

The Necessity of AI Audit Standards Boards

David Manheim^{1,2}, Sammy Martin³, Mark Bailey⁴, Mikhail Samin⁵, and Ross Greutzmacher³

¹*Technion - Israel Institute of Technology*

²*ALTER (Association for Long Term Existence and Resilience)*

³*Transformative Futures Institute*

⁴*National Intelligence University*

⁵*Independent*

Abstract

Auditing of AI systems is a promising way to understand and manage ethical problems and societal risks associated with contemporary AI systems, as well as some anticipated future risks. Efforts to develop standards for auditing Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems have therefore understandably gained momentum. However, we argue that creating auditing standards is not just insufficient, but actively harmful by proliferating unheeded and inconsistent standards, especially in light of the rapid evolution and ethical and safety challenges of AI. Instead, the paper proposes the establishment of an AI Audit Standards Board, responsible for developing and updating auditing methods and standards in line with the evolving nature of AI technologies. Such a body would ensure that auditing practices remain relevant, robust, and responsive to the rapid advancements in AI. The paper argues that such a governance structure would also be helpful for maintaining public trust in AI and for promoting a culture of safety and ethical responsibility within the AI industry.

Throughout the paper, we draw parallels with other industries, including safety-critical industries like aviation and nuclear energy, as well as more prosaic ones such as financial accounting and pharmaceuticals. AI auditing should emulate those fields, and extend beyond technical assessments to include ethical considerations and stakeholder engagement, but we explain that this is not enough; emulating other fields' governance mechanisms for these processes, and for audit standards creation, is a necessity. We also emphasize the importance of auditing the entire development process of AI systems, not just the final products. The proposed approach will help ensure that auditing AI does not devolve into safety washing, and instead directly addresses risks and ethical concerns that will continue to arise as AI becomes increasingly important in society, and as human interaction with these systems changes over time.

CCS CONCEPTS: Computing / technology policy • Human and societal aspects of security and privacy

Additional Keywords and Phrases: AI Governance, AI Audit, Audit, Ethical AI, AI Policy, Organizational Culture, Audit Standards, Standards Setting

1 Introduction

Audits are used in different domains both for giving an account of what is happening within a system, and verification of requirements. (Courville et al. 2003) When considering how to perform audits in a new domain, drawing on best practices from other domains is critical. There is now significant focus on audits for ensuring the safety and evaluating the risks and harms of AI systems, (Mökander et al. 2023, Shevlane et al. 2023; Sharkey et al. 2023) as well as significant earlier work on audit methods for evaluation of societal implications (Raji et al. 2020) and on what a mature ethics process involves. (Krijger et al. 2022) While it is encouraging to see action addressing the critical role of evaluating and auditing risks from

frontier models and on evaluation of ethical standards, there are many challenges for these types of evaluations and audits. (Costanza-Chock et al 2022) Below, we argue that the current approach of standards development for AI systems is harmful, among other reasons, due to proliferating, inconsistent, and rapidly outdated static standards, along with lack of clarity about what is appropriate in any given domain, for any specific AI system, or application. This fragments efforts, undermines efforts to make any specific auditing methods standard, and reduces the usefulness of standards development.

To supplement important technical approaches being developed for auditing AI systems, we need a process for broader audits, and for ongoing development of standards — an audit standards body, not just audit standards. To explain what is needed and why, we review past work and provide a brief background on current audit approaches. We then explain why static standards and current efforts are fundamentally incapable of addressing the relevant ethical challenges and risks. We also note that auditing standards are not the same thing as standards for audits, and neither necessarily implies regulation. In addition, different methods, audit approaches, and standards are needed for different model types and applications. (Frase, 2023) This is especially true when specific standards are unclear or disputed, or when detailed standards would be unwise, as we will explore. Therefore, the body of the paper revisits some known ideas in AI audit, as well as some drawbacks of some of the approaches methods, both to provide a brief overview of the issues that evaluation and auditing should ideally address, and to show how the suggestion of audit boards differs from other approaches to standards.

1.1 Background

The idea of auditing IT systems is well established in the context of computing. (van Biene-Hershey, 2007) Standards for doing so, such as COBIT, date at least to the 1990s, significantly predating current paradigms in artificial Intelligence. Recently, debate about safety, misuse, and bias has led to internal and external checks on models, notably including the internal evaluations and staged release of GPT-2. (Shevlane, 2022) Continuing in the tradition of auditing, there have been audits specific to AI systems, including both a growing ecosystem of AI ethics and accountability audits, (Birhane et al 2014) as well as safety audit efforts such as the red-teaming performed for GPT-4. (OpenAI 2023a, 2023b)

Self-reporting via “Model Cards” (Mitchell et al 2019) has become commonplace, and internal auditing and red-teaming is a growing feature prior to frontier model release, albeit with notable exceptions. (Anil et al 2023, xAI 2024) There have also been broader mandates proposed for auditing AI systems, (Koshiyama et al 2021) though a principles-to-practice gap exists, especially noted for AI ethics, (Tidjoh and Khomh 2023) which is even more of a problem for the newer auditing methods for safety.

