

Transcript | How to Solve Complex Policy Problems

1

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:00.990

Will Lockhart - Moderator: we do this...

2

00:00:01.140 --> 00:00:17.130

Will Lockhart - Moderator: by equipping public servants worldwide, with the knowledge and skills that they need to lead change. So, let's, get going. We are, also, before we start, actually, we're thrilled,

3

00:00:17.190 --> 00:00:36.430

Will Lockhart - Moderator: apolitical, you know, lots of you all know us as a kind of a training provider. We also organize events, like this, but we also run, online communities, so community spaces, you can log in and share questions, you know, share your views, share ideas with each other, and talk to colleagues from all around the world.

4

00:00:36.430 --> 00:01:01.359

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Please do, you know, pop over to what we call our Global Policy Making Community. It's a great forum, you can share resources, ask questions, and gain all sorts of wisdom. The link to that is in the resources tab at the bottom of the screen, and there'll be a link to it in the chat as well, so please do pop over there. You know, there'll be the conversation after this event will continue in there in a way that I think will be quite fun.

5

00:01:02.010 --> 00:01:24.359

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Couple of technical notes. This event is being recorded. Lots of our events are available online after they've concluded, so don't record it yourself. It will be available there for you on the website, and obviously available for others too. If you have any privacy questions, the contact details are in the apolitical homepage footer, so if you go to our homepage, you can find out about that.

6

00:01:24.370 --> 00:01:32.820

Will Lockhart - Moderator: And there are, closed captions for the whole meeting, which are available. You can toggle them, on or off in your screen settings.

7

00:01:32.820 --> 00:01:54.990

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Good, right, that's the boring bit. So, before we introduce our speakers, let's run a couple of, polls. It's always a nice way to get to know folks. Who have we got? Let's see, we've got some chat, this is great. Look at that, look at that. Well, Genevieve, you're not far from me in the borough of Hackney, that's good to know. Nova Scotia's slightly further away, it's good to see that we're, covering a couple of bases there, that's very good.

8

00:01:54.990 --> 00:02:00.230

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Toronto, Shetland, Manchester, fantastic, good, I'm going to Manchester in January, very nice.

9

00:02:00.230 --> 00:02:05.050

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Was that the... did I see the... did I see the... the Cayman Islands? Fantastic. Well, welcome, you've probably...

10

00:02:05.050 --> 00:02:21.910

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Probably got weather about the same as us. Right, I'll stop singing that. Let's do some polls. Let's ask you how you're all feeling. Thanks so much for telling us, that you're here. Let's ask what you're thinking about things. So, two very quick polls, that sort of situate the, the session that we'll be running today. First one's really easy.

11

00:02:22.210 --> 00:02:29.500

Will Lockhart - Moderator: How has the complexity of your work changed in the last two years?

12

00:02:31.170 --> 00:02:32.220

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Very good.

13

00:02:34.310 --> 00:02:35.300

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Excellent.

14

00:02:35.890 --> 00:02:37.630

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Fantastic.

15

00:02:43.130 --> 00:02:58.610

Will Lockhart - Moderator: So look at that. So we have 80% of respondents there. Thank you so much for doing that all so quickly. So we've got, what is that? 86% of our respondents are

saying it's either increased significantly, or it's increased moderately. I find that totally fascinating, right? So there's a question about whether that's actually

16

00:02:58.650 --> 00:03:22.679

Will Lockhart - Moderator: true, right? Or there's a question about whether it just seems to be that we're perceiving it to be true. Doesn't really matter. The point is that, you know, as we go about making policy, it feels like it's becoming harder and harder and harder. I think that's probably a good thing, because what we're doing is recognizing that in order to be really effective, policies have to be much more holistic, right? Much more end-to-end, much more carefully considered, and that feels like an increase in complexities. I think that's a positive thing.

17

00:03:22.680 --> 00:03:29.639

Will Lockhart - Moderator: But of course, it begs the question, what on earth do we do about it? So let's try the, let's try the second poll.

18

00:03:29.640 --> 00:03:51.450

Will Lockhart - Moderator: We've got, you know, there are a number of different ways that you can use design methods, right, to try and, you know, develop policy. So things like we'll be talking about today, behavioral insights, for instance, like systems thinking, there's lots of different kind of tools you can use to unpick complexity. To what extent do you use it, right? Your ministry, your organization, do you use those tools?

19

00:03:51.900 --> 00:04:01.209

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Let me see, is it consistent? Do you practice it? Look at this. So here we've got a much more balanced set of answers, right? Which I think is really interesting. So there we go, you've got...

20

00:04:01.350 --> 00:04:25.130

Will Lockhart - Moderator: 20% or so... still got a few answers coming in, but look, 20% of people are saying that they don't use these kind of tools at all. They're just kind of, you know, we don't... we don't have any kind of structured approach to thinking through policy complexity. We've got 30% saying it's emerging, so that's kind of 50% at the lower end, and then we've only... we've got a much smaller number, 15%, in terms of consistency. So look, we've got a problem here, right? It feels like things are getting more complex.

21

00:04:25.130 --> 00:04:37.240

Will Lockhart - Moderator: and yet we're not deploying the tools that we need to cut through that complexity. So, that's why we're here. That's why we're here, that's what we're doing. We're going to be working through those things.

22

00:04:37.570 --> 00:04:57.320

Will Lockhart - Moderator: If you want, if you've got time, drop into the chat and give us a couple of words to describe how the complexity of your work has changed. If you want, there's a free text answer, so open up the chat box, if you like, tell us how the complexity of your work has changed, and we can comment on those as we go through. But let's get on to our speakers. You've heard enough from me already.

23

00:04:57.640 --> 00:05:15.599

Will Lockhart - Moderator: We've got three brilliant guests, today. We're very, very grateful to them for joining us. We've got Anna Pieta-Kainen, Bruno Rosadi, and Flora Finimore-Pfeiffer. Hi, everyone. Thanks so much for being here. I'll introduce them in turn. So, Anna is a Senior Policy Analyst in the Public Governance Directorate

24

00:05:15.600 --> 00:05:29.279

Will Lockhart - Moderator: At the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, that's the OECD. She leads their regulatory policy work, she launches initiatives on digital regulation and oversees performance reviews across member countries. Excellent. Hi, Anna.

25

00:05:29.410 --> 00:05:48.030

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Bruno is the co-founder and the partner director of Innovation Catalie's Social Innovation Studio, which is in Brazil. He's led over 50 cross-sector projects and served as program director in the Vice Minister's Office of the Ministry of Management and Innovation in Public Services. Thanks so much for being here, Bruno.

26

00:05:48.180 --> 00:06:04.300

Will Lockhart - Moderator: And Flora is the co-founder and executive director of the Brazilian Institute of Behavioral Sciences. She's a behavioral scientist working in applied projects to social impact, and she currently works as a consultant for the Mind, Behavioral and Development team at the World Bank.

27

00:06:04.300 --> 00:06:12.690

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Huge welcome, Flora. You can read all those bios, and they're in the resources tab at the bottom of the Zoom screen, and there's a... there's a speakers section.

28

00:06:12.690 --> 00:06:33.070

Will Lockhart - Moderator: So, without further ado, you've heard lots from me, we've situated the discussion. Each of our panellists is going to talk for eight or so minutes, about how they see the, you know, the question of policy complexity and trying to address it. And so I'm going to hand straight over to, Anna and a Pieta Konnen, who's going to kick us off. Anna, thank you so much, over to you.

