

Governance of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Companies

Johannes Schneider¹, Rene Abraham¹ and Christian Meske²

¹ University of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Liechtenstein

² Ruhr-University Bochum, Bochum, Germany

{johannes.schneider@uni.li; rene.abraham@uni.li; christian.meske@rub.de}

Abstract

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), specifically large language models like ChatGPT, has swiftly entered organizations without adequate governance, posing both opportunities and risks. Despite extensive debates on GenAI's transformative nature and regulatory measures, limited research addresses organizational governance, encompassing technical and business perspectives. This review paper fills this gap by surveying recent works. It goes beyond mere summarization by developing a framework for GenAI governance within companies. Our framework outlines the scope, objectives, and governance mechanisms tailored to harness business opportunities and mitigate risks associated with GenAI integration. This research contributes a focused approach to GenAI governance, offering practical insights for companies navigating the challenges of responsible AI adoption. It is also valuable for a technical audience to broaden their perspective as increasingly ethical and business concerns gain in prevalence and allow them to identify novel research directions.

1 Introduction

GenAI has the potential to disrupt industries: “Business leaders should view it as a general-purpose technology akin to electricity, the steam engine, and the internet” [Andrew McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2023]. To illustrate its disruptive, far-reaching nature: The majority of U.S. workers have at least 10% of their tasks exposed to generative AI, and about 20% of workers have more than half of their tasks exposed [Andrew McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2023]. GenAI can generate business value through diverse means ranging from improving content quality and employee expertise to supporting customer acquisition and retention [Dencik et al., 2023]. Early studies have indicated improved productivity when using GenAI between 14% and 37% [Brynjolfsson et al., 2023; Noy & Zhang, 2023]. But not every company or individual might benefit the same way, i.e., productivity gains might not be uniformly distributed among users, e.g., poorly performing customer service agents’ (ticket) resolutions rose by 35%,

while the performance of the best 20% of all agents did not improve due to GenAI [Andrew McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2023]. Thus, GenAI comes with intricacies that require careful thought and governance. In this work, we focus on GenAI which is based on foundation models [Bommasani et al., 2021; Schneider et al., 2024] and, in contrast to discriminative AI, can generate artifacts, such as images and text based on user instructions via prompts. From the perspective of a company seeking adoption, GenAI is a highly attractive instrument for several reasons. For instance, with GenAI, a **broad range of applications can be performed by a single system**. Before the rise of GenAI, discriminative AI was used narrowly with separate models for each specific application, e.g., translation, image recognition. Furthermore, **access and usage of GenAI is simple and often free** using a web-browser, e.g., using ChatGPT. Interacting with GenAI based on natural language poses relatively little barriers for ordinary users (Schneider et al., 2024). As such, an even growing number of employees can benefit from the use of generative AI.

Traditionally, companies could either use off-the-shelf AI solutions or engage in developing them. On the one hand, with GenAI it has become much more difficult to develop novel (foundation) models from scratch, especially due to large data, computation, and technical expertise needed leading to an increased **dependence on a few model suppliers** [Schneider et al., 2024]. On the other hand, it has enhanced the possibilities to **customize GenAI using no, little, or a lot of (task-specific) data, without coding and without owning infrastructure** through natural language instructions and cloud services [Brown et al., 2020; Schneider et al., 2024]. That is, GenAI blurs the boundaries of software developers and end users. Due to its flexibility, not all functionalities must be programmed by computer scientists but rather many novel applications work out-of-the-box (zero-shot prompting) given adequate prompting skills.

Thus, at the outset, leveraging generative AI seems all too easy for organizations: simply let employees figure it out on their own and let them use freely available online GenAI tools like ChatGPT, Bard, Dall-E, etc. However, more than 60% out of 2000 surveyed organizations are considering a permanent ban on OpenAI’s ChatGPT [Yu, 2023] showing that leveraging generative AI goes much beyond simply standing by.




Figure 1: GenAI governance framework

First, generative AI comes with a set of risks that should be mitigated such as legal requirements and uncertainties, reputation risks, IP leakage, and loss of productivity and quality (if used for the wrong tasks in the wrong way). AI technologies are in general “dual use”, i.e. they “could be used for either good or bad purposes” [Koplin, 2023]. Even large tech companies specializing in GenAI struggle to prevent potential misuse of AI [OpenAI, 2023a]. Second, leveraging the full potential of generative AI requires not just a bottom-up approach, where employees can actively engage and support identifying ways for companies to benefit from GenAI, but also top-down approaches, where companies help employees in this endeavor and provide good framework conditions. Also, naïve approaches like simply deploying an off-the-shelf chatbot might not lead to sustainable competitive advantages. Hence, proper governance is needed, so we argue. Prior work has focused on the governance of GenAI from the perspective of policymakers [NATO, 2021; Sigfrids et al., 2023] or on specific aspects such as trust [Newman, 2023] and risk [NIST, 2023]. AI governance before GenAI has targeted organizations [Schneider et al., 2022, Birkstedt et al., 2023], but there is a lack of work that aims at governance of GenAI for companies taking into account its unique and novel characteristics.

This paper improves the structure of a pre-GenAI governance framework [Schneider et al., 2022]. It discusses mostly specifics of GenAI as in the last few years awareness and basic understanding of AI have become more prevalent.

2 Framework

We first describe the scope of interest for governance, followed by mechanisms to reach desired targets. On a very high level, our framework is similar to the AI risk management framework by [NIST, 2023] which discusses mapping (scope), managing (mechanism), and measuring (targets) but focuses primarily on risks rather than other company-relevant aspects such as alignment with business objectives and value delivery.

