually impact assessments, for instance, how mountain vegetation is affected by reindeer grazing (SR1) or how biodiversity is influenced by the management of forest set-asides (SR6). As the topics and questions are natural science-oriented the literature reviewed reflects this and does not include much social science literature. EviEM has started to expand its methodological scope through a systematic review using methods of political science. This project will focus on voluntary measures to engage forest owners in nature conservation and will be based on a Ph.D. thesis project which will grow into a full systematic review to be conducted 2017-2019. Furthermore, a new staff member with expertise in multidisciplinary methodology was recruited in late 2015 to the EviEM secretariat. These are positive developments but in order to respond to the variety of information needs by the stakeholders – which were evident in the interviews by the evaluation panel – EviEM should consistently consider broadening and diversifying its portfolio of evaluation methods and include social science (including economics) methods and approaches. Environmental economics is a well-established subject in many universities and by including this area in the reviews, there could be added value for stakeholders in their decision-making capacities. Complementing existing personal with staff with such expertise will be needed, and imply increased operational costs.

EviEM has focused its activities on systematic reviews, but it is evident from stakeholder interviews that also other types of assessments are needed, especially ones that respond faster than full systematic reviews to knowledge needs of the stakeholders. EviEM has completed some 'lighter' reviews in the form of Evidence Overviews which take between a couple of weeks and three months to complete, and EviEM Comments. EviEM should consider the balance between performing full systematic reviews and these 'lighter' reviews in collaboration with stakeholders in need of the information. Furthermore, it would be worthwhile to increase the number of systematic reviews or other types of assessments of management interventions and practices that involve human activities, e.g. management approaches for protected areas.

2.2. Evaluation criterion 1b. How has Mistra EviEM contributed, in other ways, to the field of evidence-based environmental management?

It is evident from the documentation, news on EviEM's website and interviews conducted by the evaluation panel that EviEM has increased awareness of the importance of evidence-based management among researchers and stakeholders. For instance, professor Jon Moen who chaired the reindeer review (SR1) says that the review process was a valuable learning experience for the researchers involved (EviEM Annual Report 2014, p. 8). Also presentations of EviEM's activities in congresses and seminars have provided visibility for EviEM and more

broadly for systematic reviews. This has encouraged the use of research-based evidence in decision-making as evidenced by the many interviews on EviEM's website. However, as Eva Thörnclöf, member of EviEM's ExComm, says *'It is too early yet to say how EviEM's reviews will influence the Environmental Protection Agency's environmental management activities or support for environmental research'* (interview in EviEM Annual Report 2015, p. 5). Furthermore, some of the stakeholders interviewed by the panel were unaware of the whole range of outputs produced by EviEM. Thus, the evaluation panel recommends that EviEM uses a wider variety of communication methods to make its work visible and better known among stakeholders for an improved use of EviEM's reviews.

In addition to systematic reviews, overviews and comments, EviEM has conducted a project entitled 'What knowledge is needed in Swedish environmental management' (so called 'Kunskapsprojektet'). The project surveyed knowledge needs of Swedish stakeholders as regards environmental management. The report (only available in Swedish) is very comprehensive and gives a good picture of knowledge needs of which some may result in systematic reviews by EviEM. The evaluation panel suggests that this groundbreaking exercise should be continued and the results of this exercise be widely disseminated to the scientific community and to the science funders community, perhaps in combination with research gaps identified in systematic reviews (see 2.3. iv below).

2.3. Evaluation criterion 2. What impact can be shown and expected from EviEM and the use of evidence-based methodology in the environmental arena? Including for example: i) Capacity building, ii) Awareness raising, iii) Decision making, iv) Legacy of primary research, v) Methodology

i) Capacity building. EviEM has contributed significantly to capacity building in performing systematic reviews on environmental issues, both in Sweden and internationally through standardized methods and protocols and involvement of researchers in the review teams (see also 2.1.). EviEM is thereby building competence among Swedish and international researchers to perform systematic reviews. Because of its good international connections, the evaluation panel suggests that EviEM explores possibilities to extend its international activities, e.g. by performing reviews that focus on biogeographical regions outside Sweden. The high-quality review reports and other publications such as summaries, fact sheets and annual reports are also evidence for the capacity that has been built over the first years of EviEM's activities.

