

**Report to the Minister of Statistics:
An Algorithm Charter for Aotearoa New Zealand**

Date	13 February 2020	Priority	M	Ref number	MM1933
-------------	------------------	-----------------	---	-------------------	--------

Timeline and next steps

Decision or action required by:	17 February 2020
Will be discussed at:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting with officials on 17 February 2020. ▪ Meeting with Data and Digital Ministers on 4 March 2020.
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This briefing updates you on the submissions received on the draft Algorithm Charter and seeks your agreement to discuss a revised Charter at the Digital and Data Ministers meeting on 4 March 2020.
Linkages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initiative to improve data ethics in the government analytics workforce ▪ Data Ethics Advisory Group ▪ Building public trust in Government use of data
Publicity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We seek your agreement to publish the Algorithm Charter: Summary of Submissions, ▪ This briefing will be proactively published on the Stats NZ website as per standard practice.

Recommended action

It is recommended that you:

1. **Note** that we have completed an analysis of the submissions to the 2019 public consultation on the draft Algorithm Charter (the Charter). **NOTED**
2. **Note** that the public submissions show a strong level of support for the introduction of a charter and many submitters provided feedback about the Charter's scope. **NOTED**
3. **Agree** to publish the document '*Algorithm Charter: Summary of Submissions*' (attached as Annex Two). **AGREE / DISAGREE**
4. **Note** that, based on feedback received from public submissions, we have revised the Charter text to clarify scope, improve alignment to the Treaty of Waitangi, make clearer links to the *Principles for the Safe and Effective use of Data and Analytics* and strengthen consultation expectations. **NOTED**
5. **Note** that, based on feedback received from public submissions and previous feedback from government agencies, we have amended the scope of the Charter to initially apply to all new algorithms, and to apply to all existing algorithms after a period of 5 years. **NOTED**
6. **Agree** to circulate this paper to Digital and Data Ministers ahead of their next meeting on Wednesday 4 March 2020. **AGREE / DISAGREE**

AGREE / DISAGREE

7. **Agree** to seek the endorsement of Digital and Data Ministers to the revised Charter.

AGREE / DISAGREE

8. **Note** that, if Ministers endorse the revised Charter, we propose to discuss the initial signatories at the next meeting of the Digital Government Leadership Group Chief Executives on 9 March 2020.

NOTED

Ra Milicich

Rachael Milicich
**Deputy Chief Executive and Deputy
Government Statistician – Data System
Leadership (Acting)**

Hon James Shaw
Minister of Statistics
Date:

PROACTIVELY RELEASED

Background

1. In October 2018 the Government Chief Data Steward and Government Chief Digital Officer published an assessment of the use of algorithms in 14 government agencies. The Algorithm Assessment Report (the Assessment) made several recommendations to help New Zealanders be informed and have confidence in how the government uses algorithms to inform decisions about individuals [briefing MM1811 refers].
2. In June 2019 we advised you of options to respond to these recommendations. We recommended a combination of a voluntary algorithm charter and workforce capacity initiative [briefing MM1859 refers]. This recommendation was subsequently endorsed by the group of Digital and Data Ministers, and officials were invited to report back to the next meeting of the group with a plan for delivery.
3. In September 2019, following consultation with government agencies, we outlined a proposal for a voluntary algorithm charter, based on the model used by the government accessibility charter, that would commit government agencies to improve transparency and accountability in their use of algorithms in five years. We proposed a period of public consultation prior to finalising the text of the draft Algorithm Charter (the Charter) [briefing MM1882 refers].
4. This consultation also delivers on our Open Government Partnership commitment to consult with civil society on our efforts to increase transparency and accountability of how the government uses algorithms.
5. This recommendation was subsequently endorsed by the Digital and Data Ministers, and the Chief Executives who form the Digital Government Leadership Group. We were invited to report back to the next meeting of the Digital and Data Ministers, following public consultation, and seek agreement for the implementation of the Charter in early 2020.
6. On 17 October 2019, you launched the Charter for public consultation, with submissions to close at the end of 2019.

Other work to improve government transparency and accountability is ongoing

7. The Charter forms a part of our wider work programme to improve transparency and accountability around government data use, including:
 - The ongoing operation of the Data Ethics Advisory Group to provide government agencies with expert advice on new and emerging uses of data [Aide Memoire: Advisory Group on Trusted Data Use refers].
 - An initiative to improve data ethics in the government analytics workforce [briefing MM1888 refers].
 - Consideration of whether change is needed to the current system settings of government use of data to build public trust [briefing MM1885 refers].