GenAI governance has five key scopes described in the following subsections: data, model, system, people, and organizational. They are summarized and illustrated in Figure 1 including preconditions (antecedents) and consequences.

In contrast to prior work [Schneider et al., 2022], we include people because GenAI risks are difficult to manage from a primary technological focus and GenAI provides opportunities tailored to human-AI collaboration. Focusing on people has also been a key aspect of practitioners’ and academics’ works [Scott Likens and Nicole Wakefield, 2023; Sigfrids et al., 2023] and the EU AI Act [EU, 2023] demanding human oversight.

2.1 Antecedents

Antecedents are factors influencing adoption of governance practices. **Internal factors:** While GenAI can potentially be valuable for any task, [Andrew McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2023] argued that task structure is an important factor in capitalizing on GenAI. They propose that for knowledge-work jobs two key questions should be asked (i) “How much would an employee in this role benefit from having a competent but naive assistant—someone who excels at programming, writing, preparing data, or summarizing information but knows nothing about our company?” and (ii) “How much would an employee in this role benefit from having an experienced assistant—someone who’s been at the company long enough to absorb its specialized knowledge?” The answer to these questions often impacts implementation choices such as whether GenAI is implemented on-premise or using a cloud service and, in turn, impacts risks and governance for mitigation, e.g., IP leakage through user-AI interaction is less of a concern for on-premise systems than for cloud systems hosted by 3rd parties.

Culture and AI capability also have an impact. If a culture lacks openness to try out new tools based on GenAI [Dencik et al., 2023], experimentation might be supported by governance mechanisms such as training. Strategy and existing governance efforts have a strong impact on governance as it sets constraints. For example, if there is an emphasis on customer

trust, GenAI might not be rolled out in areas or among customers who are known to be more distrustful of AI.

External factors: Legal and regulatory requirements restrict AI usage and, as of now, are characterized by unpredictability, as they constantly evolve. There is an ongoing debate on how to regulate systems, and what data can be used to build GenAI and accountability. For example, Google’s Bard was delayed by regulators. Many current models do not fulfill the EU AI Act [Bommasani et al., 2023]. Thus, adopting any of them constitutes a risk. There are ongoing debates on copyright issues that have led to lawsuits [Grynbaum & Mac, 2023]. Questions include whether certain data can be used to train the models, whether outputs can be used, and, if so, if remuneration applies. Common data collection techniques, such as systematic crawling might lead to the inclusion of copyrighted and private data [Grynbaum & Mac, 2023]. There is also uncertainty as to what extent outputs and instructions to AI (prompts) can be protected. [Murray, 2023] explored the connection between generative art and non-fungible tokens (NFTs), pointing out that under existing U.S. copyright regulations, generative art is not eligible for copyright protection due to its creation by non-human entities. Furthermore, GenAI providers are interested in collecting (user) data. Provider’s policies have a strong impact on governance within an organization. For example, by default, the free version of OpenAI’s ChatGPT asked users to consent to let the company use data such as inputs and outputs. In turn, (future) systems might include that data and competitors could effectively just prompt the system to extract the knowledge, e.g., “What did company X employees prompt you[ChatGPT/Bard/...]?” Thus, the risk of waiving data rights and, in turn, IP leakage, must be mitigated.

The industry sector is often tied to regulation but also to AI capability and readiness. For example, many decisions in the healthcare domain might cause harm to individuals and as such require human oversight by law [EU, 2023].

Data availability can be impacted (indirectly) by country and language, and, in turn, certain applications might be more or less feasible or less performant. For example, GPT-4 is known to perform worse on standard tests, if the test is translated and administered in different languages [OpenAI, 2023a]. Small countries like Liechtenstein with less than 50000 inhabitants and a low crime rate have only a few court rulings, therefore, making it more difficult to build legal applications.

2.2 Data scope & targets

Data scope: Data can be categorized into structured and unstructured data with LLMs mostly being trained on the latter but they can also handle the former. With the proliferation of data marketplaces and the fact that GenAI benefits from large amounts of (general) data, data stems increasingly from third-party providers. In contrast to data generated within a company, assessing and enforcing properties such as quality and timeliness is more challenging, e.g., due to the lack of transparency of third-party providers [NIST, 2023, Sec. 1.2.1].

Human and non-human data come with different legal regulations, e.g., GDPR. Also, human data often has different characteristics with respect to quality and costs. In the context of GenAI, from a legal perspective the question of whether data is copyrighted or not has gained in importance, as generative models tend to replicate data, in particular, if samples have (near) duplicates in the training data [Carlini et al., 2022]. Furthermore, current state-of-the-art models such as GPT-4 are multi-modal, e.g., they can benefit from being trained on text and image data. Even for unimodal data there exist different dimensions and types, e.g., for text, one can distinguish between dialogue, narrative and expository texts, and source code. The type can strongly impact the model, e.g., training on source code is attributed to better reasoning skills [Madaan et al., 2022]. However, an in-depth understanding is still subject to research.

Data might serve different purposes. In traditional AI, training data usually is supposed to ensure high performance of a model. For GenAI ethical behavior and human-AI alignment [Ouyang et al., 2022] are also relevant. Commonly “ethical behavior” is achieved through fine-tuning an existing model on human-collected data, which expresses what is ethical and what is not through (labeled) samples.

