Calling DIBS

Episode 105: "Good Data Informs Good Policy"

with Kieran Findlater, Lead for Behavioural and Data Science
at the Impact and Innovation Unit

Kieran Findlater shares how his cross-disciplinary background prepared him to work at the Canadian federal government's Impact and Innovation Unit (IIU). Kieran explains the IIU's approach to projects and how it has evolved. He also provides an overview of the recently completed Program of Applied Research on Climate Action or PARCA, which promoted climate action through a combination of longitudinal surveys, online experiments, and in-field testing.

Transcript:

KIRSTEN APPELT, HOST: Welcome to this edition of Calling DIBS. I'm your host, Kirstin Appelt, research director with UBC Decision Insights for Business and Society, or DIBS for short.

Today we're Calling DIBS on Kieran Findlater. Kieran is lead for behavioral data science at the Impact and Innovation Unit within the Privy Council Office, which he'll explain those words to us in a bit. As we'll hear, Impact Canada Initiative has had a really fascinating portfolio of work, which Kieran gets to oversee. And he comes to the work after a PhD at UBC's Institute for Resources and Environment and Sustainability, which is also a journey I'm keen to hear about.

So basically, I've been looking forward to each part of this conversation and let's just jump right in. So welcome to the podcast, Kieran.

KIERAN FINDLATER, GUEST: Thank you. Thanks for having me.

APPELT: We'll start with a softball question. Can you just tell us a little bit about yourself?

FINDLATER: Sure. As you said, I'm lead for behavioral and data science at the impact and innovation unit within the Privy Council office. The Privy Council office is at the center of the government of Canada, acts a bit like the prime minister's department, supports the prime minister and cabinet in the way that other departments support their ministers. And so, provides a bit of a central function, especially on policy, on policy that goes to cabinet. Especially as memorandum to a cabinet. And so has a central perspective and works with line departments to advance policy proposals.

The Impact and Innovation Unit in particular is a funny little corner of the Privy Council Office and plays a different role than most of PCO as we call it, conducting a variety of different work related to centralized functions on outcomes-based financing, good data, sludge audits and a fellowship program that's meant to bring in specialized technical skills to government. As lead for behavioral and data science, I oversee and

manage a variety of work, mainly by behavioral science fellows who have been hired on for one- or two-year terms in partnership with departments across the government of Canada, including Natural Resources Canada, Canada Water Agency, Statistics Canada, and others.

Most of my portfolio at the moment relates to climate, environment, energy, and adaptation, but I also work on methodological innovation and the portfolios of each of the leads within our unit shift over time. So, I had been overseeing a much bigger team, including those working with Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada on a variety of health-related topics.

APPELT: Well, it sounds like you've ended up somewhere where you get to do really interesting and impactful work. I'm a bit of a broken record in this part, but I always think that people have interesting journeys to the work as well. And I'm curious, so you were doing a PhD at IRES Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability. Now you're affiliated with the Privy Council Office. So, what was that journey like? How did you get to be working in this space?

FINDLATER: That's a good question. I have to ask myself that every day. It's been a long journey. I finished my bachelor's degree in 2005 at the University of Alberta. And even then, I wasn't too sure about what I wanted to do and how I wanted to have an impact in the world. And so, I went off to do an internship in South Africa with what was then the Canadian International Development Agency, providing opportunities for young graduates to get international experience. That was work on transboundary water governance, the social science, whereas my previous education had been in the natural sciences and atmospheric science and physical geography.

And so, it really opened my eyes to the kinds of social and political dynamics that influence how humans interact with the world around them and how they work together or not to solve problems. And so, my entrance into a master's program was really focused on trying to understand that intersection between humans and their environment. I worked on energy policy, particularly biofuels development and how biofuels development has implications for food crop growth and the production of food, especially in developing countries where poor and rural communities might use land that appears to be underutilized by the government and could be converted to biofuel production.

But those conversions have real implications for the livelihoods of the people working and living in those areas. That was the start of a journey towards a career in social science and behavioral science, where in my PhD, I attempted to do some work in India, understanding how electricity grid extension influenced socioeconomic outcomes. But for a variety of reasons, including political reasons, I was unable to continue with the work, ended up in South Africa, trying to understand how farmers might implement renewable energy on their farms to both meet environmental and economic goals.

