DADM 3rd Review Summary

Fall 2022

Below is a short summary of the issues and changes we are suggesting as part of the 3rd review of the Directive on Automated Decision-Making (DADM). Working in the open, we plan to collaborate with Canadian and international stakeholders to review these issues and consider how best to address them ahead of the policy amendment process.

Expand the scope to also apply to internal services. Language framing the scope requires clarification. Periodic Review: Current 6-month timeframe for review creates policy and operational challenges. Clients Impacted: Reference to Canadians in some parts of the DADM does not recognize other potential clients. Data Governance: Quality assurance measures do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Data Governance: Quality assurance measures of not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Data Governance: Quality assurance measures of not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Expand the scope to also apply to internal services. Change wording from "recommend or make an administrative decision" to "make an administrative decision" or "make an administrative decision" or whate an administrative decision or a related assessment". Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the Clo of Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with	Issue	Response
Language framing the scope requires clarification. Periodic Review: Current 6-month timeframe for review creates policy and operational challenges. Clients Impacted: Reference to Canadians in some parts of the DADM does not recognize other potential clients. Data Governance: Quality assurance measures do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data – they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy.	Scope : External focus excludes automated	Expand the scope to also apply to internal
Add a requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Add and inspire decision or a related assessment of revery 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Replace reference to "Canadians sould there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Called To Action of Ford Lack and the presence to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians society". Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision—anking, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system in decision—anking, the input data and the processin	decisions impacting federal employees.	services.
Add a requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Add and inspire decision or a related assessment of revery 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Replace reference to "Canadians sould there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Called To Action of Ford Lack and the presence to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians society". Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision—anking, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system in decision—anking, the input data and the processin		
administrative decision or a related assessment". Periodic Review: Current 6-month timeframe for review creates policy and operational challenges. by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Clients Impacted: Reference to Canadians in some parts of the DADM does not recognize other potential clients. Data Governance: Quality assurance measures do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data—they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Per Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Add a require decision or a related assessment". Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing need for an off-cycle review. Replace references to "Canadians" ith the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Replace references to "Canadians" with the eterm "clients" and supplement the parent by automated decision systems and related by automated decision systems. Per Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Pee	Language framing the scope requires clarification.	Change wording from "recommend or make an
Periodic Review: Current 6-month timeframe for review creates policy and operational challenges. Clients Impacted: Reference to Canadians in some parts of the DADM does not recognize other potential clients. Data Governance: Quality assurance measures do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data – they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Automation: a justification is unclear. Reasons for Automation is unclear. Reasons for Automation: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Clients Impacted: Canadians on Creview. Replace references to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians on Supplement the latter wi		administrative decision" to "make an
review creates policy and operational challenges. Clients Impacted: Reference to Canadians in some parts of the DADM does not recognize other potential clients. Pata Governance: Quality assurance measures do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data – they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Weasures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption about peer reviews is not included. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. by the CIO of Canadian sofil-cycle review. Replace references to "Canadians with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians society". Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information sto be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the sys		administrative decision or a related assessment".
need for an off-cycle review.		Change to "every 2 years", and "as determined
Clients Impacted: Reference to Canadians in some parts of the DADM does not recognize other potential clients. Replace references to "Canadians" with the term "clients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadians ociety". Data Governance: Quality assurance measures do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data – they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Explanation: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information for interpreting it. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Integrate explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required.	review creates policy and operational challenges.	by the CIO of Canada" should there be a pressing
some parts of the DADM does not recognize other potential clients. Pata Governance: Quality assurance measures on orthogonesis do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data—they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. "Cients" and supplement the latter with a reference to "Canadian society". Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information sto be discoverable via departmental websites. Add a requirement to government to government to cover models, which are a potential processing applead to expand the existing requirement to include a require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental we		·
other potential clients. Data Governance: Quality assurance measures do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data—they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Automation: A publish information about peer reviews is not included. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with a system's production. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information for interpreting it. For explanations addressed to clients, require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system is addressing, the public of complete or summarized peer reviews. Expand the existing requirement t	<u>Clients Impacted</u> : Reference to Canadians in	•
Data Governance: Quality assurance measures do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data – they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Peer Review: Requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Add a requirement to govern the data used and generated by automated decision systems. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Carify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy.	some parts of the DADM does not recognize	• •
