

As someone who has worked with speech-to-text technology for over a decade, I dispute its categorization as "low risk." Even the best available technology is severely limited in its capabilities, especially when used to transcribe voices from vulnerable populations, including:

- English language learners
- People with disabilities
- Women
- New Canadians

If a technology this flawed is categorized as "low risk," one can only assume that the higher-risk technologies are more flawed and thus extremely dangerous. None of these should be implemented without addressing the concerns of people in the above-mentioned groups, starting with deep consultations and meaningful dialogue with community members (not only professionals) and actually responding to concerns raised and making the necessary changes (rather than simply ticking off the "consultation" box on the due diligence checklist as so many government agencies do).