



TRANSCRIPT – LAUNCH OF THE TECH POLICY DESIGN KIT

THURSDAY 1 DECEMBER 2022, 12 MIDDAY – 1.00PM

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

policy, tech, kit, technology, government, industry, Australia, point, policymakers, process, step, important, Tom, articulated, principles, Johanna, engaging, Lucas, design, questions

SPEAKERS

Johanna Weaver, Lucas Rutherford, Tom McMahon, The Hon. Ed Husic MP

Johanna Weaver 06.30

Hi everyone, we're delighted you're able to join us today for the launch and the demo of the Tech Policy Design Kit. And before we begin, I want to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. After all, it was the Indigenous Australians that were the first innovators here in Australia. We're here today to launch a project that is a partnership between the Tech Policy Design Centre at the Australian National University, the Digital Technology Task Force, the Department of Industry, and also the Tech Council of Australia. At the Tech Policy Design Centre, we reject the prevailing myth that it isn't possible for technology law to keep pace with technology, innovation. It can, and it must. And as we step in and regulate in this space, it's really important that the desire to do something isn't overridden by the need for effective regulation. This Tech Policy Design Kit was born out of a shared desire from the Tech Council of Australia, from the Digital Technology Task Force to focus on how do we design effective technology policy. And it's something that we have developed over many months in partnership with government, many different departments across government, with many different industry interlocutors, and also with civil society. The thing that binds us in this endeavour is the desire to get technology policy right. Because if we get technology policy right, we will be shaping a future in which people, technology, and the planet can thrive. Someone else who shares this desire for good tech policy design is Minister Husic, the Minister for Industry and Science, and we're absolutely delighted that he was able to take the time to record us a message to open and to launch the Tech Policy Design Kit. We'll play that message now.

Minister Ed Husic 09:01

Hi, I'm Ed Husic, Australia's Minister for Industry and Science, and I am delighted to officially launch the Tech Policy Design Kit. Technology is not just about software engineers and data analysts. We need more anthropologists and historians, more designers, more product managers, more lawyers and policymakers to be part of designing and managing technology, and we need them to come from all corners of the community. The Tech Policy Design Kit that I'm launching today encourages more people from all disciplines and backgrounds to get involved in tech policy. Developed by the ANU's Tech Policy Design Centre in partnership with my department and the Tech Council of Australia, the kit demystifies the dark arts and tech policy, making it more accessible to those inside and outside the government. From simple explainers of key technologies and expert webinars, to a step-by-step guide to the policymaking process, it includes useful tools for everyone. Never has it been more important for all policymakers of all disciplines to understand how technology impacts on our society, our economy, and our security. The Tech Policy Design Kit fills a vital gap, and will help ensure Australia's tech policies



world leading, and I congratulate ANU's Tech Policy Design Centre, Tech Council of Australia and my department for the excellent piece of work that they've done. I encourage you to go and check it out yourself. Thanks again for this great effort.

Johanna Weaver 10:35

Thank you. I think the Minister's comments there in particular, where he's talking about the fact that never has it been more important for everybody, for all policymakers, whether you work for government, and if you're a policymaker in the education domain, whether you're a policymaker in the national security, or the foreign policy space, whether you work in health policy - technology is embedded into all of those areas. And it's really important that we have considerations of good tech policy across all of those areas. But it's not just people working in government, it's also people that are working across industry. Whether you're in government affairs, or perhaps you're a company that may not be making technology, but is using technology. And we really need to be focused on both designing that technology in a responsible way, but also using that technology in a responsible way. So one, we have this shared responsibility to be using technology well, but also to be designing technology policy well. And I think one of the best ways to emphasise why it's not just the technology that's important, but also the technology policy is important, is by using an example. So I think facial recognition is something that is very topical at the moment. And if you consider facial recognition technologies, whether its facial recognition technologies being used in Australia, or facial recognition technologies being used in somewhere like China, the core technologies being used are essentially the same technologies. But we have very, very different legal and policy regimes sitting around the use of those technologies. And that results in very different experiences for society and for citizens who are experiencing the use of those technologies. And here, I want to particularly call out the excellent work of the Human Technology Institute and the work they've been doing around facial recognition laws in Australia. The point here is that it's not just the technology that's important. It's also the technology policy that has an important role in shaping our future. And as we do that, we must have partnerships with industry, with government, and with civil society. So I'm really delighted to call on the two panellists that we have for this session today. First up, we have Tom McMahon. He's the Deputy CEO of the Tech Council of Australia. And Tom has basically the perfect CV to be talking about this type of subject. So Tom is obviously now representing industry, but he's worked up on the hill as an advisor at Parliament. He's also worked in the public service. So Tom, thank you so much for being here today. But also, thank you so much for Tech Council's support of the Kit. Over to you for some opening remarks.

