

Metadata

#Author	jennyluu@uber.com	SEMANTIC
#Date Modified	06/10/2021	SEMANTIC
#DateCreated	06/04/2021	SEMANTIC
#Title	Safety Standards Refresh	SEMANTIC
Account	kaiser@uber.com;	SEMANTIC
All Custodians	Kaiser, Roger;Luu, Jenny;	SEMANTIC
All Paths	Kaiser, Roger: \JCCP_DRIVE005\JCCP_Drive005_102.zip; Kaiser, Roger: \JCCP_DRIVE005\JCCP_Drive005_102.zip; Kaiser, Roger: \MassTort_Category2_DRIVE\MassTort_Category2_DRIVE_2.zip; Kaiser, Roger: \MassTort_Category2_DRIVE\MassTort_Category2_DRIVE_2.zip; Luu, Jenny: \EDISCO-25695_DR01\EDISCO-25695_DR01_15.zip; Luu, Jenny: \EDISCO-25695_DR01\EDISCO-25695_DR01_15.zip	SEMANTIC
Application	Microsoft 2007 Word Document	SEMANTIC
Attachment Names	word	SEMANTIC
Begin Family	UBER_JCCP_MDL_001718754	SEMANTIC
Collaborators	alirorab@uber.com; kaiser@uber.com; ksengupta@uber.com; nilles@uber.com	SEMANTIC
Confidentiality	Confidential	SEMANTIC
Date Created	06/04/2021 3:27 pm	SEMANTIC
Date Modified	06/10/2021 9:11 pm	SEMANTIC
DocID	1NaYcBEJoaF8GA0Wp82bXymO81fnRB9i06QeUf_ZWvU	SEMANTIC
Document Type	Electronic File	SEMANTIC
End Family	UBER_JCCP_MDL_001718759	SEMANTIC
File Path	\JCCP_DRIVE005\JCCP_Drive005_102.zip	SEMANTIC
File Size	478863	SEMANTIC
Filename	Safety Standards Refresh_1NaYcBEJoaF8GA0Wp82bXymO81fnRB9i06QeUf_ZWvU.docx	SEMANTIC
GoogleDocumentType	DOCUMENT	SEMANTIC
Hash Value	0f844faf487a65f58c4d26cee45e08ad	SEMANTIC
Hidden Content	Yes;	SEMANTIC
ILS All Bates	UBER_JCCP_MDL_001718754;UBER_JCCP_MDL_001718755;UBER_JCCP_MDL_001718756;UBER_JCCP_MDL_001718757;UBER_JCCP_MDL_001718758;UBER_JCCP_MDL_001718759	SEMANTIC
ILS Document Date	06/10/2021	SEMANTIC
ILS Prod Date	12/20/2024	SEMANTIC
ILS Prod Vol	JCCP_MDL056	SEMANTIC
LINKSOURCEBATES	UBER_JCCP_MDL_004916625; UBER_JCCP_MDL_004916644	SEMANTIC
Other Custodians	Kaiser, Roger;Luu, Jenny;	SEMANTIC
Primary Date	06/04/2021 3:27 pm	DOC_TYP E_ALIAS
Production Volume	JCCP_MDL056;	SEMANTIC
Redacted	No	SEMANTIC
Sort Date	06/10/2021 9:11 pm	SEMANTIC
SourceHash	15fada35a29b1d9bfc201c7be12ab232	SEMANTIC



Global Safety Standards Refresh

June 2021
Central Safety Operations
Plan and Scope Signed off by: Roger Kaiser on XX/XX/2021

Background

Global safety standards were created starting in 2018 with the goal of ensuring there were consistent principles and minimum standards in place for safety-related matters. Since then there have been organizational changes between safety and the business, shifts in our business model and growth into other lines of businesses, as well as learnings and insights that require us to re-examine the current approach to safety standards. Additionally there is increasing internal and external pressures related to earner deactivations, which are a substantive component of safety standards and for which we need tighter alignment and articulation of our stance on them.

Objective

The goal of this workstream is to

1. Refresh the framework for global safety standards, including standards ownership, process development, and governance
2. ~~Align on non-negotiable "safety principles" e.g. "We do not tolerate Sexual Assault" or "Every trip must be screened"~~
3. Do we revisit current policies and standards and define non-negotiables within each standard

Plan of Action and Timelines

1. [June 2021] Gather feedback from Leadership, Regional Safety, Safety Legal, Ops, CommOps
2. [July 1, 2021] Articulate full problem statement
3. [July 15, 2021] Create a refreshed safety standards framework that clarifies roles and responsibilities, non-negotiables vs. risk management, deviations, accountability and compliance
4. [August 15, 2021] Finalize recommendations and execute on changes
5. Review current policies

Deliverable

-

Full Problem Statement [WIP]

- We don't have consistent safety or company principles. They vary from standard to standard, adapted by the author. Regardless of who writes the policy, as a safety organization, we should get to a fairly similar position, but that is not currently the case. What is our position on: fairness and transparency, warning, risk tolerance?

