



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

DIGITALISATION AND AI FOR PUBLIC VALUE

Report of Findings from Workshop

Authors:

Viviana Bastidas

Kwadwo Oti-Sarpong

Jennifer Schooling

September 2024



Cambridge Centre for
**Smart Infrastructure
& Construction**

ABOUT THE WORKSHOP

The Digital Cities for Change¹ (DC²) team, led by Professor Jennifer Schooling, OBE FICE, held a one-day workshop in the Lord Ashcroft Building at Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge on 4th June 2024. The objective of this workshop was to create a platform for local authorities (LAs) to discuss and learn about putting public value at the heart of digitalisation initiatives, AI use and their associated ethical issues.

Representatives from seven LAs from the Cambridgeshire area, one technology supplier, and one public service provider participated in the workshop, which was facilitated by an interdisciplinary group of researchers from Anglia Ruskin University and the University of Cambridge.

The workshop was in two parts, with presentations which are summarised below.

Part 1:

- **Digitalisation for public value:** Emphasized how public value creation should be the central point of departure in attempts to roll out digital innovation projects.
- **Introduction to the Digital Innovation Process (DIP) model²:** Described, with an example, a research-backed and practitioner-validated model that is useful for guiding the planning and implementation of digital innovation initiatives.
- **Introduction to Competencies:** Detailed the DC² competency framework¹ and how its delivery structure can be utilised in mapping out competency needs for addressing tasks related to a digitalisation initiative for creating public value.
- **AI - a force for good or ill?:** A provocation by Prof Neil Lawrence³ which underlined the need for public sector bodies to be at the forefront of ensuring that artificial intelligence is governed well so that their use would help in creating a flourishing society.

Part 2:

- **Using AI in the public sector:** Outlined the various opportunities for AI use with a focus on cities and connected places and highlighted the importance of robust governance structures to guide that.
- **Ethical AI for public sector decision-making:** Drew attention to the questions that need addressing in ensuring that the development and use of AI in the public sector would be rooted in ethical considerations from the start.

The presentations were followed by structured discussions among the participants, allowing them to reflect on their own experiences and learn from others.

¹ [Digital Cities for Change Project](#)

² Bastidas, V., Oti-Sarpong, K., Nochta, T., Wan, L., Tang, J. & Schooling, J. (2023). Leadership of urban digital innovation for public value: a competency framework. *IET Smart Cities*. 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1049/smc2.12063>

³ DeepMind Professor of Machine Learning, Department of Computer Science and Technology, University of Cambridge.

SUMMARY OF ANSWERS FROM DISCUSSIONS

This section presents summarised findings based on the table discussions. The Appendix contains anonymised raw data from participant notes.

1. Table discussion 1: Digitalisation projects

1.1. How are you using digital innovation in your organisation?

Participants indicated various digital innovation projects implemented in their local authorities. Most of the initiatives focused on public-facing service delivery functions, including the creation of online customer portals, real-time verification of details, and the use of chatbots/ digital assistants to answer queries during out of office hours. Another area where digital innovation is being used is productivity tools (e.g. MS Power BI, Co-pilot), commonly underlined by the need to do more with less. Some local authorities are also implementing digital innovation for strategic planning for urban infrastructure, and to go paperless through web forms.

While some LAs are implementing different innovations, there are some who are yet to do so. This is because of a lack of digital vision, resources, and observed internal and external reticence towards certain kinds of digital innovations (e.g. using chatbots).

1.2. How do you plan and roll out digital initiatives?

From the workshop, LAs plan and roll out digital initiatives using six approaches. Some LAs follow a stakeholder engagement approach characterised by interacting with different groups (e.g. councillors, service teams, digital gurus, external partners) in planning and implementing digital innovations. Others invest capital and designate planning and rolling out digital innovations to transformation teams and change managers who would undertake process and service reviews to recommend what could be modified. A more common approach adopted by LAs is the technology-driven kind, focused on landscape scanning, identifying new technologies and adapting them into existing workflows.

Few LAs described that they have an internal digital innovation process they follow that outlines a vision, and implementation and change management plans for digital initiatives. Similarly, only few LAs adopt a hybrid approach incorporating work by internal transformation teams with external digital technology solutions partners.

