

Regulatory Markets: The Future of AI Governance

Gillian K. Hadfield
University of Toronto, Vector Institute
& OpenAI
g.hadfield@utoronto.ca

Jack Clark
Anthropic
jack@anthropic.com

April 2023

Abstract: Appropriately regulating artificial intelligence is an increasingly urgent policy challenge. Legislatures and regulators lack the specialized technical knowledge required to best translate public demands into legal requirements. Overreliance on industry self-regulation fails to hold producers and users of AI systems accountable to democratic demands. Regulatory markets, in which governments require the targets of regulation to purchase regulatory services from a private regulator, are proposed. This approach to AI regulation could overcome the limitations of both command-and-control regulation and self-regulation. Regulatory markets could enable governments to establish policy priorities for the regulation of AI, whilst relying on market forces and industry R&D efforts to pioneer the methods of regulation that best achieve policymakers’ stated objectives.

Keywords: Co-regulation; Legal Markets and Institutions; Regulatory Theory; Regulation of Artificial Intelligence; Technology Policy.

1. Introduction

The past decade has witnessed a flood of striking achievements in artificial intelligence. The decade began with sudden advances in image classification (He et al. 2019). Five years later deep reinforcement learning demonstrated unexpected capacities in narrow tasks like the game of Go (Silver et al. 2016). Most recently large generative models, with billions of parameters and trained on billions of words and images have shown surprising foundational capacities to write plausible text or computer code, illustrate ideas, generate images on command, answer complex questions, and much more (Goodfellow et al. 2020; Wei et al. 2022).

The past decade has also witnessed an evolution in the conversation around AI governance. Early recognition (Sweeney 2013; Buolamwini & Gebru 2018) that opaque classification systems trained on casually chosen data (images or words scraped from the internet, a history of hiring decisions) will reproduce and possibly amplify racial and gender biases sparked global conversations around AI ethics. Soon a flurry of principles and guidelines had emerged from industry and civil society organizations (Jobin et al. 2019). Now, governments have begun to explore—and in some cases introduce—legislation to govern the development and use of a technology that is already embedded in daily life through AI-powered internet platforms and devices.

The challenge of governing AI is, however, enormous. Any new technology is faced with the “pacing” problem (Marchant 2011)—the lag between innovation at the speed of industry labs and governance at the speed of politics and bureaucracies—and AI is no exception. But the challenge of governing AI goes beyond delay to a fundamental mismatch between the capacity of traditional governance tools and the nature of the solutions we will need to ensure that a technology that is likely to touch every sector, every aspect, of economies and societies remains aligned with human goals and values.

judges and represented in the text-based statutes, regulations, and judicial decisions produced and enforced by them. Indeed, this is why, as we'll discuss, almost all government efforts to regulate AI to date have turned to the use of technical standard-setting organizations, outside of government. But this introduces the second limitation of current efforts: the democratic limitation. Many, if not most, of the regulatory imperatives we face with AI are not technocratic in nature; they are deeply value-laden choices. How do we trade off the gains of increased efficiency and innovation afforded by AI systems against risks to economic or political stability, or the health and welfare of individuals and groups? These are trade-offs that modern societies make through complex schemes of law and politics that are ultimately accountable to citizens. This is a major challenge for AI governance in democratic market-based economies, where governments have limited influence over industry, a problem not faced by state-capitalist economies like China's.¹

In response to this challenge, we propose a new approach to regulation to enrich the AI governance landscape. This approach attempts to simultaneously address the technical deficit of conventional regulation and the democratic deficit of industry standards. We call this approach *regulatory markets*, building on Hadfield (2017). This model falls between the polar extremes of regulation entirely by technically-constrained governments or entirely by democratically-unconstrained private actors. As we'll explain, this approach builds on new governance approaches that advocate for a shift from prescriptive, command-and-control, regulation to outcomes-based regulation, and goes further into the territory of effective regulation than other new governance approaches such as enforced self-regulation and risk-based or management-based regulation (Braithwaite & Drahos 2000; Carrigan & Coglianese, 2011).

In short, the model proposes the development of an *independent sector of licensed private regulators*. In this model, governments set the required outcomes for regulation; these could be metrics-based (e.g. frequency of fraudulent transactions approved or of illegal content online) or principles-based (e.g. reasonably low incidence of accidents in autonomous vehicles or prohibitions on hiring practices that have an unjustifiable disparate impact on protected groups). Governments license private regulators by evaluating their regulatory services against the required outcomes—can the private regulator seeking a license to regulate the use of AI in hiring, for example, demonstrate achievement of the government-defined objective of non-discrimination or demographic representation? The targets of regulation (social media platforms, banks, autonomous vehicle manufacturers or operators, employers, etc.) are required by governments to purchase the regulatory services of appropriate licensed private regulators. Governments establish rules governing private regulators to promote competition between them and uphold the integrity of regulation.

Private regulators could use conventional regulatory tools—establishing written requirements, monitoring for compliance with those requirements, and penalizing violations—but we also expect that private regulators would develop new *regulatory technologies* (Micheler & Whaley 2020). Such technologies could themselves be data-intensive and deploy AI methods. For example, a private regulator of banking services could build machine-learning based tools and require the banks it regulates to enable regular automated sampling and auditing of the bank's transactions and the performance of the bank's AI systems. Competition between private regulators, we believe, can help to find the right balance between promoting innovation in AI technology and ensuring new technology continues to be accountable and aligned with democratically-established goals and values. Driving investment and innovation in regulatory technologies is in fact a key reason we advocate adding regulatory markets to

the governance of AI toolkit. We think such technologies are essential and they are unlikely to be built in the public sector.

An additional motivation for this proposal is the challenge of developing regulation that can operate at global scale. Current efforts to establish global standards founder on the difficulty of aligning diverse nations on shared regulatory outcomes beyond very high-level abstract principles. Or they fall prey to the democratic deficit of leaving the development of more specific standards to international industry organizations (Hussain & Moriarty 2018, Veale & Borgesius 2021). Our proposal aims to provide another way to thread the global needle. We expect that private regulators could operate at global scale, obtaining licenses from the political jurisdictions (nation, province or state, city) in which they seek to operate. Private regulators could diversify and tailor their offerings to divergent outcomes requirements; and governments could choose when to align their licensing requirements to those of other governments in order to obtain private regulatory services in their local markets, and when to set different requirements, perhaps at the cost of regulating from within government or of subsidizing private regulatory services that are more costly due to departures from dominant approaches.

We do not think that regulatory markets will work in all circumstances. Nor will they be an appropriate approach in all circumstances. But we do think that governments need to act swiftly to bolster their AI governance options to include a role for them.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give a brief overview of the reasons why governance of AI is necessary. This includes the risks of harm that have been widely discussed in the AI governance arena, such as bias and polarization, but it also emphasizes the often-overlooked disruptions that AI could produce in a wide variety of existing regulatory schemes such as oversight of health care, medical devices, and pharmaceuticals. In Section 3 we give an, also brief, overview of the state of AI governance as of the end of 2022, reviewing the initiatives and models that have emerged around the world. In Section 4 we introduce the model of regulatory markets in more detail and provide some examples of how it could function in practice and what is required from governments to establish and regulate these markets. In Section 5 we discuss limitations and risks of the model and make the case for why the model offers a needed expansion of the AI governance approaches currently in play around the globe. Section 6 concludes.

1. Why AI Governance?

There is little consensus about a detailed definition of artificial intelligence. Some use the term AI only to refer to the machine-learning systems that have played a prominent role in producing the significant advances of the past decade (Russell & Norvig 2021); others emphasize that AI is a suite of computational techniques that includes the classical rules-based and symbolic systems that pre-dated the explosion of deep learning (Nilsson 2009).

For the purposes of policy, it is less important to be specific about computational techniques than it is to focus on which kinds of AI-systems produce new challenges for governance. Here a key consideration is the extent to which a computational system functions reliably in ways that were contemplated and intended by its designer. This is how purely mechanical systems function: an internal-combustion engine is designed to use a spark to ignite compressed fuel that changes pressure in a cylinder that moves a piston that moves gears and then wheels. Ensuring such systems function safely and as intended is

something we've learned to accomplish fairly well through testing and, when such systems are operated by complex human-coded software, through formal verification techniques (Wallace & Fujii 1989).

But as we build more intelligent systems, the distance between what a human system designer contemplated and intended increases, and the behavior of the system becomes harder to predict and test. There are two essential reasons. One, AI systems are valuable precisely because they are (ideally) capable of solving problems that humans can't solve—processing massive quantities of data, at rates much faster than humans can achieve; discerning patterns that humans don't see. The goal in many cases is super-human performance. If a machine displays intelligence that surpasses that of its designers, it can be very challenging to know how to predict and check it. This isn't to say it is impossible, just that it is a substantial, and substantially new, governance challenge. This is also why useful definitions of AI from a governance point of view, like the OECD's, emphasize the *quasi-autonomy* of these systems: even if they merely recommend actions to humans, humans who cannot match the system's reasoning capabilities may change their own reasoning and behavior, and hence the environment, as a result of receiving the recommendation (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 2019).

