Kairoi Ltd
71-75 Shelton Street
Covent Garden
London
WC2H 9JQ
United Kingdom

United Nations
405 E 45th St,
New York, NY
10017
United States

Sent via [online form](#)

21st February 2025

RE: Input for the terms of reference and modalities for the establishment and functioning of the Independent International Scientific Panel on AI and the Global Dialogue on AI Governance

Kairoi Ltd ("we" hereafter) warmly welcomes the UN's invitation to provide input for the terms of reference and modalities for the establishment and functioning of the Independent International Scientific Panel on AI and the Global Dialogue on AI Governance.

Established in 2022, Kairoi helps AI stakeholders optimise their decision-making processes to ensure thoughtful approaches to AI. Key to our work is promoting the voices of our clients —including scientific and not-for-profit organisations— before policy-makers. Indeed, we advise on responding to policy consultations such as this, and keeping abreast of relevant bodies such as the Independent International Scientific Panel on AI and the Global Dialogue on AI Governance.

The feedback below build on Kairoi's extensive experience with not-for-profit and scientific organisations. The comments follow the structure of the online form provided by the UN, focusing on a subset of questions.

What should be the mandate of the multidisciplinary Independent International Scientific Panel on AI, to be established within the United Nations?

To promote AI as an area of research as best performed through rigorous open science practices. This mandate's implications are twofold.

On the one hand, the proposed mandate calls for reclaiming AI as a scientific discipline. Indeed, "AI" was coined in the halls of Dartmouth College almost 70 years ago. The succeeding decades saw peaks and troughs in interest and funding for AI research, and success stories often resulted from academic institutions such as MIT (e.g.: ELIZA) and Carnegie Mellon University (e.g.: R1). Meanwhile, the more recent advancements in AI have

been led by for-profit organisations, such as Google, Meta, Microsoft and OpenAI. As exciting and valuable some people may find the resulting products to be, their creators' motivations needn't promote knowledge nor the rigour underpinning scientific research. Rather, for-profit organisations' are driven by their shareholders' financial interests. With this, the International Scientific Panel on AI has the opportunity to identify the instutional structures that are best positioned to advance impactful AI research. The assumption here is that for-profit organisations cannot be leading the space alone.

On the other hand, the mandate calls for good research practices as informed by the open science movement. Our work at Kairoi has shown time and time again —with organisations such as Open Life Science Limited, Next Generation Internet, the Open Modelling Foundation and GO FAIR US— that open science values and practices are powerful enablers of better AI research. Importantly, open science calls for an integration of good data management practices, multidisciplinary collaboration, community-driven standards, and technical solutions.[1] This would also further embed the Panel in the UN's ecosystem, as it can build on and partner with the Global Open Science Partnership.[2]

What should be the size, composition and governance structure of the Panel?

In-line with our research with the Ada Lovelace Institute into research ethics committees assessing AI research projects,[3] we strongly advocate for a multidisciplinary composition of the Panel. The Panel must include leading scientists from fields as diverse as statistics, anthropology, physics, biology, economics, philosophy, architecture and so on. This is to account for the fact that the impacts of AI research are far-reaching, and can consitute many tools pertinent to the methods and objects of different disciplines.

What should be the mandate of the Global Dialogue on AI Governance, to be established within the United Nations?

To platform the voice of the general public, civil society and not-for-profit organisations before the for-profit AI innovators, policy-makers, and the International Independent Scientific Panel on AI.

