

## 5.2 Characteristics of evidence intermediaries

Evidence intermediaries can be described based on many characteristics. Here we present 10 such characteristics. One evidence intermediary may be large and diversified in its strategic focus, as well as highly committed to its endowment-enabled independence and to using evidence to shape societal agendas over long periods of time. Another entity may be small and specialized in a particular challenge, and dependent on service contracts with product manufacturers (e.g., pharmaceutical companies) to support decision-making by citizens.

If one can consistently predict that a conclusion from an evidence intermediary will involve either a government-led or market-based solution or will involve a policy or program that will benefit (or a product or service offered by) a group aligned with or funding the entity, then there is a good chance that the entity is motivated more by values or private interests, respectively, than by evidence.

Characteristics	Examples
Challenges focused upon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Domestic sectoral (e.g., education)</li> <li>• Domestic cross-sectoral (e.g., economic and social policy)</li> <li>• Global coordination (e.g., international relations)</li> </ul>
Decision-makers targeted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government policymakers (e.g., to influence executive-branch regulation and legislative voting)</li> <li>• Organizational leaders (e.g., to influence organizational strategy and operations)</li> <li>• Professionals (e.g., to influence professional practices)</li> <li>• Citizens (e.g., to influence public opinion and voting)</li> </ul>
Motivating forces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence</li> <li>• Other ideas about ‘what is,’ such as beliefs</li> <li>• Values or ideas about ‘what should be’</li> <li>• Interests (public or private)</li> </ul>
Alignments that may influence motivating forces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political parties</li> <li>• Businesses or unions</li> <li>• Professional groups</li> <li>• Social movements</li> <li>• Not applicable (independent)</li> </ul>
Funding sources that may influence motivating forces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endowments</li> <li>• Foundations</li> <li>• Governments</li> <li>• Corporations</li> <li>• Individuals</li> </ul>
Revenue streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service contracts (e.g., 12 evidence products per year)</li> <li>• Licencing and subscription fees</li> <li>• Sales and events</li> </ul>
Time horizons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term (e.g., responding to urgent needs for evidence)</li> <li>• Medium-term (e.g., preparing for next election or place to retreat when political party loses election and political appointment ends)</li> <li>• Long-term (e.g., undertaking a decade-long programmatic initiative to shape thinking on an emergent policy priority)</li> </ul>
Agenda setters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funders</li> <li>• Entity leaders</li> <li>• Individual staff</li> </ul>
Strategies emphasized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence production and support, which is the focus of <a href="#">section 5.3</a></li> <li>• Consulting</li> <li>• Advocacy</li> </ul>
Locations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multilateral organizations (e.g., UN specialized agencies; OECD)</li> <li>• Governments</li> <li>• Independent non-governmental organizations and for-profit entities</li> <li>• Universities</li> </ul>