

This is an AI generated transcript

–

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Good morning, good afternoon, good evening again, colleagues and partners. Thank you for joining us today for the 4th and final session of the Webinar Series focused on the governance implications of the Human Development Report. Today's session focuses on public communication and depolarization for breaking the gridlock, where we hope to explore insights from the Human Development Report 2023-24 for innovative governance programming. We are doing so in collaboration with the OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development). I am Ms. Guster, community manager of UNDP's Global Governance Community of Practice, and I will be delighted to commemorate today's session alongside Kylotta Alphonsie, Policy Analyst, focusing on public communication and access to information at the Public Governance Directorate of the OECD.

So I will kick off with the key objectives of today's session. As we have quite a bit of an ambitious agenda to go, we will all try to keep our remarks brief. For today's session, our primary objective is to provide conceptual clarity on what public communication is in the context of Human Development Report recommendations. Secondly, we are hoping to raise awareness on how public communication, which is a critical government function to deliver information, listen, and respond to citizens in the service of the common good, can be applied to enhance citizens' trust in public institutions, reduce polarization, and strengthen democracy. And finally, we are hoping to surface and amplify lessons emerging from some of the inspiring practices from the globe, whereby public communication has demonstrated innovative methods and approaches to greater effect, to improve policy services, and promote a two-way dialogue between citizens and the state.

Before further ado, I would like to invite, firstly, Sarah Lister, Head of Governance, to deliver welcome remarks. Over to you, Sarah. Welcome.

**Sarah Lister:** Thank you very much, and good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everybody from a slightly snowy New York. So welcome to this very important webinar, which we are very pleased to organize in partnership with the OECD. And it's great to see my OECD colleagues online here. Thanks, in fact, to all of the speakers, moderators, and participants for joining us to tackle this timely topic. As you said, it's focused on how public communication can contribute to a more constructive and inclusive public debate in polarized societies.

So let me start with a question: why does UNDP care about public communication? It's because public communication is more than just disseminating information. It's a powerful

instrument for fostering dialogue, building trust, and bridging societal divides—things that, as we will hear from later, the last Human Development Report demonstrates are more needed than ever. In today's increasingly polarized world, where misinformation and disinformation often dominate the discourse, effective public communication by institutions can serve to strengthen democratic governance, reinforce human rights, and enhance social cohesion. So public institutions have a unique responsibility to lead by example, demonstrating transparency, inclusivity, and empathy in their communication. And by adopting narratives that foster understanding rather than division, they can cultivate trust and legitimacy.

Of course, we all know the rapid evolution of technology and digital communication platforms has transformed how people interact with public institutions and vice versa. These advancements present new opportunities for engagement. But, as we are also aware, they also introduce risks such as the amplification of polarizing content. So to stay relevant and effective, public institutions must innovate and adapt their communication strategies, embracing technology as a tool for inclusive dialogue while addressing the risk of digital fragmentation. These are things I hope we will reflect on today. And I won't take longer with these opening remarks, mindful of what Ezgi just warned me, and today's discussion is really an opportunity for us to learn from each other. Drawing on the expertise of specialists and real-world experiences from the field. Please all actively engage, share your insights, and contribute on how to devise practical, actionable strategies that can be implemented in the everyday practice of digital communication. Thanks. And back to you, Ezgi.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Thank you, Sarah, for those brief remarks and for setting the context more clearly for all of us. And up next, we would like to invite Gillian Dorner. If she is online.

**Gillian Dorner:** Can you still see me and hear me, Ezgi?

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Yes, we can hear you and see you, Gillian. Gillian is the Deputy Director of the Public Governance Directorate at OECD. Thanks for joining us, Gillian. Over to you.

**Gillian Dorner:** Thank you, Ezgi, and hello to everybody. Whatever time of day it is where you are. It's a real pleasure to have this opportunity to speak to you today. This is an incredibly important area of work. Let me start by congratulating Sarah and her team for the publication of the report. It will certainly help advance dialogue on the impacts of political polarization on our societies and on how these can be addressed. Here at the OECD in the Public Governance Directorate, we are very excited to be partnering with you, with the UNDP. Sarah and I have spoken about this before, and it's really great to see that we're doing it in organizing this final webinar in the context of the report and to discuss the role of

public communication practices in strengthening trust in institutions and promoting constructive government-citizen dialogue.

Our conversation is certainly timely, both because of the broader social context, but also we are finding that in our survey on the drivers of trust in public institutions, polarization has increased by 3 percentage points on average between 2021 and 2023, which, although it's only 3 percentage points, that's actually quite a short period of time to see such a rise. The rise is certainly worrying. Polarization on complex issues, partly fueled by misinformation and disinformation, risks preventing societies from finding compromise on solutions and moving towards positive change. We already saw this during the COVID-19 pandemic and the challenges ongoing in the face of other global issues, such as conflicts, economic uncertainty, and the green and digital transitions. Effective public communication is crucial for governments to encourage citizen buy-in and reassure them that they are being listened to, that they are heard. However, what the trust survey shows us is that 40% of people think it is unlikely that the government would clearly explain how a policy reform would affect them. And when the government is a source of information, only 39% think that communication about policy reforms is adequate. Similarly, small group discussions, community dialogues, or deliberative assemblies give citizens the possibility to engage constructively and find compromise. We really look forward to hearing examples of this from our speakers in a few minutes. Fostering this type of communication at the level of our whole nation and across mass communication channels is, of course, very complex. The OECD is committed to helping countries develop concrete analysis, tools, and standards to support governments in addressing this challenge. The 2021 report on public communication of the OECD sets out principles to underpin effective public communication functions in governments. These principles informed the first country-specific public communication scan of the UK Government Communications Service. The scan underlined that a national communication strategy, informed by people's interests and experience, could boost trust. And in 2025, we will be developing a practical handbook with the best evidence and examples to support government communicators on how to communicate effectively on divisive issues. We really look forward to hearing your ideas on how public communication can create room for constructive debates and break the gridlock. Through our joint efforts, we have an opportunity to support the consensus and trust which underpin cohesive and prosperous societies. Thank you very much for listening to me. I hope it wasn't too long, and I wish you all the best with your discussions.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Thank you so much, Gillian, for being so concise and to the point. We all are looking forward to the report evidence report in 2025, and remain amazed by the established work by OECD on this team. Very happy to be collaborating with you, and thanks again for joining us. So up next, we would like to welcome Heriberto Tapia and

Josefin Pasanen from the Human Development Report Office. The Advocacy, Strategic Partnerships Advisor, and Research Strategic Partnership Specialist, respectively. Over to you, Heriberto and Josefin.