29

00:06:35.230 --> 00:06:48.900

Anna Pietikainen: I will, and hello, everyone. It's great to be here. Thanks a lot for joining. It's amazing to see what a diverse geographical representation we have here, and thanks very much also to the team.

30

00:06:49.040 --> 00:07:02.729

Anna Pietikainen: at AP Politico for, thinking of the OECD for this event. So my title is actually Head of the Regulatory Policy Division. I'm no longer Senior Policy Analyst, and I have to say, thinking about the first poll question.

31

00:07:02.820 --> 00:07:09.999

Anna Pietikainen: That change in title has certainly affected the complexity of my... of my work over the last couple of years.

32

00:07:10.260 --> 00:07:16.259

Anna Pietikainen: So what I wanted to do, is talk to you today about a topic that is

33

00:07:16.590 --> 00:07:30.409

Anna Pietikainen: absolutely pervasive at the moment, and it might also be a little bit more abstract than the other examples that we will be hearing about. And, I will be talking about the development of artificial intelligence.

34

00:07:30.700 --> 00:07:39.090

Anna Pietikainen: And the very complex policy problems that it poses. On the one hand, how do we support the development of the technology and its applications?

35

00:07:39.160 --> 00:07:57.040

Anna Pietikainen: while also protecting from the risks that it poses today, and the risks that it might pose in the future. And at the OECD, we think that regulations are a key tool at government disposal to help manage these policy objectives and risks.

36

00:07:57.180 --> 00:08:16.570

Anna Pietikainen: But data from our recent 2024 Trust in Government survey shows that only 41% of citizens find it likely that their national government would appropriately regulate new technologies and help business and citizens use them responsibly. So that's a really

37

00:08:17.250 --> 00:08:30.499

Anna Pietikainen: really significant gap from our perspective. So there's a lot of work to be done from government side to increase that trust in government capacity to take on these risks.

38

00:08:31.030 --> 00:08:40.079

Anna Pietikainen: One of the main elements, thinking about the complexity, one of the main elements here is the uncertainty, of course, that is linked to the development of risks.

39

00:08:40.190 --> 00:08:53.389

Anna Pietikainen: Today, these include individual challenges like hallucinations, but there's also serious ethical breaches and misconduct, and we've all, I think, heard a lot about the existential risks linked to AI also.

40

00:08:53.470 --> 00:09:09.499

Anna Pietikainen: We don't know how much... how the technology will develop, how its applications will evolve, and how fast all of this will happen. And in general, when we're discussing technological progress in government policy and regulation, we talk often about the pacing problem. Governments are catching up.

41

00:09:09.870 --> 00:09:20.460

Anna Pietikainen: And this shortcoming is really exacerbated in the context of AI. And from the OECD, we've developed some guidance and frameworks to help governments face these challenges.

42

00:09:20.510 --> 00:09:32.839

Anna Pietikainen: The first that I'd highlight for you to be aware of is our recommendation on agile regulatory governance that proposes key pillars of action to governance, and this is from 2021.

43

00:09:33.250 --> 00:09:44.420

Anna Pietikainen: And more recently, we released a mapping tool for digital regulatory frameworks that was developed as part of our, Better Regulation for the Digital Age Initiative, or BRIDGE.

44

00:09:44.480 --> 00:09:53.499

Anna Pietikainen: And we published a paper that presents the mapping tool and applies the mapping tool to 13 pieces of AI regulation worldwide.

45

00:09:53.540 --> 00:10:07.919

Anna Pietikainen: just a couple of months ago, or a few months ago in May, that you'll be able to find on our website. And what I wanted to do in the remainder of my time speaking to you today is highlight some findings that are emerging from this analysis.

46

00:10:07.960 --> 00:10:24.649

Anna Pietikainen: that show how governments are responding to the complex policy challenge of artificial intelligence. So, firstly, what we see is that countries in the sample that we have in the paper are largely relying on existing regulatory frameworks, as opposed to creating entirely new responses.

47

00:10:24.680 --> 00:10:42.419

Anna Pietikainen: And this makes sense. We all know that AI can cause harm in areas like privacy, safety, security, inclusion, human rights, in areas where regulations are already quite strong, so it makes sense to lean on what already exists.

48

00:10:42.420 --> 00:10:49.460

Anna Pietikainen: And we encourage policymakers and regulators to ask whether risks are already covered by existing regulation.

49

00:10:49.620 --> 00:11:01.639

Anna Pietikainen: Or should they be reinforced or strengthened to close any gaps? And by considering these questions, regulators can avoid unnecessary duplication or contradictions.

50

00:11:01.640 --> 00:11:10.589

Anna Pietikainen: And we have some examples of, very good national-level coordination buddies that can facilitate harmonized approaches

51

00:11:10.590 --> 00:11:20.079

Anna Pietikainen: to this kind of gap analysis at a domestic level. For instance, there's the UK Digital Regulation Corporation Forum and the Irish Digital Regulators Group.

52

00:11:21.040 --> 00:11:40.639

Anna Pietikainen: The second finding that I wanted to highlight is that where we see that there are new regulatory efforts, these combine multiple regulatory models, including co-regulation and outcome-based rules. There's also a very strong focus on risk-based approaches. We're seeing this, for instance, in EU, Brazil, and Japan.

53

00:11:40.640 --> 00:11:53.709

Anna Pietikainen: And these types of combinations of rules are a very good illustration of the much-needed flexibility in regulatory design that we promote in the OECD recommendation that I mentioned earlier.

54

00:11:54.630 --> 00:12:04.249

Anna Pietikainen: A third finding that comes out strongly from the application of our framework is a convergence towards collaborative governance.

55

00:12:04.400 --> 00:12:07.989

Anna Pietikainen: Using public-private enforcement structures, so...

56

00:12:08.430 --> 00:12:26.940

Anna Pietikainen: What does this mean? It means that there's a shared responsibility between public and private actors with regard to supervision of compliance with rules, whether these are binding government-issued regulations or voluntary industry standards, as is often the case, for example, with regard to AI.

57

00:12:27.010 --> 00:12:42.870

Anna Pietikainen: And, it also means, for instance, that AI actors are required to implement internal risk management systems, while non-governmental actors, such as third-party bodies, can play important roles in monitoring advancements and risks.

58

00:12:43.110 --> 00:12:48.989

Anna Pietikainen: And we recommend that regulators continue to build on the relationships, because there does...

59

00:12:49.120 --> 00:12:58.650

Anna Pietikainen: Remain a need for vigilance to evaluate how well this is working out, and to make sure that compliance is, in effect, achieved.

60

00:12:59.160 --> 00:13:17.119

Anna Pietikainen: And I really do want to underline that this increased collaboration is key to addressing the pacing problem that is at the heart of the complexity of governing regulation and governing and regulating AI. And governments will struggle to have up-to-date expertise and information on

61

00:13:17.120 --> 00:13:25.910

Anna Pietikainen: frontier applications of AI, and must build this trust and efficient exchange of information with the private sector.

62

00:13:25.910 --> 00:13:29.110

Anna Pietikainen: To start breaking down this, complexity.

63

00:13:29.280 --> 00:13:30.710

Anna Pietikainen: And, ...

64

00:13:30.730 --> 00:13:45.279

Anna Pietikainen: Lastly and quickly, the fourth dimension that I wanted to highlight, of course, is that AI regulatory landscape is evolving very rapidly. We see increased use of experimental frameworks and agile mechanisms.

