

Wadden Sea Board

WSB 22
2 February 2018
Hamburg, Germany



Agenda Item: 5.6 TMAP

Subject: QSR Process Evaluation

Document No. WSB 22/5.6.1 *revised

Date: 31 January 18

Submitted by: TG-MM

WSB 18 decided to perform a process evaluation of the production of the Quality Status Report QSR 2016. Mr. Pieter de Lezenne Coulander (former director within the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority, part of the ministry of Economic Affairs) was nominated to perform this evaluation independently. His nomination was accepted and supported by the Task Group Management and Monitoring (TGMM). The concept report was presented and discussed in the TG-MM 19 meeting in Bremen end of October 2017. Attached is the final QSR 2016 evaluation document (separate pdf file).

The main findings and recommendations of Mr. Coulander (which is supported by the TG-MM) is:

- *The financial support for the QSR requires upgrading to nowadays circumstances; Current financial resources need expansion, not necessarily only from the involved governments.*
- *Prepare a comprehensive QSR project description to address most of the reported processing challenges; The founding fathers knew and had 'authority' without a project description how to manage and find solutions in their network but circumstances changed substantially making those old solutions outdated.*
- *Within the production process too much time is wasted, due to defective coordination and follow-up; Too much is within CWSS with a shortage on staff. This cannot be addressed by money alone but needs a more focussed spirit by all contributors on the schedule and a clear assignment of tasks.*
- *The use of the TMAP database requires an additional decision/evaluation.*
- *The intention to convert to a web based QSR is well accepted, however a rolling scheme needs further elaboration.*
- *The QSR is still a very well respected product, maintaining that level requires also scientific focus.*

Proposal: The meeting is invited to consider the findings and conclusions and to endorse that TG-MM, following the MC-13 and in due time before the next QSR, prepares a comprehensive next-generation QSR project description.

*the revision concerns the cover note only

PROCESS EVALUATION
of the
WADDEN SEA
QUALITY STATUS REPORT
2016

17 January 2018

Author:
Pieter de Lezenne Coulander

Contents

1)	Management summary	3
2)	Introduction	4
3)	Method	5
4)	Activities and schedule	6
5)	Bullet points	7
6)	ToR issues	10
7)	Conclusions	11

Attachments

- 1) Terms of Reference
- 2) Schedule conducted interviews
- 3) Steps in the QSR process (partly current and proposed)

1) Management summary

The Trilateral Wadden Sea QSR is produced already for the sixth time. A major achievement over the years, requiring huge coordination, for the involved scientists, editorial board and CWSS. The successful 'founding fathers' are less and less available. The access to scientific knowledge inside governmental (supported) organizations decreased over the last decades, requiring nowadays more external sources.

The QSR is a corner stone for the whole Trilateral Wadden Sea development, supported by three very strong countries. Especially, but not unique, for QSR 2016 the production process time increased, due to substantial changes in authors, editorial board and CWSS staff. On top of that came the intention to convert the QSR into a more web based design. However inadequate powers and resources were available to maintain a proposed schedule.

To evaluate this QSR production process about fifteen interviews of involved scientists, members of the editorial board and CWSS staff were organised. In the interviews (almost) all items identified in the terms of reference (att. 1) were openly discussed. Additionally the content of the available contracts with the authors were screened.

This evaluation identified, besides other issues, the following main items:

- 1) All involved recognize the importance of the QSR and are enthusiastic.
- 2) The financial resources are not in line with the required efforts of all the contributors.
- 3) A comprehensive project description, available for all major stakeholders, was not updated and/or produced during or direct after the production of QSR 2009.
- 4) The production of the QSR is embedded in a managerial cycle, started by a decision of the WSB and as final document provided to the WSB. Within this cycle actions and evaluations of actions must provide clear instructions for authors* on the specific items that must be addressed in the various chapters.
- 5) The raw data, the fundament for the chapters, was mainly gathered through accumulation inside the network of the authors.
- 6) The authors should accurately describe their data sources and processing steps up to validation, to be able to make a continuous connection over the decades.
- 7) The contracts with authors in Germany and the Netherlands focus on the scientific content and disregard the 'challenges' in the production process.
- 8) The approach to convert into a web based design is very well appreciated.
- 9) CWSS is, due to the limited number of staff and budget, vulnerable.

