**Committee Recommendations**

**Andi-Esra (returning paper from September 2024)**

The Committee suggest that there is a concern around transparency as to whether callers are aware they are talking to a robot, with further suggestions that the lack of human contact could negatively impact satisfaction amongst callers and the public.

Multiple members note that further evaluation of the technology is needed, that data concerning only the number or proportion of calls being processed and the speed in which they are, not being enough. Particularly, members expressed concerns about the lack of data or comparison between abandonment rates with and without Andi-Esra.

One member raised concerns about the disaster recovery processes of the technology, suggesting it could be a likely target for malicious actors and have disastrous affects should it go down.

A final concern raised by a member suggested there could be an issue with the technology in regards to linguistics, it potentially being difficult for the technology to understand inputs from those with thick accents. Alternatively, it was suggested that language barriers could create additional difficulties communicating with the technology.

**Recommendations:**

* The Committee recommend that there is an acknowledgement and transparent indication that the caller is not talking to a real person at the call’s inception.
* The Committee raise that further evaluation is needed and suggest that abandonment rates of the technology should be investigated and compared to the current approach.

**Outcome B – Proceed with minor amendments**

**Video Analytics:**

The most salient concern amongst the Committee regarded the application of the object recognition technology beyond investigating serious crimes. The implications it could have on the right to protest and ideas of a surveillance state further decreasing public confidence were both explicitly raised.

The committee suggest the ethical implications of the technology become less acceptable when applied to less serious crimes.

One member raised the possibility for the technology to produce false negatives as a possible issue whilst another agreed and added false positives to the claim also.

One member suggested the transferring and disclosure of data to and from the provider of the service could cause issues with data protection and further contribute to claims of a surveillance state, especially if it could be applied to facial recognition.

**Recommendations:**

* The Committee recommends that the technology should be limited to combatting serious crime.
* As a result, members also recommend that the definition of serious crime must be made clearer and more obvious so as to reduce the possibility for abuse of the technology.

**Outcome B – Proceed with minor amendments**

**Stalking Algorithm:**

One member suggested there was concern as to how the algorithm may influence and inform the decision-making process.

Multiple members expressed concerns about how the algorithm is dependant on up to date data and enough victims in order to remain continually operational. Inquiries into the management system of this data and victims were made as a result.

Overall the Committee suggested it was too early to judge the algorithm and suggested instead, that the evaluation process and interface needs to be completed before this occurs. Consequently, however, they did express concerns over how uncertainly in this process will be communicated.

**Recommendations:**

* The Committee expressed a belief that the victimisation of child sexual exploitation should be included in the algorithm.
* The Committee request that the proposal be brought back to the Committee after a clear and structured evaluation process once the algorithm is sufficiently tested and enough feedback has been gathered.

**Outcome E – More information required from the Lab to be able to advise**