Tom McMahon 13:41

Great, thanks so much for the introduction, very kind, and really delighted to be here today to launch the Tech Policy Design Kit. As someone who represents the tech sector in Australia, advocating to government, it's great to have, you know, such strong engagement across industry, government, and also civil society, including through the work that you're doing at the ANU, so really appreciate it. Before I kick off, I'd like to reiterate the acknowledgement of country that Johanna made and pay my respects to elder's past and present. The Tech Council was established to bring industry and government together so that we can get policy settings right to ensure that the tech sector in Australia can flourish. But also to ensure that regulation is well designed and fit-for-purpose. We have a significant opportunity to grow the tech sector in Australia. It's grown very quickly in the last three decades. It's now Australia's seventh largest employer and third largest industry. It's a critical source of fast growing highly paid, stable and flexible jobs. We've produced more than 100 companies worth \$100 million or more and 21 global tech unicorns. We've attracted some of the largest tech companies in the world to Australia who have invested in growing the domestic tech ecosystem. And this really represents a fantastic opportunity to grow important jobs, to improve the use of technology by companies across the economy, and to improve living standards of Australians. Now, that's, you know, that's clearly a very positive thing. But with that also comes new challenges as new technologies are introduced, which



brings up new policy issues. And, you know, as someone who has attended multiple meetings this week with politicians, representing all sorts of different areas that can become very complicated, it's not just industry policy, it's not just regulatory policy, it's not just economic policy. It covers a whole suite of areas, which is why it's really important that we are considerate in how we design that policy. Tech policy is an emerging field, just like tech itself. And it's constantly evolving with new technologies, and new regulatory developments. And if you think about the examples we've seen in recent months from cybersecurity, Privacy Act changes, the introduction this week from Minister Husic of the critical technologies fund, to improve the economic development of the sector. You know, I could go on and on, but we've seen many developments in this space, and that will continue to be the case. So this is gonna present a significant challenge for policymakers, for industry directly, for its representatives in groups like the Tech Council, as well as in civil society. But we agree with Johanna's assessment that just because it's a challenging thing to do doesn't mean we should be despondent and think that we can't actually keep up. So we think that this Tech Policy Design Kit is actually a fantastic tool, which is going to be able to assist policymakers to get their heads wrapped around technology to skill up quickly and think about how they can improve policymaking outcomes. The Kit epitomises our commitment to develop regulatory frameworks and policies that enable responsible innovation, and the use of new products and services. We think it can play a really good, really important role in bridging the gap between policymakers, industry and the community. And we're really looking to see how it's used across the government, both at a federal and state level, I just like to well, I've got the chance to just reiterate our thanks to the team for the really important work that they've done bringing this together. But also to take the chance to thank TCA's member companies who've been engaged in the consultation process. And I've had a sneaky look through the chat and seen some, some of our, you know, amazing Tech Council members. So thanks so much, to all the people who've helped work on the project and get it to this launch today. I'll finish there.

Johanna Weaver 18:03

Thanks so much, Tom. And I agree and reiterate my thanks to the Tech Council members who, as we'll show during the demo, have really been pivotal in contributing content to the Kit, as have so many members of government across different government departments. And I think you're right, this project really does epitomise that objective to build bridges between the different communities. So it's my pleasure now to introduce Lucas Rutherford. Lucas is the general manager of the Digital Technologies Task Force, formerly of Prime Minister and Cabinet, recently of Department of Industry and Science, as part of the changes and machinery of government changes that happened under the new government. I'd also like at this point to give a special shoutout to Michelle Dowdell, who isn't able to be with us today, but I know is with us, in in spirit. So Lucas, over to you to talk about why Digital Technology Taskforce has supported this project.

Lucas Rutherford 19:12

Great, thanks. Thanks, Johanna, and good afternoon, everyone. And thanks also for Tom's remarks. It is a great pleasure to be here at this launch, which the Taskforce, as you say, has had great pleasure to support. I guess by way of introduction, as you said, I'm the General Manager of the Digital Tech Taskforce standing in for Michelle Dowdell, who couldn't make it here today. But she's a great supporter of this particular piece of work and the Centre more generally. I've been asked to provide some remarks about, I guess, why we've chosen to support the Kit and development of the Kit, and some reflections on how we hope it to be used. I guess it's useful just to step back and think about the role of the Taskforce in the history of the Taskforce. And I think Johanna, you've said, we were established a few years ago now in initially in the department of Prime Minister and Cabinet with this sort of rather ambitious goal of seeking to coordinate digital policy development across the Commonwealth at very least, and certainly, you know, with Michelle's leadership as well have sought to act as something of a front door to, you know, the labyrinth of government, engaging in all things tech.