In addition to these voluntary oft ignored self-audits, there has been recent discussion of the need for mandatory external and independent auditing, which would help address the principles-to-practice gap. (Costanza-Chock et al 2022) These efforts are largely country-specific, and are likely to create regulatory overlap failure modes seen in other domains (Robb et al 2023), but there are at least attempts to make standards. The recent U.S. Executive Order requires that National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) work on “Developing Guidelines, Standards, and Best Practices for AI Safety and Security,” following on from their Risk Management Framework (NIST, 2023), and this (unfunded) mandate includes “an initiative to create guidance and benchmarks for evaluating and auditing AI capabilities, with a focus on capabilities through which AI could cause harm,” (E.O. 14110, 2023) Similarly, the UK’s new AI safety institute views “publicly accountable evaluations of AI systems” to be a key part of its mission, (DSIT, 2023), and efforts in France have been proposed as well (Commission De L’intelligence Artificielle, 2024).

For all the above-mentioned projects and initiatives, however, the focus is on what should be done concretely in the evaluation of models themselves. Despite limitations, it is a critical part of the ecosystem necessary for audits to be useful and successful, but the efforts do not address broader issues, including the need for a regime that will ensure robust standards for a quickly evolving ecosystem and uncertain but rapidly evolving ethical challenges, risks, and future threats. As recent work has shown, even when limiting the domain to AI accountability auditing, rather than the nascent and less well developed field of AI safety audits, the focus of

above efforts are irresponsibly limited to only model evaluations, and “this ecosystem [which includes broader ecosystem and product audits,] is muddled and imprecise.” (Birhane et al 2024)

1.2 Existing Best Practices

While efforts mentioned above for AI ethics are widespread, if fragmented, frontier AI developers now believe that their models may soon be capable of causing direct harm on a wide scale (OpenAI 2023d, Anthropic, 2023). OpenAI’s preparedness framework identifies cybersecurity, chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) threats, and persuasion and model autonomy as categories of dangerous capabilities that they expect from near-future models. While these dangers do not obviate the need for addressing still often ignored ethical issues, to the extent that these anticipated AI systems are high-risk, they must be treated in line with the best practices for other safety-critical settings such as aviation or the nuclear industry.

Therefore, we start by drawing on existing examples of industry best practices for auditing standards, adapting them where relevant to the setting of AI evaluation, and the role of a standards board. We also discuss the need for a shift towards safety culture, not just formal standards and practices, something that is well established in safety-critical industries, but severely lacking in the AI Industry (Manheim 2023a).

In aviation, for instance, safety culture audits are common, and FAA assessments focus on employees’ perception of safety culture and their self-assessment of how important safety is to their work. Similarly, the nuclear industry’s governance practices highlight the importance of regulatory oversight of safety culture, rather than only individual safeguards. (IAEA, 2013) In other safety-critical industries like manned spaceflight (Keyser, 1974) we see management structures changed to give increased veto power to lower-level decision-makers should they notice problems.

These governance norms can be mirrored in AI to ensure safety protocols are embraced not just operationally, but also culturally. For example, the financial sector provides a case study for how to effectively audit and disclose risks, allowing external auditors comprehensive internal access, ensuring transparency while maintaining confidentiality. Contra Raji et al (2020)’s calls for internal audit, aligning with Raji et al. (2022b), it is clear that a standards board for creating norms and best practices can mirror financial audit and ensure that independent AI audits can be conducted without requiring companies to publicly reveal proprietary details of their business.

Lastly, the pharmaceutical industry’s practice of making explicit commitments to ongoing audits with requirements for publishing results can guide AI auditing. The FDA, for instance, mandates regular pharmaceutical inspections with publicly available results, ensuring continuous compliance. This is in stark contrast to AI audits that have been proposed or are currently performed on ad-hoc bases, without external monitoring. Pharmaceuticals also provide another model for prioritizing oversight and resource allocation based on risk. (Lawrence and Woodcock, 2015) It also provides another warning about the costs and unnecessary duplication and consumer harm from differing and inconsistent national standards, with outsized harms to LMICs, (Moscou and Kohler 2018), as well as regulatory capture of standards and regulation (Carpenter 2013).

Most fundamentally, having a body with an explicit mandate to produce auditing standards in the first place is essential, and in all the cases previously mentioned (IAEA, FDA, FASB/IASB, and the FDA or its international equivalents,) some independent body exists ensuring that these standards are not merely common industry practices, but understood standards. Doing so in a way that learns from these examples, and does not fall prey to the various failure modes which are seen in those domains is possible, and would be beneficial for all parties involved.

1.3 Problems Specific to AI Development

There are a number of distinct problems faced by those attempting to develop audit standards for AI ethics and safety. Before explaining the three-pronged approach an Audit Standards

Board would need to take, we outline four challenges. Each of these, we feel, is poorly addressed by the current assumption that standards development will be helpful in limiting either speculative risks or current harms.

First, static standards created and adopted in advance of an AI system’s development are sharply limited in their ability to ensure that AI systems are safe prior to further training or eventual deployment. Standards produced today are unlikely to be sufficient in a year, much less several years, and they aim at a moving and unpredictable target. (Zhou et al, 2023) AI system development, testing, and deployment is an iterative process that can involve a wide variety of changes. For example, ChatGPT moved from GPT 3.5, to GPT-4, to GPT-4V, to include Dall-E 3 integration, completely changing first the underlying models, then the modes of interaction, all in less than a year. The process can also change access types, from UI access to API access, to fine-tuning and customized models. A safety or impact audit standard which would apply to ChatGPT when released in mid-2022 would be completely insufficient by the end of 2023.