1.3. What challenges do you face in rolling out digitalisation initiatives?

Discussions revealed eight categories of challenges LAs face in rolling out digitalisation initiatives. Most LAs identified change management as one of the leading issues to confront, including overcoming staff reticence and revising business processes. Another widely shared challenge relates to inadequate financial resources to cater for costs of digital transformation (which can be expensive and therefore less desirable). LAs also identified a lack of relevant competencies and internal expertise as another challenge they face when embarking on digitalisation projects.

For some LAs, administrative burdens linked with meeting statutory requirements and completing 'huge paperwork' are challenges to rolling out digitalisation initiatives.

Strategic (e.g. lack of a wider vision and obtaining buy-in), and collaborative (inter-organisational) cross-learning issues are also challenges that LAs face. In addition, some LAs recounted challenges they face on their digitalisation projects owing to technical problems (e.g. lack of centralised data systems, innovation islands) and data transparency issues.

2. Table discussion 2: Digitalisation processes

2.1. Do you have a process like the DIP model in your organisation?

Many participants indicated that their organizations have a process similar to the DIP model. Common responses highlighted the use of established project management methodologies, such as PRINCE 2 and APM. Some organizations follow specific frameworks, which combine hybrid and waterfall project management approaches. Others noted that while they have similar processes, the iterative element is not always included. Although some participants openly stated that they do not have a similar process, several mentioned that their organizations are in the process of developing such models specifically for digitalization projects.

In addition to these general observations, participants discussed the integration of risk management and agile models to manage the high-risk nature of digital innovation projects. The importance of focusing on public value beyond financial considerations was also highlighted. Some participants distinguished between digital and business projects, emphasizing that digital initiatives often arise from business needs rather than being driven purely by technology. Finally, some participants mentioned having a digital strategy to guide their projects.

2.2. If so, how similar is it? does it include anything else?

Participants indicated that while their processes are to some extent similar to the DIP model, there are variations in detail and implementation. Some mentioned that their process includes fewer details and is influenced by specific organisational procedures. A few noted the absence of a simplified diagram and found the provided DIP model useful, expressing interest in implementing it.

Others described their process as ad-hoc, depending on the project manager, with no standardised approach. A few mentioned that funders might influence these processes, particularly regarding benefits realisation, which can be challenging to specify. Several participants highlighted the inclusion of procurement in their processes, noting that most digital solutions are purchased and must adhere to public sector procurement rules. Some also incorporate the theory of change, vision setting, lessons learned, change management, risk management, and (digital) inclusion as integral parts of their processes. Finally, a suggestion was made to include a loop-back mechanism to ensure continuous improvement and iteration of the DIP model.

2.3. If not, how do you manage digitalisation projects?

Participants who do not use a process like the DIP model manage digitalisation projects through various approaches. Some organisations adopt an ad-hoc method, tailoring their process based on the specific project needs. For instance, some city planners use their own methodology, while others follow the 'waterfall' project methodology. Smaller

organisations, with limited staff, often take a direct approach, deciding on actions and proceeding with minimal formalities.

An iterative process is also common, where teams step back to assess the project's social impact and incorporate feedback to ensure continuous improvement and relevance. Project management tools play a crucial role in facilitating innovation. A few participants initiate the digital innovation process based on an initial plan and a dedicated transformation team that is responsible for overseeing and managing digitalisation projects.

2.4. Do you consider the factors outlined in the competency framework? if so, how do you implement this?

Many participants confirmed that they consider the factors outlined in the competency framework. However, the extent and method of implementation vary. Some participants indicated that they consider the competencies but are constrained by limited resources, requiring most roles and competencies to be delivered by a small number of people. Others stated that they consider the framework but use different terminology. A few mentioned that they consider all the outlined factors but perhaps not in as much detail. Several participants admitted they do not review competency requirements strictly, relying instead on their existing team and available resources.

Specific competencies frequently mentioned include governance and management (e.g. finance and procurement), and some ethics. Digital technology expertise was often less emphasized. Participants also noted overlaps with existing frameworks, codes of conduct, and project management methodologies, highlighting the challenge of integrating these various frameworks coherently. Finally, implementation of a competency framework is being facilitated by changes in HR processes to be more people-focused, recognizing that skills can be trained, whereas attitudes are more difficult to manage.

