

Table 1

A spectrum of impacts from the scholarship and theory on boundary spanning, with examples of what these impacts look like in real world practice.

Boundary spanning impact	Example of what impact looks like in practice
Improved knowledge exchange (e.g. Lemos et al., 2014 ; Pregernig, 2014 ; Bednarek et al., 2018)	Opportunities and events for iterative knowledge exchange. Cross-boundary communication. Interaction (of a certain type and with a certain frequency) among scientists and policy actors.
More diverse and stronger social networks (e.g. Lemos et al., 2012 ; Cvitanovic et al., 2017 ; Bednarek et al., 2018)	Social networks and relationships evolve over time, resulting in different people involved in policy dialogue, or different institutional capacity to make informed decisions.
Increased trust (e.g. Reid, 2004 ; Turnhout et al., 2013 ; Lacey et al., 2018)	Scientists become trusted advisors for policy makers. Use of scientific research, data, or models as a basis for decisions.
Empowered scientists (e.g. Smith et al., 2013 ; Cvitanovic et al., 2018 ; Wyborn et al., 2018)	Scientists engage more deliberately with policy makers. Changes in scientists, for example in their intentions, job satisfaction, or self-efficacy in exchanging knowledge. Collaborative spaces and roles for scientists and policy actors to co-produce research.
Policy windows to link knowledge production with use in policy making (e.g. McKenzie et al., 2014 ; Rose et al., 2017)	Identification of policy windows. Timeliness of interactions in response to policy windows. Framing new policy windows to create opportunities for science and policy interactions.
Enhanced capacity of policy makers and their institutions (e.g. Turnhout et al., 2013)	Changes in how policy makers define or understand an issue. Policy makers source, evaluate and use science in decision making, as reflected in content of policy documents or meeting notes.