Surveillance Advisory Working Group – 2/26/19 Meeting Minutes

Attendance

Members: Shankar Narayan, Michelle Merriweather, Joe Woolley, Negin Dahya (phone), Masih Fouladi (phone)

Staff: Seferiana Day, Jim Loter, Sarah Carrier, Mary Dory, Matt Miller, Greg Doss, Gary Smith, Jesseca Brand, Tom Van Bronkhorst, Kate Garman

Public: Jennifer Lee (ACLU)

Officer Elections

SN: Does anyone want to step into role of co-chair? Asha was interested, but we want to clarify her interest.

MW: I move to approve the slate of Shankar and Asha

JW: I second.

SN: All in favor? Co-chairs are elected.

Department of Neighborhoods – Public Outreach Overview (Tom Van Bronkhorst, Jesseca Brand)

DON's role is as a consultant on community engagement to Seattle IT

Role of this team is to work on high level policy – We work on project teams, embedded in department work – advising on how outreach and engagement can support better policy

SN: Who owns the relationship and the outreach meetings?

JB: DON is part of Executive Branch, we work for the Mayor and work directly with the Mayor's Office on this issue.

TVB: Conducting four focus groups – based on what community wants and how they want to discuss it

- CAIR
- Friends of Little Saigon
- Byrd Barr Place
- Entre Hermanos

Public Engagement event 2/27 in BKL, hosted by the Seattle IT Privacy Team

Communications plan – implemented by Privacy Team

We are collecting all information and giving it to Privacy Team, who will then pass it on as part of the SIR package for each technology.

SN: Is there a unified plan for the whole surveillance ordinance?

JB: We are learning as we go and are committed to replicating things that are successful and learning from methods that are not. We want to reach more folks in-language. This hasn't happened yet, but we hope to implement and learn. We are looking to our friends in IT to help us understand the technologies.

TVB: Seattle IT and the Privacy Team put together short videos describing each technology. In talking to the focus groups – 2 of which will be conducted in language – we asked them if translation would be helpful. These focus groups said that these videos could be interpreted on the spot because they are so brief.

MF: We hosted one of the focus groups on the 21st – The videos present a very one-sided opinion about the technologies. I'm wondering if it's possible to show other options, potential risks to community.

JW: What do you mean by one-sided?

MF: It was the department explaining why they use the technology. What is the department's responsibility to give a more holistic view of the impact these technologies could potentially have?

TVB: Many concerns were raised about considering cultural sensitivity.

JL: I can speak to the broader context. I think the broader Surveillance Impact Reports very clearly explore the alternatives – why the technologies were selected, risks mitigated. All of this information is in the SIR, but obviously the community is not going to have read the report. I think you'll find the analysis of the issues you have raised, and we look forward to the Working Group examining this.

SN: What was the goal of the public engagement?

TVB: The goal was to increase participation in the public comment process, and to bring people to the table who normally wouldn't be participating in the process. A lot of comments came, a lot of concerns. It's also a chance for us to grow partnerships with community organizations, to develop conversation around surveillance as well as other policy issues. We have MOU's with each of these organizations by funding them to hold these meetings, and to fund their staff capacity, as well as to provide incentives to participants.

SN: Is there a list of groups you are funding to participate?

JB: Yes.

SN: I share Masih's concern about the videos. It's not surprising to me that people say, yes we want this technologies, because the risks and other options aren't made clear in the videos. Community-based organizations need a lot of support to engage – We are looking realistically at these technologies, especially skeptical questions related to civil liberties. Can we start working together to develop a plan that looks more like a consistent partnership. I appreciate everything you have done thus far.

MM: We don't know what we don't know. Looking at this list (of organizations), a lot of this is foreign to me. Part of the focus groups needs to be education.

JL: The public engagement meetings are structured differently than the focus groups. These feature subject matter experts – it's harder to do many of these, but there are multiple avenues for public engagement.

TVB: The "education" component could be perceived as a sales job – we want to make sure that we are educating and answering questions, without biasing people for or against the technology through the information given.

JL: Discussion or greater transparency – how we got to the point to use certain technologies. Please keep in mind that all of these technologies go through extensive review – this information can be presented more succinctly. We can see what that could look like without each video/summary isn't overwhelming.

JW: Can you expand on the feedback given in Group 1? What was the tenor in comparison to Group 2 so far?

TVB: Main concern was what happens on the back end – what policies are in place to manage this?

SN: A single document that lays out outreach process – who is in charge of each piece. Start to figure out how we can engage with this. It seems like DON is doing their thing and IT is doing their thing. Integration of these would be a value add for us. Kate, how is your office working

KG: We are onboarding our new CTO, and making sure things are moving through the correct

JW: Who is attending these meetings?

TVB: For the focus groups, it's been different at each group, depending on how each CBO does their outreach. At Byrd Barr, it was people who had connection to the organization and the services they provide. New to technology but wanted to talk about it. They received a more extensive presentation by SPD. The CAIR focus group had a distinct concern about targeting.

JB: Our take-aways. We will send you an overall plan. We will send you questions and materials.

Establish Communications Plan for SIR's

SN: Has everyone had a chance to take a look at the email I sent about this yesterday? What we need to figure out in this meeting is both a timeline for our meetings of this group and a timeline

There are 5 high risk technologies – more like 3 – there's a group of license place reader technologies that are used by a few different agencies.

JL: Just Group 1 is ready to go. If you want to prioritize them, we are ready to send all 6 or you can prioritize how you want those delivered, and at what cadence. You'll have a six-week window to review them. Understand there are 29 total technologies, deadline of March 2020. There's a broader timeline to be kept in mind as well.

SC/JL: Draft of Executive's work is complete, but SIR is not transmitted to the Working Group until after the public comment period has occurred (per the ordinance)

SN: My idea: warm up on technologies with less risk, move to those with more risk.

MF: I recommend starting with Group 3

JW: I agree – start with a warm-up of first three technologies. Spreading it out for now, assess highest priority technologies if we need to based on time.

SN: Assuming a once per month meeting – we could get through half of them in 6 months. 9 months for second half, essentially puts us on track.

ND: I agree – if they are as innocuous as you are thinking that they are, it may be relatively easy to have a look and move the conversation.

SN: With all this in mind, my proposal is to receive transition officially for the first three Group 1 Technologies (Hazmat Cameras, Emergency Scene, CCTV), to be discussed at next month's meeting. Review the 3 City Light technologies to assess future review needed.

All in agreement. Please review all SIR's before next meeting. SIR's are less scary than they seem – Consider what is the technology, what does it do, what are the identified civil liberties concerns. We need your community-based expertise.

SC: Official transmittal of SIR's will come from CTO in digital format.

SN: Reorganization of the website and materials – it's hard to find SIR's and public outreach information.

Future Meeting Schedule

SN: Meetings once per month?

MM: Is this enough to meet our deadline?

SN: Can I get a motion to approve our monthly meeting schedule of **12pm -1:30pm on 4th Tuesday**?

JW: So motioned.

MM: Seconded.

SN: We have our meeting time.

Next Steps

SN: Read the SIR's. Passive receipt of information. Reminder to not Reply All when you get someone's set of comments. Anything else we need to cover?

JW: I know that Cybersecurity and Privacy committee meeting is interested and wants to be kept in the loop. They are interested in being involved in some way.

SN: Let's extend an invite to Privacy members for our next meeting.

JL: Members of the working group – please promote the Public Meeting happening Wednesday night. We will send out copies via email.

SN: Can we formally invite Saad to our next meeting?

We are adjourned at 11:52 AM.