P1

Expert assessment form

1. **Value change**
   Addresses the need that public AI systems are responsive to changing societal values.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☑	☐	☐	☐

2. **Appeal procedure**
   Illustrates a way for decision subjects to appeal decisions made by an AI system.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☑	☐	☐	☐

3. **Procedural relationship**
   Illustrates an adversarial process between decision subjects and system operators that serves as the basis for resolving a dispute.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☑	☐	☐

4. **New perspective**
   Is provocative and presents an alternative to the current order. Presents a new perspective on the current practice of public AI (Bardzell et al., 2014).

Strongly		Neither Agree Nor		Strongly

Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☑

5. **Plausibility**

   Is sufficiently believable for a viewer to be able to imagine ways in which it might be brought about. Cannot be easily dismissed as science-fiction. A viewer can imagine themselves living in a world where the prototype is reality (Bardzell et al., 2014).

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☑	☐	☐

References

1. Bardzell, J., Bardzell, S., & Stolterman, E. (2014). Reading critical designs: Supporting reasoned interpretations of critical design. Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1951–1960. https://doi.org/10/f3nnk2