And realized through a kind pathfinding process with 50 different interviews across the country, that that wasn't really a relevant question to farmers at that time. It has become a relevant question now, but that was 10, 12 years ago. And the relevant question at that time was how do we manage the impacts of climate change? We aren't in a position to think about climate change mitigation. We're really just trying to manage climate variability and how it intersects with all of these different risks that we face as businesses, as families, as family-owned farms, and how those intersect with economic and social risks in a country that is quite dynamic and faces lots of societal level challenges.

So that brought me to a place where I needed to understand how these farmers were thinking about and responding to a wide variety of intersecting and conflicting risks, which brought me to behavioral science. And so, though I don't have a background formally in academia, in psychology, I ended up doing a lot of work in social and cognitive psychology to understand these processes and apply theory and methods from those disciplines to this problem that I was trying to address.

And that's what IRES, as you called it, Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability is really all about. It's a problem-based research unit. I worked quite closely with partners at the University of Cape Town and other institutions in South Africa to make sure that the work that I was doing was relevant to the questions that they needed to ask and working with local government there to make sure that they were relevant to policy and the outcomes could be applied to important policy questions that would be to the benefit both of farmers, but also to communities and to the country as a whole.

Once I was done there, a long and winding PhD, I continued on into a couple of different post-docs at the intersection of natural resources, climate change adaptation, and decision-making. That was both at the community level and at the societal level, working especially in forestry in BC and on the development of climate services, which are climate information products that are intended to be tailored to decisions by being demand-driven, but often fail to incorporate social science into their development. And so are often driven by a need to improve the quality of the data rather than the quality of the decisions that are made. That brought me to the Impact and Innovation Unit where I was brought on at the start of a new program of research on climate change to be the person at the intersection of climate change and behavioral science.

APPELT: It's definitely a long winding journey, but it strikes me of really learning the right things at the right time and then coming in really prepared because in contrast to my PhD journey, which is very much focused on a traditional academic path and learning those skills, you were pulling in all these other skills like understanding all the relationships and partner management and answering the question that they have, not necessarily your question. So, it sounds like a really rich and rewarding experience that really prepared you for the work you're doing now. So even though it was winding, it seems like it was really worthwhile and fascinating.

FINDLATER: I'd like to think so. Certainly, it's given me a fairly broad toolkit, which has allowed me to respond to changes in the work that we do within government and to the wide variety of needs of partners, and especially in marrying topical expertise on climate change, energy, natural resources with the technical expertise in quantitative research and in psychology and behavioral science.

APPELT: It feels like you got to a lot of the lessons that behavioral science has been having in the last couple of years. You got there early, which is nice to see that other folks were getting there before some of the rest of us, because I think that's a lot of where we're seeing today is there's a lot of room for improvement in the behavioral sciences coming in often without that humility and kind of leading with our plans rather than the community plans.

You're mentioning it fitting well into the role in government and being able to bring those different types of expertise together. And before you helped us understand what the privy council office is, I was also hoping you could help us understand some of the other terminology. So, we have the Impacted Innovation Unit as

part of the Privy Council Office. And is Impact Canada then an initiative coming out of the unit, or how would you describe Impact Canada?

FINDLATER: It's a good question and one that comes up for all new hires. Where do we work? Is it Impact Canada, or is it the IIU, is it PCO? What are all these acronyms? You get really drowned in acronyms when you join government the first time. Impact Canada is an initiative which is housed within the Impact and Innovation Unit. So, Impact Canada is really what we do. The Impact and Innovation Unit is who we are, the people who are employed here. And the Impact and Innovation Unit is part of the structure of the Privy Council Office.

Impact Canada was launched in 2017 as a way of addressing the needs of government in a more flexible and responsive manner than had been done previously. It's really evolved to be a purpose-built organization and continues to evolve to respond to the needs of the day of government to do things differently, to do things in a more cross-cutting and collaborative manner than is sometimes the outcome of the structure of government in which line departments each have their mandate areas and sometimes aren't incentivized to work together or don't have time.

Everybody is working full out. So, they're really focused on what they need to do today, this week, this month. And there isn't much room at all for that broader, slower thinking that needs to happen to improve processes, to improve the way the government is oriented towards the problems that Canada faces as well as the collaboration that would be needed to do things as effectively as possible.

APPELT: That's really interesting. And it brings me to my next question, which is, you've talked about how there is the different lines and kind of working with all of them. And so, I'm curious because from what I've seen is as many behavioral science units as there are out there, there's also almost that many ways of working in the space. So, what is the model that you use? Is it more of a consulting model? Is it more of a client service internal model? Is it long-term partnerships? How do you all work?

