AI Safety Agency Proposal

**Abstract**

With the rapid and widespread adoption of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) algorithms in cyberspace, it is important to establish an agency to independently oversee developments in all industries affected by such systems to protect the rights and safety of the individuals in firm legal frameworks, guided by technical expertise.

**Background**

In the past decade, the field of Artificial Intelligence has seen rapid progress in a variety of disciplines, from game playing [1,2], computer vision [3], recommender systems [4,5], to autonomous vehicles [6].

What is Machine Learning?

What is Ethics?

In the past decade, public companies, private companies, universities, and government agencies have made substantial progress in the field, and the application of the technology has brought enormous amounts of wealth, power, and knowledge to their users.

**Concerns**

Many concerns have been raised over the future use of narrow and general artificial intelligent systems, as well as the negative consequences of systems already created.

Disinformation on COVID

During the coronavirus pandemic, many “bot” accounts, as they are called, flooded the internet with disinformation that can be attributed to the death of many Americans. According the National Institute of Health,

Disinformation on Climate Crisis

Self-driving cars

Although safe now, it is important to establish liability structures, to determine whether an algorithm has responsibility or developer. If developer, then certification and licenses should be issued to programmers working on AVs.

Airplanes and UAVs

Mass government or corporate Surveillance and violation of user privacy

Deepfakes

Medicine

With increased automation in the drug development process, human oversite is required to ensure

Cybersecurity

Besides malicious human actors, the release of a sufficiently intelligent self-preserving program onto the internet can pose a threat to internet infrastructure and communications networks.

AI-weaponry

Market trading bots & flash crash beyond human control

Job loss

Transportation

Factory

Lawyers

Insurance

Stock Broker

**Purpose**

As with any industry, individual agents competing in a market should and cannot be trusted to independently verify the safety and long-term consequences of their systems in an unbiased manner.

There are agencies within the Federal Government dedicated to supporting the advancement of the capabilities of the technology, from JAIC to the NSA, but there is yet to exist any organization dedicated to holding the AI developers to any significant level of scrutiny within our legal framework, to ensure the principles and ideals so often espoused are executed effectively.

Although general values have been formulated, they are abstract to such an extent to leave open for internal interpretation of AI developers.

There exists no serious consequences or licensing structure to enforce such value, even if they were more explicitly defined, so violators can continue to operate unscathed.

Just as plumbers, electricians, pilots, drivers, lawyers, doctors, and other professions whose actions affect the public sphere require licensing to practice their respective fields, AI developers, who often time create systems intended to replace these very areas of human expertise, **should** require equivalent forms of licensure.

Explicitly define privacy, safety, security, transparency, and responsibility for developers to be held accountable to.

Just as with the automobile industry before the NHTSA, we currently live in the age before seatbelts on our AI systems.

Citing experts in the domain of computer science, from Elon Musk to Nick Bostrom, the existential risk of AI is too large to leave its development unregulated.

Confidential code can still remain that way, tested in a black box sort of manner, but just with car safety testing, pushed to the worst-case scenario to prove robustness.

This document hopes to build a federal agency, comprised of experts and consultants from the public and private sphere alike, from fields related to the Safety of Artificial Intelligence Systems, whose purpose is to monitor, audit, and, if systems are found that violate privacy, safety, or security of individuals, intervene in, public companies, private companies, universities, and government agencies whose work contributes to the development of Artificial Intelligence.

Between both previous presidential administrations, the NSTC has been tasked with monitoring the industry and helping boost development to ensure American dominance in the field of AI. They have specified, across party differences, that the support for the technologies should only continue so long as they provide economic and national security, as well as privacy, safety, and transparency for American citizens. As the concerns have outlined, unregulated artificial intelligence, has, on multiple occasions, violated these standards, despite developers often time holding these ideals as well.

As **this** paper suggests, when abstract principles without clearly outlined definitions are used to guide ethical behavior, discrepancies in the exact meanings of the values will lead to behavior that seems to contradict the vision at the high level. What, exactly does one mean by privacy? What metrics can be used to measure it? Who decides what this definition is? How much safer must a system be than a human at a task, and who has responsibility for mistakes that occur?

For jobs lost to automation, we have seen that scapegoating “offshoring” of jobs is an easy emotional play for political leverage, even though the United States has continued to be one of the largest manufacturing nations in the world. This is mostly due to robotic automation, in many factories where “humans need not apply”. Without wages or working conditions required for the same work, machines look great on the company ledger, and shareholder value, but what of the alienation of the worker? In the coming decade, there will be a rise of self driving cars, trucks, and busses. According to the BLS,

**Agency**

**Structure**

The Agency shall work in conjunction with the National Science and Technology Council’s (NSTC) Special Committee on Artificial Intelligence to establish norms and practices.

**Funding**

**Consulting**

**On a regular, recurring basis, directors of the Agency will consult with experts in industry, government, and academia in order to keep up to date on the latest changes to the development of Artificial Intelligence systems.**

**Conclusion**

Overall
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