**Heriberto Tapia:** Thank you so much, colleagues, for organizing this. I'm gonna speak only for 1 minute, and then my colleague Josefin will provide the details. I will just give you one idea of why this is so important. So we are the Human Development Report Office, and the key indicators that we publish every year is the Human Development Index. And in the latest edition, the Human Development Index is reaching its highest point in history. Recovering after COVID, however, there is a generalized feeling that the world is not going in the right direction. So there is something really big that we are missing by using the traditional ways of looking at development. So in our report, we try to precisely try to understand what else, what is happening, why we are feeling so frustrated. In that space, polarization appears as a big threat. And it's something that often is looked at from the perspective of the challenges in our countries. When this is happening, country after country, it is because there is a systemic crisis. So this is a very important topic. It's a very difficult one. So it's very important that we tackle it together. But I'm gonna give the floor to my colleague Josefin, who will provide the detailed insights from our report. Over to you, Josefin.

**Josefin Pasanen:** Thank you, Heriberto. Thank you, colleagues. It's a pleasure to be here with you and to share some of the insights from the latest 2023-2024 Human Development Report. As we heard, it's called "Breaking the Gridlock." And it's all about asking a fundamental question: why is it that, despite all the wealth and all the know-how we have globally, we are still seemingly unable to come together and act at the speed and scale necessary to meet shared global challenges? Whether these come from pandemics, from plastic pollution, conflicts, or runaway climate change. And, as was alluding to, there's something deeper going on in our societies across the world that we're not capturing, perhaps with some of our more traditional ways of assessing development progress. So a central premise of the report is that today we don't necessarily lack solutions to many of the global problems we face. But rather we have a problem with collective action. And what we find in the report is that polarization, misperceptions, fears, and distrust run very deep in our communities across the world. And we already heard this from some of the intro remarks. The report cites that globally, two-thirds of the countries show increases in political polarization. And a very important point to make here is that polarization is not about having different opinions or different views on certain policy issues. It goes deeper than that. It's about us and them, us versus them worldviews. It's about sorting people into groups and basing those groups on one single identity. And how does this relate to human development, then, and to the topic of today, public communication? Well, polarization

often translates into intolerance, into aversion to others, into aversion to compromise, aversion to negotiation, and that can lead to political gridlock. In part because it erodes trust across communities, and that lack of trust and polarization, that sorting people into groups, impedes our efforts to come together and address some of our major societal issues nationally and internationally.

So, if we take the example of the recent pandemic, that is one of the examples we look at in the report. We found, or researchers have found, that some 15 million people, or maybe even more, died worldwide during the pandemic. And for the first time, the global Human Development Index actually decreased for the first time on record, at least. And even though the latest HDR shows increases in the HDI globally, as Heriberto was alluding to, more than half of the least developed countries have still not recovered. And in addition to sort of unequal access to vaccines, a key lacking ingredient was trust here—trust in others, trust in the science, trust in governments. And in many polarizing societies, vaccines became a sort of group status identifier and a separator instead of what was a lifesaving technology. So all of this to say that polarization, lack of trust, really erodes our ability to come together, and that has multiple negative impacts on human development. But the good news is that in the report, we look at different ways of sort of dialing down polarization and easing tensions. And information, public communication, and deliberation can play a major role here. On the flip side, it can also continue to fuel sort of fear-mongering narratives. So it's a very important issue for societies and governments to look at. On climate change, for example, which is another polarizing issue, there's some evidence that almost 70% of the global population are actually willing to contribute part of their income to support climate action. But when they're asked about if they think other people also are willing to act, they say that only 43% of the global population think that other people also feel the same. So in many cases, it seems like we actually agree more than we think. And information-based interventions, healthier public communication, and public deliberation can help us pierce through these misperceptions that we carry about each other and help rebuild trust. And on the international level, we do cite evidence in the report that shows that communication from and by national institutions, whether governments or civil society organizations, about international organizations actually has a lot of impact on the perceived legitimacy of international institutions, even more so than the communications from international institutions or international organizations themselves. And because in a globally shared world where pandemics, viruses, cross borders, violent conflicts affect us all, runaway climate change does not stop at national borders. We do need multilateral cooperation to address our global challenges. So here we find another key area where the role of public communication can really make a difference in mobilizing collective action at the scale and speed that we need. So there's a lot more in the report on this, of course, and

I invite you all to take a look at it. It's publicly available at the Human Development Report Office's website. We can share in the chat. But I'll stop here because we want to hear from the experts on public communication. Thank you so much.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Thank you, Josefin, and thank you, Heriberto, for that brief overview of the key messages, the key recommendations, and issues that the Human Development Report laid out. So, colleagues, one of the things that we hope to do with this session as part of the broader series is to first build the sort of conceptual clarity, the conceptual foundations, and then to move on to the more practical experiences and lessons learned emerging from the field. So in the first session, we will be holding brief dialogues with area experts from academia, from civil society, and then we will be moving on to leadership and actionable proposals and recommendations coming from the more applied part of the public communication house. So let's start. Our dialogue will start initially with an academic, Mario Riordo, who is the director of the master's program on political communication, as well as a senior expert on public communication at Austral University in Argentina. Unfortunately, Mario is unable to join us today in person. However, he has left a brief video clip which lays out his responses to key questions we posed for him. What is the difference between public communication and political communication? And how can public communications support the advancement of development agendas in polarized contexts and settings? Let's hear from Mario.

**Mario Riordo:** Hola, gracias. Soy Mario Riordo, y también suerte para mí. Quiero plantear cuatro conceptos aquí. Primero, si hablamos de la centralidad de la comunicación y el uso de pública, porque ese concepto es mucho mayor en precisión y sus límites. Si nos aproximamos a los modos y las agendas gubernamentales, es mucho más preciso hablar del sector público o incluso de gubernamental. Segundo, para responder a la pregunta, ¿qué significa comunicar bien para los gobiernos? Es necesario considerar dos enfoques: la autorregulación democrática y la performance eficaz percibida como eficaz pero no democrática. Mientras que en persona perfectamente democrático, pero en el punto tres que tenemos una de incidir para romper esa cople de práctica por niveles. En estos tiempos se le pide mucho a los gobiernos nacionales y locales en términos de calidad democrática y servicios, sobre todo digitales, mientras que para la gobernanza nacional los análisis están centrados en los retóricos asociados a la estridencia o radicalidad de los liberales y sus discursos. Y cuarto, finalmente, para volver a responder a la pregunta, ¿qué significa comunicar bien para los gobiernos? Propongo construir una matriz de análisis de al menos unas diez variables con indicadores por cada variable, poder de garantía estimativamente a cien indicadores totales. Las variables que imagino son relaciones con la prensa, reputación, opinión pública, el mito del gobierno y el sistema mercario, la capacidad organizativa, la gestión digital, la gestión del riesgo, la gestión de crisis,

gobierno abierto, y otros enfoques de inclusión, y quizás elementos intangibles o de innovación. Hay mucho trabajo por realizar. Gran grande y muchísimas gracias por seguramente nos veremos en el futuro.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** We hope that you found that introduction, that brief overview, and prompt from Mario helpful. And as our second guest, we would like to welcome Dimitra Dimitrakopoulou, who is the head of translation research at MIT Center for Constructive Communication. Welcome, Dimitra.