FINDLATER: That's also a good question. That's evolved over time from these isolated individual projects with specific teams to a more integrated team-based approach to the work, creating outsized value economies of scale across a portfolio of work rather than collecting data for one purpose only and providing that to one team.

So where we started with a client focused model, I think we've moved towards leveraging our central perspective within the Privy Council Office, which has a bit of an eagle-eyed view of the needs of government, especially on as cross-cutting an issue as climate change to understand the individual mandates of our partner departments, but seat that within the broader needs of the government of Canada and the long-term view that the immediate activities of the government aren't necessarily everything that we need to understand to solve the problem in the long-term.

If you're thinking about net zero by 2050, for instance, and get ahead of some of those evidentiary problems that will need to be solved to have that evidence on hand to answer questions as they come up and to be able to respond in a timely manner to the needs of senior decision makers, as well as the needs of individual teams on specific projects.

APPELT: Well, let's dive into talking about one of these projects, the Program of Applied Research on Climate Action. And we've talked about how government has maybe too many acronyms, but PARCA is a pretty great acronym. So, I'm happy to have that one in our arsenal. So, do you want to give us some introduction to what PARCA was?

FINDLATER: Sure. And there's a bit of history here. So, I think it's important to understand that the pandemic changed a lot about how government works. It unlocked a lot of flexibility and working arrangements. Obviously, folks were forced to work at home to start with, and we've continued to work in a hybrid manner now. That has unlocked a lot of collaboration that probably wasn't happening before that is now able to happen because people are able to participate fully in conversations that they might otherwise have been shut out of if they weren't working within the national capital region. And the Impact and Innovation Unit in particular was already working in a hybrid manner.

Many of our behavioral science fellows do not live in the national capital region. They're spread out across the country. And that was intentional, understanding that this is quite specialized expertise and that we needed to attract the top talent for the right amount of time to solve the right problems. And so, the IIU was really well-placed to respond to the pandemic, to throw ourselves fully into the problem of understanding how people were reacting to it, how public health agencies and the Public Health Agency of Canada in particular could best respond to the needs of Canadians and support Canadians in managing risks for themselves, their families, their communities, and for the country as a whole.

And so as soon as the pandemic hit, the IIU reoriented towards pandemic response to understanding how we could pave the way for vaccine uptake, how we could encourage people to use personal protective equipment and other risk mitigating behaviors. So, we pulled our fellows out of a number of other projects and really immersed ourselves in that challenge. The success that we had in doing that, in supporting senior decision makers and supporting the pandemic response, really shone a light on the value of behavioral science, think, and on the value of behavioral science for addressing the most important, most pressing problems of government, generating evidence for things, for decisions where there is a risk that personal experience or politics or partisanship might outweigh the science and the evidence, and really depoliticizing some of the questions that might otherwise be quite fraught. Might otherwise generate quite a bit of discussion or lengthy conversation.

That success led to us being asked whether there were other challenging issues that we could work on. And climate change was identified as the biggest cross-cutting challenge for government at that time. And so we were invited to build a partnership with two of the most implicated departments on climate change, Natural Resources Canada, and Environment and Climate Change Canada, to launch a new program of work that could address in a cross cutting manner, the evidentiary needs of government on perceptions, attitudes and actions related to climate change to best support policymaking and programming and communication, and to provide a shared evidence base for coordinated action by those departments and by others, not formally partners, but we disseminated our results to as many different audiences as we could across governments since climate change is such a cross-cutting issue with many different implicated departments.

APPELT: It's a really interesting backstory. And I really love hearing how it moved from just individual projects to more of team-based and really leveraging the diversity of skills and being able to focus on a project more intensively. And that seems consonant to me with the idea that behavioral science, when it was first being

adopted, tended to be more of a focus on kind of the quick wins, the cheap nudges. And so now there's this shift to having more upstream work and work that works on all different parts of a problem from different angles is that's something that you're seeing through the work of Impact Canada as well?

FINDLATER: I think so. Know, behavioral science has been changing, I think, in academia and industry and in government. And certainly, our activities reflect that change from an initial focus maybe 15 years ago on nudges, especially on easy, low-cost changes that might appear intuitive in retrospect, but really have outsized cost efficiency and their impact on people's behaviors and uptake of retirement investments, willingness to donate organs, that kind of thing. And that was probably what the unit was most focused on when the Impact Canada Initiative was launched.