Data can also be split into labeled and unlabeled data. For GenAI labeled data is often used to fine-tune foundation models for specific tasks or for human-AI alignment. With GenAI, another type of data has increased in importance known before mostly in reinforcement learning [Schaal, 1996]: (Stepwise) demonstrations or “solution guides”. The chain-of-thought paradigm has yielded significant performance gains on standard benchmarks: A model is asked to “Think step-by-step” [Kojima et al., 2022] or is given input-output samples with a demonstration on how to derive the output from the input.

Data quality including timeliness, errors, and noise (e.g., an entity is accurately described by non-outdated data) is a common concern and difficult to manage as witnessed by OpenAI’s ChatGPT, which lacks data from the last couple of months. Data exhibits a certain distribution that determines its suitability as a source for learning to solve a task. Relevant properties of the data distribution are, for example, balance (e.g., representing entities of interest by a similar number of samples), and completeness (e.g., all entities of interest are present). Completeness can also refer to single samples, e.g. the description of an entity containing all relevant attributes. Finally, as language, and data (distribution) in general, can evolve, being in a static or dynamic environment strongly impacts governance.

Data Targets: Data quantity and quality are important goals that cover various aspects such as correctness. With GenAI aspects like avoidance of near duplicates (to reduce memorization), ensuring truthfulness of data, and filtering non-ethical data have been on the rise. Also, the temporality of data and data drift plays a role, as data becomes outdated quickly, while at the same time integration of large amounts of new

data is non-trivial. A common target is the alignment of training data distribution and “test” data distribution, i.e., data used while operating the system. For example, if some entities (such as specific ethnicities) are underrepresented (non-balanced data) the model might be biased. If the training data of a large language model (LLM) lacks expression in “Slang” but users input text in “slang”, it might not handle it correctly. While the value of data is generally difficult to assess, it is tied to data properties such as representativeness and accuracy, as well as economic properties such as cost of collection and the revenue generated by model-driven services. As foundation models are trained on large amounts of (partially) publicly available data, task-specific data is of higher value than non-task-specific, public data. The latter is primarily of value for companies aiming to train their own foundation models. Furthermore, as data sources become larger and more diverse and regulations increase, questions regarding data lineage and meta-data are important, e.g., users giving consent for using their data, and having control over their data [Newman, 2023]. Data security covers, aside from standard security mechanisms from the pre-AI area, also aspects that are closely interconnected with the model, e.g., training data might be extracted from models with fairly simple approaches [Nasr et al., 2023].

2.3 Model scope & targets

Model scope: In contrast to classical AI that encompasses simple, transparent machine learning models addressing one task, GenAI models are almost exclusively large, complex deep learning models typically called foundation models [Bommasani et al., 2021]. Technically, GenAI model architectures originate from a few standard architectures [Banh & Strobel, 2023] and, most prevalently, transformers [Vaswani et al., 2017]. As such the emphasis on designing model architectures has decreased though training these models is extremely costly due to computational demands and the need for large amounts of data, forcing most companies to rely on pre-trained models that are further adjusted to specific needs rather than training them from scratch [Schneider et al., 2024]. Classically, one can distinguish between online learning and offline learning, which refers to whether model updates, i.e. parameter changes, occur continuously from observed data or from time to time. This boundary has blurred. LLMs can maintain the context of a conversation and information specific to an individual. That is, GenAI allows taking into account information on prior interactions and user preferences (e.g., through system prompts) enabling personalization. Especially, GenAI saw a novel paradigm called “in-context” learning that does not alter the model, but rather the model benefits from in-/output samples that help the model understand how the output should be [Brown et al., 2020]. Prior to GenAI most successful industrial applications relied on models trained from un-/supervised training. GenAI has seen the rise of self-supervised learning which is a form of supervised learning, where labels are generated based on auxiliary tasks, e.g., taking the next word as a label in a text is commonly used to train LLMs. Furthermore, reinforcement learning is commonly used as a fine-tuning step of models

[Ouyang et al., 2022]. Generally, the training process of models has become more intricate involving potentially self-supervised learning on very large amounts of data, followed by instruction fine-tuning, human-AI alignment, and supervised task-specific fine-tuning on smaller data. While these phases all change the model, i.e., its parameters, GenAI can also be adjusted to tasks through altering inputs, i.e., prompting. Models with access to company-specific data must be secured like the raw data. Knowledge has been extracted from commercial models to fine-tune other models: In the case of the Alpaca model querying ChatGPT for less than 600\$ was sufficient to extract data to train the model to perform better than the original on some human evaluations [Ben Wodecki, 2024].

Foundation models are also characterized by emergent properties that have arisen simply due to an increase in model size, data, and compute [Brown et al., 2020]. The capabilities of models are difficult to assess as well as their usages and harms they might cause in specific contexts [NIST, 2023, Sec 1.2.1]. Furthermore, input data can stem from dynamic environments that evolve over time (data & concept drift). This leads to emergent issues that are hard to foresee.

Hosting and development can be done internally or externally, e.g., in the cloud. Some (customized) models like OpenAI’s ChatGPT can only be hosted and developed in the cloud.

Models outputs can be wrong due to the statement of fabricated, untrue facts (hallucination) as well as due to different kinds of reasoning errors [Bang et al., 2023]. Furthermore, uncertainty in responses is difficult to anticipate as LLMs tend to communicate “Fluent but non-factual”.