In chapter 7 'conclusions' some ideas about how to further improve the production process are provided. Attachments 3 is provided to visualize the QSR production process.

The essence is:

Create conditions that QSR 2016 will, much more smoothly, be followed by the next QSR!

*: authors include co-authors

2) Introduction

The Wadden Sea Board (WSB) decided that a process evaluation of the production of the Quality Status Report (QSR) 2016 had to be performed. The Trilateral Wadden Sea Board is chaired by the Netherlands until May 2018. The Dutch nominated Pieter de Lezenne Coulander (former director within the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority, part of the ministry of Economic Affairs) to perform this evaluation independently. His nomination was accepted and supported by the Task Group Management and Monitoring (TGMM). The concept report was presented and discussed in the TGMM meeting in Bremen end of October 2017.

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for this activity was signed in April 2017 (see attachments). The evaluation was done by interviewing about fifteen persons involved in the QSR production process, mostly at their office location spread over the Wadden Sea area, at the end followed by two interviews with Dutch 'users'.

The final interview results are described in the 'bullet' points on page 7-9 in chapter 5 Interview results.

Not only for the interviewer but also for most of the interviewed persons it was astonishing that an accurate and updated written QSR production process procedure did not exist. QSR 2016 is already release number 6, following QSR 2009. **The great enthusiasm and belief of all the contributors that the QSR is very important for the Wadden Sea, has powered the production process up to this date.** The group of contributors and the Common Wadden Sea Secretariat (CWSS) changed substantially the last decade. For the first QSR's a limited knowledgeable group of respected scientists took responsibility. The process of rejuvenation of senior participants (founding fathers) by newer scientists now needs a broader 'community driven' guidance, previously given by the above mentioned group, instead of chapter updating behaviour to further elaborate the status of the QSR.

In the ToR several issues were assigned, such as the trilateral access to data and harmonisation. In the past decades a lot of effort went into the TMAP database, however this database contains, of course, only the addressed items and unfortunately not all the recent data from DK and NL anymore. Besides this the usage of non TMAP data is nowadays very significant and these sources and the required processing steps up to validation are not scientifically well described yet.

Most governments withdrew the last decades from having 'knowledge' inside their ministries and therefore depend more on external 'knowledge', such as provided through the QSR. For the QSR production process this requires at the CWSS a staff and budget that complies with these demands, also to contract external parties,. The increased challenges to coordinate the input of the knowledgeable, more and more non-governmental, scientists at the right time interval to evaluate the raw data and to describe the status and changes of the Wadden Sea, cannot not be met with only enthusiasm but require well balanced facilities.

The next QSR must be available well before the WSB meeting in May 2018. It was not finalized in 2016 or 2017, so the actual name might be updated, but in this report it is referred as QSR 2016.

3) Method

In the Terms of Reference (att. 1) the method is described as follows:

After a general introduction into the QSR, mainly in the Netherlands, an interview cycle with about fifteen key players in D, DK and NL will be conducted. The selection of key-players to be interviewed will be agreed upon with the TGMM members. After these results are available a questionnaire is likely to be sent around to give all participants the opportunity to provide information.

The above mentioned introduction into the QSR process itself was not really fulfilled, however through information provided from the CWSS website and meetings sufficient information became available for a fruitful start in April 2017. Luckily the scientific conference, ISCWW, in May 2017 in Tønder, Denmark could be attended. Many contacts were initiated during that conference as well as general information gathered about the Wadden Sea Status. The original list of persons to be interviewed was restricted to one Dane (Henrik Jörgensen). During the conference it was increased to three so that Denmark is even 'over represented' in this interview cycle.