2.5. Are there any significant gaps in your organisation's capabilities or your process with respect to these factors?

Many participants identified significant gaps in their organisation's capabilities and processes concerning the outlined competencies. Commonly noted gaps in governance and management include business models and citizen engagement. Anticipating impact was frequently mentioned as a gap within ethics and responsible innovation. Data science and solution architecture were highlighted as areas needing improvement within the digital and technical domains.

One challenge identified is that only a few individuals are equipped with the relevant competencies due to limited resources, making it difficult to develop and sustain these competencies across the organisation. Despite these gaps, a few participants believe that implementing the competency framework could be beneficial, especially because the framework is not focused only on the digital component.

2.6. For any digitalisation project you have carried out, were you in the role of Delivering, Contracting, Facilitating or Regulating?

Many participants reported playing multiple roles in digitalisation projects, often involved in delivering. Several participants found themselves in all roles—delivering, contracting,

facilitating, and regulating. They mentioned that part of their responsibility involved developing strategies and understanding the public value they could provide. They had to fulfil all these roles as part of a local authority (LA). They described their roles in delivering as defining the work for contractors, contracting out most of the work, facilitating through ICT department involvement, and regulating by enforcing good practices. They also noted the necessity of adhering to relevant regulations, such as public sector procurement rules and UK GDPR, while supporting these roles.

Participants also highlighted challenges, particularly in contracting, such as understanding what to buy and the available options. They mentioned the importance of correctly setting regulations and the difficulty in translating those regulations into practical implementation.

3. Table discussion 3: Applications of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

3.1. What applications of AI are you considering?

Discussing the question above revealed seven categories of AI applications mostly being trialled or under consideration among the LAs to varying degrees. A widely discussed application being trialled is AI for transcription and summarising notes (e.g. in social work). Similarly popular is the trial use of AI-backed Chatbots and Digital Assistants to respond to customer queries more efficiently – including during out of office hours. AI-powered internet search tools (instead of Google), as well as productivity platforms are also being trialled by few LAs, with common reference to Microsoft's Co-Pilot and Power BI Platforms. Beyond this, some LAs discussed considerations to explore the use of AI for enhanced security (anti-virus) screening and to check for data leakages. Few LAs are also working towards trialling or considering using AI to analyse planning evidence, consultations and representations, and for traffic management purposes. Some LAs did not indicate any specific considerations or trial of AI, and instead made reference to using website searches in carrying out their work. Overall, most of the AI applications discussed during the workshop are focused on public service delivery, and internal management of resources to efficiently deliver targets.

3.2. What is motivating the interest?

Several factors motivating LAs' interests in and applications of AI were identified and categorised under five groups. Most LAs are motivated to use AI for improving service delivery to customers (e.g. through expansion of services past office hours via chatbots, greater convenience via web access to council information). Another widely shared motivation relates to improving efficiency and productivity in delivering services as LAs. This motivation is strongly linked with time and cost savings, and the impetus to achieve shorter timescales for things such as local plans. As part of service delivery, some LAs also cited increasing accuracy and transparency of records as a motivation for using AI – relevant for work involving voluminous documents. For some few LAs, the motivation to use AI comes from senior leadership who seek to 'do things differently' in meeting service needs with limited resources. A very limited number of LAs are motivated to use AI because the technology (e.g. LLMs) are more readily available. For all five categories of

motivations identified, the discussion showed resource constraints and pressure to 'do more with less' faced by LAs as foundational undercurrents.

3.3. What is the public value pursued by the project?

From the workshop, the public value LAs seek to deliver using AI falls under five categories. Most discussed were improving customer service with better service delivery with the help of AI (e.g. expanding information provision services after office hours via Chatbots) and delivering on prudent fiscal administration because LAs are funded by public money. To some LAs, using AI is to help obtain relevant consistent data was important for complementing the provision of services related to human issues (e.g. social care), and to achieve greater internal efficiency and productivity; both are linked to delivering better services to the public. Finally, for some LAs, from a strategic angle, adopting AI was to signal that they are early adopters – with potentially positive reputational impact for their localities.