**Dimitra Dimitrakopoulou:** Hello! Good morning, everyone. Good morning. We have moved from Argentina to the USA, to Boston now.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** And, Dimitra, we have two questions for you as well. You will have eight minutes to respond to them. What is constructive communication, and how does it differ from other communication practices? And, secondly, based on your research, could you tell us, could you share with us, what are some of the most effective ways to promote constructive communication? Over to you.

**Dimitra Dimitrakopoulou:** Perfect. Thank you, Ezgi. Maybe I can start by describing what the MIT Center for Constructive Communication does, just as a little bit of additional context setting. And we have a short video that I would like to share with you that kind of captures the problem statement, the area we, the problems we're trying to address, and the solutions we're trying to offer. So the MIT Center for Constructive Communication, we call it C3, is an MIT-wide research center based at the Media Lab that has the mission to design tools, methods, and systems that connect us rather than divide us to create a healthier society. So all the presentations and the remarks that were made at the beginning of this webinar created the perfect background and context for what I'm going to share. And the way we do that is by actually drawing inspiration from what we call ancient wisdoms, such as facilitated dialogue, deep listening, and community organizing, to develop tools and methods for constructive communication that can be fostered with depth but also scale.

When it comes to constructive communication, I would define it with a set of principles. One of our key principles in our work is that small is beautiful. So we always, you know, although we are a research group that builds technology and tools, we always see that small groups are the essential unit of meaningful and constructive and deep conversations. We don't expect that we just, you know, we can throw large groups of people into a town hall or into digital platforms and expect them to connect constructively and authentically. So in our approach, we work with small groups of people, usually four to six people, and we invite them into small group facilitated conversations. There's always a very

careful design of questions and prompts that invite people to share their values, their lived experiences as a way of connecting with each other rather than debating over who's right or wrong, sharing opinions or perspectives that might be divisive. So what we have found in our research is that when we allow people to connect over personal storytelling and sharing of their own lived experiences, we can actually create a space for people to connect more deeply and authentically.

When we lead with our opinions, when we lead with our statements, when we try to lead with facts, we can often enter a debate over who's right or wrong, which seems to lead to more polarization and divisiveness. So we like to think of our role as bridge builders, as people creating connections. And we think that this framework that is amplified by the use of technology can really help us achieve that. And I mentioned the technology. You've also heard me talking about the method and the framework and the approach. What the technology does is that it allows us to record these small conversations as they're happening. We have a conversation platform that allows these conversations to be transcribed. And then we have AI-assisted analysis tools that allow us to identify patterns and themes that emerge from these conversations so that we can understand what people in these conversations talked about, but also introduce a very key concept in our work that we call cross-pollination, which basically means that we identify meaningful moments from the conversation that one small group had and share that with other groups, with other similar groups that are having similar conversations so that we can start exposing people to diverse perspectives from other groups that they weren't a part of.

And maybe this is the right moment to also play the one-minute video that we have so that you can also hear some more details about our approach, and then I'll follow up with some additional comments.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Right? Okay?

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Technology promised a new era of communication, but set to full blast always on everywhere. It made public conversation faster, louder, and bigger, but also distorted, noisy, and harsh. It's no wonder that only the loudest voices dominate and divide, and trust is scarce. But what if we could build something new, design a different future for how we connect, by weaving ancient wisdoms about human connection into a new generation of tools built for understanding, not overwhelming, for scaling, but only at the speed of trust, technologies that turn up the values, not just the volume.

**Dimitra Dimitrakopoulou:** Thank you. I noticed that there were some gray boxes on the video that were not part of the actual video. But I hope you were still able to get the most out of it. So with that in mind, I'd like to focus on some examples of our work, maybe to

make all these concepts a little bit more concrete and tangible. Whether I think is key to share is that we are an academic research center. We are a research group. But we have a very unique team within C3, which I lead, the translational research and practice team that actually serves as a bridge between academia, research, and practice, so that we can collaborate with partners in the field to implement and refine our methods and tools of constructive communication in a variety of real-world contexts, such as universities, schools, local communities, and cities. And I'm going to share some examples of how we have been able to do that.

One of our key programs at the center is what we call the Real Talk at MIT program, and I'm going to be sharing some resources with you all so that you can read and see more details about the work. So what we did is we launched an MIT-wide program that allows this approach of community-based dialogue, experience-based dialogues in combination with our technology in our own home at MIT. And what this allows us to do is to create a culture of listening and shared understanding in our own home. So what we do is we invite students, staff, and faculty to join these small group conversations, to record these conversations, and then using our analytical tools, surface the different hopes, concerns, dreams, challenges that the community is facing.

Another program that is relevant is called Real Talk Boston. And it's actually, again, using the same framework and the same technology. We work with a cohort of community-based organizations here in Boston who serve traditionally unheard and marginalized communities to enable them to build the capacity of holding these conversations with their community members and use our tools to be able to not just analyze the data that they collected from these conversations, but also understand how they can serve their communities better by deeply listening and understanding what are the daily struggles that their community members are facing.

We also started doing almost two years ago work in the space of deliberation. We heard earlier in one of the presentations about deliberative assemblies. Two years ago, we launched a tech-enhanced pop-up citizen assemblies lab in collaboration with Democracy Next, who's an international leader in the field of deliberation, for us to understand how we can use the methods around facilitation and listening together with our technology to support deliberation and promote more effective civic engagement. We started with a proof of concept here at MIT. Last year, we hosted the first-ever tech-enhanced student assembly. We're hosting another one in a couple of months. And we have some examples of real-world citizen assemblies where we had the chance to introduce our technology, record the conversations, and do analysis to understand how we can support deliberation as well. So more resources will be shared. I think my time is up, so I'm good to wrap up

here, and I'm looking forward to any questions at the end of this session. Thank you so much.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Thanks. Thank you, Dimitra, for sharing these inspiring entry points to advance our understanding of public communication as its hope for greater good. And we hope that there will be perhaps five to ten minutes right after this segment to welcome questions from the audience. So I highly encourage participants to use the chat box effectively and to drop in any burning questions you may have addressed to Dimitra and Aline.

