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MR. THAMKITTIKASEM: All right, everyone.
Thank you all very much for all your patience.
Sorry about that. We just wanted to make sure
we got the AV and everything, because
(indiscernible) for several people in the room.
One just -- if anyone needs any translation
services there, please (indiscernible) right up
front at the desk; we can get that to you.
Lavatories are out at the end of the hallway to
the right just so people know.

And with that, I will kick off and thank
you all for being patient and being here.
Welcome to the ADS task force's second public
engagement forum. My name is Jeff
Thamkittikasem. I'm the director for the
mayor's office of operations and one of the
chairs of the automated decision task force.

On behalf of all the members here, thank
you for taking the time to join us. Obviously,
this is a very important part of our process to
have you here engaging with us and sharing your
recommendations particularly those on our
expert panel. It's not easy work, but it's
important work.
New York City is the first municipality in the nation to dedicate this level of time and attention to a complicated function of or government. We are really appreciative of all the people engaging in that. We got an ambitious task ahead of us. And we need you to be a part of that conversation.

So before we talk too much more about tonight's forum and the speakers, I want to quickly acknowledge my co chairs. Brittny Saunders, deputy commissioner of strategic initiatives at the city commission on human rights. And Kelly Jin, the chief analytics officer and the director of the mayor's office of data analytics. I'd like to take a little moment to give the task force members to quickly give us their names and titles. We'll go down the row.

MS. STOYANOVICH: Julia Stoyanovich assistant professor of computer science and of data science at NYU.

MR. HAFETZ: Hi. Dan Hafetz, special counsel, DSS, first deputy commissioner, New York City Department of Social Services
overseeing the (Inaudible. Not speaking into microphone.)

MR. SOUTHERLAND: Hi. I'm Vincent Southerland, executive director of Center on Race, Equality, and the Law and the NYC School of Law.

MS. WHITTAKER: Meredith Whittaker, co-founder AI Now Institute at NYU. And founder of Google's Open Research Group.

MS. MEISENHOLDER: Tanya Meisenholder, assistant commissioner for Strategic Initiatives Statistic, New York City Police Department.

MR. WHITE: Hi. Andrew White, deputy commissioner for policy and planning NYC Administration for Children's Services.

MS. SAMUELS: Hi. Julie Samuels, executive director of Tech NYC.

MS. RODGERS: Hi. I'm Jennifer Rodgers. I'm a lecturer at Columbia Law School.

(Inaudible.)

MR. THAMKITTIKASEM: Thanks everyone for being here, and all these folks have dedicated their own time on top of their full-time jobs
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to participate in this task force. So we appreciate all the dedication and thought they've put into this work.

By now, many of you are probably familiar with the task force, as been mandate -- but I'll give a quick summary. The task force is charged with developing a set of recommendations for how automated decision systems should be used within New York City government. These will include processes for assessing bias or harm, providing information about systems to members of the public, and archiving elements of the systems among others. You can find a full list of our mandate on the task force website as well as bios for each of the task force members.

At our last public forum, we heard from panel experts who gave commentary to inform our recommendations. And we also heard from members of the public. Since that last forum, the task force has achieved a couple of key milestones in our process. One, we held our first deliberation session on the recommendations received at the last session.
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It was a great opportunity for us to all start to talk about the ideas that we shared. And we also had hosted presentations from two city agencies on automated tools and systems currently in use. They gave clear sense of how agencies are developing, using, communicating, and building their own capacity around these tools.

Now, we -- now, we have more guidance around privacy and security protocols for sharing these systems. We look forward to more agency presentations. Helpful in generally informing our broader recommendations. I talked about this before but the task force has devoted substantial time to clarify what an ADS really is. Especially considering the nature of the field and the diversity of use that come into play when talking about it. We made substantial progress and while there are certainly still alternative viewpoints, we're determining the best ways to document what we have agreed to and what are our views. We're making progress also in trying to put more documentation on the website.
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We recently drafted up a clarification of terms checklist, a guidance document that clarifies some of the terms that we are using in our -- that are used in the local law's definition of ADS. It's on our website now. And that was produced with the review from the entire task force.

And with that, I want to kind of move us forward just to kind of speed up and get to our time, but today's progress -- sorry. Today's program and the work ahead. So we're excited to have our second opportunity to hear from additional panelists and members of the public.

So thank you all for being here. We really appreciate every one trekking out in the rain to be here. As with the last forum, we'll kick off this evening with some prepared commentary for our panel of experts.

After each panelist speaks, we'll open up questions from the task force. And then once we wrapped up the expert commentary, we will have public suggestions from those of you in the audience who want to contribute. If you haven't already, please we ask and if you can
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sign up to speak using the form outside, it will be better for us to better prioritize who in order we should get to.

I want to emphasize and we really want to hear -- that we really want to hear from all of you here. We want to hear what you think we should be considering as we develop our recommendations, and we don't want this conversation to stop. I think as many people heard in the first forum and will repeat here, these are our first two. We will try to set up other community engagement meetings throughout the summer. As we're here, these are our first foray into this. So it's kind of a broad audience and several experts speak we'll try to identify some topics to talk to you about.

Some questions that you may want -- you may want to consider as you think about this -- oh, okay. Sorry. Slowing down.

Some questions that you may want to consider as you think about this: Are there areas that you think the city should or could deliver services by using technology. Which? Why? And then of those areas, are there those
that you would be concerned about the city using these types of technologies, the whiches and the whys. What kind of information would you want to know about the system that makes decision that might affect you or your community. Who or what organizations would you trust to be involved in deciding whether these systems get used and what information about them is made public. Why? Those are a couple of questions that come up in some conversations.

So with all that being said, I'm going to hand things over to Kelly to kick off our panelists. Thank you again for all being here. We really appreciate it.

MS. JIN: Great. Thanks Jeff.

And I just want to note Michael from the Department of Transportation, another task force member has just joined us as well this evening.

So really to echo Jeff's points and I will also accelerate my opening here, I'm really, really excited that you all are here this evening. And for those who experienced the run
of show at the April 30th, tonight will be very, very similar to our first forum. There's a few things that I'll note. So we'll have one panel this evening with three various esteemed panelists. I'm going to just given the interest of time let, them all introduce themselves and the organizations that they represent. We're actually going to start with all of you giving your recommendations and comments.

And then we'll turn it over to Q and As from the task force members. I think that a few additional points is that after we conclude the panel, we will then turn it over to public comments. And this portion of the evening that Brittny will help us facilitate.

So without further ado, I will actually briefly give the names and titles and organizations of our esteemed panelists. And then I will actually turn it over to them.

So we have Chancey Fleet who is a fellow from Data & Society and assistant technology coordinator. Andrew Heiskell Braille and Talking Book Library at New York Public
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library.

And we have Aaron Pallas, professor of sociology and education at Teachers College at Columbia University.

And Dr. Rumman Chowdhury, senior principal global lead of ethical artificial intelligence from Accenture.

So thank you all for making the journey here to join us this evening. And without further ado, I will turn it over to Chancey first to provide recommendations.

MS. FLEET: Hi. My name is Chancey Fleet. I'm a library-based technologist and educator. I am a fellow at Data & Society Research Institute. And I am the vice president of the National Federation of the Blind of New York with the city chapter and the state.

But tonight, I speak not for my employers, or affiliations but for myself as someone dedicated to helping New Yorkers with disabilities understand and traverse the often rough, frequently unmapped terrain of emerging technologies and as someone who hopes to make that terrain safer for us to travel.
It's a challenge and a joy to address you tonight. Local Law 49 has been passed to bring long overdue scrutiny and policy craft to a problem posed by modern technology. It can be hard to agree on definitions. City agencies aren't always going out of their way to assist with the project. People who initially greeted the formation of this task force with pride and optimism, people who were glad to be called to serve are perhaps feeling weighed down by unresolved ambiguities and logistical sandbags.

I hope to be an emergently useful voice on issues where automated decision systems and disability intersect. Oh my God, a pop up.

I know that I am a career expert though in the genre of bureaucratic pain and personal divestment that can occur when people are given a mandate to improve conditions to align with values of fairness, accountability, and transparency without receiving commensurate authority and access to necessary information. Because we've been through this in the world of accessibility.

I have served on committees tasked with
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recommending accessibility standards for
third-party products without the benefit of an
RFP to examine products that were direct
introduction to the users who were allegedly
protecting.

I've been asked to give accessibility
advice without the expectation that I would
ever examine the system in question, let alone
question its creators. I've come perilously
close to leaving this work because it can be so
discouraging but I implore you to stay in the
trouble. Take solace in granular, persistent,
well-documented action.

In order to draft meaningful
recommendations and to move the city towards a
culture of transparent ADS, you have to firmly
and cohesively state your need for a full
accounting of ADS currently in use by city
agencies. This must include many things, the
structure and scope of current and historical
RFPs, how and whether explainability,
anti-bias, vendor measures and vendor liability
exist in procurement contracts. What systems
exactly are currently deployed? How and where
they acquire their data? How that data is
processed algorithmically? Whether and when
that data is processed, stored, and shared by
third-party vendors. Whether and how results
of ADS are presented as individual cases for
human review. Who does that reviewing?
Whether and how people affected by the results
of an automated decision are informed about
those factors proceeding. And how or whether
affected people can appeal automated decisions
in particular, or flag the system for review in
its entirety.

In communities of disability, ADS can have
unpredictable potentially devastating
consequences when we show up as outliers in
data sets, when bias against us is encoded, and
when ADS reinforce and routinize existing
inequities we face.

Consider facial and body tracking
technology for threat modeling and traffic
control. Some disabilities manifests in
movements that might seem erratic or unusual.
My blindness manifests in a gaze that
perpetually shifts and perennially evades eye
contact. If disabled bodies and gazes like mine aren't in data sets where erratic movement and gaze collaborate -- correlate with threat, we may be flagged as dangerous and handled accordingly.

Wheelchair users passing through intersections may register in some ADS as bicycles on account of the wheels. As automated vehicles enter the cityscape, being an outlier from pedestrians in an ADS model could kill you.

Around the country, blind parents sometimes lose custody of their kids because a social worker or nurse somewhere equates blindness with risk to a child.

People in our civil rights movement have fought protracted court battles and spent years with their families torn apart. We need to know that those realities won't be magnified and perpetuated in ADS. That none of the systems that touch our families such as child risk and safety assessments will ever encode disability as though it were a salient factor as a risk that merits separation from our loved
Although children with disabilities carry the full range of human potential, our youth are beset by disadvantages including uneven access to instructional resources and the persistence of architectural barriers to entry in many city schools. We need to know that the school assignment algorithm can balance every student's preferences with physically disabled students absolute need to attend an architecturally accessible school that's also an academic fit.

We also need to know that students who might thrive -- who might thrive in challenging academic programs but test poorly because of inaccessible or biased test design have a clear and effective way to appeal when an algorithm underestimates their abilities because of test scores.

The task force is perhaps not empowered to demand this level of transparency outright, but you are equipped to ask for it and to make a granular record of answers and silences. I hope that agencies will realize as they weigh
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the risks and benefits of cooperating that this
time of inquiry in response to Local Law 49's
public mandate constitutes a unique opportunity
to share information, identify problems, and
develop more accountable and equitable systems
going forward at a reduced reputational cost.

In the world of digital accessibility with
which I'm familiar, once legislation is passed
the arc of time does end -- does bend toward
justice. Those entities who transcend their
territorial instincts to work on the common
project and get investigation and improvement
become leaders who inform better practices
within their organizations and around the
world.

Those who chose to do only what's
absolutely required are cited in cautionary
case studies and often in case law. Executive
and agency resistance to the cultural movement
toward digital equity is not a sensible
long-term plan. And while documenting this
resistance day after day is surely dispiriting,
it's useful to our shared long -- our shared
long-term goal of making public servants
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accountable for how they employ and govern ADS. Communities of disability and other marginalized groups who are at high risk for collective harm by opaque bias and unaccountable ADS are your allies in this work to the extent that you activate us. Each member of the task force can reach out to colleagues and stakeholder groups and ask us to shake our respective grapevines and solicit written comment, presence and advisory groups and input as definitions and recommendations are fine tuned.

To best engage us, please, we need frequent updates on the task force's work and challenges with granular action items that clearly indicate how we can help and where the trouble spots are.

For those of us who are lifelong advocates that may be new to ADS, I really recommend that the task force -- and it sounds like some of this has very recently happened with the clarification of terms -- add to its online presence a page of plain language explanations of terms, a road map of completed and planned
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work, a schedule of upcoming opportunities for engagement, a readily discoverable way to submit comments, and a way for New Yorkers to ask questions. Many advocates don’t engage because they encounter material that makes this topic seem highly technical, academic, and welcoming of discussion by experts only. Plain language material and a way to ask questions will help strong community advocates develop the confidence they need to be helpful in your work and to know that their perspectives are worth hearing.

