Surveillance Advisory Working Group – Meeting Minutes: 9/10/2019

## Attendance

Members: Shankar Narayan; Via Phone: Masih Fouladi, Rich Stolz, Joseph Woolley

Staff: Seferiana Day, Ginger Armbruster, Andrew (ITD), Greg Doss, Kate Garman, Gary Smith, Saad Bashir, Sarah Carrier, Omari Stringer, John Campos

Public: Cynthia Spiess, Jennifer Lee (ACLU)

Meeting called to order at 12 PM

## Introductions and Housekeeping

All in the room introduced themselves.

**Update: current status on implementation (executive, IT, central staff, CSWG members)**

Shankar Narayan (SN): In process of preparing for discussion at GET committee, turning that into an actionable report. Recent meeting included SDOT – 2 technologies from this department. We seemed to make it through a good number of substantive issues. From my perspective, we made a lot of progress. Key question is how to make the policies and procedures enforceable.

Ginger Armbruster (GA): 4 open issues that weren’t resolved

Greg Doss (GD): 2 CSIR’s amended with new language. Revised SIR’s will be proposed as an amendment to the legislation. 4 outstanding issues – hearing 9/17, 9:30 AM. Materials will be published this Thursday.

SN: Does this mean we won’t see them before they are published?

GD: Yes, this is my understanding from Bruce Harrell’s office.

Saad Bashir (SB): What remaining issues are there?

SN: These are solvable issues. We largely had agreement on the use. For me, the main question remains are we going to achieve the main goals – clear, concise, enforceable. I’d like to be able to offer feedback on these documents before they go public. It’s not right that only the community groups aren’t able to see the documents. We will make this known to Vinh and Harrell’s office.

GD: I asked Harrell if it was shareable to the working group. He advised that it be published.

GA: We agreed on all issues, aside from the 4 remaining.

SN: Even so, this is not the way collaborative processes have worked in my experience.

GD: All council members will be briefed this week - you may reach out to them.

SN: Anyone on the phone have thoughts on this?

Joe Woolley (JW): Outstanding issues, on page 3 of the document you shared, correct? - I agree, that I can’t imagine there wouldn’t be anything objectionable to sharing. I’d appreciate getting a cc on that.

Rich Stolz (RS): I agree.

GD: I would offer that – I understand where folks are coming from. The materials have just been finalized in the last couple of days. I assume the councilmember is wanting his colleagues to see them first. I assume there’s no intentional snubbing of community here.

SN: There’s no magic around the Thursday date, is there? I’m questioning which documents are made public – and that those that are made public, reflect further feedback from this group.

## Review and discuss annual equity impact assessment document

SN: 3 pieces that the impact assessment is supposed to address. This deadline snuck up on us – September 15th. I propose we do a quick walk-through of both documents.

GA: CTO shall produce a community equity impact assessment and policy guidance report – to council, Inspector General. Consult co-chairs of working group. Drafted independently.

SN: Based on where I think we’ve been … 3 specific areas:

1. RSJI goals. Long-term goal as set forth in RSJI – to change underlying race-based disparities
2. Changes to laws and policies
3. New approaches and considerations – things that aren’t official changes, but reflect lessons learned as they related to race equity. Impetus for Surveillance Ordinance is to center race equity.

Page 2 – Reiterates the process that resulted in initial passage of the 2013 ordinance, and the 2017/2018 engagement of community organizations voicing concerns of technologies acquired by the city.

Second section – race equity impacts – overall assessment. My suggestion is to say this is a good start, but there are still significant concerns. SIR’s are useful for the public and marginalized communities.

Book: The Smart Enough City – gives the WG a shout out. The Surveillance Ordinance and the Working Group are a first, and we are being recognized for that.

Community outreach – positive, but predictable concerns – these haven’t turned into statutes yet. Timeline, broad engagement by the public in the implementation process.

Q1: how do you make it enforceable?
Page 4: ensuring accuracy of the SIR’s, meaningful opportunity to review, community outreach

I’d invite folks on the phone to give feedback

JW: Page 3: the first two points. “inaccurate” is a pretty hefty charge. I would strike “inaccurate” -

SN: I’m thinking the fire chief’s memo that said, “ we are adopting policies around these camera technologies.” and then it turned out they hadn’t done that.

GA: To clarify - They are planning to do that but haven’t done it yet. The limitation we have is they do update to policy every 6 months, and we missed that cycle.

Cynthia Spiess (CS): There are inaccuracies in the SDOT SIR’s - the Acyclica SIR.

GA: This was written two years ago. Technology has moved ahead, we’ve had a year of delay. It does not excuse not updating, but does explain some of the issues.

JW: can we say “outdated”? I think we should keep the tone and tenor of the WG as collaborative as possible.

SN: that’s well taken. Does anyone else object to that or have another suggestion? Hearing none, OK, we will do that.

RS: I haven’t reviewed the document, so I am catching up now.

Masih Fouladi (MF): Same here.

SN: Let’s look at Seattle IT’s document.

SB: What is the flavor that you’d like to leave?

SN: It’s our assessment that the implementation of SSO – significant concerns remain to be addressed. I tried to keep it balanced. I think this is an important process. This is exactly the way that technology should be done, with community input, and that we have a clear assessment of the costs and benefits.

SB: There is a lot of behind the scenes work, many hours consumed over several months. I hope that people who aren’t privy to this work, are able to understand the effort on all sides.

SN: We can add a sentence or two about the process – innovative nature, keeping civil liberties benefits and benefits of the technologies. How does that sound?

