Trailblazing with CorbettPrice Podcast – Series 2, Episode 5

Transcription

INTRO: Welcome to Trailblazing with CorbettPrice, where we present new and fresh perspectives that challenge how you approach change to solve some of the biggest challenges faced by business and government leaders today. Here's our host, Andy Corbett, to introduce the final episode in our series on embracing organisational change.

ANDY CORBETT: Hi, everyone. I'm Andy Corbett, Managing Director of CorbettPrice. Thank you once again for listening to our second podcast series on embracing organisational change. We've had some tremendous speakers in this series that have shared their valuable insights and case studies across key transformational changes that public sector organisations need to embrace now and into the future.

Steve Brady from TAFE NSW took us through shifting mindsets and empowering employees. Dan Bowes provided us with an example of how Revenue NSW optimised service delivery for customers through an operating model approach. We also had Julie Etchells, who's the CHRO for the Department of Child Safety, Seniors, and Disability Services. She shared her insights on realising diversity, equity and inclusion aspirations. And last week we had Tina McAllister, who's the Acting Director for People and Culture for the Queensland Department of Agriculture and Fisheries. Tina explained strategies on attracting and retaining the best talent, which is an underpinning theme across many of our episodes and both of our series so far.

So as we close out this current series, we will be tackling an important change on the minds of most public sector leaders today, and that is how do we adopt new technologies responsibly? According to a recent McKinsey report, more than half of global survey respondents said that they had adopted AI in at least one of their business units, and nearly two thirds expected that their

companies' investments in AI would increase over the next few years. Yet despite this, according to [Boston Consulting Group,](#) Australia lags behind globally with around 70% of Australian organisations yet to succeed in delivering digital transformation, which of course is a critical first step to succeed in AI. Some of the key barriers which were highlighted included implementation, scaling, managing risk and gaining customer trust with responsible AI.

Here to help us navigate this key transformational change and provide a unique perspective for how public institutions can approach the responsible adoption of AI is Pia Andrews. Pia is a prolific global expert in open and digital government, and a former public servant. Pia has spent the last twenty years trying to make the world a better place, and she's been doing this by working within and around the public sector to transform public services, policies and culture through greater transparency, democratic engagement, citizen centric design, open data, emerging technologies and real pragmatic, actual innovation in the public sector beyond. Pia was one of the global top 20 most influential in digital government in 2018 and 2019 and works as a member of apolitical Advisory on 21st Century Government peer. Welcome back to the podcast.

PIA ANDREWS: Thank you so much for having me.

ANDY CORBETT: Good, good. All right. So I think the first question I'd like to ask you here is the statistic that's coming out from research from Boston Consulting Group. And that statistic states that around 70% of Australian organisations have yet to succeed in delivering digital transformation, which is a critical first step to succeed in AI. And in terms of AI maturity, the research also shows that a sample of Australian companies and government agencies self-score their AI maturity at an average of 3.5, lagging the global average of 4.3 out of ten. The explanation that they give is scattered projects with few that are successful and with limited value to date. So the question for you Pia is do you think that's an accurate view of what you see in the public sector?

PIA ANDREWS: So what I'm seeing across Australia is that there are actually a lot of highly mature data analytics capabilities in government, in the state governments, in federal and a few local governments as well. And those where you have high maturity data analytics teams, they have been doing some extraordinary things with AI actually, particularly around where AI machine learning is very strong: around patterns, analysis, around looking for trends, around looking for challenges. But also now with the emergence of generative AI, we're starting to see things like the NSW Government taking all of the gazettes, which are a means of communicating the changed rules or changes to names of streets or all kinds of things. The gazette is sort of the news feed of changes to legislation in NSW. They turn that into one giant LLN for instance, as a means to make it easier for public servants to understand and engage with changes to legislation and what the current status is.