But over time, we've really shifted towards a broader understanding of behavioral science and an understanding that the government needs other forms of evidence for how people think about the world and how they respond to or are affected by government action. There's a more basic need for understanding Canadians than I think we initially anticipated. And so that looks more like social science rather than behavioral science. It includes broader surveys that provide baseline understanding of where people are and what they are doing and how they're thinking about the world and not just the design and implementation of interventions that might nudge them into new behaviors.

APPELT: Well, that seems like a really good segue into talking more about the work of PARCA because you had the different arms of work. And I know part of it was scoping and longitudinal data collection. So, can you tell us a little bit about what the purpose was for that and what you actually did?

FINDLATER: Yeah, thanks. PARCA had four initial objectives, and I've talked a little bit about this. The first was generating high quality original evidence in a way that government often lacks. Rigorous research is sometimes viewed as taking too long, taking too much money. And so we were really devoted to improving the evidence base for climate change policy, then helping to mainstream social and behavioral science and government, helping to increase the capacity, especially to use evidence, to use rigorous evidence in policymaking, but also to conduct primary research and design studies that might be fielded through public opinion research mechanism or through a third party contractor, but to apply the evidence from that in supporting evidence-based decision-making across multiple domains. And then finally facilitating more effective implementation of the government's climate and environment mandate.

So, we did that through three streams of research. Stream one was ongoing national surveying, and that launched in December of 2021 at a regular cadence. It started every two months. Establishing baseline data for things that the government didn't have a clear understanding of, where there wasn't necessarily evidence specific to Canada. At the time, the US, the UK, and Europe had a lot of evidence. A lot of papers had been written about how people in those jurisdictions thought about and responded to the issue of climate change. But the evidence in Canada was a bit spotty. Mostly coming out of universities and without as much coordination and synthesis.

And so, we really wanted to develop that baseline understanding for the Canadian context, which is different than those other places, not just culturally, but also in terms of governance, in terms of the history of policies, in terms of our history, the relationship of indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, for instance. So, we wanted to understand that for government and generate the baseline data, but then understand changes over

time, track changes over time and respond to emerging needs. It was really a unique moment in late 2021. I think COP26 in Scotland had just occurred. There were atmospheric rivers in BC, which nobody had heard of before that, lots of flooding, landslides. Wildfires, storms. So, climate change was really salient.

It was a really important moment, but was a bit of a difficult moment to start this kind of work because we saw that attention being paid to climate change in the years since has declined. Other things have taken priority, even though we have seen dramatic and drastic impacts of climate change in wildfires especially, but also in and other forms of extreme weather in Canada. So that's Stream 1, establishing baseline data and tracking changes over time.

Stream 2 was in-depth studies geared towards the specific needs of partner teams and partner departments, usually led by an embedded behavioral science fellow who attended all of the meetings of those teams really immersed themselves in the day-to-day rhythms of the teams and understood their needs for evidence and could interpret what they were doing through a behavioral science lens. So those two studies focused on a wide variety of climate and environment related issues, but we had a number of foci, for instance, on the adoption of electric heat pumps for home heating.

On the adoption of zero emission vehicles by prospective car buyers, on the conservation of sensitive lands, on climate literacy, on misinformation, and a variety of other topics, but all coordinated with the kinds of questions that we were asking this ongoing national surveying. Those stream two studies were largely focused on the development of literature-based literature reviews, followed by primary data collection in the form of online survey experiments, which provided a bit of baseline data, but mostly tested interventions that might shift the way that people think about the issue or might provide a mechanism, an entry point for departments in communicating about the issue.

Stream three is real world testing, in field testing, in partnership with external organizations. The government has specific jurisdictional areas in which it works, for instance, and doesn't always have direct access to policy levers that could improve uptake of heat pumps, for instance, apart from providing a monetary incentive, which was done in the form of the Greener Homes Grant. But of course, there are many other players in the space, many other actors who could influence the uptake of heat pumps. And so, for instance, we worked with Toronto Hydro to implement a large-scale field trial testing different messaging interventions through email campaigns to understand what resonated most with their customers and what shifted the dial on heat pump uptake at a low cost.

So, this was more of a classic nudge. What is salient? How can you start people thinking about heat pumps early so that by the time they need to replace their home heating system, often under duress, often in the middle of winter on cold night, how can you prepare people to replace their heating system with something new and unfamiliar? Get them thinking about it early, provide them with the step-by-step guide, and really accelerate the planning that's needed for such a drastic change or for something that seems so drastic and so meaningful in that moment in the cold.