I also want to say something about approachable and equalizing public spaces. This is a beautiful venue. It’s architecturally barrier free, and it’s open to the public. Most of my library patrons would never come here. We need to pursue meeting in spaces that are equalizing that are perhaps not so grand that are not associated with any particular level of socioeconomic standing or academic achievement such as community centers and libraries.

Thank you so much for your service. I’m
in solidarity with all of you on the task
force, workers within the agencies, with
advocates and everyday New Yorkers. All of you
who choose to endure through this sometimes
frustrating but deeply necessary time of
transition and growth toward a city that makes
ADS accountable, understandable, fair, and safe
for all New Yorkers and all humans. Thank you.

MS. JIN: Thank you for those very
personal recommendations.

And I want to turn to Aaron who I believe
we are going to have slides potentially up
here, at some point. All right. Hang tight
for one moment.

MR. PALLAS: Slides because I'm naked
without a PowerPoint.

This is a big screen although my goal is
eventually to do a PowerPoint on a screen the
size of (indiscernible) field.

So thank you for the opportunity to
participate in this public forum. I'm going to
talk tonight about a very specific automated
decision system that's used in the evaluation
of public school teachers in New York City
known as Advance. It affects about 70,000 city employees. And so in this respect, my presentation I think will be very different from Chancey's but I hope informative perhaps in a different way. In -- in 2010, the state legislature passed a law creating a new state-wide system for evaluating teachers and integral to the law was breaking down a longstanding firewall that separated student's academic performance from teacher evaluation. The law has been revised a few times since 2010, but it basically calls for summarizing a teacher's performance annually as being in one of four categories, highly effective, effective, developing, or ineffective based on their ratings in two different domains. One, measures of student learning and the other measures of teacher practice. And there's a matrix that's used to look at these two different domains and determine the final overall rating for a teacher.

In New York City, a teacher who is rated ineffective or developing is placed on a teacher improvement plan. And a teacher who is
rated ineffective two consecutive years may be subject to an expedited hearing in which they are presumed incompetent and subject to dismissal regardless of their tenure status. Implementation of parts of the law call for local bargaining between school districts and teacher unions.

And New York City, the ratings for measures of student learning are derived from an automated algorithm that was developed jointly by the New York City Department of Education's office Talent Research and Data and a non-profit firm known as Education Analytics that specializes in developing what are called value added or growth models.

There's also a technical advisory committee that's jointly agreed upon by the local teacher's union and the department of education that -- that oversees the model. And I'm one of the members of that technical advisory committee.

In developing the model what's known as the New York City growth model, the DOE sought to adhere to a set of design principles. A
fair model, for example, would not provide advantages or disadvantages to teachers based on the kind of students they teach or the features of their schools and classrooms. The models intended to yield results that are reliable and valid in predicting teacher performance to involve the minimum of disruption of ordinary school processes to allow schools and teachers to have some discretion in the choice of outcome assessments and to assist teachers in making instructional decisions in the classroom.

And in the realm of transparency, the model is intended to be clear and understandable to teachers. The operation of the model in the algorithm is complicated, and I'll just sketch what's involved very, very briefly.

First step is a set of common business rules that are used to associate students with their teachers based on enrollment and attendance patterns. And essentially the model seems to estimate if a particular teacher's students learn more less or about the same as
they would have if the students had been taught by other teachers in New York City. Teachers whose students learn substantially more than similar students will be rated highly effective. Those whose students learn a bit more about the same or a bit less than similar students, will be rated effective. Those whose students learn somewhat less than similar students will be rated developing. And those whose students learn substantially less than similar students will be rated ineffective.

And to develop these estimates, each student associated with a teacher is summarized using a statistical tool and matched with 100 other students throughout the city in the same grade taking the same end-of-year assessments based on the students previous academic performance, demographic characteristics and school and classroom characteristics. These 101 students are then ranked on their score on the relevant end-of-year assessment. And the student's location is summarized by what's called the student growth percentile.

Basically, the percentile of a particular
student relative to the peer group. Indicating whether the student did better than of the students, about the same, or worse. A student growth percentile of 71 for example would indicate that a student did better than 71 percent of similar students in that student's peer group. So each teacher's student gets a student growth percentile for the appropriate end-of-year assessment and these are averaged to create a teacher's mean growth percentile where values greater than 50 indicate that on average the teacher's students are doing better than similar students on the end of year assessment. And values less than 50 signifying that teacher's student did worse than their peers. No two students are identical. And thus there is some imprecision and uncertainty in defining a group of students as being at the same academic starting point and with the same demographic characteristics as well as some imprecision in estimating a student's location relative to the peer group. The growth model adjusts for this imprecision and uncertainty. Essentially, pulling teachers towards the
middle of the distribution and the rating will affect it.

There are more than a hundred different end-of-year assessments that are available for use in the Advance system. And this is necessary -- necessary to accommodate teachers teaching different grades and different school subjects. And this slide shows just a subset of the different assessments that are used in the Advance growth model.

And what I've described has been done separately for each assessment. Each combination of grade and subject. Which means that there are more than a hundred different growth models that are estimated out of the system.

Now statistical models such as the one used in the Advance growth model are sometimes derided by critics as junk science. I don't think that's a fair characterization, but there can be little doubt that the interworkings of the model are difficult for non-specialists to understand.

So this slide shows just one of several
computations that are used as part of estimating the teacher's overall rating. I'm not going to comment on it. It's just sort of to convey the complexity. So one of the results of the model, the vast majority of teachers are in fact rated effective under the model with a small fraction who are rated highly effective and an even smaller fraction rated ineffective. And these percentages are pretty stable regardless of a teacher's grade level or the subjects that the teacher is teaching or the features of the teacher's school. These ratings feed into the matrix that I showed earlier in which a teacher's overall rating is based on these two components, the measures of student learning typically produced by this algorithm. And the measures of teacher practice in the form of classroom observations done by a teacher's supervisor and scored against a standardized rubric known as the Danielson Framework for Teaching. And that part is definitely not automated.

Is the growth model transparent? Yes and
no. Yes, in the sense that teachers get some of the information that goes into the production of their measure of student learning and reading including a roster of the students that are linked to them and these students' end-of-year assessment performance, previous academic performance, student growth percentiles, attendance, and enrollment status.

And yes, two in the sense that there is a technical report produced annually for the growth model that's published on the Department of Education's intranet, its internal website available to educators who work in the system. And that report does document how the growth percentiles are calculated and the department's efforts to ensure that the ratings are valid and fair.

However, as the gory equation I showed earlier documents, there's a lot about the derivation of the measures of student learning rating that really require specialized expertise to understand. Most teachers treat the algorithm as, at best, a black box, and, at worst, junk science.
Developed by the Department of education, the New York State Education Department which has a similar model, and the United Federation of Teachers have not been successful in communicating how the model works. I've interviewed along with a research team 145 teachers in the city, and it's clear that most teachers don't understand the model and feel they have no control over the results that it generates. Under these conditions, it's unlikely that the model will serve as a resource that will actually change teachers practices in the classroom. What I'm pointing to here is an interesting tension between fairness and transparency.

To be fair, algorithms such as the Advance Growth Model may need to be extremely complex with many moving parts neither accessible to nor understood by the individuals who are affected by them. Figuring out an appropriate balance between fairness and transparency is an ongoing challenge both for the Advance Growth Model and for Automated Decision Systems in general.
MS. JIN: Thank you, Aaron.
And I'll turn things over to Dr. Chowdhury.

MS. CHOWDHURY: Thank you.

The responsible AI team at Accenture has played an active role not only to advise on and implement systems of governance at private corporations but also to advise on and implement these systems for the public sector. Responsible AI team has branches in San Francisco, Atlanta, London, Brussels, and Singapore. Our input to this task force mirrors the recommendations we have provided to the Federal Trade Commission, the Singapore Personal Data Protection Commission, the U.K. House of Lords Committee on AI and other similar bodies.

Accenture is committed to New York City. We employ 5,000 individuals throughout the city including an active public services arm engaged currently in the development of AI systems. Our advisory services extend to our engagement with the New York City Economic Development Council on the new Responsible AI Center.
Before I begin with my thoughts on transparency for algorithms, I want to make a broader statement about standards and regulation: As the human impact of -- and implications of AI decisions increase; so does the need to explain. Moreover does the need to effectively evaluate recommendations to make sure they are both helpful and fair. In areas such as credit risk profiling and police investigations as well as medical diagnoses, the potential cost rises dramatically. If explainability is limited in these areas then the risk of making a wrong decision may outweigh the benefits it could bring in terms of the speed, accuracy, and efficiency of decision making. This means that humans must retain -- maintain responsibility over the AI and insure they are adhering to the very best guidelines in governance as they innovate. In that vein, we encourage all policy makers to derive best practices through globally driven guidelines that can help create and safeguard trust at the heart of AI driven systems and business models and permit the flexibility for
innovation allowing codes to develop with the technology.

Because AI is not a singular technology and because algorithms themselves are very complex and unique in their applications, standards are limited in that they can only give guidance into the development of the technology and create a process — oh sorry. I will slow down a bit.

Because AI is not a singular technology and because algorithms themselves are very complex and unique in their applications, standards are limited in that they can only give guidance into the development of the technology and create a process by which companies can prepare for regulators and stakeholders to audit the results of derived said process. Standards or assessments must not be used to create a checklist for ethics or fairness.

Because of how the technology works, the governance of algorithms must include both quantitative and qualitative measures.

Quantitative measures are the empirical
evidence necessary to prove AI systems are effective, fair, and transparent. Qualitative measures enable the critical thinking necessary to interpret evidence effectively.

Because there is no one definition of fairness, nor one understanding of sufficient transparency, both context and evidence are necessary to understand risks. Evaluations of fairness and transparency in AI systems such as algorithmic impact assessments can be tools to proactively identify, mitigate and monitor these risks, but they should also be used to foster conversations between policy makers, regulators, and stakeholders, not to certify the technology is fair.

Now, onto transparency: The objective of this session is to consider the practical implementation of transparency in the use of algorithmic systems in the civic sphere. Before discussion on practical implementation, I'd like to first address the notion of transparency.

In addition, I encourage policy makers to consider that just like the city would want to
ensure that both the technology of the subway train is properly vetted, they would take care to ensure that the train operator is properly vetted and trained. We must take care to consider both sides of the equation.

Transparency is the ability to understand how and why an AI system decides and acts particularly in the context of increasingly complex models.

Transparency should include two important factors, understandability and interpretability. Understandability enables a non-technical person, a business executive, or a citizen to gain insight into how an algorithm works and why it made a given decision. It is critical that non-technical persons understand how their data is being used and how their actions can generate new predictions. There is an important difference between merely meeting legal requirements to be transparent versus a desire to establish trust and prioritize understandability.

Interpretability allows a technical expert such as an AI machine learning expert to
understand why an algorithm made a given decision. Interpretability would allow government to know how their models would act in the real world. Interpretability tends to be the focus of what organizations such as DARPA called explainable AI. DARPA defines explainability as the ability for machines to, one, explain their rationale; two, characterize the strengths and weaknesses of the decision-making process; and three, convey a sense of how they will behave in the future. In addition, organizations may want to consider how to proactively justify their design choices by explaining: One, why they chose a particular data set to draw inferences; two, why these inferences are relevant and ethical for the chosen decision they are trying to make; and three, whether the data and methods used to draw the inference are accurate and statistically reliable for the population they are trying to serve.

For example, a data set full of Iowans would not serve the population of New York whose population is full of different
characteristics. Human participation is critical to creating AI systems. In considering the human impact of integrating AI into high-risk areas such as criminal justice and healthcare, organizations can set out to design, build, and deploy AI systems whereby human responsibility is enhanced.

Transparency provides insights into the systems driving decision making, human participation enables the ability to change or alter how consumers interact with that system. An added complexity that is aligned with issues of transparency is the accountability of human and algorithmic systems.

Presumably, we built algorithms, at least in part, to standardize and address human bias even while we simultaneously say AI is biased and call for human oversight. Because of this we need to remain focused on tracing decision making not just of algorithms but of people. In addition, ethics are critical to informing an organization strategy for its technology deployments. Organizations should consider what are the values that should be encompassed
in their product and how these values might vary across different demographics. Organizations can then proceed by developing AI that incorporates those values. Policy makers have long used the word “transparency” to address issues and data privacy and security but not algorithmic harms or disparate impact. This is an important distinction as any discussion of potential harm to impacted communities must consider systemic and institutionalized bias and discrimination as well as systems of power. This means that representative data sets must be selected carefully and that even an organization were to build what they consider to be a representative data set, especially in cases that would impact a human life such as in criminal justice, healthcare, or finance, we need to consider implementing systems that enable agency defined as the ability to take meaningful action against harm.

