

**Part 1**

Q1:

Since Alice processes the teenage (aged below 18) personal data in her project, according to GDPR, the data objects aged below 16 years old are categorized as children. Alice is required to receive the consent of the parent or guardian of the child before processing children's personal data aged below 16. However, for the teenagers aged above 16, Alice can process their sensitive personal data when she receives the consent of the data objects. Moreover, the consent listed for the data collection purposes and the items of sensitive personal information that will be collected should be written in clear and plain language, easy to withdraw, and not necessary for the performance of the contract of her app.

Q2:

Since the discrediting posts on the internet provides false information that damages Paul's reputation. He has the right to ask the information providers to rectify the wrong information or may even erase the posts providing false information. However, due to the information providers being anonymous, it is hard for Paul to find them and ask them to correct/ delete the discrediting posts.

Q3:

@home classifies the controller in the case mentioned, since the company makes decisions about personal data processing activities, i.e. allowing the customers real-time control of their orders. To fully comply with data protection legislation, @home should minimize the personal data collected from the drivers and provide adequate, relevant, and limited driver's personal data to the customers. Moreover, the driver's personal data should not be kept when no longer is necessary for which the personal data is processed. For instance, the customers could not check the driver's location after the transition is finished.

## **Part 2**

In the paper, it mentioned that a food delivery company, called deliveroo, offers a self-employment system to her workers. The workers' reputations are solely judged and ranged by algorithms, where the potential issues and inequalities are not determined. Before the court ruled Deliveroo used the 'Discriminatory' Algorithm, many people may think that algorithms could judge from an objectively neutral perspective.

Due to the details of the algorithm are not public and may not be easy for the general people to understand. Some unfair conditions are possible to be added in the calculation by the algorithm. Some Deliveroo workers are automatically fired by the blackbox algorithm.

All the people will be judged on a uniform scale when using an algorithm to make judgments. However, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, a blackbox algorithm can favor a group of people by some criteria. Judging a case should not only consider the result, but also the object's intention and the process of the case. Judges should consider case by case. For example, in COMPAS case, blacks are labelled higher-risk than the whites, but it found that only 20 percent of people predicted to commit crimes are actually went on to do so [1].

Since people tend to trust technology more than themselves, the judges' may prejudge if machine learning results are implied before the judges make decisions. Judges should not partly or solely include the result provided by technology to make decisions.

**References**

- [1] Wikipedia contributors. (2020, September 29). COMPAS (software). Wikipedia.  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COMPAS\\_\(software\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/COMPAS_(software))

CHEUNG, Hau Yee (2013004) Group 3