There's lots of great projects like at the ATO, who are using machine learning to look for patterns, unusual patterns of taxation, payments and behaviours in order to identify hundreds of millions of dollars of inappropriate tax behaviour. So there's really great usage of the machine learning aspects of AI. I think where maturity has a bit of a challenge is around where you should and should not use it, right? So the data analytics team is using AI to do analysis makes total sense and there's lots of

great projects happening there. And actually I'm very excited about some of the stuff happening. But where people start looking at things like automated decision making, there's very low maturity in how to do that and whether you even should use machine learning to do that. So every Australian government entity is governed by administrative law. Administrative Law is very simple. Any decision you make in government needs to be traceable back to your legal authority, needs to be explainable, needs to be appealable, and needs to be auditable. So when you start using data-trained machine learning systems to automate decisions, you are directly contradicting that requirement. And even worse, you're creating a system where, as the machine learns over time, you're getting inequitable outcomes or certainly inconsistent outcomes, where common inputs get different outputs over time.

So I think we've lower maturity in practical guidance: practical is where you should use different forms of AI. Here's where you shouldn't. Here's the genuine guardrails. There's a lot of signage in this space, a lot of signaling like, "you should consider this", "you should consider that", "you should have ethics", you should, you know, "look at your data quality", but there's very little actual guardrails. How do you know? How do you mitigate harm if you can't detect it? So the key areas I want to focus on and I'm trying to encourage people to focus on is actual guardrails, things that will stop the system when it's doing the wrong thing, things that will detect when it's having an adverse effect both on a person or on the policy intent and things that actually start to create issues around the legality of how it's being used.

And just as a quick example, there was a wonderful video recently where ChatGPT was put up against an older rules-based chess system. And what was interesting was that ChatGPT, of course, started to guess at how things move because it's trying to imitate and learn from the rules-based chess software. And inevitably it got some of the rules wrong. People were saying, "Oh, see, this is a really great example of why it's so problematic", but what if we were to start merging, if you like, different forms of AI so that you had generative AI actually not just using data or observation, but actually using rules, so you could actually test your outputs against something. You could involve the rules as part of the test training suite, or you could just take the outputs and test it back against rules before you actually take the next step in the case of chess, before you make the move.

So the maturity about where not to use it, the practical guidance to make sure we have guardrails, to detect and understand and improve over time, and to shift away from the idea that you can design the perfect AI system being sufficient to getting ethical outcomes or responsible outcomes. You actually need to have a whole management approach which detects, monitors for, and intervenes, when the system is going in the wrong direction. All of that's where the maturity gap is at the moment around operational systems as opposed to the analytics and analysis systems that I think Australia is actually doing very well in.

ANDY CORBETT: And, you know, that's obviously one major gap, as you've just highlighted. Why do you think there are other gaps in terms of maturity?

PIA ANDREWS: So if I was to delve in for a minute to the things that I think are lacking at the moment, no government in the world has fully committed, even though there has been several years of major experimentation and starting to shift into this model, no government has actually

provided its rules as code. If we don't have the digital form of legislation and regulation, then we have no way for our digital systems to test, consume, or be validated, or verified, against the law. So that's a gap that pretty much everyone has, although it's starting to be addressed. But how can you have lawful, traceable, or explainable, outcomes from any system, let alone, let AI systems? If you don't have a digital twin for legislation and regulation, that's a massive gap.

We need to have feedback loops that are realistic. So not just a "hey, how was your experience with us today", but also tell us if this is creating a negative outcome or a positive outcome for that matter. And that sort of feedback shouldn't just be to citizens, it should be to staff, it should be to contractors, it should be to vendors, because many eyes make all bugs shallow, as we like to say in software land. And the idea of getting more eyes out there to be able to report when an issue is an issue, and then to have the operating model that allows you to stop, pivot, or iterate, or improve, a system over time means that you can create a self-correcting approach to your implementation.

There's a huge gap around monitoring for impact. So unfortunately, not just with AI, but with everything happening in government, including policy, there's a huge amount of effort and good effort, around improving the design phase. Let's get a little bit more human-centered design, iterative, multidisciplinary, service design layer, design thinking led, etcetera. And then right at the end of the phase, let's do a better evaluation, let's introduce RCT and all kinds of other techniques. But the problem is that everything in between is not being focused on, which means you might have the shiniest, best possibly designed thing in the world, but then you don't know what its real impact is until someone does an evaluation or indeed a royal commission some years down the track.