65

00:13:45.280 --> 00:13:52.679

Anna Pietikainen: like, joined-up approaches between regulators to improve coherence, as well as regulatory experimentation, and I think

66

00:13:52.780 --> 00:14:08.210

Anna Pietikainen: Most people on the call will probably have heard of regulatory sandboxes that have been the major experimental tool that countries are deploying. For instance, Singapore has a generative AI evaluation sandbox.

67

00:14:08.210 --> 00:14:22.460

Anna Pietikainen: to test the trustworthiness of generative AI. Norway have an AI sandbox to help the development of AI solutions that comply with data protection, and sandboxes are also a key tool in the implementation of the EU AI Act.

68

00:14:22.950 --> 00:14:27.280

Anna Pietikainen: I think I'll stop there for now. Overall.

69

00:14:27.310 --> 00:14:43.930

Anna Pietikainen: Governing AI is an extremely complex policy task. I think that's one of the most complex policy challenges that our governments are currently faced with. And I wanted to share some of these insights of what we are seeing in terms of approaches to tackle the complexity, so

70

00:14:43.930 --> 00:14:49.579

Anna Pietikainen: Firstly, relying on existing regulatory frameworks, using a combination of regulatory approaches.

71

00:14:49.620 --> 00:15:02.620

Anna Pietikainen: investing in collaborative models of governance, and finally, developing agile and experimental approaches to regulation. A lot more could be said, and I'll be very happy to take questions and to continue that conversation. Thank you very much.

72

00:15:03.540 --> 00:15:06.619

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Oh, Anna, that was excellent, thank you so much. ...

73

00:15:06.720 --> 00:15:16.239

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Huge thanks. So, colleagues, please do post questions in the chat. We'll be pulling out the good ones, you know, and putting some of them to our panelists later.

74

00:15:16.240 --> 00:15:30.630

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Anna, that was great. It's really funny, I was listening to a podcast the other day about AI, I'm sure we all do that quite a lot, and it was really interesting that, you know, industry present the pacing problem, as you've called it, as just being

75

00:15:30.630 --> 00:15:53.369

Will Lockhart - Moderator: well, there's a pacing problem, therefore governments can't do anything. And it's really interesting the way that it's often portrayed as being an absolute blocker over which we simply can't move, and I think you've given us four really interesting ways of getting around that complexity. That's great. Bruno, I'm going to hand over to you. Thanks, so much for being here with us today. Tell us how you overcome policy challenges. Thanks.

76

00:15:54.710 --> 00:16:02.110

Bruno Rizardi: Thank you, Will. It's a pleasure to join this webinar, and also it's an honor to be a part of the political community.

77

00:16:02.310 --> 00:16:18.470

Bruno Rizardi: So I want to take a step back and talk a little bit about what is complexity, and to talk about that, I want to... before... I can assume that we all think that we face very complex challenges on the public sector, right?

78

00:16:18.470 --> 00:16:33.879

Bruno Rizardi: So, we're talking about healthcare, climate change, education, those are all... can be described as messy, they're interconnected, they are full of surprises, and all of those characteristics are characteristics of complex systems.

79

00:16:33.910 --> 00:16:49.950

Bruno Rizardi: So, whenever we try to solve them with linear logic and step-by-step work, sometimes it doesn't really pan out, and we have, like, very limited results, or even we make the problem worse.

80

00:16:49.950 --> 00:16:54.879

Bruno Rizardi: And that's because we need a different approach to work with those challenges.

81

00:16:54.880 --> 00:17:08.059

Bruno Rizardi: That's where, systems thinking come in. Systems thinking is an approach that is, comes from the systems theory, and helps us to, understand more what systems are and how to work with them.

82

00:17:08.079 --> 00:17:10.520

Bruno Rizardi: Soap systems, they are...

83

00:17:10.569 --> 00:17:26.939

Bruno Rizardi: Systems thinking bring us to look at the bigger picture of those systems instead of the individual parts, and then we try to understand how does those components that are called variables connect to each other and make the system complex.

84

00:17:27.000 --> 00:17:43.279

Bruno Rizardi: So, systems, for example, they have feedback loops. Sometimes they are positive, sometimes they're negative, meaning they either are exponential or they balance it out, and that means that whenever we make an effort to change the system, sometimes we have

85

00:17:43.280 --> 00:17:52.740

Bruno Rizardi: Some grades change, and sometimes we have no change, because those feedback loops make the input different from the output in proportion.

86

00:17:52.740 --> 00:17:54.710

Bruno Rizardi: That's why they're complex.

87

00:17:54.730 --> 00:18:07.840

Bruno Rizardi: This characteristic is called nonlinearity, and is one of the characteristics of complexity. And that's something that I want to appeal to whoever's working with

88

00:18:08.020 --> 00:18:19.309

Bruno Rizardi: complex challenges, is that complexity sometimes is used as a way to refer to difficulty or confusion, but it rather means non-linearity and uncertainty.

89

00:18:19.350 --> 00:18:30.260

Bruno Rizardi: And those two things, they can be addressed by systems thinking tools. And I want to show you, just, a map, just really, really quick.

90

00:18:30.400 --> 00:18:33.329

Bruno Rizardi: That shows what I'm talking about.

91

00:18:34.630 --> 00:18:36.260

Bruno Rizardi: Can you see my map?

92

00:18:36.430 --> 00:18:37.040

Bruno Rizardi: So....

93

00:18:37.040 --> 00:18:38.109

Will Lockhart - Moderator: We... we can't....

94

00:18:39.320 --> 00:18:58.730

Bruno Rizardi: Yeah, okay. So this is, it's in Portuguese, but I won't get into the details of it, but this is a system map about burnout cycles working in government. And it's very complex, because there's a lot of variables, and they interconnect with each other in various ways.

95

00:18:58.730 --> 00:19:04.900

Bruno Rizardi: Sometimes they make cycles, they're reinforcing, sometimes they're... they balance each other out.

96

00:19:04.900 --> 00:19:17.960

Bruno Rizardi: And so, burnout is more complex than just the actual situation. It has a lot of variables, and they all work together to get to that result. That's what we call a system.

97

00:19:18.080 --> 00:19:19.000

Bruno Rizardi: ...

98

00:19:20.500 --> 00:19:33.609

Bruno Rizardi: And this... this tool that I just showed is called System Mapping. We can use that this actual, system was built in Kumo.aiio, which is a tool that you can build maps.

99

00:19:33.740 --> 00:19:42.709

Bruno Rizardi: And you can visualize them, and try to understand how those variables relate to each other and bring these results that are complex.

100

00:19:42.980 --> 00:19:44.120

Bruno Rizardi: ...

101

00:19:44.500 --> 00:19:55.180

Bruno Rizardi: And so, whenever we're working with these systems, we have to have a different approach. Rather than control it, we have to actually try to steward the system.

102

00:19:55.300 --> 00:20:05.220

Bruno Rizardi: But that means that instead of trying to work it out, the different components and individual parts of the system, we have to look at the system as a whole.

103

00:20:05.220 --> 00:20:16.809

Bruno Rizardi: understand where are the leverage points that we can next change for the whole system. This is a concept that Danella Meadows presents on her book, Thinking in Systems, which is...

104

00:20:16.850 --> 00:20:25.629

Bruno Rizardi: Probably the best book for anyone who's starting to get into this, this, ... This approach and this practice.

105

00:20:25.680 --> 00:20:44.610

Bruno Rizardi: And these leverage points are parts of the system that we can make changes, and then they have changed through the whole system. And we can only identify them once we map the whole system and understand where can we change it, to have the better... the best results.

