Change log for the changes made to the Algorithmic Transparency Standard for 2nd iteration

Area of change	Changes	Rationale
Structure	Addition of a metadata section, including: - Report id - Report completion date - Report update date - Report archive date	We wanted to be able to capture essential data around the publication and review dates of the transparency reports. We received feedback during the pilot process recommending that we add metadata fields We also received feedback during the pilot process to add a 'report id' field that would allow reports to be easily referred back to.
Structure	Addition of a headline information section, including: - Report title - Organisation name - Phase the tool is in - One sentence description	We wanted to create a section that captures all the title information which a reader will see when accessing the repository of all the transparency reports. This section should sit divorced from the Standard itself as it duplicates information from the Standard.
Structure	Addition of an annex section	Throughout the pilot process we recognised the need for teams to be able to provide complementary information in the form of an annex that contributes to a better understanding of other sections or fields in the standard but that would be too long or detailed to add to a given field in the standard itself.
Structure	Overall change to the structure of the Standard and different sections - The previous structure included the following sections in order: Tier 1; Owner and Responsibility; Description; Oversight; Information on Data; Risk Mitigation and Impact Assessment - The new structure includes the following	We received feedback during the pilot process that any information on technical specification such as information on the model should not sit divorced from the 'Data' section as there is considerable overlap between the two sections. Previously, information on technical specification sat under the 'Description' section, and has now been moved to the newly created 'Technical Specification and Data' section. The remaining parts of the Description Section mainly concerned

	sections in order: Metadata; Title information; Tier 1; Owner and Responsibility; Description and Rationale; Decision-making Process; Technical Specification and Data; Risks, Mitigations, and Impact Assessments	justification of the use of the tool, so the section was renamed into 'Description and Rationale'. The oversight section was renamed into 'decision-making process' as it mainly includes fields that have the aim to detail the wider decision making process and how the tool is integrated into that process.
Owner and Responsibility	Addition of 'external_supplier_involvement' field	We added a Boolean field to indicate whether an external supplier has been involved. This addition helps determine whether the subsequent fields in the 'Owner and Responsibility' section concerning the supplier involvement are displayed or hidden in the specific report.
Owner and Responsibility	Renaming of the 'external_supplier_identifier' field to 'companies_house_number'	The renaming of the field to 'companies_house_number' is intended to reflect the fact that we are specifically asking for the companies house number as an identifier and not other systems of identification.
Owner and Responsibility	Addition of the 'procurement_procedure_type' field	We received feedback during the pilot phase recommending that we include a field on procurement procedure type in order to specify the way in which the contract has come into place.
Description and Rationale	Addition of 'detailed_description_field' in Tier 2 in addition to the short description in Tier 1	We received feedback during the pilot phase pointing out that in the first version of the Standard, there was no single field dedicated to telling a consistent 'story' about how the tool works. The short description in Tier 1, while aimed at giving an overview of how the tool works, is intended to be kept at a high level and as concise as possible, while the different fields in Tier 2 are all capturing relevant information, however, in a fragmented fashion. By adding a non-mandatory 'detailed_description_field' in Tier 2, we wanted to give teams the option to tell a consistent story about how the tool works in one place. This field will necessarily contain some repetition of other fields in Tier 1 and Tier 2.
Description and Rationale	Addition of 'previous_process' field	We received feedback during the pilot phase recommending that we add a separate field for detailing the process prior to the introduction of the

		tool. This will give teams the opportunity to showcase how the process has changed with the introduction of the tool.
Description and Rationale	Addition to the definition of the 'alternatives_considered' field to include an explanation for why the tool was chosen over other alternatives	We received feedback during the pilot phase recommending that we should not only detail any alternative approaches to operationalise the decision-making process, but also add a justification of why the adopted approach was chosen over alternative approaches that were considered
Decision-making process	Addition to the description of the 'provided information' field to detail any internal procedures that are in place to document the relationship between the output and the decision	We received feedback during the pilot phase recommending that we add a field on how the tool influences the view of the decision maker. We have implemented a suggestion that we should include this information by asking teams to explain the processes they have put in place to document the impact that a given algorithmic tool has on decision(s).
Decision-making process	Renaming of the 'human_decisions' field to 'human_decisions_and_review'	We renamed the field to 'human_decisions_and review' to reflect that this field should not only describe the decisions that humans take, but also the review options that humans have where automated decisions are concerned.
Technical Specification and Data	Renaming of the 'model_type' field to 'method'	We received feedback during the pilot phase and from open public feedback recommending that we rename the field to 'method' as different methods in, for example, machine learning can contain more than one model, so that the expression 'model type' falsely implies that one model only should be specified.
Technical Specification and Data	Frequency_usage field has been renamed to frequency_and_scale_of_usage	We renamed the field to include the expression 'scale of usage' to better reflect the aim of conveying the scale at which the tool is employed, for example, the number of decisions made each hour/day/month, the number of people affected by a decision.
Technical Specification and Data	Addition of 'model_performance' field	We received feedback during the pilot phase and from open public feedback recommending that we include a dedicated field on model/tool performance to give teams the opportunity to list the metrics they are using to measure the performance of the tool.

Technical Specification and Data	Addition to the description of the 'source_data_description' field to include a description of the individual variables used	We received feedback during the pilot phase and from open public feedback, recommending that we specify that the description of the data should include a description of the individual variables used. At a minimum, this information should cover: whether the data contains personal and special category information; variables of interest, such as protected characteristics and potential proxies; and variables with high predictive power or that have a significant bearing on the model.
Technical Specification and Data	Addition of 'data_cleaning' field	We received feedback during the pilot phase recommending that we include a field detailing any pre-processing or cleaning of the data that was performed. This will give teams the opportunity to set out the measures they have completed to ensure the data is suitable for processing.
Technical Specification and Data	Addition of 'data_completeness_and_representativeness' field	We received feedback during the pilot phase recommending that we include a field on how complete and representative the data is. This gives teams the opportunity to reflect on the quality and limitations of the data.
Risks, Mitigations, and Impact Assessments	Merge of the 'impact assessment name', 'impact assessment description' and 'impact assessment date' fields into one	We received feedback during the pilot phase that it would be helpful to merge the 'impact assessment name', 'impact assessment description' and 'impact assessment date' into one, as a split of these fields might create confusion where there is more than one assessment.
Risks, Mitigations, and Impact Assessments	Merge of the 'risk name', 'risk description' and 'risk mitigation' fields into one	We received feedback during the pilot phase that it would be helpful to merge the 'risk name', 'risk description' and 'risk mitigation' fields into one, as a split of these fields might create confusion where there is more than one risk.
Other	Various additions to the 'description column' of the Standard for several fields to give more guidance on how to fill out this field - not logged individually as these don't present major changes to the Standard	n/a