4. Table discussion 4: Ethical issues of AI

4.1. What ethical issues are you aware of/concerned about?

Participants raised several ethical issues they are aware of/concerned about in relation to the use of AI in LAs. Nine groups of issues were identified overall, with the two most prominent ones being about data sharing and security of data, and accuracy of generated responses from AI. Other ethical issues participants discussed in relation to AI use include sensitivity of private data being accessed (e.g. about individuals), data fairness of data (with implications for outcomes derived from AI use), and bias arising from what may be missed by AI. Furthermore, participants raised concerns about transparency in using AI, responsibility, the potential exclusionary impacts from AI use, and the risk of erosion of humanity (maintaining individuality) and human impact (e.g. job losses).

4.2. What ethical frameworks, or governance structures are you using or considering (if any)?

The workshop explored what ethical frameworks or governance structures LAs are using or considering (if any). A widely shared view was the unawareness of any specific ethical frameworks to refer to when using AI. Responses from participants shows some limited awareness of Government frameworks and guidance for AI use (e.g. algorithmic transparency standard). Nonetheless, participants are focused on following current information governance rules and UK GDPR. The discussion also shows that internal governance boards in LAs are not yet in place – however, there are considerations to set some up. Finally, from the discussion, LAs hold an expectation that the UK Government should be providing governance frameworks to guide the use of AI with respect to areas including understanding individual needs, tackling misinformation and equality of opportunity.

CONCLUDING REMARKS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In the ongoing 'wave' of technological innovation, local authorities (LAs) are obligated to deliver public value using several means, including through digitalisation projects. Linked to this is ensuring that ethical considerations shape the development and use of AI by LAs.

The discussions among participants from LAs in the Cambridgeshire area during the workshop led to informative insights about digitalisation initiatives and AI use. The findings also raise issues that need further exploration, and these are outlined below.

Table discussion 1: Digitalisation projects

Despite several digital innovation projects being implemented, for some LAs, there is a need for a strategic and clear digitalisation vision. In terms of planning and rolling out digital initiatives, a variety of approaches emerged – all of which could be leveraged into a comprehensive process to guide the delivery of digital innovation projects. Mechanisms for how LAs could address the various challenges, including the lack of dedicated resources and competencies for such projects also need to be identified to help LAs fully harness the potential of digital innovations in the creation of public value.

Table discussion 2: Digitalisation processes

LAs mostly follow mainstream project management methodologies in undertaking digitalisation projects. Others follow ad-hoc processes, or do not have any defined processes at all and are in the process of developing internal models for their digitalisation projects. Between these two ends of the spectrum, there are issues around the lack of a standardised, robust, simplified, repeatable model that is specifically designed for digitalisation projects. There is therefore a need for a process model that can address these issues identified and guide LAs through key stages of various kinds of digitalisation projects with an emphasis on public value creation.

Deploying such a model for digitalisation projects needs LAs have access to the requisite multidisciplinary competencies that cut across the ethics and responsible innovation, governance and management, and technical and digital dimensions. Meanwhile, the workshop showed that there are competency gaps owing to resource constraints. How these competency gaps may be addressed within the constraints LAs face, alongside the regular roles they play (Delivering, Contracting, Facilitating or Regulating), is a useful line of enquiry. This is relevant to help LAs realise the full potential of their digitalisation initiatives through the application of a robust model with requisite competencies.

Table discussion 3: Applications of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

There is a clear appetite for the use of AI, and there is evidence of different kinds being trialled for various uses. Public value creation through AI use leaned more towards internal management objectives that will feed into improved service delivery for citizens. The objectives identified were usually framed around achieving 'better' and 'improved' outcomes from using AI, suggesting a potential technology optimism bias. Such framing underlines the

need to emphasize non-technical aspects of AI, including how to govern its use to deliver responsible innovation outcomes to the society.

Across the applications identified, underpinning the motivations identified, 'productivity and efficiency' seem to form the main undercurrent, linked to the challenges of meeting growing service demand and societal needs, and limited resources. From the preceding, a future line of enquiry would involve exploring how these pressures impact LAs in procuring for and using AI for to meet various needs while prioritising public value objectives.

