ChatGPT

Radical Transparency of Money and Algorithms

Introduction: The **third layer** of David Shapiro's *"Pyramid of Power"* calls for **radical transparency** in how public resources are spent and how algorithms govern decisions. In essence, it proposes opening up the *"source code" of governance* – both financial flows and computational rules – to meaningful public scrutiny [1]. This transparency layer responds to rampant corruption, inefficiency, and algorithmic bias that erode trust in institutions [2]. The goal is to shine light on public finances and decision-making code so that citizens can audit, understand, and influence them in real time. This white paper provides a deep examination of this transparency layer. First, we review real-world programs that are implementing or piloting radical financial and algorithmic transparency across the U.S., Europe, OECD countries, Asia and beyond. We then detail the enabling technologies – from blockchains and open ledgers to explainable AI and algorithm registries – that make such transparency possible. Next, we analyze how radical transparency fosters civic trust, empowers citizen action, rebalances information asymmetries, constrains corruption and bias, and creates feedback loops in a post-labor society (with links to other layers of the Pyramid such as digital identity and programmable money). Finally, we explore transparency as power through political-theoretical lenses – from critiques of surveillance capitalism to democratic accountability and epistemic justice – emphasizing how making governance transparent transforms citizens from passive observers into active participants with real leverage. The format is a dense, formal white paper with maximum technical and conceptual depth.

Global Implementations of Radical Transparency

Governments worldwide are beginning to **pull back the curtain** on public finances and algorithms. Pioneering programs in multiple regions demonstrate that radical transparency is not just a theory but an emerging practice. Below, we survey notable real-world initiatives that embody "transparency of money and algorithms," including cutting-edge pilots in finance (e.g. open budgets, blockchain ledgers, transparent procurement) and in algorithmic accountability (e.g. public AI registries, audit laws). These examples span the United States, Europe, Asia, and global innovators, illustrating how transparency can be implemented in diverse governance contexts.

Financial Transparency Initiatives in Government

- **Open Budget Portals and Spending Dashboards:** Many governments now publish detailed budget and spending data online to enable public oversight. For example, the United States' federal open data portal **Data.gov** hosts over 335,000 datasets – including budgets, expenditures and procurement records – for public use [3] [4]. However, traditional open data often comes with significant lag and in cumbersome formats [5]. **New York City's "Checkbook NYC" portal** was an early breakthrough: since 2010 it has published *nearly every city expenditure online on a daily basis*, allowing users to drill down to individual agency payments and even specific checks [6]. This near-real-time city ledger effectively opens the municipal checkbook to taxpayers each day. Such initiatives demonstrate the feasibility of granular, timely financial transparency at scale, setting a model for other cities and countries.

- **Transparent E-Procurement Systems: Public procurement** – the purchase of goods and services by governments – has been a major focus of financial transparency reforms, given its historical vulnerability to corruption. Electronic procurement platforms that publicly post tenders, bids, and contract awards have now become standard in many OECD countries [7]. For instance, **Chile's ChileCompra**, launched in 2003, is an open online marketplace for government contracts. By requiring all tenders to be conducted on a transparent platform, ChileCompra greatly increased competition and accountability, yielding an estimated **$693 million in annual savings** through lower prices and efficiency gains [8]. It has grown to serve 900 agencies and tens of thousands of suppliers, leveling the playing field for vendors and exposing procurement processes to public view [8] [7]. **South Korea's KONEPS** and other national e-procurement systems similarly have reduced corruption and streamlined contracting. In **Ukraine**, following the 2014 revolution, the government launched **ProZorro**, a fully transparent e-procurement system under the motto "everyone sees everything." By 2016, use of ProZorro was mandated for all public purchasing. Every tender, bid, and award is posted openly, allowing **citizens, media, and businesses to monitor and detect irregularities** [9]. This radically open system has been credited with significantly curbing post-Soviet procurement corruption. It also broadened competition (attracting new bidders) and saved public funds. Crucially, transparency enabled civic action: Ukraine later built **DoZorro**, a citizen monitoring platform where users have flagged over 70,000 procurement concerns, *20,000 of which were confirmed as actual violations*, prompting authorities to investigate and correct issues [10] [11]. This demonstrates how making procurement data public creates a feedback loop—citizens become watchdogs, bolstering oversight capacity.

- **National Transparency Portals and Open Spending Data:** Beyond procurement, some governments provide comprehensive views of **all public expenditures**. **Brazil's federal Transparency Portal** (Portal da Transparência) publishes millions of public spending transactions, allowing journalists and citizens to scrutinize officials' use of funds. In one notable case, investigative reporters using the portal uncovered **questionable government credit-card charges**, leading to the resignation of a cabinet minister and reimbursement of misused public money [12]. Building on such efforts, Brazil has gone a step further by developing a **national blockchain network for public finance**. In 2022, Brazil launched the **Brazilian Blockchain Network (RBB)** as a partnership between the national audit court (TCU) and the development bank (BNDES). RBB's purpose is to provide a *permissioned, public ledger for government expenditures* to combat graft and restore trust [13]. A Brazilian official noted that *"The Brazilian Blockchain Network can definitely change the functioning of the public machine in terms of transparency, efficiency and security,"* with one of RBB's main goals being **greater accountability in public spending** [13]. Although RBB is still in development, its layer-1 blockchain infrastructure is envisioned as a backbone for transparent government applications, ensuring that once spending data is recorded, it cannot be altered unilaterally [14]. Similarly, **Peru** piloted a blockchain-based procurement system in 2019 (leveraging the IADB's LACChain network) after high-profile corruption scandals. The pilot aimed to immutably track government contracts and prevent data tampering or unauthorized adjustments [15] [16]. While Peru's prototype did not advance beyond the trial phase [17], it provided lessons for Latin America's growing interest in DLT (distributed ledger technology) for clean government. In Europe, the region of **Aragón, Spain** has operated a blockchain-backed public procurement platform since 2018 [18]. This system uses smart contracts to enforce bidding rules and award contracts with public visibility. Though the underlying technology in Aragón's case behaves more like a distributed database than a fully decentralized public blockchain, it nonetheless immutably logs procurement decisions, ensuring **integrity and transparency in the award process** [18]. These global examples – from

open portals and e-procurement to blockchain ledgers – show a clear trend: governments are experimenting with technology to open up *financial records in real time*.