Okay. Our next presenter, next speaker, is Aline Castro, who is joining us from Brazil. She's the Deputy President of Relations with Associates, ABC Publica, Brazilian Association of Public Communication. Welcome, Aline.

**Aline Castro:** Thank you, Ezgi. I'm really honored to be here with you today. Thank you.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Thanks again. Okay, so we have two questions for you as well, Aline, and please use the next eight minutes the way you wish to address them. How can public communication support more constructive public debates in polarized contexts? And could you tell us a bit more about the key principles for successful public communication?

**Aline Castro:** Yeah, yeah, of course. I think in polarized contexts, public communication has never been so important. And just, I just want to take a quick step back and clarify and add some notes on the concept of public communication, because it's very important that we know what kind of communication we are talking about here. So adding some thoughts on what Sarah and also Mario have brought to us, I think it's very important that when we think of public communication, we might picture government announcements spreading out information about what they are doing, what are their initiatives, their programs. And actually, the concept that the Brazilian Association of Public Communication, ABC Publica, which I represent here today, we believe that public communication needs to go beyond that. So we truly believe that it has to be related to dialogue, with connecting with the citizens, and also with empowering the citizens, so they can have a more relevant role in society, and they can also, you know, make more informed decisions. So, as I said, in polarized contexts, this becomes even more essential. And in so many ways, I think the first one is that public communication is focused on providing information that is relevant, reliable, accurate, helpful, and evidence-based. So when we do that, we can create a much healthier information environment. We can raise the quality of the public debate, and we can help people to make better decisions.

And second is because once again, public communication needs to be about dialogue. And when I say dialogue, I mean in multiple ways. I think in a personal, individual way, I loved what Dimitra has brought to us about the small, small is beautiful, because I truly

believe in that. I really believe in the power of, you know, this interaction when public institutions can do with individual citizens one-to-one, so we can answer their questions, so we can hear their concerns, and we can answer with empathy and with kindness. I really believe this is very transformative, but also dialogue in a much broader way. Also relating to what Dimitra has brought to us, I think it's very important to, you know, create spaces where people with different views can come together to shape policies, you know, to share their thoughts on problems that we all have, and then to share. So by that, I mean creating public meetings, maybe assemblies, or even creating councils, where, you know, the civil society can be representative. So I believe when we have those three elements altogether, though good information, interaction, and also a space for open debate, we are really on the right path.

And also answering your question about the key principles, Ezgi, I would say that the first one is that public communication needs to be people-centered. So it is about delivering benefits for society. It is about, you know, turning lives better and making people's lives easier. So once again, it's not about marketing on governments. It is about delivering benefits. And to do that, we really have to understand what people's needs are. So we really have to know what their expectations are, who they are, where they come from, and also what the challenges that they face, what their routine looks like. So the more we know about those people, the more we can connect with them, the better our message will be, the more effective it will be. So to do that, we definitely need to listen. And that's the second key principle I want to highlight here today. So when we talk about communication, and especially public communication, we really have to know how to listen to people. And so we have to hear all their voices, and we have to create mechanisms to do that. It doesn't have to be, you know, something very expensive or a big research. So I used to do this practice with my team. We used to have this agreement that once a month we would come to a meeting, and each of us would bring a real conversation, some thoughts and insights that we would have from a real conversation with a real person, a real stakeholder. And this was so rich, this was so powerful, so we could shape our message, and we could, you know, tailor our campaigns better to society. So I really believe in the power of active listening.

And also a third principle I would highlight is being plural. So by listening, we have to make sure that all voices are being heard. We have to be inclusive. We have to pay attention to diversity, of course. And this is where I believe that language comes in, because public communication needs also to be about translation. You know, a public sector can be very difficult, can be very complex, technical in some ways. So it is a matter of translating this and making this become easier, so people from different backgrounds and different segments can understand us and be active in the debate. So this becomes even more

important when we have educational gaps. You know, in Brazil, we have some statistics that say that more than 80% of our population is not able to understand complex information. So when we are not paying attention to the language we are using, the words we are using, we are leaving people behind. So we have to make sure to use plain language and to, you know, make sure everyone is able to understand us.

And last but not least, I think my time is almost up. I must emphasize that it's also important that public communication needs to help the public institutions to be more efficient, more transparent also, and more problem-solving. And this is definitely not an easy task. This is, we have to have very strong strategies. We have to do a lot of planning. We have to measure our efforts. And I would also emphasize the role of internal communications here, because once again, communication is not about only pushing out information, spreading out information. It is about really connecting with the citizens. So that means that communication doesn't happen only in the communication department. It is about creating a real culture of communicating inside out the institution. So I truly believe in the power of that. And you know, I think just that public communication has so much potential, is still so underexplored. And that's why I'm so happy to share these thoughts with you today. So thank you. Hopefully, we can go deeper into those topics during the Q&A. Thank you.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Thank you so much, Aline, and as well again, once again to Dimitra as well. And we've heard from both of your interventions the importance of being deliberate in the efforts we make to create spaces for deliberation and for them to not just be about seeking information or communicating information, but essentially trying to extract meaning, identify meaning for the participants themselves. So sort of moving away from stakeholder engagement for the purpose of engagement or inclusive decision-making to actually participatory frameworks.

I do see some good questions on the chat lined up. So perhaps we can start first with the questions for Dimitra, and then two questions for you, Aline. We have about five to eight minutes left for Q&A. So, Dimitra, one of the questions is around the issue of active listening. How can we ensure that we are getting a diversity of opinion? And how can we remove any of the biases of the listeners in the process of deep listening and active listening? And then there's a specific question about the AI function that you have mentioned in your presentation. If you could elaborate a bit more on that. Over to you.

**Dimitra Dimitrakopoulou:** Sure. And I see the questions in the chat as well. So I think there is a third one. I'll try to respond to everything very quickly. So I mentioned that our small group conversations are always facilitated. We don't bring experts to facilitate these conversations. We do a lot of work to focus on capacity building in the local communities

for them to learn the skills of facilitation so that they can support the group in actually doing the active listening together as a group. So there is light moderation of the conversation, and that really supports the group so that everyone can listen to each other. They are encouraged and empowered to focus on their personal stories and experiences. And just to give you an example, if there's a conversation participant who starts sharing some facts or sharing some opinions that might be polarizing, the facilitator mildly and very kindly brings them back to the focus of the conversation. So the conversations are always very carefully designed. There is a set of questions that the participants respond to so that this can safely create a space for active listening to flourish. And we have seen that, you know, when we invite people to lead with their values and their experiences, biases and polarization drops. I'm not saying that we can entirely eliminate them, but it can be a first step of actually engaging with each other in a different way.