In addition to the changes in systems over time, developing standards is challenging due to the emergence of capabilities in foundation models¹, (Bommasani et al. 2021) which suggests that dangerous and/or difficult to anticipate or forecast capabilities can emerge with increasingly large AI systems, when systems are scaled up by orders of magnitude (Wei et al. 2022). The result is that both accountability audits focused on system outcomes, and safety audit efforts like red-teaming, are rendered obsolete. This suggests that many proposed metrics and evaluations are likely to end up insufficient or misleading when applied to increasingly large systems. (Corso et al. 2023) One example is the emergence of language modeling in diffusion models, which can generate increasingly valid text inside of generated images, which may make audit questions previously limited to LLMs, such as biased language, necessary in image generation models as well. Furthermore, while increased model size often enables greater capabilities, it is not determinative, so even when we know what possible capabilities we are concerned about, the specific capabilities to emerge are not obvious in advance.

A third issue is that evaluations of capabilities may fall short if they fail to capture new modes of human interaction with the models, especially due to emerging misuse opportunities, or via extensions of models into new systems (e.g., AutoGPT). At a minimum, extensive red teaming is necessary, even if automated, (Zhu et al, 2023) but the risks associated with increasingly complex and capable models will also require novel strategies of risk assessment. There are currently significant unsolved issues with model adversarial robustness, and it is also possible to use highly capable models to adversarially attack each other, making them yet more vulnerable. (Shah et al, 2023) There are also new threats, such as the recently identified “Sleeper Agents,” which have emerged. (Hubinger et al 2024)

A fourth reason that standard requirements can fall short is that models are deployed in rapidly changing technological contexts. A model capable of programming that poses no risk of misuse for bioterrorism may later pose risk as biological design tools become more capable. (Sandbrinck 2023, Mouton et al. 2023) Similarly, new applications and uses of the model itself can create danger. Foundation models that only output text were originally assumed to be incapable of multi-stage projects and agent-like behavior. The assumption was correct, until the early 2023 creation of AutoGPT (and similar programs) that harnessed multiple instances of an LLM to pursue multi-step plans. This risk was speculative, and for that reason no internal audit of the model contemplating current uses foresaw or tested for this risk in advance. For example, even OpenAI’s very flexible evaluations, which included continuous monitoring, did not suggest the emergence of agentic applications for GPT-3.5 in advance of their appearance.

Therefore, to achieve the intended evaluation and mitigation of risks and harms, we need not just a standards board, but one which embraces a number of practices and standards. This approach needs to do more than just evaluate and monitor the models which are produced. We split the identified needs into three areas. First, we need to audit the process, not just

¹As defined elsewhere, foundation models are large AI models trained on one or more modalities of data in an unsupervised or semi-supervised fashion that are able to generalize well to a wide variety of downstream tasks as they are well-suited for zero-, one-, or few-shot learning and for transfer learning, i.e., transferring the knowledge learnt on large corpora to downstream tasks via fine-tuning. (Bommasani et al. 2021.)

the product. Second, we need to change the culture of safety complacency. And finally, we need to empower auditing standards boards, not create standard auditing procedures. Figure 1 depicts these fundamental principles and practices that should be adhered for each of these three elements of our proposed approach.




Figure 1: We highlight the three elements of the approach we suggest that a standards board should take, and further identify best practices relevant to each that we recommend be promoted in the approach of boards, or other equivalent standards organizations.

2 Audit the process, not just the product

As explained, a language model or other AI system poses risks that change over time. Furthermore, black-box systems also cannot necessarily be evaluated only as a final product, for instance, because training data attacks can be imperceptible in the final model (Khalid et al. 2019) making evaluation of inputs and processes necessary. We see a parallel between process evaluations for AI and cases such as pharmaceuticals and nuclear power, where the entire design process must be overseen. In all of these industries, it is impossible to tell just from looking at the final result whether it is safe and effective.

There are also risks and issues that are directly about inputs or training, such as ethical audits of data sources and human curation, (Miceli & Posada, 2022) and limitations and

issues with RLHF for which audit standards have already been discussed (Casper et al, 2023). Moreover, an AI system is not a single static artifact that can be evaluated in isolation. The increasingly interactive use of multiple models within AI systems also means that there are complex relationships between individual changes and ethical and safety concerns. An audit that addresses these concerns must be broader than the evaluation of a single product.

There are also specific model evaluation techniques that require integration with the process. For example, use of predictions to evaluate model capabilities, and judging the safety of a model in relation to whether it does more than expected (or less) requires a clear process for pre-training statements of predictions, and post-training evaluation. This could also address problems raised by Raji et al. (2022a), where AI projects fail to correctly do what they were designed to do.

