# A Interview Methodology

A primary component of information gathering for this research was empirical data derived through qualitative interviews conducted solely by this paper's author with twelve sources in Canada, Chile, and Singapore who have developed, implemented or used the three tools addressed here. The 12 sources were interviewed in 2024 and 2025 during a total of at least 15 interview sessions in addition to email communications and fact-checking. Interviews were conducted via digital video calls and emails.

## A.1 Interviewees

The following are more detailed descriptions of the people interviewed:

- In regards to Canada's Algorithmic Impact Assessment, the author interviewed a total of five people including two members of Treasury Board of Canada who have helped develop and adjust the AIA, a representative of the Artificial Intelligence and Data Ethics Division of the Employment and Social Development Canada, and two lawyers who focus on Canadian immigration and refugee related cases.
- In regards to ChileCompra's Standard Bidding Terms for Data Science and AI Projects, the author interviewed four people including a project manager at Chile's Department of Social Security Superintendence, and three people from the Ethical Algorithms Project at GobLab UAI, the public innovation laboratory at Chile's Universidad Adolfo Ibáñez's School of Government who assisted in conducting assessments of the medical claims model and applying the ChileCompra tool.
- In regards to Singapore's AI Verify, the author interviewed three people from the AI governance team at Singapore's Infocomm Media Development Authority including members of its AI Verify Foundation.

## A.2 Sample Interview Questions

Questions and topics discussed during interviews with sources for this research varied depending on their role or interactions with the AI governance tools addressed; however, several subjects were covered during interviews about each tool in an effort to illuminate design, evolution, practical implementations and impacts of the tools and their uses.

The following are some sample questions used in the interviews conducted for this research:

- Please give a brief description of [your organization or government agency].
- Please give a brief description of your role and the types of people you interact with in relation to the [AI governance tool].
- How have you or other [organization or government agency] staff interacted with the [AI governance tool]?
- Can we discuss an example of a particular [AI governance tool] use case?
- Is there an example of a use case you can share that led to a change either in how an algorithmic or AI system was built, refined or used?
- Please walk me through the steps of how the [AI governance tool] was used.
- What types of stakeholders were involved in development of the [AI governance tool]?
- How have [organization or government agency] staff or other stakeholders worked with the team developing the [AI governance tool] in regards to development, refinement or changes to the tool?

- What types of stakeholders or end users have accessed or implemented the [AI governance tool]?
- How have stakeholders or end users of [AI governance tool] actually implemented or accessed the tool?
- What specific types of methods, metrics or assessment criteria for measuring or improving fairness, explainability, robustness or other aspects of algorithmic and AI systems are mentioned or recommended in the [AI governance tool]?
- Why and how did the team developing the [AI governance tool] decide to mention or recommend the specific methods, metrics or assessment criteria for measuring or improving fairness, explainability, robustness or other aspects of algorithmic and AI systems?
- How have specific types of fairness, explainability, or robustness related methods, metrics or assessment criteria mentioned or recommended in the [AI governance tool] actually been applied by tool users?
- How has the [AI governance tool] been refined or adjusted since it was first made available?
- What led to the decisions to make those adjustments?
- What specific areas have the [organization, government agency or other AI governance tool users] sought to alter or clarify when it comes to the scope or implementation of the tool?
- How has use of the [AI governance tool] improved algorithmic and AI systems to which the tool has been applied?
- How has use of the [AI governance tool] affected or benefitted stakeholders or end users?
- What are specific ways the [AI governance tool] could be improved?
- What recommendations would you make to other organizations that use the [AI governance tool]?

## B AI Governance Tool Types Lexicon

The tools discussed in this paper represent different tool types that are categorized according to an AI governance tools lexicon created by this paper's author for World Privacy Forum's 2023 Risky Analysis report [1]. That report included evidence from a 2023 survey of the international landscape of AI governance tools published by multilateral organizations and by governments, in addition to early evidentiary documentation regarding multiple aspects of those tools, in-depth case studies and a review of related scholarly literature. The tool types were developed on the basis of evidence gathered through the research conducted for the Risky Analysis report and reflect the commonly found components of the AI governance tools identified and named in that report's review of tools. In general, all of these tool types are designed to improve or measure AI systems, particularly in relation to AI principles including fairness, explainability, and robustness. When classifying AI governance tools according to these tool types, types may be combined to form hybrid types depending on the components of each tool in question.

Table 2. AI governance tool types and their descriptions from *Risky Analysis: Assessing and Improving AI Governance Tools, An International Review of AI Governance Tools and Suggestions for Pathways Forward*, World Privacy Forum 2023.

| AI Governance Tool Type | AI Governance Tool Type Description |
|---|---|
| Practical Guidance | Includes general educational information, practical guidance, or other consideration factors |
| Self-assessment Questions | Includes assessment questions or detailed questionnaire |
| Procedural Framework | Includes process steps or suggested workflow for AI system assessments and/or improvements |
| Technical Framework | Includes technical methods or detailed technical process guidance or steps |
| Technical Code or Software | Includes technical methods such as use of specific code or software |
| Scoring or Classification Output | Includes criteria for determining a classification or mechanism for producing a quantifiable score or rating reflecting a particular aspect of an AI system |
| Catalog | A collection of multiple AI governance tools and types |