While transparency is necessary, it is -- it is insufficient. When we consider transparency in algorithmic systems, it is
often framed as a top down explanation of a
system and how it performs. When implementing
a system, we must strive to describe in a
user-understandable fashion what the system is
doing and how it operates. Agency moves beyond
transparency to acknowledge and address the
disparity and power dynamics between government
agencies utilizing algorithmic systems and the
communities that are subject to them. Citizen
empowerment requires resolving differences in
levels of technical literacy, access to
resources, and an understanding of ones rights
within the system.

With regards to the implementation of
transparency in agency, it is important to note
that technical tools are only one part of the
solution. To address the specific questions
raised by the task force, namely the three
questions about whether -- whether there are
systems or areas that the city should or could
deliver services, whether there are systems or
areas that we'd be concerned with, and what
kind of information that we would want to know
about a system that makes the decisions on
behalf of citizens. In our suggestions to both
government and private organizations, we
encourage inclusivity by design. This means
meaningful engagement. And design deployment
of -- design development and deployment of
algorithmic systems with all stakeholders
including impacted communities. This also
means allowing for meaningful and transparent
systems of addressing and redressing harms and
importantly, a culture and pipeline for
constructive descent as well as the right to
veto the use of an algorithmic system.

Specifically when thinking about the
requirement that the team has for processes by
which impacted people can request information
about ADS, we suggest asking the following
questions: Why would an individual request
this information? What are the knowledge gaps
that may exist? How can this communication be
structured in a way that is understandable and
meaningful for the requester? Once given this
information, what agency does the individual
have to action on it? Are there choices they
can make and are these choices evident and
relevant for them? When thinking about strategies for publicly disclosing information about those systems, we ask how can the existing community and civic organizational infrastructure in New York City be leveraged to disseminate this information? This would address two issues, first, improving technical literacy of communities through local leadership and second, allowing for feedback from the bottom up to iterate and improve the dissemination process.

On behalf of Accenture, I appreciate the opportunity to engage this task force in its important charter.

I hope this process continues to yield stakeholder engagement and in addition, I hope that the product of this process yields something which will lay a foundation that we can continue to work on together, all stakeholders, to iterate them. We are encouraged and hope that the City of New York continues to engage a broad stakeholder audience in this process to ensure that city officials gather the perspectives beyond data
scientists, AI developers, and non-IT government program experts. Professionals from across disciplines and interest including non-tech civil society must work closely together during AI development to systematically tackle these key requirements around AI fairness and this process to develop technical best practices should reflect that as well. Thank you.

MS. JIN: Thanks to all three panelists for your remarks and comments.

I think just a quick note for the folks in the room here, as well as on livestream; so the panelists comments will be made public and posted on our website. Also, the transcript will also be available within the next week as well as a video recording of this evening as well. Just for your reference, for those folks who may be taking notes.

We're going to switch to Q and As with task force members.

And I'm going to selfishly ask one question just to kick things off which is geared toward Mr. Pallas but also for all three
panelists. You know, I think reviewing this presentation and -- and the comments, one thing that we are working through as a task force is that there is an intersection between city ADSs and, also, the use of ADSs that comply with federal or state regulations and -- and mandates. And so really interested in first off, the New York City, slash, New York State intersection but also any advice or recommendations from you as well as all three of the panelists because that is something that certainly here in New York City is -- is something that we're grappling with and I think is an important lane that we think about in our recommendations.

MR. PALLAS: So New York State had a similar growth model using the test that the state administers annually to students in Grades 3 through 8 in English and math. And the state legislature and the governor agreed to have a moratorium on the use of that model because of concerns about the nature of the tests.

And one thing that makes the New York City
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model a bit distinctive is there is much more discretion regarding what tests are -- are used. And one set of tests are called New York City performance tests, tasks that were developed jointly by the United Federation of Teachers and the Department of Education. So there's more shared agreement about how best to measure student performance across a wider range of grade levels and subject areas. The state still does produce growth models that are applied to some teachers, particularly using regents' exams as outcomes.

Frankly, New York City has a lot more capacity. The Department of Education has staff that are more skilled in the development of these models than the state education department does. But one of the transparency objectives for the city was to use a model that would be familiar to teachers because they have been subject to the state model. The city's model is better. It's -- it's -- it's a more sensitive and -- and I think a more accurate model than what the state has done. But it is a challenge. I think the city was fortunate
that the state has given local school districts a lot of discretion and implementation. There's still state oversight regarding what the models look like and how districts go about generating these overall ratings.

So the state vets that but the city and the teachers union here locally were given much more free rein to figure out how to do that.

MS. JIN: All right. We will open up the floor for task force questions, Meredith.

MS. WHITTAKER: Yeah. I want to -- I want to thank you all for testifying.

And I -- just a question for Aaron. And this is to push a little bit on the distinction or the sort of tension you drew between transparency and fairness. Because, of course, when I look at the equation you showed, you know, the terms are defined. It looks fairly untransparent. And I might nod along thinking, yeah, that's the kind of explanation that some of the things I might want if we are talking about transparency. Surely, that might not be appropriate questions. But when I look at some of the inputs that we used to test -- I'm not,
you know, I'm not familiar about this education sector. So I'm maybe schematizing a little bit. We have things like attendance and so some of the transparency I could come up with is, you know, are there infrastructural difficulties and transport that might affect the attendance scores at a given school?

Were there reasons that different students were unable to attend and can we take those into account?

Does the score take those into account?

Things like standardized testing are any of the tests that are used -- they have been tested for racial bias. I'm thinking about, you know, only seven black students were admitted to Stuyvesant this year. A lot of people pointed to standardized testing as, you know, one of the reasons that we're seeing such biased admissions at some of these elite schools.

So there are deeper questions about the inputs or, you know, the data inputs that are used for this test and how we can actually understand whether that data is reflecting, you
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know, teacher performance or, you know, other
contextual factors that would need to be taken
into account. And when I see sort of a list of
standardized tests, you know, I wonder if those
are -- the construction of those tests, what
types of skills they are testing for. You
know, who performs better on those tests and
why are all questions -- I really want
transparency on to be able to understand how
this test is functioning especially given the
significant determination that can be affected
and had on the teachers and students.

MR. PALLAS: Sure.

That's a very fair question, and the
reality is that an automated decision system
like this that relies on test scores is only as
good as the quality of the tests that are being
used as -- as outcome measures. And it's a --
it's a constant frustration for me that we
actually know more about the algorithm that
generates these ratings than about all the
properties of the tests that go into it.

MS. WHITTAKER: Yeah.

MR. PALLAS: Some of the tests we know a
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lot about. And these are all tests that we
generally accepted psychometric criteria for
reliability and fairness. But a lot of the
information is not made accessible to the
public or to the people who are affected by --
by the algorithms.

So for example, the New York State
Assessments that are used for the New York
State Growth Model, the technical report that
documents the property of the state test is
typically released about two years later long
after consequential decisions have been made.
Now, it happens that, in general, the tests are
constructed in ways that survive scrutiny. And
there are standard ways of testing whether test
items function differently for members of
different social groups.

Differential item functioning is an
important criterion in -- in developing tests
as is the use of field tests. And New York
State and New York City use tests that have
been developed I think in good ways. But it's
still the case that there is a gap between some
of the information that you want to have
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available in a timely way and -- and when it actually is available.

Just the one thing about attendance is the reason that's in the model is so that teachers are only -- a student who is not present a lot of the time is not going to count as much towards a teacher's rating as a student who is there all the time. So it's a waiting factor to -- to make sure that a teacher is not penalized by virtue of the fact that a student does not show up for (indiscernible).

MR. SOUTHERLAND: I want to also thank you for all of you testifying.

I have a question about in terms of -- if your teacher doesn't score in the highly effective category, what's your mechanism for challenging the results of the --

MR. PALLAS: They're -- the contract between United Federation of Teachers and the Department of Education provides mechanisms for appeals.

They typically can be on the grounds that the -- the calculations were done incorrectly. But that involves figuring out if they were.
There -- there has been operationally what I would call a kind of safety valve. Because there are these two different dimensions that go into the calculation of the overall rating. The measures of student learning section where about four percent of teachers annually are rated ineffective and maybe seven or eight percent developing. And the measures of teacher practice which is the observational ratings.

And when those two things are put together, typically, 99 percent of teachers are rated developing or higher. Only about one percent of teachers in the city get -- get an overall rating of ineffective each year. But there still are ways of challenging that.

But as a practical matter, it has not have much consequence even though there is this law that says that teachers who receive ineffective ratings two years in a row can be subject to dismissal regardless of their tenure status. I'm not aware of any teachers who've actually had that happen to them.

MS. JIN: Questions from task force
TASK FORCE MEMBER: I have a question.
(INAUDIBLE.) And I actually have two
questions: One for Chancey and one for Aaron.

Chancey, thank you so much for your
testimony. (INAUDIBLE.) You really made me
cry. Both describing the personal story of a
person living with disabilities but also
describing your story of being engaged in
efforts where not enough power was given to
participants to really get the results.

So specifically what I would like to know
is how do you go about documenting lack of
response? How do you go about documenting
silences?

MS. FLEET: I think -- I think it's a team
effort. On -- on committees where we have
improved our outcomes with the strategy, it
begins with whoever is on a committee or
whoever is acting in concert sending sort of a
formal letter and a follow up and then just
having a document that takes note of what was
sent, when it was sent, what came back, if
nothing came back. And just doing the really
un glamorous work of -- of being your own sort
of secretary and making a chronicle. Because
if it turns out that a body is unable to do its
best work because of lack of cooperation, it
helps to have a clear and convincing timeline
as you advance up the chain of responsibility
or -- or escalate things to another -- to
another sort of stage.

And I hope that that's -- I hope that
that's helpful and that that generalizes well.
It can be when there are so many folks that
have a little bit of responsibility for
something and no one who has all of the
ultimate responsibility.

It's very easy for people to use their
silence, strategically, to avoid giving you
what you want. But have -- turning that into a
timeline, can make it a little -- a little more
stark and a little harder to avoid confronting
I think.

TASK FORCE MEMBER: Thank you for -- this
is very helpful.

And also a question for Aaron, and this is
when -- when you spoke to teachers and you of
course observed that they didn't really understand these models and they didn't understand the formulas, do you have any insight as to how we might engage with stakeholders like teachers or others being affected or decision-makers in designing methodologies for interpretability?

How might we go about figuring out what a good way is to explain things to them?

MR. PALLAS: I -- I think that with a model like the Advance Growth Model, the development has been done by specialists in the Department of Education statisticians, economists, psychometricians. There is representation in the form of input from the United Federation of Teachers which does represent the stakeholders who are in fact affected by the model.

But I don't know that there's been any systematic effort on anybody's part to try to figure out what would be helpful to them in understanding how this algorithm actually works. It's something that I'm personally interested in doing. But still I'm struggling
to figure out why it is that they don't understand the model?

And I think that part of the challenge is the labels that have been used by this -- the city which are mandated by the state of highly effective, effective, developing, and ineffective convey certain things that really have very little to do with the workings of the model. Teachers who are tenured take great offense at being labeled ineffective or developing. Teachers who are probationary think it's appropriate. They should be classified as developing. But it's -- it's -- there's an emotional charge to the labels. I think that interferes with the ways in which they make sense of how the model works.

MS. CHOWDHURY: One model you might want to look at: So I sit on the advisory board for the Royal Society of the Arts Citizen's AI Jury. And the RSA periodically does citizen's juries to advise the U.K. government on certain topics. And it's structured the way grand juries are where they get a representative sample of the U.K. population they are posed a
question and in this case the question was, in which cases should AI not be used and they are presented with evidence by experts. So they are not lectured at. They are not told what they should think. But instead they interrogate these experts. They ask for people to come. And at the end of it, they write a perspective on what their thoughts are. And these thoughts are then used to inform the U.K. Government.

So there might be a similar model whereby it's actually driven by the public rather than thinking of it as a teaching moment for the experts to educate people.

TASK FORCE MEMBER: Thank you.

MR. HAFETZ: Excuse me. So I have a couple questions for Rumman. One is you have laid out a couple terms, “explainability” -- I'm sorry “understandability” and “interpretability.” I think you used the DARPA definition for interpretability which I got a little confused by cause I thought it referred back. If your -- in your mind, if you could just clarify the distinction between -- sorry
-- interpretability and explainability.