2.1 Process Audits and Stakeholder Participation

Model auditing involves and impacts a number of stakeholders, including model developers, auditors and safety evaluators, government and regulators, and the public. Ensuring all parties' views and needs are represented in the development of audit processes requires not just consultation with all parties, but continuing engagement. (Anderljung 2023b)

Raji et al. (2020) suggest viewing audits of machine learning models as a multistage process that in part is focused on generating artifacts which can provide insight to external stakeholders. This nicely highlights both the need for process, which we discuss below, and the way that the needs of stakeholders are integral to what an audit accomplishes. While that work is focused on a subset of the concerns we discuss, the suggestions are critical, and points to exactly the sort of stakeholder engagement we argue is more broadly valuable.

That work, and the much broader literature, focuses on current harms that exist from building and using the systems as intended. These ethical issues have been highlighted by Mitchell et al (2019). To address these harms, there is a nascent set of identified dimensions (Krijger et al 2023) and best practices for ethics in AI — but similar to other concerns discussed extensively in the Fairness and Transparency literature, this requires more than auditing the model which is created. For example, addressing harms that emerge from biased training data or appropriation of copyrighted data requires engagement with the data collection and training process, rather than just the final product. Such data audits are defined, but often remain outside of the scope of model audits. (Birhane et al 2024)

Given the current state of practice and how far short of long-standing and well understood standards for transparency almost all AI models fall, (Liang et al. 2023) these recommendations must be adopted, and failures to do so must be highlighted. But the different equities involved mean that adopting recommendations is not enough. Instead, both those benefiting from the model and those harmed by it need to be represented when discussing what should be audited during these processes.

Furthermore, systemic and structural risks, and risks from misuse, require a sociotechnical approach to both AI safety (Lazar and Nelson 2023) and model auditing (Weidinger et al. 2023). Those harmed by algorithmic injustice are rarely represented in current efforts towards standards development, and the types of effort needed to include these stakeholders (Lombe and Sherraden 2013, Bhaumik et al 2015) seems largely absent in AI Audit standards development, and in the research needed to enable it, respectively. (Birhane et al 2024)

In addition, as of now, it is unclear where the responsibility lies for harms caused in ways that are not directly dependent on AI systems' capabilities or accidents resulting from them; the interaction between the AI system, the deployment, and the use of the systems requires ongoing processes to understand risk. Having multi-stakeholder engagement in defining standards and requirements benefits both society as a whole by reducing risk, but it is also in the self interest of AI developers as it ensures that they have clearly defined responsibilities.

2.2 Audits for Process Beyond Development

The inclusion of stakeholders in standards for auditing is critical, but the audits themselves must be focused on more than just the models. As Raji et al. (2020) argued, auditing needs

to be present throughout the development of a model. However, auditing for harms needs to extend beyond the development of a model. (Raji et al 2022a)

Process audits can and should start with evaluating the company, its structure and governance, and its safety and ethical orientation and commitments, as discussed below, and must extend from the process of data collection and training through post-deployment monitoring. These require both ongoing checks, and revisions of what practices and norms should be monitored. For example, we can consider abuse risks, which are already occurring, that need to be addressed. Checking whether models can be abused is critical but it is probably impossible to remove all potential for abuse. Therefore, ongoing monitoring and processes for auditing that work will be critical.

The abuses to address will not only be those that are occurring already. For example, mass spear-phishing is an existing threat which can leverage LLMs to further reduce costs, (Hazell, 2023) but waiting for proof that this type of abuse is happening before including the risk in evaluations turns risk evaluation into a reactive and ultimately ineffective process. And despite sensationalist presentations of capabilities, it is clear that threats like AI-enabled bioterrorism are currently implausible, (Mouton, 2023) but capabilities may continue to progress. For that reason, it seems likely that by the time it is clear such uses are possible, mitigations need to already be in place. Any process for audit that attempts to address any of these risks will need to move beyond point-in-time evaluation and passing or failing an audit, and require processes for ongoing risk analysis that include routinely revisiting questions about forms of abuse and the safeguards needed.

Societal impacts are hard to determine a priori, and will change as these systems develop new capabilities, as society adapts to them, and as the digital landscape changes over time. The set of concerns that should be highlighted in audits again argues for a diverse set of stakeholders, but also requires broader and continuing engagement and public discussion of how and what audits must cover, rather than one-time consultations typical of regulation or standards development. This shows that, while sociotechnical approaches and involving broader stakeholder groups are critical, (Lazar and Nelson, 2023) those approaches need far more than static evaluation to be meaningfully effective in reducing harm. As we argue, inclusive boards are a solution that incorporates the advantages and which can mitigate many of the problems.

2.3 Interim Audits during AI Training

In addition to the ethical harms and risks of abuse of models for current and anticipated risks, there are also risks arising from capabilities that AIs may possess in the near future. Several groups have noted that auditing model checkpoints and audits during training may be necessary, both because the AI's capabilities may advance suddenly during training, resulting in the need for new safeguards to be developed or applied, and because auditing the non-final version (Avin 2023, Anderljung 2023, Sharkey et al. 2023) can reveal or help predict latent capabilities. For example, safety measures like RLHF, which are essential, can nonetheless be reversed via fine-tuning. (Gade et al. 2023, Lerman et al. 2023) This implies that safety audits of models before fine-tuning are likely to be necessary for models which will be made available to fine-tune.