So getting that adaptive operating model everywhere in between, particularly for policy, particularly for legislation and regulation, and particularly for systems that are making decisions about people's lives, is absolutely critical. And not just having an operating model that allows for adaptation, but monitoring not just for your policy impact to see if it's going in the right direction, monitoring for unintended human impact. If you put a system, any form of system into place, and that system creates issues for people, creates homelessness, creates debt, creates any form of negative impact, you need to know about it so that you can mitigate it. But if you're not detecting if you're not monitoring for impact, not just monitoring for the known knowns, monitoring for what you expect, but monitoring for patterns that you don't expect. Otherwise you have no chance of being able to mitigate that.

Couple more quick things that I see as gaps at the moment. System and data provenance. I think a lot of people think if we're running the system of data ourselves, then we should be fine. But even that's not really fine. You need to, for particular types of systems, you need to be able to determine, do I need to have full provenance or not? How risky is it if someone else injects different data, injects different training, injects different rules, injects different code. So really getting to the full supply chain veracity of systems I think is critical. Independent oversight is critical, not just using the same old internal governance models, but actually having members of the public and advocates for the public involved in oversight is also critical and transparency in government.

In several governments around the world, they have models where every algorithm, every AI system has to be put through a risk analysis, a centrally, you know, run consistently applied risk analysis. Why wouldn't we have a single register of all the algorithms and AI systems in government, not just a register of them, but what their risk frameworks are and what their oversight bodies are? If you can't see them, you can't manage them. And at the moment, the complete lack of visibility to that is a real problem.

I will say just one last thing, which is test suites. I would love to see a situation where we have, particularly for the form of where we're using any form of technology, including AI for decision-making, for ADM (automated decision-making) systems, we should have test suites. If software is meant to make a decision about benefits or taxation or eligibility or, or emergency payments. Being able to say a person with these characteristics or a business with these characteristics should get this outcome. Imagine if you could generate and have access to a very simple "these inputs should equal these outputs" test suite, as a nationally available resource. It means that no matter what your software and whenever you make changes to your software, you can be testing back again with the test suite to make sure that at least the test suite provided or the use cases provided by government are testing correct in your system before you apply it in the real world.

ANDY CORBETT: That's great. Thanks, Pia. And I'm really drawn towards the idea of having an operating model in place to monitor for the unintended impacts. Do you have any examples of where that's done well at the moment across the public sector or beyond Australia? Yeah, any particular examples of where that's done well at this point in time?

PIA ANDREWS: Ah, no. What I'm seeing is that there are a lot of cases where, for instance in NSW they have the Human Service Outcomes framework, which is a fantastic framework based on seven quality of life categories of indicators, and they use that framework effectively to measure the return on investment of publicly funded social services, so not-for-profits or non-government organisations that are funded to provide social services. They needed a way to figure out are these investments and are these providers are actually driving social outcomes, which of course comes back to quality of life indicators. So, as a measurement framework that is used to do return on investment analysis on human impact, but that could be a framework that, for instance, that you could be monitoring for.

In terms of patterns analysis, what I tend to see is most government analysis most, and this is why better evaluation is simply not sufficient to better outcomes. They're retrospective. They tend to be positivist. They tend to say did this project or software or system achieve what it set out to achieve? And when you are looking for the known knowns, then you're measuring for what you know. Even if you say, and let's take the human or environmental or other indicators that they expected to impact, that's still around your intended impact.

Using software defined unintended impact is currently the domain of research projects, and there are many research projects that do this as just the normal, their normal process, their normal activity. But what I've seen is that with the gap widening between public sectors and the research sector, some of these techniques that are very common in research are simply not being adopted in the operating models of government. So this also, I think, makes a case not just for having more

multidisciplinary people in government, but actually closing that gap between government and research.