It's been quite a journey, I think working with partners external to government is challenging, especially when you're coordinating across departments within government, meeting the needs of all partners and developing the legal framework for that and working through their institutional processes takes time. It takes a lot of

learning and relationship building on both sides. But I think that the outcome has been quite impactful. We have a fellow who is who's just presented at the Retrofit Canada Conference in Toronto in June.

Some of the outcomes of that work where we found that there was significant boost in uptake in certain groups, especially when describing the functions of a heat pump. Who knew that heat pumps could cool your home? A lot of people don't. Just telling them that, just hooking them in with that little nugget of information and then providing them with the step-by-step information they need to think through the following processes prepares them well for that moment of decision. And so that single presentation at the One Conference has generated a number of different conversations where we are being asked to come in and talk to folks across the country about how we can shift the dial on heat pumps.

APPELT: That's really exciting. You mentioned the difficulties of collaboration and learning each other's processes. The paperwork alone is nothing to sniff at in these relationships. I'm curious because you mentioned in the longitudinal surveys a bit about how you kind of started when it awareness was at a high watermark and then it I guess which is in ways a pun of sorts and then kind of tailed and then you mentioned a little bit of the results on the heat pump project in the infield work and I don't know that you gave us a little snippet of a result on something you found in the rapid online work so is there any particular results you could share there?

FINDLATER: Well as I said we work in a variety of ways. One of the most important impactful things that we've done actually wasn't an online survey at all. It was just a series of interviews with proponents who were applying to a major granting program. The Low Carbon Economy Fund was a program to support large organizations especially, but a variety of sizes in implementing low carbon solutions to industrial or energy processes.

And one of the things that the program had experienced over the years was that some of the successful applicants dropped out of the program upon receiving notice of their success. And they wanted to understand why this was happening. And so, one of our behavioral science fellows did a number of interviews with applicants to understand both why the successful applicants sometimes dropped out, but also why other applicants stayed in. This ended up being a bit of a precursor to our sludge work because it was really process oriented. But the outcome was a finding that operational transparency was lacking in the program. Applicants didn't understand what was happening with their application in the months or years between when they submitted it and when they received notification of the result.

Government has this habit of sometimes working really hard in the background, but not communicating much with the folks that are impacted. And that was certainly the case with the low carbon economy fund at the time, where the government would go six or eight or 12 months without providing any information or any updates to applicants on the status of their application and business cycles operate on a much shorter timeline. So, these companies, especially that had applied and then not heard back, moved on and weren't prepared for success when success came.
And so, they hadn't invested in the necessary preparations. They hadn't invested in the logistical elements that would allow them to act on. That grant upon its receipt. So, one of my colleagues likes to say that money doesn't come for free, that there are important things that need to happen within organizations that receive grants and the government needs to understand what those are, needs to understand what the business

process is, what the organizational behavior is to enable those folks to make best use of resources when they are provided.

And so, the program changed the way it operated. It invested in providing more information and resources upfront about what the process would be, anticipating various update points, providing more information about where things were in process, providing more information about the previously successful applicants so that organizations could compare themselves to those applicants and have some sense of whether they would be successful in the end. And so could then better risk manage the process from their end and invest in that resource to be prepared when they finally received word, whether or not it was successful.

So that's just a small example, but it was a study that had outsized impact based on the small amount of data that we collected, just because there was just a lack of understanding between the parties and a lack of understanding by the folks that were managing the program that applicants were experiencing the process this way. Not because they weren't well-meaning, not because they weren't working really, really hard on this, but just because, as I said before, nobody had the time and space to slow down and think about this issue.

As I said, that's a precursor to some of the sludge audit work that we're doing now where we're applying a process that was initially conceived by a team in New South Wales in Australia and then propagated by the OECD at the international level. And we're applying a made in Canada version of this. Across government through different partnerships to really identify points of friction, unnecessary friction, unnecessary administrative burden that either Canadians on the one hand are experiencing in interacting with government in seeking services or in communicating with government for instance, or that public servants within the government are experiencing.

And unnecessary frictions and administrative burden creep up for various reasons, often good reasons at the moment, but then they become obsolete over time. Asking for a variety of information at different points and through different forms, for instance, and sludge audits are a structured and evidence-based approach to identifying those and streamlining processes, improving the experience of Canadians and public servants, and increasing the speed with which with which government can effectively respond to important problems.