106

00:20:44.670 --> 00:21:00.389

Bruno Rizardi: And working through stewardship, we have to navigate through complexity instead of trying to control it. I'm sure Anna and her work has some examples of regulatory policies that have gotten

107

00:21:00.390 --> 00:21:15.150

Bruno Rizardi: no results, or maybe have, fired back, have, very poor results, and maybe some regulatory practices that go on and change the whole system. And that's because systems are really complex.

108

00:21:15.150 --> 00:21:21.310

Bruno Rizardi: And, that's why we have to understand it as a whole, understand the connections between the variables.

109

00:21:21.410 --> 00:21:34.010

Bruno Rizardi: I think I'm gonna stop here because I want to have more time to answer questions, and I'll be happy to show more tools and explain better how to make these maps work.

110

00:21:36.120 --> 00:21:59.009

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Well, that's great. Thanks so much, Bruno. Yeah, I mean, I'm a huge, huge fan of systems thinking. It's so critical when you're thinking about trying to solve big, global, complex problems like, climate change. I spent a lot of time at international negotiations, and it's, it's, you know, both the negotiations are a complex system, but then actually trying to bring about real-world change. And yeah, the...

111

00:21:59.010 --> 00:22:19.329

Will Lockhart - Moderator: We could talk about it all day. We'll hear from others in a moment, but I'd love to talk about it all day. I'll stop before I start asking too many questions myself. Flora, why don't you round off our set of panelists? Guys at home who are watching, please do keep dropping questions in the Q&A. This is a brilliant panel, there's so much to talk about, we'd love to hear from you all.

112

00:22:19.330 --> 00:22:21.909

Will Lockhart - Moderator: But first of all, let's hear from Flora. Over to you.

113

00:22:22.680 --> 00:22:39.359

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Thanks, Will, and good afternoon, everyone. It's a pleasure to be here, and Bruno and Anna, it was super insightful to hear your thoughts, and in fact, I think both perspectives are really aligned with what's being discussed in the behavioral science literature currently.

114

00:22:39.360 --> 00:22:55.459

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: So, coming from a behavioral science background, I've been asked to give a talk today on how to solve complex policy problems with behavioral sciences. And may I say that that's a good question, a question we don't yet have the answer to, but I can offer you my thoughts on fighting it out.

115

00:22:55.560 --> 00:23:14.290

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: So, I think a good point is starting with the word solve. I don't believe we can solve the world's most pressing challenge, right, from climate change to chronic health conditions with the new methodology, but we sure can help with that. And especially because behavioral science, it adds human lenses to challenges that are inherently human.

116

00:23:14.290 --> 00:23:25.460

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: But frequently, discussions in the policy arena, or in other arenas as well, neglect the topic or rely on assumptions that are faulty or incomplete, let's say.

117

00:23:25.640 --> 00:23:31.850

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And... The common view on human behavior, citizens, politicians.

118

00:23:31.850 --> 00:23:48.029

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: they're usually wrong, in a sense. We're even wrong, if you think about it, when trying to explain our own behaviors, right? How many of us haven't felt shame or guilt by not being able to follow an exercise routine or a diet.

119

00:23:48.030 --> 00:23:51.010

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And usually, that's because we...

120

00:23:51.010 --> 00:24:10.409

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: We tend to link that this is due to self-control failures, or failures in our moral values, and not pay special attention to our environment, in our broader sense of the word, so the one that encompasses both physical aspects, social relations, or also our previous experiences.

121

00:24:10.590 --> 00:24:24.599

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And now imagine the difficulty of being able to explain the behavior of others that are different from us, that come from different backgrounds, or to do that population-wise, where there is heterogeneity, so there's multiple perspectives, in a sense.

122

00:24:24.940 --> 00:24:34.889

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: So, I think a first step to answer that is understanding how humans really work, and bridging that with the proposed solutions.

123

00:24:34.890 --> 00:24:57.049

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: also as means of justifications, right? So when we talk about regulation, how this can bridge with also an improved understanding of how humans work, and not merely talking about more surface definitions, like heuristics and biases that maybe you have heard from behavioral economics, but truly embracing the multidisciplinary in behavioral sciences.

124

00:24:57.050 --> 00:24:58.510

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And then, ...

125

00:24:58.530 --> 00:25:13.700

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Understanding studies from neuroscience, from psychology, from cognitive science, anthropology, sociology, so disciplines that have been gathering answers on the why for a while, but we can bridge that with the

126

00:25:13.960 --> 00:25:18.610

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: More scaled and... scaled view of how to intervene in society.

127

00:25:18.860 --> 00:25:24.039

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And, with that, we can uncover some hidden myths that shape our society.

128

00:25:24.130 --> 00:25:39.099

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: So, let's say for... in health, for instance, that mind and body are separate entities, or that reason and emotion are opposites, or that a rational person means that someone who will maximize their outcomes.

129

00:25:39.100 --> 00:25:49.029

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Those implicit assumptions are like the fish in the water tale, for those who are familiar to that. And once we can map that and start seeing that.

130

00:25:49.030 --> 00:26:05.330

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: maybe we can think we can change systems. Donella Meadows, the same author that Bruno mentioned, she proposed the importance of changing paradigms as a power leverage point for changing systems, and maybe if we look for the paradigms that,

131

00:26:05.420 --> 00:26:19.080

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: are behind politician decision makers, or high-level decision makers regarding human behavior explanations, that's a first really important point. And to do that, maybe we need to work a bit more on advocacy towards that.

132

00:26:19.210 --> 00:26:29.319

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: The second thing is that complex problems are multicausal, so bridging also with systems thinking, right? That means that linear thinking will not yell at all the answers.

133

00:26:29.320 --> 00:26:44.780

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: So the current methodology in behavioral science, let's say, it relies on a singular view that looks mostly for causal explanations, X causing Y, and we have this granular thinking of breaking down a big problem in

134

00:26:44.780 --> 00:26:54.980

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Unities in single components and look at them in isolated ways, that's extremely useful in some cases. But in this case of complex challenges, it may not be enough.

135

00:26:55.070 --> 00:27:03.990

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And I think to avoid all the problems we see today in the literature, like backfiring effects, or small effects, or no sustainability of the effects.

136

00:27:03.990 --> 00:27:16.009

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: We need to step back and see the broader relations, see the relations between bigger components, and maybe this can show pathways to start working on that in a more strategic manner.

137

00:27:16.130 --> 00:27:35.490

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And with that, it's important to adopt a pluralistic view, so not an only view, but add multiple perspectives from multiple actors, and also a holistic approach, which is another system component, which is to understand the relationship and dynamics among them, so it's not something fixed on time, but that changes on time.

138

00:27:35.590 --> 00:27:36.530

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And...

139

00:27:36.810 --> 00:27:58.850

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: With that, having the system view doesn't mean, blaming in, like, big problems, like, oh, it's the hidden forces of the market, or the politics, or the lack of education, but rather applying science to those claims, mapping which are these big components, how do they relate and influence to each other, and how then we can intervene.

140

00:27:59.040 --> 00:28:10.880

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: we can adopt an S-frame view, which is a term that is being discussed in the behavioral science literature, by understanding these bigger components and,

141

00:28:10.910 --> 00:28:22.729

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Just like we did with the smaller ones, and then trying to fix it, maybe with broader interventions, like regulations, redesign of policies, and creations of new ones, rather than simple solutions.

142

00:28:22.810 --> 00:28:38.360

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Estada Flo, which is the Nobel Prize winner in economics. She has a great paper that poses the economist as a plumber, suggesting that we need to fix the pipes. But now, it might be time to do a full hydraulic renovation in our homes.

