

Volkswagen**Stiftung**



Explainability Auditing for Intelligent Systems:

A Rationale for Multi-Disciplinary Perspectives

Vision Paper

Markus Langer, Kevin Baum, Kathrin Hartmann, Stefan Hessel, Timo Speith, Jonas Wahl

RE4ES: First International Workshop on Requirements Engineering for Explainable Systems

Explainability

- Ability to explain the outputs and internal processes of intelligent systems to relevant stakeholders (e.g. developers, deployer, end users, human in the loop), so that
 - stakeholders can decide whether their interests, needs and demands are met;
 - the system can be improved more easily with respect to a given desideratum.
- Commonly featured concept in regulatory guidelines on AI.



Explainability



• what is considered a 'good explanation' will depend on the stakeholder to whom the explanation is given.

Ensuring and assessing system explainability is a highly complex task that requires a multi-disciplinary approach.

How to assess explainability?

- Ways to ensure that explainability requirements are fulfilled are
 - explainability audits by specialized auditing firms or institutions,
 - explainability certification, as a means to communicate that a system has undergone quality control.
- Contribution of our vision paper: present a (non-exhaustive) list of explainability requirements based on research in different disciplines.
- See references of our article for more potential requirements.



ALGO RIGHT

The different dimensions of explainability





<u>The different dimensions of explainability</u>

Technical dimensions:

• Ante-hoc vs. Post-hoc:

Is the system designed to allow for human insight or are additional methods employed to generate explanations?

• Global vs. Local:

Is the decision-making process explained as a whole or with regards to specific outputs?



ALGO Right

The different dimensions of explainability

Technical dimensions:

• Interactive explainability:

Can the system's explanations be adapted to the stakeholder's needs or is there a one-size-fits all solution?

• Explainability trade-off:

Is there a trade-off between explainability and accuracy/performance and are choices for one or the other justified?





<u>The different dimensions of explainability</u>

Psychological dimensions:

• Understandability:

Does the system provide explanations that helps people to gain a better understanding of decision processes?

• Context-Dependency:

Does the system provide context-related intellegibility of its decision-making?



The different dimensions of explainability

Psychological dimensions:

• Usability:

Is the provided information easy to access and easy to use?

• Honesty:

Is the provided information non-deceptive?

Example: An explanation could be phrased so that contesting a decision appears pointless.







The different dimensions of explainability

Ethical dimensions:

- Responsibility:
 - Does the system provide information that enables responsible decision-making (e.g. for a human in the loop)?
 - Does the information make the allocation of moral responsibility possible?
- Non-Discrimination:
 - Does the system provide information that makes it possible to detect discrimination?



The different dimensions of explainability

Legal dimensions:

- Does the system comply with
 - data protection laws, e.g. GDPR.
 - cybersecurity laws, e.g the Cybersecurity Act of the EU.
 - *AI-specific laws and regulations*, e.g. the 'proposal for a regulation laying down harmonized rules on artificial intelligence' of the EU.





Conclusion: the benefits of explainability auditing

- Technical benefits:
 - Improved understanding of malfunctions;
 - Improved system safety.
- Psychological benefits:
 - Increased system acceptance/trust;
 - Improved human-system performance.

- Ethical benefits:
 - Adequate allocation of responsibility;
 - Contesting decisions made easier.
- Legal benefits:
 - Compliance with legal obligations can be demonstrated.





Thank you for listening!

More about our work: <u>https://algoright.de/</u>