Not only is it important to have process audits to ensure the end product is safe, but there are also a number of mitigations for bias and similar problems that can be applied throughout the model training process. (Bellamy et al. 2018) For these and other reasons, we expect defense in depth and lifecycle threat analysis to be very valuable. (Ee 2023). If it proves useful for external auditors to audit AI systems over multiple steps during training, and throughout the process, then they will need in-depth engagement throughout the development process.

2.4 Rapid Progress Requires Evolving Standards

In various domains, best practices for risk evaluation have evolved to recognize the need for proactive or dynamic risk evaluations. (Rasmussen & Suedung 2000) This means that even in much less dynamic fields than AI, proactive engagement with risk management is vital. In artificial intelligence, the dizzying pace of advances makes this even more critical. But

changing rules can easily create incoherent or conflicting standards, and different standards suggestions have already created a difficult to follow patchwork of best practices, requirements, and an emerging regulatory tangle of overlapping and burdensome requirements. And because standards bodies do not exist, the suggested best practices and requirements are not necessarily updated, and there is no group that can decide when or if obsolete regulations have been superseded.

Not only is this messy, but static standards can have perverse effects. Specific requirements and maximums imposed by regulation often become a target when they relate to a system property of interest, per Shorrock’s Law of Limits. (Shorrock, 2019) In the case of AI, a requirement that systems not score over some limit on a risk scale, or not have a racial or other bias that exceeds some numerical value, would require checking of compliance, and if there is any expense associated with compliance, this produces implicit pressure to get as close as possible to that limit without exceeding it.

Another risk of static standards for evaluation of models is leakage, (Kaufman et. al. 2011) where data about the test set, in this case, the analyses or tests which are part of the standard, are included in the training data. For AI systems which can generalize, this seems likely to be particularly challenging; even if a specific question is absent from training data, thematically similar ones could be present, allowing the model to “study for the test” or the equivalent. For systems that are under continual development, which are retrained or fine-tuned on recent public data, any public knowledge about the contents of a test could compromise the integrity of the test, at least to some extent.

Iterative standards development needs to occur in parallel to, and must be informed by (but separate from), model development. That is, auditing should not be an internal process to enable development, as discussed below. Instead, standards setting groups should define tests which must be passed by models if and when new concerns or capabilities emerge. Alternatively, the emergence of unexpected capabilities may itself be a reason to halt development or release of a model.

2.5 Continued Monitoring and Ongoing Analysis

As well as monitoring throughout the development lifecycle, it is also necessary to monitor systems post-deployment. This approach is already being adopted, for example OpenAI’s preparedness framework, where the model provider monitors usage and identifies abuse or misuse of various types. This process, however, is not currently done in a principled or public way — there are no clear commitments to report on these ongoing evaluations on a regular basis or to include a specific set of information in them. There is also no architecture for bug bounties or patch notes. The current process is also reactive, whereas audits are potentially and ideally proactive. Ideally, ongoing monitoring would be part of a principled and public process that tries to anticipate future misuse rather than reacting as new implicit capabilities are discovered.

Additionally, the OpenAI framework emphasizes forecasting future risks to develop adequate safety and security measures ahead of time. For example, they intend to privately fine-tune models towards dangerous applications to determine how far their dangerous capabilities can be stretched, and continuously monitor their deployed models in worst case settings. This framework’s inclusion of continuously monitoring capabilities along various dimensions could address many of the requirements we have outlined for AI auditing – though this auditing is done in-house, with no reporting requirements, and no longer term commitment to the process, so it obviously fails the goal of providing public or regulatory assurance.

2.6 Inadequate audits can cause failures

Major AI developers expect that work at the AI frontier will increasingly focus on designing AI systems to autonomously pursue large-scale goals (Anthropic 2023, OpenAI 2023, Christiano et al. 2023). If such systems are developed, then audits must also ensure both that these autonomous agents do not have discriminatory or otherwise unethical consequences, and that their goals are and remain more broadly aligned with human values and ethics over time. However, internal teams repeatedly testing these sophisticated AIs against simple audits

could influence them to develop unintended and dangerously deceptive behaviors. This could directly cause dangerous failures, or at least lead to complacency about safety as dangers are merely papered over by trained success in audits.

Christiano identifies three specific dynamics that make it hard to detect misalignment in AI systems. First, the "simple training game" is, where an AI behaves sycophantically to make deception more difficult to notice. Second, "deceptive alignment" is where AI has hidden goals other than what is apparent in its performance and predicts what will fulfill these goals over a long timescale. Both have already been seen to some extent in the wild. (Park et al, 2023) Third, "gradient hacking" is, where AI prevents training from changing its hidden long-term goals (Christiano et al. 2023). It is unclear the extent to which any of these will occur, but there is at least a strong reason to be concerned that poorly managed audits will create these risks. Of course, auditing versions of models without alignment or safety mitigations implemented – as suggested in the OpenAI Preparedness Framework (OpenAI 2023) – is one crucial way of addressing this risk, as is ensuring that audits are not part of the internal development process.

3 3 Governance for safety

Building on the work of Raji et al. (2020), we note that culture can be studied at multiple levels. The nuclear industry (IAEA 2013) draws on Schein (1992) to look at three levels of culture, artifacts, as discussed by Raji, espoused beliefs and values, and underlying assumptions. As the nuclear industry has found, technical safeguards are insufficient, and building a culture of safety is critical in minimizing failures. The airline industry, among others, has found the same. (CANSO 2008) A number of concrete suggestions for how this impacts audits more specifically will be highlighted below, but the overarching theme is that change in the industry requires industry buy-in to standards and norms, of the type facilitated by standards boards in which they have an active role, but undermined by proliferating standards.