MS. CHOWDHURY: So actually I believe the terms I used were understandability and so interpretability.

MR. HAFETZ: Sorry. Thank you. Yeah.

MS. CHOWDHURY: So understandability means that a non-technical person can gain insight into how an algorithm works. So in practice and actually quite similarly when we work with teams to vet their projects and algorithms, there's often a very visceral reaction.

You know, people don't like to think that they make biased decisions. It's very difficult if you have a female program lead to say you should vet your algorithm for gender bias because they would then say I'm a woman, why would I make a model that has gender bias?

So understandability enables a non-technical person to gain insight into how an algorithm works. Because often they are not necessarily -- the project itself is developed by a non-technical person such as the project manager while they may have technical people working with them.
Interpretability is a very close -- the data science definition of an algorithmic understandability. So this allows a technical expert to understand why an algorithm made a decision. This may mean understanding a neural net, understanding, you know, the output of a random forest. What an output of a random forest is maybe understandable to me as a data scientist.

It would not be understandable to, let's say a teacher who is subject to the outcome. So it would be translating a data science outcome into something that, let's say, a teacher is able to understand.

MR. HAFETZ: Okay. Thank you. That's helpful.

You had also gone through a list. It sounded like a list to me. It was like a list of questions that an agency, a government agency, or an architect of AI could ask itself. That's sort of how I was interpreting it. But the questions were to the effect of, how would someone who's affected -- why would someone who is affected by the AI ask for information about
it? What are some of the informational gaps? Can you talk a little bit more about not necessarily a list of the questions but how you -- where those questions come up, how you would see them being used.

MS. CHOWDHURY: Absolutely. So when you think about especially the diversity of New York City. We have so many different communities that come from so many different backgrounds and very different struggles. What they prioritize in their life may or may not be the things that we prioritize in our lives. So asking a question of what would be the process is useful, but at the same time these processes need to be developed from the prospective of the person who would be requesting the information. And why would they even want to. How is it relevant to their day-to-day lives? If I am a struggling single mother with children, why do I, you know, why is it important to me that algorithm is making a decision on my behalf? Am I even understanding what this algorithm means?

Often because we create human-centric AI
solutions, it will be a human being that is talking to them and let's say deciding what their benefits should be. But behind the scenes, there is an algorithm that is informing let's say a social worker, a case worker. The individual being impacted, the single mother may not actually be aware or understand how the algorithm is playing a role in this decision making. So my ask here is that understand -- before we can think through what the process is, it's important to also think through the knowledge gaps. And what would be the motivations for an individual to request this information?

And importantly it's actually wrapped up in the notion of agency. What -- what can they do with this information once they have it? What are their choices?

And I love the question about what -- what pushback teachers can give because it's the same question. If I am told in a transparent fashion this is why a decision was made, but again understanding the systems of power, I may not actually have a system of redressing the
harms because simply having the information doesn't always give me the ability to do something about it.

MR. HAFETZ: One of the -- sorry to ask a follow up.

But I think one of the -- where I'm trying to get through to know actually, what can agencies do sort of internally; what sort of questions should they ask? It sounded like the list of questions that you went through would be -- potentially, it could be a viable exercise for an agency to sort of ask itself for -- if it's thinking about something that could fall, what could be an AI and to sort of evaluate.

Is it fair to say that these -- one, that's how you envision -- is that a -- is that a role that you envision these questions playing? And then two, if you can talk a little bit more about any agencies, bodies that have, sort of, some of the processes that they use to, sort of, interrogate a business solution or business process, something that would involve AI before implementation around
the issues of fairness and transparency.

MS. CHOWDHURY: Yeah. Great question.

So yes. I think this is a start of a good set of guidelines to think through transparency and agency mechanisms. I think there's maybe an interesting parallel to be made with the GDPR and general data protection regulations. And in implementing it people were given the right to access to their information, the right to not be found, et cetera.

And at Accenture, we helped companies adhere to this law. And actually it's quite difficult. Because you now have to have an infrastructure. I would just -- somebody requests their information, you have to way to compile and send that over. That doesn't automatically happen.

So I think often when we think about governance systems, we think it -- of a top-down perspective, when we also need to think of the bottom-up perspective. If somebody were to take advantage of this ability to ask for their information, do I have the infrastructure in place to provide that to
them? That's actually not an easy task to develop and deploy. And then sort of thinking through again this notion of -- of agency to -- to the point of have we seen this implemented?

I mean, I can't speak to specific clients, but absolutely, this is -- this is why I emphasize the need for things like constructive descent. The ability to actually influence the development of the system, not just during development but actually close development. All of these models are iterative. All of these things will be forever ongoing processes.

I don't imagine your task will be done once you've come up with the system. And actively building that infrastructure shouldn't -- needs to actually happen and should not just be assumed.

TASK FORCE MEMBER: I've got a quick question: I want to dig in a little bit to the interpretability kind of point. You know, with the understanding that a lot of agencies and a lot of parts of city governments might not have internal expertise -- you know, thank you. Thanks. With the understanding that at least
in the near term, you're not going to have a lot of kind of the data science expertise in-house. When you start thinking about how these kinds of systems can be interpreted, I'm curious if Rumman or anyone has thoughts on what best practices might look like, what kind of validation, should it be third party, should -- where should it come from? And that is --

MS. CHOWDHURY: So you're actually asking a question that some of our clients ask.

If we remove tech companies from the narrative, and we think about companies, telcos or retail clients that are adopting AI, a lot of times, they actually just use a third-party vendor and you're basically asking the same question. If they don't have the internal expertise and they are hiring some third-party AI company to, let's say, do their personalization or recommendation algorithm, how are they to understand if there is some sort of unfair outcome. I think like that's a question that I think a lot of companies are grappling with at the moment.

This is where the notion of algorithmic
impact assessments can come in. The notion of quantitative biased checks married to policy of critical thinking questions. It's important to develop these.

And what we have been doing at Accenture, actually, we've created an arm called responsible innovation and responsible business, where we vet every single project whether it's internal projects, projects we build for clients. Actually, importantly, vendor projects -- contracts we have with vendors. So we have actually internally developed a process to vet our vendors.

And one suggestion might be this could be a standardized process for the vendor acquisition pipeline. If somebody wants to bid on a project as a third-party vendor, they may have to go through this level of transparency, you know, that's sort of standardized or adjusted to the technology that they would be providing, just a thought.

MR. THAMKITTIKASEM: So similarly, actually, I have a question on this idea -- it's all right. I'm trying to speak louder.
I think to that point, what models have been in place for trying to set standards that -- I think we are trying to make recommendations for the city's understanding that each of the agencies have different areas of expertise and therefore just taking both of the examples for teacher assessment, there is something very particular about knowing and understanding the categories that would go into that and whether or not there will be appropriate pieces or not versus what would say a third party whether it's private or linked-to-the-city-kind of set standards or evaluate whether or not there should be extra scrutiny or a review of something. I think that's something certainly on a personal level, I'm trying to figure out.

You've got a lot of different people who inside their own organizations may not have a lot of expertise, but may not understand the process by which you'd evaluate an algorithm or an ADS. At the same time, you have many people who have probably expertise in algorithms, ADS
and so forth, but don't have a good understanding. And how do we bring that together in some process that would allow for, you know, that kind of review?

MS. CHOWDHURY: So the best example I can give actually, internally, we created a responsible AI for HR task force. So as I mentioned, or responsible business and innovation deployment started off as us saying we have to be very, very careful about all the algorithms that we use internally for hiring, externally for clients, et cetera.

And we ended up actually creating a multidisciplinary task force where we have data scientists, strategy folks, legal team as well as actually what I think is probably I would argue the most important on the team the industrial organizational psychologist. Somebody who actually vets the measurement systems.

So when we think about -- this is how else to teach in measurements -- how do we operationalize the variables?

So this actually does draw on the
experts of this individual who has worked with HR to understand measurement. I think a good way maybe to think about it is to create this task force. We spent about six months developing a process. And now we're in what I call basically red team mode where we actually vet each of these algorithms.

And I'll tell you kind of the challenge we ran into: It's quite difficult to scale. If we are to have a level of thoughtfulness required to vet these things, one of the challenges we have is scaling. Simply the number of algorithms that are used, the number of projects and pipelines and giving everything, you know, the -- the -- the time it -- it deserves. I cannot tell you there is a good solve for that. Maybe there will be over time. Maybe as we develop these processes. You know, it's a still learning curve for everybody. Maybe we will all get better at it. Maybe we will all sort of improve our abilities.

But actually I think drawing on the expertise of the teams themselves is often
very, very helpful and their voice is actually quite necessary.

MR. THAMKITTIKASEM: Can I kind of clarify a statement that I think that you had made around the standards not necessarily being a checklist. Just if -- I would just like to hear a little bit more about that in terms of what your thoughts were on that.

MS. CHOWDHURY: Right.

So when we think about -- you said, I believe you mentioned in your introductory statement that this is an evolving space. Creating a static checklist is not always -- it's not future-proof. And will require constant iteration.

The other issue is that if we make a checklist, we may not allow people to do the level of critical thinking required to really think deeply about the impact of what they're building. People will optimize. People inherently optimize towards a metric. If I give you a list of ten things you have to do, you are just going to, kind of, do those things.
So I'll give you a kind of a frivolous example of weight loss. Why are people so obsessed with the number of steps they take or the number of calories they consume when that actually does not have very much to do with fitness because it's a number you can optimize towards. I can say I walked 10,000 steps per day and think that I am healthy even if I have an unhealthy lifestyle of smoking a pack of cigarettes, right. So if -- if we are not asking people to holistically assess, let's say, their healthiness and instead emphasize here are the five things you need to do to be, quote, healthy, we are doing them a disservice because we are not asking them to think about their lifestyle choices.

Ms. Saunders: Sorry. Just to follow up on that.

In your experience from what you've seen, like what's the kind of best structure to encourage that kind of thoughtful interrogation over time. I mean, maybe it is the -- the kind of task force structure you just described but with the challenges of scale that come with it.
But I just wanted to ask you that.

MS. CHOWDHURY: Yes. That's a great question.

So when we develop our products the way I think about it having been a data scientist, this needs to fit into the way we do our work. Right.

So like when we have to gather data, analyze data, build a model, test a model, deploy the model, how do we create key intervention points where we ask these questions, ask for that level of review and understanding. And are able to allow the time for teams to critically reflect, and that's built into their development process. One thing and -- and I think the diversity and inclusion space is the same thing. Bringing this in at the very end is quite difficult. Because then we are seen as a blocker. There's -- this one ends the same thing.

There's -- there's human psychology component to this. If we are allies by design from the beginning, we are received so much more positively than if we are a team that
comes in at the end and they think of us as trying to poke holes in what they have so painstakingly built. So sort of a way to frame this where it's helping them build it well rather than us policing them or telling them what's wrong.

MS. STOYANOVICH: So about the -- the framework that you guys developed at Accenture to oversee the development and deployment of these complex algorithmic systems, how much insight did you actually have into the systems that are governed by the framework to help you develop the framework itself?

MS. CHOWDHURY: Yeah. And I think this is related to the sort of third-party vendor question.

Even before we do an impact assessment, we actually do a level of riskiness so like it's sort of a risk versus impact. So the probability of something going wrong and how bad is it if something goes wrong. And that ends up sort of influencing how in depth we are going to go with this analysis.

To your question of visibility, we have
different levels. So if we are building it in-house, we have absolute visibility in a pure white box model. We know what the data is. We know what the model is. We can interrogate it. We can literally talk to data scientists, right.

A second tier level might be if it's a project for your client where I'm not actually going to access to the data but as Accenture I may be able to talk to the team and say what kind of models did you use, you know, and ask for metrics of that model. But I'm not going to necessary know because of client data protections, what the variables are, the problems, the variables.

And the third and most opaque would be a third-party vendor where I sort of send them homework, and they send me back their answers. And each has its different level of scrutiny.

I think one good way that we have been thinking about it is trying to draw from some of the new model assessments that are coming out from different research organizations. I'm looking at black box models. But again, I
think what you're touching on is absolutely
correct as the level of transparency to model
development increase -- decreases, it becomes
increasingly harder.

And then I would suppose that the best
thing to do is have the right sort of systems
of model monitoring post-deployment to make
sure that the kinds of biases the disparate
impact that might happen don't actually happen
when they are put into the wild. And also
giving people the right to address and
readdress harms that happen.

And I will say here that there is no --
we're not going to be able to make perfect
systems. Things will go wrong. So we actually
do need to make sure that there's sort of a way
to mitigate and help people when things go
wrong because that is -- that is inevitable.