143

00:28:38.360 --> 00:28:50.160

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Which then links me to my next point, which is the need to be creative, right? If we're going to unexplored territories, if we're going to innovate to answer questions that no one has answered, we need to add arts to science.

144

00:28:50.160 --> 00:29:12.170

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Or, better yet, to not forget that art is inherent to science, that awe and curiosity are also a driving force, and our methods, our methodologies are like the artist's techniques, let's say. And if we're just creating slight variations of what has already been discovered, this is like a machine of production, standardized science. We need inspiration to answer big questions.

145

00:29:12.170 --> 00:29:24.680

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: They will to experiment and maybe fail, but to try to do so. And we need to have awareness and confidence of what are the expertise that a behavioral science can offer, because

146

00:29:24.710 --> 00:29:30.900

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: It's important to balance our methodologies with our reasoning in that sense.

147

00:29:30.900 --> 00:29:46.979

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: to not end in anomalies, like policy-based evidence instead of evidence-based policy, right? So, when we try to maximize a certain outcome because it is what is measured, or what is the goal, rather than trying to fix the main objective of the project in itself.

148

00:29:47.280 --> 00:30:07.839

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And... or to act with the constraints of an experiment, rather the constraints of the real policy of action. And by any means, I'm criticizing here the need for rigorous methodology, that's key, but to further explore what exactly do we need to test, and how is the best approach to do so, that's something that is important.

149

00:30:07.840 --> 00:30:16.660

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And sometimes there's so much focus on testing that we forget to discuss further how to materialize a theoretic concept into the world.

150

00:30:16.730 --> 00:30:22.060

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And that's really important, right? We can, make that bridge in so many different ways.

151

00:30:22.170 --> 00:30:25.819

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: ... My final point here is that

152

00:30:25.870 --> 00:30:50.659

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: behavioral science has an important role in making different people working together, people from different disciplines and different backgrounds. So, the very origin of the field was about psychologists talking to economists in academic terms, and embracing a multidisciplinary perspective, and I think a grade of the evolution in behavioral public policy was making academics talk to practitioners, to politicians, to

153

00:30:50.660 --> 00:30:55.709

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: lawyers, and then being able to do so. And if we're experts in people.

154

00:30:55.710 --> 00:31:15.590

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Right? In human behavior, that's a true value of making those people understand each other, acting like us translators of different disciplines. So, behavioral scientists don't know the answer to chronic health conditions or climate change. Maybe doctors do, or environmental experts do, but

155

00:31:15.670 --> 00:31:30.190

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: they might not know the how to shift towards that change, and that's an expertise of behavioral science. So truly working together, that's another important point, into that, this, answer this... all these questions.

156

00:31:30.190 --> 00:31:37.969

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Speaking in practical terms, we're, just launched the Brazilian Institute of Behavioral Sciences as a space to work in that sense.

157

00:31:38.090 --> 00:31:51.190

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And if I may just wrap up and summarize our five takeaways. So the first is to reveal our assumptions and the high-level decision-makings about the foundational explanations of re-award behavior.

158

00:31:51.190 --> 00:32:00.180

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Second, adding system thinking through our toolset, there's a new area called Behavioral Systems that integrates these two perspectives.

159

00:32:00.400 --> 00:32:09.339

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Third, focusing on broader S-frame approaches that might involve regulation or the formulation of public policies rather than simple interventions.

160

00:32:09.380 --> 00:32:26.649

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Fourth, experimenting with new solutions and methodologies to test beyond intervention and RCTs. And fifth, collaboration among different knowledge areas. So, behavioral science as the bridge, in that sense. So that's it, and looking forward to the discussion. Thank you very much.

161

00:32:27.330 --> 00:32:44.019

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Thank you very much, Flora. Brilliant. So, look, we've had, we've had half an hour of, kind of, you know, presentations, and we've covered, in a way, this extraordinary breadth of, you know, the way that policymaking works, right? So we've talked about the fact that at the foundation of it all, we've just heard from Flora.

162

00:32:44.020 --> 00:33:04.510

Will Lockhart - Moderator: it's people. It's human behavior, right? It's human behavior in all its rich complexity, you know, that is what, in the end, is dictating whether or not our policies are going to be effective, right? You know, then Bruno's explained that these people, these behaviors, will work in systems, really complex systems that sometimes interact in very, you know, counterintuitive or confusing ways.

163

00:33:04.510 --> 00:33:28.840

Will Lockhart - Moderator: And then Anna has overlaid on top of this, this, you know, this fact that governments come in. What is our... what is our lever in government? It's regulation, right? We regulate, but that there are innovative ways of thinking about regulation. She's given us four particular examples. Innovative ways that you can think about regulation, you know, in particular, with respect to AI, to try and understand how you can intervene in these systems and influence behavior. So we've got this extraordinary, kind of.

164

00:33:28.840 --> 00:33:53.829

Will Lockhart - Moderator: landscape laid out in front of us, a real kind of depth of complexity. Let's start talking about it. So we've got lots of questions, already coming in. We've had some pre-submitted questions, some have come in on the chat. Please keep putting them in the chat, you know, we will... we'll work through them all now. Just a quick reminder about our global policy-making community, so if you do want to keep, you know, talking about some of these issues after the call is over.

165

00:33:54.090 --> 00:34:12.810

Will Lockhart - Moderator: head over to our community, you can log in, you can, you know, talk to each other about what we've discussed today, and try and get a little more, insight. The link's just been posted there. So, let's start with, a question for all three of you. I'll go Anna, Bruno, Flora.

166

00:34:13.139 --> 00:34:17.130

Will Lockhart - Moderator: ... None of you mentioned politics.

167

00:34:17.940 --> 00:34:34.829

Will Lockhart - Moderator: So, in this extraordinary kind of, you know, this extraordinary kind of deep, profound, complex situation, you know, that you've laid out for us so beautifully and so brilliantly, this is building on a question from Rudy in the chat, so thanks, Rudy. Where does politics fit? How do we manage that kind of, you know.

168

00:34:34.830 --> 00:34:40.630

Will Lockhart - Moderator: sort of the uncertainty that comes when a political boss comes in and tells us what to do. Anna, I'll start with you.

169

00:34:43.820 --> 00:34:51.940

Anna Pietikainen: Could I not go last on this one? No, thanks, it's... I mean, it's... it's a very good question, and ...

170

00:34:54.989 --> 00:35:09.889

Anna Pietikainen: I think where we come to from this when we're working on regulatory policy is that our role as practitioners of regulatory policy is precisely to provide stable tools for evidence-based policymaking.

171

00:35:10.610 --> 00:35:17.769

Anna Pietikainen: That can... Provide a little bit more predictability into how decisions are made.

172

00:35:18.180 --> 00:35:31.939

Anna Pietikainen: and kind of decouple that decision-making from the political cycle and, you know, whims that might be brought in with the political cycle. That's very nice in theory, right?

173

00:35:32.250 --> 00:35:49.830

Anna Pietikainen: Does it actually work? Not always. And I think the types of regulatory management tools or practices that we talk about and that we really recommend that, governments use, like doing ex ante regulatory impact assessments.

174

00:35:49.920 --> 00:35:57.749

Anna Pietikainen: Doing, inclusive stakeholder engagement and providing feedback to stakeholders who have.

175

00:35:58.260 --> 00:36:15.079

Anna Pietikainen: given you their ideas on how to tackle these policy issues, as well as thinking about ex-post evaluation. Politicians don't like these tools. Politicians want quick action, quick results, and politicians like announcements, right?