- **Real-Time Public Ledger of Government Transactions:** The ultimate vision for financial transparency is a **"live" open ledger of all government receipts and payments**, accessible to all in real-time. Technologically, this is becoming feasible. If every public agency and official transacted on a common digital ledger (for instance, a national blockchain or integrated financial system), then any citizen could query transactions instantly – akin to using a "*government blockchain explorer*" similar to Etherscan for Ethereum [19] [20]. For example, one could search a project name and see all payments made to it, or look up a department's address to see every expenditure by that office [19]. Some cities have begun moving in this direction even without full blockchain integration. **New York City's Checkbook NYC** (mentioned above) is updated daily, approaching real-time disclosure [6]. **Ukraine's ProZorro** posts all procurement events essentially in real time, immediately opening tenders and results to the public [9]. Such transparency has tangible benefits: in Chile and Ukraine the open procurement systems not only increased trust but also *saved hundreds of millions of dollars* through better pricing [8] [21]. In sum, radical financial transparency is moving from idea to implementation, leveraging digital platforms so that "the books" of government are open and searchable by anyone, anytime. Early results indicate reduced corruption and stronger public trust where these systems are in place [22] [23].

Algorithmic Transparency and Accountability Initiatives

- **Public AI and Algorithm Registries:** A cutting-edge innovation in governance transparency is the creation of **public algorithm registries**. In **September 2020, the cities of Amsterdam (Netherlands) and Helsinki (Finland) launched the world's first open AI registers** [24]. These online registries serve as *public catalogs of the algorithms and AI systems* used by the city governments. For each system, the registry provides plain-language descriptions of how the algorithm works, its purpose, the datasets it uses, the factors it considers, and an assessment of its fairness and accuracy [24] [25]. For example, Helsinki's register describes an AI that helps answer citizens' questions on a helpline, including what data it learns from and how bias was evaluated [26]. Amsterdam's register details algorithms used for parking enforcement, welfare fraud detection, etc., including their inputs and oversight mechanisms [27]. Uniquely, these registries also offer a **channel for public feedback**: citizens can submit concerns or questions about specific algorithms [28]. This means residents not only learn about the automated decisions that affect them, but can *actively engage* – effectively crowdsourcing algorithm oversight. Such transparency in city AI is revolutionary; traditionally, government software was treated as an internal black box. By openly cataloging algorithmic "sources of authority," Amsterdam and Helsinki invite public scrutiny and co-governance. Their approach has drawn wider attention. The European Union is considering requirements for transparency around high-impact algorithms as part of its pending **AI Act**, and the Amsterdam/Helsinki model aligns closely with these emerging European regulatory frameworks [29]. In fact, a coalition of cities through Eurocities has since developed a standard schema for algorithm registers to encourage adoption by municipalities across Europe [30]. The **City of London** is also developing an Emerging Technology Charter with transparency criteria, and **New York City** created a dedicated Algorithms Management and Policy Officer in 2019 to inventory and oversee municipal AI systems [31]. These efforts signal that public algorithm registries could soon become a norm, much like open data portals – providing a *"window into the AI systems"* that govern public services [32].

- **Algorithmic Transparency Laws and Audits (New York City and Others):** In 2018, New York City became the first major jurisdiction to tackle algorithmic accountability via legislation. The NYC Council passed **Local Law 49 (2018)** establishing an **Automated Decision Systems Task Force** to examine how city agencies use algorithms and to recommend transparency and bias-mitigation measures [33]. Although the task force's 2019 report faced challenges (including resistance from agencies in disclosing their algorithms), it did result in the creation of a new **Algorithms Management and Policy Officer (AMPO)** position in City Hall [34] [35] – an institutional mechanism to continually audit and guide the city's use of AI. In 2021, New York City went further by enacting **Local Law 144**, which mandates that private-sector employers in NYC who use automated hiring tools conduct annual **bias audits** and disclose the results. Since July 2023, any AI-based hiring or promotion system used in NYC must be independently audited for disparate impact on race/gender, with a public summary of the findings [36] [37]. While the law focuses on employment decisions, it represents one of the world's first binding requirements of algorithmic transparency and accountability in practice. Elsewhere, governments are also requiring algorithmic **impact assessments and audits**. **Canada**, for example, has implemented a mandatory Algorithmic Impact Assessment (AIA) tool for federal agencies deploying automated decision systems, which gauges the system's potential impacts (e.g. on fairness, rights) through a detailed questionnaire and requires mitigation plans for higher-risk algorithms [38] [39]. This AIA process is public-facing, creating a paper trail of how algorithms are evaluated before use. These types of laws and processes acknowledge that algorithms, like financial ledgers, must be subject to checks, documentation, and public oversight to prevent harm.

- **National Policies on Open Algorithms – France's Digital Republic Law:** Some countries have enshrined algorithmic transparency as a legal right. A milestone example is **France's Digital Republic Law** (Loi pour une République numérique) enacted in October 2016. This law added provisions to France's administrative code that **require transparency for any algorithm used in making individual administrative decisions**. Specifically, if a public service uses an algorithm to make or aid a decision about a person (for instance, assigning school places or calculating benefits), the individual must be informed of the algorithm's use **and has the right to request an explanation of how it works** [40] [41]. Citizens can obtain "the algorithm's main rules" – including the criteria and data used – in understandable terms [40]. Moreover, the law declared that **government source code is a public document**: the source code of public algorithms is subject to disclosure upon request, just like any administrative record [41]. In effect, France made *open algorithms* part of open government. It also encouraged (via Article 16) that agencies use free/open-source software and open formats in their IT systems, to facilitate this openness [42]. Implementation is ongoing – France's digital agency Etalab has worked with ministries on publishing code (e.g., the tax code simulator) and even held public consultations on how to open algorithms [43] [44]. While challenges remain (journalistic investigations found some agencies lagging in compliance [45]), the French case is a pioneering legal framework treating algorithmic transparency as a component of citizens' rights and government accountability.

- **Precedent-Setting Court Rulings (Netherlands and UK):** Transparency pushes are also coming via courts and public pressure when secret algorithms backfire. A landmark case occurred in the **Netherlands** with an algorithm called **SyRI** (System Risk Indication), which the government used to detect welfare fraud by profiling citizens. In 2020, a Dutch court *halted the use of SyRI*, ruling that its opaque algorithmic risk scoring violated human rights and privacy protections – especially given its disproportionate targeting of poor and immigrant neighborhoods [46] [47]. The court emphasized

that lack of transparency about how SyRI worked made it impossible for citizens to challenge or understand decisions affecting them, which was unacceptable in a democracy. This was one of the first instances globally of a court shutting down a government AI system for being a "black box." The case sent a clear message: **"secret" algorithms that impact the public will not be tolerated** [48]. In the **United Kingdom**, the dangers of opaque algorithms were highlighted by the 2020 **A-level exams fiasco**. When exams were canceled due to COVID-19, an algorithm was used to assign students' grades – and it systematically downgraded high-performing students from disadvantaged schools, while inflating some grades at elite institutions. The algorithm's bias sparked immediate public outcry; protesters in London even chanted *"Fuck the algorithm!"* outside the Department of Education [49]. Within days, the government scrapped the algorithmic grades and reverted to teachers' assessments [49]. This episode, though not a deliberate transparency initiative, became a vivid example of **algorithmic accountability driven by public scrutiny**. It demonstrated that once the impact of an algorithm is made visible to the public (in this case through its outcomes), citizens can mobilize to demand its replacement. Together, the SyRI case and the UK exam scandal have informed new policies (such as the EU considering a ban on certain high-risk AI and requirements for explainability) and have underscored the need for proactive transparency *before* such algorithms are deployed.