The Danish and German interviews were all conducted in English, mostly at the office location of the interviewed person and generally structured as follows:

- Introduction/getting acquainted,
- General remarks about the QSR process evaluation,
- Role of the interviewed person in the process and possible contract information,
- Overall coordination,
- Data access and harmonisation,
- Financial aspects,
- Possible blind spots,
- Development of QSR into web based,
- Further usage of the QSR,
- Any other issues.

In the first interview of Gerard Janssen (Editorial Board-member) the appointment was made including the participation of Ronald van Dokkum, member TGMM, to provide more information about the QSR process itself. In another interview at BioConsult two persons were interviewed simultaneously.

To end up with a list of 'bullet' points, derived from the information provided in the interviews, a certain degree of personal judgement was used. Sometimes only in one or two interviews a specific issue was addressed and assessed to be very important. One interview took less than 30 minutes because the person interviewed judged that another could better be interviewed, though he still gave some information. Sometimes issues were discussed more in depth. In all circumstances the suggestions were made in the sincere intention to improve the challenging trilateral production process with so many persons involved, even partly on a voluntary/personal basis. The final result shows opportunities to improve. Some (most?) items are already known and discussed, however not implemented, because for the QSR 2016, that at the start was already long over time, it was decided, due to the minimal resources (€ 230.000) made available, to keep it as 'simple' as possible.

4) Activities and schedule

The interviews were, with a clear permission, recorded on a laptop to be able to recapture the provided information. The interview time varied between 21 minutes and 2 hours and 28 minutes and averaged to about 90 minutes. During the interviews no notes were taken, this was done afterwards. The provided information was, as much as feasible, structured and summarized into an excel worksheet, only for personal usage, and abstracted to the bullet points in chapter 5 page 7-9.

In line with the ToR the 'contract information' between author and CWSS or Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs was added in the interviews to try to be able to report the precision of the contract itself and also compared to the provided input by the contracted person for her/his task. Unfortunately only a few Dutch contracts were available to discuss with the authors. The CWSS contracts were provided on 5 October 2017 after coordination delay and the mutual agreement of involved participants. At the Danish side no contracts have been made for any of the contributions.

Another request for the 'managerial' information at the CWSS, such as the relevant notes of the WSB, TGMM and EB during the production process from 2015 up to 2017, was up to 18 October 2017 only partly fulfilled, namely the 'open to the public' WSB part. If made available this might have shown already known 'challenges' and 'actions' in the current QSR production process. October 2017 was the closing month for additional information for this report to be able to finalize. Therefore it was not possible to combine statements from persons with that information.

The fifteen interview sessions were conducted between 24 April and 21 July (att 2). With one listed person an interview on location could not be arranged, however a valuable response on the subject per e-mail was provided.

To increase the input for the issue 'improved usage of the QSR', besides the information already provided by the authors and Editorial Board members, two additional interviews on that subject were arranged at the end, however only in the Netherlands.

In the original anticipated schedule a *concept* report should have been made available in August to be able to finalize and/or adjust with a questionnaire up to October with the aim to submit the final report in time for the WSB of November 2017. However, due to the delays, this step is now arranged differently by asking the interviewed persons for their degree of agreement of with the reported bullet points. Those abbreviated bullet points, see italic parts on page 7-9, were submitted in an excel datasheet to the interviewed persons on 5 October 2017 accompanied by a few additional columns with three questions:

Discussed during interview Y/N	Statement: A=Agree, B=In between, D=Disagree	'Weigth' from 1=Low 10=Max
-----------------------------------	---	----------------------------------

Please note that not all questions were answered and that the description of the bullet points sometimes contain more than one statement, causing unintended 'challenges' in the replies. In the TGMM meeting in October 2017 it was decided to cancel an additional questionnaire, judging that the e-mailed bullet points described the provided information well.