MS. STOYANOVICH: But just to -- maybe too
often (inaudible) because as you were
developing -- as you were developing mechanisms
and criteria for what kinds of systems to
assist to what degree in the process of
framework development, were you looking at
actual systems?

MS. CHOWDHURY: Yeah. Absolutely.

MS. STOYANOVICH: Thank you.

MS. CHOWDHURY: We -- you know do -- I guess what we usually do in AI building the plane as we fly it, you know, we're, we were already looking at using AI in particular systems, and we just latched onto projects that were already in -- in play.

MS. STOYANOVICH: Great. And do you think that you could have develop an effective framework if you did not have access to the systems as you were developing that framework?

MS. CHOWDHURY: I think it would be -- it would not be the easiest thing to do, you know. I really can't, kind of, (indiscernible) it. I'm not sure how to answer that question. I don't think it would have been the easiest thing in the world to do, no. I think there are maybe guidelines you can make or recommendations but the ability to purely investigate on the ground (indiscernible) with the team was very helpful in our development.

MS. STOYANOVICH: Thank you very much.
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TASK FORCE MEMBER: I found from your discussion about algorithmic impact assessment a strong inclination to look at systems that are sort of in the early stages of development rather than to try to go in and critique existing systems which suggest to me that one approach to -- for complex set of institutions like New York City might be to offer some recommendations for the contracting process, for new ADS systems as they are being developed as opposed to trying to go back and systematically root out bias in existing systems.

What -- what are your thoughts on that?

MS. CHOWDHURY: I think there are two different processes. I think the revise and review of existing algorithms is absolutely necessary. And impact assessments can be adjusted accordingly. It is -- it is not the easiest because there's institutional momentum. And also, you know, we can create something that is maybe fair and equitable moving forward doesn't necessarily give justice to the harms that may have happened before.
So there is this notion of okay, well, it's going to be good from now on but what about the cases in which it didn't happen? I think there's a lot of thoughtfulness that needs to be put into vetting existing systems not to think about moving -- not just to think about moving forward but think about retroactively.

TASK FORCE MEMBER: You're -- I guess your -- Accenture is brought into act as an advisor to companies that are trying to develop these systems. My sense is that there is fairly limited institution or, you know, technical capacity to do these kinds of algorithmic impact assessments across the world. And so in thinking about how to prioritize scarce bandwidth and technical capacity to go in and do algorithmic impact assessment, what's your sense as an expert of where the best balance lies in terms of focusing on developing new systems that demonstrate new models and approaches that are more effective versus sort of going back and trying to battle over existing frameworks?
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MS. CHOWDHURY: So is your question about technical expertise more about there are not enough data scientists?

TASK FORCE MEMBER: Yeah.

MS. CHOWDHURY: Okay. That is certainly an issue. I'm not quite sure how to solve that problem, and we do run into this at some of our clients and companies were attracting data science talent to, you know, a company that may be a data scientist wouldn't find to be as attractive or as sexy as, you know, a big tech giant, is quite difficult.

One of the -- one of our men -- one of the ways we built our impact assessment was to make sure we choose methods of understanding bias, et cetera, that were understandable by what I would call an average data scientist. That level of expertise can be found most of the time. I think there are a lot of data scientists that are interested in this kind of work. I think it's a new and growing field that I increasingly find younger data scientists are very interested to be engaged in.
Actually, the number one question I get asked within Accenture by young data scientists is: How do I get to work on your team? So there -- there is hope. People really do want to do this kind of work. I think enabling them to do it, making it clear that their job is of value is what will attract data scientists.

TASK FORCE MEMBER: So capacity building itself may be a key area for New York City to focus on as it tries to engage this more effectively.

MS. CHOWDHURY: I think young data scientists are simply not aware that New York City might want to hire people to do this kind of work.

TASK FORCE MEMBER: Thank you.

MS. JIN: Questions?

MR. SOUTHERLAND: Thanks. This is Vincent Southerland.

Chancey, I really appreciate your comments and your testimony. I was wondering kind of based on your experience, you have a lot of wonderful recommendations. I'm wondering if you could point to any models that might be
useful for the task force to follow in terms of
doing its own work based on your own
experiences that have been successful.

MS. FLEET: Can you be a little bit more
specific?

MR. SOUTHERLAND: So I mean -- so I guess
what I'm saying is you mentioned kind of in
terms of your own experiences of work you've
done in the past and having run into issues in
terms of getting access to systems and things
of that nature, I'm wondering if you have had
any positive experiences I might try to point
to as a model for us to follow as a task force
as we do our work.

MS. FLEET: I can't be terribly specific
in what I disclose, but what I can say is that
I think it's important to have direct
conversations with folks that might be in the
agencies or places where these systems are
being deployed and really have, where possible,
a lot of face time and build trust. Because in
my accessibility work, we often have to proceed
from and diffuse the assumption that the
process is going to be adversarial. And that
the best way forward for the other party lies
in just not engaging. And I think we have to
have rigor in our expectations but also a
degree of faith in the good intentions of the
other party that we can gain enough concrete
and specific information to make
recommendations.

I often find that once we hit that point
and we are able to issue recommendations to the
other party, if those recommendations are
implementable and if we can back them up with
reasoning, we -- we often, not always, but
often can go far. And we find out that we do
share a common purpose. Because the other
party, at the end of the day, does not want a
system that is dysfunctional, one hopes. And
does not want a system that is going to be
dragged into the limelight at some future time
by litigation, by complaint and so if it's
possible to build those person-to-person
bridges and build a degree of trust so that you
can have a more concrete conversation, I think
that that's the first and sometimes hardest
step. And I think it's a -- it's a terribly
big undertaking. But if you can identify one or two agencies, one or two working teams where you have the seed of a little bit of rapport and you can start working with those teams, when productive work comes out of a few collaborations and it turns out that the end product is -- is something all parties can live with and, in fact, welcome that makes other folks more happy to hop aboard the effort.

And, again, I'm very well versed in accessibility. And I have been looped in on ADS for about nine months. And I hope very much that all of this generalizes, and I think that it does.

I also think that another conversation that you can have very productively going forward, although, you can't have it instead of the one about existing systems is figuring out what language can be used in RFP solicitations and -- and procurement contracts in terms of where the liability rests. In terms of really specific, concrete expectations for understandability and interpretability and -- and -- and right of action by folks impacted by
the system. I think those are things that if
you don't encode them into procurement
contracts, you enter a very unhappy loop of the
contractor saying that what was -- what's being
asked for wasn't specified in the contract and
folks in the agencies having to defend their
lack of contractual specificity. And if you
could keep that loop from happening in the next
wave of procurements, you can make future work
easier if not the work that's needed to
retrofit existing systems.

TASK FORCE MEMBER: Thank you.

MS. WHITTAKER: No. I was waiving the mic
for Vincent. I didn't realize he --

MS. JIN: Questions? All right. So --
all right. So I think we are close to almost
8:00 and I'm going to turn things over to my
esteemed co-chair Brittny Saunders.

MS. SAUNDERS: So thank you everyone.
Again, we very much appreciate the time that
you are taking to be a part of this important
policy conversation. And, again, we are really
grateful to the folks on our panel who came and
shared their perspectives. And now, it's the
part of the program where we are really excited
to hear from members of the public.

So if you have not already signed up, I
ask that you let, I guess, Alex know. So that
you can get in the cue. As we've noted before
the commitment to public engagement as part of
this process is something that everyone on this
task force shares. And we started building
that in early by creating a channel for
submission of public comments on the website
that created. We've done outreach through a
range of civic and community-based
organizations in order to make them aware of
the work of the task force and the public
engagements opportunities.

We've tried to plan these two events with
-- that focused on inclusion and accessibility
in mind. And we're also as I think Jeff
mentioned at the top, planning a series of
community sessions that would take part in
other parts of the city. And I think to --
Chancey's point is a point well taken around
finding a range of different spaces to convene
people and arrange different ways to engage
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people. And I think to Dr. Chowdhury's point thinking about the -- the access point and the relevance and how we can kind of structure these conversations so that folks can find their point of entry.

And we are really incredibly excited to nurture a broader public conversation on ADS and recognize that's something that will not probably stop at the end of this task force process but that will be ongoing at the city level. And appreciate also that there are a range of different types expertise that are going to be relevant here, right. So we have, you know, folks who might spend their 9 to 5 thinking about these issues and that's incredibly important and incredibly helpful. But we are also really eager to hear from folks who might not engage with the issues as technological issues or might not engage with them as often. So very excited to open up that part of the conversation as well.

And this is a really valuable opportunity I think for folks to share their ideas and their recommendations with the task force
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because we will be going back and deliberating
as a group over them. As Jeff mentioned, there
are number of questions that can help to spark
thinking here. So some of them might be are
there systems or areas where you think the city
could or should deliver services using
technology. Are there systems or areas where
you might be concerned about the use of these
types of technologies. What kind of
information, again, would you want to know
about the system that makes decision that might
impact you or your community. And who or what
organizations would you trust to be involved in
deciding whether these systems get used. And
what information about them is made public.

So each person will have about three
minutes to share their insights. And we set
that time limit in order to ensure that we hear
from as many folks as possible. So please do
bear with us if we interject in order to let
you know that your time is up or to kind of
clarify the thoughts that you are sharing. And
we -- I'm happy to report that we have a nice
list of folks who shine -- who have signed up
already. So with that, we'll get started with Abraham -- sorry.

MS. JIN: And let me -- apologies because this was my notes but I completely forgot -- to our esteemed panelists, thank you very much. You are welcome, more than welcome to stay for the public comments if you do need to head out this evening. We really do appreciate it.

MS. SAUNDERS: Thank you, Kelly.

So we'll start with Abraham Hemio [ph.] or Himiel.

MR. HIMIEL: Do I need a microphone? Can everybody hear me?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No.

MR. HIMIEL: Okay.

TASK FORCE MEMBER: You have to scream --

MR. HIMIEL: Okay. Okay. Is it on? I've been following this issue for a few years. And I work in a consulting company in data science and analytics similar to the one that Dr. Chowdhury represents.

A personal anecdote is -- anecdotes are becoming more common, I personally have not seem to be affected by any automated
ADS TASK FORCE - PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT FORUM

decision-making systems in the City of New York but who knows. I had a conference call about changes to my employee health plan, employees mostly are tech workers and a fair portion of them are in data science and analytics. The plan change to a data driven one that quote, eliminates waste and selects only high-performing providers, end quote. The result was that the vast majority of providers was eliminated and every person on the call would comment or question or on the web ex chat express their disgust.

MS. SAUNDERS: Sorry. Could you hold the microphone a little further away --


The point being data-driven solutions to problems are not necessarily better for people who are just minding their own business. However, data scientist like myself are trained to optimize business outcomes and cut costs especially the ones that are really close to the ground.

As a result, it's really hard for me to
put any trust into an organization to oversee
algorithmic transparency or ADS that have ties
to private companies or publicly traded ones
since their goals are in profit margins or
shareholder value and not justice.

Also, it's very hard for me to trust the
NYPD or groups like DARPA for strategic control
of data resources to serve power. They always
don't equate to justice. I quite enjoyed Dr.
Chowdhury's suggestion about citizen juries in
the U.K.

But what would justice look like? For the
most part, I agree with the recommendations of
Chancey Fleet not everyone is a software
engineer. So stakeholders should at the very
least create an FAQ about each automated
decision-making algorithmic in use, how much it
is purchased for, what the procurement process
was like, what's the time period of any service
contracts, whom does it affect, how it makes --
how to appeal decisions, and to publicize this
information especially in transit and get as
many -- get in front as many people as possible
and as many languages as possible.
Furthermore, I'm -- I'm people like my end, the source code of such decision-making systems hopefully -- I mean, I'm a little radical here, but I think it should be released along with anonymized (indiscernible) trained it to the extent that that exists. Unit tests, integration tests, et cetera, the schedule of deliverables for the vendor and any documentation.

I'm very concerned about policing, facial -- facial recognition, mass surveillance without accountability. And especially concerned that the affects will be greatest for our already marginalized populations. I'm also very concerned that software engineers and data scientist are not trained in science and technology studies or sociological implications of data science and automated decision-making systems.

And I would really like to see more people -- more people doing this work in the future. Thanks.

MS. SAUNDERS: Thank you. All right.

So next, we have Sumana Hariharanwa.
Hi. Is my voice being amplified sufficiently? Okay. Great.

Hi. I'm Sumana Harihareswara. I'm a programmer, a manager. I've worked in the software industry for over a decade. I'm the founder of Changeset Consulting where I've worked on multiple public sector and private sector projects.

I have a number of points, many in response to things that have been said tonight or during the previous forum.