The second reason the distance between designer intent and system behavior grows with AI is that intelligent systems can be general in application; they can be deployed in environments and put to uses not contemplated by their designers. The engineers who develop a facial recognition or large language model cannot possibly anticipate and test for all the different ways in which the models could be used. Indeed, the great promise of AI lies in its generality. Even if it is very long before we see systems that might go under the heady title of artificial general intelligence (sometimes defined as able to do any cognitive task a human can), AI is already understood as a *general-purpose technology* (Brynjolfsson et al. 2018), a *method of inventing inventions* (Cockburn et al. 2018). Moreover, increasingly, the barrier to entry for using this technology to invent something new is quite low. This low barrier to entry means designers of AI are putting tools on the market that they themselves cannot possibly test and validate in all uses; and users that did not design the tools may be too far from the design and conception phase to contemplate all the ways in which they could go astray in a particular context.

For both reasons, the machine learning models that have dominated the headlines of the past decade are a good paradigm for the AI governance challenge, even if they are not the only form of advanced AI we can expect. We will focus on this paradigm through the rest of the paper.

Machine learning models epitomize the disconnect between human intent and system behavior because the software that is ultimately deployed (to recognize a face, to summarize a text, to recommend a medical diagnosis) is written not by a human but by the machine itself. [Figure 1] Machine learning models are given massive quantities of data and human-designed algorithms that instruct the machine how to use the data to build a *model* that accomplishes a statistical objective: classify objects to match the human-generated labels on a training set, explore an environment to discover which actions maximize a human-designated reward function, cluster objects in groups to minimize the extent to which each member of a group differs from the others, reliably predict from some elements of a collection of words or an image what the remaining elements probably are, infer from human behavior what the humans probably value. The resulting software (model) is the end product of that process. The model may be simple to understand: if we provide the machine with historical data structured with human-defined variables—age, gender, credit score, for example—and instruct the machine to do a linear regression to predict another variable—probability of repaying a loan, for example—we can easily

understand how the resulting 4-parameter model (three coefficients and a constant) will behave, and what pitfalls it might contain, if we then use it to decide to whom to give credit. But as a general matter, and increasingly, machine learning models are complex and difficult to interpret : as we noted earlier, some of the most striking results of the past few years have come from large language models with billions of parameters (Ganguli et al. 2022).

It is the gap between what a human designer intended and the way complex AI systems can behave that generates the AI governance challenge.

2. The AI Governance Landscape circa 2023

For most of the past decade, discussion of AI governance has focused on what Gutierrez and Marchant (2021) call “soft law.” This has been the era of “AI ethics” (Black & Murray 2019). This approach to governance looks to broad principles, ethical mandates, and voluntary codes of conduct to steer AI development and deployment in desired directions. As of 2019, Gutierrez and Marchant identified 634 soft law programs (defined as programs that set out “substantive expectations that are not directly enforceable by governments”), with 95% published between 2015 and 2019. AlgorithmWatch maintains a global inventory of AI Ethics Guidelines, which contained 173 frameworks and principles as of April, 2020. Frameworks and principles have been produced by governments, civil society organizations, corporations, industry organizations, and professional associations. Most are fairly abstract and there is substantial overlap in content, with convergence around five high-level concepts: transparency, justice and fairness (non-bias, non-discrimination), non-maleficence (security, safety, non-subversion), responsibility and accountability, and privacy (Jobin et al. 2019).

Gutierrez and Marchant (2021) predict that soft law “will be the dominant form of AI governance for the foreseeable future.” And as late as 2019 leaders in the tech industry were still taking the position that “self- and co-regulatory approaches...have been largely successful at curbing inopportune AI use” (Google 2019). But spurred by highly publicized problems ranging from the Cambridge Analytica scandal, in which millions of Facebook profiles were harvested and used for political influence in the 2016 U.S. presidential election, to the abuse of AI in policing and immigration (Whittaker et al. 2018), as of 2020, calls for a shift from broad-brush voluntary ethical codes and principles to more formal regulatory tools were widespread. Governments have responded, broadly-speaking, in two ways: either by enacting AI-specific legislation that cuts across existing regulatory domains; or by formalizing reliance on broad principles and voluntary industry-led standards, leaving specific legislation to existing sectoral regulators. Almost across the board, however, whether mandated or voluntary, the approach to AI regulation falls into the category of *management-based regulation* (also called process-oriented, risk-based, or enforced self-regulation) which requires (or encourages) firms to evaluate the risks generated by their business and to develop their plan for how those risks will be managed (Gilad, 2011; Coglianese et al. 2003; Braithwaite 1981; Ayres & Braithwaite 1992; Braithwaite 2011).

2.1. The E.U. Approach: Comprehensive AI Legislation

The European Union has led on the first, legislative, approach. Arguably the first AI legislation seen globally was a provision in the E.U.’s 2018 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which requires entities that use automated decision systems to disclose this fact; to provide “meaningful information about the logic involved”² and a right to obtain human intervention and to contest the decision;³ and not

to use “special categories of personal data” such as race and gender unless an exceptional lawful basis for processing such data is present (Council Regulation No. 2016/679, 2016 OJ L 119, 4.5.).⁴ Subsequently in 2022, the E.U. passed two key pieces of legislation. The first is the Digital Services Act, which regulates very large online platforms and the AI systems they use to recommend content and deliver search results (requiring, for example, that platforms identify the most important parameters used to rank content for a particular user). The second is the Digital Markets Act, which regulates the AI-powered “gatekeeping” providers of core platform services in the digital economy to ensure that they do not distort market competition (requiring, for example, that automated ranking of consumer search results not prioritize the gatekeeper’s own products and that the gatekeeper’s access to aggregate data not be used to compete unfairly with business users of its platform) (Council Regulation No. 2022/2065, OJ L 277 27.10).

Most comprehensive is the E.U.’s AI Act, proposed in 2021. This is sweeping legislation that is directly focused on the regulation of AI systems. The AI Act would apply to any AI system placed on the market or put into service in the E.U., regardless of where providers are physically located. Penalties for violation of the act range upwards to as much as 6% of global annual revenues.

The scheme of the Act is risk-based, differentiating between unacceptable, high, and low-risk uses of AI and providing specific carve-outs for providers of general-purpose AI systems (such as large generative models) that are intended to provide inputs to AI-based products and services. Unacceptable-risk uses (subliminal manipulation, exploitation of vulnerable groups, social scoring, some real-time use of biometrics by law enforcement) are prohibited. High-risk uses include products that are already regulated by the EU such as machinery, toys, medical devices, and transportation vehicles; safety components of critical infrastructure; and products or services impacting education, employment, public benefits, credit, law enforcement, border control, or judicial or democratic processes where the output of the AI system is either fully automated (no human intervention or validation) or constitutes the sole or principal basis for a human decision.

All providers of AI systems—high- or low-risk—must ensure that people know they are using an AI system if it would not be obvious to a reasonable user, and must disclose the presence of “deep fakes” and emotion-recognition systems. Otherwise, low-risk systems can only be encouraged to voluntarily adopt codes of conduct based on the Act.

High-risk and general-purpose AI systems are required to have in place a risk-management system, and practices to ensure data quality, technical documentation, and that systems are accurate, robust and secure against intrusion and manipulation. They must be sufficiently transparent to users that they can understand the system and use it appropriately and there must be post-market monitoring. High-risk systems must also have in place practices that enable traceability (record-keeping), human oversight, and a quality management system to ensure compliance with Act requirements. Most providers of high-risk systems can self-certify their compliance with the Act (and are required to mark the system documentation with a symbol to this effect); but providers of AI systems that contribute to critical infrastructure must have conformity confirmed by a third-party certifying body approved by a member state (Artificial Intelligence Act (Proposal) COM/2021/206 final).⁵

A critical feature of the E.U. approach is the anticipated role for private standard-setting bodies. The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) both had begun to publish AI-specific standards as of 2021 (Gutierrez & Marchant

2021) include standards in their catalogue of soft law programs; as of 2019, 10% of the programs they identified were classified as standards, and about half concerned autonomous vehicles. The E.U. AI Act contemplates that the European Commission can ask private European standardization bodies to create harmonized standards to provide technical implementation of the Act's requirements; compliance with such standards will then be taken as compliance with the Act.

In 2022, the Canadian government proposed legislation, the AI and Data Act (AIDA), that is far less comprehensive than the E.U. AI Act but which creates a framework for more detailed regulations. AIDA would require "persons responsible for AI systems" to assess whether it is a "high-impact" system (to be defined by regulations), "establish measures to identify, assess and mitigate the risks of harms or biased outputs" that could result from use of the system and measures to monitor compliance with, and the effectiveness of, mitigation measures. They must keep records of these assessments and reasons for determining whether a system is high-impact, notify the government of serious risks, and publish on a publicly-accessible website a plain language description of the system. The government may, on reasonable grounds, require a person responsible for an AI system to produce their records and may order an audit, and require additional measures or cessation of use of the system. AIDA would make it an offence, with fines up to 3% of global revenues, to put an AI system on the market knowing or being reckless about the risk of serious harm (and the harm occurs) or with intent to defraud or cause serious economic loss to an individual (and the loss occurs); due diligence is a defence to conviction for this offence (C.27, 44th Parliament, 1st Session 2022).

The Canadian government was also the first in the world to require AI impact assessments to be conducted by government agencies when procuring AI systems⁶ and as part of the proposed Consumer Privacy Protection Act, similar to the GDPR, requires any organization using an automated decision system "to make a prediction, recommendation or decision about [an] individual that could have a significant impact on them" to provide on request an explanation of the decision, indicating the type of personal information used, its source, and the "reasons or principal factors that led to the prediction, recommendation or decision."⁷

2.2. The U.S./U.K. Approach: Existing Regulators and Voluntary Standards

In contrast to the E.U. and Canada, the U.S. and the U.K. have chosen, thus far, to look primarily to existing regulators to develop regulations pertaining to AI in their particular domain (transportation, finance, consumer protection, etc.) and to otherwise rely on, and participate in the development of, voluntary international standards in bodies such as the ISO and the IEEE.