In summary, real-world implementations of radical transparency are emerging on two fronts: **money** and **algorithms**. On the financial side, we see open spending portals, blockchain pilots, and e-procurement systems converging toward a future where *every public transaction could be auditable by the public in real time*. On the algorithmic side, from city-level AI registers to national laws and audits, the once-murky decision algorithms of government are being exposed to daylight. These early programs in the US, EU, Asia, and other regions (including trailblazers like Brazil, Ukraine, and Finland) provide *empirical proof of concept* for Layer 3 of the Pyramid of Power. They show that radical transparency is technically and politically feasible – and yields benefits in accountability, efficiency, and trust. We now turn to the **technologies and systems** enabling this transformation.

Technologies and Systems Enabling Radical Transparency

Implementing radical transparency of money and algorithms requires re-thinking traditional data systems and deploying new technologies purpose-built for openness, auditability, and public accessibility. In this section, we provide a technically detailed overview of the key **enabling technologies and governance systems** that underlie the above initiatives. These include blockchain-based ledgers for public finance, open data standards, explainable AI techniques, algorithm registries, impact assessment frameworks, and more. Each of these tools helps solve part of the transparency puzzle – whether by providing tamper-proof records, interpretable model logic, or channels for public oversight. Together, they form an emerging *tech stack for transparent governance*.

Blockchain and Open Ledger Technology for Public Finance

Blockchain technology is a foundational tool for radical financial transparency. A blockchain is essentially a distributed public ledger – a tamper-evident record of transactions maintained across many nodes – which is *designed to be transparent, immutable, and available in real time*. In the context of government finance, blockchain's value lies in its ability to **record every transaction on a public or permissioned ledger that no single actor can falsify** [50] [22]. By removing the need for a trusted central bookkeeper (replacing it with cryptographic consensus), blockchains allow *"trustless"* verification of data integrity [50] [51]. This means

citizens and oversight bodies can trust the ledger's correctness without having to trust the government's word alone, since the ledger entries are secured by code and widely distributed [50] [51]. For example, if all of a ministry's expenditures were recorded on a blockchain, any attempt to later alter or delete a transaction (to hide a misdeed) would be evident to all, as it would break the cryptographic chain.

Blockchain's **real-time transparency** is also crucial. With on-chain government accounting, every transaction (down to micro-payments) could be published instantly to the ledger as it occurs [19] [52]. Contrast this with current practice where citizens often see budget data only in annual reports or after lengthy delays. An on-chain system could enable a *continuous audit*, where irregularities are flagged by watchdogs or even by automated scripts the moment they appear [53]. Indeed, researchers have shown that machine-learning can be applied to standardized procurement data to **predict and detect corruption patterns** if the data is made available in structured form [53] [54]. By having all spending data on a common ledger, one can run analytics to spot anomalies (e.g. suspiciously timed contracts or payments exceeding market prices) and set **red-flag alerts** that notify officials and the public of potential issues [53] [54].

The design of blockchain systems for public transparency can vary. Some governments are using **public-permissioned blockchains** – where the network is open for anyone to read, but only authorized nodes (government entities or auditors) can write new transactions. Brazil's RBB, for instance, is envisioned as a permissioned network among government institutions, but with the data publicly accessible [14] [55]. This avoids the energy-intensive mining of public blockchains while still ensuring openness. Other approaches include building *layer-2 sidechains* for specific applications (like a procurement chain) anchored to a public chain for security [56]. The core principle is that **blockchain provides data integrity and availability**, forming a **single source of truth** for state finances. It essentially upgrades "Open Data" to *Open Ledger*: rather than publishing static datasets after the fact, the ledger becomes a live database that the public, journalists, or civic tech developers can query via explorers or APIs [20] [57].

Blockchain-based transparency is still in early stages, but pilot projects illustrate its promise. In the Aragon, Spain procurement case, smart contracts were used to encode the rules of contract awards, ensuring the process executes fairly and is viewable publicly [18]. In Brazil's RBB, the very *infrastructure of government transactions* is being rebuilt on blockchain to tackle chronic distrust in state governments [13] [58]. And hypothetical designs have been proposed for systems where each government agency or even each public servant has a **public blockchain wallet address** for all expenditures, enabling direct mapping of every penny spent to an owner and purpose [19] [59]. Of course, moving all government finance on-chain raises challenges (privacy for certain sensitive transactions, the need to authenticate off-chain inputs, managing smart contract complexity, etc.). Nonetheless, the technology provides a powerful toolset to achieve financial transparency *at scale* – making corruption "by design" far more difficult because **every transaction leaves an indelible, public audit trail** [60] [61].

Open Data Standards and Open Government Platforms

While blockchain is one path, an equally important enabler of transparency is the use of **open data standards and platforms** to publish information in usable forms. Early transparency initiatives often faltered because governments would release data as scanned PDFs or in ad-hoc formats that were hard to analyze. Today, the push is for **machine-readable, standardized data** by default. For example, the **Open Contracting Data Standard (OCDS)** provides a common format for publishing all stages of public procurement (planning, tender, award, implementation) in a structured JSON schema [62] [63]. Countries like Ukraine, Colombia, and the UK have adopted OCDS so that procurement data from their systems can be

easily aggregated and compared internationally [64] [65]. In Ukraine's ProZorro, OCDS was used to format the API outputs, allowing civic tech organizations to build rich analytics dashboards (like *bi.prozorro.org*) to visualize how public money is spent [66] [67]. The use of global standards makes transparency efforts more powerful by enabling cross-checks (e.g. linking contract awards to company ownership records to spot conflicts of interest) and by lowering the barrier for watchdog groups to build oversight tools.

Open government data portals are another key piece of infrastructure. Nearly every OECD country now has a central open data portal (data.gov, data.gov.uk, data.gov.fr, etc.) where thousands of datasets are freely available [3]. These include budgetary data, agency spending reports, public service performance metrics, and more. The significance of these portals is that they institutionalize transparency – instead of data being released only on request, there is a proactive "open by default" ethos taking hold [68]. That said, the first generation of open data (call it **Open Data 1.0**) often had issues: data updated infrequently, varying quality, and siloed in different agencies. The next generation, **"Open Data 2.0,"** envisions data that is *real-time and interoperable*, often through APIs or live dashboards rather than static files [5] [69]. For instance, New York City's Checkbook site exposes a JSON API for live expenditure data, and London publishes dashboards of real-time air quality and transportation data. The trend is to embed openness into systems from the start, so that whenever a transaction or decision is made, a public-facing record is simultaneously generated.