A voluntary charter provides an important level of consistency

8. One of the key findings of the Assessment was that, while government agencies are applying a range of safeguards and assurance processes in relation to their use of algorithms, there's a lack of consistency across government.
9. The Charter addresses this lack of consistency by providing a clear and articulated expectation of the actions that agencies will take in relation to algorithm transparency and accountability, given effect by a written commitment from Chief Executives and key managers responsible for algorithm development.
10. During our previous consultation with government agencies, some felt that an incremental approach posed by a voluntary charter was 'too little' while others felt that it was too much and risked 'stifling innovation'.

11. As a result of the feedback we received, we revised the Charter to be clearer around its scope, implementation and accountability, as well as clarifying where it was positioned amongst other related tools and initiatives such as the Data Protection and Use Policy (published by the Social Investment Agency in December 2019) [briefing MM1882 refers].
12. On the basis of subsequent discussion across government, it is clear that some government agencies and sectors are well served with guidance, oversight and tools around the use of data and algorithms, while others have no such support¹.
13. We believe a voluntary charter strikes the right balance between providing clear, consistent expectations for those agencies who seek them, without being overly prescriptive to agencies who already have well developed approaches to managing algorithm transparency and accountability.

There's strong public support for a charter on algorithms

14. We received 34 written submissions on the Charter as part of the public consultation process. Submissions were received from a range of individuals, organisations, and government agencies. The '*Summary of Submissions: Draft Algorithm Charter*' report is appended to this report as Annex Two.
15. Most submitters supported the introduction of a charter and provided feedback about defining the Charter's scope. The key themes from the public submissions are:
 - That the purpose and scope of the Charter should be broadened to include all algorithms, not just operational algorithms.
 - That government algorithm use should reflect the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the Charter should specifically consider the protection of Māori interests.
 - General support for monitoring Charter implementation, including several proposals for the establishment of an independent monitoring body.
 - The need for regular review of bias and public reporting of implementation.
 - The need to develop specific guidance to accompany the Charter and aid implementation.
 - That human judgement and evaluation are part of the decision-making process based on data, and this should be addressed in the Charter.
16. Public submissions provided valuable insight on how this topic is perceived outside of government, and provided many positive suggestions for improvement. In particular, we believe that the scope of the Charter, the way in which Te Ao Māori is described and arrangements for implementation and accountability need further consideration.

Many submissions disagreed with limiting the Charter to operational algorithms

17. The feedback we received suggests that the public see no reason for the scope of the Charter to be limited to only operational algorithms, however, there was a recognition in some submissions that extending the scope more broadly would likely involve additional cost and complexity for government agencies.
18. The original rationale for a limited scope was to align the Charter with the Assessment and focus the efforts of government agencies on those algorithms that have the most significant impacts on the lives of people.

¹ For example, the Director-General of Security and the Director-General of the GCSB have advised us that they believe the Inspector-General of Intelligence and Security provides a sufficient level of rigorous oversight for the algorithms their agencies use.

19. Based on the feedback from some large data agencies we understand there is a clear preference to limit the scope of the Charter, due to the resource implications of retroactively reviewing current algorithm settings. They argue that additional processes required to give effect to the Charter may stifle innovation. It is possible, therefore, that extending the scope could reduce the number of agencies willing to sign the Charter.
20. Based on feedback from government agencies, and public submissions, we've identified several possible options for the scope of the final Charter:
 - **Operational algorithms.** This was proposed for the reasons outlined in the paragraphs above, but many public submissions were critical of this narrow scope.
 - **New algorithms.** This would allow for a more gradual adoption of the Charter by agencies, reducing the resourcing burden, and allow the Charter to apply to all algorithms.
 - **All algorithms.** This option was supported by many public submissions, suggesting it would have the greatest impact to increase public trust, but it may have a negative impact on the number of agencies willing to sign as outlined above.
21. On balance, we recommend that the Charter have a staged implementation. Initially the Charter would apply to:
 - **All new algorithms** (those not yet in service), including both operational and others, from the date of signature.
 - After a 5-year period the Charter would also apply to **all current algorithms** used by an agency (including both operational and others).
22. This removes the distinction between operational and other algorithms proposed by the draft Charter, in line with the submissions from the public, while also responding to feedback from agencies about the challenge associated with retrospective review.