Commented [1]: @nilles@uber.com added this

Commented [2]: Might answer your question below

Commented [3]: This is just too big for us to manage right now. Maybe we pick a slight few like SIPC

Commented [4]: do we want the scope of this to be the standard only? or the interplay between the standard and how we action on feedback through SIPC and DACT

Commented [5]: what do you mean by the latter?



- Engagement and sign-offs from stakeholders are delayed. Perhaps the designated signers are not clear on what sign-off entails or do not believe it to be a priority.
- There is no accountability on adherence or compliance to current standards.
- They can be overly complex and long-winded, making it difficult for a wide range of stakeholders to digest. Additionally, making it difficult for global operationalization.
- They can be overly stringent and do not allow for local adaptation without a cumbersome deviation approval process.
- Decision-makers are not clear and likely not updated for recent organizational changes.
- The timeline from standard creation to implementation is long.
- Safety impact or effectiveness of standards are difficult to measure.

Brainstorm Notes

Guiding Questions for Today's Jam Session 6/9:

Opening thoughts:

- Why do we have policies and what does it look like in practice?
- E triggered 1000 drivers and 60 riders

First, let's align on: what are our safety policies and standards? How and why were they developed

[Jenny/Hannah- 5 min]

- SPS started under legal, during high growth time, desire to have minimum standards irrespective of legal regulations. Safety should be like Coca cola- everywhere you go should feel the same- every trip should be screened, every incident should be responded to in a consistent way- separated by onboarding and incident response
- Policy being the company stance on a topic and standards bridge the gap for how to get there
- Difference between and policy and standard and the spirit of each. And the difference between our overarching policies, standards and the way we action against them
- **Access:** Onboarding, Identity, Screenings, Account Integrity (wrong driver/courier included)
- **Trip Safety:** Incident response, Health safety

What is the real purpose of standards and what is our obligation as a company? [5 min]

- Preventing incidents
- Minimize safety risk to our users and to the company
- To outline guardrails in order to operate as safely as possible
- If we don't have standards for who is behind the wheel then anyone can get behind the wheel so the riders, public and other drivers lose trust in us to do what they think is our obligation- we are doing this because it is a trust degradation and we want to be best in class
- Externally defensible to our user base, regulators, media- perception of reduction in incidents- feeling of fairness, justice, safety
- Our purpose/goal is **not** to be the police- our bar is much lower and our goal is to protect the company and set the tolerable risk level for our operations



- It's ok to have global minimums- but we should lay out the variables for how to tighten various controls
- Is fairness baked into our standards?
- In the creation of SIPC standard, we thought of fairness but didn't explicitly include

What are our core principles in managing safety risk? [10 min]

- Let's talk about two types of principles, and where do we need alignment most?
- General principles: Some might include fairness, safety, defensibility
 - If three different people in safety wrote a policy on the same topic, we would have three different outcomes
 - We should have a few core principles that guide all of our work. But what do these things actually mean?
 - Do we care about global consistency?
- Specific principles for specific policies:
 - Screenings- effective, defensible, fair
 - Sexual Assault- Zero tolerance policy for sexual assault, expeditiously, fairly, empathetically dealt with, immediately restrict access to protect the community

How does a risk management approach fit in with the idea of a minimum standard? [10 min]

- We are getting feedback from regional teams that our standards are too strict in some cases and we should allow for more market flexibility
- Do we need flexibility at the policy or standard level?
- At what level should we align on non-negotiables?

How do we and how should we measure the success of our policies and standards? [10 min]

- Introducing the concept of controls into our policies and standards?
- Today we don't have fairness baked into how we measure success

Deactivations/Actioning

- For sexual assault- we're willing to draw the line and accept false positives because the risks outweigh the benefits of letting a user keep access
- If there's a video, the person is removed regardless
- There may be a different trigger point or adjudication criteria for riders and drivers
- Trigger rates between riders/drivers are quite different

How do the principles we defined above come into play as it relates to deactivating a user's account? Are they the same? Different? [10 min]

Short/Long Term Focus

- Review the IPC standard, looking at SOE applied for all IPC vs just sexual assault- feels far from defensible
- More open to exemptions like notation count for a given issue
- Getting signals from these could help us see a longer term pattern or framework
 - Taxonomy is fixed at the regional level



- Notations is flexible and Recency is flexible
 - And giving the approval process to make that change
- Max count- fixed- could introduce this and say no customer can ever
- SA- fixed, off the table
- How do we build something that gives some specific dials to the regions
- Matrix for approval or discussion/changes
- There may be some things structurally we won't allow- commops calling things different things

Parking Lot Topics for Another Session:

- SPS governance and change management
- Specific deactivation thresholds
- Nuance of specific standards
- Appeals

Next Steps

- Review Serious IPC
- Look at DACT dashboard, trigger rates, ticket floors, etc...
- What signals do we have on how the policy is impacting our users etc?
- Jenny to send bullet points for responding to Sean email and how we will package this as a program

There are a lot of different workstreams focusing on Earner Fairness and Deactivation Transparency, both within Safety Ops and across other functions. We need a better operating model within our team.