176

00:36:15.250 --> 00:36:19.090

Anna Pietikainen: So there's, there's always, ...

177

00:36:20.370 --> 00:36:39.360

Anna Pietikainen: a bit of a tension there, I think. I do think that if we think about complexity overall, what we are seeing is that there's kind of even more tension that is being built into the

178

00:36:39.530 --> 00:36:45.359

Anna Pietikainen: System into the ecosystem of government and public administration and existing regulations.

179

00:36:45.620 --> 00:36:53.380

Anna Pietikainen: Which I think now is really Starting to, ...

180

00:36:53.530 --> 00:36:59.919

Anna Pietikainen: be at a level where something has to happen, and that's the whole conversation that we're seeing everywhere, certainly in the UK.

181

00:37:00.250 --> 00:37:07.759

Anna Pietikainen: Where you are, but also in a number of other countries, which is about the complexity of the regulatory frameworks themselves, right?

182

00:37:08.160 --> 00:37:12.960

Anna Pietikainen: And we don't really know exactly why we have come that far.

183

00:37:13.140 --> 00:37:22.770

Anna Pietikainen: Is it just because there has not been enough attention to, kind of, managing the stock of regulation? Or is it because...

184

00:37:23.250 --> 00:37:32.609

Anna Pietikainen: Governments have been very ambitious in tackling the complex policy problems, and therefore the regulations themselves are more complex as well.

185

00:37:32.800 --> 00:37:37.520

Anna Pietikainen: And so... That's kind of my second...

186

00:37:37.800 --> 00:37:47.249

Anna Pietikainen: a second part of my answer to your question is that I think that right now we are at a point where we probably have a really good opportunity

187

00:37:47.620 --> 00:37:50.099

Anna Pietikainen: To pitch our tools.

188

00:37:50.490 --> 00:38:02.460

Anna Pietikainen: These good regulatory practices to politicians to try to do away with this regulatory burden, so-called regulatory burden, that we're seeing right now.

189

00:38:05.040 --> 00:38:15.829

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Oh, it's really thought-provoking, it's really thought-provoking. ... okay, I won't comment. Bruno, maybe you'll comment. Tell us, Bruno, about politics and systems thinking, and do reflect on Anna's answer, if you'd like.

190

00:38:16.470 --> 00:38:19.899

Bruno Rizardi: Sora, do you want to go first? You muted yourself.

191

00:38:21.170 --> 00:38:28.670

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: That's okay. So I think, if I, if I may, ... the...

192

00:38:29.200 --> 00:38:37.890

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Most of studies in behavioral science so far focused on citizen behavior, or even public servants' behavior at the end of the chain, let's say.

193

00:38:37.890 --> 00:38:59.239

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: But, now there's some, recent studies going on that... to start... to push the... the need to start focusing on high-level decision makers, on politicians, right? Because, if

we're talking about, systemic changes, about SFRAME, about changing regulations or formulation of public policies, you need these actors.

194

00:38:59.240 --> 00:39:06.069

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And, ... So I think there's a growing interest on that, and...

195

00:39:06.340 --> 00:39:14.199

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Also, behavioral science can help in, giving more nuance to that debate about, let's say, an, ...

196

00:39:14.370 --> 00:39:38.130

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: started her answer mentioning politicians don't, don't want that. They don't look for that. Okay, so what do they... and how exactly the decision making... their decision-making happen? What is relevant to them? And how can we frame these policies towards that? And another point is towards advocacy. So, I think the... the literature, even because it's, like, a...

197

00:39:38.130 --> 00:39:43.179

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: scientific method in an applied arena. It hasn't moved a lot in that.

198

00:39:43.180 --> 00:39:44.590

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Which, for...

199

00:39:44.660 --> 00:39:53.900

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Lots of other innovation cases rely on advocacy efforts, so maybe also a need towards that, a push towards that, it's important.

200

00:39:55.500 --> 00:40:12.419

Will Lockhart - Moderator: So, I'm gonna bring in Bruno, but it's a really helpful answer. Thanks so much, Flora. It's super, provocative. If you have any links, to those kind of studies about, you know, behavioral studies of politicians, I'd love... I'd love for those to go in the community so that, people can.

201

00:40:12.420 --> 00:40:23.319

Will Lockhart - Moderator: read about those afterwards. The classic example, right, in the UK of behavioral science in practice is this line that says, 9 out of 10 people on your street, 9 out of 10 people

202

00:40:23.320 --> 00:40:41.270

Will Lockhart - Moderator: you know, pay their taxes, or 9 out of 10 people. I love this idea that you could do this for prime ministers, you know, or, or, you know, or presidents. 9 out of 10 presidents agree in the rule of law, or 9 out of 10... you know, you try and nudge behavioral... use behavioral insights to try and nudge, you know, very, very senior politicians. It's quite provocative, actually, it's quite interesting.

203

00:40:41.570 --> 00:40:51.149

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: But that also adds a lot of ethical debates, right, on what is exactly the extent? Is Nudge the way to do so, or other mechanisms, let's say?

204

00:40:51.610 --> 00:40:55.520

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Really interesting. Bruno, come on in. Thanks for, thanks for, waiting.

205

00:40:56.030 --> 00:41:20.840

Bruno Rizardi: So, I... I'm gonna answer in the line what Flora brought about decision making, and I think the hardest part about trying to work with complex, problems and systems thinking, with politics is that, it's so complex that instead of trying to understand the complexity, we just go over and use our own heuristics to deal with that.

206

00:41:20.880 --> 00:41:32.049

Bruno Rizardi: And build stories that are more simplistic to try to solve complex problems. And that happens with everyone, including politicians and decision makers.

207

00:41:32.390 --> 00:41:49.260

Bruno Rizardi: So, what I think is the challenge with this, and it's also a challenge with using scientific evidence in policymaking, or farsight in policymaking, is that we have to, as practitioners of those methods, of those approaches.

208

00:41:49.310 --> 00:42:06.570

Bruno Rizardi: Understand that politics is part of the game, it's part of the system, actually, and bring this culture of how people make decisions and what heuristics are important for them. It's important for us to communicate better about those challenges and those complex systems.

209

00:42:06.570 --> 00:42:12.169

Bruno Rizardi: Sometimes complex systems, they're... they have counterintuitive insights.

210

00:42:12.170 --> 00:42:22.810

Bruno Rizardi: And how do you communicate that to politicians? They have to be clear about their intentions to the public. They cannot have, oh, if we move this leverage down, something's going to go up.

211

00:42:22.810 --> 00:42:32.690

Bruno Rizardi: People don't understand that, necessarily. So we have to be careful about how we communicate, those systems and those complex behaviors.

212

00:42:32.690 --> 00:42:46.759

Bruno Rizardi: in very... more understandable stories, so those politicians can make their decision and communicate it to whoever they need to, to the public, to the citizens. So I think it's a communication issue, but also it's a...

213

00:42:46.810 --> 00:42:52.870

Bruno Rizardi: Something to bring politics as a culture to practitioners of complex systems as well.

214

00:42:53.960 --> 00:43:18.939

Will Lockhart - Moderator: I think that's a lovely point, Bruno, this point around storytelling, and you used the phrase, case studies, right? And that's picking up on some of the comments we've got in the chat around, I think people are talking from experience of working with ministers and politicians here, which is that you can present them with a lot of evidence, but there's often just a kind of a... they're following a kind of a gut feeling, right? You know, and our job is to provide evidence-based policymaking, but they often follow their kind of instant

215

00:43:18.940 --> 00:43:23.949

Will Lockhart - Moderator: And so I think Bruno being able to speak to that is, this is really, really helpful.