I see a question also about the team that I mentioned. I was talking about my team of translational research and practice. We do make events. So I'll share the link to our website so that you can check it out. But I think something that might be interesting for this group as well is that we at C3, we have a special field collaborator. It's a nonprofit organization called Cortico. And you can think of Cortico as our deployment partner when we need not to just focus on some emerging research questions or to test the boundaries of what is possible with our methods and our tools. We bring in our deployment partner so that they can work with organizations in the field themselves. And at the moment, there are over 200 organizations who have been working with Cortico to kind of bring our methods and tools into their contexts. The AI function is tools that we have developed so that people can first of all, transcribe the conversations that they hosted and then use AI-assisted tools to identify topics and themes that emerged from the conversations. And I can share more links later for anyone who's interested in learning more. And I think these were the questions that I had.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Thanks. Thanks a lot, Dimitra. And yes, indeed, we will be compiling all the resources shared throughout this event and package it back to the registered participants after the session. Aline, would you like to comment on these questions as well? And yes, as Dimitra said, there was a third question around how can we strengthen capacities of public institutions to better integrate a public communication approach in the formulation and implementation of public policies? If you would like to add on additional examples in response to this question, we would welcome your intervention.

**Aline Castro:** Oh, okay. Well, I think we can move on to other questions, Ezgi.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Okay. And then the other question was around active listening. Dimitra has shared her perspective. How do we ensure that we are getting a diversity of opinions, and how do we remove the biases of the listeners? Would you like to come in on this one?

**Aline Castro:** Yeah, thank you. Well, I think it's a real challenge, you know. To listen better, we also have to make sure we use a multiple channel strategy. So we definitely need to, you know, I love digital, but we have to go beyond digital. So we have to go where people are, we have to pay attention to the way they consume information. And we also have to open different ways that people can connect with us. And this is part of real listening. And also about the biased listening, that's actually a challenge because, you know, all of us are human, and we have our own biases. But I think the key is to have a diverse group where we can then have more diverse thoughts on what we have collected during the listening session. So that can be helpful for avoiding any bias. And the more diverse the teams, the better, I suppose.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Okay, thanks a lot, Aline. Just turning back to the audience, if we have any additional questions, we have time for one more question. I'm checking if there's any hands or any additional questions on the chat. If not, we can quickly wrap up this segment. I thank again Dimitra and Aline for being present and for sharing these inspiring concrete entry points and clarifying the difference between public versus political communication with us. Some of the key recommendations that we have taken away are around small versus big or large, so smaller groups can accommodate more genuine and deeper interaction, and in getting into active listening and deep listening and deep demonstrations, the importance of occasionally meeting the audience where they are, so rather than keeping a static approach to outreach, ensuring that we complement the digital with in-person interactions. And there are many more insights that you brought to bear. But we're hoping that the resources that you've shared with us will be incredibly helpful for the audience to advance their understanding on this issue. Without further ado, I would like to move us away from the sort of conceptual overview to more practical experiences. And I would like to welcome Carlotta Alfonsi, who is with the OECD team, to moderate this second segment of the session. Over

**Carlotta Alfonsi:** Thank you very much. Thank you for being here. It's really a pleasure to continue this conversation. It's been fascinating so far, and I really appreciate hearing from our speakers concepts that I've encountered a lot in the work that I do and that I've been trying to echo as part of the OECD's program of work on public communication. So I'll say maybe a couple of words about OECD. I lead an area of work that looks precisely at strengthening the contribution of public communication to build trust and deliver policy impact. We have assembled a public communication network. I see some of our members

are online, and I'm really excited that they were able to join us. And this network is bringing together practitioners from public institutions in our member countries and beyond, and they are participating in our work to learn from each other's experiences and then to turn these experiences into common principles and guidance, and take on board the lessons that are shared in settings like the event today. So with this next segment, we hope to do exactly that. We hope to match what we've heard so far from our experts with some lessons from the ground. And the questions that we hope to answer with the next presentations include, how have organizations implemented communication in polarized contexts? What results have they achieved through their approaches? What are the lessons that have come out of these approaches and try to see what we can replicate in other countries, in other settings, and other policy issues and so forth. So we'll hear from two speakers next, who've been working on practical solutions in two different countries, the United Kingdom and Guatemala. And then we'll have some time again to answer some of the questions that come out from all of you joining online. So please keep posting those directly in the chat. Let me start by giving the floor to Tim Dixon, who co-founded More in Common. More in Common is a nonprofit that's been active in seven countries, if I've got it right, and works to address the drivers of fracturing and polarization. Tim, please tell us a bit more about what More in Common does and what you've observed that makes a difference on polarization on the ground.

**Tim Dixon:** Thanks very much, Carlotta, and it's great to join everybody. In a past life, I was an economist writing economics textbooks, and I feverishly used to refresh my browser looking for the release of the HDR. So exciting to join in a different context now. I think that one point that comes out that Gillian mentioned, and Aline also mentioned, is that to counter polarization, public institutions need to be more people-centered. And that's what I want to focus on in sharing three insights around how we can build better communications that reflect a more people-centered approach. In the context where obviously you have lower levels of trust, you have greater fragmentation in the media environment. It's much harder to reach many parts of the public than what it was when media environments were more simple a generation ago. And this is the heart of More in Common's work, to understand these dynamics of polarization and help leaders in different public roles to navigate polarization more effectively. So I'm going to share a few slides if we can just bring up the deck. With our work, we work in partnership with a lot of public institutions ranging from political leaders through to public broadcasting, government agencies, and also leaders in nonprofits and philanthropy, and many other walks of life. And all of them are grappling with the increased challenges of how you communicate in an environment where the levels of trust are lower, where it's harder to reach audiences, where there's a lot more disinformation. So what I want to do is share