The current wording around Te Ao Māori needs to be improved

23. Submitters agreed that it was important to recognise the Treaty of Waitangi. Half of the public submissions supported the concept of embedding Te Ao Māori into algorithm development or procurement, but thought that the Charter could go further and be clearer about what this means.
24. Several submissions suggested that the Crown's Treaty of Waitangi obligations be made explicit. We have consulted with the Office for Māori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti and revised wording to ensure we align with other references to the Treaty used within the Crown.
25. Some submissions also suggested that the Charter needs to reference Māori Data Sovereignty. This is a complex topic, and we are currently working in partnership with the Data Iwi Leaders to consider system-level governance arrangements. We have added an introduction to the Charter to clearly describe that this is not within scope.

Implementation and accountability were significant issues for the public

26. A number of submissions raised concerns about how accountability would be enforced once the Charter is signed. Some submissions suggested the establishment of an organisation that could provide monitoring, oversight on implementation by government agencies and advice and support to help adoption.
27. The system settings for the devolved model of public service in New Zealand mean that overall accountability for agency decision making across a wide range of functions, including algorithms, sits with individual Chief Executives, who are in turn accountable to the State Services Commissioner.

28. Checks and balances exist in the form of external regulators who can investigate and respond to complaints about the conduct of government officials and agencies, through the Ombudsman and in relation to the privacy of individuals, through the Privacy Commissioner.
29. The Assessment showed that operational algorithms are currently employed to automate existing services or create new services within the existing portfolio responsibilities of government agencies. In these cases, the agency responsible has an existing level of accountability for that service and an established process to resolve complaints or requests for information. These algorithms would also be subject to the checks and balances referenced previously.
30. For this reason, the Charter serves to make explicit and consistent the commitment of government agencies to a level of good practice, through the signature of the accountable person (the Chief Executive), rather than establish a new process or organisation. However, we have revised the Charter to require signatories to designate a clear point of contact for algorithm issues and a channel for challenging or appealing decisions informed by algorithms.

We have revised the Charter to reflect the feedback we received

31. In addition to the changes referenced above, we've significantly revised the text of the Charter on the basis of the feedback we're received. The changes include:
 - Clearer alignment with the *Principles for the Safe and Effective Use of Data and Analytics*.
 - Strengthening the commitment for agencies to actively consult with people, communities and groups interested in, or impacted by, algorithms.
 - More accessible plain English text. We will also publish a te reo Māori translation of the final text.
32. A revised copy of the Charter text is appended as Annex One. We believe that the revised Charter is a significant improvement on the previous draft.
33. We seek your agreement to circulate this paper, and discuss the revised Charter, at the next meeting of the Digital and Data Ministers on Wednesday 4 March 2020. If Ministers endorse the revised Charter, we propose to discuss the initial signatories at the next meeting of the Digital Government Leadership Group Chief Executives on 9 March 2020.

Agencies will require support to implement the Charter

34. Government agencies will require support and guidance to implement the Charter. We already have some elements of this support in place, through the operation of the Data Ethics Advisory Group, who can provide agencies with advice on ethical considerations of the new algorithms they develop.
35. We anticipate developing and publishing a further suite of advice in partnership with agencies, as new algorithms are developed in alignment with the Charter commitments. This work will be enabled by the additional funding to the Statistics Multi-Category Appropriation made through Budget 2019.
36. A key aspect of public feedback not currently addressed by the revised Charter is the need to have a central point that provides monitoring and reporting of algorithms. By adopting a staged approach, with an initial focus on new algorithms, it will be possible for the Government Chief Data Steward to maintain and publish a quarterly list of new algorithms supplied by signatories. This is well aligned with our current work on lifting the transparency and accountability of government data use.

37. We will provide you with further advice on options to the above proposed function for all government algorithms employed by signatories ahead of the 5-year Charter deadline. This advice will form part of the next paper considering possible system changes to build public trust in government use of data [Briefing MM1885 refers].

Next steps

38. We seek your agreement to publish the *Algorithm Charter: Summary of Submissions* document appended to this paper as Annex Two.
39. If you agree with the revised Charter, we will circulate this paper to Digital and Data Ministers ahead of their next meeting on Wednesday 4 March 2020.
40. At that meeting we recommend that you seek the endorsement of Digital and Data Ministers to the revised Charter.
41. If Ministers endorse the revised Charter, we propose to discuss the initial signatories at the next meeting of the Digital Government Leadership Group Chief Executives on Monday 9 March 2020 and will work with your office to coordinate a public announcement.

PROACTIVELY RELEASED

Annex One – Revised Algorithm Charter for Aotearoa New Zealand

Introduction:

This Charter demonstrates a commitment to ensuring New Zealanders have confidence in how government agencies use algorithms.

This Charter is one of many ways that government is demonstrating transparency and accountability in the use of data. However, it cannot fully address important considerations, such as Artificial Intelligence and Māori Data Sovereignty as these are complex and require more focussed solutions.

