

Welcome to the AI Clause Assistant

This assistant is designed to help policy advisors, legal drafters, and regulatory analysts **co-author enforceable, ethically sound AI legislation clauses**, grounded in Egypt's legal frameworks.

Use Case: Drafting a Data Protection Clause for Government AI Policy

Meet Sara

Sara is a digital policy advisor at Egypt's Ministry of Communications. She's working on a new AI policy and needs to:

- Propose **legally enforceable clauses**
- Align with Egypt's **Law 151 (Data Protection)**
- Reference **constitutional principles** and the AI Charter
- Incorporate critiques from civic actors like **Masaar**
- Preserve a consistent, formal **legal tone**

But Sara doesn't want a generic AI summary or a random PDF analysis.

She wants an assistant that can:

-  Retrieve legal precedents from trusted sources (via RAG)
 -  Flag ethical or enforceability gaps
 -  Rephrase drafts into formal legal style
 -  Let her review, revise, and approve the final clause
-

How It Works

1. Enter your clause idea — in plain language
(e.g. "I want a clause to prevent algorithmic bias in public services")
2. Review the Draft — see the generated clause

3. Explore Precedents — review retrieved legal documents
 4. Get Legal Commentary from the Ethics Guardian — highlights gaps or issues
 5. Approve or Request Revisions — you're in charge
-

Human-in-the-Loop by Design

This assistant is **not** a black box. It guides you with transparency, evidence, and editable clauses—so that **you** remain the final author.

AI Clause Assistant - Mock Trial Showcase

User Input

I want a clause that prohibits algorithmic discrimination in public services in Egypt.

Draft Clause (Initial Output)

Article X – Prohibition of Algorithmic Discrimination in Public Services

No public entity or service provider utilizing artificial intelligence systems sha

All AI systems must undergo regular bias audits, and outcomes must be documented t

Violations shall be subject to penalties under relevant legislation, including sus

Retrieved Precedents

View Precedent Summaries



Ethics Guardian Commentary (Before Revision)

The initial clause offered a strong ethical position but required significant legal refinement. Key issues included:

- **Vague language:** "Unjustified differential treatment" was subjective and lacked clarity.
- **Enforceability gaps:** No specification of who audits, how often, or what penalties apply.
- **Lack of redress:** Individuals couldn't challenge biased outcomes or claim damages.
- **Omission of private entities:** Contractors delivering public services were excluded.
- **Transparency loopholes:** No public audit disclosures, risking accountability.

The revised clause addressed all of these with specific legal references, annual audits, publication mandates, clear penalties, and individual rights to appeal or compensation.

Review Decision

Revision Requested — to address enforceability, clarify protected groups, strengthen audit mandates, and add redress pathways.

Revised Clause (First Draft)

Article X – Prohibition of Algorithmic Discrimination in Public Services

1. No entity providing public services in Egypt—whether public or private—shall use AI systems to discriminate based on protected characteristics.
2. All AI systems must undergo annual independent bias audits, conducted by entities certified by the National Authority for Civil Liberties.
3. Individuals harmed by discriminatory algorithmic decisions may appeal to the relevant administrative body for redress.
4. Violations shall incur penalties under Egypt's Anti-Cybercrime Law (Law No. 175).

###Legal Stylist Reasoning (Post-Review)

Upon further review, the clause was improved to meet enforceability and rights-protection standards. Key changes include:

- **Clearer legal grounding:** Referenced specific constitutional articles, Civil Code provisions, and named Egyptian laws with numbering.
- **Expanded audit language:** Audits must now meet fairness standards, mitigate bias, and be publicly summarized.
- **Expanded coverage:** Now includes **nationality** and explicitly protects under both law and the Constitution.
- **Corrective mechanisms:** Introduced mandatory documentation and correction processes, not just redress.
- **Structured format:** Broken into numbered sub-articles for clarity, each fulfilling a legal function (prohibition, audit, redress, enforcement).

Final Clause (After Review)

Article X - Prohibition of Algorithmic Discrimination in Public Services

1. No entity providing public services in Egypt—whether public or private—shall de
2. All AI systems used in public services must undergo annual independent bias aud
3. Entities must document algorithmic decision-making processes and implement corr
4. Violations shall incur penalties under Egypt's Anti-Cybercrime Law (Law No. 175

Final Decision ↵

Approve Clause

Request Further Revision