Table discussion 4: Ethical issues of AI

LAs share concerns about ethical issues from the use of AI that must be addressed. To tackle these ethical issues, as public sector entities, LAs need clear, implementable guidelines from the Government that can be used to guide the development of internal AI governance structures. From the workshop, most LAs are unaware of existing ethical frameworks or guidelines that can be drawn upon and used.

An ongoing review as part of a project on ethically rooted AI in the public sector shows that for the UK alone there are at least 40 regulations and guidelines for AI use. This number can be expected to grow, as several new guidelines/standards/regulations/principles could be published within days/weeks given the rapid evolution of the AI landscape. Creating awareness about these guidelines is a first step in addressing the knowledge gap on the part of LAs. To apply any of the guidelines or regulations in practice, LAs need help to distil and draw out what is most applicable to the AI they are using. Finally, beyond awareness, there is a need to show how relevant ethical principles for AI can be practically integrated into LAs processes that are now augmented with AI.

The above lines for future enquiry drawn from the table discussions are positioned to help address pertinent issues of practical relevance for local authorities when it comes to undertaking digitalisation projects and using AI to help deliver public value outcomes while tackling ethical concerns from the start.

Acknowledgements

The Digital Cities for Change (DC2) team is grateful to the following for their support:

- All participants who attended the workshop. Without you this event would not be possible.



- Anglia Ruskin University for funding, and for the time of facilitators who are academics at this institution.



- The Ove Arup Foundation for funding the DC² project [RG89525]



- The University of Cambridge's AI@CAM flagship initiative for [funding](#)

Contacts

- Professor Jennifer Schooling (jennifer.schooling@aru.ac.uk), Faculty of Science and Engineering, Anglia Ruskin University.
- Dr Viviana Bastidas (vab44@cam.ac.uk), Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge.
- Dr Kwadwo Oti-Sarpong (ko363@cam.ac.uk), Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge.

Declaration

This report on the “Workshop on digitalisation and AI for public value” is an original work resulting from the workshop held on 4 June 2024 at Anglia Ruskin University. The report represents our observations, findings, concluding remarks and future directions based on the discussions and presentations during the workshop.

We affirm that:

1. The content of this report is a true reflection the workshop proceedings.
2. Any views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated agency or institution.
3. All sources of information used in the creation of this report have been properly acknowledged (or anonymised where relevant).

Appendix: Tables showing derived headings and anonymised raw data from workshop participants

Format note for each table: **Derived Heading**; Raw data from workshop; [\[Researcher text\]](#).

Table discussion 1

Question 1.1: How are you using digital innovation in your organisation?		
Strategic planning • Planning systems • Urban infrastructure planning • Remove single points of failure • Using AI for financial decision making	Digital records management • Paperless processes • Digitisation of paper records • Web forms	Public-facing service delivery • Service delivery- customer portals for citizens • No face to face on demand contact -all contact centre or website • Automation of processes – e.g. real time verification of details, payments, subscriptions • Note taking /customer service • Apps for bin days • Projects to analyse representations submitted by the public • Service transformation for citizens and businesses by transforming the process around it - e.g. real time verification of details. AI bot answering calls and responding to queries, for out of office hours. • Customer portals for attracting business services • Service transformation for attracting businesses
Productivity and efficiency • Dataset -online dashboard – spreadsheet/pie chart / decision • Co-pilot -roll out across services • MS Power BI • Power automate / power platform • Power BI / co-pilot • Testing co-pilot – same differentiation between	No identified digital innovation project • Need a digital vision • No dedicated data analysts /resources concern/licenses software • Not using AI chatbots because that's not welcome internally and among the	