APPELT: That's really neat. And I think the example from the interviews is so fascinating because that's one of the ones that on the face of it, people, like an economist would be like, people are turning down free money, but then when you dig in, it makes sense. And as someone who applies for grants and often feels like you're waiting around and you can't really make. Forward motion until you know if you've got it, but then when you get it, you're underprepared.

So that resonates a lot and I can totally see how that was a segue into the sludge work, which is really fascinating in the way it's being rolled out around the world. So that sounds like one thing that's grown out of the PARCA work in a new direction. As PARCA is now wrapped up, do you have any other reflections about the results, the methodology, or anything else about PARCA?

FINDLATER: I think one of the biggest learnings over the course of the program was the fact that having a bunch of smart people thinking about a problem and embed it in a variety of areas that don't normally talk to each other has outsized impact. It really allowed for us to have conversations across government that weren't otherwise happening and to provide a rigorous evidence base for those conversations. Direction comes top

down through the ministries, but there are a number of tables that attempt to provide a coordinating function without evidence to talk about though.

Those conversations often rely on some amount of anecdotal and personal experience. And so PARCA unlocked conversations that weren't otherwise happening, I think, and provided more value as a whole than the sum of its parts in conducting rigorous social science work in a variety of areas and then bringing folks together to talk about the common challenges and the potential solutions and then testing those solutions using experimental methods. And so, a program like PARCA where we were generating a lot of new evidence in response to specific problems, but also with a longer-term view, allowed us to anticipate the kinds of questions that the government would need to answer in implementing the next step or the step after that and anticipating the individual household level community and societal challenges that would come with those next steps.

APPELT: That strikes me as really valuable, like you said. Having the evidence, then also, like you said, bringing the folks together to have the conversations that otherwise wouldn't happen and bringing in the different methodologies, the different viewpoints, the different lines of sight together is something that I find really powerful in the work because so often people are just heads down on their, like you said, the task of the week. And so, giving that space to do this longer sighted work is really exciting. And I know we're running out of time, so I'll ask my traditional last questions. So, we always ask our guests if they have a message for folks who are newer to the field, so folks who are BI practitioners in training or new entrants.

FINDLATER: Well, if I learned one thing over my winding journey to behavioral science, it's that nobody has all the answers. And as much as the big names in your field might have something to say and have made names for themselves by saying important things, they're not always right and there's always something new to say. And that's true in academia, it's also true in government.

The way things have been done isn't always how they should be done or how they can best be done. There have been constraints along the way and maybe those have changed. And so don't be shy to rethink things. Don't be shy to have new ideas and to advance them with a passion to make a case for yourself and for your ideas. I think there's a lot of, especially in behavioral science, there are still a lot of unknowns and human behavior, human thinking is so context dependent. The context is always changing. Something that was true 10 or 20 years ago isn't necessarily true anymore.

And so, we always need to be thinking critically about the world around us and questioning our assumptions about how people are thinking and reacting and behaving and why. Most people have good intentions in the world. I'm an optimist that way, even though I'm broadly a pessimist. Most people have good intentions in the world and understanding why they make the decisions they do and why they think about the world the way they do is really important to achieving societal consensus on the most challenging problems we have.

We're in a difficult moment now, but it's not fate. We have tools available to us. We have compassion and empathy and only on the basis of compassion and empathy can we truly make headway on the most difficult questions we face because they are really values based questions and we have to understand each other's values and understand how they intersect to come to consensus on the solutions.

APPELT: Well, I can't imagine a better note to end on that. So, I'll pause it right there and just thank you so much for your time. And I've been a long-time fan of Impact Canada and the amazing work that's being done there. So, it's really exciting to see, know, living up to its name, having an impact on Canada on so many important topics. And I'm sure we'll be inviting you back in a few years to hear about the next tranche of work you're all doing. So, thank you for leading the important work, doing the important work and taking the time to share it with us today.

FINDLATER: Thanks. It's been great to talk to you today.

APPELT: And thanks to our listeners for joining another episode of Calling DIBS.

Calling DIBS is recorded and edited on the traditional, ancestral, and unceded territory of the xwməθkwəy̓əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and Səl̓ílwətaʔ/Selilwitulh (Tsleil-Waututh). *Calling DIBS* is edited by Rishad Habib, Siobhan Cook, Isabella Jaramillo, Parnian Ashrafi, Kashish Khatri, Ethan Lee, Olin Becker, and Kirstin Appelt. Intro and outro music are excerpts from “resonance” by airtone (2020; http://ccmixter.org/files/airtone/61321), licensed under Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial (3.0).