5) Bullet points

The responses of the interviewed persons on the *abbreviated bullet points* (see *italic* below) was just over 60%. The calculated 'Weight' (sum/N) was between 5,8 and 7,8 for all bullet points. Only the statement in bullet point number 11 (Dutch contracts) was ranked around 'B' (Between), the rest favoured to 'A' Agree. Remarkable is that bullet point number 7 (accurately describe data) is, only 4 times discussed in interviews but showed the highest in 'Weight'. The top three 'Weight' bullet points are 7, 9 and 1, with weights of respectively 7,8; 7,7 and 7,6. The lowest are bullet points 10 and 11 with weights of respectively 5,8 and 6,1. The others are between 6,5 and 7,3. Above also underlines the imperfectness of the description of the statements in the bullet points. Sometimes two statements are included and only one of them may be supported, making it hard to answer by only Yes or No. However the bullet points were originally described taking the total evaluation into account and not an individual ranking by the interviewed persons.

All interviewed persons are enthusiastic about the QSR and want to go for it, even though it did not went as smooth as anticipated. The following bullet points were identified during the interviews, either direct by information provided or assessed by personal judgement:

- 1) *The financial support for the production of a QSR is not in line with the required efforts of the contributors.* For this sixth QSR of the Wadden Sea the intention was to make a cheap, short and simple update, focussed on the observed changes compared to QSR 2009. However, due to the time lapse between the fifth and sixth edition, the world changed substantially and also regarding the Wadden Sea stakeholders. In the network of contributors, the 'founding fathers', with their expertise and knowledge were less available. The above intention needed to be, at least partly, fulfilled by newer scientists and staff. Probably more than before authors did not belong to a governmental supported organisation and had to be paid for their contribution, but also governmental supported organisations started to feel the budget cuts. Governmental policies reduce the in house 'knowledge' and 'in kind' contributions are more difficult. Seen some of the contracts, reported additional time required than agreed upon in the contract, given the number of people involved in the writing process and the input by the Editorial Board and CWSS my estimation is that the production of QSR 2016 requires about 4 to 6 (wo)man-years of work. Only a part is additionally budgeted for within the assigned € 230.000 and this is not in line with the increasing needs for external experts. It was mentioned in some interviews that originally just a few days writing effort was 'anticipated' per chapter, with all data available at the beginning..., no time losses with challenging coordination, no need for travelling to join meetings to discuss the information, ... These 'few days' proved to be a very wrong assumption. Also at CWSS the intended change to a web based QSR, that at the end may prove to be cheaper than a printed QSR, required a different budget. The conversion of a supplied pdf document by the author into a web based chapter also needs 'manpower'.
- 2) *A comprehensive project description, available for and accepted by all major stakeholders, was not updated and/or produced during or direct after the preparation of QSR 2009 but is vital for a smooth process with many new authors due to retirement, changes in the Editorial Board and a new coordinator at CWSS.* The major force to produce the QSR is now the positive attitude of all contributors, however their input needs clear procedures, responsibilities, delivery dates, data sources, review procedure, communication lines, enforcement power, fees, fall back opportunities etcetera. Of course not all can be dealt with in any procedure, but