One cannot overstate the importance of **data governance frameworks** in making transparency effective. Legal frameworks like **Freedom of Information (FOI) laws** and Open Data mandates provide the *right to access information*, but technical frameworks like **data standards, open APIs, and data catalogs** provide the *means to access it usefully*. Moreover, ensuring data quality and completeness is a continuous challenge. Some governments have created **central data oversight offices** (e.g. chief data officers or open data teams) tasked with standardizing and cleaning datasets before publication. The **French Etalab** unit, for instance, not only handles open data but also works on opening source code and algorithms, developing methodologies to help agencies identify what information can be published and how [70] [44]. Without such governance, transparency can become a flood of unusable information. With good data management, however, transparency becomes a platform for innovation – enabling journalists to do *"uninhibited data-driven journalism"* and uncover stories (as seen in Brazil's ministerial credit-card scandal) [12], and enabling citizens and civic hackers to build apps that e.g. notify people of new construction in their neighborhood or track how their city spends tax dollars.

In summary, open data infrastructure – from standards like OCDS to portals and APIs – is the **software backbone of radical transparency**. It complements the cryptographic backbone of blockchain by ensuring that information, whether on-chain or off-chain, is published in forms that *people and machines can readily use to drive accountability*.

Explainable AI and Model Auditability

As governments deploy more complex algorithms and machine learning models, another critical enabling technology for transparency is **Explainable AI (XAI)** – techniques that make AI's decisions interpretable to humans. Traditional AI models (like deep neural networks) are often black boxes, which is antithetical to accountability. Explainable AI methods (such as SHAP values, LIME, decision trees, or rule-based systems) can be used to **provide reasons for an algorithm's output** in understandable terms. For example, if an algorithm is used to assess welfare eligibility, an explainable system could produce a human-readable explanation: *"Application denied because income above threshold and missing documentation X,"* rather than a

cryptic numeric score. Some jurisdictions are now mandating such explanations. The EU's GDPR already gives individuals the right to *"meaningful information about the logic involved"* in automated decisions, which has pushed AI vendors to include explanation modules [71] [72]. In the public sector, **explainability is not just a nicety but often a legal or ethical requirement** – especially when decisions affect rights or benefits.

Model auditability goes hand in hand with explainability. This refers to the ability for independent experts to **inspect and evaluate an algorithm or model** for fairness, bias, and performance. Technical tools here include things like **model documentation (Model Cards)**, bias testing suites, and version control for algorithms. For instance, a city using an AI system for allocating housing might maintain a *model card* that details the model's intended use, training data, performance metrics across different demographic groups, and known limitations. This documentation can be published on algorithm registries to inform the public. Additionally, before deployment, the model can be audited by simulating its decisions on historical data to see if it has disparate impacts. In NYC's bias audit regime for hiring tools, as noted, auditors must calculate selection rates for different race/gender groups and produce an **impact ratio** showing any disparity [36] [37]. Tools from the AI fairness research community (like Google's What-If Tool or IBM's AI Fairness 360 toolkit) can automate parts of such bias audits.

Another aspect is **open-source algorithms**. Making the source code of government algorithms open (as France's law encourages) allows technically skilled citizens to *review the code directly*. There have been instances where civic hackers found errors in public benefit calculation code or improved the efficiency of government scripts. Open sourcing also deters the use of proprietary "black box" algorithms that officials themselves might not fully understand. To balance transparency with security, some algorithm disclosures come after deployment or in controlled settings (e.g. allowing experts to review code under non-disclosure for sensitive systems). But the overall direction is that **the logic of automated public decisions should be exposed to scrutiny**, whether through high-level explanations, detailed audits, or actual code review. This is crucial for building public **trust in AI**: people are more willing to accept algorithm-assisted governance if they know *what factors the algorithm considers and that it has been vetted for fairness*. The Helsinki and Amsterdam AI registers implementing *explainable summaries* and listing datasets is a practical example of XAI principles being applied in governance [73].

In short, explainable AI and model auditability tools are the **answer to the "black box" problem**. They ensure that as we adopt smarter government systems, we do not sacrifice the intelligibility and contestability that democracy requires. These technical measures enable algorithms to be not only seen, but *understood and corrected* if necessary.

Public Algorithm Registries and Impact Assessments

Building on explainability, more systemic approaches to algorithm governance are emerging as **public registries** and **algorithmic impact assessments (AIAs)**. We discussed how Amsterdam and Helsinki created **AI registers** to list all city-used algorithms with key details [24] [25]. From a systems perspective, these registries required developing new **data schemas** and governance processes: agencies have to catalogue their software, update the registry as algorithms change, and possibly secure vendor cooperation to disclose information. The development of a standard schema by cities (through organizations like Open & Agile Smart Cities or Eurocities) is enabling more governments to adopt registries without reinventing the wheel [30]. For example, *Toronto* and *Barcelona* have expressed interest in similar registers. A technical challenge is interoperability – ensuring the registry can interface with an inventory of algorithms across

departments, which may involve APIs pulling info from each department's systems. Companies like **Saidot** (which built the Helsinki register platform) are providing software-as-a-service to help cities implement these transparency registries [74].

Meanwhile, **Algorithmic Impact Assessments (AIAs)** are increasingly used at the design stage. Canada's AIA, as noted, is a questionnaire-based web tool that any government department must fill out *before deploying an automated decision system*. The questionnaire asks about the system's purpose, the data it will use, the decisions it will make, and prompts an assessment of potential impacts on privacy, rights, and marginalized groups [75] [39]. Based on the answers, the tool assigns a risk level (Tier I low risk up to Tier IV highest risk) which then dictates the level of oversight needed (e.g. a high-risk system might require a third-party ethics review and a public consultation). The filled AIA is often made public, creating transparency *even before* the algorithm is live. The U.S. and EU are also considering mandatory AIAs for high-risk systems (the EU AI Act will likely require something akin to this for systems like credit scoring, policing, or hiring algorithms). The AIA framework ensures that transparency is not retroactive; instead, it embeds a kind of due diligence process in the procurement or development of AI, much like an environmental impact assessment for a new construction project.

Finally, **data governance frameworks** also encompass privacy and security measures that enable transparency **without compromising personal data**. Radical transparency of money doesn't mean every citizen's welfare payments must be public, for example – personal identifying details may be anonymized or aggregated. Techniques like data masking, differential privacy, or releasing data in ranges can allow insight into spending or algorithm behavior *while protecting individuals*. In algorithmic transparency, sometimes only the *logic* is published, not the entire dataset (especially if that data contains sensitive personal information). Governance frameworks help strike this balance by classifying what data or code can be fully open, what should be partially open, and what must remain confidential (with oversight done in camera). For instance, France's policy includes consideration of privacy and trade secrets before releasing source code [45]. As transparency initiatives mature, we see the development of complementary measures like **"personal data vaults"** or **privacy-preserving ledgers** that allow auditing of transactions or algorithms by authorized parties without exposing private details to everyone. The overarching point is that with careful system design – using **open standards, registries, AIAs, and privacy tech** – radical transparency can be achieved in a way that is both *meaningful* (useful information is exposed) and *responsible* (risks are mitigated).

