Feedback on the Interim Report of the Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence.

Connected by Data Draft

> The UN Secretary-General's AI Advisory Body has launched its Interim Report: Governing AI for Humanity. The report calls for a closer alignment between international norms and how AI is developed and rolled out. The central piece of the report is a proposal to strengthen international governance of AI by carrying out seven critical functions such as horizon scanning for risks and supporting international collaboration on data, and computing capacity and talent to reach the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It also includes recommendations to enhance accountability and ensure an equitable voice for all countries.

This document contains the Connected by Data response to the Interim Report of the High-level Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence, using the headings from the submission form.

About Connected by Data[1]

Connected by Data is the campaign for communities to have a powerful voice in the governance of data and AI. A UK-based non-profit, working with partners around the world, we work to transform narratives, policy and practice to centre collective, democratic, deliberative and participatory data and AI governance. We co-organised the 2023 AI Safety Summit open letter (https://ai-summit-open-letter.info/) & People's Panel on AI (https://connectedbydata.org/projects/2023-peoples-panel-on-ai).

---

[1] Responding to "Please provide a brief description of your organization / entity"

Opportunities and Enablers

We welcome the outline of AI opportunities provided in the report, and the focus on how different national and local ecosystems are differentially equipped to access, develop and deploy AI.

It is important to recognise that many factors that will enable AI to be used for the public good are external to the technology itself, including factors related to, for example, the resourcing and capacity of the public sector to adopt tools and provide exception routes or redress mechanisms for cases or citizens whose needs AI-models do not address well.

To draw on the GAVI example, access to medicines is one part of the equation: but supply chains in-country, and investment in the health systems to safely distribute those medicines also matter.

We suggest that any case studies and use-cases detailing potential benefits of AI should always clearly report on the complementary and non-digital enablers that they have relied upon.

(Maximum 3,000 characters)

Risks and Challenges

We welcome the risk analysis that looks at individuals, groups & communities, society, economy, eco-systems and values/norms.

Robust, layered and adaptive public participation mechanisms have a critical role to play in early identification of risk and assessment of levels of risk that are socially acceptable or not. This may include accessible listening mechanisms at regulators to provide early-warning systems, through to deliberative national and global fora (e.g. Citizens Juries and Assemblies) inviting members of the public to consider and evaluate expert evidence on opportunities and risks.

Public engagement can also support the negotiation of redress or adaptation support for those particular communities impacted by a socially accepted risk. For example, social dialogue might decide certain uses of AI with impacts on a a particular workforce are a net positive, but should also discuss how to support those whose jobs are changed/displaced as a result.

In addition:

- We would suggest elevating environmental ecosystems to top-level category, to recognise both direct (energy use, water strain, extractives) impacts of AI, as well as indirect risks (stimulating excess demand for finite resources, supporting climate misinformation etc.).

- Under societal risks, the risk of AI generating increased economic inequality should be explicitly named (in addition to the reference under 'Groups' to social inequality.

Guiding Principles to guide the formation of new global governance institutions for AI

We welcome the five guiding principles.

The elaboration of Principle 1 currently conflates governance and access and should say more about practical measures to ensure all those who could benefit from, or who are affected by, AI have meaningful opportunities to shape governance frameworks and decisions.

A clear definition of governance should be included. E.g. "Governance is the process of making and enforcing decisions within an organization or society. It encompasses decision-making, rule-setting, and enforcement mechanisms to guide the functioning of an organization or society." [1]

CONNECTED
BY DATA

Author: Tim Davies
Date: March 2024
Status: Final ▾
Sharing: Open ▾

Under guiding Principle 2, we suggest addressing that the public interest is something that can only be defined and discovered through open and inclusive public dialogue.

In guiding Principle 3 we suggest including a focus on INCLUSIVE Data Commons, in order to draw attention to the importance of making sure that the commons available for training data models (a) include representation of a range of knowledges, languages and interests; and (b) that efforts are taken to remove discriminatory, exclusionary content from these commons.

Under Guiding Principle 4 we recommend making clear that AI governance must ultimately be connected to grassroots networks and publics. Lowering barriers to entry involves not only removing geographic barriers, but also including young people, the elderly, disabled, indigenous and other communities within participatory governance processes.

[1]: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Governance

Institutional Functions that an international governance regime for AI should carry out

We are concerned about the absence of institutional functions adequate to support the delivery of Principle 1: namely robust institutional support for public engagement that ensures that all those affected by AI have opportunities to input.

Drawing on proposals for a Standing Global Citizens Assembly [1], and in-line with the principle of universal, networks and adaptive governance we would like to propose that The High Level Panel should:

- Back proposals for a Standing Global Citizens Assembly to regularly consider Artificial Intelligence;

- To feed into this Global Citizens Assembly, support the creation of a distributed network of local 'People's Panels on AI' [2] that allow national and local groups to discuss, learn about, deliberate on and feed grassroots citizen perspectives into AI policy decision making;

- Support the creation of a clearing house (potentially as part of Institutional Function 1) for public participation findings and public attitudes research on AI to both ensure public attitudes are fed into decision making, and to create feedback loops to demonstrate to publics where public perspectives are taken into account, building public trust in AI governance.

Developing and resourcing such ongoing participatory mechanisms offers the opportunity to gather agile 'AI speed' inputs into policy-making, allowing timely citizen inputs into policy making (rather than relying on slow channels for input to global issues from citizens to state to global decision making). Broad based participatory practice around AI governance can contribute substantially to public trust in the process, and to widening awareness of and engagement with AI development.

[1]: See https://www.gcacoalition.org/

[2]: https://connectedbydata.org/projects/2023-peoples-panel-on-ai

---

Other comments on the <u>International Governance of AI</u> section (aside from Principles and Functions, covered in above questions)

The Open Government principles of Transparency, Accountability, Participation and Inclusion should be applied to the design of all institutional structures established to support governance of AI. In particular:

- The funding arrangements for institutions should be transparent, including clear declaration of the source of any private funding;

- Representatives of affected communities should have a role in formal institutional governance and oversight structures (e.g. boards);

- Institutions should regularly report on the steps they are taking to engage affected publics, and ensure inclusion of different communities in their work.

For more information about Connected by Data, and our campaign for communities to have a powerful voice in the governance of data and AI, visit https://connectedbydata.org