JW: I think that’s worthwhile.

RS: I agree.

MF: Me too.

SN: Do IT folks want to do a quick walk-through?

GA: We are still in the beginning part of formulating this work. This sets the purpose.

Outline:

* Background – why we’re here, SIR completion status, annual report
* Summary- because of delays, we haven’t been able to assess the law just yet. Next year, we should have a much better ability to speak to where we are a bit better
* RSJI goals – does it meet the goals, whether or not specific communities are impacted; public comment analysis; disparate concerns were not raised; themes/concerns we did see: themes: government, data sharing, data use and management, concerns around law enforcement use
* Policy and legal adjustments – did not see concerns re: disparate impact
* Future review considerations – in final stage when we got around the table, we seemed to have the most robust conversation. It seems that this stage could come earlier on – this was the most productive aspect of the process.

SN: To ask a question, in terms of the last point – review of policy principles in advance. I’m wondering how it is scheduled with the SIR.

GA: Perhaps once we are assessing new technologies (not the backlog / retroactive look)

Kate Garman (KG): I thought it was helpful having the department reps there to answer questions.

GA: I think it eliminated concerns.

SN: I would be all in favor of that.

GA: When we write the next ones, we will be looking to the CSIR format.

SN: Feedback on the Seattle IT equity assessment?

JW: None from me, appreciate the thorough rundown.

RS: No feedback at this time.

MF: Me neither.

SN: The way you do equity is process – there is value in the process. The fact of transparency helps when people can engage in the process. Page 4, Themes: either there is a difference in opinion

GA: there is a difference between assumed concerns, and actual concerns – how it is being used.

SN: Understood. This looks different to me than that. I think that this should be reworded. With surveillance technology especially

GA: for example, LPR and CCTV – we did an exhaustive study of how they are used. We feel fairly certain that they are not being abused. So to continue to raise concerns about civil liberties’ potential abuse -

SN: I’m hung up on that first sentence - I'd feel more comfortable with it not being in there. It’s a theme that we heard.

KG: This is the city’s perspective – this is the data received through public engagement.

GA: I hear you on this concern.

SN: The way it’s written now is very misleading. It suggests that people don’t care. I’ll make the motion to approve the draft

* Add a piece about the importance of the ordinance, and to replace the word “inaccurate”

Rich seconds, all vote in favor.

Edits and document unanimously approved.

## Community Outreach Planning (IT)

GA: One of the things this group is tasked with doing is to advise on community outreach. Getting the word out, planning events – also working with Dept of Neighborhoods

As we had narrow conversations about specific technologies it kind of didn’t address the general concerns. There may be a more fruitful conversation to be had with a more general conversation.

I want to put this to the working group. We are now looking to October, early November.

How do we do outreach, with limited staff and DON support.

SN: We are running up against our deadline. Is there a way to break up the outreach about technologies so they are not all done at once?

GA: We have the ability to ask for a six-month extension. We have group 3, group 4 is not ready – we have one more group 3 SIR that is being finalized. Right now we can look at Group 3 and surveillance in general.

SN: We have been working with two groups of technologists – at the UW and Microsoft. An algorithmic equity toolkit, and Watching the Watchers

Jennifer Lee (JL):

* Algorithmic Equity Toolkit – to offer community members the ability to understand
* Watching the Watchers – walks people through surveillance and understanding what it is

SN: These will be public facing. We have a limited timeline on at least one of them, and we are running a pilot in mid-October with Watching the Watchers – could be a walk-around-the neighborhood.

Algorithmic Equity – wants to get at the next generation of surveillance technologies

Tech Fairness Coalition – we will have the opportunity to talk about public engagement and both of these tools

Seferiana Day (SD): Davida at SPL would like to put something together related to surveillance, which may coincide with your timeline

GA: “Vendor fair” style – we want to have folks available to talk more in-depth. If we give people more information over time, their comments may be better informed.

SN: Spacing over time is good, longer lead time is good. More collaboration in outreach ahead of time. The broader tech fairness coalition is huge – 50+ groups that have self-selected in. Part of the challenge is if you put it out like “come to a tech fair” people may not come. You need to give opportunity for people to share feedback, coordinated into agenda.

CW: It would be an improvement to have communities fully educated. When there is vocal feedback, it’s usually technical people rather than those most impacted.

GA: I agree with you on that. How do we move the planning process?

SN: If you have a clear sense of timeline, let’s plan backwards.

GA: November 4th or so.

SN: Do you have thoughts on what would inspire people to come out?

MF: We organized people to come out for a previous focus group. Depts have a one-pager or a representative there speaking . People can be easily swayed, so to get them more engaged, I think it’s helpful to give an overview. Going to communities where they are at.

GA: We are limited to how much running around we can do to communities. What’s the best way to maximize outreach with limited capacity.

SN: Existing meetings, people are already planning to show up. Group 3 is all SPD, 5 technologies.

GA: We will produce videos – this is what it is; one-pages in languages

SN: Include PCLIA’s as well, since they will be done.

Sarah Carrier (SC): We will contact El Centro de la Raza and get dates locked down.

GA: We can bundle it all up and send it out – all the past groups we reached out to

## Looking ahead: Discuss timeline and next CSWG action items

SN: We voted on the Equity Impact Assessment, which will be edited and transmitted to Seattle IT.

Next week’s GET Committee hearing – 9:30 AM, Tuesday 9/17

I’ll see if we can get copies of the documents before the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 1:27 PM