However, as pointed out by Manheim, (2023a) there are many challenges in building a culture of safety in the AI industry. In the context of auditing, these challenges are critical. There are two aspects to addressing safety culture that are relevant to audits; the way that safety culture makes audits more effective, and the way that audits can ensure safety culture. For both, formulaic and fixed standards seem insufficient. Until recently, the AI industry was not focused on these issues and is complacent as regards safety.

3.1 Safety Culture Enables Effective Audits

Auditing systems is not, in and of itself, a method to reduce risks. Instead, it functions as part of an ecosystem of regulation, risk analysis, internal controls, public oversight, and changes to the systems themselves in response to all of these factors. Because of this, the value of auditing in improving safety lies partly in how those being audited view the process and anticipate or respond. In domains where audit is adversarial or viewed as superfluous, knowledge of problems does not lead to addressing them; if any attention is paid, it can lead to deception in order to move forward, or at best patches that minimally address the deficiencies. Designing metrics that can be evaluated in such an environment is possible, but very challenging - and a key strategy for overcoming the challenge is adaptability and flexibility. (Manheim, 2023b) It seems likely that standards boards would make this type of adaptability and flexibility easier.

In contrast to such antagonistic relationships between auditing and business, there are many domains where auditing is aligned with the mission and values of those audited. In safety-critical industries like the nuclear industry or aviation, safety of the power plants or airplanes is vital to the overall success of an organization, and safety failures are business failures. These are industries where safety is valued, and firms take note of highlighted deficiencies, which can then be integrated into plans for improvement. If it is important for the AI industry to emulate the positive examples, a critical role of those tasked with monitoring and evaluating safety of AI systems is promoting cultural change in the industry. Unless and until safety is a goal of those producing the models, among other things, auditing

will lead to adversarial engagement, or at best grudging compliance. Such cultural change also benefits greatly from collaborative engagement in standards settings.

3.2 Internal Auditing is Insufficient

Internal auditing is one way to try to build alignment between auditing and development. This has a number of advantages over external audits, as clearly discussed by Raji et al. (2020). However, public assurance requires more than just internal auditing. Whether audits are conducted internally, externally, or (preferably) both, it is essential to establish and enforce audit reporting standards independent of the firms being audited. Among other concerns, this is because internal auditing without broad input about the concerns that must be addressed can easily become safety-washing. (Lazar and Nelson, 2023) A business which declined to have their financial records audited externally because they did sufficient checking internally would be farcical, and a business which decided to set the standards which it used would be similarly unacceptable.

For this reason, attempts to bring auditing under the control of firms developing models, such as OpenAI’s push to keep their red-teaming under their own control, (OpenAI 2023b) is a worrying development. Similarly, the “Frontier Model Forum” (OpenAI 2023c), while laudable as an attempt to ensure that standards exist, could allow industry to maintain control over what those standards will be.

At the same time, developers’ concerns should also be a critical consideration. Developers claim that proprietary concerns merit keeping capabilities evaluations in house, and some go so far as to suggest that these concerns merit exclusion of third-party evaluators (Weidinger et al. 2023). As noted, this is fundamentally opposed to trusted audits, but the risk is critical. Standards setting bodies must find ways to balance external inputs and requirements with internal control, as has been done by standards boards and regulators in other industries.

For example, model auditing processes, and the standards that inform them, must be careful to take stringent steps to protect developers’ intellectual property. Toward these ends, it is not unreasonable for third party evaluators to be embedded in organizations and subject to confidentiality agreements—it can work to the advantage of auditors to have unfettered access to engineers and scientists developing the systems, and without such access, evaluations might be far less effective. Despite that, contrary to the status quo, the confidentiality agreements must themselves be public, to allow consumers of these independent audits to know what the auditors may be prevented from saying. Negotiations between model auditing providers and firms, however, make it difficult for auditors to insist on such terms.

Only external standards that balance these and similar considerations, developed openly as part of an independent and iterative process with industry participation, have been shown in other comparable cases to lead to reasonable assurances of safety. In such a broad-based process, those who are not dependent on firms, including regulators and the public, must push for more openness, where auditors would not be willing or able to do so. A forum which sets standards is an ideal setting for this.

3.3 Audits Should Provide Transparency, Not Create Requirements

One critical component of an audit is to create common knowledge of what is and is not true, and what has or has not been done. While it is important for standards for audits to be created, that does not mean an audit itself implements or enforces a standard. For this reason, an audit may show that a system is capable of a certain class of abuse, or is not, and in either case, that is an acceptable audit outcome, even when it is a substantive failure. Similarly, a firm which is audited financially and is found to have debts in excess of assets may be insolvent, but the audit was not failed. The equivalent determination for an AI system or company would be that it abides by a given standard or follows a regulatory requirement, or not.

For example, there are debates about the legality or morality of training models on copyrighted material. While an audit standard will not resolve this debate, an audit can determine whether such material was included in the training data, what efforts were made to exclude both copyrighted material, and material which creators explicitly request to have excluded.