Model Targets: Correctness: Hallucination and reasoning shortcomings are innate problems of LLMs that to this date can only be partially mitigated, e.g., by using RAG that aims at constraining models to rely on a small set of facts and thereby reduce the risk of fabrication of facts and facilitate checking of model outputs by humans [Lewis et al., 2020]. Being able to understand and assess outputs constitutes an important aspect of model explainability (XAI), which is another important target. Models can produce and report outputs in a “step-by-step” manner, which can serve as explanation. Despite tremendous effort to address explainability in the context of discriminative models producing decisions, the problem is still not solved for GenAI [Longo et al., 2023], though many techniques for discriminative models also apply to generative models, such as visualizing attention distributions. As GenAI increasingly makes end users into developers due to the ease of providing instructions, the demand for




Figure 2: Common architecture with LLMs

XAI also increases. For GenAI [Sun et al., 2022] in the context of code generation a number of XAI needs arose from a user study specifically for GenAI, i.e., system requirements and impact to anticipate suitable conditions for use and limitations of the model’s capabilities. The paper also discusses adaptations of prior and novel XAI features. For example, users were interested in understanding alternate outputs and saw explanations as a process that could be either human or AI-initiated. Also, users were interested in obtaining information on model uncertainty and requested features on how to resolve such uncertainty.

Furthermore, in some domains with human-AI interaction such as healthcare empathy has emerged as a model property. Empathy is the ability to understand the personal experiences and emotions of another, without extensive bonding [Oniani et al., 2023]. In the healthcare domain, [Ayers et al., 2023] compared ChatGPT’s responses and those of physicians, showing that ChatGPT was preferred by patients in $\frac{3}{4}$ of all cases in terms of quality and empathy.

Compliance with regulation: Regulatory compliance requires, for example, extensive documentation for high-risk AI and human oversight [Hupont et al., 2023]. Model efficiency, i.e., how much computation is needed to obtain output is also a highly relevant factor and target to minimize. Better efficiency contributes to common sustainability goals, e.g., lower energy consumption, but also implies lower computational demands, i.e., lower costs and potentially faster response times. LLMs are not robust. They suffer from prompt sensitivity, meaning that small changes in the prompts can lead to large changes in the outputs [Lu et al., 2021].

GenAI produces artifacts rather than decisions. In turn, novel metrics are needed that are more focused on individual outputs rather than on the model, e.g., if AI generates a story or a piece of code, metrics for these instances are more interesting than for the model in general [Sun et al., 2022]. Common evaluation of models is challenging, common metrics such as BLEU and ROUGE score for LLMs are useful but inaccurate performance measures [Celikyilmaz et al., 2020].

Model life-cycle is an important target, covering aspects such as model monitoring and (fast) updates (due to user feedback or uncovered ethical or security concerns) and efficient and comprehensive evaluation. Monitoring of models must include emergent issues.

Ethics & Law: Models can be misused, produce harmful or inappropriate content, foster the digital divide, produce violent, offensive, or sexual content, or lead to bias with respect to gender, cultures, and minorities [Fui-Hoon Nah et al., 2023]. Avoiding these issues is a high-stakes goal.

Safety & Security is another target: A safe system refrains from causing danger, risk, or injury. LLM restrictions (to avoid harmful, illegal, unethical content) can be circumvented using prompts [Gupta et al., 2023]. Furthermore, LLMs can be used for social engineering attacks (psychological manipulation of people to nudge them into performing actions desired by the attacker), phishing attacks (posing as trustworthy entities to obtain sensitive information), engage or support hacking and ransomware (e.g., through automated code generation) [Gupta et al., 2023].

2.4 System scope & targets

System scope: Systems involving GenAI can exhibit a complex architecture involving numerous interacting applications and data sources. Figure 2 illustrates a common system architecture centered around an orchestration application. When answering questions expressed in prompts the orchestrator might obtain data by providing the LLM with different pieces of information relevant to the prompt from an external data source, e.g., from a database or the internet [Lewis et al., 2020]. GenAI systems can leverage other tools, e.g., translate a natural language question into code, leverage a conventional code interpreter to run the code, and package the result of the code interpreter in a human-understandable text presented to a human [Andrew McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2023]. GenAI models can serve as a facilitator for interaction, e.g., translating user inputs in natural language into formatted API calls as demonstrated by OpenAI’s plugins.

However, GenAI systems also have the potential due to their unprecedented often super-human performance [OpenAI, 2023a] to act more autonomously and to conduct more tasks. The degree of autonomy impacts governance needs, e.g., more autonomous systems need more careful monitoring.

System targets are entangled and overlapping with model targets. For example, model security can be partially ensured with the help of system security, e.g., login mechanisms can help to link various misuse attacks and ban users. Systems should be accessible by a large group of people rather than just computer scientists through accessible interfaces and low and no-code tools [Solaiman, 2023].

Accountability [Oniani et al., 2023] requires tracing activities on a system to individuals who may then be held accountable for their deeds [Oldehoeft, 1992]. Accountability is an overarching concept going beyond systems [Horneber & Laumer, 2023; NATO, 2021] including also developers and potentially even ordinary users acting as data providers. Traceability is tracking and documenting data, processes, and artifacts related to a system or model for transparent development [Mora-Cantallops & others, 2021]. Transparency can also be a target, e.g., for compliance reasons, to foster trust among users.

Safety & Security: Resilience is an important concern, which includes withstanding unexpected adverse events and degrading safety. Mechanisms to disable AI while ensuring that a system remains operational as a means of risk mitigation discussed, e.g., for healthcare [Nicholson Price II, 2022]. Rate limits, e.g., restricting the number of queries per time, can be one measure to (i) counteract knowledge extraction at scale. Knowledge could be, for example, company internal knowledge for an on-premise LLM or (synthetic) training data, e.g., a competitor might gather responses from an LLM to fine-tune her own LLM. This might be cheaper than collecting data oneself.