- 'surprises' within the EB, authors and CWSS should be reduced. In previous QSR's this was 'automatically' handled by the 'founding fathers', including the CWSS. (Note that the coordination of six QSR's at the side of CWSS was in the hands of four persons.)
- 3) *The production of a QSR is embedded in a managerial cycle, started by a decision of the WSB and as final document provided to the WSB. Within this cycle actions and evaluation of actions must provide clear 'instructions' for authors on the specific aspects that must be addressed in the various chapters.* Managerial information about the progress in the process (and the challenges/issues) was not available within TGMM.
 - 4) *The instructions provided to the authors for the QSR 2016 focussed on the intended conversion to a web based approach, the size of their contributions and the request to pinpoint 'changes' compared to QSR 2009, however without the under 3) mentioned specific aspects. The 'changes', showed at the end, were hardly identified.* The authors found it also difficult to restrict their contribution to a limited number of words. This 'challenge' between a full 'status' report and 'changes' requires more structure in the process and explanation of the possible reasons, such as web based and budget. Certainly keeping in mind that both the EB and group of authors was, at least partly, renewed.
 - 5) *The Editorial Board was 'surprised' that they had to write the Synthesis Report.* The Synthesis Report can only be written at the end of the production process as soon as most relevant issues are known. To be able to write this Synthesis Report a very broad knowledge of the Wadden Sea eco-system is required. In previous QSR's this task was given to a small group of very knowledgeable scientists, including the CWSS. For QSR 2016 somewhere in the timeline this task was assigned to the EB. At the start both FdJ and SK were participating in the EB, but FdJ retired in March 2017 and in between SK was not available for several quarters and replaced by FdJ. This reduced the input 'manpower' from CWSS.
 - 6) *The raw data, the fundament for the chapters, was mainly gathered through accumulation inside the network of the authors. Sometimes the authors were forced to undertake data processing and validation steps. The data, as available in the TMAP database at CWSS, appeared hardly used.* The input into TMAP database suffers already years from gaps. For authors it is essential to be able to make a sound connection with data used in previous QSR's. This was reported to be challenging with respect to on time availability, proven validity, accessibility of sources and degree of refinement.
 - 7) *To avoid 'double' work the authors should accurately describe their data sources and processing steps up to validation and provide that to CWSS.* 'Connection' in data and graphs from QSR 2016 with previous QSR's turned out to be 'challenging' for new authors. This is essential for a series of status reports. Currently it appears that the authors themselves arrange most of the data retrieval. However in case new scientists are involved an accurate description is valuable, as is the case for a sound scientific judgement within the community.
 - 8) *The existence of Expert Groups substantially facilitates in the process within 6 and 7.* It is obvious that an Expert Group, that communicates and/or meets several times a year, keeps a good eye on the data and status of the eco system. Also with the possible changeover to a rolling scheme a higher coverage by Expert Groups will improve the 'change' awareness for minimal additional costs.
 - 9) *The editing/reviewing communication between the authors, Editorial Board and CWSS has to be clarified and then maintained.* Without an up-to-date and maintained written procedure, communication lines usually find their easiest path. Some members of the EB communicated directly with authors, some did not because for them the CWSS was the central communication hub. A clear, accepted and maintained procedure will easily solve this, keeping speed and information needs at a high level.

- 10) *The fact that the position of chair and secretary of the Editorial Board are both in the hands of CWSS and now even in one person may look effective but is actually risky and seems not advisable.* After the retirement of FdJ the chair of the EB came available. It is not clear to me whether CWSS wanted to continue the chair or was forced to keep the chair. The coordination of the production of a QSR was mentioned to be a major task that might better be assigned to an additional project manager, keeping the CWSS staff with eco-system knowledge in control. (It was indicated in one interview that the Waddenacademie offered 'support' for the QSR production, but this was not accepted. Note that QSR 2016 is edition number six, with FdJ, GL, HM and now SK named as major coordinators. This means that only a few times the same person kept his position and experience.)
- 11) *The evaluated Dutch contracts between the ministry of EZ and authors usually describe only the bare minimum: chapter, time and money involved and terms of delivery. For a well streamlined and smooth process this might do, however for a Trilateral project with other non-contract partners as important stakeholders (co-authors, CWSS and the Editorial Board) this is due to give rise to various issues.* Some examples: - The administrative 'processing' time of the contracts took too long, making the originally planned delivery date too challenging. (At the end this was no problem for the authors due to shifting deadlines anyhow.) - Knowing that the QSR is a Trilateral product it is important to have all trilateral contributors known at the beginning. - To have a good connection with previous QSR's the data sources and steps up to validation should be made known. - The role of the CWSS should be described, because the ministry of EZ provides only the budget while CWSS is the coordinator. - The communication lines should be described. - The procedure for the production of the QSR with clear responsibilities etcetera, should be referred to. The German contracts became available just after the e-mailed bullets points. They are all more 'legally' written. However in both cases the scientific contents overshadow the production process aspects. The contracted value for D and NL is about €253.000 and does not reflect the required input in manpower against usual rates.
- 12) *The approach to convert the production to web based is very well appreciated, keeping the option to print a pdf. The conversion into a 'rolling' scheme for the chapters needs further elaboration with respect to interdependency and ability to draw conclusions using the oldest data.* If it turns out that this interdependency is very high, than a rolling scheme might be too challenging. Also for the production Synthesis Report the 'oldest' information limits the description of the status.
- 13) *CWSS is, due to the limited number of staff and budget, vulnerable. The available enthusiasm and responsibility compensates but nevertheless the tasks of CWSS are much more than the production and coordination of a QSR.* Not for the first time the production did not went smooth and this time the time gap between QSR 2009 and 2016 will be substantially over seven years. CWSS appears to be a very lean organisation. It should be known that like lean top athletes an illness is easily caught. With the increasing attention to WHS and a new building the dark clouds need to be taken care of.
- 14) *The interviewed persons appreciated to be involved in the QSR production process and are (mostly) available in the future to participate, if asked. However for several interviewed participants, due to a learning cycle also at their side, only when the conditions are improved.* The various waiting times (no response), sometimes over half a year, to continue for finalization of chapters are very ineffective. EB and authors appraise their contribution as a recognition of their status as eco-scientist. Knowing that the organisational background of the scientists varies between civil servant to private undertaker, the circumstances for their valuable input should be optimized to make it much more efficient.