Impacts of Radical Transparency: Trust, Empowerment, and Feedback Loops

Radical transparency of money and algorithms is not an end in itself, but a means to reshape the relationship between citizens and the state. By rebasing governance on openness, this layer of the Pyramid of Power aims to foster **civic trust**, enable informed civic **action**, correct power imbalances born of information asymmetry, reduce corruption and bias, and create self-correcting **feedback loops** in governance. In a post-labor society – where traditional leverage like labor strikes wane – transparency becomes a new source of leverage for citizens. Here we analyze how these dynamics play out, drawing linkages to the other layers of the pyramid (such as digital identity and programmable money, which underpin transparency's effectiveness).

Restoring Trust and Legitimacy: Widespread corruption and opaque governance have led to a multi-decade decline in public trust in institutions worldwide [23]. Transparency directly addresses this trust deficit. When citizens can *see* how funds are spent and *why* decisions are made, they are more likely to believe that authorities are acting in good faith – or to demand corrective action if they are not. Studies have found transparency correlates with higher government efficiency and service quality, which in turn improves trust [23]. Radical financial transparency in particular can *rebuild trust* by assuring taxpayers that their money is used as intended. As one report noted, **improving public budget literacy and enabling real-time tracking of spending can minimize corruption and "also rebuild trust in government."** [22]. For example, Estonia's government saw rising trust in its digital services after implementing blockchain-backed record integrity, because citizens knew that no official could surreptitiously alter their data. On the algorithmic side, opening the "black boxes" reassures the public that government AI is not a mysterious authoritarian tool but just another implement subject to checks and balances. When Amsterdam publishes its parking enforcement algorithm, drivers understand it's not arbitrary but follows set rules – and they even know whom to contact with concerns [25] [28]. This openness fosters a sense of fairness and mutual respect. In short, **transparency signals respect for citizens**, treating them as partners in oversight rather than subjects to be managed. Over time, this can heal the cynicism that "government has something to hide," replacing it with a baseline of goodwill.

Enabling Civic Action and Co-Creation: Transparency by itself, however, could be mere *observation* unless paired with avenues for **action**. The programs we reviewed illustrate how information transparency empowers people to do something about it – essentially turning passive transparency into **civic leverage**. We saw this in Ukraine's ProZorro/DoZorro system, where releasing procurement data allowed citizens and NGOs to actively monitor purchases and lodge official complaints, leading to contract cancellations and investigations [10] [11]. In Brazil, budget transparency enabled journalists to expose abuse of public funds, resulting in resignations and reimbursements [12]. In both cases, transparency provided the *raw material for accountability*, but it was the engagement of civil society that delivered consequences. Radical transparency thus goes hand-in-hand with a robust civil society and free press. By lowering the cost to *discover* malfeasance or errors, it enables watchdogs to act more effectively and routinely. Furthermore, transparency can enable **co-creation and crowdsourced solutions**. When France open-sourced its tax code algorithm, independent developers built simulators that helped citizens understand their taxes better, and researchers suggested improvements to the code. When transit agencies publish their data, civic hackers create useful commuter apps. Such activities turn governance into a more participatory enterprise: citizens are not just monitoring but *contributing* – whether by analyzing data, providing feedback on algorithms, or suggesting policy tweaks based on open evidence. This fulfills the promise that **transparency transforms citizens from passive subjects into "auditors, co-creators, and informed participants."** [60] [76]. David Shapiro's Pyramid explicitly notes that with transparency, *citizens are no longer treated as passive consumers of arcane processes*; they gain agency to question and shape those processes [60] [76]. In a post-labor context, where people may have more time for civic engagement and rely on governance for basic income or services, such **feedback loops** become even more critical. They allow society to continually course-correct policies through open input rather than waiting for infrequent elections.

Rebalancing Information Asymmetries: Knowledge is power, and traditionally the state (and large corporations) held vastly more knowledge about society than the public did. This asymmetry is accentuated in the era of "**surveillance capitalism**" (as scholar Shoshana Zuboff terms it) where institutions leverage big data to influence behavior, while individuals have little visibility into those algorithms or decisions. Radical transparency seeks to **invert or at least level this asymmetry**. If the government knows everything about its citizens, then citizens should have the right to know how government allocates resources and on what

basis it exercises authority. In economic terms, transparency reduces the *information asymmetry* between principal (public) and agent (officials), alleviating classic problems of hidden action (corruption) or hidden bias. By mandating open ledgers and algorithms, we empower citizens with information that was once exclusively inside bureaucratic black boxes. For example, when procurement is moved from closed paper files to open digital platforms, a local small business can finally discover opportunities and compete, whereas before only insiders might have known of a tender – this *"levels the playing field"* for market participants [7] [77]. Likewise, when government algorithms are disclosed, a community group can scrutinize whether a welfare eligibility formula inadvertently disadvantages a minority group, whereas without transparency they could only suspect unfairness but not prove it. Over time, this rebalance in information can translate to rebalance in **power**: officials and AI systems are constrained by the knowledge that their decisions will be reviewed and challenged. It also enhances **epistemic justice**, the idea that all groups in society deserve equal rights to participate in knowledge systems. Marginalized communities often suffer not only from economic injustice but also from *opacity* – decisions affecting them (policing, public assistance, etc.) happen in darkness. Transparency shines a light here and gives communities the tools to demand better, thereby contributing to justice. A concrete example was the Dutch SyRI case: low-income immigrant neighborhoods were being targeted by a secret algorithm – an epistemic injustice. When the algorithm was exposed and struck down in court for its secrecy and bias, it was a victory for restoring a just balance of knowledge and power [46] [48]. Radical transparency aims to make such knowledge hoarding by authorities impossible or at least legally indefensible.

Constraining Corruption and Bias: A core promise of transparency is that it serves as a **deterrent**. Sunlight is a disinfectant; when officials know that *any* financial irregularity can be immediately seen by the public or that *any* algorithm's outcomes can be traced and questioned, they are far less likely to engage in corrupt or discriminatory practices. Real-time financial transparency makes corruption **riskier and more difficult**, as "anyone can audit the books in real time" which in turn makes it hard to hide illicit diversions of funds [78] [60]. Brazil's move to blockchain was explicitly to address *distrust* fueled by corruption – the immutable audit trail is meant to foreclose the kinds of budgetary manipulations that fed scandals like Odebrecht [13] [58]. Similarly, algorithmic transparency and external audits make it **harder for biased or unethical algorithms to survive in use**, because they "cannot hide in darkness" once subject to public evaluation [78] [60]. For instance, if a police predictive algorithm were openly known to over-target certain neighborhoods, public backlash would likely force its suspension (as seen when such biases were revealed). We might compare this to the evolution of **financial auditing in the private sector**: once independent audits became mandatory, outright fraud became easier to catch and therefore less rampant. We are extending that paradigm to public finances and algorithms. Of course, transparency alone doesn't magically end corruption or bias – it must be coupled with enforcement and reform. But it provides the *evidence and pressure needed to trigger enforcement*. In an environment of radical transparency, corrupt actors must assume they will be caught eventually, which shifts the cost-benefit calculus in favor of honest behavior. And when wrongdoing or inequality is objectively exposed by data, it creates a **mandate for policy change**. For example, if open data reveals one district is consistently underfunded in schools, that fact can no longer be ignored in budget negotiations. In sum, transparency constrains malfeasance not by force, but by *illumination* – making the covert overt and thereby actionable.