And it's a role that we continue to seek to play now in the industry portfolio, we're very, very happy to be in the industry portfolio, not the least of which is because we have, as we've seen, from the opening kind of video, a very enthusiastic Minister, who's engaged in all things tech. We continue to work across government at the moment on issues relating to skills, and of course, regulation of things like automated decision making and artificial intelligence. And working across with our colleagues in respective portfolios. So in that context, I guess it's sort of an obvious thing that, given our role, it's an obvious thing for us to support. But I might go through a couple of I guess, the key reasons why we support the Kit and the value, I think it can play going forward, and will be certainly supporting its use across the Commonwealth across our colleagues in the APS. And I guess the first one, which I think you both touched on, Johanna and Tom, really the the development of the Kit and the way it's been developed, is it sort of highlights the importance of bringing together perspectives on a set of issues. It's not just government, government obviously has a big role, its industry, civil society role, we're all grappling with the same technology driven forces at play in our society, in our economy. You know, the the data and digital transformation underway, is breaking down traditional barriers. And it's, you know, it's challenging business models, certainly from a government point of view, regulatory institutional architecture, across the board. And, of course, you know, technology, technology is not new. But I guess what we're seeing really is a challenge brought about by the pace and scale of change, you know, somewhat accelerated in recent years by the pandemic, where we've had to respond to a changing way of thinking and doing things. And I think those changes are sort of here to stay in many respects. So I guess, you know, from a government perspective, we all bring different perspectives to the changes that are underway. But I think the key point, highlighted by the manner in which this Kit has been designed is, you know, the way we can fully maximise the benefits of this transformation is really, we really need to focus on bringing together those perspectives in a constructive way. And certainly it's a challenge for government is, how do we do that? How do we engage with the people in industry, in academia and civil society more generally. And I think that leads on to I guess, the more, on a more practical level, you know, our ambition for what this Kit could become, for government. I really think it does, it can become a, it will become an important tool. It's pause for thought to think that, you know, through our work, we're aware of, or have been working with 16 Commonwealth departments, and over 90 regulators, which are playing a role in digital tech policy. You know, I think the Kit's going to play an important role in providing a methodology and approach and a way of thinking to develop best practice tech policy. I think one of the key things and in some respects, good tech policy is good policy and good tech policy development is good policy development. And these are sort of they should be fundamental skills of the APS. But I think tech brings with it some unique challenges that we need to grapple with. And one of these, I think, which is borne out in in some of the modules is the need for drawing, on the particular need to draw on expertise where it's not available within government. So you know, emerging technologies, there's a lot happening at the cutting edge being undertaken by industry. And I think it really underpins the importance of government, in embedding, embedding consultation processes and engagement in a policy development process. I think the value of this kit as well is also in providing a best practice approach to tech policy development, it can embed a focus on developing coherence because instead I think, Johanna, you know, different parts of government, different regulators, are confronted by the same sets of challenges, but will bring together different, will bring to the those issues, their perspectives informed by their particular context in which they're engaging. And so I think if we're all approaching the issues with a solid, best practice model in mind, then I think that's going to help support a more coherent approach to dealing with the challenges that we face. And it's been said, I think the Minister said this is at the start. I think the other key point here is that the Kit plays an important role in demystifying government to those outside. I think we in government probably, to some extent take for granted some of the processes, and some of the engagement that we've become familiar with in our day to day jobs. Although even then, you know, in areas like technology, it can be quite challenging, because technologies are creating challenges that are linked across government. And this is really the core of the the Digital Taskforces' role. So if we face



those challenges, those outside of government, you're dealing with a set of issues such as these, the process can be more opaque. So I think, I think some of the products that have been released today will help industry, civil society better understand, I guess, importantly, better engage in the development implementation of digital tech policy and regulation. I think it's just an A final note, if I can sort of reiterate I think Tom's point, big thank you to Johanna and the Design Centre, I think the Centre is going to play an important role going forward in bringing together voices. And I think that sort of coordination role, really, which is at the heart of our role within government. But certainly it won't be sitting with us alone. I think in voices like the Tech Policy Design Centre, work like this is going to be really important going forward if we're going to create a coherent approach to dealing with tech policy issues, and therefore maximise the benefits that we face in sort of, in engaging with these emerging technologies. So thank you.