- First, we think there is value in bringing together a global safety ops working group given the urgency to address the following points in a cohesive manner. Jenny can take the lead on bringing the right regional stakeholders together if you all agree.
- The group should collectively define what Fairness means and identify areas of opportunity within safety deactivations. For example, the impact of reporting rate, support abuse, SOE, etc.
- As a more urgent deliverable, we will revisit the Serious IPC standard to achieve two goals:
 - Addressing fairness within the standard. For example, should SOE apply to non-SA/SM?
 - Adapting to a more agile framework where there are clear minimum requirements (or non-negotiables) and levers that regions can utilize to manage risk for their markets. For example, Sexual Assault notations must remain consistent globally but other sub-categories can be flexed. This is to address separate feedback we've received about the application and rigidity of global standards.
- This group would also tackle topics like deactivation appeals, fairness within other standards and DACT, external transparency like webpages or marketing campaigns, and be the connectors to other local workstreams around Earner Fairness.



Hannah/Jenny Notes

Risk-Management Lens in Safety Standards

Set minimum global safety standards that outline where a market must have a certain control for the management of a material risk (the 'what'), but not necessarily specify the detailed 'design and operation' of that control (the 'how'). Drives aligned approach to where global material risks need to be managed but allows for localised risk management, nuance, variance and innovation around a controls design for managing a risk.

Examples of this:

Earners documents: Markets must document required, acceptable forms, authenticity requirements, submission timeframes and validity periods for Earner documents for each product. Have approved by Ops GM, Legal & Safety Ops

Earners screenings: Markets must undertake a risk assessment to determine the design, operation, re-run cadence and limitations for an Earners screening program for each product. Have approved by Ops GM, Legal, Policy & Safety Ops.

Non-Negotiables in Safety Standards

Definition/principles of what non-negotiables mean

- Some standards cannot be circumvented, no matter what you do- we will select which standards fall in that category
- For each standard, there will be defined principles that must be followed in application of the standard
- For each risk space, we will outline the controls a market must have in place to mitigate that risk, our safety standards should support that

What is the real purpose of standards and what is our obligation as a company?

- Minimize risk to the company and to our users
- To outline guardrails in order to operate as safely as possible
- Our purpose/goal is **not** to be the police- our bar is much lower and our goal is to protect the company and set the tolerable risk level for our operations

Standards Principles

- How do we measure success?
- What are non-negotiables? What are the key principles?

Principle	Definition	In Practice
Safety	- Doing our diligence as a company to protect users of our platform by preventing incidents before they happen and intervening when they do.	- Using all safety signals and reports - Taking action when warranted
Fairness	-	- Clear disclosure e.g. not deactivating for RTID if not clear - Full investigation

Commented [6]: so i think we need to separate our onboarding requirements from our incident related standards. for anything onboarding/operational related, i think this is the approach we're trying to take

Commented [7]: then we also develop principles that are socialized with every team for guiding them during risk assessment as well.



		- Consider safety history
Defensibility	- Legal/Litigation - Users - Media/Public/Regulators	

- Is there a 'checklist' of items that a standard should include?
- Why do we need global consistency/cohesion?
 - U4B
 -

Deactivation Principles

- What does fair mean?
 - Does not mean parity
 - How do we treat power users?
- What behavior do we want to permanently deactivate for?
 - High confidence in offender's role of a serious incident
 - High confidence = SOE for SA/SM, dashcam/audio/GPS, other locally-relevant supporting relevant facts
 - Offender's role = intent?
 - Serious incident = Category A
 - Excessive pattern of unsafe behavior
 - Excessive - Global recommendation decided on by region (notations, DACT threshold)
 - Unsafe behavior - Global mapping adapted and decided on by region
 - Recent vs. historical behavior
 - Lookback period and why we assign different methodologies to different incident types
 - Static strike vs. notations vs. credibility weighted
- How do we measure success?
 - Deactivation rate
 - Appeal rate

Session with Regional Heads of Safety covering (session on the 24th?):

- What each principle means
- Fairness in deactivations
- Non-negotiable portions of safety standards