do not address the need to trace, protect, and retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data – they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Automation about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Reasons for Planning: Terminology is misaligned with the policy on Government Security. Benefictiveness of the systems. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision—making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information for interpreting it. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement wi	other potential clients.	reference to "Canadian society".
retain and dispose of data used and generated by a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to cata — they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Reasons for Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision—making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information for interpreting it. Integrate explanations criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Countingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy.	•	
a system. Model Bias: Bias testing measures are limited to data – they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Peer Review: Requirement to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misalligned with Treasury Board security policy. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews.		generated by automated decision systems.
Model Bias:Bias testing measures are limited to data – they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model.Expand the bias testing requirement to cover models, which are a potential source of bias.Inclusion:Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking.Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities.Explanation:Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent.Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information for interpreting it.Approach to publishing explanations is unclear.For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision.Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites.Reasons for Automation:A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required.Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered.Peer Review:Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included.Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews.Timing of peer review completion is unclear.Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production.Contingency Planning:Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy.	retain and dispose of data used and generated by	
data – they do not account for other possible sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. models, which are a potential source of bias. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews.		
sources of bias such as the model. Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		· - ·
Inclusion: Measures supporting intersectional approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. For explanation addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation to riteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Require the completion of a GBA+ during the development of a system and an assessment of potential impacts on persons with disabilities. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information for interpreting it. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	models, which are a potential source of bias.
approaches to the design and implementation of systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy.		
systems are lacking. Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy.		
Explanation: Criteria for what constitutes a meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Expand the existing requirement to include criteria concerning the role of the system in decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information for interpreting it. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		
meaningful explanation are absent. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Criteria concerning the role of the system in decision—naking, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system in decision—naking, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system in decision—naking, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system in decision—system in decision—system in the output of the system in the output of the system in the output of the system in the AIA and require public explanations to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		·
decision-making, the input data and the processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information for interpreting it. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Approach to publishing explanations is unclear. processing applied to it, and the output of the system and related information for interpreting it. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.	meaningful explanation are absent.	•
system and related information for interpreting it. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Piming of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		•
it. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.	Approach to publishing explanations is unclear.	
For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. For explanations addressed to clients, require justifications of the decision. All and require public explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		
Justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		it.
Justifications of the decision. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		For evaluations addressed to clients require
Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Integrate explanation criteria into the AIA and require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		
require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		justifications of the decision.
require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. require public explanations to be discoverable via departmental websites. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		Integrate evaluation criteria into the AIA and
departmental websites. Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		
Reasons for Automation: A justification for the adoption of AI in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Add questions to the AIA concerning the user (or public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		
adoption of Al in relation to user needs and program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. public) need that the system is addressing, the effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.	Reasons for Automation: A justification for the	•
program goals is currently not required. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. effectiveness of the system in meeting that need, and the alternatives considered. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		,
And the alternatives considered. Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.	·	•
Peer Review: Requirement to publish information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Expand the existing requirement to mandate publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.	F G. s Gent is entirely like required.	•
information about peer reviews is not included. Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Publication of complete or summarized peer reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.	Peer Review: Requirement to publish	
Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. reviews. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Timing of peer review completion is unclear. Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.	,	
Clarify that peer reviews should be completed prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.	Timing of peer review completion is unclear.	
prior to a system's production. Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Policy on Government Security.		Clarify that peer reviews should be completed
<u>Contingency Planning</u> : Terminology is misaligned with Treasury Board security policy. Harmonize the contingency requirement with the Policy on Government Security.		
with Treasury Board security policy. Policy on Government Security.	Contingency Planning: Terminology is misaligned	
specify a timing for AIA release. production of a system.	specify a timing for AIA release.	production of a system.