Johanna Weaver 26:37

Thank you so much, Lucas. Sorry about that. So I couldn't agree more with you, in terms of the opportunity that we have here. You know, I fundamentally agree that technology will be at the heart of solving so many of the greatest challenges of our time, whether we're talking about climate change, whether we're talking about the future of the food we eat, or the fibres that we wear, technology is absolutely central to this. But we also know now that there are a number of known risks and harms. And we have to be much more responsive in regulating and developing policies that minimise those harms, whilst also ensuring that we're positioning Australia to seize those opportunities, including the future of jobs, for example, which Tom was talking about, as well. So I'm now going to do a demo of the kit. And then for those of you who would have questions, as we're going through, I can see that Matthew has popped a question in the Q&A for us already. So Matthew, is asking about how do we embed measures of effectiveness into the tech policy design process, and Matthew will be delighted that I'll show you that as we demo the process that we've developed, with industry and with government. But if anyone else has questions, please pop them into the Q&A. I'll try and get to them as I go through. Otherwise, we'll have them at the end. And then at the end of the demo, we'll have Lucas and Tom here to answer any questions that you may have about the development of the Kit, and how we intend to use it going forward. So let me share my screen here. For those of you who would like to follow along, live, the Kit should now be live on the internet techpolicydesign.au. And then you can navigate through projects to the Tech Policy Design Kit, or if you like you can do forward slash tech policy design here. For anyone wondering yes, we are going to get a .anu.edu.au. It's coming and we will redirect there very shortly. And I just wanted to reflect a little bit on the origin of this Kit. When I established the Tech Policy Design Centre a little over a year ago, I did what you always do when you start this type of new job. I went out and had discussions with the leaders in the field here in Australia. And I was particularly struck by conversations that I had with Michel Dowdle and with Kate Pounder. And they really were talking about the need for there to be a greater visibility of the principles that guide tech policy and the process of tech policy, and then drawing out the point that I think was Lucas who made about the need for greater expertise. So the Tech Policy Design Kit has become one of the foundational projects of the Tech Policy Design Centre. But it was actually never a project that I thought would be our initial project, it really is emblematic of us of responding to very much the need that was articulated from industry and from civil society. And, from the Digital Technology Taskforce, the Kit itself will be iterative. So we are launching the kit with five modules, which I will go through in a moment. But the idea really is that if you have ideas or suggestions about additional modules that we should add to the Kit, we very much welcome your suggestions, and also your input, if you would like to join with us and partner to develop additional modules. All of the modules that we have here are modules that were developed in partnership with Tech Council and the Digital Technology Taskforce. And it really is intended to be this touchstone of a starting point for those who are involved in tech policy design in Australia, so that we can have this common foundation for our collective efforts. So the Kit opens with videos from myself, from Kate Pounder, and from Michelle, it's me prior to my haircut, we can take a



straw poll as to which which look is better. But we then move on to the five modules that we have. As we said, if you would like to contact us and share your thoughts about additional elements of the modules, please do reach out and get in touch. So we start with Tech Policy Principles, we have Tech Policy Process. And we also have what I call who's who in the zoo, the Australian Government, Digital Tech and Cyber Responsibilities. We have the equivalent for the tech sector. So looking at an overview of the Australian tech sector. And we also have some fabulous tech explainers. So I'll just touch on the elements of each one of these. For you all. The Tech Policy Principles were again, something that we developed consultatively. And we did consults in Canberra, Sydney and Melbourne, two rounds of consultations, talking about what should be the principles that guide good, best practice technology design. And one of the things that really came out from those consultations was that it wasn't just about the principles that we needed to be articulating, but also that we needed to have a purpose statement. Why is technology policy important? And I gave the introduction in the introduction, I gave the example of, you know, technology policy in terms of facial recognition. But it's actually overarching, the reason that we should all care about technology policy is because this is about shaping a world in which people technology and the planet can thrive. And so this is the overarching purpose statement that we have. We've then through the consultation, and I think it really is important to emphasise here: these are principles that are principles that have been developed in consultation with industry and with government. We used as our base, the Australian Government principles for policy design, we looked at the COAG principles, we looked internationally, for example, at the OECD principles, we also looked at principles that have come from industry and here, a particular shout out to the Atlassian principles of tech policy, development and design. I won't go through each one of the principles here, but I will just highlight a few of them, particularly number two. This was something that we heard a lot of in the consultations both from industry and from government, about the need to actually work to define well, the outcomes of the objective of tech policy or regulation. Often, tech policy is developed in response to a particular incident or in response to a particular harm. And this is recognising that actually, we do need to articulate the end outcome rather than just being reactive to the particular incident. The other thing we heard loud and clear, and which both Tom and Lucas, were referring to, is principle for about consultation being a theme, not a step. That it really needs to be something where we're building trust between all of the different actors in the ecosystem. And in doing so, we increase the effectiveness of the technology policy that we're developing, because we're drawing on that breadth of expertise as well as the depth of expertise. And ensuring we're taking into account the diversity of people who use these technologies, rather than just looking narrowly. Another point that really came out a lot, was the fact that regulation actually shouldn't be the default, that we should be considering all available options and policy tools available to government. In some instances, it may be more appropriate to have a grant process, then a new set of regulations, for example. So this idea that we don't necessarily have to default to regulation for government to be taking action. And the point, which I'll come to you, when we get to the process as well, that bad ideas do exist. Sometimes we do need to step back from ideas that are put forward. And the final point I wanted to harness is, that I wanted to highlight here, is the principle number eight about revisions and refinements are strengths, not weaknesses. And I think, again, there's this sense that, you know, we have to get it right the first time. And actually, in the same way that technology is agile and iterative, we have to get more comfortable with the fact that we will design technology policy, and that we need that technology to be responsive to the changes that are made to the technologies. And actually, if we are responsive, that shouldn't be seen as we got it wrong the first time, it should be applauded, because we are being responsible to the changing circumstances. So, these are the eight tech policy principles. If you want to download them as a PDF, you can do so in one set. I'll move now on to the Tech Policy Process. And again, to acknowledge right up front here, it was a point that has been made about tech policy is actually just policy design. And this policy process, if you take the word tech out, it is actually a policy process. What is different about this is that we've really tried to recognise the fact that tech policy design is messy. And it's very rarely linear. So we've tried to demystify a little, the way that technology may jump from different steps, and make that more



