**ANSWERS**

* **Find out what Responsible AI is?**

Responsible AI is a governance framework that documents how a specific organization is addressing the challenges around artificial intelligence (AI) from both an ethical and legal point of view. Resolving ambiguity for where responsibility lies if something goes wrong is an important driver for responsible AI initiatives.

As of this writing, the development of fair, trustworthy AI standards is up to the discretion of the data scientists and software developers who write and deploy a specific organization's AI algorithmic models. This means that the steps required to prevent discrimination and ensure transparency vary from company to company.

* **Find instances where AI has failed? Or been used maliciously or incorrectly**

**Uber’s real-world testing has gone all wild**

We all know the progress Uber has made to date. Yet, in 2016, Uber tested its self-driving cars in San Francisco without taking permission and approvals from the State. That is ethically and legally not right. Moreover, the internal documents of Uber stated that the self-driving car crossed around 6 red lights in the city during testing.

This is one of the clear examples of AI gone wrong as Uber uses top-notch vehicle sensors and networked mapping software as well as a driver to take care if things go out of control. However, Uber said that the blunder was the result of a driver’s mistake. This AI experiment gone wrong is bad.

* **Implications of when AI fails. There is a specific article in the GDPR Law that covers this, especially with automated decision-making. (opt-in and out options**).

Because of the complex nature of AI, problems arise due to the use of these technologies and further complications may arise if the fault or defect arises from decisions the AI system has made itself based on machine learning principles with limited or no human intervention.

They may lead to loss, injury, discrimination, and privacy loss.

The UK government however created a list of items that should be considered in the case of prevailing losses.

* the defendant owed a duty of care to the claimant.
* the defendant breached that duty; and
* that breach caused injuries to the claimant and were foreseeable.

To rectify this, the report recommends that certain adjustments need to be made to the existing liability regime and outlines key findings on how the existing liability regime should be designed and adjusted as follows:

* Strict liability
* Adapted Range of Duty and Care
* Joint and Several Liabilities
* Proving Causation
* Insurance
* Separate Legal Personality is not necessary.
* **What should organizations do to ensure that they are responsible for AI and the wider use of data in general?**

Organizations that breached the duty of care to shareholders should ensure that they take absolute measures in securing data.