In the U.S., which is by far the dominant jurisdiction for AI research and development (Stanford University Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence 2022), this policy was first expressed in a presidential Executive Order, issued in 2019, that emphasized the importance of supporting "continued American leadership in AI." (Maintaining American Leadership in Artificial Intelligence, Executive Order 13859 2019) The executive order directed the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to create guidance for regulation of AI applications to inform the development of regulatory approaches "that advance American innovation while upholding civil liberties, privacy and American values" and the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to issue a plan for Federal engagement in the development of technical standards.

The OMB guidance issued in 2020 directed regulatory agencies to “avoid regulatory or non-regulatory actions that needlessly hamper AI innovation and growth.” It then set out principles to guide regulation including a focus on public trust, through the promotion of reliable, robust, and trustworthy AI and protection of reasonable expectations of privacy, non-discrimination, safety and security, and transparency to enable understanding of how an AI application or system works. The OMB guidance called for the use of risk assessment and management approaches that avoid “unnecessarily precautionary approaches to regulation that unjustifiably create anticompetitive effects or inhibit innovation” and encouraged flexible, performance-based approaches “that are technology neutral and that do not impose mandates on companies that would harm innovation,” including “targeted agency conformity assessment schemes, to protect health, safety, privacy and other values.” (United States Office of Management and Budget, 2020)

NIST issued a plan in 2019 for U.S. participation in developing technical standards, which called for research into standards development and the development of metrics and data sets to assess “reliability, robustness and other trustworthy attributes of AI systems” that could be incorporated into standards, support for public-private partnerships to develop innovative approaches to standards, and participation in international standard-setting efforts “to advance AI standards for U.S. economic and security needs.” (National Institute of Standards and Technology 2019) NIST’s AI Risk Management Framework

(second draft) appeared in late 2022 (National Institute of Standards and Technology 2022), organized around principles familiar from the multitude of principles statements that appeared beginning in 2015 (Jobin et al. 2019, Gutierrez & Marchant 2021): validity and reliability, safety, fairness and non-discrimination, security, resilience, accountability and transparency, explainability and interpretability, and privacy. The framework is voluntary and intended to aid organizations to “manage both enterprise and societal risks related to the design, development, deployment, evaluation, and use of AI systems.” It is “not a compliance mechanism. It is law- and regulation-agnostic.” (National Institute of Standard and Technologies 2022)

The absence of legislation at the federal level in the U.S. may not last. In late 2022 the White House’s Office of Science and Technology released a principles-based blueprint for an “AI Bill of Rights”⁸ and in February of 2022 an AI Algorithmic Accountability Act was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives, which would direct the Federal Trade Commission to require impact assessments of automated decision systems.⁹

The U.K., as of late 2022, appeared to be following the same path as the U.S., with an emphasis on promoting innovation, leaving AI-specific regulation to the remit of existing regulators, and indicating a plan to focus Parliament only on developing cross-cutting high-level principles to coordinate these regulatory efforts, based on the OECD principles. In a white paper, the government said it did not currently see a need for regulation but did not close the door to future legislative action; it encouraged existing regulators to look to guidelines or voluntary approaches. The white paper specifically declines to define AI, but emphasizes two key characteristics which generate regulatory challenges: the adaptiveness and autonomy of AI technologies. Also similar to the U.S., the U.K. is looking to global standard-setting initiatives: in 2022 the government announced the creation of an AI Standards Hub operated by the Alan Turing Institute (a non-profit joint venture of several U.K. universities) with the participation of the British Standards Institute and the National Physical Laboratory “to lead in shaping global technical standards for Artificial Intelligence.” (United Kingdom Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport, Office for Artificial Intelligence 2022)

2.3. The state of AI governance: technical and democratic deficits

The E.U. and the U.S./U.K. have staked out different territory in the AI governance landscape. The E.U. AI Act and, to a lesser degree, the Canadian AIDA, will create significant compliance obligations—at risk of substantial penalties (and probably at significant cost.) The U.S. and the U.K. have made clear the policy choice to rely primarily on voluntary and existing sectoral approaches. But, with the exception of the Digital Services and Digital Markets Act, the approaches we see globally do not differ as much as it might otherwise seem. All are forms of management-based or risk-based regulation, in which industry is responsible for identifying and managing the risks of their products and services. None, in our estimation, are building a robust regulatory response that can meet the AI governance challenge.

First, with respect to the Digital Services and Digital Markets Act: these are not AI-specific laws but they reflect nuanced attention to particular risks arising from AI in the context of the large online platforms that now provide the infrastructure for so much of how we communicate and transact. These platforms simply could not function without AI. And these laws are sophisticated pieces of legislation that will require these platforms to modify how they use AI. The Digital Services Act (DSA), for example, will require providers and users of AI-powered recommender systems—in social media, online commerce, video-sharing, music and podcast hosting, online search—to disclose much more than they do now about how these systems function; very large online platforms will be required to offer at least one alternative to algorithmically-generated content recommendations/rankings (Council Regulation No. 2022/2065, OJ L 277 27.10). The Digital Markets Act (DMA) prohibits large online platforms that operate as gatekeepers to core platform services from using algorithmic ranking systems that favor their own products relative to their business users/competitors who reach consumers through their platform. It also aims to equalize the capacity of gatekeepers to use AI to extract insights from data by requiring platforms to share some data (such as ad performance or end-user behavioral data) with their business users/competitors (Digital Markets Act (Proposal) COM/2020/842 final).

Together the DSA and the DMA reflect substantive engagement with the impact of AI on the digital environment and they implement substantive policy trade-offs about how AI is built and used. They take a stand. Democratic processes have drawn a line saying “this behavior (such as refusing to share data or refusing to disclose the parameters of a recommender systems) is not acceptable.” Whether the line has been drawn in the right place or not is another question, one we do not offer a view on here. But this *is* democratic regulation.

In contrast, *both* the E.U. comprehensive legislative approach to general AI regulation, and the U.S./U.K. voluntary approach more or less kick the regulatory can down the road. More: they kick the can over to non-democratic processes for regulation.

The E.U. AI Act does make a few substantive policy choices: prohibiting some uses such as “subliminal manipulation” (although commentators suggest there is less here than appears (Veale & Borgesius 2021)) but at its core the E.U. AI Act simply requires providers and users of AI systems to engage in risk-management, with an emphasis on process: documentation of the choices made around data-sets, design, and deployment, quality management and logging of system behaviors to allow traceability, and post-market monitoring. Compliance with the Act, which is mostly self-certified, means having these kinds of operational systems in place. These are laudable and necessary steps, and they do take us from

the world of entirely voluntary, exclusively market-driven risk-management and oversight of practices and procedures to the mandatory creation of systems that need to be conducted with careful attention to data and AI choices. An important effect of the Act would clearly be to change internal culture and organization of AI development and use.

But what we *don't* have in the E.U. AI Act are any policy choices about what constitutes acceptable, or unacceptable, risk. Indeed, we don't have any detailed treatment of what constitutes an AI risk at all—except in the high-level abstractions familiar from AI principles, frameworks and ethics. These are the same high-level principles articulated by the U.S. and the U.K. governments as 'guidance' for AI development and regulation.

There are ostensible flags planted in the E.U. AI Act, such as the requirements of human oversight and transparency. But as with the high-level principles and guidelines they are supposed to replace, there is very little here in the way of concrete limits and expectations. How these requirements will be translated into actual operational decisions—and compliance assessments—is very, very unclear. This lack of clarity is in one sense for good reason: the reason the call for AI governance has difficulty gaining traction beyond vague principles and AI ethics is precisely because it is an enormous *technical* challenge to define what it means for an AI system to have appropriate human oversight and transparency, and then to build such a system. It is an enormous *technical* challenge to know how to evaluate whether an AI system is compliant or not. We are still in the very early days of understanding how to build AI well. It is easy and uncontroversial to say “there must be human oversight.” But oversight of what? When? And how? What we know from early research on human-AI interaction is that it is a very complicated relationship: humans, even experts, can over-trust AI recommendations (Passi & Vorvoreanu 2022; Gaube et al. 2021); and there is evidence (but much more research is needed) that they will be *more* inclined to trust a faulty recommendation if the model is explained to them than they are when they are given 'black-box' output (Poursabzi-Sangdeh et al. 2021). The *theory* of regulation is faulty here: the idea that humans can easily align AI outputs with what we want systems to do—it is just a matter of paying attention. This view deeply misconceives the fundamental challenge of building societies and economies using computational methods that surpass our abilities to process data and see patterns—the very reason AI produces value and attracts development and use. This is one way in which the harms framework for AI regulation has distorted government response: a focus on harms, particularly those of behaviors that clearly violate well-established norms such as anti-discrimination, understates the challenge that AI presents throughout our regulatory landscape. Ensuring our regulatory regimes work to ensure safe medical devices or competitive markets requires much more than more attention and transparency.

Government regulators know that they lack the technical capacity to define more precise policy choices for AI. But across the globe there is the same, false, hope: technical details can be worked out by industry standard-setting organizations (SSOs). The most significant difference between the European approach and the British/American approach is that the E.U. will require compliance with SSO standards; for now, the U.S. and the U.K. will just encourage compliance.