Commitment:

Our organisation understands that decisions made using algorithms impact people in New Zealand.

We commit to the actions outlined in this charter in developing all new algorithms.

Over the next five years, we commit to aligning existing algorithms with the actions outlined in this Charter and the *Principles for the Safe and Effective use of Data and Analytics*.

Committing to using algorithms fairly and transparently means we will:

Maintain transparency by:

- Clearly explaining how decisions are informed by algorithms, this may include:
 - Plain English documentation of the algorithm,
 - Making information about the data and processes available (in some cases, such as algorithms being used for national security, there may be exceptions),
 - Publishing information about how data are collected, secured and stored.
- Deliver clear public benefit through Treaty commitments by:
 - Embedding a Te Ao Māori perspective in the development and use of algorithms consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.
- Focus on people by:
 - Identifying and actively engage with people, communities and groups who have an interest in algorithms, and consult with those impacted by their use.
- Make sure data is fit for purpose by:
 - Understanding its limitations.
 - Identifying and managing bias.
- Ensure that privacy, ethics and human rights are safeguarded by:
 - Regularly peer reviewing of algorithms to assess for unintended consequences and act on this information.
- Retain human oversight by:
 - Nominating a point of contact for public inquiries about algorithms.
 - Providing a channel for challenging or appealing of decisions informed by algorithms.
 - Clearly explaining the role of humans in decisions informed by algorithms.



Submissions Summary: Draft Algorithm
Charter
February 2020

PROACTIVELY RELEASED

Contents

Introduction	2
Public consultation on the draft Algorithm Charter	3
Profile of submissions	3
What we heard	5
Summary of responses to consultation document questions	5
Does the proposed text provide you with increased confidence in how the government uses algorithms?	5
Feedback on 'Embed a Te Ao Māori perspective in algorithm development or procurement'	6
Perspectives of communities and minimising bias	6
Should the Charter apply only to operational algorithms?	7
Have we got the right balance to enable innovation, while retaining transparency?	8
Have we captured your specific concerns and expectations, and those of your whanau, community or organisation?	9
The algorithmic system	9
Artificial Intelligence (AI)	9
Trust, confidence and social licence	10
Human rights	10
Data collection and quality	10
Implementation of the Charter	10
Review period	11
Guidance	11
Consultation	11

Introduction

Computer algorithms are now a fundamental element of data analytics. Algorithms support the services that government provides to people in New Zealand and help government agencies deliver new, innovative, and well targeted policies to achieve government aims.

In a world where technology is moving rapidly, and the use of artificial intelligence is increasingly common, it is essential that government has the right safeguards in place when it uses public data for decision-making. The government must ensure that data ethics are embedded into its work, and always keep in mind the people and communities being served by these tools.

New Zealand is a member of the Open Government Partnership, which brings together government and civil society leaders to create action plans that make governments more inclusive, open, responsible and accountable. As part of the 2018-2020 Open Government Action Plan, the government committed to take action to make its algorithm use more transparent and accountable.

In 2018, the Government Chief Data Steward (GCDS) and Government Chief Digital Officer undertook a review of how 14 government agencies use algorithms to deliver their functions.

The Algorithm Assessment report provided a summary of the review. The review focused on areas where algorithms were used in decision-making processes that affect people in direct and significant ways. The review also considered the use of algorithms against the principles for the safe and effective use of data and analytics² published by the Privacy Commissioner and the GCDS in May 2018.

In 2019, the Minister of Statistics, Hon. James Shaw, launched a draft Algorithm Charter (the Charter). Signing the Charter would commit government agencies to improving transparency and accountability in their use of algorithms over the next five years. The text of the draft Charter consulted upon has been provided in the Annex of this document.

The Role of the Government Chief Data Steward

The Government Chief Data Steward responds to new and emerging data issues and ensures that government agencies have the capability and right skills to maximise the value of data.

This is achieved through setting data standards and establishing common capabilities, developing data policy, strategy and planning and undertaken in conjunction with other Functional Leads such as the Government Chief Digital Officer, the Government Chief Information Security Officer, the Chief Archivist and regulators such as the Privacy Commissioner.

Public consultation on the draft Algorithm Charter

The consultation period ran from 17 October to 31 December 2019 and this was reported by domestic and international media. Beyond central government agencies, submissions were also solicited from a range of key stakeholders including academics, non-government organisations, civil society representatives and regulators.

Consultation on the Charter was also promoted at the All-of-Government Innovation Showcase on 3 December 2019 and Internet NZ facilitated an online discussion session on Twitter on 20 November 2019. The consultation documentation was available online at data.govt.nz and public were invited to make submissions by email.

