THAMES VALLEY TOGETHER

Data Ethics Committee
2 February 2022
12 – 14.30

Please note, when performing their duties as chair they will be referred to as the chair in the minutes. When commenting on the specifics of a use case that is presented they, like others, will be referred to as a committee member to sustain anonymity.

1. **Welcome**

   a. **Observers and conflicts of interest**
   An observer was present, they introduced themselves to the room and the purpose of their observation.

   b. **DARAT and the Transparency Standard – Lewis Prescott-Mayling**
   A point of note. The Centre of Data Ethics and Transparency are leading the National Data Strategy. They have reached out to us to potentially use DARAT for their Algorithm Transparency Standard.

2. **New Phase One Presentation**

   a. **Paul Gresty/Lee Whitehead *Social Impact Bonds***

      i. Presentation
      LW gave an overview of the Social Impact Product. Detailed documentation was provided to the Committee prior to the meeting.

      ii. Discussion
      Q: **A committee member** – Can you share your metrics criteria and the processes for gaining those metrics?
      A: LW - Metrics at an aggregated data level can be shared and the definition why these have been chosen is based on 3 facts. 1) Is the data collectable? 2) Is it clean and trackable? 3) we also ask the young people for their feedback. LW to provide **a committee member** with documentation of this.
      Q: **A committee member** – Do you provide aggregated data that protects a particular community?
      A: LW – We sub-categorise.
      Q: **A committee member** – We need to ensure areas of inclusivity and accessibility is addressed. Are you looking at a broader region, or just looking at Oxford?
      A: LW – The Compass service will have a definition criteria of access. People will need to meet thresholds. It is an Oxford based service at this point, however we do have an ambition to push this out across the Thames Valley, and is available to other areas within the area.
      Q – **A committee member:** Who is carrying out the measurement of the outcome? And how much information is being provided to the families?
      A: LW – Data independence is very important in an impact project. We are working closely with TVT, this creates a level of independence. Families are being engaged as they are part of the change that the young person is going through.
      Q: **A committee member** – What was the study design and methodically, who was involved with that.
      A: LW – Impact product does have a principle design given to us by government. A cohort of a number of people who come into the service. We provide the

interventions, track that for one year on how that has made a difference. Some binary, some frequency. The aim is to look at a reduction. We do have the ability to tweak the design, and its more integrated approach. We are following a model where impact projects have gone before.

LPM: The VRU are asked, as a requirement of our grant, to show what works. The point of principle today is around investment in services, and whether that is the right thing to do. The methodology is not as robust as we would like, however the point in principle today is the principle of using data I a way where we may add or attract social impact bonds.

Q: TO - Would it go ahead on the assumption of benefit rather than the testable benefit?
A: LW - The cohort has to be large enough, to manage the risk, and it would be approach early on with the assumption. We utilised the investment that the project is robust in that it can generate its data.

Q: **A committee member** - Certain communities will be marginalised. How will you deal with that?
A: LW - We recognise that there are core groups that are not getting the service, so we will be positively understanding there are groups whereby there is an over representation at the moment. We will define the criteria to include those groups who are more excluded.

Q: **A committee member** - What support do people get if it is a bad outcome?
A: LW - The Compass project is working with people one to one. Not all will see a positive outcome, once their episode has closed, they can be included back to the service at a later date.
Q: **A committee member** - Longer term interventions. Is that something that would be useful to be transparent about with the young people?
A: LW – The VRU have funded a Young Leader's Project and they would be able to feed into this project.

   iii. Committee requests

   Case Studies –: from where a client is first involved to an end project.
   How we understand the assessment of impact, capturing the benefits and outcomes of what we think are valuable.

   Actions: LW.
   1. Share measures document with group. It would be helpful if there was a document could outline coproduction development of measures in the form of case studies and implementation. Public facing ideas of involvement.
   2. Document regarding non measurable and difficult to measure values, and how they can be incorporated.

4. **Phase Two Presentation**

  a. **Tori Olphin/Dave Powell** *DARAT*

   i. Presentation
    DARAT v3 was presented to the group. A copy of the presentation was provided to the group prior to the meeting.
   ii. Discussion
    Q: **A committee member** - When do you think DARAT will be ready for a test implementation?
    A: DP – We are unable to set a date as some of the work is within the control of ICT.
    A: TO - We have to provide an idea of the final module to the Home Office at the end of the financial year.
    A committee member: Missing Data because it wasn't being collected at that time. When you are evaluating the accuracy of the module. From a user perspective

understanding that there is a considerable about of data missing could have a negative impact on how good the impact of that module is.

TO: we are going to test the impact of the module decision by removing each of the variables.   It is important that this is fed back to the officer, this would then give them the information that the module may not be good in case and will override it. This would makes more sense, without having this information. We need to think of a way of displaying this.

A committee member: If there is missing data it doesn't mean the module will be impacted but may have an impact when the decision is made and may cause the officer to overrule the decision when they shouldn't be. There are a lot of unanswered questions.

TO: No one has tested that, we don't know, nobody knows. We are in a stage to build something to find out by.

DP: It's really clear that whatever predictive module we set on needs to be clear what is available and what is not. It is understand of how the officer interacts.

A committee member - This is a huge project, perhaps we need to think as a committee how we can add value. There are three main chunks, modelling, data management and implementation. What would be most helpful for us to hone in on and use our time to help the best?

TO: I am finding most useful the questions around different ways of thinking about it and problem you would see and you want us to address to be transparent. Not necessary ethical issues but it will make it more transparent.

iii.   Committee requests

The DARAT module will not be presented to the group again until it is ready for officer implementation. What does it look like and how do we decide that this is OK. At this time there maybe the need for community involvement at this stage. The Committee agreed.

The Q&A log is good, everyone can see the questions and answered.
When you are approaching design output for officers and approvals we would want to talk to you. Plans for an implementation process, asking a range of different people of how it works. A board account and justifications of the other technical decisions you have made.

A committee member: Bias checking and removal, it would help to have incite as to what TO has done there, fighting against the systems natural instincts. How and why you have reasoned your intervention.

A committee member: If you build the module and not taking in account anything bias related you get the accurate module, to take bias out you have to make your module less accurate for everyone to make it fairer for other groups. An ethical question not a technical question.   More decision worthy. We need to decide or discuss whether it is an ethical consideration of parameter. Being accurate or not is nothing to do with being ethical or not. What would resolve the problem going back to the implementation? How do we avoid the police officers avoiding the algorithmic output?

TO: Your second problem will be addressed by feedback, if they are creating officer based bias that will be obvious.

The Chair: if there are questions that TO would like to engage the committee beforehand they is no reason why they cannot be contacted by email.

5. **AOB**
   None

6. **Closing**
   Committee members will contact TO with any further questions outside of the meeting.