But this puts the entire approach to AI governance into democratic deficit. Others have already emphasized the constitutional dangers here (Veale & Borgesius 2021): SSOs are private entities, albeit non-profit ones. The ISO is a non-profit corporation operating as a global network of national standards bodies. In some cases, the national bodies are independent of government entirely (although perhaps recognized as “the” national standards body, as with the British Standards Institute); in others they are

owned or otherwise financially supported by government. (The Standards Council of Canada, for example, is a Crown corporation and is accountable to Parliament.) ISO produces standards that are developed by technical committees composed of industry experts, most of whom are employed by the companies that will adopt standards.¹⁰ Standards produced by SSOs such as ISO are proprietary: they can only be accessed by purchasing them; they are not published or open for review and comment by the public.¹¹ Technical committees can include non-industry stakeholders such as civil society organizations or consumer groups; but as many have observed there is substantial imbalance in the capacity for large corporate entities to support full-time employees' participation in standard-setting and the capacity of small businesses and non-profit public interest groups (Mattli & Woods 2009, Büthe & Mattli 2011, Veale & Borgesius 2021). These features of SSOs generate substantial democratic accountability challenges.

A deeper democratic concern, however, engages with the *premise* that the standards we need for AI are properly generated by bodies that are primarily focused on and staffed by people with *technical* expertise. SSOs have their origins in 19th and early 20th century efforts to coordinate engineers and scientists on common systems of measurement and design choices for physical objects: standards for resistance coils in telegraph systems, screw threads, and chemical and performance characteristics of steel rails for railroads, for example (Yates & Murphy 2019). In these early examples, the benefits of standardization are primarily in terms of market efficiency—promoting comparability of products, interoperability, and markets for parts. Other than through the interest in well-functioning markets, there is little public concern at stake in the standards set for screw threads and steel rails, and hence little call for democratic oversight. Moreover, in those cases in which the public interest was sometimes adjudicated through technical choices, the public interest was fairly uncontested. As Yates and Murphy (2019) recount, the dangers associated with steam boilers, which sometimes exploded on riverboats and caused highly publicized deaths, were ultimately addressed with safety standards governing boiler design, materials, construction, and maintenance developed by the private Franklin Institute in 1836. Again, democratic oversight to develop technical standards to avoid boiler explosions in public places seems unnecessary.

But the matters being left to technical standard-setting today in the context of AI governance are anything but purely technical. We are probably well-advised to leave to engineers the development of standards that will reduce to minimal the risk that an autonomous vehicle will randomly lose control. But the AI standards governments are electing globally to leave to private technical standard-setting bodies go far beyond non-controversial safety standards. They include core human values and choices about the shape of our social and economic lives.

Consider, for example, work that has started to emerge from standard-setting bodies with respect to algorithmic bias: the risk that AI systems such as facial recognition or automated decision-making will discriminate against people on protected characteristics such as race or gender. ISO/IEC 24027, for example, is a 'standard' entitled "Bias in AI systems and AI aided decision making" published by ISO in November 2021. It consists of a 'technical report' that discusses sources of bias in an AI system ("human cognitive bias," "data bias," and "bias introduced by engineering decisions") and lays out a set of statistical metrics to assess bias and methods for treating unwanted bias. The concepts and measures of bias in this standard, however, are controversial (Galaz et al. 2021). They reflect technical approaches to a societal harm that, elsewhere in the economy, we address not through statistical analysis but through nuanced legal analysis (which can include consideration of statistical evidence) of rich concepts such as disparate impact or intentional discrimination, and adjudication conducted by specialized regulators,

judges and juries, not engineers (Mulligan et al. 2019). Technical standard-setting is simply inappropriate as a method of regulating the phenomenon of discrimination, even when it occurs through the operation of a system with important technical elements.

2.4. From Harms to Regulatory Disruption: Meeting the Core AI Governance Challenge

In all of the existing approaches, the AI governance challenge has largely been framed in terms of the harms that AI systems can do and managing the risks of those harms (Kaminski 2023). Autonomous vehicles pose the risk of *physical harm* if they fail to recognize pedestrians or obstacles or make unsafe moves. Machine learning systems trained on historical data can learn and amplify *biases and discrimination* against protected groups, even if the designer suppresses data about the group to which someone belongs—learning race from zip codes, for example. As demonstrated by scandals such as Cambridge Analytica (Heawood 2018), the hyper-personalization of content and advertising that AI-powered social media platforms enable and the capacity for generating “deep fake” digital content in high volume can cause harms arising from *misinformation, behavioral manipulation, and polarization* (Prummer 2020; Levy 2021; Yadin-Segal 2021). The *privacy* concerns of the digital age are much amplified by AI, because machine-learning systems trained on larger datasets generally perform better (Ganguli et al. 2022), setting off a veritable “data hunger games” and machine learning enables the discovery of personal information even from data that is ostensibly anonymized (Narayanan & Shmatikov 2006) AI-powered facial recognition systems generate dangers of broad-based *surveillance* and *errors and abuses* by law enforcement or immigration officials. In the public sector, there is concern about *autonomous weapons* and distortion of the *adjudication of claims* and benefits (United Nations General Assembly 2013; Henley 2021; Ranchordas 2022).¹²

In this harms framework the challenge of AI governance is the challenge of developing regulations to mitigate or eliminate these harms, engaging a focus on assessing *AI impacts* (Kaminski 2023). This approach analogizes AI governance to product safety regulation: when a new technology embodied in a new product or service is introduced, we evaluate what dangers it poses and regulate to address those risks.

A product safety approach focuses on how new technologies disrupt markets and systems and thinks of regulation as a means of responding to that disruption. But here AI is different. AI is not a product, or even “a” new technology. It is a means of invention, of problem-solving—it is *intelligence*. If it is helpful to characterize it as a technology at all, it is a general-purpose technology—capable of being used in the production of just about any good or service, and the operation of just about any system. For this reason, it is, we think, more illuminating to think of AI as *disrupting regulation* itself. There are some new harms and risks that AI-based products generate. But more fundamentally AI poses a challenge to how we regulate for *any goal*, in any context.

Consider, for example, the regulation of healthcare. Healthcare is a complex system of interacting providers of goods and services. We regulate it in multiple ways. We use professional licensing to set standards of competence for doctors and nurses. We require producers of pharmaceuticals and medical devices to obtain approval from government agencies before putting them on the market and require inspections to ensure the quality of manufacturing processes. Legislation establishes rules for how hospitals and insurance companies offer their services and handle and secure patient data. Tort law gives the right to sue for damages to anyone who claims to have been harmed by health care services that fall

below a reasonable standard of care. Together, this web of regulatory efforts aims to ensure that healthcare systems achieve multiple and competing goals: high quality diagnoses, safe and effective treatment; medical research and innovation; reasonable health care cost; patient dignity, privacy and choice; equality of access; compensation for medical injuries; and so on.

AI disrupts this regulatory scheme in multiple ways, primarily because this complex web of rules was not designed or evolved with AI in mind (Linkov et al. 2018). What expertise do health systems require to competently evaluate and interact with AI-based systems intended to assist diagnoses, treatment choices, and patient monitoring? Will they over- (Bansal et al. 2021) (or under- (Schaffer et al. 2019)) trust AI recommendations? If pharmaceutical and medical device manufacturers begin widespread use of simulated data or simulated *in silico* clinical trials, how will regulators apply standards that require and were developed to evaluate human trials (Viceconti et al. 2021)? If AI-based medical devices continuously adapt following approval and deployment, how will they be evaluated by a system designed to evaluate static technologies (Benjamens et al. 2020).¹³ If the safety and efficacy of an AI tool is critically dependent on the environment and human inputs in ways that are novel relative to conventional diagnostic and treatment devices (Gulshan et al. 2016), how will a regulatory regime designed to evaluate products evaluate entire systems (Gerke et al. 2020)? If someone suffers a negative outcome during a hospital stay, will lawyers and judges and juries be able to trace and evaluate the causes of harm, and hold relevant persons (natural and artificial) accountable, even when AI behaves in ways that—as our definition of AI emphasizes—are hard to foresee?

These questions are not engaged by a harms and product safety risk management framework. They require a redesign of how regulation achieves its objectives. Our existing mechanisms for balancing the cost of training health care professionals with their levels of competence need rethinking when AI shifts this balance by increasing or decreasing the cost of training, or increasing or decreasing baseline competence. This is a regulatory need not captured by a narrow focus on the harms or risks of an AI product or service. If the safety and efficacy of novel AI tools are dependent in novel ways on the environment and human inputs, we need novel approaches to evaluating the entire system in which they are deployed, not just the AI tool. As Agrawal, Gans and Goldfarb (2022) emphasize, large-scale deployment of AI is likely to require entire system change. Regulatory methods will sometimes need to focus on entire systems, not simply conventional product safety testing (Smuha 2021).

This regulatory rethinking is obscured by existing AI governance discussions or legislation focused on AI harms, product safety, and risk management. Some sectoral regulators—such as agencies that regulate medical devices (Viceconti 2021; Benjamens et al. 2020), automobiles (Firlej & Taeihagh 2021; United States Department of Transport 2018; National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 2017), or air traffic (European Union Aviation Safety Agency 2020)—are engaged in this rethinking. But by and large the true AI governance challenge is not engaging the level of attention it requires. Legislators and regulators are not systematically exploring new methods of governance to address the AI challenge or providing guidance to regulators across the board for how to engage in regulatory innovation.

