# Values

**Responsible Sensing Lab x ESDiT x Gemeente Amsterdam** 

# **Core team**









#### **Fabian Geiser**

AMS Institute

Project manager Responsible Sensing Lab

#### Julia Hermann

ESDiT - Ethics of Socially Disruptive Technologies

Assistant Professor in Philosophy and Ethics of Technology

#### Kathrin Bednar

ESDiT - Ethics of Socially Disruptive Technologies

Post-doc, Eindhoven University of Technology



City of Amsterdam

Project Manager Smart Mobility

# **Advisory team**









## Matthew J. Dennis

ESDiT - Ethics of Socially Disruptive Technologies

Assistant Professor, TU Eindhoven

#### Ibo van de Poel

ESDiT - Ethics of Socially Disruptive Technologies

Professor in Ethics and Technology at TU Delft

#### Wijnand IJsselsteijn

ESDiT - Ethics of Socially Disruptive Technologies

Professor of Cognition and Affect at TU Eindhoven Thijs Turèl

AMS Institute

Initiator Responsible Sensing Lab & Program Manager at AMS Institute

# esdit

#### **Ethics of Socially Disruptive Technologies (ESDiT)**

- 10-year long international research programme of 7 academic institutions (2020-2029)
- Funded by the Dutch Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO)
- Breakthrough research at the intersections of ethics, philosophy, technology, engineering and social sciences
- https://www.esdit.nl/

# esdit

#### **Ethics of Socially Disruptive Technologies (ESDiT)**

#### • 3 focal points:

- New digital technologies
- Bio- and brain technologies
- Environmental and sustainable technologies
- **Objective 4**: develop new collaborative models between philosophers, engineers, social scientists, policy makers, designers, and artists, aimed at improved philosophical and ethical analysis and responsible innovation

# **1. Project overview**

### **Driving for Values**

- Fictional navigation aid that would enable the municipality to manage the public space in real time by steering the users of this space on the basis of collective values.
- Inspired by the Code the Streets pilot run by the city of Amsterdam.



### **Driving for Values**

- We explored the influence of different features\* of the Driving for Values navigation aid...

\*such as:

- Whether or not following the routes is mandatory.
- Whether or not car drivers can influence the values underpinning the social routes.

### **Driving for Values**

- We explored the influence of different features\* of the Driving for Values navigation aid...

...on car drivers' experience of Autonomy, Acceptance and Acceptability.







#### Acceptance, Acceptability, and Autonomy

- Acceptance: willingness to use the app
- Acceptability: the system's adherence to moral norms and principles
- Autonomy:
  - the ability to *freely choose* among different options
  - the availability of *meaningful* options

# **Project overview**

- Total of 7 studies with approx. 65 participants.
- Regular workshops with philosophy of tech. and human-computer-interaction experts.
- Literature review.

**Outputs** 

- Recommendations for the responsible design of the Driving for Values concepts for the city of Amsterdam.
- Insights into how we can study people's experience of values shared in scientific publications.

# 2. Studies





# Individual interview study

#### Goal

Gather insights on the four most promising features (identified in the mini studies) affecting car driver's autonomy, acceptance and acceptability.

#### **Participants**

- 18 participants
- 22-64 years old, 8 female and 10 male,
- Self identified as regular car drivers in Dutch cities.



We designed **six prototypes**, differing on some of the four features. Each participant compared two prototypes:

- 1. Participant engages with one prototype.
- 2. Participant engages with a second prototype.
- 3. Comparison of prototypes guided by questions.

# **Example features**

# Drivers can / cannot choose an alternative social route.



# **Example features**

# Drivers can/ cannot influence the values for which the system optimizes.



Value Preferences

Below you see the list of values for navigation created bottom-up by the citizens of Amsterdam.

19:02

util LTE

# **Example features**

The list of values for which the system optimizes is defined by the city council of Amsterdam/ defined bottom up by the citizens of Amsterdam.