ANDY CORBETT: Yeah, excellent. That's great. And I think, you know, this idea of culture as well, it was touched upon when we spoke with Steve Brady in the first episode of this of this series, and Steve Brady, Managing Director of TAFE NSW, should I say. And we were speaking to him about the importance of overcoming the cultural mindset to embrace change. Do you think that this idea of cultural mindset within Australian public service may act as an inhibitor in making digital transformation and the adoption of AI unsuccessful? Do you believe that's also a potential challenge as well?

PIA ANDREWS: What I've noticed in the public services in Australia is that the people most motivated to experiment are the most inhibited. So what you see is the people up the stack in the senior executive are largely taught, and this isn't entirely their fault because they are conditioned this way, they are largely taught to micromanage their staff. They are also largely taught to not be experts in what they do or what they manage. They are taught to become generalist managers. So that generalist mentality combined with a micromanagement culture, means that they are, let's say, unmotivated and certainly not incentivised to experiment or take risks.

But they are also perversely not incentivised to actually trust their staff to take risks. So the expertise is way down the chain. It's in the EL2's and below. The expert, and the gap between expertise and decision making is now wider than ever. Now, luckily, the APS Reform Agenda combined with Robodebt, combined with COVID, combined with the Integrity Review in Queensland, are all providing kind of the perfect storm where EL2's and below who know their stuff, they really do, they are experts, they want to experiment. A lot of them do a lot of innovation on the side of their desk or, you know, in communities with each other. I mean, think we have one of the strongest, certainly proportionally digital professions in the world. We have 20,000 of our 180,000 public service in the digital profession.

We have a very innovative culture in EL2's and below, I think, and I have seen and I experience regularly, but these people are largely told to just stick in their lane and punished when they try to innovate, at least when they try to innovate openly by an SES that is systemically motivated to distrust them. So what we need to do is I think most of the public service, that lower 80 to 90% are raring to go. And right at this exact point in time they are feeling vindicated and excited and in a position of, you know, knowing that that they can be better.

What we need to do is shift the culture of the Senior Executive Service (SES). We need to shift to a culture of not just adaptive leadership, but servant leadership, where senior executives are encouraged and supported to understand the expertise of that which they managed. They are encouraged and supported to delegate decision-making down to their staff and to embrace expertise as a valuable thing, not as a low-level thing. And when you actually get that that delegation down and that it's not about taking on risk, it's about unleashing the capability and power that you have in your people. That's the biggest change to make. Everyone else is just wanting and raring and waiting to go. But that's also why so many highly skilled people in the public

service either stay to just carry the load and just be the crutch to stop the system falling over or they leave out of frustration.

Imagine if all of that capability was unleashed and supported and if everyone was given a little just a little bit of capacity. Because also when you're working people 110% of their cognitive load, they're constantly in a fight, flight, or fright mentality. If you can clear up just 5% or 10% of the capacity in the programs that you run, and everyone every executive has the delegation of authority to do that, then you can free up a little bit of capacity and your staff will thrive and blossom and show you the most extraordinary things you've never seen.

ANDY CORBETT: Absolutely. And some of the best, most the greatest innovation that we've seen within public sector comes from involving those people, the people that see and they experience these things on the day-to-day, the people that actually have that expertise, as you say. So that's a big a big thing to sort of change as we move forward.

PIA ANDREWS: Yeah, absolutely. And I think that in Australia we have a thing called The Mandarin, you know, which is a publication focused on telling public service stories. Prior to that existing, I think it was very hard to tell those stories for a period of time. 20 years ago, it was easy to tell those stories because we didn't have comms departments that basically stopped all public servants from having a voice. But for a long time there hasn't been a mechanism to tell those stories. And The Mandarin has been extraordinary, so has Apolitical and other similar publications. But more public servants being able to tell their stories actually really shows everyone, including the public and including private sector, just how much innovation there is in the public sector.

ANDY CORBETT: Absolutely. And I just want to touch as well now on the Trust Framework and that you pulled together for the [Government Use of AI and ADM](). And in that framework, you recommend you recommend an open by default culture which seeks and values feedback that's designed for trust. Can you just explain to our listeners what you mean by this? And then also just describe some of the key functions of a trustworthy system and why that's especially important for a public service?