AI will not only disrupt our regulated market economies; it will disrupt regulation itself. This insight shifts the work of responding to the AI governance challenge. What we need is not (just) to enact new legislation or regulatory regimes to address new risks of harm introduced by AI; what we also, even primarily, need are new regulatory approaches and tools that can adapt regulation to the pervasive role AI is going to play in existing, not to mention new, regulatory domains.

3. Regulatory Markets

The challenge of regulatory innovation to address technological change is not a new one. In recent decades, regulatory theorists have proposed “new governance” techniques to supplement or displace traditional command-and-control forms of regulation (Braithwaite & Drahos 2000; Carrigan & Coglianese 2011). New governance responds to the call for more “agile” governance (World Economic Forum 2016; World Economic Forum 2018; World Economic Forum 2019; World Economic Forum 2020) in the face of rapid change and high levels of complexity.

These new governance techniques fall into three large groups. Performance-based regulation (also called outcomes-based or principles-based) specifies results (sometimes expressed as metrics, sometimes expressed only as principles) that regulated entities must achieve but does not specify how to achieve those results (Coglianese et al., 2003; May, 2011). Management-based regulation (also called process-oriented, risk-based, or enforced self-regulation) requires firms to evaluate the risks generated by their business and to develop their plan for how those risks will be managed. Plans might need approval from government or a third-party certification agency. (Gilad, 2011; Coglianese et al., 2003; Braithwaite 1981; Ayres & Braithwaite 1992; Braithwaite 2011). Meta-regulation embeds these new governance techniques in a system in which both regulated entities and government regulators continually learn from experience to update required processes and outcomes (Gilad, 2010). The move to new modes of regulation has been fostered by the perception that traditional approaches inhibit both efficiency and innovation in the achievement of regulatory goals. The theory of new governance approaches is that government should harness the expertise and cost-minimizing incentives of industry itself in the pursuit of politically-established goals such as a safe food supply, reduced pollution, or stable financial systems (Parker 2002).

A critical feature of new governance methods is increased reliance on what Abbott, Levi-Faur and Snidal (2017) call *regulatory intermediaries*. They define an intermediary as “any actor that acts directly or indirectly in conjunction with a regulator to affect the behavior of a target.” Intermediaries can include private actors (such as for-profit companies supplying auditing and certification services), civil society organizations (such as NGOs supplying fair trade standards) or government agencies (such as independent national bodies established to oversee human rights compliance.) In their *regulatory intermediary theory* (RIT), instead of a direct relationship between a regulator and a target,

R --> T,

they posit a relationship that interposes a third-party intermediary, making the relationship between regulator and target indirect:

R --> I --> T.

In this model, regulators integrate regulatory intermediaries into a governance scheme as a means of recruiting the intermediaries’ greater capacity to implement, monitor, and/or enforce rules and the role they can play in providing feedback about rule performance for purposes of rule revision. Intermediaries may also play a role in “soft” RIT regulation by generating consensus-based non-binding standards (such as fair trade or forest stewardship standards) that help direct an industry in ways desired by a government. This is the sense of regulation defined by Black (2008, 139): “sustained and focused attempts to change the behavior of others in order to address a collective problem or attain an identified end or ends, usually through a combination of rules and norms and some means for their implementation and enforcement, which can be legal or non-legal.” The more actors involved as intermediaries, the

more *polycentric* a regulatory regime is; the greater the reliance on non-state actors, the more *decentered* it is (Black 2001, 2008).

The approach seen in existing responses to the AI governance challenge clearly reflect a decentered regime with substantial reliance on regulatory intermediaries—namely non-state standard setting bodies and private auditing and certification services.

Our model extends the regulatory intermediary model in a new critical direction. Specifically, we focus on the goal of building a *regulatory market* not merely to recruit the expertise or cost-efficiency of non-state intermediaries but, more importantly, to attract investment of human and financial capital into the design and development of true regulatory *technologies* that can keep pace with AI (Micheler & Whaley 2020). This is our proposed response to the technical deficit we see in governments' efforts to regulate AI directly. We also propose, however, to structure regulatory markets in a framework that addresses the democratic deficit of existing approaches that lie too far on the self-governance end of the regulatory spectrum.

There are three principal actors in our regulatory markets model: the targets of regulation, private regulators, and governments. Targets are businesses and other organizations that governments seek to regulate. In the AI context, these are the companies or organizations building and deploying AI or integrating AI into their products, services, or systems. Private regulators are for-profit and non-profit organizations that develop and supply regulatory services, which they compete to sell to targets. Governments require targets to purchase regulatory services (entering into a regulatory contract with a private regulator) and directly regulate the market for regulatory services, ensuring it operates in the public interest. Private regulators would gain their authority to regulate via the regulatory contract with the target and authorization from governments to collect fines or impose requirements on the targets that submit to their regulatory system. (See Figure 2 for an illustration of how this model compares schematically to traditional command-and-control regulation.)

Private regulators could employ conventional means of regulation: writing text-based rules, monitoring for compliance, and penalizing violations. But the private regulator might also develop *regulatory technologies* that directly control or shape the business decisions of the targets it regulates. And indeed, this is a primary goal: encouraging investment in novel methods of aligning the behavior of targets with desired outcomes, overcoming the technical deficit of direct government regulation.

Here are a few examples of regulatory technologies:

- A private regulator of self-driving cars might require self-driving car companies to allow the regulator access to data produced by the vehicles and then use machine learning (ML) to detect behaviors that raise the risk of accidents beyond thresholds set by the regulator. The private regulator might bring these to the attention of the target and require risk-assessment; or it might develop technology that allows the regulator to modify the algorithms or data sources used by the target's vehicles.




Figure 2: In conventional regulation, shown on the left, the government directly regulates entities. With regulatory markets, shown on the right, a private regulator directly regulates the targets that have purchased its regulatory services, subject to oversight by government to ensure regulators are achieving outcomes set by government. It does this by developing regulatory procedures, requirements, and technology.

- A private regulator in the banking industry might require a bank using ML to analyze customer data and develop new products to implement differential privacy techniques (Dwork & Roth, 2014) to minimize the likelihood that a customer is harmed by the use of their data. The regulator could prescribe the specific techniques/algorithms to use; or it could establish a procedure for the banks that it regulates to propose techniques that survive tests conducted by the regulator.
- A private regulator of drone manufacturers equipped with facial recognition systems might require companies to implement particular cybersecurity features to ensure their models are not discoverable by malicious users and conduct algorithmic audits of system accuracy across demographic groups. The regulator might also create systems that enable people to raise flags about drone behavior to detect malicious or discriminatory use.

Regulatory techniques developed by private regulators might include hardware, risk assessment tools, information processing systems, conflict or complaint management procedures, and so on.

In order to participate in the market by selling regulatory services to targets, private regulators must be first *licensed* by the government in the jurisdictions in which they wish to operate. In any given domain, multiple regulators are licensed so that they compete to provide regulatory services to targets. Targets must choose a regulator but they have the capacity to choose, and switch, regulators. They do so by comparing across regulators in terms of the cost and efficiency of the services provided by regulators. Private regulators do not compete, however, on the quality of their regulatory services, that is, the extent to which they achieve public goals. This is because in order to obtain and maintain a license, regulators must demonstrate their regulatory approach achieves outcomes that are mandated by government. Outcomes are metrics or principles set through the bureaucratic processes of the public sector. They are the mechanism by which the delegation of regulatory oversight of target to private actors is made legitimate, overcoming the democratic deficit (Stemler 2016).

For example:

- In the self-driving car context, governments could set thresholds for accident rates or traffic congestion. They could establish principles for private regulators such as maintaining public confidence in road safety.
- In the banking industry, governments could set thresholds for access to credit by consumers that must be met by licensed private regulators. They could establish principles such as traceability of transactions and maintenance of confidence in the stability of financial markets.
- In the context of facial recognition use in drones, governments might establish thresholds for the likelihood that software could be accessed by malicious users. They could establish principles such as realistic consumer consent to recognition and/or metrics to ensure comparable likelihoods of identification across different demographic groups is local population.

The central innovation of regulatory markets beyond existing new governance models is a shift by government to establishing the goals of regulation rather than the methods of achieving those goals (the concept behind performance-based regulation), but with methods developed by independent private regulators who are themselves regulated by governments (rather than leaving the methods to achieve goals to regulated entities, as we see in performance-based regulation). The regulation of private regulators would occur through a combination of upfront evaluation of the capacity for a regulator's system to satisfy government goals and ongoing auditing and oversight: measurement of outcome metrics and assessment of the achievement of principles by the private regulator.

For example, in the self-driving car setting, governments may develop techniques to track accident and congestion rates and assess the contribution of a particular regulator to excessive accidents or congestion. In banking, governments could conduct periodic audits of random samples of transactions from the targets of a particular regulator to determine the incidence of money-laundering. In drones, governments might stress test a regulator's procedures by employing adversarial efforts to infiltrate algorithms or data.

Regulators that fail to pass the tests set by governments would risk having their licenses suspended, conditioned, or revoked. This requires governments to regulate to ensure that the market for private regulators is competitive, ensuring that there is sufficient scale in a given domain to support multiple regulators (possibly restricting the share of the target market that a given regulator can service) and that targets have the capacity to switch regulators with relative ease. This obtains the benefits of competition between regulators, spurring them to invest in developing more effective and less costly means of achieving regulatory objectives.