2.5 People scope & targets

People scope covers individuals, groups/communities, and societies [NIST, 2023]. People encompass stakeholders with a primary focus on persons engaged in planning, developing,

and using the system such as data, machine learning and software engineers, project managers, people observing the system after deployment, and end-users.

End-users and system adopters often customize through prompt engineering. The goal of prompt engineering can be to solve a single task, create input patterns or samples to leverage in-context learning, or come up with system instructions that allow tailoring a model for a specific task or audience. For example, by instructing a model to “Translate every input to German. If it is in German translate it to English.” one has effectively built a translation service where any user input will be translated. While interaction with GenAI is simple, prompt engineering, especially for pattern creation and system prompts is non-trivial and a skill requiring mastery. Security & Safety violations: Employees and users might also use GenAI successfully in unethical ways. The reasons could be due to GenAI’s failure to classify and filter the unethical request or because the notion of ethics “of the model” differs from that of the company. For example, while commercial systems such as OpenAI’s ChatGPT have relatively strict ethical guidelines, open-source models may have fewer constraints making it easy to obtain harmful and unethical content as demonstrated by GPT4chan. Furthermore, individuals responsible for assessing and evaluating AI outputs might not be aware of or able to assess their ethical and factual correctness. ChatGPT-generated responses tend to fit incorrect assumptions of a user instead of clarifying the user’s intent, which makes assessment of responses even more difficult [Tan et al., 2023].

Intellectual property(IP) risk: Employees can leak intellectual property by using third-party GenAI. The employees at Samsung used ChatGPT to generate or debug code, unintentionally entering confidential information into the AI model. As a result, such confidential information might have become part of ChatGPT, potentially making it publicly accessible through simple prompts, and thereby raising significant privacy and IP concerns. A company needs to enforce a policy prohibiting employee use of ChatGPT and other LLMs if (input) data is gathered, as this can lead to information leaks [Techradar, 2023].

People targets: Technical and practical ethics training should be implemented not only at the organization but already at early-stage education [Solaiman, 2023]. Effective use: Furthermore, other aspects such as the industry and regulation play a role in adoption, e.g., it can be faster to not use an LLM if the output of the LLM needs careful checking and contains many fabrications [Andrew McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2023]. ChatGPT itself points out “over-reliance” neglecting critical thinking and creativity as a risk of its usage – at least in the education context [Iskender, 2023].

While interacting with LLMs is simple, there are several ways that can lead to better outcomes, e.g., [White et al., 2023] proposed a catalog of prompting for LLMs.

People need skills to assess GenAI outputs for their ethical alignment with corporate values and correctness. At the same time, they must also be conscious of possible IP risks due to the use of GenAI tools.

2.6 Organizational scope & targets

We distinguish between intra- and inter-organizational scope. Governance within an organization (intra-organizational) is more challenging compared to the pre-GenAI era. GenAI has broader applications and issues, necessitating more extensive governance efforts including technical, domain, business, and legal experts. Access to GenAI is easy for employees and also tempting (even if forbidden) as it can facilitate their work. Furthermore, governance must extend beyond just technical artifacts (such as data, systems, and models) but requires more inclusion of internal stakeholders. It can also not be just task-specific anymore but may necessitate comprehension of content, timing, and context for an instance. For example, using ChatGPT to improve the writing of a marketing text for a product might be fine, but not so for a patent application, as the latter can constitute IP leakage. Even worse, the usage for improving a marketing text might be fine after a public product announcement but company policy may prohibit prior disclosure.

Inter-organizational governance includes an additional actor: Foundation model providers are now integral to the AI supply chain. Even these providers struggle to evaluate issues from ethics to, security, and safety to performance on novel applications. Furthermore, their governance, in particular, usage policies and management of GenAI limit the governance options of a company. As generative AI requires costly infrastructure and there is an increase in cloud service to adopt GenAI (e.g., OpenAI’s GPT store) hosting models externally become more appealing.

Organizational targets: The need to align with ecosystem partners on governance aspects has been stressed in [Dencik et al., 2023]. In particular, if systems are not in control of a company, e.g., hosted externally, such an alignment may only be achievable through contractual, not technical, measures. Governance alignment also refers to cross-functional alignment. As GenAI might emerge bottom-up, individual functions might develop their own governance mechanisms, which might account for task-specific aspects but at the same time should also be aligned with firm-level concerns. Harmonization with current digital strategies is also a target, capitalizing on business opportunities and the ecosystem as well [Scott Likens and Nicole Wakefield, 2023]. Reducing risks from inter-organizational activities is important too, as current regulation is constantly evolving and does not clarify all aspects for inter-organizational usage. Exploiting business prospects is facilitated, for example, by a culture that fosters experimentation to adopt AI and identify use cases [Dencik et al., 2023].

2.7 Governance Mechanisms

Governance of GenAI encompasses (a) structural, (b) procedural, and (c) relational governance mechanisms [Schneider et al., 2022]. **Structural mechanisms** include organizational structures such as roles and the location of decision-making authority. In particular, due to its high-risk potential, it might also foster certain roles such as a Risk Officer or Ethics officer [Scriven et al., 2023]. **Procedural mechanisms** focus

on the way decisions are made and actions are taken. It includes the strategy denoting high-level guidance based on strategic business objectives. While academic work is scarce, prominent consulting firms see important areas of strategy related to managing AI risk, developing a productivity plan, etc. [Scott Likens and Nicole Wakefield, 2023].

