

# Nôthraîne

---

*Recondition The Human Condition.  
Submission to the Human Rights and Technology Project.  
Additional Comments.*

## Additional Comments

---

Following up on Northraine's response submitted on the 15<sup>th</sup> of October, 2018, below are some additional thoughts and insights in response to the Australian Human Rights Commission's Human Rights and Technology Issues paper.

**It is important for people to have affordances to change their decisions.**

This means it is important to allow for people to change the scores they are given by an algorithm. In finance, justice, marketing and many more fields, we are moving in a direction where algorithms will assign a score to individuals. Recently, we have seen this with China's social credit system – a system that ranks and favours individuals based on employment, criminal history, family and friends, purchases and behaviours to assign a score of trustworthiness. By no means are we proposing such a system in Australia, but it is important for individuals to be able to 'fix' or amend their credit scores of all kinds so they can live a life that is fair.

This point particularly pertains to questions 5 and 6, which looks at how Australian law should protect human rights in AI-informed decision making and strongly relates to 'A Life of Data' in our response to question 2 about discrimination and minorities.

**Understanding how AI models are built is crucial to preserving and promoting Human Rights.**

As our society progresses in the field of AI and machine learning, more decisions will be made and more lives will be impacted by these models. Human Rights Law, Government and Industry must encourage the understanding and awareness of how these models are built so all people comprehend how and why these decisions are made. Consumers who are denied credit, offered higher interest rates on a loan, face harsher penalties in the legal system or receive certain marketing material have a right to understand what informed this decision and how the decision was made.

This point relates particularly to question 3, which looks at how Australian law can protect human rights in the development, use and application of new technologies, question 4, which looks at how human rights in new technology can be promoted outside of legislation, questions 5 and 6 which address AI-informed decision making and questions 8 and 9 which look at the adoption, opportunities and threats presented to disabled Australians with new technology.

**Models should be restricted by the cost of error.**

Models which are built to make decisions that impact lives (AI-informed decision making) must be built with a restriction based on their cost of error. Decisions made in fields such as the justice system, consumer credit and the navigation of machines such as driverless cars, have huge implications from slight errors. These models should be built with no room for error, and in cases of high-impact on a person's life, they must be closely monitored and reviewed to ensure decisions made do not infringe on Human Rights and/or damage lives.

This question highly pertains to questions 5 and 6, which look at AI-informed decision making and its impact on human rights.

# Philosophy

---

## Open algorithm design

Design as little as possible

Implementation over performance

The environment will change

Explain an element, explain the whole

Transparency over complexity