First, I would like to second Ms. Fleet a lot on the matter of publishing on your public website a road map, slash, schedule for this task force regarding procurement reform, regarding the need to encode in that procurement reform right of action liability clauses regarding vendors.

And, second, let's move onto talking about vendors. About the vendors who sell, who make money off of citizen data, and off of, you know, my taxpayer money as the saying goes. If you look at the October 16th, 2017, testimony before the committee on technology of the city
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council when we discussed the original
introduction that turned into the law creating
the task force, open source and transparency
are a way to better security. If there are
vendors telling you that security means they
have to close the source code, look at them
with a gimlet eye.

If there are businesses in our community
making money off citizen data that can't show
us the recipes for the decisions they are
making, they need to get better and we need to
hold them accountable with independent
verification and validation and with the
leverage that we have for the procurement
systems.

If they say that we need to give them a
nondisclosure agreements because they need to
be protected against their competition and that
we need to be putting things under escrow so
that only certain experts are allowed to even
look at their sainted source code, then there
needs to be a carve out to make sure that we
can talk to other municipalities about what we
find.
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There needs to be a carve out to make sure that we can report important security vulnerabilities to this and other relevant institutions. It can't be the situation that our expert says, I think you shouldn't use it, but my zips are lipped [sic] about why.

And this is a response to Nicklin's testimony from the previous forum on April 30th telling our neighbors about what's good or bad about the software we use is a thing that practically all of us want to do and is at the heart of I think transparency. Development -- new development of software being undertaken by the city should be open source by default. And new procurement and RFP's and commissioning new code bases, we should -- even if there is existing code where it would be difficult in various ways to use Chowdhury's point to open up the software then at least say, okay, well, you are making new stuff. It should probably be open from the start to avoid the kinds of problems that we might run into now, right, ten years from now.

We should have a goal of being able to
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list and inventory of all ADSs run by the city. Especially when it comes to Shadow IT that turns out isn't even being run by centralized IT. It's just oh, someone thought it would be a good idea to have a server there to do XYZ. That inventorying could be an explicit goal of the task force.

MS. SAUNDERS: Sorry. So we get three minutes but if you could just wrap up.

MS. HARIHARESWARA: Sure.

Forensic science labs are an example where business rules and notifications sometimes serve as a kind of algorithm that augments decision making. And I think that's relevant to consider.

Looking at the PCATH, the Presidential Council of Advisors on Science and Technology Report from 2016 and the IG, the state-wide IG reports on forensic science labs problems across the state might be a useful guide on that. And training in-house data scientists within the city, people who would like to step up using open licensed curriculum like Data Carpentry is also a way into the lack of
capability problem. Thank you.

MS. SAUNDERS: Thank you very much.

Next, we have Rashida Richardson from AI Now Institute.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you.

A more detailed (indiscernible) of the recommendations I'm going to be giving and context will be electronically submitted. But for brevity, I'm offering the following recommendations to the task force.

First, we encourage the task force to use existing recommendations in recent state and local policy developments. Last August, the task force received a letter with robust recommendations by a group of researchers and advocates.

This letter included detailed policy recommendations based on provisions of the law. And we encourage the task force to adopt these recommendations in its final report. Second, the task force should require all city agencies to proactively and publicly release data to assess bias and discrimination concerns related to current and prospective ADS use. And any
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agency that wishes to be exempt from this
requirement should publicly post an explanation
for non-disclosure.

For example, the school assignment
algorithm used by the DOE has been subject to
disputes given the extreme racial and
socioeconomic segregation in New York City
schools. In response to these growing
concerns, the city enacted the school diversity
accountability act which requires the DOE to
publicly release demographic data related to
school enrollment by individual grade levels
and programs within schools.

However, enrollment data does not show
whether there are disparities in who applies to
specific schools and who actually gets in. In
order to accurately assess whether school
assignment algorithms contribute to
discriminatory outcomes, the public needs
access to the assignment algorithm's data
including student choice inputs and matching
outputs. Third, the task force should provide
a right to protect (indiscernible) advisory
guidance to all city agencies on how to
interpret and comply with requests for information regarding the ADS, pursuant to the New York freedom of information law.

City agencies have much discretion in assessing which documents are responsive to FOIL requests regarding ADS. Yet instead of providing the public with information, they have the right to review. Some agencies claim to not understand the technological capabilities or other relevant information about the technologies they are currently using and properly claim exemptions to FOIL or other employ other obstructionist practices that have resulted in administrative appeals.

Challenging such systems and decisions is resource and time intensive which can have a chilling effect.

Given the gravity of some of the risks ADS pose, the task force should ensure that existing laws like FOIL are interpreted in a manner that empowers New Yorkers. Fourth, the task force should recommend data and decision providence requirements regarding any data that is collected by individuals or communities and
subsequently used in an ADS or shared with other agencies in use -- for the use of ADS.

And finally, I'd like to close with a question for the task force that I hope you can answer given the time at the end. And that is: To what extent have the task force reviewed whether any ADS currently in use violates local, state, or federal antidiscrimination laws?

MS. SAUNDERS: I mean, I guess I'll start. Which is that as folks may or may not know that one of the requirements or the mandates that is before the task force is to set up a process for -- or develop a set of recommendations for a process around how the city would identify if a system is having a disproportionate impact or a disparate impact on the basis of a protected category like race, gender, age, disability, and several others. So that is something that this task force is charged with developing setting a road map for doing that, but we haven't completed that work yet.

MR. THAMKITTIKASEM: And just in terms of
-- I think that we certainly have gotten further in trying to get an example from different agencies to start taking a look at and we've had a couple or reviews but none of those were reviews particularly for any of the things that were -- it's more to get an understanding of one, the types of things that would be discussed.

And then also some discussion around the plain language versus technical kind of difference in terms of where we should focus our attention. Because some of them are as a couple of the examples brought here. Some were very technical and specific to the activities of agency versus those things that were more on just logic of what the -- it was the system or the example was trying to do.

MS. SAUNDERS: So next, we have Angel Diaz of the Brennan Center for Justice.

MR. DIAZ: Hi. My name is Angel Diaz and I am counsel to the liberty and national security program at the Brennan Center for Justice.

The Brennan Center is a non-partisan law
and policy institute that seeks to advance our systems of democracy and justice. And the liberty and national security program focuses on issues of government oversight and ensuring that crime fighting and terrorism -- counterterrorism efforts do so without ethnic profiling.

As part of this work, we actively seek greater transparency into the NYPD's use of surveillance technologies including the use of automated decision systems. We are currently party to a multi-year lawsuit with the New York City Police Department seeking information about how it uses predictive policing technologies.

As many of you know, these systems use -- rely on algorithms to analyze large data sets and generate statistical estimates about crime. These estimates are then used to direct police resources. While predictive policing tools have been roundly criticized by civil rights and civil liberties advocates because they often rely on historical data that both reflect and recreate decades of biased enforcement
against communities of color.

Here in New York City, even historic crime data that goes back ten years would be tainted by the department’s stop and frisk policies that targeted black and Latinx communities.

Unfortunately, our understanding of this system remains very limited. Our public records lawsuit has been slow-balled by NYPD until a judge order them to produce responsive documents and it took almost a year after that order for them to produce some information.

We think that this task force is uniquely situated to engage in a more meaningful evaluation of this system. I submitted longer testimony, but I want to use my remaining time to make four quick points.

First, some of the city's most invasive and unaccountable uses of surveillance technology -- sorry -- of automated decision systems are being used by the New York City Police Department. We urge that this task force meaningfully engage with some of these systems as they have the potential to harm the public welfare of entire communities.
Second, we urge this task force to evaluate the predictive policing system as a representative case sample of -- of a system. This is one of the systems that was actually contemplated when we established the task force in the first place. And it has many of the problems that we hope that this task force can solve such as tainted inputs and the ability of an algorithm to condemn entire communities to a lifetime of over-policing.

Third, we recommended that this task force call on the city council to pass legislation that would require the NYPD to publicly list each surveillance tool that it has, and to -- and to list what protections it has in place for the privacy of New Yorkers. Initiative 47 known as the post doc would do just that. In cities around the country including San Francisco, Seattle, Nashville, Cambridge have all passed even stronger legislation. It's time for New York City to catch up. And, finally, city contracts with vendors should include provisions that require them to disclose the data sets that were used to
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develop and implement ADSs. This information should be made available to auditors who evaluate ADS for bias and disparate impact. In closing, the NYPD’s use of surveillance technology threatens to completely redefine the right to privacy, freedom of speech, and equal protection under the law.

These are fundamental values that need to be zealously guarded if we’re going to maintain a strong local democracy in New York City.

Thanks very much.

MS. SAUNDERS: Thank you.

Next, we have Albert Cahn from S.T.O.P. 

MR. CAHN: Good evening. My name is Albert Fox Cahn. I’m the executive director of the surveillance technology oversight project or S.T.O.P. We are a local civil rights and privacy advocacy group that litigates and legislates to protect the rights of New Yorkers impacted by ADS and other forms of surveillance technology.

I want to echo the remarks of the prior speakers. And to also note that the topic of tonight’s discussion, transparency is crucial.
not only protecting the rights of New Yorkers impacted by ADS but for also protecting the agencies that deploy them.

We've seen countless examples of agencies across the country implementing ADS without the understanding of how the impact marginalized communities only to later find out in litigation that they didn't have a basis to defend themselves against the liability that they incurred. Examples include Arkansas's 2016 Medicare ADS which resulted in the cessation of food and other benefits for impacted members. It included an ADS in Idaho that detrimentally affected numerous recipients of benefits for those with -- who are developmentally disabled.

We have so many examples of how this goes wrong. And transparency has to be a part of not only how we approach ADS at the agency level but how this task force approaches its mission of engaging in this broader discussion. I want to turn to a specific question regarding the checklist that was recently published by the task force which seems to adopt a narrower
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definition of ADS than what had been included
in Local Law 49 referring only to algorithmic
decisions and those derived therefrom which is
narrower than the definition under Local Law
49. Is that something else that has been
adopted for the purposes of the final report
and guidelines that are being used by the task
force? And is that something that the task
force had complete consensus on? Thank you.

MR. THAMKITTIKASEM: To the question of
the check list, it was a means by which to
actually coalesce around a couple of ideas that
we could actually go towards talking to
agencies about what we might use as examples
for the group because there wasn't a lot of --
as we kind of discussed in the first part,
there wasn't an immediate consensus on how to
use the definition.

And one of the things and one of the
questions the task force members had were how
can we get better understanding of examples, at
the same time we also had discussions from
agencies around we're not really quite sure
what does or does not qualify which is really
recommendations for this group. So a checklist
is an opportunity for us to kind of clarify
some of the terms.

And we've been using them to try to kind
of solicit some ideas for further discussion
within the group. It's not necessarily the
definition that we would record out. I think
there are a lot of these recommendations that
still have to go in front of each of these
deliberation sessions that we are having so
that we can kind of get an understanding of
what options there are and then we'll have a
vote later amongst the group.

MS. JIN: And I'll add I think from --
from best practice of when you are looking at
legislation what are some of the clarifications
of specific terms that are in there. And I
think just to echo some of Dr. Chowdhury's
points to us is an iterative process. And so
putting the checklist online for public
comments for you all to take a look and review.
But also something that we're working in
partnership with city agencies on is -- is a
part of the process. But we're really, really
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looking forward to feedback from you all.

And again just to echo the broader points that this is an involving field with a lot of very technical complex terms that we've talked about. And so we can -- if we can upgrade our game there, really open to input.

MS. SAUNDERS: So next, we have Kyle Struck.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So but -- but can -- can we also respond to questions or only the task force chairs?

MS. SAUNDERS: No --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So there was not consensus among the task force on the check list that was published. Thank you for the question.

MS. SAUNDERS: No. Just -- I just want to say I think we acknowledged as both Jeff and Kelly have that this is an area where folks have lots of different perspectives. I don't think that it's a secret right that we spent a lot of time discussing the question of definition. And part of that is because it is complex. Right. So we had a definition that
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came from the local law. We spent a lot of time grappling with it. People had their concerns about it. And this was an attempt as Kelly said as part of an iterative process to try to put pen to paper on something. Understanding that there would still be kind of differing perspectives. And it’s not the end of the conversation.

But did you want to say something, Dan?