4. Limitations, Risks, and Opportunities

The regulatory markets model is a natural evolution of the widespread use of regulatory intermediaries, particularly in fast-moving and complex contexts. We do not suggest that it is the right solution for all AI settings; we propose it as an addition to the AI governance toolkit. But we believe that it is a critical direction in which AI governance needs to go in order to meet the core AI governance challenge of ensuring that regulatory technology evolves at a comparable rate to AI technology itself. This is the key motivation behind the market element in this model: the need to match the market incentive to invest in

AI advances with a market incentive to invest in AI regulation. We don't see any evidence that existing approaches are capable of filling this need. Even if the public sector could compete in the market for technical talent and recruit top engineers into government jobs, which is widely seen as an obstacle to effective AI regulation (Scherer 2015; Guihot et al. 2017; Mannes 2020), publicly-employed engineers would not face the incentive and enjoy the supports needed to innovate publicly-owned regulatory technologies. This is just not what the public sector is good at. At the same time, the private incentive within AI companies to invest in regulatory technologies is currently unmoored from democratic oversight: investments are being made to meet corporate goals. These corporate goals are only loosely connected to public goals, given the lack of concrete AI standards and the lack of visibility the public has into how corporate AI systems are functioning.¹⁴

In this section we consider limitations, risks and opportunities presented by this model.

4.1. Limitations and Risks: Independence, Capture and Lax Oversight

Regulatory markets come with risks around the challenge of ensuring that private regulators are competitive and independent of the entities they regulate.

Competition might fail because there is insufficient scale to support multiple regulators--if there are only two or three companies involved in developing a particular type of AI, it will be difficult to sustain a competitive market of regulators, each of which needs to regulate multiple entities and each of which needs to be at risk of losing market share in order to prompt continual investment in better regulatory technology. Even where there is sufficient scale, competition might not emerge if a single regulator gains too much market share or if the costs of switching regulators is too high. Competition might also fail if regulators collude. Some of these concerns can be addressed through the design of the regulatory environment imposed by governments: antitrust and competition law could protect against the monopolization of the regulatory market, but robust competition might require additional protections such as limitations on market share or rules to reduce switching costs.

The independence of regulators will require close attention. Regulatory capture is a known risk in existing government-led regulation--both through explicit corruption and through more subtle mechanisms: campaign finance and lobbying, overlapping industry and regulator professional networks, the dependence of regulators on information supplied by industry, etc. (Dal Bó, 2006). Regulatory markets put an additional layer between governments and industry. This creates a risk that private regulators, which are trying to sell their services to AI companies, will collaborate with those companies to cheat on government goals. Protecting the integrity of regulation will require governments to monitor the results achieved by private regulators and to have effective threats to condition, suspend, or revoke the licenses of regulators that skimp on performance to win the business of targets. This is a transformation of the existing problem of regulation: regulation is only as good as the capacity and willingness of governments to regulate. With good design it is possible that regulatory markets make it easier for governments to regulate: multiple regulators means multiple sources of data and industry expertise. Participants in the regulatory market will also have an incentive to monitor the performance of their competitors, perhaps exposing cases in which competitors are "cheating" on regulatory outcomes to achieve markets share. Further, instead of regulating, for example, 1000 companies engaged in the production of AI systems in a given domain, government will be focused on regulating perhaps 5 or 10 regulators.

Another core risk is the risk that governments will fail to invest in oversight. Two recent failures of regulatory intermediaries are vivid cautionary tales that demonstrate this. The first is the failure of credit rating agencies in the 2008 financial crisis (Partnoy 2017). The second is the insufficiency of FAA oversight practices in the context of the Boeing 737-MAX tragedy (Herkert et al 2020). In the case of the credit rating agencies, these regulatory intermediaries were deliberately shielded from liability for errors in their ratings and there was no formal oversight from government. In the case of Boeing, FAA oversight was grossly underfunded and inadequate, as repeated reports from government inspectors prior to the crashes made clear. This emphasizes the need for a sustainable funding model that accords with the true cost of regulation. Under our proposal, at least some of this cost would be priced in the market as the cost of regulatory services, rather than being entirely dependent on taxation and government budgets.

The converse risk to inadequate government oversight is the risk that governments will come under political pressure to displace private regulators in response to high-profile accidents or crises. Legislators might then encroach on the domain of the private regulator—moving away from specifying and evaluating outcome metrics and principles to dictating more of the details of regulation. If this is anticipated it could undermine confidence in the power of the private regulator and diminish the willingness of targets to cooperate with them.

Finally, although an important benefit of multi-jurisdictional regulators, as we discuss below, is that less-wealthy jurisdictions can free-ride on the regulatory oversight of wealthier ones, a general free-riding problem could result in governments as a whole under-investing in oversight.

4.2. Opportunities: Meeting the Challenges of Globalization and Regulatory Disruption

We have emphasized throughout the core opportunity presented by the use of regulatory markets. This is the fostering of increased investment in regulatory technologies that are as sophisticated and agile as the underlying AI technologies they regulate. Here we address two other key advantages of this regulatory approach: the capacity for regulatory markets to address the challenge of globalization—stemming from the fact that most AI technologies are deployed in ways that easily transcend jurisdictional boundaries—and the fundamental challenge of AI’s potential disruption of almost all regulatory goals.

The expansion of trade with later 20th century globalization and the increasing use of digital platforms (Hadfield 2017) heightened the call for harmonization of regulations across jurisdictions. AI technologies raise the pressure for harmonized standards, as AI is increasingly trained on massive and global data flows. Precisely because AI technologies are general purpose technologies, which can be expected to disrupt almost all sectors of the economy, however, harmonization of regulation across jurisdictions is a pipe dream: the world’s legal jurisdictions are too varied and dynamic, and protective of their sovereignty, to give up rulemaking to supra-national international bodies in everything from health, education and policing to financial markets and advertising standards. What is deemed fair and safe in one jurisdiction will not easily translate around the globe and political convergence is unlikely. Again in the spirit of cautionary tales, a global effort begun in 1992 to settle on harmonized regulations for medical devices failed after twenty years to produce a harmonized regime, a core reason being the inability to coordinate the legislative changes need to implement regulatory proposals (Tominaga 2013).

Regulatory markets offer a more promising mechanism for achieving the underlying goal of harmonization, which is not to require governments to agree on regulations in international bodies but rather to reduce the burden on companies operating at global scale of complying with multiple regulatory regimes. As we envision the model, regulatory markets are global markets. Multiple private regulators, ideally, are licensed by multiple governments, each implementing their own outcome requirements. Consider a global market for the regulation of facial recognition technologies to ensure these technologies operate in similar ways for different demographic groups. Suppose that there are seven private regulators offering this regulatory service. Regulators 1, 2 and 3 use auditing techniques focused on ensuring that the training data used to build a facial recognition system is demographically representative. Regulators 4, 5 and 6 use statistical tests run on audited samples of the facial recognition technology in operation. Regulator 7 employs human review panels—like juries—to adjudicate in qualitative terms whether test cases show fair treatment of different demographic groups. Each country assesses each regulator to determine if the regulator meets the country’s outcome goals—which could be evaluated using quantitative or qualitative methods. Country A could license all 7 regulators to provide regulatory services in its jurisdiction. Country B could license only regulators 1 to 6, lacking confidence in the qualitative approach of regulator 7. Country C could license only regulators 4 to 7, lacking confidence in ex ante data controls to achieve representativeness. All three countries could have different specific demographic goals—and licensed regulators would be required to implement country-specific demographic requirements. But facial recognition technology providers could choose their regulator, based on which jurisdictions they want to access. Provider X could opt for Regulator 1, and design its technology subject only to the training data requirements of Regulator 1—this would give it access to Country A and B. Provider X might need to provide different specific demographic guarantees for its training data in Country A than in Country B. But it wouldn’t have to also aim to satisfy ex post statistical tests or qualitative assessments like those designed by regulators 4 to 7. Meanwhile, Provider Y could opt for Regulator 4, which is licensed in all three countries but which requires Y to satisfy specific statistical tests that could vary from country to country. Provider Z could opt for Regulator 7, foregoing operations in Country B; or it could engage Regulator 6 as well to meet Country B requirements if Country B was lucrative enough and the burden of a different ex post test of its systems was not too great.

In this way, providers achieve the benefits of harmonization—they are subject to only one or a small number of regulatory regimes, while gaining access to multiple jurisdictions. And jurisdictions retain their sovereign authority to decide what their own regulatory goals and requirements will be—choosing the regulators that satisfy them. To be sure, countries will not make their choices about which regulators to license in an unconstrained way. Country B could face pressures to give up some sovereignty *de facto* under lobbying from Provider Z, who wishes to gain access without taking on a second regulator. But B’s decision to align with other countries would come without conceding sovereignty *de jure* – as formal harmonization efforts require.¹⁵ Indeed, if Country B is a less wealthy country, it could profitably choose to free-ride on the oversight efforts of Country A and Country B—again, without giving up sovereign authority to change its regulatory stance under political pressure in the future. And it can benefit from Provider Z’s ability to generate data from its regulation by Provider 7 to allow Country B to determine that its demographic goals are, in fact, met by 7’s qualitative methods.