early adaptors and those more reluctant Smart tech – digital assistants / chat box on phone/website	citizens in the locality.	
Question 1.2: How do you plan and roll out digital initiatives?		
Digital innovation process - Vision, investigation, Implementation, Change management /training & Roll out - We have a digital target operating model , a digital, data and technology funded project	Transformation team responsibility - Transformation Teams & Change managers - Transformation teams – service reviews /digital transformation , digital strategy - Internal process review teams – transformation practices	Stakeholder engagement approach - Engagement with councillors - Engagement with residents - Engagement with service teams - Social work > magic notes > record the conversation > customer services > use AI - Use of digital gurus >trying to understand the challenges [A possible illustration of the engagement with service teams?] - External partners (digital) came along to review processes – sort of process audit
Technology driven model - Integration of different systems - Adapting new tech in workflow - Adapting AI and gen AI services - Landscape scanning for what’s out there and the innovations to be used and tested - Standardization (API) web services	Resource investment Capital Investment in transformation teams to give additional capacity to do research/best practice	Hybrid approach A mix of approaches - internal review by transformation team and followed by discussion with external digital technology suppliers audit process / identify solutions.
Question 1.3: What challenges do you face in rolling out digitalisation initiatives?		
Administrative burdens - Council registration/ restriction - huge amounts of paperwork/documents (regulation changes)? - Statutory requirements - Digitalisation of forms	Data transparency Data transparency	Strategic - Lack of a wider vision - Buy – in of staff and residents - Expectations - Knowledge share > sits with the people [Difficulty of tacit

		knowledge transfer (retained in the people)]
Financial • Resourcing/funding • Cost of changes/damages (eg. Programmes). • Resources, Funding • Cost of investing in new technologies • Capital • Cost of APIs • Costs of digital transformation can make things less desirable	Competencies • Resources/skills • Skills • Skills to implement • Knowledge, Understanding • Lack of capabilities and internal expertise to optimize the digital technologies they have • Upskilling	Change management • Change management • Business process (iceberg) • Resistance • Fear of the unknown • Small changes may have a large effect • Perception of tech improvements and ability of residents to cope/access • Staff perception of change and concern about future employment • Among teams, difficulties to change old practices • People and AI
Technical • Integration of technology • Lack of centralised data systems that can be shared to optimise services being improved through digitalisation • Non-existence APIs • Data integration –Could we get taxi licensing data direct from DSs. Taxi license automation • GDPR – cross team within organisations and between organisations • Islands of technology and innovation	Collaborative cross-learning • Sharing of best practice across local government so we're not all trying to improve the same process	

Table discussion 2

Question 2.1: Do you have a process like the DIP model in your organisation?		
Similar process: • Implicitly yes. • PRINCE 2/APM project management. • Project Management - e.g., PRINCE 2 (Planning,	Risk management: • Mitigate risks given the high-risk nature of digital innovation projects.	Agile model: • Mixing the model with an agile model.

vision, strategy, action, repeat). • Yes, but it does not always include the iterative element. • Local Authority's Connected Methodology - framework combining waterfall and hybrid PM • Yes, we have something similar. • Project management principles - depends on the project/scale/urgency. Similar to this. • No! • No, not for digitalisation but it is being created currently. We do have similar process models for project/programme delivery.		
Public value: • Public value is focused on the finances	Purpose and approach: • Difference between 'digital project' and 'business project'. The first is not necessarily starting from digital but from a business need, and so not digital for the sake of 'digital'.	Digital strategy: • Digital strategy is in place
Question 2.2: If so, how similar is it? Does it include anything else?		
Similar process: • Almost similar but with some lesser details and some organisational process. • We do not have a simplified diagram. This diagram is very useful and we will implement it. • Ad-hoc; depends on the project manager. No standardised process. • Staging is similar and is underpinned by values.	Procurement (includes): • Procurement - most digital solutions are purchased and we need to follow public sector procurement rules. • Procurement and theory of change. • Sometimes, procure, rather than physically implement it.	Lessons learned (includes): • Lessons learnt • Lessons learned for other projects

Funders might set some of these processes. Increasingly looking at benefits realisation can be hard to specify. Variations in the process followed depending on the type of project and who is involved.		
Change management (includes): - Change management (Embed phase) - Change management	Risk (includes): Risks	Vision (includes): Vision setting
Inclusion - Inclusion. - Digital inclusion.	Suggestion (Should include) There should be a loop-back	
Question 2.3: If not, how do you manage digitalisation projects?		
Different approaches - Ad-hoc - This is used in one area of the council; in other areas we just run 'waterfall' projects - Our organisation has 6 employees- we just say we are doing "this" and just get on with it.	Iteration process Step back and revisit the impact on the social and closing the loop via feedback	Using tools Project management tools
Based on an initial plan Initial plan	People responsible Transformation team	
Question 2.4: Do you consider the factors outlined in the competency framework? If so, how do you implement them?		
Similar factors: - Yes - Yes, but we are constrained by the limits on resources, so most roles/competencies have to be embedded in a very small number of people.	Specific competency clusters: We consider governance and management; we consider some ethics; we don't really consider digital tech.	Specific competency units: - Finance and procurement - Stakeholders and collaborators (1.1) Government, policy, and regulation (1.4) Citizen engagement and participation (1.5) Business models