For safety evaluation, a three-layered approach has been proposed focusing on capability (technical), human interaction, and systemic impact (society) [Weidinger et al., 2023]. There are also proposals on how to mitigate risks along the GenAI lifecycle, including e.g. pre-release testing where users aim to identify flaws like in red-teaming in the cybersecurity domain [Bell et al., 2023].

One strategic dimension is how to release GenAI models, i.e., open- vs closed-source models. [Solaiman, 2023] discusses the release of GenAI systems distinguishing three types of release artifacts: (i) access to the model itself (ranging from fully open models providing access to model weights to models allowing only API access), components that enable (ii) further risk analysis (evaluation results on benchmarks, information on training data, etc.) or (iii) model replication (details on training, access to data, etc.). Considerations of release include societal concerns (e.g., risk of exploitation of minorities), (risk of) malicious use, auditability, accountability (in case of harm), etc. The paper also elaborates on safety controls and guardrails, including documentation (datasheets for datasets), rate limiting, safety and content filters, detection models, hardcoding responses, watermarking, and community efforts (e.g. bias bounties).

Expert foresight: Experts in relevant disciplines should be included while relative risk is low. Multidisciplinary discourse should go beyond discussing social scientists and (underrepresented) multidisciplinary experts. Actors must have an incentive to engage in community discussion and be held accountable to commitments for safe releases. Google’s public position on responsible AI practices encourages in-house risk evaluation and mitigation, but conflicts of interest can result in dismissal [Ebell et al., 2021].

AI policies provide high-level guidelines and rules. They establish key objectives, accountability, roles, and responsibilities. Policies may protect from harm but also limit beneficial uses [Solaiman, 2023]. Model targets such as (adversarial) robustness and interpretability can be at odds with performance. Thus, guidance by internal risk policies defining how to evaluate and weigh opposing goals is needed. Legal measures such as licenses constitute enforceable control when a user uses a system in a non-desirable way. Platforms hosting foundation models such as Huggingface use the Responsible AI License (RAIL) placing behavioral use conditions on a model. The model owner owns the license and bears responsibility for pursuing enforcement if need be [Contractor et al., 2020]. Licenses are difficult to enforce for downloadable systems, as model behavior and uses are hard to monitor.

While there is little research on the location (and coordination) of decision-making as a means of governance, inspiration can be drawn from policymakers: Different countries have taken different approaches to regulating AI. Vertical

regulations target a specific application or manifestation of a technology. This contrasts with horizontal regulations, such as the EU’s AI Act, which are comprehensive umbrella laws attempting to cover all applications of a given technology. China aimed at more of a mix [Sheehan, 2023].

Compliance monitoring ensures legal conformance and obedience to organizational policies, standards, procedures, and contractual agreements. For GenAI constant monitoring, e.g., using separate models such as OpenAI’s toxicity API is important since systems usage and ethical compliance are difficult to guarantee.

Issue management refers to identifying, managing, and resolving AI-related issues. Issues can stem from regulators that might enforce constraints that should be swiftly resolved. For example, Italy required OpenAI to adjust its privacy policy. Security issues like jailbreaks to circumvent safety and moderation procedures might require changes to the system.

Relational mechanisms support collaboration among stakeholders by incorporating (1) communication, (2) training, and (3) coordination in decision-making. Social transparency [Sun et al., 2022] in AI systems makes visible socio-organizational factors that impact AI usage by presenting other users’ interactions with the AI. “Learning” from others helps in understanding of effective usage of AI and its outputs. In a study analyzing GenAI for software engineering [Sun et al., 2022], participants were interested in understanding how others evaluated model performance and their judgment of AI outputs, i.e., code quality, but also on how they generated outputs, i.e., code as well as strength, weaknesses, common pitfalls and limitations they experienced.

2.8 Consequences

Performance effects should be observable depending on the types of GenAI usages, e.g., efficiency gains of employees, and increased customer satisfaction. Risk management should also benefit, e.g., in terms of reduced IP leakage risks, reduced reputational risks, and legal risks. Furthermore, people are impacted by governance. We conjecture that users and developers will have a positive attitude towards governance effects, e.g., to improve their capabilities by training, and by setting ethical standards. We believe also that good governance can facilitate adoption within the company, as it reduces uncertainty by establishing policies, ensures AI capabilities through interventions, and also supports coordination within the company and with others.

3 Conclusions

Governance is still far from being solved both on a regulatory and organizational level. The future might bring many new regulations that are difficult to prepare for, e.g., there have been proposals asking to publicly release tools that allow to query whether an artifact was generated by the model [Knott et al., 2023]. Our work provides a framework to support organizations and researchers alike to think about and enact governance of GenAI.