PIA ANDREWS: Cool. Thank you. I might start with why I wrote that paper. And for everyone, I'm sure the link will be available in the information about this cast, but I was talking to some people who only work in private sector and we were talking about the special context of government. Well, I was trying to talk about the special context of government, and someone actually said to me, there's no such thing as a special context of government. And I said, well, no, there's major requirements for that space that are quite different. But there's also transparency and portability and accountability. And the person actually said, well, there's no difference to a private sector company being accountable to its shareholders as public servants, being accountable, you know, to the public. And it made me so frustrated, but also realised just how little understanding there is about the public sector, not just outside of government, but also often enough inside the government. So I thought I'd write a paper that would achieve kind of three things.

First of all, to define that special context of government. Second of all, to say here is why, you know, nice principles and ethics and human in the loop are insufficient for good AI systems that make the special context of government. And third of all, to really delve into the requirements

around decision-making and government, which then extends necessarily to ADM. So it was sort of a bit of three in that way. So just briefly, some of the key context of government that I that I tried to communicate was around not just the requirements, around access to justice and privacy, preservation, human outcomes, administrative law like the legal and constitutional and legislative context. All of that is very unique for government. I think what a lot of people don't realise, though, is and it's the first time in my life that I've used the term state monopoly on violence in a professional context. But it's true. When people talk about, well, if the public are happy to share their data with, you know, insert big social media company here, then why aren't they happy to share it with government? And that question has become a real red herring.

I have found in a lot of contexts because people are like, well, there is no privacy anymore because of, you know, sharing with these things. So why not just share with government? The simple answer is this, none of those actors have a state monopoly on violence. None of those organisations can lock you up, can take your kids, can penalise you financially, can, you know, actually use the full weight of powers that government has on a personal community or family. So it's a complete red herring, and it's completely frustrating. So I sort of went through that. What I put into the paper is that there were sort of six major questions that we need to be able to answer when you are trying to design for trust. And I find these are actually useful in the terms of government service delivery or program management or product management. You could treat these as business requirements. You could treat these as epics in your product management backlog. However you want to use them, these are questions that you should try to figure out how to answer in order for a system to be trustworthy. Because that's the other shift moving away from how do we have trust, you know, how do we get social license to do this thing, which presumes that trust is a granted thing, is a sort thing. Shifting the mindset away from getting trust somehow to being trustworthy is a huge shift, I think, for a lot of public servants.

So, here are my six questions.

1. **How would you audit and monitor the decisions/ actions made, their accuracy, the legal authority in real-time?** That's a really interesting question because if you're generating decisions, particularly automated decision-making kind of systems, if you can't monitor for their accuracy, monitor for their legality in real-time, then you know, some of these technologies can actually then create devastation at scale as we've seen.
2. **How would an end-user; that is a citizen or a business or a resident, etcetera, how would they know, understand, challenge and appeal the decision action?** And if you're not communicating that as part of the transaction you're having with them, then you're forcing them to have the onus of effort to go and figure that out for themselves. So how do you enable that, how do you support that, is a really big again, requirement on government, I would suggest.
3. **How would you know whether this action or process is having a fair, positive or negative impact?** That goes to impact monitoring that goes to monitoring for bias, some of the use of machine learning in the justice system to actually look for patterns of sentencing is absolutely brilliant because it's not about at all automating the sentencing. It's the opposite. It's actually about monitoring for sentencing that's being done by judges to look

for bias, to look for patterns, to look for where those people can be better supported to be, to overcome internal or unintended bias.

4. **How would you ensure and maintain independent oversight and effective governance**? I think a lot of people ask that, and part of that comes down to the public participation. How do you actually get the public involved? How do you have participatory not just design, but participatory governance?