approachable for people who aren't necessarily involved in the day to day machinations of government every day. And so the process itself is an 11 step process. What was really interesting as we went through the consultation process, in developing, you know, and articulating the process for good tech policy design, was that many interlocutors outside of government felt that they were only ever consulted or became aware of the fact that technology policy was being developed when we get to stage six, so drafting of the legislation. And actually, we have all of these other steps that happen before, where if we involve a much broader cross section of actors, and this really goes to Matthew's question, how do we get the effectiveness into the design process? Well, if we engage with a much broader group of people in the design process through steps one through to six, then you're going to have much more ability to influence the design of the policy, rather than once you get to the drafting of the legislation, where you're really tweaking around the edges, rather than getting to the substance of the policy. So I'm not going to go through all 11 steps, you'll be pleased to know. But what I will do is just take you through one, the first step that we have here, and just highlight the different elements of each step for you. So we have the articulation of what is the step, we have an extract of the principles from the previous page and how they impact on the different steps, because different principles are probably more applicable to different steps. We have here, the lead actors. So who is the lead actor in each step. And this was something that when we beta tested the kit, with government, with industry, and with civil society, this was something that we really, we've beefed up the text here, because there was a lot of interest in the fact that the lead actors changed through the process. And this is really about the point of the Minister made about demystifying the dark arts. So at this point when we're articulating outcomes, etc. The lead actor to be engaging with at this stage is the Australian Public Service. So the department that has the lead on the issue. But as you move later down the process, it may be that the lead actor is the Minister's office. And that is the person or the focus of advocacy at that point. We then have for each page, a number of questions and a number of outputs. The point of this is that you can go through and say, 'can we actually articulate and answer each of these questions?' And when you get to the bottom, we start the sort of choose your own adventure style element, which is trying to simulate the messiness, the nonlinear nature of tech policy design. So if you can't answer these questions, then you probably need to be moving to an independent inquiry. We have this pop up box with the examples about the independent inquiry, we're going to assume at this point, that you've had your independent inquiry, you can answer your questions. And we're going to move on to the outputs here. And assuming that we can draft our outcome statement, prepare our gap analysis, have a list of expertise, we've identified who is the lead policy department, which is sometimes harder than one might think, and we've got our stakeholder map and engagement plan. Well, now at this point, we can move on to Step Two. And we go through the process as you go through. And you'll see as you move down the Steps, it starts to become more complicated. So once we have the advice to government, there's questions here about well, do we need to have inter intra or inter departmental approval? And if you do, how does that happen? So are you going for example to the Secretary's National Committee, for a committee for national security, for example, to get approval before it goes up to government. There are different options here that are set and outlined. We've also emphasised that there is an exit ramp, you may get to this point and decide actually, we don't need to have a regulatory response here, it may be that a policy response is a more appropriate response. But we're also remembering the principle that 'tech policy is a journey, not a destination'. And we'll probably need to be back here at some other point. If we've got our intra and inter departmental, approval, we probably need to go through a budget process. And we've set out the information here about the budget process. And also recognising that if you don't get budget approval, but you still want to be progressing, then you're going need to go back to Step Two in the Process, which is about looking at your options. But let's assume that we've got our approval, interdepartmental approval, and we've got budget approval, no big feat in the current climate. And we'll then move on and say, 'can we actually answer these outputs?' And then we'll be moving on to the next Step. And you'll see, as we're moving on through the steps of drafting the legislation, the lead actors, the Office of the Parliamentary Counsel, become important at this point,