19:02 ILTE < Back Route Information The municipality of Amsterdam wants to improve the city based on values that the city council finds important. Below you see how social route A and social route B relate to this list of values. Social Route B Social Route A 34 min (9.6 km) 31 min (8.8 km) Liveability High quality of living for individual citizens and communities Min Mid Max Sustainability Protection of the natural environment. Min Mid Max Safety Safe streets and neighbourhoods for all citizens **Start Navigation** 



# Focus group



#### Goal

Explore whether a group of diverse participants can agree on an ideal version.

#### Set-up

**1.5 hour session in which participants explored all 6 prototypes and build their ideal version of the Driving for Values system.** 

#### **Participants**

- Five participants.
- Had previously participated in the interview study.

# **Example results**

- Predominantly positive reactions towards the Driving for Values concept.
- Citizens' trust and support necessitates a deeper understanding of the system's objectives and impacts.
- Being able to choose between routes is a desirable option.
- Values should be defined in collaboration between the city representatives and citizens.

# 3. Recommendations for Amsterdam

# **Recommendation example**

Autonomy is not about having complete freedom or as many choices as possible but about having options which facilitate meaningful choices:

- 1. Influence the high level public values that the system promotes across the city (valid for all drivers in the city).
- 2. Set personal value preferences to receive routes that are in line with one's own ideals.

3. ..

# **Recommendation example**

The introduction of such a system should be accompanied by a campaign in which people are informed about the purpose, the ideas behind it, the precise workings of the system and in which discussions with citizens are organized.

# 4. Wrap-up

# **Full report**





# Want to collaborate?

Get in touch with: fabian.geiser@ams-institute.org



/responsible-sensing-lab

/esdit-research-programme

### Newsletter

# Receive our quarterly newsletter in your mailbox

Scan the QR code to visit the Responsible Sensing Lab website. You can subscribe to our newsletter at the bottom of the page.

Or stay updated via **Responsible** Sensing Lab on LinkedIn



# **Recommendation example**

Not everybody has to contribute to every goal: The level of compliance with route advice correlates with the public value created. For example: every car that does not go past a primary school at school opening time reduces the risk of a traffic accident in which a child gets hurt. This means that not everybody has to abide by the advice, allowing people who really do not like this not to do so, thereby minimizing infringement on people's autonomy.

# **Reflection on collaboration**

- Having a core team and an advisory team worked well
- Bi-weekly meetings of the core team important for making progress and transdisciplinary learning
- **Highlight**: moment in which we realised we had successfully moved from individual research questions to **shared questions and goals**.

# Newsletter

Receive our quarterly newsletter in your mailbox

www.responsiblesensinglab.nl You can subscribe to our newsletter at the bottom of the page.



# **Recommendation example**

**Please add more** 

### **Driving for Values**

- Is inspired by the Code the Streets pilot run by the city of Amsterdam:
  - Navigation aid
  - Providing social routes
  - Informed by collective values

# **Tested features**

1. The system is voluntary / mandatory:

#### - Voluntary

Drivers can choose between the fastest route and a social route.

#### - Mandatory

Follow the route or no navigation provided (all navigation aids use social routes).

# The Responsible Sensing Lab explores how to integrate public values in the design of smart systems in public space.

# **Example questions**

#### Acceptance

- Can you imagine actually using the app? Which app version?

#### Acceptability

- Is there anything that you find morally problematic about the design of the two app versions?

# **Example results**

Participants ideal system:

- Is voluntary (fastest and social route are available),
- Strikes a balance between sufficient information on the impact of routes and information overload,
- Values are defined by city representatives and citizens in a yearly referendum,

. . .

# **Example questions**

#### **Autonomy**

- The system (or feature)...
  - a. ... constraints my individual freedom;
  - b. ... enables me to make morally good choices;
  - c. ... allows me to make well-informed decisions:d. ...

### **Driving for Values**

#### **Different in that we explore a broader set of features**



### We explored the influence of different features\* of the Driving for Values navigation aid...

\*such as:

- Whether car drivers can influence the values underpinning the social routes.
- Whether following the routes is mandatory or voluntary.
- Whether card drivers can choose alternative routes.