three insights. The first piece is about understanding audiences according to people's values and worldview. And the thing about effective communication is it's about both senders of messages, it's about the message itself, and it's about the receiver. And I think there's a tendency in a lot of our thinking about communications to look at two of those, who's sending and what the message is, and not to think a lot about the third, the receiver. A while ago, I was a judge on a narrative change competition in the United States for a philanthropist, and we had about 140 submissions, people seeking funding for narrative change work around poverty and perceptions of poverty. And it fascinated me that out of 140 applications, only two of them made any mention of audiences. But you can't do narrative change if you don't understand the audience that you're trying to reach and their values. And that's a significant part of our work, has been creating better ways to understand the audiences that we're trying to reach. We've traditionally thought about, you know, if you ask somebody in a public communications role, who are you trying to reach? And they'll say, well, the general public. But it's not really a meaningful thing to say any longer, because there is no general public. There's very atomized and fractured audiences. Now, when we start thinking about that, we typically think, okay, there's groups according to age or class or gender or racial background or region, and all of those, of course, are true and helpful. But I think we default to those just because it's the easiest way in which the data categorizes audiences for us. And a part of our work is to better understand people according to their values and worldviews, which can create real breakthroughs in terms of how effectively we communicate. And that way you can communicate with people much more according to the way that they see the world. And if you don't do that, and if you just sort of use these broad, very visible categories, what the communicators tend to do is project their own values upon those audiences that they're trying to reach and not necessarily do it effectively. So if we look at the next slide, what we've done with More in Common's work is to build these maps of people according to their values and their identity, working with behavioral scientists and social psychology. And what that gives us is a capacity to look at people's starting points on relevant issues. So if we jump to the next slide, I'll show you a more detailed breakdown. What I had in the previous slide was the US, France, and Germany, where we have work in seven countries, and we've done these quite detailed typologies. So if you're in France, Germany, Poland, Brazil, US, UK, those are all published. Brazil is coming next year. And what they're helping to do is to get more what people's values and starting points are. If I talk in very general terms, and this detail is a lot of detail, there's like, you know, huge data sets behind this research. And we've worked with a lot of academics to build them. And they turn out to be very predictive of people's views, but also very helpful in finding innovative ways to reach audiences and to engage people. But if I sort of simplify across our countries, I think typically you find three key groups. One is groups who in polarized societies are very politically oriented. So their identity is very

much around politics. It's not never more than about a third of the population. And it's often smaller than that. And the really, the groups with very strong identities are typically more like under 10% on the left and 10% on the right. But in this case, this is just to use the UK segmentation, progressive activists and backbone conservatives, kind of the left and the right flank. And we often, if we do, if we are familiar with the political world, we often think in terms of the political spectrum as explaining the world, and it explains some things, but doesn't explain a lot of things. So another dimension is to think about engagement and disengagement. Actually, people highly engaged on the left and right are in this sense really similar, that their identity is really tied up with their politics. And they're very loud, very, very visible on social media, as the MIT video mentioned. And they tend to take a lot of the time of people doing public communications because they're so highly engaged. But when you focus on them, you miss out the fact that there's two-thirds of the rest of the public, who are much less visible. One group disengaged, characterized by lower levels of trust, lower levels of information, but also more at risk of the us versus them dynamics that we've discussed. And then also stabilizers, as we call them. That's a group whose orientation in this case, civic pragmatists and established liberals in the UK. They're people who, their orientation is much more towards community and people. They were really important parts of a strong civil society, but they very much dislike conflict. And so they're withdrawing from the public sphere, withdrawing from involvement in organizations and political parties and so forth, because they dislike conflict. And so much of where public communications take place now are arenas for conflict. So that's just to give you a deep dive. But here's how this applies to finding those starting points that I mentioned. Next slide, please. So progressive activists' starting point and how they see the world is often about injustice. Civic pragmatists, they look at the world through the lens of fairness. Disengaged battlers through the lens of insecurity, their own particularly financial insecurity. Established liberals, they're much more status quo. They want to protect things as they are. Loyal nationals are very more kind of nationalistic group. They think about place, and they feel very threatened. They feel under attack. Disengaged traditionalists, these are people who really see society like order in society as being very important. And so security and concerns about crime, terrorism, particularly strong for them. And then the last group here, backbone conservatives, they have a more nostalgic view, and they like heritage, tradition, and those dimensions of society. So that's just seven examples of starting points. Now, to give you an example of how this applies, we have been working on the green transition in a number of countries. A lot of communications that were being built by the organizations trying to shift consumer behavior around embracing different technologies was the save the planet message. Now, save the planet works if you have a worldview that you have that level of agency and were quite political. Actually doesn't work at all for many of the disengaged groups. When we shifted their message to start with their starting point, which

is financial survival. And so the message was save money. We saw a significant increase in the uptake of that technology. So it's all about where is their starting point? And people have different starting points. But very often the communicators communicate from their own starting point rather than from the audiences they're trying to reach. Next slide, please. So the last point is building communications that engage people around their values and worldviews. And here what I want to mention is an example of one of the most contested and polarized issues, which is refugees and immigration. So we've worked more in common's work on these issues the last eight years. One of the most exciting innovations we found in migration policy was the sponsorship, private sponsorship model that has been developed in Canada. Why is that important? Because if you start where people are at, where people have concerns about immigration and newcomers coming to their community, a lot of those concerns, it's often assumed by people who work in the field that it's a moral debate, and they need to communicate on morality. What our research has consistently showed is it's actually most of the public thinks in migration, not through moral terms, but practical terms. And so that message about how you integrate people successfully into a community with refugee sponsorship provides reassurance to delivers different outcomes in terms of the public's willingness, their support for refugees coming into their community. And here's an example here. This is research taken from the United States. We saw an increase in support for refugees coming through community sponsorship from a 48 to 42 difference rising to 58 to 33, so a 25 point gap rather than a six point gap in support. And this detail behind that, but it comes out of really understanding the sources of anxiety and insecurity in the community and finding policies that communicate to that, that communicate in this case with sponsorship, a more successful integration to community into jobs and a sense that there won't be, the people won't be sort of on the fringe of the society, but they will be fully integrated in. So that's just a very practical example, but it's deep at a policy level that we can bring these insights and do individual things. And in this case, refugee sponsorship was in one country 10 years ago, just in Canada. It's now in 17 countries, and a million people have come in through sponsorship schemes in the last year. So it's an area of really significant innovation in migration policy. Back to you, Carlotta.

**Carlotta Alfonsi:** Wonderful, just on time. Thank you, Tim. It was really, really interesting. I think there's a lot of key lessons that can be replicated in many other contexts and definitely be taken on board. I think let's move on directly with Carlos and the experience of Guatemala, and then we should have time for some questions. I think some are already coming in the chat. So Carlos Benitez is the UNDP Resident Representative in Guatemala and will tell us a bit more about their experience with communicating to overcome polarization there.