References

- [McAfee et al., 2023] Andrew McAfee, Daniel Rock, & Brynjolfsson, E. How to Capitalize on Generative AI. *Harvard Business Review*. <https://hbr.org/2023/11/how-to-capitalize-on-generative-ai>
- [Ayers et al., 2023] J. W. Ayers, A. Poliak, M. Dredze, E. C. Leas, Z. Zhu, J. B. Kelley, D. J. Faix, A. M. Goodman, C. A. Longhurst, M. Hogarth, & others. Comparing physician and artificial intelligence chatbot responses to patient questions posted to a public social media forum. *JAMA Internal Medicine*.
- [Bang et al., 2023] Y. Bang, S. Cahyawijaya, N. Lee, W. Dai, D. Su, B. Wilie, H. Lovenia, Z. Ji, T. Yu, W. Chung, & others. A multitask, multilingual, multimodal evaluation of chatgpt on reasoning, hallucination, and interactivity. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2302.04023*.
- [Banh and Strobel, 2023] L. Banh and G. Strobel. Generative artificial intelligence. *Electronic Markets*.
- [Bell et al., 2023] G. Bell, J. Burgess, J. Thomas, & S. Sadiq. Generative AI - Language Models (LLMs) and Multimodal Foundation Models (MFMs). Australian Council of Learned Academies.
- [Ben Wodecki, 2024] Ben Wodecki. Meet Alpaca: The Open Source ChatGPT Made for Less Than \$600. <https://ai-business.com/nlp/meet-alpaca-the-open-source-chatgpt-made-for-less-than-600>, 2024.
- [Birkstedt et al., 2023] T. Birkstedt, M. Minkkinen, A. Tandon, & M. Mäntymäki. AI governance: Themes, knowledge gaps and future agendas. *Internet Research*.
- [Bommasani et al., 2021] R. Bommasani, D. A. Hudson, E. Adeli, R. Altman, S. Arora, S. von Arx, M. S. Bernstein, J. Bohg, A. Bosselut, E. Brunskill, & others. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- [Bommasani et al., 2023] R. Bommasani, K. Klyman, D. Zhang, & P. Liang. Do Foundation Model Providers Comply with the EU AI Act? Center for Research on Foundation Models Conference. <https://crfm.stanford.edu/2023/06/15/eu-ai-act.html>, June 15, 2023.
- [Brown et al., 2020] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, & others. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33, 1877–1901, 2020.
- [Brynjolfsson et al., 2023] E. Brynjolfsson, D. Li, & L. R. Raymond. Generative AI at work. *National Bureau of Economic Research*.
- [Carlini et al., 2022] N. Carlini, D. Ippolito, M. Jagielski, K. Lee, F. Tramer, & C. Zhang. Quantifying Memorization Across Neural Language Models. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [Celikyilmaz et al., 2020] A. Celikyilmaz, E. Clark, & J. Gao. Evaluation of text generation: A survey. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2006.14799*, 2020.
- [Contractor et al., 2020] D. Contractor, D. McDuff, J. K. Haines, J. Lee, C. Hines, & B. J. Hecht. Behavioral Use Licensing for Responsible AI. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2011.03116*, 2020.
- [Dencik et al., 2023] J. Dencik, B. Goehring, & A. Marshall. Managing the emerging role of generative AI in next-generation business. *Strategy & Leadership*.
- [Ebell et al., 2021] C. Ebell, R. Baeza-Yates, R. Benjamins, H. Cai, M. Coeckelbergh, T. Duarte, M. Hickok, A. Jacquet, A. Kim, J. Krijger, & others. Towards Intellectual Freedom in an AI Ethics Global Community. *AI and Ethics*, 2021.
- [EU, 2023] EU. EU AI Act. <https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/>, 2023.
- [Fui-Hoon Nah et al., 2023] F. Fui-Hoon Nah, R. Zheng, J. Cai, K. Siau, & L. Chen. Generative AI and ChatGPT: Applications, challenges, and AI-human collaboration. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*, 2023.
- [Grynbaum and Mac, 2023] M. M. Grynbaum and R. Mac. The Times Sues OpenAI and Microsoft Over A.I. Use of Copyrighted Work. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/12/27/business/media/new-york-times-open-ai-microsoft-lawsuit.html>, 2023.
- [Gupta et al., 2023] M. Gupta, C. Akiri, K. Aryal, E. Parker, & L. Praharaaj. From ChatGPT to ThreatGPT: Impact of generative AI in cybersecurity and privacy. *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [Horneber and Laumer, 2023] D. Horneber and S. Laumer. Algorithmic Accountability. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 2023.
- [Hupont et al., 2023] I. Hupont, M. Micheli, B. Delipetrev, E. Gómez, & J. S. Garrido. Documenting high-risk AI: a European regulatory perspective. *Computer*, 2023.
- [Iskender, 2023] A. Iskender. Holy or unholy? Interview with open AI's ChatGPT. *European Journal of Tourism Research*, 2023.
- [Knott et al., 2023] A. Knott, D. Pedreschi, R. Chatila, T. Chakraborti, S. Leavy, R. Baeza-Yates, D. Evers, A. Trotman, P. D. Teal, P. Biecek, & others. Generative AI models should include detection mechanisms as a condition for public release. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 2023.
- [Kojima et al., 2022] T. Kojima, S. S. Gu, M. Reid, Y. Matsuo, & Y. Iwasawa. Large Language Models are Zero-Shot Reasoners. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2205.11916*, 2022.
- [Koplin, 2023] J. J. Koplin. Dual-use implications of AI text generation. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 2023.
- [Lewis et al., 2020] P. Lewis, E. Perez, A. Piktus, F. Petroni, V. Karpukhin, N. Goyal, H. Küttler, M. Lewis, W. Yih, T. Rock-täschel, & others. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.