because they're the ones that will be leading on the drafting of the legislation. And as we get through the consultation on the draft, remembering this is the point at which a lot of external actors are first starting to, or traditionally first starting to be involved in the process, rather than all of the steps that happen before. And emphasising the fact that we really need to have much better consultation in those earlier stages to harness all of that expertise. But we're also recognising that once we get into parliament, where the bill is introduced into parliament, there's then you know, the parliamentary process, which gets particularly messy, you could end up in all different places in the Kit here, you could end up back towards the start of the process, you could end up in committees, and there's information about the committee process here. Or again, you could end up at an exit ramp. Assuming we're successful, and our bill is approved, and we're also highlighting the importance of implementation, evaluation, and review. And this is really making the point that designing the policy revisions, refinements are strengths, not weaknesses that are coming out here. And for each Step, again, it's possible for you to download the individual Steps. Or, if you would, like, you can download the entire Process as a PDF. So that's the Tech Policy Process. And really, this is about how do we embed consultation? How do we embed the knowledge and expertise and the questions that we that are articulated there? To Matthew's point in the Q&A, the questions and the outputs that we have articulated through consultation with government and with industry are really looking to get down into the nitty gritty of how do we design effective tech policy, rather than just policy, rather than just more policy. So that's the Tech Policy Process. And I'll quickly dive through the other three modules. This is the federal government Tech, Digital and Cyber Responsibilities. We have here a video from Michelle Dowdell, who is giving an overview of who does what. You can download the presentations from her, the slides from her slide there, from her video. And then also we have this document, which was quite a feat to pull together. And it really is a map, a 'who's who' of who has responsibility for what across the Australian Government on issues relating to technology, digital or cyber. And that's a downloadable resource, which we will keep updated. The source of the information for this is largely from the administrative orders that set out the roles and responsibilities. And so it really is trying to, for those who are new to these issues, make it easier for people to quit to identify, you know, who are the lead actors across government on these on these particular issues. We also have an overview of the Australian tech sector, with a fabulous overview from Kate Pounder, who provides the overview, but also sets out a lot of stats about the contribution that the tech sector makes to the Australian economy and the potential going forward. And again, her slides are available and downloadable here. We also have a video here from James Cameron, who is a partner at AirTree ventures, who's just giving an introduction on startups and the use of venture capital in Australia. And this module really came out of the consultations and a number of projects that we're doing, where the need for government to be able to understand tech business models keeps coming up as something that is really important for government to be able to understand. And so this is a short webinar that's seeking to address that desire, that need that has been articulated. I've got down at the bottom some of the Tech Council's, or links to some of the Tech Council's key reports, including the economic contribution and the jobs commitments that they have made. And so the last element that I wanted to show you is our Tech Explainers. The point of the Tech Explainers is to say that often policymakers are required to be developing policy on technologies that they're not necessarily familiar with. And so we've curated here a source of information for you as policymakers to be able to come to and understand the technologies from really basic levels. So you know, we have Explainers here that a one or two minutes about what is AI, going through to and here's examples of the contributions from members of Tech Council, So we have here a video from Nick, who's from Max Kelson, and also we've got one from Microsoft here, about the way that AI is being used and, you know, really trying to explain AI for policymakers. And then we move through as you go through to some of the more challenging questions that AI represents. So most of this information, not all, but most of this information is publicly available out there on the internet. What we're doing through these Tech Explainers is curating for policymakers a place that you can come and know that this is an authoritative description of AI in this instance, or we have them for