34 written submissions were received in relation to the Charter and associated issues.

Profile of submissions

Of the 34 submissions, 12 were from individuals and 22 were from organisations or groups.

Type of Submitter	Number of submissions
Individuals or groups of individuals	12
Organisations or group submissions	22
All submissions	34

The names of individual submitters have been withheld to protect their personal information. The names of organisations that submitted are listed below.

² <https://www.stats.govt.nz/about-us/data-leadership#principles>

List of organisations that made submissions

- The Artificial Intelligence Forum of New Zealand
- Antistatic
- Canterbury District Health Board
- Chartered Accountants of Australia and New Zealand
- Deloitte
- New Zealand Human Rights Commission
- Internet New Zealand
- Lowndes Jordon
- Microsoft
- New Zealand Council for Civil Liberties
- New Zealand School Trustees Association
- Office of the Auditor General
- Transparency International New Zealand
- Xero

Government agencies

- Archives New Zealand, Department of Internal Affairs
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Universities

- Auckland University of Technology
- Joint submission Te Mana Raraunga and University of Auckland
- Sheffield Hallam University
- University of Auckland
- University of Otago

PROACTIVELY RELEASED

What we heard

Most submitters supported the introduction of a charter and provided feedback about defining the Charter's scope. For example, The Artificial Intelligence Forum of New Zealand (the AI Forum) stated that the Charter was "an important step in helping to ensure that any algorithms and associated data sets used within the public sector in New Zealand are developed and utilised in a fair and transparent way".

In considering a possible charter many submitters considered different elements of transparency and accountability, and how this relates to trust. Across all of the submissions received, the major themes were:

- That the purpose and scope of the Charter should be broadened to include all algorithms, not just operational algorithms (algorithms that impact significantly on individuals or groups).
- That government algorithm use should reflect the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the Charter should specifically consider the protection of Māori interests.
- General support for monitoring the Charter implementation, including several proposals for the establishment of an independent monitoring body.
- The need for regular review of bias and public reporting of implementation.
- The need to develop specific guidance to accompany the Charter and aid implementation.
- That human judgement and evaluation need to remain part of the decision-making process based on data, and this should be addressed in the Charter.

Summary of responses to consultation document questions

Question: Does the proposed text provide you with increased confidence in how the government uses algorithms?

Many (68%) noted that the introduction of a charter is an important step forward and would contribute towards providing assurance around how the government uses algorithms as there is currently nothing else in place to provide this. A submission from the University of Auckland stated that "government algorithms can have wide-reaching and long-lasting impacts, so it is only appropriate to have principles that ensure high-quality decisions are being made".

Other submissions noted that implementation of the Charter's principles would greatly improve New Zealand's use of algorithms in the public sector and would provide a valuable resource for those working to improve the private sector.

There is a range of feedback on whether the proposed text will provide increased confidence in how the government uses algorithms. For example, Archives New Zealand agreed that the assurance provided by the introduction of a charter is helpful, while 14 submissions by individuals and organisations commented that more is needed to meaningfully develop trust in government.

Submitters who thought that the Charter would not increase public confidence in government were concerned that the proposed text did not necessarily align with how government uses

algorithms today and focussed too much on how government would use algorithms in the future.

Feedback on ‘Embed a Te Ao Māori perspective in algorithm development or procurement’

Half of all submissions supported the Te Ao Māori commitment but suggested it go further and provide more clarity about how agencies will embed a Te Ao Māori perspective. Some of the submissions suggested a Te Ao Māori perspective may include concepts of Indigenous Data Sovereignty, a shared governance structure, and community rights.

Submitters also suggested that there is a need to monitor implementation and questioned why the Treaty of Waitangi and other obligations are not directly referenced. Six submissions suggested that a reference to Māori Data Sovereignty be included in the Charter.

The main feedback from Te Mana Raraunga (a Māori data sovereignty network) is that “an ‘Algorithm Charter’ is insufficient to protect Māori rights and interests and is highly likely to fail. Such failure will not only be to the detriment of Māori, but also puts at risk the trust in the public data system that is foundational to the willingness to participate and provide high quality data. Regulation that includes mechanisms for accountability and redress is necessary. Such regulation would need to include Māori data governance at all levels”.

Te Mana Raraunga also stated that “any framework on the use of government algorithms needs to actively recognise government obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi and under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples”. Te Mana Raraunga also stated that “a voluntary Charter is unlikely to provide the necessary protections and safeguards for Māori in relation to government use of algorithms”.