A global regulatory market provides the added benefit of scale, allowing more regulators to operate and compete with different regulatory technologies and approaches. This generates competitive benefits as more regulators have greater incentives to invest in regulatory innovation to secure market share, with reduced likelihood of monopolization. A global market also generates spillover benefits, as smaller or

less wealthy countries can benefit from the investments made in regulatory innovation by regulators seeking to secure licensing approval in larger or wealthier jurisdictions.

Finally, a core benefit of regulatory markets lies in the promise of better responding to what we have identified as the core AI governance challenge: regulatory disruption. Regulatory markets promise to recruit ground-level ‘intelligence’ to regulatory innovation, and this can help us avoid the trap of focusing only on a handful of politically salient risks (like algorithmic discrimination) or being blinded by existing harms-based regulatory frameworks such as product safety regulation. As emphasized by Hadfield (2017), market mechanisms enable more information embedded in actual practices and experiences to make their way into creative regulatory problem-solving. By creating opportunities for entrepreneurs to build and profit from novel regulatory technologies and approaches, we incentivize those working most closely with AI technologies to transfer what they have learned about how to build these technologies from providers to regulators. Engineers and designers who have worked most closely with building autonomous vehicles, for example, may be best placed to develop the technologies that ensure vehicles meet democratically-established safety and traffic-management goals. Regulatory markets open up another pathway for knowledge to make its way from target to regulator.

This is a vital pathway as AI technologies continue to develop because it will identify the ways in which regulatory goals across the board are disrupted by these technologies. The scientists, lawyers and compliance personnel who work in medical device companies, for example, along with the regulators who currently evaluate medical devices using conventional methods, have a front-row seat to how AI disrupts regulation---in specific contexts, with specific goals. They are perhaps the actors most likely to come up with novel ideas for how to translate regulatory goals into AI-driven contexts—how to demonstrate the achievement of safety and efficacy goals, for example, using simulated data rather than human clinical trials, or how to update the testing required to accommodate the evolution of a device which continues to learn and update its software after it has been put into service. To be sure, regulated entities currently have an incentive to educate their (government) regulators about how AI disrupts the regulatory scheme, and how regulation might adapt. But existing methods of regulatory innovation—as demonstrated by the overwhelming emphasis in the AI governance debate not on regulatory disruption but rather on a list of specific AI harms—clearly are sluggish to respond. Moreover, government regulators are understandably cautious about being lobbied by their regulated entities to change regulatory approaches. A market mechanism opens the field of innovation up to a broader range of participants, beyond regulated entities themselves, and recruits the support of human and financial capital that is more diverse and capable of bearing risk (Hadfield 2017). Finally, a market opportunity to solve a regulatory problem creates an incentive to ‘see’ regulatory disruption even when regulated entities or government regulators may wish to avert their eyes.

5. Conclusion: The Urgency of AI Governance

We began with the speed and scale of AI development, and we will end with speed and scale as well. Regulatory science is not a fast-moving field. The “new governance” approaches we have highlighted have been under discussion for decades; so too has the recognition that regulatory intermediaries play an essential role in complex, modern economies. We offer up the proposal for regulatory markets however not merely as an addition to the literature on regulation. We feel considerable urgency for the regulatory community to recognize the impending and potentially widespread failure of our regulatory models to manage the enormous transformations that AI is producing. This is a core reason we also emphasize the limitations of the harms-based frameworks that are currently informing the efforts to respond to the need

for new regulatory initiatives around AI. We think these approaches are missing the boat. Or, to muddy the metaphor, they may amount to rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. Regulatory theorists appreciate more than most just how subtle, complex, and essential regulation is in the modern world. They avoid the superficial contests in political discourse about regulation as a drag on innovation; they recognize the sense in which there is no such thing as an unregulated market. The urgency of the moment is that AI technologies have the capacity to rewrite the fundamental structure of human societies and economies—and they are doing so in ways today that are galloping past the regulatory frameworks put in place to manage the 20th century world. We think it is time for bold new ideas for regulation, and we think regulatory markets are one such idea. We believe they are a critical tool that governments can, and should, begin to deploy to meet the core governance challenges of AI.

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to numerous audiences and commentators for feedback on this work, an early version of which was presented at ICLR 2019 and NBER Economics of AI 2019, and appeared on arxiv [2001.00078] Regulatory Markets for AI Safety (arxiv.org). Thanks especially to Jan Leike and Deb Raji for early input and the residents at the Bellagio Center in September 2022 for comments and engagement. Hadfield would like to acknowledge financial support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Schwartz Reisman Institute and Chair in Technology and Society. Alex Bernier provided superb feedback and research assistance. Hadfield is a Senior Policy Advisor to OpenAI and Clark is a founder of Anthropic, both of which are artificial intelligence companies.

References

- Abbott KW, Levi-Faur D, Snidal D (2017) Theorizing regulatory intermediaries: The RIT model. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 670(1), 14-35.
- Agrawal A, Gans J, Goldfarb A (2019) Economic policy for artificial intelligence. *Innovation policy and the economy* 19(1), 139-159.
- Ayres I, Braithwaite J (1992) Responsive regulation: Transcending the deregulation debate. Oxford University Press, USA.
- Bansal G, Wu T, Zhou J et al. (2021) Does the whole exceed its parts? the effect of ai explanations on complementary team performance. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1-16.
- Benjamins, S, Dhunoo, P, Meskó B (2020) The state of artificial intelligence-based FDA-approved medical devices and algorithms: an online database. *NPJ digital medicine*, 3(1), 118.
- Black J (2001) Decentring regulation: Understanding the role of regulation and self-regulation in a 'post-regulatory' world. *Current legal problems*, 54(1), 103-146.
- Black J (2008) Constructing and contesting legitimacy and accountability in polycentric regulatory regimes. *Regulation & Governance*, 2(2), 137-164.
- Black J, Murray AD (2019) Regulating AI and machine learning: setting the regulatory agenda. *European Journal of Law and Technology*, 10(3).
- Braithwaite J (1981) Enforced self-regulation: A new strategy for corporate crime control. *Michigan Law Review*, 1981-1982:1466–1507.

- Braithwaite J, Drahos P (2000) *Global Business Regulation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Buolamwini J, Gebru T (2018) Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In: *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency* (pp. 77-91). PMLR.
- Büthe T, Mattli W (2011) *The New Global Rulers: The Privatization of Regulation in the World Economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Brynjolfsson E, Rock D, Syverson C (2018) Artificial intelligence and the modern productivity paradox: A clash of expectations and statistics. In: *The economics of artificial intelligence: An agenda* (pp. 23-57). University of Chicago Press.
- Carrigan C, Coglianese C (2011) The politics of regulation: From new institutionalism to new governance. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 14:107–129.
- Cockburn IM, Henderson R, Stern S (2018) The impact of artificial intelligence on innovation: An exploratory analysis. In *The economics of artificial intelligence: An agenda* (pp. 115-146). University of Chicago Press.
- Coglianese, C, Nash J, Olmstead T (2003) Performance-based regulation: Prospects and limitations in health, safety, and environmental protection. *Admin. L. Rev.*, 55, 705.
- Dal Bó E (2006) Regulatory capture: A review. *Oxford review of economic policy* 22(2) 203-225.
- Dwork C & Roth A (2014) The algorithmic foundations of differential privacy. *Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science*, 9(3–4), 211-407.
- European Union Aviation Safety Agency (2020) *Artificial Intelligence Roadmap: A Human-Centric Approach to AI In Aviation*.
- Firlej M, Taeihagh A (2021) Regulating human control over autonomous systems. *Regulation & Governance*, 15(4), 1071-1091.
- Galaz V, Centeno MA, Callahan PW et al. (2021) Artificial intelligence, systemic risks, and sustainability. *Technology in Society*, 67, 101741.
- Ganguli D, Hernandez D, Lovitt L et al. (2022) Predictability and surprise in large generative models. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 1747-1764).
- Gaube S, Suresh H, Raue M et al. (2021) Do as AI say: susceptibility in deployment of clinical decision-aids. *NPJ digital medicine*, 4(1), 31.
- Gerke S, Babic B, Evgeniou T, Cohen IG (2020) The need for a system view to regulate artificial intelligence/machine learning-based software as a medical device. *NPJ digital medicine*. 3(1), 53.
- Gilad S (2010) It runs in the family: Meta-regulation and its siblings. *Regulation & Governance*. 4(4), 485-506.
- Gilad S (2011) 31 Process-oriented regulation: conceptualization and assessment. In: *Handbook on the politics of regulation*, 423.