MR. HAFETZ: Just on the definition. So speaking on behalf of a city agency and as someone who used to work at the city council and has drafted legislation for the city and I think there are -- I have all due respect for that process. I think we have a definition in the law that is perhaps to capacious than is actually really what was intended with the intent of the law. I think a lot of our comments that we heard tonight from the panelists were really were probably speaking more on point to technologies that are sort of a narrower set than what would be covered with the law. And so I think from the agency perspective, what I can say is I'm personally
sort of struggling with that definition, and I think further clarification of that definition would be hugely beneficial to agencies who are doing all sorts of examples and discussions among the task force of how it's just sort of overbroad to a degree that really doesn't make sense and doesn't serve any purpose or doesn't at least serve the purpose that was sort of intended with the task force. So I think to the extent that members of the public or the panelists have suggestions for refinements, I think that would be very -- I mean personally think that would be really beneficial to the task force. I think as we think about what we need to put in place, it would be -- it would be a big burden.

MS. SAUNDERS: So next we have Kyle Struck, but you're going to pass.

Next, we have Fabian or Fabian Rogers. Fabian. Thank you.

MR. ROGERS: Good evening.

I want to say I am a living example of one of the people that might be affected by some of the communication that might be had between you
and government officials as well as other sort
of organizations that you might be in cahoots
with because I am simply here as a resident of
249 Thomas S. Boylan, Atlantic Plaza Towers.

I'm here off the simple fact that I ran --
I, as well as many other tenants within my
living residency, are dealing with a problem of
facing facial recognition technology being
implemented into our buildings not necessarily
with our consent. Being under, sort of, the
control of our landlord. I don't want to put
it in evil terms that way. But you kind of
feel like you don't have control of the
technological advances that might affect your
livelihood and your privacy.

And I come here as a living example of the
issues and the things that which you speak of
and the things that you come to consensus about
affect people like me. And I don't have the
money, nor do I have the government connections
as a lot of people in this room to really
create a -- a powerful footstep on my own. And
I'm really balancing -- I'm really hoping to
project my voice and allow for you folks to
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bounce off and be a perfect middle man to explain the things that I don't personally understand on the technological level. Because a lot of this conversation, I will be honest, went over my head because I am nowhere within the technology industry.

All I do know that -- all I know is that there's a lot of technology up there that at the end of the day within certain sectors, for me, specifically, the private sector concerns of public residency and places owned by landlords. There's a lot of -- there's not -- actually, there's no real regulation on the city nor state level to handle privacy policies in regards to the technology that's being presented on the table not necessarily implemented in all housing although there is some sort of facial recognition within certain parts of the city.

But I'm dealing with the fact of trying to stop that implementation and checking the processes being had. Making sure that whatever's being implemented is ethical. It's justful [ph.] For the people that are going to
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be affected because ultimately, I was a tenant
that didn't have a voice to say, hey, I have
security concerns. There were other concerns
on my mind within my housing establishment.
Security wasn't one of them. The landlord made
that a concern. And it concerns me that I had
no control in that sort of process.

So I'm hoping that me being here, shows
that there's real life implications and
ramifications being had from these
conversations. And from that -- that we take
serious the ethical implications of certain
things in terms of the technological processes.
And that we take serious that there's no real
privacy policies against certain technologies
that really can be intrusive on people's
livelihoods. If I can have just a quick few
seconds just to explain.

MS. SAUNDERS: Yeah.

MR. ROGERS: The facial recognition
technology that's being involved within my
housing establishment takes a heat mapping of
my face. That of which I don't necessarily
have consent to either opt in or opt out. I
don't even want to have any sort of particular participation in this process. But my landlord has made it clear on a media level, on a public level, on a national level, if you look into the news that there is no opt out process. So what does that leave me as a tenant that has no understanding of technological processes or the sort of statutes at which the levels of how technology is implemented. How do we go about making sure that it's correct, that it's just and that it's affective. And that it doesn't fail once implemented. There was no conversation with that.

So I simply have the fear that if I don't opt into this technology then therefore I don't have a place to live at. And with the rental increases and the rental laws that many tenants have to worry about, that means most likely I might not have a place to live at in Brooklyn. Therefore, I might have to move out of state.

So I'm just giving a brief example of the possible implications that can come from not being mindful of all the sectors and all the effects that this technology can have. So I
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guess one of my questions is: Does anybody or official currently track the use of invasive ADS used in the private sector that pose significant risk to New Yorkers' civil rights, safety, or security.

For example, like the use of facial recognition within residential housing or public schools or companies. I just want to say I'm not -- I didn't want to come from a perspective of bashing. I just wanted to bring prospective because I could see that there's not much conversation being had about certain sectors. And that's perfectly fine because people have certain careers. I just wanted to bring up the fact that there are many other sectors besides the ones that panelists brought up. And I hope those perspectives are open to you all. So thanks, I guess.

MS. SAUNDERS: So first, I want to say thank you for joining us tonight. I think that your comments are really valuable.

A couple things I'll point out, one, to your question about whether there is any city office or agency that is consistently tracking
in the private sector. I'll say it's an interest of the commission. So we are very interested in those sorts of questions about how use of these technologies in the employment sector, in the housing sector and on public accommodations are kind of intersecting with our law. I will also say that I think that there -- well, kind of the focus of this task force is on the use of ADS in the government context, right, there are lessons I think that we can draw in thinking we can do around people's interactions with these technologies in the private sector.

And then two, I would like to take you up on your offer around helping us to think through -- I hope I'm interpreting correctly what you were saying but helping us to think through how to reach folks who may be impacted by these technologies but aren't necessarily kind of thinking about them on the day to day or maybe think about them when something like this happens. But helping us to connect more closely with members of the community. But --

MS. JIN: Yeah. I just think to piggyback
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off of Point Two, would love to actually set up a conversation. So something that I think both Jeff, myself and Brittny alluded to is we are hosting some community round table sessions in the coming weeks and months. And if you're going to stick around a little bit, I think we'll get your information and reach out and actually come have a conversation with you and some of the residence there as well if you would be up for it. Cool. Thanks.

MS. SAUNDERS: So next, we have John Cusick from NAACP Legal Defense Fund.

MR. CUSICK: Good evening.

As our associate director counselor, Jamai Nelson, testified at the last forum the city's deployment and implementation of ADS especially the NYPD's threaten to exacerbate racial inequities throughout the city. And we know from the limited reporting whether it's through FOIL requests FOILs or disclosures that residents throughout the city are being experimented on by these technologies and deployments of these ADS systems. I think Fabian's -- you know, your story right now gets
at the heart of that.

But also the underlying point is I think especially having attended the last forum as well as trying to wrap my head around all of this, it's extremely difficult to really understand this technology and to understand how it's implemented.

I know we brought it up last time and my question back to the task force is since the last time, what has been done to try to figure out ways that you can actually share information with how it's being used, how it's being deployed with community members because it seems really difficult again to have a discussion about the impact, the assessment, and how it's going to be used without community members even knowing what the technology is let alone them trying to explain it. And so I'm wondering how you plan on tackling that road map if there is a disclosure about what ADS systems are actually being implemented, deployed, developed in-house. We know that several agencies are deploying it, you know, and they often times conceal it as testimony
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That's my question back; I just don't see
how robust conversations can happen at the
community level when there isn't public
disclosure about these systems and how they are
actually working.

MS. WHITTAKER: Since I learned that task
force members can also answer.

I personally feel the same way and many of
the people on the task force have been asking
for a long time for more information about the
full spectrum of systems that are being used by
agencies, where they are being used, what data
they are using, and how might we begin to
classify those so that the people most at risk
of harm from that use have a voice in, you
know, understanding -- have a voice in both
determining how these are used going forward
and potentially in rejecting their use. So I
agree. We cannot have transparency. We can't
have accountability. We can't actually do the
work of overseeing these technologies if we
don't have the sort of foundational
understanding that these technologies are being
used where they are being used and, you know, start from there with building accountability.

MS. SAUNDERS: Next, we have Katurah Topps from the Legal Defense Fund.

MS. TOPPS: Good evening. So I think there is a clear -- can you guys hear me?

I think there is a clear theme tonight especially with the worry that these ADS systems will disproportionally affect certain communities. And, particularly, we are thinking of communities of color, black and brown communities.

And so I have a question specifically addressing the NYPD and how the task force plans to address the fact that the NYPD has said before that it believes that it could be exempt from disclosing all its ADSs and all the uses of its ADS. That's something that we keep hearing over and over again, and it's a worry. And so I'm just wondering how the task force is interpreting Section 1-6 of the Local Law 49 which says specifically, quote, Nothing herein shall require compliance with the task force recommendations or disclosure of any
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information where such disclosure would violate
local, state, or federal law, interfere with
law enforcement investigation or operations,
compromise public health or safety or that
would result in the disclosure of proprietary
information.

So how is the task force interpreting
that? Is the task force planning to address
the fact that the NYPD expects to be exempt
from the task force's recommendations? And
does the NYPD consider transparency about
algorithmic decisions such -- included in that
sort of disclosure of law enforcement
operations.

MS. MEISENHOLDER: I'm curious that who
from NYPD said that we wouldn't be exempt from
the task force recommendations.

MS. RICHARDSON: That's a --

MS. TOPPS: Maybe -- let me -- if they're
exempt from the task force recommendations but
exempt from disclosing all of their current
uses and future uses of ADSs.

MS. MEISENHOLDER: I think the NYPD is
open to transparency just like all of the other
city agencies with respect to our ADS.

There may be certain exemptions with respect to law enforcement, privacy and security concerns. But as a member of the NYPD, I don't expect that we would be exempt in a great deal more than any other city agency.

MS. WHITTAKER: I guess a question that might be good to clarify is: How would the determination that a system is or is not exempt be made and who would be in charge of making that determination?

MS. MEISENHOLDER: Yeah. I think I would probably differ to Jeff on that. I don't think we're in a position to answer that at this point, but certainly open to discussion about it.

MR. THAMKITTIKASEM: From the task force perspective, I think that the task of the task force -- sorry -- was really on focusing on a couple of different areas as we kind of repeated in the beginning on the mandates of our work. We got to figure out, kind of, the criteria by which agencies can begin to take a look at what would or would not fall into that
category. We would have to think through, kind of, the processes and the criteria for what would be publicly disclosable and what would not.

And then we would have the process around, kind of, assessing harm and bias and then processes for, kind of, the appeal for what disproportionate harm might be and for individuals and for groups whatever they are. Because there is I think as you've heard a lot here, each of the different agencies have different, kind of, experiences and different uses. I think the task force is really trying to set forth recommendations that would be applied across the city. There's no specific agencies that are exempt from it.

At the same time, we want to be very clear that we are trying to create standards and recommendations that don't, kind of, apply to the right now so much as they are frameworks so it can be used for, kind of, not just current examples but actually into the future. And so that's some of the work that we're doing right now. And so I think as Tanya mentioned, no
agency is exempt. There will have to be considerations within that second recommendation on, kind of, security or public disclosure. Whatever those are, those will have be decisions we have to make recommendations on. And other people have to feed into that.

MS. SAUNDERS: So next we have Icemae Downes from the Atlantic Plaza Towers Tenants' Association.

MS. DOWNES: Thank you. Good evening.

I'm here to piggyback on my fellow tenant.

My concern is, is there -- are you all investigating the policy, the city policies and state policies regarding the use of current ADS? Okay. Example, there's a new development that just opened up in the Bronx called Morris Avenue apartments. Okay. They have ADS. Okay. As a resident of New York City, if you need an apartment, you'd almost sell your first born to get an apartment. So these people have moved into this development that has ADS. Okay. Because they need an apartment, but they have no means to challenge this. And you have
ADS TASK FORCE – PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT FORUM

to look at the make up of the people who are moving in there.

I mean, I think that the ADS residential requirements now are preying on people of color. I live in an area which is Brownsville. And you know Brownsville is mostly of people black, brown, or people of color. Okay. And my landlord has 12 developments in the city, one of which is down in the south sea port area. Okay. But he chose us, a development that is predominantly black females. Predominantly in a black area that has been rezoned, Brownsville has been rezoned. And all we can think of is gentrification. When we asked him why are you coming to us with facial recognition? He said because he wants better tenants. Okay. Better tenants.

I have lived there 51 years, just to let you know. Okay. We do not feel that facial recognition belongs in residential buildings. Okay. We pay our rent. We have certain expectations. However, when we got our notice of modification of our lease from DACR, all they asked us is: Check, yes, you want this or
no, you don't want this. If you checked no, you had to explain why you didn't want it. You didn't have to if you checked yes. You didn't have to explain why you wanted it. But you had to explain why you didn't want it. I want to know why nobody is checking on DACR why we have to explain our nos. Okay. What type of policy is that? Okay.

And one of the things that we're pushing for, we're asking the city and the state to set a policy that they will not allow facial recognition in private sector residential buildings. And you know there's a bill that's been introduced in the senate. Okay. But we also need the city to act fast because we are fighting a man who has a lot of buildings and a lot of money.