Te Mana Raraunga also provided feedback on how the Charter relates to their Principles of Māori Data Sovereignty (Rangatiratanga, Whakapapa, Whanaungatanga, Kotahitanga, Manaakitanga and Kaitiakitanga).

Two submissions suggested the Charter be provided in both English and in te reo Māori.

Perspectives of communities and minimising bias

Submitters generally supported the commitment to consider perspectives of communities but suggested more clarity be incorporated into the Charter on what this commitment meant in practical terms. There were a range of submissions supporting greater community involvement in the creation of government algorithms and providing specific suggestions about how these can be accomplished, including communities being involved in governance, decision-making and testing around the use of algorithms and not to simply include their perspectives.

Some submitters felt that it would be helpful to require active consultation for the use of algorithms, especially with people who are likely to be impacted by decisions made using algorithms. While submitters recognised this could be a costly step, many argued it would help to establish social license and help people understand the impacts of this technology.

It was noted in several submissions that the draft Charter only mentions bias in relation to reviewing the performance of algorithms. Antistatic (a private research and communications group) argue that “minimising bias and discrimination should be considered much earlier in the process, when the system (including the data collected and used) is being designed”. The University of Auckland suggested that an algorithmic impact assessment, similar to a Privacy Impact Assessment, could broadly check for possible negative impacts.

Microsoft (a private technology company) stated “that inclusiveness is a fundamental principle and all stakeholders have a role to play in how to address AI issues and their implications”.

Question: Should the Charter apply only to operational algorithms?

More than half of the submissions received provided views on whether the Charter should apply only to operational algorithms.

Nine submitters suggested that the Charter should apply to more than operational algorithms and the scope widened to include algorithms used for policy and research development. Some reasons provided to support widening the scope of the Charter were:

- All algorithms should be used in a fair, ethical and transparent manner.
- All algorithm-enabled decisions made by government agencies should be subject to high standards of transparent and safe use.
- Potential bias is reduced or eliminated by extending algorithms to policy and research development.
- Operational algorithms will be developed based on available data and may already exclude a Te Ao Māori perspective, which suggests widening the scope of the Charter.

Other submissions noted the similarities between operational algorithms and ‘business rules’, suggesting that applying the Charter to operational algorithms and not business rules would create ambiguity. Some submissions suggested the Charter should be based on international classifications of algorithms.

Three submissions supported the proposal to apply the Charter to operational algorithms only. This was because respondents believed:

- This would add clarity and usefully define a more manageable scope.
- Operational algorithms are the most “public-facing” algorithms that may directly involve the public’s information and data and involve decisions that significantly impact on individuals and groups.

The Office of the Auditor-General recommended a staged approach “the Algorithm Charter and its success (or otherwise) should be reviewed after the proposed five-year period of commitment. When reviewed, consideration should be given to extending the Algorithm Charter to other types of algorithms, advanced data analytics techniques and/or business rules used by government agencies”.

Two submissions suggested the scope of the Charter should be extended to algorithm development, with Transparency International NZ (a global civil society organisation against corruption) strongly recommending “clear definition of both and a centralised register of both so that there is more clarity on how many agencies are using algorithms on both operational and other types of algorithms, and what the purpose of each of these algorithms is”.

Internet NZ (a non-profit organisation, who administer the .nz domain name and provide infrastructure and security to support it) recommended that “agencies using operational

algorithms be required to accept the Charter, to adopt specific measures for public accountability and to be subject to independent review in light of emerging best practice”.

Some submissions challenged the ‘undefined’ category of operational algorithms, suggesting a preferred approach of clearly defining the type of algorithmic tools to which the Charter is intended to apply, and making this definition clear and comprehensible.

Some submitters also proposed that data collection, where applicable, should also be included in the scope of the Charter. This is because the structure and the quality of the data determines the extent to which the interests of various stakeholders can be considered and/or realised in algorithm development.

As part of responses to this question some submitters also considered possible signatories to the Charter, suggesting that the Charter should be offered as an optional commitment for any organisation using algorithms, including organisations outside of government.

Question: Have we got the right balance to enable innovation, while retaining transparency?

More than half of the submissions specifically provided feedback to this question, however, feedback on transparency was also provided in general comments and has been captured in the summary below.

Overall most submitters believed that it is difficult to say in advance whether the balance is right, but most agreed that innovation and transparency are not opposite ends of a trade-off. Two submissions were comfortable with the balance and agreed that the Charter does not stifle innovation and explored the benefits and challenges of innovation and transparency.