ii) Awareness raising. EviEM has been very active in promoting awareness of the importance of evidence-based environmental management and decision-making. Awareness has increased among researchers as many of them have been involved in the reviews, and a number of publications have been published in addition to many presentations given about EviEM (see also 2.2.). Awareness and capacity building has also taken place among stakeholders as several important Swedish stakeholders have proposed topics for review and have benefited from the results. Also the public has been informed through popular articles. However, as mentioned below, the dissemination and communication of results could be improved, e.g. to relevant parliament committees.

iii) Decision making

Impacting decision-making through systematically collected evidence is one of the main goals of EviEM's reviews. Andrew Pullin, member of EviEM's ExComm, says that *'Without a synthesis of the most reliable findings, you get stakeholder groups using evidence to support their entrenched views.'* (interview in EviEM's Annual Report 2012, p. 4). However, stakeholder

interviews performed by the evaluation panel suggested that the systematic reviews performed by EviEM have had limited impact on decision-making so far. On the one hand, this was said to be due to the short period of time from the completion of the systematic reviews, and it was expected that impact would increase as organisations have more time to digest the reviews. On the other hand, stakeholders felt that the information provided by the systematic reviews is sometimes of limited usefulness. Furthermore, some stakeholders were not aware of reviews that could have been useful for them. In order to improve the societal impact, use and uptake of EviEM's reviews, EviEM should consider working with organisations such as government agencies so that these agencies are enabled to interpret and 'translate' the key messages of the reviews to practitioners and policymakers. EviEM should also use various communication methods to make its work better known among stakeholders for an improved use of the reviews, as well as for the general public to promote the use of scientific evidence in management and decision making.

While the evaluation panel recommends EviEM to improve the impact of its outputs, the panel recognizes that there are reasons to distinguish between generating evidence and making recommendations or guidelines for decision-making. Preferably, all stakeholders would accept the evidence presented, but they can disagree on consequent measures to be taken and their priorities. Recommendations include weighing between different goals and objectives where stakeholders can have different views. EviEM should therefore focus on providing evidence and not making recommendations, as there is a risk that evidence is adjusted to recommendations. However, in order to improve practice-oriented decision-making, EviEM should increase collaboration with stakeholders such as governmental agencies (e.g. Swedish EPA, Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management) and county administrations and frame the questions it reviews as evidence needed to support action.

EviEM's review reports do not include estimates of level of uncertainty of the evidence or assessments of the strength of the evidence presented. The evaluation panel recommends that EviEM develops estimates of the level of uncertainty and/or strength of the evidence found in the reviews it performs.

iv) Legacy of primary research

Based on bibliometric material provided to the evaluation panel, the scientific impact of EviEM's outputs (especially peer-reviewed publications) seems to be high. Furthermore, EviEM's reviews identify gaps in scientific knowledge and thereby encourage researchers and funding agencies to focus on such topics. EviEM could develop a searchable database of knowledge gaps which could be distributed to researchers and funding organisations as suggestions for future research. This could perhaps be combined with the mapping of knowledge needs of Swedish stakeholders performed in 'Kunskapsprojektet' (see above).

v) Methodology

As stated above (2.1.) EviEM has contributed to the development of methods for systematic review of environmental literature. Much of this impact comes from international collaboration within CEE. However, the original goal of developing methods particularly in social science and interdisciplinary research (Franke et al. 2011) requires further attention (see also evaluation of the original goal above). The evaluation panel thus encourages EviEM to broaden and diversify its portfolio of evaluation methods and develop social science (including economics) methods and approaches.

According to documentation and interviews, EviEM does not measure its impact although the issue has been discussed several times at ExComm meetings (minutes of ExComm meetings 7,

9, 10 and 11). The evaluation panel urges EviEM to develop measures and indicators for assessing its impact on capacity building, awareness raising, and, in particular, on decision-making. Examples of impacts on decision-making could be improvement in environment status, environmental management or national legislation, discussion of systematic review findings or decisions taken by governmental agencies, confidence for the products among stakeholders or research initiatives based on identified knowledge gaps, and raised awareness of the potential of systematic reviews for decision-making in environmental management.