6) ToR issues

In the ToR (see attachment) a variety of issues were mentioned. Most of them are addressed in the bullet points. Two issues remain: possible 'blind' spots and (further) usage of the QSR.

With respect to blind spots several remarks were given:

- The coverage of social economic aspects was already discussed in the EB and not implemented in this QSR due to obvious time and budget constraints.
- The influence of the off shore area into the Wadden Sea was already discussed and is substantial, however the knowledge of that area is very limited.
- As technical blind spot the cohesion between chapters was mentioned.

With respect to (further) usage of the QSR the following information was gathered:

- Increase the interaction with the outer circle such as provinces.
- Create a portal for citizen science.
- Intensify the usage of the QSR by 'translators' of the ecosystem to the general public.
- A well kept structure within the QSR facilitates the 'translation'.
- Make, after publications of the new QSR, a promotion trip along the coast.
- Do not expect that a QSR is read by the public in general.
- Ministries refer to the QSR for the development of their policies.
- Promote the QSR at the various NGO's.
- The QSR needs an owner/promotor.

7) Conclusions

Complaining about the final delivery date of the QSR 2016 is not a common attitude within the Wadden Sea community. To my understanding the three involved countries have benefitted a long time from the availability of the 'founding fathers' within the Trilateral Wadden Sea community. However after several decades a turnover to other persons and institutes is underway. The unintended but witnessed delay in the production should be addressed by those that can really address it by creating the right circumstances for an up-to-date and smooth production process with a known supportive 'owner': the WSB, supported by TGMM, authors, members of the editorial board and CWSS staff.

- The financial support for the QSR requires upgrading to nowadays circumstances; Current financial resources need expansion, not necessarily only from the involved governments.
- Prepare a comprehensive QSR project description to address most of the reported processing challenges; The founding fathers knew and had 'authority' without a project description how to manage and find solutions in their network but circumstances changed substantially making those old solutions outdated.
- Within the production process too much time is wasted, due to defective coordination and follow-up; Too much is within CWSS with a shortage on staff. This cannot be addressed by money alone but needs a more focussed spirit by all contributors on the schedule and a clear assignment of tasks.
- The use of the TMAP database requires an additional decision/evaluation.
- The intention to convert to a web based QSR is well accepted, however a rolling scheme needs further elaboration.
- The QSR is still a very well respected product, maintaining that level requires also scientific focus.

The essence is:

Create conditions that QSR 2016 will, much more smoothly, be followed by the next QSR!