**Carlos Benitez:** Good morning. Good afternoon, colleagues. It's a pleasure to hear the experiences and to hear the thoughts, and I think that this is very much aligned with where we are currently living nowadays, not only in Guatemala, but I would say in Latin America and the Caribbean. And so I'm so glad I have a friend who knows more or less the world of UNDP in Guatemala, Emmanuel, and of course, Heriberto and Sarah. But this is more and more importantly, I think that this is an experience that we have during the process of elections in Guatemala. I don't know if someone can show the slides. Okay. So this is made of two processes and two experiences, but basically, it's about how we are addressing polarization for democratic resilience. Next, please. And in general, you might know already there's some numbers from Guatemala. Guatemala is a 17 million population with a GDP of 3.4. It's expected to increase in 2025 to 3.6 approximately. So the Human Development Index is 0.629, and the multidimensional poverty is 28.9, and the malnutrition is about 47%, which is the second highest in Latin America. This gives you a picture of more or less what are the structural problems that are behind these indicators. And just to complement also, the corruption perception index is 23 points. That was data from 2023. And I think that maybe we can move to the other slide, please. Okay, so what in my experience with polarization provides, I think that this case may provide some valuable insight into addressing this challenge in a complex government context. So we're moving back in 2023 during the elections. But for those of you who don't know the specifics of the election process, Guatemala, between the election and when the president takes office, it lasts more or less for five months. So elections are happening first round in May, June, more or less the first and the second round. But the government takes office in early January. So these five, six months of transition period, sometimes when there is a calm transition period, we at UNDP, we used to take this opportunity to bridge the programmatic, to bridge our narrative, and of course to bridge the whole portfolio that we are working with the previous one. But this time, the context was quite different. Why do I call this? Because the result of the 2023 general election shocked many. Why? Because President, current President Arevalo of the Movimiento Semilla, he unexpectedly won the presidency with 58% of the total vote. It was a respective colleagues in the first round, President Arevalo was 12th in line to win office, 12th in line. So then for the second round, he moved to be in the top two. So of course, this is about the atomization of the parties in Guatemala. But political rivals questioned the legitimacy of the president and incited public doubt and initiated legal challenges, and the escalation led to protests and confrontation. But it was very interesting because one of the, I would say, the strong supporters of President-elect at that time, Arevalo, they were the indigenous organizations who played a key role in supporting Mr. Arevalo against judicial attacks and who were trying to invalidate the elections for more than 100 days. So there was a fight in the 100 days before he took office. So during this period, this transition, long transition period, while we were trying to

understand exactly how to support, because we realized that it was an uncommon process, that it was not only just a bridging from one government to another government, but that it was a very chaotic case in terms of not only trying to support the incoming president, but also just trying to see how to balance the power and how to support the governance of the new government. Maybe we can move to the next slide. So during this period, and recognizing the complex scenario of polarization, the Accelerator Labs conducted a prospective analysis exercise that explored innovative approaches to address this issue. So there are two times. So in between during the transition, through the Accelerator Labs, we conducted this prospective analysis. And after the president took office with the Human Development Global Human Development Report that was launched, the country office organized a local presentation. And given the relevance of the report, the new General Secretary of the Presidency requested to address polarization within the institution. So this is the second milestone in this process because we always see that in the transition we assume that internally among the public servants it's just a common transition that they used to have this kind of transition from one government to another government. We're talking about 300 public servants from 60 institutions. So in the second stage, what we did was we addressed institutional participation through workshops, where they reflected on the importance of promoting dialogue and the need for better and closer collaboration between institutions. So this exercise was systematized in a brief document that we call "Promoting Dialogue and Collaboration in Polarization Scenarios" and basically in the process that we led, what we learned is that addressing how to address polarization from the perspective of public servants was especially important given the tension between the incoming public servants and those from the previous administration, the political polarization present in the legislature, and the social division regarding the election results.

Going back again, I'm going to disaggregate a little bit the prospective analysis of what it was about and, more importantly, the outcomes. During the prospective analysis, what we did was assist experts representing diverse perspectives spanning politics, sociology, media, academia, civil society, and also the private sector participating in two workshops. We used the future toolkit, specifically the axis of uncertainty and policy stress testing. These tools helped us understand and make a prospective analysis, identify drivers of polarization, anticipate scenarios, and test policies that could foster dialogue and collaboration. The main two outcomes were the model of understanding polarization, which was about the balance between the mechanisms that instigated division and those that resist it, especially during crises that threaten the interests of power.

In terms of the mechanisms that instigated division, the approach was on persuasive tactics and coercive measures. Instead, the mechanisms that resisted division focused on

communicational issues, specifically countering misinformation and divisive rhetoric, and also addressing emotional intelligence, social cohesion, personal agency, and effective mediation. In terms of policy recommendations for diverse scenarios, in high polarization scenarios, the focus was on addressing sensitiveness, being aware of symbolic communication, reducing barriers to honesty, sustaining credibility and trust through actions, enforcing agreed rules, managing difficult emotions, and prioritizing private and individual interaction. In low polarization scenarios, the recommendations included expanding diversity and scale, introducing digital tools, emphasizing value-based discussions, and accelerating actionable initiatives.

Now, the second part of this experience was the workshop with the General Secretary of the Presidency. At that time, the government was already in office, so we

conducted sessions that revealed the polarization affecting public officials on two fronts. One was from dysfunctional social interactions, heightened societal unreasonable expectations, apathy, intolerance, hostility, and fragmentation. The second was from the institutional capacity perspective, focusing on decreased collaboration, policy paralysis, and defensive work environments. Public officials identified actionable responses, including hasty communication for quicker and clearer engagement, coordinating across institutions at multiple levels, supporting soft skills and emotional well-being, and encouraging inclusive and public participation in institutional processes.

While fighting misinformation is essential, the focus should shift from resolving differences by determining who is right or wrong to embracing those differences as opportunities to foster broader and more inclusive collaboration. This is what, in my experience, is important in understanding that polarization is a multifaceted challenge.

**Carlotta Alfonsi:** Thank you very much. Thanks, both Tim and Carlos. We have a couple of questions, and I think they will help us get deeper into the examples that you've shared. I see one that has come up just for Tim on the method that you use to determine the dimensions along which you segment the public. If you want to take a couple of minutes to share about that.