216

00:43:23.950 --> 00:43:25.120

Will Lockhart - Moderator: ...

217

00:43:25.890 --> 00:43:50.839

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Let's keep going. So we've got some more questions from the chat, and actually, this has been asked a few times, but let's pick, let's pick Chris's one, and we'll go in the same sequence. So, Anna, I'll bring you in first, sorry. But I think it builds on where you'd got to in your last answer, so it's very helpful. I think people were really struck by, Anna, what you were saying about regulatory complexity, and how in many jurisdictions it feels like it's built up over time.

218

00:43:50.950 --> 00:44:00.230

Will Lockhart - Moderator: And so we're talking about complex policy problems, and we're talking about how to solve them. We've brought in behavioral science, we've brought in, you know, systems thinking.

219

00:44:00.660 --> 00:44:10.049

Will Lockhart - Moderator: isn't it just gonna make regulation more complicated? I mean, isn't... we're just gonna... now we know about the people and the behaviors, now we know about the systems thinking and how complex the systems are.

220

00:44:10.190 --> 00:44:18.720

Will Lockhart - Moderator: isn't it just all going to get more complex when we start regulating? How do we manage that risk? What's the right way through, through that problem? Anna?

221

00:44:18.960 --> 00:44:29.760

Anna Pietikainen: Sure, thanks, and thanks a lot for the follow-up questions and comments in the chat. I mean, I'll go back to a couple of things that I said in my first remarks.

222

00:44:30.340 --> 00:44:38.149

Anna Pietikainen: I mean, more complex policy problems does not need to mean more complex regulations. It potentially has.

223

00:44:38.660 --> 00:44:45.539

Anna Pietikainen: But it shouldn't. It should mean more agile and potentially lighter, regulation.

224

00:44:46.220 --> 00:45:03.489

Anna Pietikainen: It should mean regulation that is focused on outcomes, as opposed to telling regulated entities, companies, citizens, how to reach those outcomes, but just lay out the outcomes and let people figure out how they get there, with some oversight, of course.

225

00:45:03.790 --> 00:45:10.710

Anna Pietikainen: So really moving from this command and control approach to regulation, which is the case in many OECD member countries, but

226

00:45:10.900 --> 00:45:12.180

Anna Pietikainen: Not always.

227

00:45:12.510 --> 00:45:23.360

Anna Pietikainen: So... so this focus on agility and outcomes, and again, the question of engagement is really key. You have to talk to the people who are

228

00:45:23.550 --> 00:45:28.719

Anna Pietikainen: Affected by the problem that you're wanting to solve, and who are going to be affected

229

00:45:28.810 --> 00:45:46.869

Anna Pietikainen: by the regulation that you are designing, and how it's going to be implemented. And you also have to engage internally in government with those who are going to be tasked with enforcing the regulation, because that's what we see, that's often where we see a breakdown.

230

00:45:47.350 --> 00:45:51.629

Anna Pietikainen: It's all fine to have very good

231

00:45:51.660 --> 00:46:09.099

Anna Pietikainen: laws and rules on paper, if you don't think about who's going to be responsible, which ministry, which agency, or increasingly, as I said, also which private sector entity is actually going to be having the responsibility of making sure that that rule is implemented and enforced.

232

00:46:09.100 --> 00:46:12.150

Anna Pietikainen: And delivers the desired outcomes.

233

00:46:12.150 --> 00:46:13.870

Anna Pietikainen: That... that link.

234

00:46:14.090 --> 00:46:25.459

Anna Pietikainen: still does not, take place, systematically. So those are, those are some key recommendations that we're, you know, always, always coming back to when we're discussing this.

235

00:46:26.960 --> 00:46:29.379

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Oh, that's great. Thanks so much. ...

236

00:46:30.400 --> 00:46:54.600

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Bruno and Flora, you're welcome to come in on that. I've got some other questions, that, might be more targeted. Should we... should we press on, and we'll cover... well, let's try and cover a few questions. So, Anna, that was immensely helpful. I love the point around agility and outcomes focused, right? And then also the point around talking to people, right? Talking to people. It's just such an important part of, making this stuff work, right? Let me bring in Flora.

237

00:46:55.030 --> 00:46:55.990

Will Lockhart - Moderator: ...

238

00:46:56.080 --> 00:47:09.620

Will Lockhart - Moderator: I'd love to ask a question, from, Amaya. I hope I'm saying that right, Amaya. I'm really interested in this, question Amaya's asked about, things that feel bad for citizens, right? So basically.

239

00:47:09.620 --> 00:47:27.239

Will Lockhart - Moderator: taxation, or fines, or, you know, trying to drive behavior change by, you know, disincentivizing things, right? So making things bad for citizens. How... what's a... what's a... what's an effective way of kind of trying to set about that conversation with citizens from a... from a behavioral science point of view?

240

00:47:28.950 --> 00:47:37.139

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Well, usually those, let's say, financial tools, the carrots and sticks someone put in the chat.

241

00:47:37.140 --> 00:47:43.850

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: They're more of the traditional approach of intervening on behavior. And behavioral science, it offers

242

00:47:43.850 --> 00:48:00.870

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: other... other tools, other lenses towards, shifting citizen behavior. So, sometimes it can be as alternatives, or sometimes it can be complementing. So, how do you, for example, use such tools to increase acceptance of a new tax?

243

00:48:00.940 --> 00:48:23.480

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: So you can think about that in that way. Sometimes when you add a monetary incentive, you move from an intrinsic value or a moral mindset towards a monetary mindset, and that kind of shifts the way we perceive something. It can crowd out an intrinsic motivation, it can crowd out an initial will.

244

00:48:23.500 --> 00:48:31.069

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: And I think another important aspect here is the framing that you give towards something. Sometimes you even have

245

00:48:31.310 --> 00:48:37.490

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: policies that... Could be easier accepted, even though they're harsh.

246

00:48:37.490 --> 00:48:54.180

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: But because they... they are connected to a certainty framing, a certainty narrative, a certainty... a certain, sorry, identity-based narrative in some cases. It can lead to polarization, not because of the...

247

00:48:54.180 --> 00:49:03.310

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: of the regulation or the policy in itself, but because of how it occupied the space in the debate. So...

248

00:49:03.620 --> 00:49:24.710

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: Usually, those are components that are important to consider. It's always important to understand. It's hard to talk in an abstract way, but it's important to understand what is the target audience that you're trying to influence, what are the drivers' intake, what is their mindset upon that perspective, and how can you best convey the message in a best tone.

249

00:49:26.020 --> 00:49:27.180

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Oh, yeah, go on.

250

00:49:27.740 --> 00:49:44.250

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: just one last point, because, I think she mentioned, like, negative tools, right? And sometimes this can even happen in using emotions, let's say, right? If you use a really negative, or using shame, or guilt.

251

00:49:44.310 --> 00:49:53.660

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: to make people change their health, or change environmental behaviors. It will most likely backfire, because we tend to avoid negative aspects.

252

00:49:53.660 --> 00:50:08.259

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: So, instead, if you can think about how to make it attractive, or how can you make it towards a more positive framing, that also links to an ethical discussion and can provide greater results. So I think that's another important point.

253

00:50:08.730 --> 00:50:16.070

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Oh, that's such an important point, thank you. I really like this point around the move from intrinsic to monetary, that's really provocative, as well.