Serving as a conduit between for-profit AI innovators and the general public —often, their potential customers—, the Dialogue can enable what the Responsible Artificial Intelligence Network (RAIN) calls "targeted" innovations; that is, innovations that respond to people's actual needs, rather than for-profit motivations.[4] Relatedly, meaningfully engaging with the public can help innovators foster trust.[5]

---

[1] Kherroubi Garcia, I., Erdmann, C., Gesing, S. *et al.* (2025) Ten Simple Rules for Good Model-sharing Practices, *PLOS Computational Biology*, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pcbi.1012702

[2] UNESCO (2025) UNESCO Global Open Science Partnership, online [accessed 21 February 2025]

[3] Petermann, M., Tempini, N., Kherroubi Garcia, I. *et al.* (2022) Looking before we leap: Expanding ethical review processes for AI and data science research, *Ada Lovelace Institute*, online [accessed 21 February 2025]

[4] Kherroubi Garcia, I. *et al.* (2024) Introducing the Responsible Artificial Intelligence Network, online [accessed 21 February 2025]

[5] Kherroubi Garcia, I. (2024) The Four Pillars of Responsible AI, *Kairoi,* online [accessed 21 February 2025]

The three most prominent international AI-related summits —held in the UK in 2023, South Korea in 2024, and France in 2025— all ignited a sense that more must be done to include diverse voices in the AI space.[6] [7] [8] In this regard, the proposed mandate would mark a drastic shift in current AI practices for the better. Indeed, such a mandate would allow the Dialogue to bring regulators much closer to the people for whom they are regulating.

By bringing the Dialogue and the Panel together in conversation, there is opportunity for the Panel to develop the technical assessment mechanisms that respond to the Dialogue's concerns, and have oversight of their implementation across academia and industry. Conversely, the Dialogue can find in the Panel a source of independently and rigorously generated evidence concerning AI. Rather than depending on courses about AI developed by for-profit organisations, members of the Dialogue can build a degree of AI Literacy with the Panel.

What types of outcomes should the Dialogue achieve?

The Dialogue should deliver reports and presentations that capture the expectations of the general public, civil society and not-for-profit organisations before for-profit AI innovators, policy-makers, and the International Independent Scientific Panel on AI.

The above outcomes would result from large-scale surveys, focus groups and in-depth interviews with relevant stakeholders represented by the Dialogue. Whilst these data-gathering processes may be conducted year-round, the outputs should be delivered to for-profit innovators and policy-makers at least yearly, whilst developed iteratively through monthly meetings with the Panel.

What should be the relationship between the Panel and the Dialogue?

The relationship must be close. We believe this is already the intention, as both are being developed through one process. What is worth noting is the ambitious shift we are advocating for: a reclaiming of AI as a product of the scientific process that integrates the knowledge held by the general public, civil society and not-for-profit organisations. All these stakeholders are then juxtaposed before policy-makers and for-profit innovators, each of whom can work on laws, guidelines, tools and technologies that respond to people's actual needs and the most cutting-edge science.

How can the UN system best support the Panel and Dialogue in a coordinated manner?

Resourcing will be key. Some resources will be financial compensation for members' time and contributions, tools for collaborating (e.g.: shared drives), a code of conduct, events planning, facilitated calls, and copy-editing and graphic design standards for publications.

---

[6] Connected by Data *et al.* (2023) AI Safety Summit Open Letter to the Prime Minister, online [accessed 21 February 2025]

[7] Klovig Skelton, S. (2024) AI Seoul Summit Review, *Computer Weekly*, online [accessed 21 February 2025]

[8] Birhane, A. (2025) Bending the arc of AI towards the public interest, *AI Accountability Lab*, online [accessed 21 February 2025]

Importantly, the UN system must bridge the conversation between two parties that are often quite far apart. On the one hand, the Panel may benefit from training in communicating in less technical terms. On the other hand, the Dialogue may benefit from training to better understand not only how AI works, but the much broader AI ecosystem.

Additional comment

It is critical that the composition of both the Panel and the Dialogue include diverse perspectives, being representative of the UN's own globally distributed membership, and the lived experiences of different ethnicities, genders, sexualities, ages, socioeconomic backgrounds, educational levels, (dis)abilities, professions, and so on.

Once again, we are grateful for the opportunity to provide input.

Ismael Kherroubi Garcia, FRSA
Founder and CEO, Kairoi
On behalf of Kairoi Ltd