



Commonwealth AI Assurance Framework Pilot Survey

At the end of each Framework assessment, agencies are required to complete this survey and provide along with completed assessments to the DTA.

Completed Framework assessments and surveys are to be emailed to aistandards@dta.gov.au.

Assessment Details

Name of AI Use Case

Vervoe bespoke online skills assessment tool

Reference Number

Lead Agency

Services Australia

Assessment Contact Officer Name

Section 22

Assessment Contact Officer Email

Section 22

The Framework

1. On a scale of 1-5, how useful did you find this assessment process for ensuring responsible use of AI? (1 being not useful at all, 5 being very useful)

☐ 1 ☒ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Please include a brief explanation of your score. (Optional)

This rating has been selected as we believe this assessment process was not entirely relevant to our needs. This seems to be more relevant to a business area designing/developing an AI tool. We are a recruitment team that designs the questions and answers, tests, optimises and QA's the AI responses in a bespoke Vervoe online assessment tool. The tool is used and administered by an external recruitment provider, so, is a third party product for our Agency.

2. On a scale of 1-5, how clear and easy to understand were the questions in the Framework? (1 being very unclear, 5 being very clear)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐ 5

Please include a brief explanation of your score. (Optional)

The questions themselves appeared to be relatively simple to respond to in first instance. However as noted in the response above, difficulty in providing responses stemmed from the questions maybe not being completely relevant to how we intend on utilising machined learning (AI).

3. What sections or questions, if any, did you find particularly challenging to complete? Why?

N/a

4. Approximately how many people were involved in completing this assessment? What are their roles within your agency (for example, project officer, decision maker, procurement officer etc.)?

Approx 20 people in total. The assessment primarily involved 2 x Assessment contact officers and 1 x Executive sponsor. There was also involvement from representatives from Digital Delivery and Privacy Legal, Fraud and Identity Assurance, Automation and Architecture and Cyber Capability teams. Externally we were required to engage the support of our external recruitment provider who engages with and holds a contract with Vervoe. In addition, we have attended and presented at the Data Trust and Ethics Committee (DTEC).

5. Did any of the delegates request further information before approving the assessment? If yes, please briefly describe.

There were discussions had with the SRO to outline the process and the responses.

6. Did you need to consult any specialist expertise to complete the assessment? If so, what kind and why?

We were required to engage with representatives from: Digital Delivery and Privacy, Legal, Fraud and Identity Assurance, Automation and Architecture, Cyber Capability Teams. Technical information for these business areas was sought from our external recruitment provider who engages with and holds a contract with Vervoe. **Section 47G**

Section 47G In addition we have attended and presented at the Data Trust and Ethics Committee (DTEC).

7. Did the Framework help you **identify and assess** any risks that existing processes would not have captured? If yes, please briefly describe.

No. As noted in question 1, we do not believe that this assessment process is relevant to the recruitment tool we are using and the extent to which we are using AI.

8. Did the Framework help you **manage and mitigate** any risks that existing processes would not have? If yes, please briefly describe.

No

9. Did completing this assessment lead to any changes in your AI project or use case? If yes, please briefly explain.

No

10. Did you encounter any usability issues with the Framework document itself?

No

11. How long do you estimate it took to complete a) the Framework document, and b) the overall assessment process? (i.e. hours, days, weeks)

This process has not yet been completed. It has been a work in progress over the last couple of months. The initial completion of this assessment appeared to be quick given we were utilising a tool provided by a third party with minimal AI use. However, following initial completion there was no clear guidance on who to engage or what information to provide. The team was regularly directed to different teams to speak with and additional documentation requested. In addition the assurance plan did not appear to be fit for purpose. For example, there was a section that indicated should low risk ratings be selected, no further responses were required. Upon submitting, we were advised that this was not sufficient to Services Australia requirements and additional responses were required.

12. Do you have any suggestions for improving the Framework or assessment process?

A central point of contact would be extremely beneficial, minimising the need to engage with 4 to 5 different teams who were often seeking similar information. If a central point of contact is not possible, a clearer understanding of the process and requirements including details on the correct teams to engage and the information they require.

The Guidance

13. On a scale of 1-5, how helpful was the guidance for completing the framework? (1 being very unhelpful, 5 being very helpful)

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☒ 4 ☐ 5

Please include a general explanation of your score. (Optional)

Whilst evident that the process was new, when support was sought the team was helpful and provided guidance where possible.

14. What additional guidance or resources would have been helpful in completing this assessment?

Process maps, lists of contacts and forms detailing information required would have been beneficial in the completion of this task.

Governance

15. What is your agency's governance structure for the oversight of this AI use case?

The initiative was not presented to a governance committee responsible for decision-making on this initiative. A representative from the Automation and Artificial Intelligence has advised that the governing body for AI decisions is Digital Capability and Automation Committee (DCAC) or Executive committee. We have not yet been directed to either of these which would align to comments throughout this survey in that the process is not clear.

16. Was your agency's existing governance structure sufficient to oversee this AI use case? If yes, please briefly explain why? If not, what did you change to ensure it is?

The initiative was not presented to a governance committee responsible for decision-making on this initiative. A representative from the Automation and Artificial Intelligence has advised that a Governance body consists of Digital Capability and Automation Committee (DCAC) or Executive committee. We have not yet been directed to either of these which would align to comments throughout this survey in that the process is not clear.

Anything else?

17. Any other comments or feedback in relation to the Framework, Guidance or governance structures.

This process is very difficult to follow and keep on track. When undertaking this assessment piece there was no initial clear guidance on teams that need to be approached and there either appeared to be no communication between all of the different teams or very minimal communication. Our understanding of AI is minimal and relates only to the recruitment tool that we are utilising, we feel that the extent of this assessment may have been more than needed for this tool. This tool is only intended to use machined learning to help with assessing a portion of a recruitment activity. The machine learning is informed by Services Australia employees by careful moderation.