Feedback Loops and Adaptation in a Post-Labor Society: One of the most profound impacts of radical transparency is how it contributes to **adaptive governance**. In the Pyramid of Power model, higher layers (4: direct democracy, 5: forkable governance) rely on feedback mechanisms to correct course if institutions fail to serve the people [79] [80]. Transparency (Layer 3) is a precondition for those higher-order feedback loops. It's the sensing mechanism of society – allowing the public to observe what is going right or wrong.

In a future where automation and AI may cause rapid social changes (post-labor economy, shifting economic roles), governance must respond quickly to new challenges or injustices. **Transparent data and algorithms enable continuous course correction.** For instance, if a universal basic income (UBI) system is implemented (as might be needed in a post-labor scenario), a transparent ledger of UBI payments and outcomes would allow the public to see if the policy is working – are people's livelihoods improving? Are certain groups left out? – and then demand adjustments. Without transparency, such evaluation is left to sporadic expert studies or political spin. With transparency, *society can iterate*. We see glimpses of this already: participatory budgeting in some cities publishes spending proposals and results, and citizens then vote or comment each cycle, refining priorities. Algorithmic impact assessments similarly create a loop: design, disclose, get feedback, redesign. Moreover, transparency helps **preempt crises** by exposing issues early. In finance, a transparent system might show that a particular contractor is being favored all of a sudden, alerting oversight before a full scandal erupts. In AI, continuous monitoring might catch an uptick in error rates for a model on a new population and prompt a retraining before a lawsuit happens. This kind of responsive governance is crucial in a post-labor world where social stability may depend on fine-tuned policy instruments (like AI-managed welfare, dynamic taxation, etc.). Transparency turns every citizen into a potential sensor and responder in the governance system, creating a decentralized network of accountability.

Links to Digital Identity (Layer 1) and Programmable Money (Layer 2): Radical transparency does not stand alone; it builds on the layers beneath it. **Secure digital identity (Layer 1)** provides the foundation for transparency by ensuring that records of money or algorithm usage are tied to reliable identities and immutable records. For example, you can't have a trustworthy open ledger of land titles or spending if you can't uniquely identify who owns what or who spent what. Estonia's blockchain ID system (an example of Layer 1) ensures that every log entry (like a health record access or a vote or a budget change) is linked to an unforgeable identity, creating accountability [81] [82]. In financial transparency, digital IDs mean each government wallet or account is verifiably owned by a specific agency or official, so published transactions clearly indicate **who is responsible**. Likewise, identity is key in algorithmic transparency: audit trails of algorithmic decisions often require recording which official or contractor approved a model or who tuned its parameters. A robust identity layer prevents misconduct from being anonymized or lost in bureaucratic ambiguity.

Programmable money (Layer 2) – i.e. state-backed digital currencies or smart contract-based payment systems – is a natural complement to transparency. Programmable money makes transactions **traceable and taggable by design**. Consider a central bank digital currency (CBDC) where every token is associated with metadata (e.g., "welfare payment" or "infrastructure budget") – this could enable automatic routing of transaction data to public dashboards. India's massive digital payment infrastructure (UPI) and others have already digitized flows at scale; the next step is layering transparency on top. In Brazil, the PIX instant payment system is used for many public payments, and integrating that with RBB's blockchain could yield a realtime feed of government PIX transactions [83] [84]. **Smart contracts** (self-executing code on blockchain) allow embedding policy rules directly into transactions – for example, a smart contract for public grants that automatically publishes a report when funds are released, or even returns funds if not used as intended. They could also enforce conditions (only pay vendor X when milestone Y is verified), which if all visible on-chain, let citizens see not just spending but *performance*. In short, programmable money turns budgets into active software, which can be open-sourced and audited like any code. This synergy between Layer 2 and Layer 3 means a future where **public funds are both digital and transparent by default** – money that carries its ledger with it, so to speak.

Finally, transparency also **feeds into the higher layers**. Layer 4 (direct democracy) and Layer 5 (forkable governance) both assume citizens are well-informed. Radical transparency supplies the information base for meaningful participation and the nuclear option of exit. As Shapiro notes, the ultimate vision is *"credible exit, credible bargaining"* [79] [80] – citizens can credibly threaten to revoke consent (by voting officials out, launching referenda, or in extreme cases forking off into new jurisdictions) if governance is poor. But citizens can only gauge governance quality if they have clear visibility into what government is doing. Thus, transparency empowers the electorate to make better choices and to back up their demands with evidence. It also ensures that if a community does "fork" or secede (Layer 5 concept), they can copy the necessary data and systems to start anew, since everything was openly documented – whereas a secretive government might hold data hostage.

In sum, the impacts of radical transparency are multi-faceted and transformative. By shining light on money and algorithms, we **build trust**, but also **arm citizens with knowledge**. That knowledge enables action – whether that's holding a corrupt official accountable, tweaking a public service for the better, or reallocating resources more fairly. Transparency reshapes power dynamics, as discussed next, turning what was once one-way surveillance into a two-way street and providing a foundation for a more equitable, participatory, and resilient governance in the digital era.

Transparency as Power: Theoretical Perspectives

David Shapiro's paradigm of "Radical Transparency" ultimately posits **transparency itself as a form of power** – power for the public that counterbalances traditional top-down power. To fully grasp this, it's useful to explore several theoretical frameworks and critiques around transparency, surveillance, and governance:

- **Surveillance vs. Sousveillance (Inverting the Panopticon):** In modern society, we often find ourselves in a *"surveillance capitalism"* (Zuboff) or surveillance state scenario, where governments and corporations gather vast data about individuals, leading to an asymmetry of visibility. The powerful see the lives of the powerless in minute detail (through CCTV, data mining, etc.), while their own workings remain opaque – a digital-age Panopticon. Radical transparency flips this dynamic into what some call **sousveillance** (watching from below) or "coveillance" (mutual watching). By mandating transparency of money and algorithms, society trains the cameras back on the powerful. It doesn't eliminate surveillance of citizens, but it *regularizes* an opposite flow of information: citizens surveilling the state (and to some extent corporate actors, via open data like government contracts with companies). This creates a more symmetrical **"Transparency–Power nexus"**, where each observation of the public by authorities can be matched with an observation of authority by the public [85] [86]. Importantly, transparency as power is not about voyeurism or retaliation; it's about **accountability**. The knowledge that they are being watched by the citizenry compels officials and algorithms to behave better (as earlier noted). Think of it as *democratizing the panopticon* – making oversight multi-directional. This aligns with philosophies of civic republicanism, where citizens are expected to keep watch on the res publica (public affairs).