And all we have is our Brooklyn Legal Services to represent us, and they have been doing a good job. But -- I have to give you your props. But tenants do not have the money. And we also don't have the knowledge. All we know is we don't want this. And we have no place to go in the city to help us. We have no
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city agency that we could go to and say why is this happening to us? Okay. And I know you're dealing with -- with -- with governmental things, and going on the same level as San Francisco and the Oakland County is talking about -- but you need to think about there is an avalanche coming. Okay. Rolling down the hill, and it's going to go from government ADS into private sector residential. And we're asking you to include this in your program. Thank you.

MS. SAUNDERS: First, I want to say again, thank you for coming and for sharing your comments.

I think you're certainly right that the government piece of this picture is not the only piece of the picture. That there is a tremendous amount of thinking that needs to be done along the same lines of questions of bias. What are ways for people to appeal and to challenge? What are the questions or the demonstrations that folks who are developing these technologies on the private sector side need to think about?
And I hope that there are folks at the state and local kind of legislative levels thinking about this as well. And I don't know if there are -- and, again, would also like to connect with you on the same kind of question that we raised with Fabian around how to connect with community folks -- Vincent.

MR. SOUTHERLAND: Quick comment. So I want to thank both of you and Fabian for your comments, and I think to my mind for us to get our, kind of, job right what we need to be doing is thinking about the people that are the most vulnerable, the most harmed by these tools, and regulate with those folks in mind.

And so to the extent that we can garner as much, kind of, information and input from folks who are directly affected by these technologies, I understand there is kind of the need to balance concerns that agencies have but I'm really actually more concerned and far more concerned with the harms that come to everyday New Yorkers. Because I think that's, like, critically important and too often ignored in these processes. So that's to my mind the
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purpose of this task force. That's why I think
the most expansive definition possible is one
that we need to adopt. That's why I think we
need to adopt things that in terms of like what
Jamai Nelson talked about at the last forum.
The presumption that's placed on the agencies
who are using these systems that they have to
prove that they are not operating in a
discriminatory manner rather than putting the
onus on individuals to kind of raise harms
themselves.

So that's my perspective. And that's kind
of what I'll be pushing for on this task force.
So I really appreciate your comments and hope
that in the months ahead, we get more and more
public engagement as we go through this
process.

MS. SAUNDERS: Thank you.

Next, we have Mona Khalil. Mona may have
Left but next we have I -- Manojit Nandi.

MR. NANDI: Hi. So I guess I was just
wondering. So like there's a lot of emphasis
on transparency, and Dr. Chowdhury brought up
the two parts of like interpretability and
certain understanding. But I guess my concern with transparency is it's sort of shortsighted. You can sort of tell why an algorithm made a decision or a particular person but that doesn't really help them improve their outcomes.

So for example with the static case of interpretability in sort of in finance for example, if you didn't get a credit loan, here's why you didn't get your credit loan because the model says you don't match XYZ. But it doesn't really give you information of like what can you do to change your outcome? And so as the task force, if you think like promoting transparency would be able to say like this is why you didn't get your -- for example, you were like a bad teacher evaluation for example it's like this is why you're a bad teacher. What you could do better? Do you think that the task force should be more forcing agency or encouraging agencies to be able to say, like, what can you do to change your outcomes rather than just saying like this is why you got a bad outcome or this is why you
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get a particular outcome.

And, again, a second part is like tying
into what Dr. Chowdhury is saying about
understanding like: Do you believe
understanding could be done at scale? Because
different people care about different things.
For example -- also, do you think this could be
something that could be done proactively? That
you could sort of come up with a widespread of,
like, layman explanation for people. Or is
there something that has to be done reactively
where people call in and say like I got this
outcome. Like, why did this happen to me? And
you have to come up with a custom-made
explanation sort of like customer support.
Customer support for algorithms of like this is
what the algorithm gave you this particular
decision-kind of thing. And then I guess tying
to that like how do you -- I guess you really
can tell why an algorithm made a decision. And
how do you allow people tort of, contest that
decision?

For example, one thing that was brought up
was, like, threat modeling is erratic motion.
So that people who do sort of -- condition may be prone to erratic motion.

Then there I guess people like me who are like a circus acrobat. Where I could walk normally if I need to but I prefer to walk on my hands or do flips which would flag as like erratic motion. So how could I, like, appeal? Like, no, I am not a threat. I am just walking on my hands in public because that's sort of my job.

MR. THAMKITTIKASEM: Sorry. I think that's actually why this task force was developed to try to answer some of those questions because we don't have a kind of routine answer to that in terms of an appeal process, what the action standards should be for what an appeal are.

And, I mean, thank you for your questions because some of those are exactly some of the questions that I will just admit on a personnel level, like, it was only a couple months into the plain language issue became a real issue for me. We were thinking a lot around kind of the broad kind of definition but really we got
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some examples where just trying to understand
what the impact and how to say it in a way it
was pretty easy to understand raised an issue.
And certainly for me on a personal -- like
raising some of the thoughts around how to make
recommendations around how to include that
within both agency kind of -- and you're going
to review the ADS once you do it. There should
be some things that you're reviewing for. And
there's a lot about the logic model and the
data and so forth.

I think the other is really about the
explainability and some plain language. That's
on a personal level. But that's actually what
we're supposed to discuss and makes
recommendations on. So thank you so much.

MS. SAUNDERS: Next, we have Liz
O'Sullivan.

MS. O'SULLIVAN: Okay. Thank you.

So a lot of what I was planning on asking
has been asked already so good question. Thank
you for that. But I just wanted to say as
somebody who has been working in AI for about
eight years now, some of the different
advancements in the industry are troubling me. The way that certain engineers might try to debias an algorithm and say, now, we're done here. This is perfectly fair algorithm and maybe it doesn't discriminate against black people, but it's fair enough and we're just going to leave it be. And similarly, also there are a lot of technologies out here claiming that they have fair or explainable AI which again, you know, is maybe well and good enough if they have ability to explain a decision if you're making, you know, uncontroversial decisions.

But when you are deciding something like financial support or where to put a police car or whether to arrest a certain person because they maybe look like somebody who might have committed a crime. I just want to reiterate again that I think it's very important that we not just have these definitions be in the technical decision making process explainable but as Rumman said understandable. And that these decisions be -- factors leading into them are explained directly to consumers. So in my
mind, if somebody is arrested with the use of facial recognition technology then that algorithm, that photo for that person for that particular decision and the factors leading into how it was come to need be available for discovery process for a court process cases.

So I just wanted to ask you again, like: Have you looked into or have you thought about how this material be relevant to court cases in the case of either appealing these decisions or understanding whether or not there was bias or there was unfair play involved with some of the decisions that are supported by the algorithms?

MS. SAUNDERS: So I'll start: I think certainly as we start thinking particularly about the question of disproportionate impact, we'll be looking to, you know, how that's been interpreted by courts just as a bit of guidance but not necessary the only thing that we will consider.

But yeah, I think you're right. There's probably a lot of wisdom there, a lot of good there. Or maybe a lot of the things that we want to avoid and do differently. But I don't
MR. SOUTHERLAND: I mean I think it's a phenomenal question and I think it's one that we're all trying to grapple with because I don't -- you know, quite frankly like the current new regime is not one that has ever been like friendly to marginalized repressed communities that these tools are often aimed at.

And so I think to the extent that we adopt something that is within that framework, we're only going to do ourselves a disservice. But then -- first of all, we're up against the reality of what the law actually says right now. And so, you know, to my mind, we're going to need to be kind of reinventing or invent a kind of a new way of holding these types of accountable because the law just simply doesn't do it, and we'll never kind of catch up to it right now as it currently is constructed. So it's certainly something that's been on top of my mind. And I think it's, you know, one of the concerns that I'm really, you know, focused on. And I think many members of the task force
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are focused on it as well.

MS. SAUNDERS: And our next speaker is Jessica Lax.

MS. LAX: Thank you. Well, thank you for organizing this, and I just -- everyone had such amazing comments.

I just have a few -- they're like a mix of comment/question. One, is just thinking about technology and how quickly it's moving. And how rapidly it's quote-unquote disrupting everything. And also just has all these really terrifying implications. And on the juxtaposition thinking about government and how slow and bureaucratic everything is. And so really thinking about how are you going to create a system that's going to allow for the flexibility to adjust to constantly changing technology.

So I don't think -- for me it's not -- all of these one-off questions are really great but in two years from now, they're going to be completely different questions and we really just need a completely new system for addressing technology within government. So
that's just one thought. Another thing sort of related is it's amazing to have a task force, I know that's first in the country or something I read that quickly. I'm in Google phone right now. And so that's cool but, you know, there needs to be -- I think this all your like extracurricular activity. This needs to be a mayor's office. There needs to be a full-initiative thinking about this across all the agencies and across other mayor's offices as well.

But so, you know, I think that's just one thing logistically like really putting some energy towards getting some full-time staff to be thinking and working on this. And then the last piece is about informing the public which came up in a few different ways already. You know, I think so many people are affected by this but A, don't even know it's happening at all. And B, don't even know that it's affecting them or could be. I definitely think there's room to be going to adults, but also wonder what the opportunities are to go to high school students. Specifically, because they
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will be impacted in four years from now which
is really not that long probably right now, and
they will talk to their parents and so it's a
nice way to infiltrate with -- with a means
that you have access to. And I'm not talking
about a full curriculum. Maybe I'm thinking
about a one day drop down. So just some
thoughts.

MS. SAUNDERS: I think that's a great
idea. I mean, I'll just state that over the
last few weeks I've had a number of
conversations with different community-based
organizations including youth groups to try to
understand, like, what's the, kind of, best way
to engage with you. How do you feel that these
issues are particularly relevant to you and the
like. And it's kind of a tough nut to crack.
And one that I can see require ongoing work.
But I'd -- like your suggestion around thinking
about different modes of engaging with young
people, curriculum, et cetera. I like that. I
think that's something we could think about.

MS. WHITTAKER: Yeah. Thank you for that.
I'm going to address the first question around
sort of different speeds, tech versus government.

I've been in a private tech company for well over a decade now. And I think, you know, while technology, you know, there certainly have been sort of step changes in technological capacity and certain ways and there's certainly been new markets opened up for new iterations and different gadgets and different capabilities. I think it does make sense to sort of question the -- the narrative of inevitability. The fact that these technologies are just going to keep going, and all we can do is catch up and they set the pace.

I think what you saw in San Francisco and what you are seeing across the country is that actually we need to think about iterating on different capabilities. Like allowing industry to just continue to define what technology means and to continue to sort of define what scientific achievement means is -- left us in a place where we have a lot of gadgets but we actually haven't innovated on how to determine
whether those technologies are harming people
and how to redress the wrongs of these
technologies. How to ensure that they are used
in ways that are ethical and to make sure that,
you know, they align with the values of the
people who are most at risk of harm. So those
are things we have a lot of catching up to do.
And I am personally okay with, sort of, you
know, putting in place some road blocks to the
kind of corporate juggernaut of rapidly
proliferating technologies to make sure that we
have some time to catch up and answer those
questions clearly.

MS. STOYANOVICH: Thank you for your
wonderful comments.

I'll just maybe respond that although of
course technology will always be moving forward
and we can always try to figure out what the
future dangers may be, it is my dream for this
task force to do something that is practical
and relevant to today. Given the kinds of
questions and the kinds of dangers and the
systems that we already run, I think that it's
really on us to come up with a set of
recommendations that are not so high level as to be impractical, but rather something that we can use to improve people's lives today in the city in which we live today. And I hope that this will happen.

MS. SAMUELS: So thank you. Did you want to say something?

MS. JIN: I feel like now I'm just holding everyone here because it's almost 9:00. I think just two thoughts is being -- I know we have a lot of techies here within the task force, but also in the room. I think the operating mode of how do we actually move purposely and fix things is really important within government. So that's point number one.

And then I think point number two, is just this is -- this is like I talked about it first of the kind in the country, but also that this is the start of the conversation. Every single person in this room and in this task force, we're going to be in this together for the next decade at least. And so I think what's really been interesting to me is how do we, again, continue to iterate build infrastructures that
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are flexible and figure out like whether there
is ownership in a specific office or across the
agencies. But really those are just continued
to be ongoing conversations as -- as we
continue to evolve as government.

MS. SAUNDERS: Great. So with that, I
want to say thank you again to everyone for
giving us such a large portion of your time
this evening, and for your really wonderful and
thoughtful questions and commentary. And we
hope that you'll continue to participate in
this conversation which we said is going to be
ongoing. And stay tuned for more updates from
us. Thank you.

(Time noted: 8:55 p.m.)
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