It will then be up to regulators and the public to insist on reasonable rules. Similarly, audits of AI models should detail whether internal or external red teaming processes occurred, and what they did or did not cover. This is different than a requirement to do so - and whether such a requirement should exist is again, up to regulators and lawmakers, not those who design or carry out audits.

3.4 Audits Must Allow for Failure

Despite the above points, if an audit cannot be failed, it cannot serve its full purpose as an audit. In domains where auditing does function as an independent check on firms, such as in financial accounting, the auditors will collect instances of material misrepresentation and report them, rather than simply demanding compliance. This is because such post-hoc compliance is ineffective at addressing core concerns; a firm which lies to auditors should not have their remaining claims trusted. For this reason, requiring them to correct the specific instances in which the misstatements occurred does not change the need to report that misrepresentation occurred.

Similarly, a firm which builds unsafe systems for audit, expecting that the unsafe system will be remedied during the audit, has already failed to build a safe system. For this reason, allowing them to correct the specific instances in which the model is dangerous is insufficient. Not only is it unlikely to fully address the problems uncovered, but the safety failures should be reported by auditors even when the firm addressed the failures before release. This means that in practice, auditors should expect to see the reports for safety failures that were caught internally by a responsible company's monitoring and reporting, not by auditing - and the absence of such events being flagged before auditing should be seen as a red flag, not a positive sign.

Unfortunately, a variation on this can easily be used perversely to render auditing far less valuable. Audits that are within the development cycle are often used as a way to iterate on failure rather than as a check. In such cases, the supposed existence of an audit is (perhaps unintentionally) actually enabling development rather than acting as a check. This is especially acute if the audit is under the control of those being audited, either because the audit is performed internally, or with nondisclosure agreements. In fact, this is explicitly the process that OpenAI's Preparedness framework adopts, where high or critical risk systems are not stopped, and instead, mitigations are put in place so that the systems can be argued to be below the internally defined threshold. (OpenAI 2023d) For this reason, audits should be independent of development, and should have the mandate to honestly report what was found, acknowledging failures rather than ensuring that failures are individually addressed.

Even for less serious concerns, and for audit requirements that do not impose a standard at all, as discussed above, allowing firms to address problems without announcing the issues or changes prompted by the audit is a failure. For example, models that are fine-tuned to eliminate individual problems still have capabilities that can be abused by prompt engineering, or by fine-tuning to reverse the new safety measures. Unfortunately, quietly and iteratively fine-tuning failures away as they are discovered, either before or after release, seems to be the current modus operandi. (Mitchell, 2019) But post-hoc patches do not provide public knowledge of fallibility and cannot serve the same purpose as auditing. For parallel reasons, audits of training data that identify biases, or problematic content of various types, must report this fact even if the training data is amended to exclude that content.

Non-public failures and responses also fail to alert others about measures which individual firms found to be effective. This is true of a broad variety of harm mitigation measures, and while businesses developing AI have reasonable incentives not to publicize proprietary methods, if the culture of proprietary technology applies to safety and ethics, insights about how to address problems will remain unknown, and safety of other systems will be impeded. In this case, the benefits of openness parallel early claims for the necessity of open-source in machine learning endorsed by both Bengio and LeCun, (Sonnenburg 2007) rather than their recent debates over whether model weights should be open-source. (Nuñez, 2023) At the same time, auditors will presumably have the prerogative not to publicize measures which would be compromised by public knowledge.

3.5 Auditing for Governance and Culture

To conclude the discussion of the relationship between auditing and building a safety culture, we reiterate our earlier point that a sufficient audit must have a scope that includes the firm and its governance, management, and culture. Ideally, auditing should inform everything from strategic goals to monitoring. (Filyppova et al., 2019) Once that is the case, auditing should be used to understand and monitor the safety culture.

For example, audits should include a review of the risk management systems internal to the firms being audited. A company with a healthy safety culture would have well documented safeguards for internal reports of safety failures and incentives for reporting risks and failures, would use risk registers to document what risks they address and which have been raised, would have robust systems in place to address each of the risks, would have systems for raising and addressing internal safety concerns, and would have clear procedures for stopping development or training if concerns are raised. All of these systems would have clear processes in which actions taken are documented, and in each case, an audit would create artefacts, as discussed by Raji et al. (2020) documenting how the systems have been used, the concerns and risks they currently address, and exercises done to test the system’s ability to respond.

Surveys of employees’ view of risks and their understanding of how the company engages in proactive identification of new sources of risk are another type of tool that auditors can and should use. Beyond this, however, firms can also use similar tools internally to proactively assess and reinforce safety culture. Similarly, process improvement targeted at improving risk management can be a result of audit recommendations, but far better than needing auditor feedback is auditors ensuring that the firm itself has internal process improvement methods that focus on safety and identify risks and concerns, and address them openly, in ways that auditors can observe. To ensure this, it seems likely that auditors should, as a part of their audit, ensure that management and oversight systems are in place for reporting failures, either publicly, or at least to the auditors. All of these suggestions are issues that an audit standards board should discuss and choose how auditors should implement.