- **Democratic Accountability and the Informed Citizen:** Classical democratic theory holds that informed voters are essential for legitimate governance. James Madison wrote that a popular government without popular information is "but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy." Radical transparency operationalizes that ideal by providing *timely, granular information* to the public. It strengthens **accountability mechanisms**: elections, public hearings, the free press, and judicial review all work better when facts are available. For example, legislators approving a budget have

greater incentive to spend wisely if they know every line item will be exposed to constituents immediately (some legislatures now livestream and live-itemize budgets). Public choice theory, which models politicians and bureaucrats as self-interested agents, suggests they often have incentive to obscure or distort information to avoid blame. Transparency removes this shield, forcing public choice dynamics toward outcomes that favor the general interest (since hiding rent-seeking is harder). Additionally, transparency can shift the locus of control from bureaucrats to citizens – moving toward what some call **"algorithmic governance with a human-in-the-loop"** (where the human is the citizen collective). With public algorithm registers and open decision-making, democratic input can occur not just at elections but continuously (Layer 4), as people give feedback on policies or propose alternatives backed by open evidence. In theory, this makes governance more *deliberative and epistemic*: policies can be debated on their merits using shared data, reducing reliance on propaganda or appeals to ignorance.

- **Civil Rights and Digital Rights:** Transparency intersects with civil rights in critical ways. The Civil Rights Movement historically fought for equal treatment under law; in the digital age, unequal or hidden algorithms can undermine those rights (e.g. a secret algorithm that unwittingly redlines certain groups from housing or jobs is a civil rights issue). By demanding transparency of algorithms, we assert that **due process** and **nondiscrimination** must be verified. Some scholars argue there is a emerging right to an explanation and a right to audit automated decisions – essentially new civil rights for the era of AI. France's recognition that citizens have a right to know the "main rules" of any algorithm judging them is an example of codifying this principle [40]. Moreover, **privacy and transparency are often seen in tension**, but they can be reconciled as dual rights: the people's right to know versus the individual's right to be let alone. The key is that transparency targets the *powerful entities* (governments, corporations using public data) and the *systems*, not personal private details of ordinary people. In political theory, this aligns with the concept of **reciprocity of visibility**: those who exert power over others (like making a decision or spending public money) should be visible to those others; but private individuals not affecting others can remain private. Thus, radical transparency empowers the people **collectively** without infringing on personal privacy, if well-designed.

- **Public Choice and Corruption Deterrence:** As mentioned, from a public choice theory standpoint, officials may act in self-interest (which can include rent-seeking or corruption) especially when they can do so unobserved. Transparency changes the incentive structure by increasing the probability of detection and punishment. It's analogous to how in economics, full information forces market players to price things fairly. If every bribe or kickback in procurement had a high chance of being exposed on a public ledger, far fewer officials would take the risk. In many countries, anti-corruption agencies struggle due to lack of evidence or political will; radical transparency provides abundant *hard data* that can be used by watchdog agencies or the judiciary to take action. Furthermore, it enables **external checks**: international organizations, NGOs, and journalists all become part of the monitoring ecosystem, not just internal police. This pluralistic oversight reduces reliance on any single watchdog that could be captured. Public choice also notes the problem of *principal-agent*: citizens (principals) can't easily monitor their agents (politicians), leading to agency slack. Radical transparency inverts the information flow, so the principal can constantly observe the agent's behavior (like an employer monitoring an employee's work log – except here the employer is the public). This theoretically brings agent behavior more in line with the principal's interest (the common good).

- **Algorithmic Governance and Epistemic Justice:** We now live in an era of **algorithmic governance**, where decisions are not only implemented by bureaucrats but often *made* or *recommended* by computational systems. This raises questions of legitimacy: how do we ensure these systems respect our values? Transparency is one answer – it makes algorithmic governance **legible and contestable**. Legal scholars like Cary Coglianese have argued that algorithmic governance can actually enhance legitimacy if it is paired with transparency and oversight, because algorithms (when visible) can be tuned to be *more consistent and fair* than fallible humans [86] [85]. On the other hand, if algorithms are opaque, they undermine the rule of law (people can't know the rules that govern them) and pose threats to **epistemic justice** (certain groups may be systematically misrepresented or excluded in algorithmic decision-making). Epistemic justice, a concept from philosophy, is about fairness in knowledge – who gets to know things and who is recognized as a knower. Radical transparency promotes epistemic justice by *democratizing knowledge of governance*. It asserts that everyone has the right and capability to understand and question the knowledge (data/algorithms) that shapes their society. This is especially empowering for communities who historically were told to "just trust" authority – now they can verify. It also invites diverse epistemologies into governance: for example, indigenous groups or minority communities might analyze transparent data to offer different interpretations of what policies are needed, thus enriching governance with plural perspectives.

- **From Observation to Leverage – Empowerment in Practice:** Transparency alone could still be inert if citizens lack avenues or motivation to act on it. The Pyramid of Power envisions that transparency *combined with the other layers* yields true empowerment. Identity (Layer 1) gives individuals secure access and control over their data and civic credentials; value rails (Layer 2) let them transact and organize economically; transparency (Layer 3) gives them information; direct democracy (Layer 4) gives them voice; and forkability (Layer 5) gives them exit. In political theory terms, this is reminiscent of Albert Hirschman's **"Exit, Voice, and Loyalty"** framework – transparency amplifies both *voice* (by informing protests, votes, and participation) and *exit* (by informing choices to leave or reform systems), and in doing so it forces governments to be more *loyal* (responsive) to citizens. When citizens have transparency plus voice, they can exert **leverage** short of exit: e.g. embarrassing a ministry into changing course by publicizing its wasteful spending. We saw an example with the UK exam algorithm – public outcry (voice) combined with visible unfairness (transparency of results) led to a rapid policy U-turn [49]. When transparency plus exit are combined, it's even more powerful: people could move their investments or communities away from jurisdictions that are proven (through transparent data) to be corrupt or unjust, thereby incentivizing competition in good governance. This ties to **public choice's Tiebout hypothesis** (people "vote with their feet" for better governance) but updated for the digital age – now data lets them compare governance in detail and blockchain-based identity/assets might let them *port* their civic life elsewhere if needed [80] [87]. Thus, transparency transforms what was passive dissatisfaction into an *active bargaining chip*. It is no coincidence that authoritarian regimes often fear transparency – it undercuts their power by enabling collective action and undermining propaganda. Conversely, democracies that embrace transparency often see more civic engagement and healthier public discourse, which in turn can lead to more effective and trusted governance, creating a virtuous cycle.