quantum computing. And you know, we have modules here from Q-CTRL. We've got Michelle Simmons contributions, and it really ranges from again, that high level introduction, but then going through and providing you know, if you really want to go and have a look at being able to use a quantum computer, there's a great link here to be able to get in and start doing, for example, quantum programming. And so it's it's taking you from, you know, 101 through to more in-depth materials. We have this for semiconductors, the blockchain, big data, 5G, intellectual property, this is something that we've worked with IP Australia on to embed some of their very excellent materials here as something that is particularly relevant. And in every one of these modules, we have worked with either a member of the Tech Council, or in some instances members of civil society. So, for example, we have in the internet and Domain Name System, we worked with AP NIC and also with auDA, the domain name register in Australia. So we've got, you know, authoritative videos from Australian sources, and then curated it to have other materials here for you to be able to go and look at. Now, the challenge of course, when you do something around Explainers, is first of all those of you that are experts will look at them and say, 'well, why haven't you included my materials?' If that's the case, please send them through to us. We really, this is a community project. It is what it is because of the community that has been behind us as we've built this. So please, if you have additional materials that you would like, and you think we should be contributing, please don't be shy, get in touch and send them through. And likewise, if you are a member of the policymaking community, and you would like a new technology, or a different technology to be added here, this is a living breathing Kit. This is a living, breathing kit. So if there is a technology that you would like us to add, please get in touch and we'll source the authoritative material for you there. So really, I do want to, I can't name all of the Tech Council members and contributors for this Kit. But we could not have done it without you. And I particularly wanted also to give a shout out to Amy Denmead, who helped to curate much of the open source materials here. So that brings us to, that's the last module in the Kit. And I just wanted to emphasise again to everyone that there really is the possibility. These are the first five modules of the Kit, we will be expanding the Kit, and very much welcome your thoughts in terms of other modules that we should be including. I'm going to stop my screen sharing now. And we'll open it now. If anyone has any questions or comments, we can, if you have a comment, if you raise your hand, you can raise your hand and we will give you the mic. If you have a question, please pop it into the Q&A. Lucas and Tom are here as well, if people have questions for them. Otherwise, we're here to encourage you to use the Kit. But most importantly, please give us feedback on the Kit. Is it actually hitting the mark? Is it useful to you? And are there things that you would like us to be including in the Kit? I'm just going to give it a moment in case anyone has any questions or comments. Otherwise, we'll, oh, we've got a question. Okay. Similar to the principle of tech policy not being a journey, how often do you think the Kit will need to be reconsidered and revised? And what will be the impetus behind the revisions? Similarly, how will you assess the success of the Kit? So absolutely, we will be looking at revising the Kit. It is a Kit that will be constantly updated and revised, likewise with the Process. We also recognise that the Process, as I said, is a very nonlinear process. We've tried to articulate that with the 'choose your own adventure' element. But it is also there as an example. As for the other elements of the Kit, they will be constantly being updated in terms of how we assess the success of the Kit, maybe I'll throw to Tom and Lucas to see how you would assess the success of the Kit. Why don't I go to Lucas first?

Lucas Rutherford 54:50

Thanks, Johanna. Well, I think for us, I mean, as I said in my opening remarks, the benefits are twofold, really. One is the adoption by government. So I guess what we'd like to see, working with our colleagues at APSC and so forth, sort of the actual practical use of this Kit being applied in tech policy development. And I guess the other part is a bit harder to sort of measure is, is the sort of demystification element. And I guess really, that's a question of the extent to which people outside government are engaging with this, and we hope they do. Because I think there's a lot of lot of value in actually understanding how government works. And I think that's probably going to make industry, civil



society, better positioned, to know where and when to engage with government. So I guess, that'll be seen in the outcomes of tech policy, really.

Tom McMahon 55:43

So my sort of two metrics, I guess, is one from a government engagement perspective. I think the extent to which we are receiving that engagement earlier in the process. You know, I find actually, that is the time when we both can contribute in the most useful way. But also, when people are most open to new ideas. The moment things become exposure drafts, in my experience, they become very difficult to change. And I think secondly, you know, the extent to which we can use it to help demystify the policy process for people in industry. For better or for worse, I've spent my entire career doing this stuff. And so I know about how it works. But it's not an intuitive process by any means. So I think the extent to which, you know, TCA member companies and other people who work within industry can have a better sense of when and how to engage with the process, I think would be how we would assess success.