Transparency is a major concern for submitters. Some submissions mentioned that the transparency encouraged through this Charter not only protects people's rights and increases confidence, but it can help improve the quality of the algorithms and models as well as build social license with people who may be subject to these algorithms.

For example, Internet NZ describes social licence as a key concept to include in the Charter and sees the Charter sitting alongside other frameworks such as *the Principles for the safe and effective use of data and analytics* (Stats NZ), the Social Investment Agency's *Data Protection and Use Policy*, the Ministry of Social Development's *Privacy Human Rights and Ethics Framework* and the work by the Data Futures Partnership.

Many submitters acknowledged the importance of processes relating to transparency, for example identifying and engaging with stakeholder groups for feedback, co-design, algorithmic audits and reporting.

It was also noted in some submissions that there is no clarity on what New Zealand users are looking for in terms of transparency relating to algorithm use, or what they trust. Research to learn more about what New Zealanders are seeking in terms of the different levels of transparency (including explanation) might be helpful. Some submissions agreed that more openness should in theory at least enable more innovation and listed some practical ways of increasing transparency such as:

- Sharing algorithm code as open source.
- Data sets other than personal information should be shared as open data by default.

- The Charter could refer to alignment with the Open Data Charter and/or the Open Government Partnership Action Plan.

Others suggested that the current wording means that an agency could fully comply with the Charter and still not deliver meaningful transparency. They suggest, as a minimum, information should be made available about how decisions were made, consultation undertaken, and how bias is tested for.

Submitters were also concerned about the impact of innovation. Submitters commented on the importance of innovation that is beneficial to New Zealanders, pointing out that irresponsible innovation is not in the interests of the public good.

There was also a concern that government agencies need to be mindful of potential downsides as technologies have a greater impact on society and recognised the Charter as a key opportunity to ensure that government approaches algorithms in a way that protects and enhances public confidence, privacy, human rights, and other vital community interests.

Some submissions suggested that there are views that the accountability and transparency may be better positioned as elements that contribute to equitable outcomes for New Zealanders, rather than accountability and transparency being the outcomes of the Charter themselves. Other submissions made specific suggestions on how we might amend the wording in the charter to improve the balance between innovation and transparency.

Some submissions acknowledged the risk that a charter that is too prescriptive will hinder innovation, and that too many rules would make compliance more challenging and supported a principles-based approach for the Charter.

Question: Have we captured your specific concerns and expectations, and those of your whānau, community or organisation?

12 Submissions provided specific responses to this question and suggested a broad degree of comfort that their individual concerns and expectations had been captured through the consultation process. However, a range of issues were raised around the possible implementation of the Charter.

The algorithmic system

Algorithms are part of a wider system that goes beyond the tech itself. Antistatic recommends “the whole algorithmic system, including data, governance, and decision-making processes, is covered and that this is made clear in the Charter’s wording”.

Artificial intelligence (AI)

Submissions encouraged consideration of clarifying the scope of the Charter. Microsoft and the AI forum believed the scope should be broader and not solely focused on algorithms. It would be perhaps appropriate to look at algorithms as part of the AI system. An Artificial Intelligence Charter title would be able to capture broader aspects than solely algorithms and could take a more expansive approach, i.e. better encompassing humans’ role in AI/algorithms adoption. In addition, the adoption of the Charter would help the responsible use of AI going forward. This would be an opportunity for the New Zealand Government to be a frontrunner in the practical implementation of AI policy.

Submitters noted that there has been progress in developing technical tools for managing some of the challenges associated with responsible AI, including detecting bias, traceability through model-management, AI security, and improving intelligibility. Microsoft suggested further leveraging these existing efforts in the Charter and in subsequent operational work of the NZ Government and its agencies in line with the Charter.

Trust, confidence and social licence

Several submissions suggested the Charter includes guidance for people about what to do when there are concerns about how an algorithm has been implemented, what data is used to inform decision making, or when reasons for a decision are not clear.

Internet NZ suggested that the public need to understand how a decision was made and when it affects them and recommends the “government develops guidance on a right to appeal automated decisions and resources a responsible agency to hear appeals” and if that is not possible there needs to be a process or develop guidance on how to appeal automated decisions.

Human rights

There was support for the Charter included in five submissions to unequivocally guarantee that all algorithm development, procurement and application adhere to the government’s human rights obligations, including non-discrimination, with a recommendation to include a statement in the text to this effect. The Human Rights Commission wanted to “ensure that privacy, ethics and human rights obligations are safeguarded and integrated as part of algorithm development, procurement, and application”.