Conclusion: Radical transparency of money and algorithms, as the third layer of the Pyramid of Power, represents a profound shift in how power is distributed and exercised in society. It leverages technology and policy to ensure that *information, the lifeblood of power, flows outward to the many and not only upward to the few*. By reviewing global case studies, we see that this is no utopian fantasy – real systems are in place and growing, from open ledgers in Brazil and Ukraine to AI registers in Europe and audit laws in New York.

The enabling technologies – blockchains, open data, explainable AI, etc. – are maturing to support transparency at scale, albeit with challenges to navigate. The benefits in terms of trust, reduced corruption, and citizen empowerment are already being felt where these innovations take hold. Yet transparency is not a panacea; it must be coupled with the ability for the public to respond (voice) and reorganize (exit) when transparency reveals problems, lest we end up simply witnessing dysfunction in high definition. Fortunately, as this white paper has outlined, transparency is deeply interconnected with other layers of a new digital social contract that together provide those very avenues for action. In political theory terms, transparency reconfigures the social contract into one of **visibility, accountability, and mutual responsibility** – it is power not as domination, but as illumination that *enables* rather than *constrains*. We stand at a juncture where societies can choose to continue concentrating knowledge (and thus power) in elite institutions and opaque algorithms, or choose the radical openness that equips all of us to share in governing. The Pyramid of Power framework, especially its third layer, makes a compelling case that the latter path leads to a more just, trusting, and resilient post-labor society. The challenges (balancing privacy, preventing information overload, ensuring transparency leads to real change) are significant, but the examples and analysis herein show that they are surmountable with thoughtful design. Transparency, ultimately, is the oxygen of democracy – invisible when present and plentiful, but painfully fatal when cut off. By hard-coding radical transparency into our money and algorithms, we breathe new life into the ideals of government of the people, by the people, and **for** the people – turning those from aspirations into verifiable, accountable reality.

Sources:

1. Shapiro, D. *The Pyramid of Power: A Modular Framework for a New Digital Social Contract*, Layer 3 – *Radical Transparency of Money & Algorithms* [1] [88].

2. Institute for Global Change – *Budgets on the Blockchain: Maximally Transparent Transactions* (2022), on blockchain-ledger transparency and case studies (NYC Checkbook, ChileCompra, Brazil RBB, etc.) [89] [8].

3. Open Government Partnership – France Commitment (2018) *"Transparency of Public Algorithms"*, on the Digital Republic Law mandating algorithmic transparency [40] [41].

4. Open Government Partnership – Ukraine *"ProZorro"* case study, on e-procurement transparency and civic monitoring via DoZorro [10] [11].

5. AI for Good/ITU – *"Helsinki and Amsterdam launch AI registers"* (2020), detailing the world's first public AI algorithm registries [24] [25].

6. StateScoop – *"NYC Algorithm Task Force Report"* (2019), on New York City's algorithmic accountability efforts and creation of an Algorithms Policy Officer [33] [35].

7. The Verge – *"UK ditches exam results algorithm after student protests"* (2020), on public outcry ("Fuck the algorithm") leading to the scrapping of a biased algorithm [49].

8. Brazil TCU/BNDES – *Brazilian Blockchain Network (RBB)* press (2022), on goals of blockchain for public expenditures accountability [13].

9. Europapress (Spain) – Report on Aragón's blockchain-based procurement system (2018) [18] .

10. NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection – *Automated Employment Decision Tools Law FAQ* (2023), on NYC Local Law 144 bias audit requirements [36] [37] .

---

[1] [2] [5] [6] [9] [21] [24] [25] [26] [27] [28] [29] [46] [47] [48] [60] [61] [69] [73] [76] [78] [83] [84] [88] The Pyramid of Power - A Modular Framework for a New Digital Social Contract.pdf
file://file-BAkHXMAFL9vCnEgke68Rka

[3] [4] [7] [8] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] [22] [23] [50] [51] [52] [53] [54] [55] [56] [57] [58] [59] [68] [77] [89] Budgets on the Blockchain: Maximally Transparent Transactions
https://institute.global/insights/tech-and-digitalisation/budgets-blockchain-maximally-transparent-transactions

[10] [11] Empowering Citizens as Watchdogs in Ukraine
https://www.opengovpartnership.org/stories/lessons-from-reformers-empowering-citizens-as-watchdogs-in-ukraine/

[30] Nine cities set standards for the transparent use of Artificial Intelligence
https://eurocities.eu/latest/nine-cities-set-standards-for-the-transparent-use-of-artificial-intelligence/

[31] [32] [74] Helsinki and Amsterdam launch AI registers to detail city systems - AI for Good
https://aiforgood.itu.int/helsinki-and-amsterdam-launch-ai-registers-to-detail-city-systems/

[33] [34] [35] NYC algorithm task force makes broad suggestions in final report | StateScoop
https://statescoop.com/new-york-city-releases-algorithm-task-force-report/

[36] [37] Automated Employment Decision Tools: Frequently Asked Questions
https://www.nyc.gov/assets/dca/downloads/pdf/about/DCWP-AEDT-FAQ.pdf

[38] [39] ALGORITHMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT - STIP Compass - OECD
https://stip.oecd.org/stip/interactive-dashboards/policy-initiatives/2023%2Fdata%2FpolicyInitiatives%2F24387

[40] [41] [42] [43] [44] [70] [71] www.opengovpartnership.org
https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/france/commitments/FR0035/

[45] FRANCE - AlgorithmWatch
https://algorithmwatch.org/en/automating-society-2019/france/

[49] UK ditches exam results generated by biased algorithm after student protests | The Verge
https://www.theverge.com/2020/8/17/21372045/uk-a-level-results-algorithm-biased-coronavirus-covid-19-pandemic-university-applications

[62] [63] [PDF] Open Contracting Data Standard - World Bank Document
https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/744551614955316901/pdf/Open-Contracting-Data-Standard.pdf

[64] [65] www.opengovpartnership.org
https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/ukraine/commitments/UA0064/

[66] [67] About - Prozorro
https://prozorro.gov.ua/en/about

[72] Algorithm Accountability: What Government Can Do Right Now
https://www.ogpstories.org/algorithm-accountability-what-government-can-do-right-now/

75 AI Governance on the Ground: Canada's Algorithmic Impact ...
https://montrealethics.ai/ai-governance-on-the-ground-canadas-algorithmic-impact-assessment-process-and-algorithm-has-evolved/

79 80 81 82 87 Pyramid of Power – A Hierarchy For A New Social Contract.pdf
file://file-1N7zCwuA33Wz1XXGY4uqgg

85 Cyber-governance of the natural world the implications of digital ...
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2589811625000424

86 "Transparency and Algorithmic Governance" by Cary Coglianese ...
https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/faculty_scholarship/2123/