2.4. Evaluation criterion 3. What have been the facilitators and barriers to EviEM's functioning to date?

The main facilitators are:

- supportive and independent host organisation
- independence of EviEM and its Executive Committee
- close collaboration between EviEM and stakeholders, relevant topics for reviews have been received from stakeholders
- highly qualified review teams
- being part of the international community that is developing these methodologies
- appropriate and well-defined methodology for systematic reviews
- transparency of the methodology and reports
- dissemination of the results to the stakeholders
- appropriate resources

The main barriers are:

- practical issues related to the review process such as time use by the review team, establishment of databases etc (<http://www.eviem.se/en/how-we-work/Experience-from-the-reindeer-review/>)
- dissemination and use of the review results is not always what had been desired by the stakeholders (see also 2.3. iii)

2.5. Evaluation criterion 4. What should be the vision for a future EviEM, what are the crucial success factors that would maximise its value, and what limitations might affect its success?

Several assessments have been produced recently about how to organize EviEM type of activities in Sweden in the future. In the document 'Vägar till ett effektivare miljöarbete' (SOU 2015:43, G. Ekström, pages 384-385) it is stated that EviEM should be used as model for a future activity which would be placed in Formas with additional funding. Formas would then get a new task of scientifically assessing environmental research, systematically summarising research results of good scientific quality, and presenting these results in a simple and easily understandable manner usable by practitioners in the environmental field. Formas should also identify areas within the environmental field where relevant practical research is missing.

This report was open for public comments after its release. There were mixed responses to the suggestion of giving Formas the new task of analyzing and summarizing environmental research (summarized in EviEM Executive Committee meeting minutes 12). EviEM Executive Committee provided comments to the report (letter dated 12 Oct, 2015) and noted that the preferred host of a future EviEM would be Stockholm Environment Institute (the current host) or a similar independent organization with access to scientific literature.

Thereafter the Ministry of Energy and Environment commissioned Erik Arnberg to assess the future host of an EviEM type of activity (either Formas or another organization). In his report 'Inrättandet av analysfunktion för miljöarbetet' (M2016:A) he listed three possible ways of organizing such an activity within existing organisations: Formas, SEI or SBU. However, he did not prioritize these three alternatives. This document is summarised in the minutes of EviEM ExComm meeting 13. Formas submitted its views on the document (letter dated 10 February 2017). Formas is in favour of hosting an EviEM type 'analysis function' in the future.

The Ministry of Energy and Environment asked EviEM to produce a proposal for its future (see Executive Committee minutes 12). Executive Committee submitted a proposal to the ministry (letter dated 11 April 2016) of continuing EviEM under the auspices of SEI but expanding the secretariat to about 10 persons (from current 6). As an alternative host the Executive Committee saw Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences but felt that it would be more difficult to be entirely independent within a university than if associated with SEI.

The Ministry of Education and Research stated that in order to better utilize existing research to achieve Sweden's environmental goals, an 'analysis function' for environmental activities will be created during the year 2018. Formas would be granted funding for this. (Utbildningsdepartementets promemoria 'Satsning på forskning om stora samhällsutmaningar', 2016-09-09).

The Swedish government's document 'Regeringens proposition 2016/17:50. Kunskap i samverkan – utmaningar och stärkt konkurrenskraft' refers to the document 'Vägar till ett effektivare miljöarbete' by G. Ekström stating that there is a need to improve the use of environmental research. The Government sees a clear need to improve the accessibility of results of environmental research in order to achieve Sweden's environmental goals. The Government asserts that this 'analysis function' should be established in 2018 and should build on experiences and processes of EviEM. The Government is prepared to increase the funding of Formas for establishing this 'analysis function' but the Government will return to the organization and host ('placering') of this activity later.

All the above documents and assessments indicate that EviEM has performed valuable work and that EviEM should function as a model for an 'analysis function' of one form or another. Based on the analysis of the above documents and interviews with EviEM and stakeholders we propose that EviEM continues its activities and that the crucial factors for the future success of EviEM include the following (which are to a certain degree similar to those listed under the following point 2.6):

- for credibility and legitimacy among academia and among end-users, EviEM should maintain a recognized status as a trusted, independent and unbiased messenger of syntheses of environmental research
- for maintaining such a status, EviEM should be hosted by an organization independent from stakeholders (see also 2.6.). An alternative would be to establish an EviEM organization entirely independent from any other organization but that would be costly as the administrative and support structures would not be supported by a host organization (e.g. it would also be costly and complicated to arrange access to electronic literature & databases)
- it is important that EviEM has an independent Executive Committee. Currently, the Executive Committee is nominated by the Board of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, in consultation with Mistra. To strengthen the independency and status of the ExComm it is suggested that it will be appointed by the government of Sweden