Johanna Weaver 56:50

Yeah, I think, for us, it's, we'll have some metrics around people visiting the site, for example, but also the feedback we have. And so just as a background for people here, we've had three different agencies reach out to us in the last week asking us to come and do demos of the Kit with members of the departments. So I think, you know, that really indicates that there is appetite for this type of thing. And it is, I think, Tom, it is definitely for better that you've been involved in policy. But also, the the intuitive nature of you know, that it's not that it doesn't necessarily follow that linear process, is what we're trying to capture here so that people can have a sense of those dark arts that exist. Stephanie, I somehow in trying to respond to your very, very simple question, I think I may have signed it off as answered. But for those of you who want the link, if you click on the answered questions, the link to the Design Kit is there. That should be up and live now. And available to anyone in out in the public. To Dipin, your question about including web three and the Metaverse explainers? Absolutely. In fact, we have some material already provided by the Responsible Metaverse Alliance for a Metaverse explainer. So that will be going up soon. And we would very much like to include more information about web three. So again, if there are people who feel here among participants that you know of those authoritative sources that should be included, please send them through to us. We very much welcome that input from experts in the field. And on the question of have state government's been involved in the development of the of the Kit, and they haven't been involved in the development of the Kit so far. But again, one of the outreach that we had was from state government. So what what is interesting about the Kit is that we can quite easily amend and modify it to, the way that it is currently drafted is for the federal government process in terms of the examples through ministerial and cabinet, but it is relatively easy to modify that through state government processes, it's the same process. And interestingly, we've also had some interest from other countries. So for example, looking at how do we replicate this for a UK Government environment? So there certainly is. And that really goes to your questions, Margaret, about the appropriate citations and references. That's just a bit that needs to be tweaked. Because the examples that we've given our federal government specific All right, if there aren't any further questions or raised hands, I might just give Tom-uh, oh, Timothy, is it? Sorry, Timothy, I think you should be able to speak. Let's see if this works. And just Tom and Lucas, I'll give you each one minute for closing remarks at the end, so giving you fair warning.

Timothy 1:00:15

Thanks, Professor Weaver and colleagues on the panel. I'm from the University of Melbourne, and my question relates to, I guess, something I see in the digital government tech space is there's a understanding that we all know our own policy areas. I also work in the APS. And something I'd probably like to see in this Tech Toolkit is actually an explainer on policy areas. So, what is workplace



relations policy? What is health policy? Because, we only care about technologies that are being implemented in certain contexts. You know, gig work is a great example. We're not really regulating the technology, we're regulating that specific use case of the technology. And I think something I see across academia, government, private sector, is there is a real gap in knowledge about how we got to this current point in our policy landscape. How has healthcare policy come about? How has workplace relations policy come about? And without that understanding, I think people enter this process without the level of nuance they need to navigate the real, as you would well understand, complexities and nuances of our policy process and bureaucratic infrastructure.

Johanna Weaver 1:01:20

Yeah, I think that's a really, really good point. And it represents sort of the two sides that we're trying to bridge here. There's the technologists that are coming new to policymaking in a particular field. And then from the other side, you have policymakers who are experts in their field of policymaking, who are now being asked to have considerations of the impact of technology, for example, in health policy, and how do we bridge that so that we're, you know, it's not even about speaking a common language, but it's about being able to be working towards the same objectives, which are clearly articulated. So I like that idea. And we'd be very happy to work with you, if you want to if you'd like to get in touch. We have started towards that, in terms of articulating who does what across the federal government. And that was no mean feat to be able to actually articulate, you know, which government agency has the lead on which, and so I think the idea of developing that supporting policy work makes a lot of sense. Alright folks, I'm gonna draw this to a close as we are at time. So Tom, why don't you go first, and then Lucas, we'll throw to you.

Tom McMahon 1:02:39

Alright, look, I just would reiterate my previous thanks for putting the work together. Look, it's clearly an excellent resource. And I think it's going to be really useful. So thanks, again to you for all your work and for engaging with the Tech Council on it.

Lucas Rutherford 1:02:55

Yeah, I probably echo the same. I think, actually, some of the questions highlight to me that this is just the start a journey. I think it's a useful resource, but there's a lot of places it could go. I think state, territory is an obvious one. I mean, you know, let's go ambitious, let's go the international context as well. I mean, there's a lot happening overseas that we're interacting with as a country. So I think this is a really good solid base, and looking forward to building on it from here, being involved.

Johanna Weaver 1:03:23

Thanks, Lucas and Tom. So this is the intention that this is just the base of the Tech Policy Design Kit. The intention is that we continue to update it and more importantly, to expand it. We can't do that without your help and your input. So you know, thank you to Tech Council, thank you to the Digital Technology Task Force. Thank you to all of the experts who have inputted and provided your expertise and your time in developing this Kit. I also before we finish, we're very much thank my team, who have done an amazing amount of work, Ben Gowdie, who led this project for a long time, but also the team today who have run this webinar, who 15 minutes before the webinar started, had to relocate from one side of the university to the other as the internet stopped working in the building that they were in. So, to Lucy to Sarah to Tanvi and to Christabel, thank you so much for making this happen today. And we look forward to working with everybody A closer look reveals a system, characterised by many symbiotic relationships.