- Goodfellow I, Pouget-Abadie J, Mirza M et al. (2020) Generative adversarial networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(11), 139-144.
- Google 2019. Perspectives on Issues in AI Governance.
- Guihot M, Matthew, AF, Suzor NP (2017) Nudging robots: Innovative solutions to regulate artificial intelligence. *Vand. J. Ent. & Tech. L.*, 20, 385.
- Gulshan V, Peng L, Coram M et al. (2016) Development and validation of a deep learning algorithm for detection of diabetic retinopathy in retinal fundus photographs. *Jama*, 316(22), 2402-2410.
- Gutierrez CI, Marchant GE (2021) A Global Perspective of Soft Law Programs for the Governance of Artificial Intelligence. Report. Center for Law, Science and Innovation at the Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law at Arizona State University
- Hadfield GK (2017) Rules for a flat world: Why humans invented law and how to reinvent it for a complex global economy. Oxford University Press.
- He T, Zhang Z, Zhang H, Zhang Z et al. (2019) Bag of tricks for image classification with convolutional neural networks. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition* (pp. 558-567).
- Heawood J (2018) Pseudo-public political speech: Democratic implications of the Cambridge Analytica scandal. *Information polity*, 23(4), 429-434.
- Herkert J, Borenstein J, Miller K (2020) The Boeing 737 MAX: Lessons for engineering ethics. *Science and engineering ethics*, 26, 2957-2974.
- Henley R (2021) Dutch Government Faces Collapse over Child Benefits Scandal, The Guardian.
- Hussain W, Moriarty J (2018) Accountable to whom? Rethinking the role of corporations in political CSR. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 149, 519-534.
- Jobin A, Ienca M, Vayena E (2019) The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389-399.
- Kaminski ME (2023) Regulating the Risks of AI. Forthcoming, *Boston University Law Review*, 103.
- Levy RE (2021) Social media, news consumption, and polarization: Evidence from a field experiment. *American economic review*, 111(3), 831-870.
- Linkov I, Trump BD, Anklam E et al. (2018) Comparative, collaborative, and integrative risk governance for emerging technologies. *Environment Systems and Decisions*, 38, 170-176.
- Marchant GE (2011) Addressing the pacing problem. In: *The growing gap between emerging technologies and legal-ethical oversight: The pacing problem*, 199-205.
- Mattli W, Woods N (Eds.) (2009) *The politics of global regulation*. Princeton University Press.

- Mannes, A. (2020). Governance, risk, and artificial intelligence. *Ai Magazine*, 41(1), 61-69
- May PJ (2011). 27 Performance-based regulation. *Handbook on the Politics of Regulation*, 373.
- Micheler E, Whaley A (2020). Regulatory technology: Replacing law with computer code. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 21, 349-377.
- Mulligan DK, Kroll JA Kohli N et al. (2019) This thing called fairness: Disciplinary confusion realizing a value in technology. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 3(CSCW), 1-36.
- Narayanan A, Shmatikov V (2006) How to break anonymity of the Netflix prize dataset. arXiv preprint cs/0610105.
- National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) (2019) U.S. Leadership in A.I.: A Plan for Federal Engagement in Developing Technical Standards and Related Tools.
- National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) (2022) Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (second draft, 2022).
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) (2017). Automated Driving Systems: A Vision for Safety 2.0.
- Nilsson NJ (2009) The quest for artificial intelligence. Cambridge University Press.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). Scoping the OECD AI principles: Deliberations of the Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence at the OECD (AIGO), OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Parker, C (2002). The open corporation: Effective self-regulation and democracy. Cambridge University Press.
- Partnoy F (2017) What's (still) wrong with credit ratings. *Wash. L. Rev.* 92, 1407.
- Passi S, Vorvoreanu M (2022). Overreliance on AI: Literature review. Microsoft AI Ethics and Effects in Engineering Research.
- Poursabzi-Sangdeh F, Goldstein DG, Hofman JM, Wortman Vaughan JW, Wallach H (2021). Manipulating and measuring model interpretability. In Proceedings of the 2021 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems (pp. 1-52).
- Prummer A (2020) Micro-targeting and polarization. *Journal of Public Economics*. 188, 104210.
- Ranchordas S (2022) Empathy in the digital administrative state. *Duke Law Journal*. 71(6), 1341-1390.
- Russell S, Norvig P (2021) *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*, 4th US ed. University of California, Berkeley.

Schaffer J, O'Donovan J, Michaelis J et al. (2019, March). I can do better than your AI: expertise and explanations. *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces* (pp. 240-251).

Scherer MU (2015) Regulating artificial intelligence systems: Risks, challenges, competencies, and strategies. *Harv. JL & Tech.* 29 353.

Silver D, Huang A, Maddison C. et al (2016) Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature.* 529, 484–489

Smuha NA (2021) From a ‘race to AI ’to a ‘race to AI regulation’: regulatory competition for artificial intelligence. *Law, Innovation and Technology* 13(1) 57-84.

Stanford University Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence. Artificial Intelligence Index Report 2022.

Stemler A (2016) Regulation 2.0: The marriage of new governance and lex informatica. *Vand. J. Ent. & Tech. L.*, 19, 87.

Sweeney L (2013) Discrimination in online ad delivery. *Communications of the ACM*, 56(5), 44-54.

Tominaga T (2013) The ICH, the GHTF, and the future of harmonization initiatives. *Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science* 47 572-580.

Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat (2022). Algorithmic Impact Assessment.

United Kingdom Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport, Office for Artificial Intelligence (2022) Press Release: New UK initiative to shape global standards for Artificial Intelligence.

United Nations General Assembly. Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions A/HRC/23/47 (2013).

United States Department of Transport. (2018). Preparing for the Future of Transportation: Automated Vehicles 3.0 (AV 3.0).

United States Office of Science and Technology Policy. (2022) Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights.

United States Office of Management and Budget. Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies: Guidance for Regulation of Artificial Intelligence Applications (2020).

Veale M, Zuiderveen Borgesius F (2021) Demystifying the Draft EU Artificial Intelligence Act—Analysing the good, the bad, and the unclear elements of the proposed approach. *Computer Law Review International*, 22(4), 97-112.

Viceconti M, Pappalardo F, Rodriguez B et al. (2021) In silico trials: Verification, validation and uncertainty quantification of predictive models used in the regulatory evaluation of biomedical products. *Methods*, 185, 120-127.

Wallace DR & Fujii RU. (1989). Software verification and validation: an overview. *IEEE Software*, 6(3), 10-17.

Waterson J & Milmo D. Facebook whistleblower Frances Haugen calls for urgent external regulation. *The Guardian* 2021.

Wei J, Tay Y, Bommasani R, Raffel C et al. (2022) Emergent abilities of large language models. arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682.

Whittaker M, Crawford K, Dobbe R, et al. (2018) *AI Now Report 2018* (pp. 1-62). New York: AI Now Institute at New York University.

World Economic Forum (2016) *Global Agenda Council on the Future of Software and Society: A Call for Agile Governance Principles*.

World Economic Forum (2018) *Agile Governance: Reimagining Policy-Making in the Fourth Industrial Revolution*.

World Economic Forum (2019) *Global Technology Governance: A Multistakeholder Approach*.

World Economic Forum (2020) *Agile Regulation for the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A Toolkit for Regulators*.

Yadlin-Segal A, Oppenheim Y (2021) Whose dystopia is it anyway? Deepfakes and social media regulation. *Convergence*, 27(1), 36-51.

Yates J, Murphy CN (2019) *Engineering rules: Global standard setting since 1880*. JHU Press.

Laws Cited

C.27, Parliament, 44th Parliament, 1st Session (An Act to enact the Consumer Privacy Protection Act, the Personal Information and Data Protection Tribunal Act and the Artificial Intelligence and Data Act and to make consequential and related amendments to other Acts, 2022).

Council Regulation No. 2022/2065, OJ L 277 27.10. (on a Single Market For Digital Services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act)).

(Council Regulation No. 2016/679, 2016 OJ L 119, 4.5.(on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC)).

Directive on Automated Decision-Making, Government of Canada, 2019.

H.R. 6580, 117th Cong. (2022) “Algorithmic Accountability Act.”

Presidential Executive Order 13859 “Maintaining American Leadership in Artificial Intelligence” *Federal Register* Vol. 84, No. 31(2019).

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on contestable and fair markets in the digital sector (Digital Markets Act) COM/2020/842 final.

Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and amending certain Union legislative acts COM/2021/206 final.

¹ https://csis-website-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/211007_Kennedy_Chinese_State_Capitalism.pdf?34C5XDb775Ws8W6TZ6oMGPIWhIY8Z.rf

² GDPR Art. 13.2(f), Art. 14(2)(g), Art 15(1)(h).

³ GDPR Art. 22 (3).

⁴ GDPR Art. 22 (4).

⁵ Products that are otherwise regulated by the E.U. such as machinery and medical devices must also obtain third-party conformity assessments if required by the relevant product-specific legislation.

⁶ Although as of 2023, only 4 agencies had conducted a total of 5 such assessments [Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat 2023].

⁷ Directive on Automated Decision-Making, Government of Canada, 2019.

⁸ United States Office of Science and Technology Policy 2022.

⁹ H.R. 6580, 117th Cong. (2022) “Algorithmic Accountability Act.”

¹⁰ As ISO puts it on their website: “One of the strengths of ISO standards is that they are created by the people that need them. Industry experts drive all aspects of the standard development process, from deciding whether a new standard is needed to defining all the technical content.” <https://www.iso.org/get-involved.html>

¹¹ For purposes of preparing this paper, for example, we purchased the 14 AI standards that had been produced by ISO as of summer 2022, at a cost of approximately \$2,500. A condition of the license purchased is that they are not copied or shared with anyone.

¹² Henley R, Dutch Government Faces Collapse over Child Benefits Scandal, The Guardian, 2021: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jan/15/dutch-government-resigns-over-child-benefits-scandal>.

¹³ <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41746-020-00324-0>.

¹⁴ Waterson J & Milmo D. Facebook whistleblower Frances Haugen calls for urgent external regulation. The Guardian 2021: <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2021/oct/25/facebook-whistleblower-frances-haugen-calls-for-urgent-external-regulation>.

¹⁵ <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2018/12/21/brexit-make-hard-choices-but-dont-confuse-sovereignty-with-autonomy/>.