5. **How would you detect, respond to and implement continuous change**? And that's responding to external continuous change or internal continuous change. If you don't have an operating model that allows you to continuously evolve the system, then you run the risk of it getting stuck and even worse, getting stuck doing the wrong thing. And then finally, and this is actually very specific to every portfolio,

6. **How can you, your team, your department, your portfolio operate in a way the public would consider trustworthy?** This is not something that you can just make up for yourself. You need to take into account that context because the actions and requirements it would require for a intelligence agency versus a service delivery agency versus a commissioner versus a taxation department. Every one of them has a slightly different context. So you actually need to engage the public. What do you need for us to be trustworthy?

And just as a quick side note, a quick story for you. I ran a roundtable around Federated Data Architecture a few years ago, and we had in that particular government, which I won't name, all of the major data agencies in the room. And we were sort of going around and talking about the data infrastructure. And I stopped the talk at one point and said, look, would you all mind, we'll just spend three minutes on an extra activity. I want to know. If I, Pia Andrews, asked you, you personally, each one of you personally, for your data, your husband or wife's data, your partner's data, your kids data, your spouses, your parents data. If I asked for your personal data and I told you I'll give you all the value or the benefit in the world or the services in the world, like I'll make your life better, you just need to give me all your personal data. What conditions would you make? What requirements would you have? What would you need to say or know?

And we went around and they were like, and these are all very, very senior people running major, major programs. And they all wrote down some very interesting things. You know, I'd need to know it's not going to be sold to someone else. I'd need to know how you're how you're managing it. I'd need to know what the oversight was. I'd need to know you're not going to go and use it to punish me or to lock me up. I'm going to need to have some agency in it.

The reason this is such an interesting story is because the very next question was back on track with the program, which was what are your work programs doing around public engagement and trust and such? And they all went around and told everything that they were doing. And I just pointed out, quite coincidentally, I didn't expect this, but it was a happy coincidence, I pointed out that none of their programs included a single one of the things that they told me that they would need individually and personally to trust me with their data.

And when they realised that, they sort of realised they had a gap, right? So there's a very interesting thing where public servants, I think, have been encouraged to turn off their humanity in the job. You know, just be a professional, treat it as a technical problem. But every problem we deal with in

government is a human problem. So if we can't bring our humanity to it and then that creates, I think, a bit of a vacuum of getting the right outcome.

ANDY CORBETT: That's great. Thank you. We are approaching the end of the of the podcast, but and I guess throughout we've spoken about best practices, we've spoken about maturity gaps. We've just spoken there about the trust framework as well. And just sort of before we finish, what would be your sort of top key recommendations for government agencies in adopting new technologies? Like, what would your sort of top three tips be for getting started?

PIA ANDREWS: My number one tip is:

1. Remember the outcome you're trying to achieve. If you start from a position of, ooh, there's a new tech, how might we use it? Then you end up running down quite the interesting rabbit hole. But if you start with, our mandate is to try to address homelessness, our mandate is to try to make sure that people have the social support that they need to live well, our mandate is to try to get people back into work. Whatever your mandate is, always look at these emerging technologies through the lens of how might this help us achieve our mandate? Because if you can stay focused on your purpose, stay focused on the mission and be very clear about what success looks like for the people that we serve, then you have a better chance of your projects being driven and designed in the right way to make a meaningful difference for people.

I think my second tip would be:

2. Look for the patterns, look for and understand what things are. Just because someone comes to you with a pretty PowerPoint deck, and I know lots of people have been subject to this, doesn't mean you believe the hype. Actually, do your own assessment and again, bring your humanity to it. And I'll give you a quick example. I have heard public servants, luckily not in Australia yet, but I have heard people say, oh, we could just use generative AI to create new policies. Now let me tell you why that is so inherently ridiculous. Every generative AI tool is a synthesis engine. They don't create anything new. They take everything that exists or everything that you feed it and they generate a new iteration of those things, not even iteration, a mash-up of those things. All you get is a synthesis of what you feed it. And so it can be fantastic for environmental scans, fantastic for helping with research. It can be fantastic for helping navigate the status quo. But the one thing it is absolutely not suitable for is for generating something new.