Attachments

- 1) Terms of Reference
- 2) Schedule conducted interviews
- 3) Steps in the QSR process (partly current and proposed)

Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE

PROCESS EVALUATION OF THE QSR 2016

Project owner: Jaap Verhulst, Head of Delegation, Ministry of Economic Affairs

Project support: Bernard Baerends, Focal Point Trilateral Wadden Sea Cooperation, Ministry of Economic Affairs

Project execution: Pieter de Lezenne Coulander, advisor NVWA, Ministry of Economic Affairs

1 Background	<p>At regular intervals, assessment reports of the Wadden Sea are published, providing information on the status of the Wadden Sea ecosystem and adjacent subjects to the Trilateral Governmental Conferences. The reports describe and evaluate on the basis of the trilateral Monitoring and Assessment programme (TMMAP) and additional scientific information the current ecological status of the Wadden Sea, identify trends and changes in this status and their possible causes, identify issues of concern and indicate possible measures of redress, including evaluation of the likely effectiveness of these measures and identify gaps in knowledge.</p> <p>The latest published assessment report, Quality Status Report (QSR), was issued in 2009. See (http://www.waddensea-secretariat.org/monitoring-tmap/tmap-results-qsr) The 2016 report is almost finished. The production of about 30 chapters involved a group of lead authors, co-authors and an editorial board, with overall facilitation and coordination by the CWSS. The scientists and experts involved work in Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands in governmental and scientific institutes or as consultant.</p> <p>During the last decades part of the information on which the QSR is based, was gathered in a trilateral database with the intent to harmonise and to make the data better accessible for trilateral usage. The production of the raw data is excluded from this process evaluation. The data base provides also a unique data source for the UNESCO World heritage Site The Wadden Sea.</p>
2 Objectives	<p>The process evaluation will focus on the production process of the QSR 2016 from available data to content. Some of the lead authors and members of the editorial board will be interviewed for their process experience. The gathered information will be reported in a condensed style</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to provide possible recommendations for the production process of future QSR's. b) to provide input to the coming Science Agenda and platform

3 Issues	<p>The request for this process evaluation is based on several issues or 'challenges' encountered during the production process of the QSR 2016 in comparison to QSR 2009:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the overall as well as topic specific coordination within the process, - direct access to authoritative data in the three countries, - harmonisation of data, - availability of financial resources, - differences in costs/fees for the writing of the chapters, - completeness or 'blind' spots, flexibility in its design and planning, - further (improved) usage of the QSR and - options for graphical online interfaces.
4 Methodology	After a general Introduction into the QSR process an interview cycle with about fifteen key players in D, DK and NL will be conducted. The selection of key-players to be interviewed will be agreed upon with the TG-M&M members. After these results are available a questionnaire is likely to be sent around to give all participants the opportunity to provide information.
5 Reporting	An intermediate result of interviews will be reported in June 2017. The final report is planned for August 2017 and depends upon the response speed and quality of the questionnaire.
6 Work plan	<p>March and April: introduction into QSR process.</p> <p>April ↔ July: interviews in the Netherlands, Germany and Denmark</p> <p>June/July: questionnaire, if decided to be useful</p> <p>August: reporting to TG M&M, final report submitted to WSB</p> <p>November 2017</p> <p>The advisor time involved is covered within the NVWA and will not be charged to the project owner. Additional costs for facilities and travelling will be covered by the project owner.</p>
Agreed upon	<p>Date and place Den Haag 10-4-2017 Jaap Verhulst, project owner</p> <p>Date and place Geeuwarden, 27 march 2017 Pieter de Lezenne Coulander</p> <p>Date and place 10 april 2017 René Dolman, hoofd P&O NVWA</p>

