# Submission

I have been involved in marketing an AGI (Artificial General Intelligence) product, so I have some understanding of the complexity of the English language. My submission is intended to cover textual systems only, not autonomous vehicles or graphical systems.

I would suggest three levels of regulation of textual AI:

1. The simple chatbots that answer simple questions, and pass you on to a person for anything complicated.

Little or No Regulation

1. LLMs or Generative AI

There already is, and will continue to be, a huge marketing push, to recoup the billions expended on Generative AI – regulation will be difficult and hotly contested.

LLMs are rapidly growing in the amount of text they contain. Their output can result from a conversation with the machine, and can seem to be specially crafted to the needs of the user.

Two prongs:

**Feedback**

The user is given information about how well the machine carried out their wishes.   
This would include the words in the prompt that were used for searching, and the words that were not used.  
An accretion path of search terms if a conversational approach was used.  
A list of inflammatory or derogatory words and phrases in the output text (“n\*\*\*\*\*”, “coloured folk”, etc.)  
An idea of the stability of the result – for example, this answer rated 0.65, other possible answers rated from 0.63 (a single number may not be adequate to express the closeness of complex concepts).  
Other information, allowing the versions of the program and the stored text to be known. LLMs are already showing signs of instability, so it will be important to be able to trace versioning precisely, and recreate the exact conditions for any claim.  
As well as allowing the user to view the information, these details should be held by the provider for at least a year, remaining accessible to (but not modifiable by) the user.

**Responsibility**

The provider of the service has full responsibility for any inflammatory material produced or advice given. The variety and complexity of the potential output, from a very large body of text, is beyond the understanding of its developer, and completely beyond the understanding of the LLM machine, as it does not operate on the meanings of words, only their presence in the text. That means that no disclaimer, no matter how well-written or all encompassing, can eliminate the provider’s responsibility – the regulation should have the disclaimer ignored in any claim brought against the provider. The provider of the service is required to have an insurance policy covering at least $2 million per claim, covering physical, mental and/or financial injury, or any injury resulting from a delay in seeking professional advice. The insurance company also has to cover claims brought after a provider goes out of business – say for 12 months. There will be a large number of specious claims, where people who understand how these things work have set out to lead the system into error, but they have suffered no ill consequences as a result. Some of these probings would be of benefit to society, so should be rewarded from the insurance policy (as a way of reducing future claims), while many would be frivolous, and will need to be actively discouraged (telling the difference won’t be easy).

1. AGI tools capable of understanding the regulations

This is a class of AI that would allow the machine to read and “understand” the regulations, and act according to them. It will be found very difficult to turn concepts like “safety’, “loyalty”, “ethics” into meaningful regulations (the concepts tend to be strongly interwoven, and ethical dilemmas are soon encountered), but the advent of AGI is not that far off – we would expect AGI tools to be used in support of the development and administration of legislation and complex projects within the next few years. We would expect the generation of the regulations for AGI to occur in a similar or longer timeframe, and their development to rely heavily on AGI machines, as the only way to support the collaboration of people with a very limited shared technical vocabulary – think lawyers, ethicists, legislators, public servants, technical experts, the AMA, the Business Council, each defending their own bailiwick, with little understanding of the others’ needs.