- The current Executive Committee consists mainly of scientists (4 of the 7 members), while only one member clearly represents stakeholders (SEPA). We would suggest that EviEM modifies the composition of the Executive Committee to include more stakeholder members and establish a separate Scientific Advisory Board consisting of scientists which would have a more advisory and supporting role
- for credibility among academia, EviEM's reviews should be performed by researchers of high international reputation who are independent of the stakeholders proposing the review. To be able to attract the best scientists for the work it is advisable to place EviEM in a high standing scientific institution with experience in hosting science-performing groups and units
- credibility also requires continued maintenance of standardized and transparent methods of reviews
- for relevance for stakeholders, the reviews done by EviEM should primarily be ones that have been proposed by stakeholders and which they find useful
- in addition to the previous point, a crucial success factors is – as was highlighted by this evaluation (see e.g. 2.3. iii) – that the use of the review results in the decision-making processes of the stakeholders be strengthened
- EviEM should take a more active role in communicating review results to the stakeholders and the public but the role of EviEM towards the stakeholders should be well-defined and transparent to avoid advocacy
- for performing scientifically high-quality reviews that are of use for the stakeholders, EviEM should have sufficient resources (space, personnel etc) and easy access to literature relevant for the reviews (see also 2.6.)
- also broadening and expanding the portfolio of methods to cover social sciences requires personnel with appropriate skills
- as there is a great demand of systematic reviews on numerous environmental topics to support decision-making, the need of an EviEM type of activity is not foreseen to diminish in the future. Thus, it is important that funding for this activity is long-term.
- indicators of the impact of the reviews among stakeholders need to be developed to find out what kind of effects such review results have in the society.

Main limitations/risks are:

- EviEM can lose its credibility in the eyes of the academia and stakeholders.
- EviEM can lose credibility for several reasons, e.g. the host organization having a real or perceived conflict of interest, review teams not competent enough, methods used not transparent etc.

2.6. Evaluation criterion 5. What criteria should characterise any future host organisation?

Candidate criteria include: intellectual independence; recognized status as a trusted and unbiased messenger; established access to scientific journal, monographs and other relevant materials for conducting evidence-based reviews; adequate space to house EviEM staff; administrative and technical structure capable of supporting EviEM's functions.

Based on the evaluation of EviEM, the above criteria suggested for a future host organisation of EviEM are relevant but the evaluation panel feels that it is important to add a few criteria (credible and academically attractive host organisation, expertise in natural and social sciences, transparent organizational structure and review processes, host organization with good international status and networks).

Intellectual independence of the host organization is vital but also financial and political independence from stakeholders who propose reviews to be made is crucial. Conflicts of

interest and steering by the stakeholders of the review process in any way should be avoided. In addition to independency of the host organization, it is vital that EviEM itself is intellectually independent and that it functions as an *administratively and financially independent unit* within the host organization (e.g. it should have its own, independent board and finances).

Recognized status as a trusted messenger is a vital characteristic of a host organization. Furthermore, as stated above, EviEM itself should be intellectually independent from the host organization but the host organization should have the capacity to provide technical assistance and capacity to support EviEM in *disseminating & communicating the results of reviews* to stakeholders and the public. However, it is important that the responsibility for communication is within EviEM.

Related to the above criterion is that the host organization should be a *credible and academically attractive research organization* in the eyes of the national and international academic community as well as stakeholders. Academically this means that the host organization has to have a high status as an independent research organization and must have *experience in hosting research units*. This would also help in attracting high-quality staff and internationally respected experts for the review teams. From the stakeholder point of view this criterion means that the host organization must be credible, transparent and trusted in the way it interacts with the society.

As one of the original aims of EviEM is to develop methods for the evaluation of environmental studies, particularly in social science and interdisciplinary research, the future host organization has to have broad *expertise in both natural and social sciences*.

For the credibility and legitimacy of EviEM activities, it is also important that the host has a *transparent organizational structure* and that the *review processes continue to function in a transparent fashion*. For its credibility and legitimacy it is also important that EviEM has an independent board and a scientific advisory board (see 2.5.).

Adequate space to house EviEM staff and sufficient administrative and technical resources and structure capable of supporting EviEM's functions are critical characteristics of a future host organization. It is vital that funding and other support provided by the host institution is *long-term*, as each review may take several years (2 yrs on average, EviEM Executive Committee meeting minutes 12/2016), and there clearly is a need for numerous systematic reviews to support achieving the Swedish environmental goals.

Access to (electronic) scientific material is vitally important for performing high-quality reviews. The host organization must provide easy access to electronic databases and literature as it is not possible to perform literature-intensive systematic reviews without such access. It would be prohibitively expensive and difficult for EviEM to organize access to literature on its own.

In addition, it is important that the future host organization has *high international status and well-established national and international networks*. These characteristics help in attracting high-quality members for the review teams and ensures the credibility of the produced reviews in the international arena. In particular, collaboration is important among the Nordic countries (Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland) as the physical environment, the human societies and environmental problems/issues are quite similar. Relevant research for Sweden is done in these countries, as the completed reviews show. For instance, in the case of SR6

about the same number of studies were included in the review from Sweden and from Finland (page 20). Furthermore, in many of the reviews search terms in several Nordic languages (including Finnish) were used.

Stockholm Environment Institute has for some years now a record of being an excellent host to EviEM and SEI fulfills all the formulated criteria for a suitable host organisation. In this early phase of EviEM's development, it is important to stabilize its future by keeping a well-functioning relationship with its current host organization. This will also facilitate the possibilities to keep and recruit competent staff.

Based on documentation, interviews and the above analysis, the evaluation panel suggests that EviEM continues to be hosted by SEI. Excluding potential host organisations, all interviewees who wanted to make a statement about the host stated that SEI would be the preferred host organization in the future. Since SEI already today receives funding from the government for certain activities (e.g. via Formas) there should be no insurmountable practical obstacles to let SEI host a government funded EviEM. According to the evaluation panel, SEI fulfills the criteria of a future host organization better than the other options, provided that intellectual and managerial independence for EviEM can be secured. The panel especially wants to emphasize SEI's high international status and credibility, their access to scientific material and their attractiveness as a research organisation.

3. Conclusions and recommendations

Based on the assessment presented above, the evaluation panel concludes that EviEM has performed a number of scientifically high-quality reviews which are useful for the stakeholders. In addition, EviEM has produced other useful assessments (commentaries, systematics maps). Furthermore, several systematic reviews are currently being prepared.

The methodology used by EviEM is of high quality and EviEM is clearly a forerunner internationally in terms of refinement of, and capacity building in, the methodology of systematic reviews. Thus, EviEM has significantly contributed to improving the use of environmental research results in the society. We therefore conclude that activities of EviEM should continue.

Based on the above assessment, the evaluation panel makes the following recommendations for further developing and improving the functions and, in particular, the societal impact of EviEM:

1. The evaluation panel suggest that EviEM clarifies and further develops the process of selecting review topics (see section 2.1.). Furthermore, EviEM could adopt a more interactive process when identifying and framing review questions (but stakeholders should not be involved in the appraisal phase).
2. The evaluation panel suggests EviEM should consider including one or two more practice or policy-oriented experts into the review teams. They could be helpful both in formulating questions and in work with others to interpret the evidence.
3. High-quality systematic reviews take time to prepare, but they are very important as a trusted basis for decision-making, so the panel thinks that this review type should continue to be the basis of the future EviEM's work. However, stakeholder interviews indicated that – in addition to systematic reviews – also other types of assessments are needed, and therefore EviEM should diversify the types of reviews that it conducts. In

particular, stakeholders are in need of faster reviews. EviEM has already produced a range of other products (e.g. commentaries and evidence overviews) (see 2.1.), so there is experience of these types of reviews.

4. In addition to types of reviews, EviEM should broaden and diversify its portfolio of evaluation methods and develop capacity to include social science (including economics) evidence, methods and approaches (see 2.1.). It is positive that EviEM is supporting a PhD project using methods of political science and has employed a staff member with multidisciplinary skills, but in order to respond to the variety of information needs by the stakeholders – which were evident in the interviews by the evaluation panel – EviEM should consistently continue broadening its methodology. Furthermore, in addition to reviews of causes of environmental impacts, it would be worthwhile to increase the number of assessments of management interventions and practices that involve human activities, e.g. management approaches for protected areas. It may be necessary to further complement existing personnel with staff with expertise needed for such methodological diversification.
5. In terms of dissemination of the reviews, the aim of EviEM is to inform stakeholders without giving recommendations (see 2.1.). While this is acceptable, stakeholder interviews indicated that a more interactive, dialogue-like communication process from the side of EviEM would be helpful for a more efficient uptake of the results of the review results.
6. In addition, to improve societal impact and use of EviEM's reviews in the society, EviEM may want to consider working with organisations such as government agencies to help them interpret or 'translate' key messages of the reviews for practitioners and policymakers. Furthermore, EviEM should use a variety of communication methods to make its work better known among stakeholders and the public for an improved use of EviEM's reviews and to increase awareness of the benefits of the use of evidence in management and decision making.
7. In addition to systematic reviews, overviews and comments, EviEM has conducted a project entitled 'What knowledge is needed in Swedish environmental management' (so called 'Kunskapsprojektet'). The evaluation panel suggests that this groundbreaking exercise should be continued.
8. EviEM is internationally well-connected and a forerunner in review methodology. Therefore, the evaluation panel suggests that EviEM explores possibilities to extend international activities, e.g. by performing reviews that focus on biogeographical regions outside Sweden.
9. EviEM's outputs have identified gaps in scientific knowledge. EviEM could develop a searchable database of these knowledge gaps which could be distributed to researchers and funding organisations to help inform future research.
10. At present, EviEM does not measure its impact (see section 2.3.). The evaluation panel urges EviEM to develop measures and indicators for assessing its impact, in particular societal impact.
11. EviEM's review reports do not include estimates of level of uncertainty of the evidence or assessments of the strength of the evidence presented. The evaluation panel urges EviEM to develop estimates of the level of uncertainty and/or strength of the evidence considered.
12. It is important that EviEM has an independent Executive Committee. Currently, the ExComm is nominated by the Board of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, in

consultation with Mistra. To strengthen the independence and status of the ExComm it is suggested that it will be appointed by the government of Sweden.

13. The current ExComm consists mainly of scientists (4 of the 7 members), while only one member clearly represents stakeholders (SEPA). We would suggest that EviEM changes the composition of the ExComm to include more stakeholder members and establish a separate Scientific Advisory Board consisting of scientists which would have a more advisory and supporting role.
14. The evaluation panel learned that EviEM is applying for external funding. While this is a positive sign of activity, EviEM has to be cautious in not starting to spend too much time and energy applying for external funds. The core funding of EviEM should be sufficient to allow it focus on performing reviews useful for the stakeholders.
15. Based on documentation, interviews and the above analysis, the evaluation panel suggests that EviEM continues to be hosted by SEI. Excluding potential host organisations, all interviewees who wanted to make a statement about the host suggested that SEI would be the preferred host organisation. SEI fulfills the criteria of a future host organization better than the other options, provided that intellectual and managerial independence for EviEM can be secured. The panel especially wants to emphasize SEI's high international status and credibility, their access to scientific material and their attractiveness as a research organisation. Since SEI already today receives funding from the government for certain activities (e.g. via Formas) there should be no insurmountable practical obstacles to let SEI host a government funded EviEM. In this early phase of EviEM's development, it is important to stabilize its future by keeping a well-functioning relationship with its current host organization. This will also facilitate the possibilities to keep and recruit competent staff.



The Swedish Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research

Gamla Brogatan 36-38, SE-111 20 Stockholm, Sweden
 phone +46 8 791 10 20, fax +46 8 791 10 29
 mail@mistra.org www.mistra.org

2016-12-02

Appendix 1.

Evaluation of Mistra EviEM – Terms of Reference

About Mistra

Mistra seeks to promote sustainable development by investing in collaboration between researchers and users – with the aim of solving important environmental problems. Mistra offers support to those who wish to play a part in addressing such problems, by means of research that builds bridges – both between different research disciplines and between research and practical benefits. Mistra’s investments are expected to promote the development of strong research environments of the highest international class.

As a foundation, Mistra has a specific purpose, which is set out in its Statutes:

The purpose of the Foundation, whose name shall be the Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research, is to fund research of strategic importance for a good living environment. The Foundation shall promote the development of strong research environments of the highest international class with importance for Sweden’s future competitiveness. The research shall be of importance for finding solutions to important environmental problems and for a sustainable development of society. Opportunities for achieving industrial applications shall be taken advantage of. (Article 1 of Mistra’s Statutes)

Mistra EviEM

The Mistra Council for Evidence-Based Environmental Management (EviEM) works for environmental management to be placed on a scientific foundation. Through systematic reviews of various environmental issues, the Council aims to improve the basis for decisions in Swedish environmental policy.

Mistra provides funding totaling SEK 66 million for EviEM’s activities in the period 2012–2017. EviEM is governed by an independent Executive Committee, and has a Secretariat — comprising five employees — that occupies premises at the international research institute Stockholm Environment Institute. This ensures the Council’s independence, both financial and political.

Back in 2012, Mistra’s funding decision was preceded by a background report (Franke et al. 2011). The report concluded that the Council should have the following aims:

- To identify and systematically collate research results in strategically important environmental issues according to decisions made by the council’s board,
- To analyse research results and establish their value as evidence,
- To disseminate scientifically grounded research results and conclusions to end users and decision makers,
- To develop methods for the evaluation of environmental studies, particularly in social science and interdisciplinary research.

The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences (RSAS) was the council's first host. The main reason for the choice of organization was that RSAS was considered an impartial institution. In January 2016, the council moved to Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI).¹

Evaluation of Mistra EviEM 2017

Mistra have decided to conduct an evaluation of EviEM in 2017. The main objective of the evaluation is to see how the council has developed and performed since its inception in 2012, particularly with regard to the visions and goals that were originally set. Another objective is to, in the broad sense, seek to identify EviEM's societal impact. Thirdly, the evaluation should scrutinize the prerequisites for developed activities after Mistra's exit, especially with regard to necessary criteria for any future host organization.

The evaluation will be carried out by an international panel, consisting of both academics and practitioners. Expertise on the specific characteristics and methods of systematic reviews must be well represented. Panel members will be appointed by Mistra after consultation with EviEM.

The panel should submit a joint report to Mistra with the panel's conclusions and recommendations. The prime audience for the report is Mistra's Board, although it is likely that it will be of great interest for other actors as well.

Evaluation criteria

1. How has Mistra EviEM performed in relation to the goals that were originally defined? In addition, how has Mistra EviEM contributed, in other ways, to the field of evidence-based environmental management?
2. What impact can be shown and expected from EviEM and the use of evidence-based methodology in the environmental arena? Including for example: i) Capacity building, ii) Awareness raising, iii) Decision making, iv) Legacy of primary research, v) Methodology
3. What have been the facilitators and barriers to EviEM's functioning to date?

Recommendations for the future

4. What should be the vision for a future EviEM, what are the crucial success factors that would maximise its value, and what limitations might affect its success?
5. What criteria should characterise any future host organisation? Candidate criteria include: intellectual independence; recognized status as a trusted and unbiased messenger; established access to scientific journal, monographs and other relevant materials for conducting evidence-based reviews; adequate space to house EviEM staff; administrative and technical structure capable of supporting EviEM's functions.

Preliminary time table

2016	Oct	Terms of Reference
	Nov	Recruitment of Panel
	Dec	Final appointment of Panel by Mistra

¹ The Council was originally named the Mistra Council for Environmental Evaluation (MCEE), but changed to its current name in March 2012.



The Swedish Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research

Gamla Brogatan 36-38, SE-111 20 Stockholm, Sweden
 phone +46 8 791 10 20, fax +46 8 791 10 29
 mail@mistra.org www.mistra.org

2017	Jan/Febr	Evaluation meeting 1 in Stockholm (2-3 days)
	March	Evaluation meeting 2 in Stockholm (preferably in conjunction with EviEM ExComm meeting 28-29 March)
	31 March	Preliminary evaluation report submitted to Mistra
	20 April	Evaluation report, final version

Background materials

Franke, Sigbrit et al. (2011-03-04): Förslag om inrättande av Mistra Council for Environmental Evaluation. (English Summary: Introduction – the Need for a Council)

Ekström, Göran: Vägar till ett effektivare miljöarbete (SOU 2015:43)

Arnberg, Erik: Inrättande av en analysfunktion för miljöarbetet (M2016:A). Redovisning av uppdrag 2016-06-21

Kunskap i samverkan – för samhällets utmaningar och stärkt konkurrenskraft Prop. 2016/17:50 2016-11-24

EviEM output

EviEM Review Reports and other publications available on <http://www.eviem.se/en/publications/>

EviEM Annual Reports 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016

EviEM Executive Committee Minutes 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016

Mistra's Board Minutes

2011-03-21 (SP 84): Funding decision

2012-03-27 (SP 88): Decision to allow for change of name

2014-03-26 (SP 96): Decision to allow for change of host organization

Appendix 2.

FINAL VERSION

Evaluation of Mistra EviEM – draft agenda

26-27 January and 29-30 March 2017, Stockholm

1st meeting – January

Venue (most of the time): Mistra's Office, Gamla Brogatan 36-38, Stockholm

January 25	After-noon	Arrival and check-in at Elite Hotel Adlon, address Vasagatan 42 (https://www.elite.se/en/hotell/stockholm/hotel-adlon/)
	18.30	We gather in the lobby of your hotel
	19.00	Dinner
January 26	08.30	Introduction
	09.30	Transportation to Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), host of EviEM
	10.00	Meeting with EviEM secretariat (30 min. presentation + Q&A)
	11.30	Summing up and preparing for the interviews
	12.00	Lunch at SEI with Henrik Lange , Ministry of the Environment and Energy
	13.00	Transportation to Mistra
	13.30	Stakeholder interview: Ruth Stewart , CEE Johannesburg (Skype)
	14.00	Meeting with Erik Arnberg , investigator
	14.30	Meeting with ExComm chair Lisa Sennerby Forsse
	15.30	Coffee
	16.00	Stakeholder interview: Mark Marissink , Swedish EPA
	16.30	Stakeholder interview: Johan Rova , County Administrative Board Jönköping (phone)
	18.30	Dinner <i>Cont. next day</i>
January 27	09.00	Work session
	09.30	Stakeholder interview: Paul McAleavey , EEA (Skype)
	10.00	Stakeholder interview: Anna Jöborn , Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (Skype)
	10.30	Coffee
	11.00	Stakeholder interview: Tuija Hilding-Rydevik & Tommy Lennartsson , Swedish Biodiversity Centre
	11.30	Stakeholder interview: Anders Turesson , Ministry of the Environment and Energy
	12.00	Lunch (in-house)
	13.00	Work session, division of labour, next meeting etc.
	15.00	End of meeting



The Swedish Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research

Gamla Brogatan 36-38, SE-111 20 Stockholm, Sweden
 phone +46 8 791 10 20, fax +46 8 791 10 29
 mail@mistra.org www.mistra.org

2nd meeting – March

March 28		Arrival and check-in at Elite Hotel Adlon, Vasagatan 42 (same as previous)
	18.40	We convene in the lobby, then walk to the restaurant
	19.00	Dinner
March 29	08.30	Work session and stakeholder interviews (venue: Hotel Adlon)
	10.00	Interview with Jimmy Lundblad , Swedish Forest Agency (phone)
	11.30	Lunch meeting with Johan Kuylenstierna , CEO Stockholm Environment Institute (World Trade Center, 5 min walk)
	13.00	Meeting with ExComm ² (venue: Mistra)
	14.30	Coffee
	15.30	Interview with Andy Rowe , Canadian Evaluation Society/ARCEconomics (Skype)
	16.15	Interview with Magnus Bång , Swedish Board of Agriculture (phone)
	19.30	Dinner
March 30	09.00	Meeting with ExComm member Kjell Asplund
	10.00	Meeting with Ingrid Petersson , Director General Formas
	12.00	Lunch (in-house)
	13.00	Work session, including oral presentation to Mistra (Åke Iverfeldt)
	15.00	End of meeting

² ExComm members participating in the meeting: Lisa Sennerby Forsse (chair), Jerry Melillo, Henrik Smith, Kathrine Richardson (most of the time), Andrew Pullin (most of the time). Separate meetings were held with Kjell Asplund and Johan Kuylenstierna. Apologies: Eva Thörnelöf.



The Swedish Foundation for Strategic Environmental Research

Gamla Brogatan 36-38, SE-111 20 Stockholm, Sweden
phone +46 8 791 10 20, fax +46 8 791 10 29
mail@mistra.org www.mistra.org

Evaluation Panel

Prof. Jari Niemelä (Chair)

University of Helsinki, Finland
jari.niemela@helsinki.fi

Prof. Isabel Sousa Pinto

Centre of Marine and Environmental Research and University of Porto, Portugal
ispinto@ciimar.up.pt

Prof. Birger Solberg

Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU), Norway
birger.solberg@nmbu.no

Prof. Måns Rosén

Karolinska Institutet and former at Swedish Agency for Health Technology Assessment and Assessment of Social Services (SBU), Sweden
mans.rosen@comhem.se

Senior Lecturer Rebecca Rees

University College London, UK
rebecca.rees@ucl.ac.uk

MSc Maria Wetterstrand

Chair of the Council for the Swedish Environmental Objectives, former member of the Parliament, Sweden
wetterstrandmaria@gmail.com

Contact at Mistra

Johan Edman, +46 70 73 240 73, johan.edman@mistra.org