Schedule of conducted interviews

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Status per 18-10-2017

	Editorial Board:	Organisation	City	E-mail	Date
1	Gerard Janssen	RWS, Min I & M	Groningen, NL	gerard.janssen@rws.nl	24-4-2017
2	Henrik P Jorgensen	EPA, Min. Env & Food	Arnum, DK	hepgi@svana.dk	15-5-2017
3	Martin Baptist	IMARES, Univ. Wag.	Den Helder, NL	martin.baptist@wur.nl	12-7-2017
4	Lars Gutow	AWI	Bremerhaven, D	lars.gutow@awi.de	27-6-2017
5	Christian Buschbaum	AWI	List (Sylt), D	christian.buschbaum@awi.de	21-6-2017
6	Kai Jensen	Univ. Hamburg	Hamburg, D	kai.jensen@uni-hamburg.de	22-6-2017
CWSS					
7	Gerold Lürßen	CWSS	Wilhelmshafen, D	luerssen@waddensea-secretariat.org	26-6-2017
8	Sascha Klöpfer	CWSS	Wilhelmshafen, D	kloepfer@waddensea-secretariat.org	8-6-2017
(Co)Authors					
9	Jesper Bartholdy	Univ. Copenhagen	Tonder, DK	jb@ign.ku.dk	9-5-2017
10	Karsten Laursen	Univ. Aarhus	Tonder, DK	kl@bios.au.dk	10-5-2017
11	Eelke Folmer	EcoSpace	Lemmer, NL	e.o.folmer@gmail.com	29-5-2017
12	Peter Esselink	PUCCIMAR	Vries, NL	peter.puccimar@gmail.com	1-6-2017
13	Katja Philippart	NIOZ	Den Burg, NL	katja.philippart@nioz.nl	11-7-2017
14	Heike Büttger	BioConsult	Husum, D	h.buettger@bioconsult-sh.de	19-6-2017
15	Julia Baer	BioConsult	Husum, D	j.baer@bioconsult-sh.de	19-6-2017
16	Klaus K Stephan		Tonning, D	Klaus.Kossmagk-Stephan@lkn.landsh.de	only e-mail
TGMM					
17	Ronald van Dokkum	RWS, Min I & M	Groningen, NL	ronald.van.dokkum@rws.nl	24-4-2017
18	Bernard Baerends	Min. EZ	Groningen, NL	B.Baerends@minez.nl	21-7-2017
19	Hein Sas	Programma naar een Rijke Waddenzee	Leeuwarden, NL	hsas@xs4all.nl	9-10-2017

Steps in the QSR procedure (partly current and proposed)

In due course the following QSR procedure steps were identified, not necessarily describing the actual status but a possible guideline/starting point for further development:

Step	Activities	Lead time (months)	
		Step	Total
1	Decision to prepare the next QSR by WSB, accompanied with 'conditions' such as budget, focus points, overall time schedule		
2	Identification of key issues for forthcoming QSR based on scientific knowledge		
3	Installation of Editorial Board (secretariat at CWSS) including the assignment of chapters to EB members		3
4	Nominating the lead authors	1	4
5	Preparations of a document describing the major process steps, role of the editorial board, chapter format, key issues, interrelations between chapters, TMAP and other data to be used and data, including processing and validation steps supplied afterwards to CWSS, overall time schedule, communication lines, responsibilities and conditions for authors (and their 'home' organisations)	1	5
6	Recruitment and selection of authors and co-authors	1	6
7	Acceptance 'contract' by the authors taking the above document into account, preparing their time schedule with the co-authors and a clear separation in time of the raw data analysis phase and writing	1	7
8	Gathering specified trilateral raw data, analysis of the raw data including validation so that authors are provided with reliable data to start writing	1	8
9	Writing chapters by lead author with co-authors	1	9
10	Editing and review process with EB and ??? (cycle until finished and taking other relevant information from related chapters into account)	2	11
11	Finished chapters go with the graphs and underlying processed data within 1 month after finalization to CWSS for further preparation of the web based and pdf documents	1	12
12	The EB combines all relevant information to write and review the synthesis report	2	14
13	CWSS processes the chapters for the web based and pdf publication	2	16
14	Close the adaptive management cycle by a scientific discussion and return conclusions to WSB	4	20