Data collection and quality

The submission from the University of Auckland suggested that it would be useful to explicitly acknowledge that for some people or groups of people, there may simply be no data available to represent them, which leads to algorithm models that do not accurately reflect the real-world (which is one form of bias) and therefore leads to algorithms making errors.

Several submissions noted that researchers have also raised concerns about decisions being guided by advice generated automatically by a machine, based on a large set of data which can extend far beyond the experience of the decision maker. Without appropriate training of employees who use the system, (including a thorough description of the data set on which it was assessed and the ways in which it may encompass inherent biases or distort data) further discrimination can be perpetuated.

Implementation of the Charter

Many submitters recognise that governance of automated algorithms is still developing, both in New Zealand and globally. Some believe there is an emerging global consensus on the governance of algorithms and reference international examples (for example external audits are accepted practices in other fields that require both expertise and oversight).

Submissions suggested the Charter might benefit from greater emphasis on a commitment to action in addition to oversight and asked for clear information about:

- How the introduction and application of the Charter will be resourced, monitored and reported on.
- How agencies will be supported to implement the Charter, including costs.

- How communities will be supported to use the Charter to hold agencies to account.
- Whether the Charter will be regularly reviewed/revisited.

Ten submissions suggested the establishment of a group or entity that might provide advice on how agencies ought to implement the Charter and provide some consistency in the application of the Charter commitments. The detail of these suggestions varied from a centrally monitored list of government algorithms and algorithmic impact assessments to the involvement of the Ombudsman or a similar entity in reviewing Charter compliance, or the establishment of a new regulatory body.

The University of Otago recommend that “a new regulatory body should be established to support government agencies when conducting internal reviews and serve a range of functions, including producing best practice guidelines, provide for review of agencies’ in-house evaluations (including seeking more information where appropriate), maintain a register of algorithms used in government, producing an annual report on such uses and conduct ongoing monitoring on the effect of these tools”.

Review period

It was suggested that the *Principles for the safe and effective use of data analytics* and the Charter should be reviewed no less frequently than annually, given the rapid pace of technology development.

The AI Forum suggest “the Algorithm Charter be seen as a ‘living’ document to be kept under review by the government”. The Chartered Accountants of Australia and New Zealand recommend “piloting the Charter prior to rolling it out to the entire Public Service to obtain practical feedback on how it could be improved”.

Guidance

Archives New Zealand feedback included, “the Charter does not provide comprehensive technical guidance on using algorithms in a way that meets the Public Records Act 2005 (PRA) obligations. We see potential for guidelines and, potentially, standards under the PRA to ensure that this occurs”. Algorithms are, and are generating, public records under the Public Records Act 2005 (PRA). Five submissions saw the potential for guidelines to assist public sector agencies to implement the commitments in the Charter.

Consultation

Some submitters thought consultation on the Charter requires that the wording of the Charter is considered in the context of the reasoning that led to the document. This would mean that the thinking should be shared and consulted on so that the resulting Charter accurately reflects stakeholder and community concerns as well as international best practice. There was a view that the Charter should restrict itself to the specific actions required for algorithm use, over and above the standard principles of good public policy practice, which of course apply.

Annex: draft Charter text for consultation (October 2019)

Across the government data system, algorithms have a key role in supporting agencies to undertake their work to improve the lives of people in New Zealand. This Charter exists to demonstrate government's commitment to using algorithms in a fair and transparent way.

Our organisation is committed to transparent and accountable use of operational algorithms and other advanced data analytics techniques that inform decisions significantly impacting on individuals or groups. Over the next 5 years we will use the Principles for the safe and effective use of data and analytics in our work. We will draw on best practice guidance where it exists.

This means we will:

- Clearly explain how significant decisions are informed by algorithms and be clear where this isn't done for reasons of greater public good (for example, national security).
- Embed a Te Ao Māori perspective in algorithm development or procurement.
- Take into account the perspectives of communities, such as LGBTQI+, Pasifika and people with disabilities as appropriate.
- Identify and consult with groups or stakeholders with an interest in algorithm development.
- Publish information about how data are collected and stored.
- Upon request, offer technical information about algorithms and the data they use.
- Use tools and processes to ensure that privacy, ethics, and human rights considerations are integrated as a part of algorithm development and procurement.
- Regularly collect and review data relating to the implementation and operation of algorithms, and periodically assess this for unintended consequences, for example bias.
- Have a robust approach for peer-reviewing these findings.
- Clearly explain who is responsible for automated decisions and what methods exist for challenge or appeal via a human.

Chief Executive:	Chief Information Officer:	Chief Privacy Officer:
Organisation:	Organisation:	Organisation:
Date:	Date:	Date: