AI Systems Deployment Responsibility

The following is my submission for a model determining the responsible use of AI, where it should be restricted, and who should be held responsible if harm is done using AI systems. This submission is dedicated to the public domain.

AI for Deployment vs Personal Use

There needs to be **strict regulation** through **a clear line of responsibility** for **AI systems deployment,** particularly when these systems are at large scales (100+ potential AI interactions). This should not fall on individuals, but on organisations and leaders.

When I say **AI systems deployment**, I mean the first instance where it is deployed for direct use, or when it collects individualised data from the public.

I am suggesting the concept of **AI deployment responsibility:**

This model is split into two categories: **A) AI for deployment;** and **B) AI for individual/personal use.**

A) AI for Deployment

This is any instance where an AI system is created…

for use with:

- the public
- a large group of people (100+)
- an organisation
- government

or;

inputs individualised/personal data into the AI from:

- the public
- members of an organisation, for the running of that organisation
- members of the government/bureaucracy, for the running the government/bureaucracy

Therefore, any person or organisation using **AI for deployment**, has **a clear line of responsibility** for any harm caused by the AI system.

Example 1: AI developer *XYZ Systems* releases an AI model to the general public on their website. The AI becomes incredibly popular with individuals, and the system is used to collect data from its users (personal data) – to grow the AI.

- *XYZ Systems* is using **AI for deployment**, and therefore has **a clear line of responsibility** for how the AI impacts society at large and it's users.

Example 2: A medium sized business owner, *John Smith* feeds resumes (personal data) into an off-the-shelf AI system from *Company N*, to help with selecting new employees.

- *John Smith* is using **AI for deployment** because he is inputting individual/personal data, that he requested from the public. Therefore, he has **a clear line of responsibility.**
- *Company N* is *also* using **AI for deployment** because they generated the product for use in businesses. Therefore, they have **a clear line of responsibility.**

B) AI for Personal Use

This is any instance where an AI system is

created, or used for:

- a sole individual
- a small group, such as a family

or;

does not input **individualised/personal data** (unowned copyrighted works, personally identifiable data) into AI from:

- the public
- members of an organisation, for the running of that organisation.
- members of the government/bureaucracy, for the running the government/bureaucracy

Example 1: *Jane Stevens* uses an AI chat bot from *Company Z* to organise her day, get recommendations on the purchase of a new car, and find a nearby hairdresser.

- *Jane Stevens* is using **AI for personal use** because she is inputting her own **individualised/personal data** into a publicly available piece of software.
- *Company Z* is ***not*** using **AI for personal use** because they generated the product for use with the public. So, they are using **AI for deployment,** and therefore have **a clear line of responsibility.**

Example 2: *Tim Jones* uses an AI image generator from *Company K* to draw pictures for a video he is planning to make on YouTube. He makes money from the video. *Company K* has trained the AI on art from the public.

- *Tim Jones* is using **AI for personal use** because he is inputting his own **individualised/personal data** into a publicly available piece of software.
- *Company K* is ***not*** using **AI for personal use** because they built the AI product using inputs of **individualised/personal data** (unowned copyrighted art). So, they are using **AI for deployment,** and therefore have **a clear line of responsibility.**

Restrictions, Regulations and Responsibility with AI for Deployment

If an individual or organisation uses **AI for deployment**, there must be restrictions and regulations on its use. Any individual or organisation with **a clear line of responsibility** should therefore be liable for criminal, and civil prosecution if any harm is done because of the **AI for deployment**.

NOTE: When there is **AI for personal use,** laws may still apply where they already exist for the outcome of AI use (for example, deliberately spreading defamatory material), so long as harm can be proven. It is important to recognise that individuals will flock to using AI quickly, and without little thought. It is therefore the role of leaders, governments, and organisations to demonstrate responsibility, under strict regulations, while also showing compassion to individuals who may want to experiment with AI in a personal context.

Restrictions on AI for Deployment

AI for Deployment should **never** be used in these examples, and more:

- Determining legal decisions *(e.g., a guilty verdict in criminal case; sentence duration)*
- Determining welfare assessments, distribution of social services, drug scheduling *(e.g., what medication is publicly subsidised, who gains access to welfare payments)*
- Determining employment *(e.g., selecting new staff members; selecting leadership members)*
- Determining debts *(e.g., personalised bank interest rates; tax owing; welfare repayments)*

- Determining individual ratings/classifications *(e.g., credit ratings; social credit systems; predictive potential for criminal activity)*
- Determining criminal activity from video or images *(e.g., asking an AI to enhance footage to determine a suspect; AI as a lie detector; determining the social context of a crime; AI to analyse handwriting)*
- Determining medical diagnoses without the input of a human doctor. *(e.g., diagnosing cancer without a doctor to review the results)*
- In monopolistic environments *(e.g., two major retailers (65% market share) deploy AI profiling to increase prices strategically, impacting inflation and cost of living).*
- Determining OHS decisions without human guidance *(e.g., risk assessments without a human review)*
- Planning and executing political campaigns, especially when misinformation or misrepresentation are involved. *(e.g., using AI chatbots to change public conversation about political candidates)*

Reasoning for this list: In situations where **AI for Deployment** is **widespread**, or the person affected **has limited choices to avoid its use** – then it must not be used in these circumstances - as the outcome will seriously affect the livelihood of the person affected.

Regulations on AI for Deployment

AI for Deployment should **be highly regulated,** and **publicly available knowledge** in these examples, and more:

- Training AIs
- Determining medical diagnoses with the input of a human doctor.
- Replacing human workforces
- Educating students without input, or curation of human teachers at the class-level
- Collection of public personal/individualised data
- Research in all fields
- Replacing human interaction for customer support, online-only requirements for government services.

In these cases, use of AI would need to be **notified to the public through some kind of rating system.** There would also need to be bespoke regulations for each industry and application in this category – to reduce harm.

Responsibility on AI for Deployment

It is crucial that the responsibility of AI and its use lies on the shoulders of those who wield great power – leaders, governments, and corporations. ***Individual members of society have not collectively asked for AI to become part of our world – and yet it has.*** Therefore, responsibility must be modelled by those using **AI for deployment**. **AI for personal use** must allow for learning – rather than taking a punitive, restrictive, red-tape approach.

This model represents a fair balance of power and responsibility within society at large when AI is considered.

Context of AI Use and its liabilities

AI for Deployment

AI for Personal Use

Bespoke laws directly invoking AI use, with harsh penalties for misuse, with criminal and civil liabilities.

Civil laws, where appropriate.

Existing criminal laws for general social contract, where harm is proven.

Underpinning Idea: Leaders, companies, and governments <u>must</u> demonstrate responsibility, if individual members of the public are to comprehend the gravitas of AI and its positive and negative impacts on society.

Underpinning Idea: A legislative philosophy of compassion. Understanding that AI is 'out-of-the-gate', and therefore individuals are unlikely to fully understand their responsibility, or the consequences of its use – just yet.