**Tim Dixon:** Yeah, sure. So this is, there's some complex kind of data science behind this, but just to describe it quickly, we work with social scientists to identify what are the dimensions of people's social psychology that we know from behavioral science shape the way they navigate division and polarization. There's five areas of that. For example, one is moral foundations, Jonathan Haidt's work, the 2012 book, "The Righteous Mind." Another is about how people perceive threat, another is what they call the authoritarian personality, which actually is about how your approach to parenting. There's five areas. So you ask, I

think it's about 55 questions that are asked in the battery of questions that have been used, slight variations from one country to another, but quite similar. And then there's a method called hierarchical clustering analysis, which is essentially looking at similarities across a very large sample. So we typically take 8,000-10,000 people, similarities in people's responses. And then you identify, okay, we see this clustering of people with quite similar responses. And then maybe 12% of the population. And then we look at them, and then we conduct focus groups with them. So we think we're actually discovering something that's real in terms of a worldview, a sort of similarity within a group. And then it's telling that story. And this is kind of exercise, like a meaning-making exercise, working out the right term to describe them. And we don't do a sort of cookie-cutter approach. Each country is different because there are unique cultural elements. But there are some similarities as well across countries when you do it in several countries. So what's so helpful about this, I mean, so you know, there's a bit of data science behind it, but it actually gets you to seeing, wow, there's very consistent patterns in how people respond to very diverse issues. Culture wars, trans rights, LGBT, immigration, climate change, inequality. And it gets you away from thinking that the world is a 50-50 polarized society, two sides, and you realize no, no, there's much more diversity. Now, some countries are more like they do more have sort of two opposing sides. Most countries not so much. The US is an obvious example of a very polarized binary society. But this just gets you into better understanding what's people's starting points, and that can then build communications that can turn down the heat of polarization.

**Carlotta Alfonsi:** Thanks, Tim. That's very interesting. I think getting into the mechanics of how you do this is quite important, and we'll look to dig deeper into that, perhaps in the future. And I'll mention that we'll be sharing materials from the colleagues who have presented so that anyone following online can find out more and look into the footnotes of the really complex work that you just explained. So there's another quite good question from Mario that maybe I'll post to Carlos. And then, Tim, if you have any other thoughts to add on, feel free. So Mario is asking about moving beyond the content of the message and trying to change the framing on a certain issue that's polarizing when other actors have already dominated the agenda with their framing. So if I'm reading the question correctly, he's asking how we can overturn or change the framing to get applied by actors, and beyond just changing our message about an issue. How can we reshape the narrative once it's already in place?

**Carlos Benitez:** Okay, I would try to go for that one. This is a good one. And actually, maybe we can talk about how social media interacts in this approach and how social media through the algorithm somehow keeps installing the polarization and increasing polarization. But if we go back to the example of Guatemala, we're talking about a country

that is pretty well connected, but basically that was not necessarily instigated by or increased by social media. So the narrative that was put in place at that time was that the government, the new government, was not legitimate. So there was a legal narrative of illegality in terms of the incoming government. So I think that we cannot be so simplistic by saying that, okay, well, the narrative we can only find through a good way. I mean, tie back with positive information, with more information. I think that this has to do with the way you can cluster groups. From this experience, we know that basically, we say that this is a story of democratic resilience. So what we do is you work with focus groups. That's how somehow you can, they can amplify a different vision. They can amplify a different narrative. In this case, what we did was we worked with the whole public servant from the executive branches, basically 300 people from 60 institutions. So I think that sometimes you see the challenges inside when you are having this kind of transition. So the way we did, I think that it worked well, was basically targeting certain groups and just trying to toward the narrative or to recreate the narrative of the importance of the transition, the importance of the governance, the importance of the balance of power, and so on and so forth, rather than just going with the entire public. So I think that this example is interesting because in the end, I think that the transition within the government was pretty mild, although resistance always exists, it remains. But I would say that from this experience, we can say that it was pretty good in terms of mainstreaming a narrative of change in terms of political perspective.

**Carlotta Alfonsi:** That's really interesting. And obviously, it's a very complex thing to achieve. So it's a great example to see in practice. Tim, I think we have maybe one more minute. If you have anything else you want to add.

**Tim Dixon:** Yeah, just on that. I mean, this is, it's really challenging work, narrative change. But I think one aspect is going back to what I was talking about with people's starting points, understanding what's the source of someone's anxiety, the reason why they might be buying into an anxious narrative about threat, criminal migrants, the threat of green policies, and so forth. And what's the way to answer that? There's one story, criminal migrants, people crossing borders, lots of images around that part of what you're always dealing with. Communication is not also only words and concepts, it's also images. They're very important on migration. So the counter image is what I was mentioning about refugee sponsorship, families integrating into communities, into local communities. The kids are joining the football team. The parents are at work. There's people who are driving them to different, like, there's just like they're mixing as people. It's a rich, whole world of imagery. That is the counter to this idea of the young male threatening outsider. On green policies, we found that asking, getting parents, particularly parents or grandparents, to think about what are the jobs our kids are going to do in the future. So there might be anxiety right now

about some jobs here. But you know what we find is, there's a lot of agreement. Jobs our kids are going to be doing in the future are these sorts of these new industries. And so by shifting the frame to the future, you can depolarize the issue. So I think it's just, I mean, as Carlos says, it's focus groups, it's doing evidence-based work, it's bringing some creativity into that. And what you find is you can, if you're starting with people's value framework, you can find ways that can thread the needle differently.

**Carlotta Alfonsi:** Thank you, Tim. I'm afraid we have to conclude here, but this has been a really excellent conversation. There's a lot to follow up on. Let me recap a couple of things that I took away from this discussion. First, I think there's definitely an opportunity to build on the constructive communication and deliberation methods that have shown really great promise at the micro level and just scale them up. And we've got some good examples of how that could happen effectively. I also noted that it's really important for communication to be grounded in listening and to really understand the motivations and the real preferences that people have beneath what often sounds like intractable positions from the get-go. There's definitely a challenge with adapting what institutions say to different groups of people who respond differently to the same messages, so diversifying communication. So it's a very strong concept on paper, but carrying that out and making sure it's inclusive, it's targeted, and it sends the right message to everyone in practice. I can see how that is technically difficult. So really professionalizing communication is one thing that through our work at OECD we advocate for, we push for. And there's no alternative to doing this with strong evidence, rigorous methods, and good professional skills. So we'll be working on this issue at OECD. We hope to keep collaborating with UNDP in this domain. And with any one of you who's following online, definitely get in touch and let us know about your experiences and how you can get involved. Our colleagues in UNDP will also soon share all the resources linked to this event as they mentioned. And you'll be able to follow up and dig deeper into the content that was presented very briefly today. I will just ask before you sign off that you please take a very quick poll on evaluating the event. And with that, I want to thank you all very much, and thank the excellent team at UNDP that has organized this event and the whole series. Thanks all.

**Ezgi Ozturk:** Thanks, Carlotta.