• Yes, but using a different language. • Yes, all the above are considered, however maybe not in as much detail. • No, stuck with my team and we use what we got.		• (2.2) Technology applications • (3.1) Anticipating impact • (3.2) Reflecting on causes and mechanisms
Overlapping with other frameworks: • There are overlaps with existing frameworks, and then there are codes of conduct, etc. with operating frameworks, and also project management. There is a challenge to get all these frameworks together.	How is it implemented? • We are currently changing HR processes to be more 'people' focussed, understanding skills can be trained and attitudes are more difficult to deal with	
Question 2.5: Are there any significant gaps in your organisation's capabilities or your process with respect to these factors?		
Gaps: • Yes! • Yes,	Governance and Management (competency gaps): • Business models • Citizen engagement	Ethics and Responsible Innovation (competency gaps): • Anticipating impact
Digital and Technical (competency gaps): • Data Science • Solution architecture • Data Science	Human resource limitations: • Only a few people have the relevant competencies because of limited resources	Implementation/improvement: • This competency framework would be used, as it is not focussed on digitalisation process
Question 2.6: For any digitalisation project you have carried out, were you in the role of Delivering, Contracting, Facilitating or Regulating?		
More than one (mixed roles/models): • Contracting and delivering. But we have to ensure we follow relevant regulations (public sector procurement, UK GDPR, etc.)	All roles/models: • I have a hat in all areas. We are developing strategies, understanding what public value we can provide. • Part of being an LA - have to do all of them.	Challenges: • E.g. contracting - how do you understand what to buy, what options are there? • Regulating - must set them correctly. How to

Delivering and facilitating.	- Play roles in each. - Delivering - define the work that the contractors will do; don't often develop things ourselves. - Contracting - often contract out most work - Facilitating - ICT [department?] involvement to enable implementation - Regulating - enforcing good practice - All - oversee delivery through suppliers; contracting through procurement; facilitate through performing oversight roles, and regulating through review [of impact and outcomes?]	translate that into practice?
--	---	--------------------------------------

Table discussion 3

Question 3.1: What applications of AI are you considering?		
AI for enhanced security screening Security: scanning for data leakages, enhanced antivirus screening	Analysis of planning evidence, consultations and representations - Planning: analysing evidence and documents in the planning process. - Local planning - Planning - Analyse planning representations - Planning - summarising AI for planning consultation	AI for transcription and summarising - Document translation: translate documents into range of languages at lower cost (working example, Sarah), or to create easy-reader versions of documents that are more accessible. - Summarising / consolidating case notes - Social care: magic notes for transcribing conversations - Education, Healthcare, Social work [Could be examples of sectors for such kind of AI use – note taking and translation]
Chatbots and AI Digital Assistants	AI-search tools	Productivity enhancing platforms

• Chatbots in the customer service centre • Chatbots in the customer service centre • Chatbots in the council website • AI webchat • AI chat bot • Customer service chatbot • Chatbot/Digital Assistant • Chatbot & Voice Bot to support residents outside office hours, as well as, supporting contact centre staff	• AI search instead of Google search results	• Use of MS Power Platforms / Power Automate • Co-pilot • Co-pilot
Traffic management Traffic management	Website search • Website search	
Question 3.2: What is motivating the interest?		
Technology availability • Part of motivation come from the accessibility of LLMs - which are more tangible than other forms of AI	Improving service delivery • Improved service • Continuous development of services • Repeat callers/repeat queries • Convenience to customers • Give 24/7 access to council information when customer services are closed. Also divert customers to lowest cost contact option even when open. • Decision support for health and resource allocation [potentially an example of area of service delivery] • Social care: high service demand, hard to recruit and retain staff [potentially an example of area of service delivery] • Education system is pretty much the same as 100	Increasing efficiency and productivity • Efficiency • Productivity • To facilitate information searching • Time saving / cost saving on staff • Shorten the time for processing, cost • 30-month local planning; save time • Planning - speeding up local processes, maintaining interest and buy-in (unclear what this could mean); freeing up offices to add value to other areas of planning.