254

00:50:16.070 --> 00:50:39.450

Will Lockhart - Moderator: So there's good things going on in the chat. Faye has asked about any book suggestions. Faye don't fit... I mean, that's a great question. Do pop that in the community space, right? We have our community on the political website that will be there, and then people can come in at any point and recommend books. And Bruno, has already recommended one, which is brilliant. I'm gonna, I'm gonna click on that link in a moment, but not right now.

255

00:50:39.450 --> 00:50:40.500

Will Lockhart - Moderator: ...

256

00:50:40.590 --> 00:50:56.539

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Bruno, I do have a question, for you, which I think is really interesting, which, is about, ... I mean, it's... the example's about, Canada, but I think, wildfires, but I think it could be about a number of different things. So, if you've got...

257

00:50:56.970 --> 00:51:05.140

Will Lockhart - Moderator: You know that you've got a system, you've diagnosed that there's a system, and you're trying to bring about a particular outcome, but you know that it's going to have all of these system impacts.

258

00:51:05.260 --> 00:51:30.170

Will Lockhart - Moderator: how do you monitor the whole system? How do you bring all of that information together in a way that enables you to understand whether your intervention has actually kind of delivered the thing that you want it to deliver? So the example that the questioner has asked is about wildfires in Canada, and the question is, you know, how do you kind of track and maintain all the different things that you, you know, you need to track? But I think it could really be about anything.

259

00:51:30.170 --> 00:51:35.289

Will Lockhart - Moderator: could be about a... that's a crisis, but it could also be about just a slow-burn policy intervention. How do you keep

260

00:51:35.440 --> 00:51:38.669

Will Lockhart - Moderator: On top of the whole system and understand what's going on.

261

00:51:40.740 --> 00:51:42.840

Bruno Rizardi: Great. This is, ...

262

00:51:43.550 --> 00:51:57.770

Bruno Rizardi: A hard question, but it's really important for us to understand how to manage our storage systems in that way. So, I think there are two ways we can do this. One way is working with anticipatory governance on systems.

263

00:51:57.770 --> 00:52:15.809

Bruno Rizardi: Which is a way to try to anticipate how the system is going to evolve over time, and then enact change towards, or maybe try to not go that way. And that's a whole approach, but it's an approach that tries to use foresight

264

00:52:15.830 --> 00:52:33.519

Bruno Rizardi: and systems thinking to understand, future, behavior of the system, and then try to steer it towards a goal or another. So this is a way... I'm not gonna go in-depth about it, but it's a way that anyone that's interested could,

265

00:52:33.520 --> 00:52:47.789

Bruno Rizardi: go on and read about it. I can send some links. The other way is to understand that you cannot monitor the whole system, because they're way too complex, so we have to choose some variables of interest.

266

00:52:47.820 --> 00:53:06.429

Bruno Rizardi: Those variables are usually the variable that's the result variable, which is, like, the variable that, is more... it's a proxy for what you want the system to have the output of, so maybe it's literacy, maybe it's preventable diseases.

267

00:53:06.430 --> 00:53:16.139

Bruno Rizardi: And then there are variables that are in the mean of the system, so they are very central for the system. They are connected to another... a lot of other variables.

268

00:53:16.180 --> 00:53:30.049

Bruno Rizardi: Those variables are really important to monitor, and that's because... that's why we have to try to map out the system, because then you can identify those... those variables and monitor them. And then there's the third

269

00:53:30.270 --> 00:53:33.930

Bruno Rizardi: Option, which is to monitor the leverage points.

270

00:53:33.950 --> 00:53:46.639

Bruno Rizardi: But those points, they are hard to monitor because they're not systematically appear in the system, they're interventions. So you can have... they're not always present, or they're present in a short amount of time.

271

00:53:46.640 --> 00:53:58.739

Bruno Rizardi: So it's hard to get a... get a tendency over time about those leverage points. So that's why I think those variables, they're very central, connected to an,

272

00:53:58.740 --> 00:54:11.320

Bruno Rizardi: a lot of other variables are very close to the proxy variable that you want to move. Those are points on the system that you can monitor, but never try to monitor the whole system, because it's...

273

00:54:11.340 --> 00:54:18.800

Bruno Rizardi: too hard, and sometimes the... you have metrics that go against each other, and it gets more confusing.

274

00:54:19.700 --> 00:54:28.399

Will Lockhart - Moderator: That's very wise advice. Thank you, Bruno. We're running out of time, but I'm not gonna... I'm gonna, ask one more question of our panelists. They've worked very hard. You've got, you know.

275

00:54:28.540 --> 00:54:46.489

Will Lockhart - Moderator: one second, right? The shortest answer imaginable. At the beginning, we said, you know, we asked people, my job's getting more complicated, right? We say, oh, it's all getting more complicated. So, Anna, then Bruno, then Flora. Anna, is stuff getting more complicated, or are we just getting better at understanding the complexity? Anna.

276

00:54:47.510 --> 00:54:56.640

Anna Pietikainen: I think it's getting more complicated, and I think it's getting more complicated for me because of a mixture of what I was saying and what Flora has been talking about. Because people don't like change.

277

00:54:57.010 --> 00:55:16.779

Anna Pietikainen: And my job, I'm not a practitioner, my job is to advise governments, right? Yeah. And therefore, we are giving advice on how to change systems, how to change approaches, how to change culture. So that's very... it's... it's certainly uncertain, and it's certainly non-linear, as Bruno said.

278

00:55:16.780 --> 00:55:21.869

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Very good. Yeah, it's Bruno. Bruno more complicated, or we're just better at understanding the complexity?

279

00:55:22.460 --> 00:55:40.180

Bruno Rizardi: I think it's getting more complicated and more complex, because things are interacting more with each other. We have simultaneous crises going on, and they are interacting in ways that are not predictable, so I think that's a great sign of complexity, or even chaos in certain times.

280

00:55:40.360 --> 00:55:43.800

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Oh goodness, okay. And Flora, save us from the chaos.

281

00:55:44.110 --> 00:55:57.930

Flora Finamor Pfeifer: One word, time. The world is changing faster, these dynamics add complexity? So I think, yes, we're... we're adding complexity to... but also maybe improving our tools to work on that.

282

00:55:58.550 --> 00:56:18.650

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Brilliant, brilliant. Well, thank you so much to our amazing panelists. Huge round of virtual applause, that was just so fascinating. What a great way to spend an hour. Thank you so much. Quick poll will come up on the screen. On a scale of 1 to 10, was this a valuable use of your time? We'd love to know. We're always looking to improve how we do things, here.

283

00:56:18.650 --> 00:56:43.500

Will Lockhart - Moderator: Do remember to jump, over to the, global policymaking community. You can continue, the conversation, there. We've got a really nice, follow-up today. If you go over to the... if you go over to the community, Bruno has done, an article for us about solving complex problems. It's super, super interesting. If you go into the community and post there in the... in the comment, you'll see it's from me.

284

00:56:43.500 --> 00:56:48.459

Will Lockhart - Moderator: We'll send you the link to the, we'll send you the link to Bruno's piece. We're very grateful to Bruno for that.

285

00:56:48.590 --> 00:57:04.260

Will Lockhart - Moderator: That's all we've got time for. Huge thanks to our speakers, absolutely brilliant, so thought-provoking, I hope it's been helpful. Huge thanks to the audience, brilliant questions, it's been really good fun. There'll be an email sent shortly with a recording of the event,

286

00:57:04.270 --> 00:57:15.010

Will Lockhart - Moderator: We really hope to see you at another apolitical event soon. You're the reason that we're here, we love it. You know, keep using us, because it's just so nice to continue the conversation. Thanks so much, everyone. Take care.