



Australian Government

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Review Committee

Minutes

Date Friday 26 June 2026 – 1:00–3:00 pm
Location Microsoft Teams
Chair Lucy Poole, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Digital Transformation Agency
 (endorsed 7 July 2026)

Attendees

Members		
Lucy Poole	Deputy Chief Executive Officer and A/g AI Review Committee Chair	Digital Transformation Agency
LTGEN Michelle McGuinness	National Cyber Security Coordinator	Department of Home Affairs
Jo Talbot	First Assistant, Workforce Policy, Integrity and Operations	Australian Public Service Commission
Andrew Watson	Deputy Commissioner and Chief Data Officer	Australian Taxation Office
Dr Kate Conroy	General Manager, AI Safety Institute	Department of Industry, Science and Resources
Carly Kind	Australian Privacy Commissioner	Office of the Australian Information Commissioner
Presenters		
Paul Boehme	Assistant Secretary, Capability Sustainment	Attorney-General's Department
Luke Brown	Assistant Secretary, Section 47E	Attorney-General's Department
Section 47E	Solution Architect	Attorney-General's Department
Vanessa Roarty	National Manager, Business and Customer Architecture	Services Australia
Damian Tobin	National Manager, Enterprise Innovation	Services Australia
Heather Ralph	National Manager, Automation and AI Operations	Services Australia
Section 47E	Project Director	Services Australia

1. Welcome and introductions

The meeting started at 1:02 pm. The Acting Chair opened the inaugural meeting of the Artificial Intelligence Review Committee, delivered an Acknowledgement of Country and welcomed members. The Acting Chair noted that the meeting would be recorded for minute-taking purposes, confirmed that a quorum was present and invited members to declare any conflicts of interest. No conflicts of interest were declared.

The Committee noted its role under the APS AI Plan is to support agency decision-making by providing independent, practical and non-binding advice on the safe and responsible adoption of AI rather than approving or assuring individual use cases.

Members noted agencies are adopting AI in a rapidly changing cyber and technology environment, requiring attention to cyber resilience, legacy systems, information security, workforce readiness and organisational preparedness.

The Committee considered the draft terms of reference and agreed they should be amended to make clear that they will be reviewed annually, or earlier by agreement of members, to reflect the pace of change in AI technology, emerging risks and the Committee's operating experience. Members noted that the existing scope provisions provide useful flexibility for the Committee to adapt its consideration of use cases as required.

Item	Action	Lead	Due date
2026/01	Update the terms of reference to provide for annual review, or earlier review by agreement of members.	DTA	July 2026

2. Section 47C, Section 47E (Attorney-General's Department)

Use case overview

The Attorney-General's Department (AGD) framed the use case purpose as supporting the

Section 47C, Section 47E

Committee deliberation

Section 47E, Section 47C

3. AI in Operational Blueprint (Services Australia)

Use case overview

Services Australia (SA) framed the use case purpose as helping staff quickly locate and interpret complex Operational Blueprint instructions while delivering services. The proof of concept enables natural language querying of Blueprint content within a controlled environment.

SA advised the proof of concept is supported by internal assurance across data, privacy, legal, cyber, fraud, procurement, AI ethics, architecture and delivery, with engagement involving staff, the CPSU and the agency's independent advisory board.

The initial trial involves 20 experienced users from high-quality content areas. Users have submitted more than 5,000 queries and reported approximately 95 per cent satisfaction. SA advised the next phase will test less experienced staff and lower-maturity content to better understand performance, risks and training implications.

Committee deliberation

Members discussed privacy risks as use expands. SA advised the tool includes warnings not to enter customer information, technical guardrails are being developed to detect and remove identifying details, and that prompts and responses are logged and reviewed to refine controls.

SA advised the current platform uses Claude Sonnet through AWS Bedrock, user prompts are not used to train the model, data is held in Australia, and the API-based design may support future integration, although customer-facing use is not in scope.

Members discussed workforce risks, including whether less experienced staff may over-rely on AI outputs. SA advised the initial cohort was deliberately experienced and the next stage will consider supervision, training, human-centred design and user interface impacts for broader use.

Members also discussed accessibility, scaling and monitoring. SA advised it has engaged its internal Disability Coalition, the tool is not yet fit for all users, and the next six months will focus on controlled scaling, expanded content and automated monitoring.

After SA left the meeting, members agreed the use case addresses a clear service delivery and workforce need, but advice should help define the evidence needed before scaling. Satisfaction metrics should be supplemented by quality assurance that measures accuracy, decision quality, customer outcomes and lessons from errors.

Members agreed SA should further consider workforce segmentation, learning design, business continuity and maintenance of human expertise, including redundancy if the tool becomes embedded in operations and later becomes unavailable.

Members noted advice should help SA establish a scaling framework, including triggers for expansion, guardrail monitoring, harm identification, appropriate controls, workplace health and safety (WHS) considerations and continued engagement with staff and workforce representatives.

4. Member reflections (standing item)

Members noted future materials should more clearly explain the problem being solved, the AI-enabled response, users, data, outputs, key risks and controls, and the specific value sought from the Committee.

Members supported a consistent template or placemat to improve comparability across use cases. Members also suggested providing preliminary comments or questions to the DTA ahead of meetings so common areas of interest can be identified and agencies can prepare additional information where needed.

Members noted use case materials should demonstrate alignment with relevant AI standards and address not only technical risks, but also organisational readiness, workforce impacts, WHS, decision quality, public trust and service delivery implications.

Item	Action	Lead	Due date
2026/02	Consider incorporating a plain-language summary or placemat for each use case, proposed AI response, key risks and controls, and advice sought from the Committee.	DTA	July 2026
2026/03	Members to share initial comments on use cases after reviewing the meeting pack, ahead of each Committee meeting.	Members	Next meeting

5. Other business

The Acting Chair invited members to raise any other business. No other business was raised.

The Acting Chair advised that the DTA would prepare a public communiqué and written advice to AGD and SA for member review and provide the minister's office with an update as outlined in the terms of reference.

The Acting Chair thanked members for their participation and encouraged further feedback on the Committee's process as it matures.

The meeting closed at 3:04 pm.