	years ago - more room for progress	
Leadership drive Senior leadership team driving; we need to provide same services with limited funds, so need to do things differently.	Increasing accuracy and transparency of records - Reduce inefficiencies and inaccuracies in notes being taken. - Want to be able to audit social care records. - Volume of documents generated about individuals of interest, flexibility of moving cases between teams, members/managers and transferring data between teams	
Question 3.3: What is the public value pursued by the project?		
Prudent fiscal administration - Best use of public money - Public money being spent more efficiently - Best use of public money- efficiencies - Monetary savings	Improving customer experience with better service delivery - Improves user experience - Efficient use of customer time - Provide services when customers need them, not when council is open - Improved service delivery; increased access to services - Better customer service, quick and clear information. - Better education; better healthcare	Greater internal efficiency and productivity - Efficiency - Increasing productivity or stretching our limited resources. - More efficient realisation of local plan. Faster development
Data to complement response to human issues - Improving the response to human issues. - Get better, more consistent data and get more face-to-face interactions.	Early adopter objective Early adoption of AI (Adopt more quickly) [This could be for strategic identity reasons]	

• Accessible information • Social care - is to allow social workers to focus on people; free time from admin; improve retention.		
---	--	--

Table discussion 4

Question 4.1: What ethical issues are you aware of/concerned about?		
Data sharing and security • What happens to the data - is it managed securely, how is it stored, what decisions can we make with the data? • Data sharing • Data sharing • Where does your data end up? • Inappropriate/uncontrolled data sharing - an assumption that all accessible data is to be included • Security - giving out data with[out] enough authorisation	Sensitivity of private data • Use of sensitive data about individuals. • Data that is sensitive • Accessing private data • Data	Fair treatment of data • Fairness in reviewing / summarising data [Potentially fairness in outcomes derived from AI use?]
Bias • Bias - what's missed, • What is it [AI] missing?	Accuracy • Are we summarising people's content correctly? • Accuracy of AI - proliferating information incorrectly • Over-confidence in generated responses - "computer says no" • Maintaining a healthy challenge/users need to maintain ownership, even if the model is often right, or convincing, models are updated and change so could be inconsistent. • inaccurate/ hallucinated/ added in.	Responsibility • What are the opportunities for recourse?

Transparency • Explainability. • Ability to audit use and decisions.	Potential exclusion • Digital inclusion...providing solutions to people that can't do & won't do. • Not everyone will want to speak to AI • Inequality	Erosion of humanity and human impact • Does the process / system maintain individuality & humanity. • Missed opportunities for ideas/interactions due to automation • Job losses?
Question 4.2: What ethical frameworks, or governance structures are you using or considering (if any)?		
Government frameworks and guidance • Algorithmic transparency standard (CDEI) • Use GOV.UK framework • Automated vehicle Bill • Would need to follow current Information Governance Rules & GDPR	Internal governance structures [Not yet existent; to be developed] • Data + AI ethics boards (these are not yet in existence) • Governance - internal boards, change protocols • Want to build a set of protocols • Human designed framework with some sort of human firewall? • PESTLE analysis to be conducted for AI project • No strict internal guidance - ad hoc [Ad-hoc approach]	Unaware of any • Not currently aware of any specific frameworks. • Ethical frameworks?? • Looking to learn from project with BRAID on inclusivity
AI governance needs [ethical issues participants raised as needing guidance] • AI understanding individual needs - speak slower, louder, simple explanation, complex explanation, etc. • AI pulling from mis-information. How to stop this? • Equality of opportunity - example co-pilot. All staff licence is say 50 people with it, so better opportunities for those people - unequal.		

Contact us

The Cambridge Centre for Smart Infrastructure and Construction
Department of Engineering
Civil Engineering building
7A JJ Thompson Avenue
Cambridge CB3 0FA

+44(0) 1223 746976
csic-admin@eng.cam.ac.uk
www.centreforsmartinfrastructure.com

