**Introduction**

Since late 2022, the explosion of generative AI has redefined creativity and computation. Tools such as ChatGPT and DALL·E have accelerated automation but also raised new concerns about authorship, bias, and accountability.

Reading *Correa et al.* (2023) made me realise how difficult it is to achieve global consensus on AI values, while Merali and Merali (2023) argue that nations are rapidly realising that AI is pivotal to both their security at home and influence abroad, there will certainly be disruption, especially in the short term. And these processes could have significant macroeconomic implications that require policy attention.

Reflecting on these insights, I argue that a hybrid governance framework—blending shared international ethics with national flexibility—offers the most balanced route for sustainable AI innovation.

**Global Approaches to AI Governance**

* European Union: The proposed AI Act applies a risk-based model. It enforces transparency, fairness, and human oversight but risks slowing small-firm innovation.
* United States: Relies on soft-law guidance, emphasising flexibility and competitiveness.
* China: Enforces state-driven control, requiring content moderation and algorithm registration; ensures security yet limits freedom
* Emerging economies (e.g., Indonesia): Develop ethics-based guidelines influenced by OECD and UNESCO.

These variations reflect what *Correa et al.* (2023) call “normative fragmentation”, highlighting the challenge of aligning innovation incentives with public-interest safeguards.

**Critical Discussion**

The EU model ensures accountability but can appear bureaucratic (*Floridi, 2023*). The US approach stimulates creativity but lacks binding enforcement, allowing data opacity and bias.

China’s system demonstrates rapid control, yet ethically risks suppressing autonomy.  
For developing regions, limited policy capacity may force reliance on imported frameworks, widening the digital governance gap.

As *Correa et al.* (2023) note, true progress depends on finding overlap in core principles—transparency, accountability, and fairness—rather than enforcing identical laws.  
From a computing-professional viewpoint, these gaps underscore the need for ethical literacy alongside technical skill.

**My View and Recommendations**

I believe in a multi-layered governance model:

1. Global layer: Led by OECD and UNESCO to establish a shared AI Governance Index—similar to the Paris Agreement concept—focusing on transparency, human oversight, and fairness.
2. National layer: Countries adapt those principles to local realities. For instance, Indonesia could embed AI ethics into its Digital Transformation Roadmap, promoting inclusive participation and literacy.
3. Industry layer: Mandate algorithmic transparency reports, dataset disclosures, and third-party ethics audits.

This hybrid approach balances innovation with protection and encourages cross-sector collaboration between government, academia, and industry.

**Legal, Social, Ethical & Professional Impact**

* Legal: Clarifies liability for AI-generated content and strengthens data-protection compliance.
* Social: Builds public trust and digital inclusion.
* Ethical: Promotes fairness, transparency, and human-centric design.
* Professional: Requires developers to adopt responsible-by-design practices—bias testing, explainability, and continual ethics training.

This aligns with the BCS Code of Conduct and ACM Code of Ethics, emphasising integrity and public welfare. As a computing professional, I see these as evolving skill requirements rather than regulatory burdens.

**Conclusion**

Generative AI demands governance that is adaptive yet principled.  
As *Correa et al.* (2023) remind us, consensus on values—not uniform law—is the foundation of trustworthy AI.

I have learned that ethical alignment and policy collaboration are not opposites but complements; together, they can ensure AI development that advances human and societal good.
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**Summary Post**

This reflection offers a critical self-assessment of my initial forum post on AI governance, this reflection consists of a critical self-assessment of my initial forum post on AI governance, identifying both strengths and areas for development.

**Strengths:**  
My work demonstrates strong engagement with global governance frameworks and integrates multiple perspectives, including those of the EU, US, China, and emerging economies. The use of academic sources such as Correa et al. (2023) and Floridi (2023) strengthens the credibility of my analysis. The structured approach—moving from comparative models to actionable recommendations—maintains logical flow and clarity. Additionally, my proposal for a hybrid governance model reflects originality and practical thinking, balancing global principles with national flexibility.

**Areas for development:**  
Reflecting on my own analysis, I recognise that while the post summarises governance models effectively, it remains largely descriptive. Like similar peer posts, mine would benefit from deeper engagement with systemic factors such as geopolitical competition, economic incentives, and enforcement gaps that complicate global consensus. I also missed opportunities to critically evaluate the adequacy of existing frameworks for addressing emerging risks like generative AI misuse or algorithmic opacity. Furthermore, the discussion could have explored organisational accountability mechanisms—such as ethics audits or whistleblowing protections—which are essential for operationalising governance principles.

**Next Steps:**  
My future work will be strengthened by incorporating critical reflection on structural barriers to ethical AI governance and proposing actionable strategies for practitioners navigating competing pressures. I aim to expand the discussion to include societal impacts such as digital inequality and cultural diversity in AI ethics, ensuring a holistic approach to governance. Additionally, I will explore practical tools like compliance reporting and ethics training to bridge the gap between policy and practice.
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