Every policy that you create in government is supposed to bring about a change. It's supposed to bring about a change from the status quo. Otherwise you wouldn't be creating the policy. So you need to have people, expert people, multidisciplinary teams of people, defining here is the change you're trying to bring about. Here's what that looks like, here is the purpose of that. Here are the options that we could take. A test-driven approach to developing that policy is necessarily a shift from the status quo.

So you can't use a synthesis engine to generate it. So that's a really interesting example where people are simply not seeing it for what it is. They believe in the hype and then they're when they feed something in and they get something out, they're going, ooh, this reads really well, therefore it must be good. Use your expertise, use your understanding, use your extraordinary intelligence and

experience to understand the reality that lies below the hype. Because the hype will always be greater than the reality.

I think my third tip, which is absolutely critical, is:

3. Carve out time. You can't do anything without time. Even skills are less important than time because you can have the most skilled person in the world. But if they're spending a full 100% of their time just doing the status quo, just, you know, whack-a-moleing the backlog of problems, just dealing with urgent and high priority issues, then you will never have time for the important longer term stuff. That's not urgent. Urgency kills strategy, urgency kills productivity and urgency kills innovation. So you have to carve out time. In every work program I've put together in government, I have carved out at least 10% of the program to focus on long-value, to focus on experimentation, innovation and just giving people time. Even if your boss doesn't give you time. You make time for yourself. It doesn't matter what level you're at, you can create time for yourself. Book it out in your calendar. Time to think. Time to play. Time to explore. Time to innovate. When you build out time, everything is possible.

And the final thing I'll say is at a systems level, particularly for all the senior executives out there that listen to your podcast, is take a not just a proportional planning to your work program, not just carving out time, but look at the [OECD innovation framework](#), which is absolutely fantastic. Because it looks at how innovation is quite often driven, well, it says it can be driven from top down or bottom up and it can be either exploratory or reactive. Now, it's not about one being better than the other, but if you look at your whole work program and you find that, oh, 90% of our investment is actually going into just looking at the current issues from the top down, then you're only ever going to be looking backwards.

Try to get a proportion of your funding and all four of those quadrants looking forward, not just backwards enabling from ground up, not just top down. And if you actually get all four of those directions in play, then you will have an organisation that isn't just continuously innovating on improving how they operate today, but they're actually formulating and driving and shifting towards a far more effective tomorrow. And you're getting the scale of the whole of your workforce all able to contribute to shifting to a better future state rather than just being forced into it.

My observation is that it is usually the frontline staff that are the most innovative, the most willing to change and the most wanting positive change to help their clients, to help their, you know, day-to-day. But they have also had a lot of change forced down upon them from above that that isn't test driven, that isn't evidence driven, and that they know intuitively will not help their clients. So draw that front line in, create better futures, and really design where you're trying to get to rather than just trying to react to whatever trend is coming up today.

ANDY CORBETT: Yeah, completely agree with up here especially that point around bringing in the front line. We found that with the work that we do, I think it's absolutely crucial that they're involved throughout any project that you do since they've got that expertise. So that's some great recommendations there, Pia. Just going to say thank you very much for coming on the show once again. It's always good to have you on. Excellent insights as always and appreciate your time today, Pia.

PIA ANDREWS: Thank you so much for your time. I really appreciate it. And I hope that this has been helpful for people. Thank you.

ANDY CORBETT: We hope you enjoyed listening to Pia Andrews today and found her insights and approaches valuable. A link to view Pia's [A Trust Framework for Government's Use of AI and Automated Decision Making](), as well as a link to the whitepaper describing the [Government Lens for the AWS Well-Architected Framework]() will both be included in the full transcript of this episode. This transcript will be available to download from our website, which is [www.corbettprice.com.au/podcast](), that's [www.corbettprice.com.au/podcast]().

That now concludes series two of Trailblazing with CorbettPrice. I want to say a huge thank you to all of our trailblazers for their time and valuable input and insights into this podcast series on embracing organisational change. And finally, I want to say a huge, huge thank you as well to all of our listeners for tuning in too. Until the next series, goodbye.