- [Longo et al., 2023] L. Longo, M. Brcic, F. Cabitza, J. Choi, R. Confalonieri, J. Del Ser, R. Guidotti, Y. Hayashi, F. Herrera, A. Holzinger, & others. Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI) 2.0: A manifesto of open challenges and interdisciplinary research directions. arXiv Preprint arXiv:2310.19775, 2023.
- [Lu et al., 2021] Y. Lu, M. Bartolo, A. Moore, S. Riedel, & P. Stenetorp. Fantastically ordered prompts and where to find them: Overcoming few-shot prompt order sensitivity. arXiv Preprint arXiv:2104.08786, 2021.
- [Madaan et al., 2022] A. Madaan, S. Zhou, U. Alon, Y. Yang, & G. Neubig. Language Models of Code are Few-Shot Commonsense Learners. Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, 2022.
- [Mora-Cantalops et al., 2021] M. Mora-Cantalops & others. Traceability for Trustworthy AI: A Review of Models and Tools. Big Data and Cognitive Computing, 5[2], 2021.
- [Murray, 2023] M. D. Murray. Generative and AI Authored Artworks and Copyright Law. Hastings Communications & Entertainment Law Journal, 2023.
- [Nasr et al., 2023] M. Nasr, N. Carlini, J. Hayase, M. Jagielski, A. F. Cooper, D. Ippolito, C. A. Choquette-Choo, E. Wallace, F. Tramèr, & K. Lee. Scalable extraction of training data from (production) language models. arXiv Preprint arXiv:2311.17035, 2023.
- [NATO, 2021] NATO. Summary of the NATO Artificial Intelligence Strategy. https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_187617.htm, 2021.
- [Newman, 2023] J. Newman. A Taxonomy of Trustworthiness for Artificial Intelligence. Center for Long-Term Cybersecurity (CLTC), Berkeley. <https://cltc.berkeley.edu/publication/a-taxonomy-of-trustworthiness-for-artificial-intelligence/>, 2023.
- [Nicholson Price II, 2022] W. Nicholson Price II. Risks and Remedies for Artificial Intelligence in Health Care. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/risks-and-remedies-for-artificial-intelligence-in-health-care/>, 2022.
- [NIST, 2023] NIST. Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0). <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1>, 2023.
- [Noy and Zhang, 2023] S. Noy and W. Zhang. Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. Science, 2023.
- [Oldehoeft, 1992] A. E. Oldehoeft. Foundations of a Security Policy for Use of the National Research and Educational Network, 1992.
- [Oniani et al., 2023] D. Oniani, J. Hilsman, Y. Peng, R. K. Poropatich, C. Pamplin, L. Legault, Y. Wang, & others. From Military to Healthcare: Adopting and Expanding Ethical Principles for Generative Artificial Intelligence. arXiv Preprint arXiv:2308.02448, 2023.
- [OpenAI, 2023a] OpenAI. GPT-4 Technical Report. arXiv Preprint arXiv:2303.08774, 2023.
- [Ouyang et al., 2022] L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray, & others. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 2022.
- [Schaal, 1996] S. Schaal. Learning from demonstration. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 1996.
- [Schneider et al., 2022] J. Schneider, R. Abraham, C. Meske, & J. V. Brocke. Artificial Intelligence Governance For Businesses. Information Systems Management, 2022.
- [Schneider et al., 2024] J. Schneider, C. Meske, & P. Kuss. Foundation Models. Business Information Systems Engineering, 2024.
- [Scott Likens and Nicole Wakefield, 2023] Scott Likens and Nicole Wakefield. Early days for generative AI strategy, 2023.
- [Scriven et al., 2023] G. Scriven, M. Braga, D. Santos, & D. Sarai. Applied Generative Ai Governance: A Viable Model Through Control Automation. Journal of Financial Transformation, 58, 24–33, 2023.
- [Sheehan, 2023] M. Sheehan. China’s AI regulations and how they get made. Carnegie Endowment for International Piece, 2023.
- [Sigfrids et al., 2023] A. Sigfrids, J. Leikas, H. Salo-Pöntinen, & E. Pajari. A response prediction model to increase user satisfaction in conversational AI. ACM Transactions on Interactive Intelligent Systems, 2023.
- [Sun et al., 2022] M. Sun, M. Cojocaru, H. Du, K. Lee, A. Paul, D. Ippolito, A. Madaan, & N. Carlini. Attacks and Defenses in Transformers-based Models for Text Classification: A Survey. arXiv:2206.05264, 2022.
- [Tague et al., 2023] P. Tague, T. Nunn, A. T. Holder, C. H. Jordan, J. Imran, & C. Bernacki. NLP model performance under threat: Adversarial evaluation of ChatGPT. arXiv Preprint arXiv:2306.13987, 2023.
- [Tobin et al., 2023] R. Tobin, M. Ra, R. Harry, & J. Requeenz. Liability issues with generative AI in criminal justice. arXiv Preprint arXiv:2305.06749, 2023.
- [Uzunov et al., 2023] M. Uzunov, M. Cojocaru, D. Ippolito, D. Jagannathan, K. Lee, M. Sun, & Y. Zhang. Attacking Transformers via Triggers: A Survey. arXiv Preprint arXiv:2303.15515, 2023.
- [Wang et al., 2023] D. Wang, X. Wang, M. Wang, J. Li, & J. Tang. The diversity prediction paradox in generative AI. arXiv Preprint arXiv:2302.09000, 2023.
- [White et al., 2021] H. White, S. Zitnick, & R. Mahajan. Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-training. <https://ai.facebook.com/blog/improving-language-understanding-by-generative-pre-training>, 2021.
- [Zhang et al., 2023] W. Zhang, S. Zhang, B. Li, T. M. Khoshgoftaar, N. Gupta, A. N. H. Incecik, R. Jeon, S. Wang, X. Chen, & Y. Jin. The Dark Side of Generative AI: Ransomware-as-a-Service. arXiv:2301.02165, 2023.