4 4 Auditing standards body, not standard audits

We do not have sufficient standards for software safety in general, nor for ethical usage of such systems, compounding the problems with making AI systems safe. Building such standards is important, but disparate proposals and a lack of unification of standards undermines accountability. Industry standards are a critical step in moving forward, but allowing one-time processes to develop standards to dominate the conversation is undermining the effectiveness of these efforts. As noted initially, in comparable industries, there are bodies explicitly tasked with ongoing development of standards, and because of the likely importance of AI in industry in coming years, no less should be expected here.

4.1 Boards providing guidance, not regulations

Best practices from other fields is that standards develop as risks and practices change, but this process is ongoing, so that standards are constantly evolving. More than that, while technical research informs audit boards like FASB for accounting, or regulators like OSHA for safety, these standards are part of an ecosystem, not an endpoint. This is uncontroversial in other domains; FASB is asked to provide guidance on a routine basis whenever new accounting issues arise, and OSHA provides interpretation letters to clarify how requirements apply in new cases.

We have also seen how this fails in other domains. Organizations like NIST provide important standards for cryptography, updated routinely, and provide technical reports on blockchain systems, but regulation and standards cannot keep up with actual applications in digital securities. This happens because the faster the systems develop and change, the more agile the standards must be. This makes flexibility critical, and bolsters the case for independent boards rather than direct government regulation. It also highlights the importance of guidelines for auditors that can be interpreted into specific audit standards, rather than standards bodies constantly changing requirements.

In parallel cases, government regulators have required corporations to follow guidelines developed privately. For example, ISO standards, which are developed by experts from a variety of national standards bodies, business groups, and others, are not themselves legal standards. Regulators must often adapt or adopt the standards, and the standards are often enforced in contracts. This often helps create a norm of compliance with an evolving standard.

4.2 Balancing Principles and Rules

Whichever class of oversight and development of audit standards occurs, one critical question is whether to use principles based standards, or rule based standards. This parallels but does not exactly match the question of static versus adaptable standards; there can be unhelpfully static principle based standards, and dynamic and rapidly adapted rule based standards, but these are harder than having good principles that give rise to adaptability. And principles based standards have been shown to lead to better auditing than rule base standards in other important ways. (Peytcheva 2014, Schipper 2003)

Principle based standards also provide much more adaptability for rulemakers to provide useful guidance. For example, in the above discussion differentiating between requirements and standards, it was noted that transparency about practices can be a viable alternative to mandating specific practices. In this case, transparency should be a principle, not a specific requirement to announce that some specific method was (or was not) used. Otherwise, firms will use standard practices to fulfill requirements and ensure that the audit reports they did so, making the audits far less flexible and more of a routine. The alternative instead provides flexibility to do more or use newer and more powerful methods for assuring some specific objective is achieved, while ensuring that auditors and consumers of the audit can still understand if the methods used fall short in some regard.

But as is often the case for binary distinctions, some combination of the two is likely both inevitable, and wise. Principles relevant in this context would perhaps include transparency about model training and inputs, preregistration of training details including safety guards, prior commitments to which safety measures are employed during each phase of release, commitments for ongoing monitoring and plans for mitigating negative impacts, and external verification of the above. Rules setting minimum standards for these are then needed, but these will inevitably be both incomplete and unreasonably restrictive and will likely require adaptation of the rules in individual cases via guidance from the standards board.

4.3 Working Groups for Applications-Specific Risks

Regulations which exist in many specific domains often require intention or an act by a human, and it is unclear how this applies, or whether prosecution of violations by AI systems would be viable. There is also a lack of expertise in these domains, and the complexity of current AI systems means that specific standards for each domain are needed, and a standards board would be in an excellent position to provide assistance and guidance.

Some applications, including law enforcement and medicine, obviously have specific risks that must be understood, and weighed against benefits of the application before allowing them to proceed. Domains with regulations restricting human practice such as engineering or medicine already have standards, but the groups setting and updating those standards are both unaware of the AI-specific risks, and not currently able to regulate AI systems. The current approach seems to be that AI systems are either narrow, or are trained to refuse to answer within domains where issues exist. This is a reasonable stopgap measure, but unlikely to be sufficient moving forward.

For this reason, application audits are needed. These are necessary to ensure ethical and safe usage of AI systems or algorithms which may themselves be safe. (Akula and Garibay, 2021) These application-specific audits will involve components required of both the system developers, and the application developer, so general standards will need to anticipate the requirements of applications. Audits of the general model will need to provide guidance for what is acceptable for more specific applications. For example, a generative AI for producing CAD or similar outputs must be held to a higher standard if it will be used for car parts, much less dental implants, than if it is used to generate content for online games.

Of course, AI systems which are intended to be generally capable pose additional challenges. User agreements which list standard disclaimers about not relying on a model for medical, legal, or other advice, and fine-tuning to make AI systems disclaim their answers may or may not be legally relevant, but will have limited effect on how these systems are actually used. To the extent that a model can be urged to provide a service, there is an ethical if not legal requirement to ensure it does so responsibly. And either because it may be used in specific applications, or because it may be used directly in these higher risk domains, such general models may be required to pass any and all domain specific requirements.

Whether considering general or narrower AI systems, it is easier and more useful to consider holistic approaches and expert groups able to respond dynamically to changing needs, rather than evaluating and addressing each class of harm with different sets of incomplete and overlapping audits. To enable this, coordination between regulators, industry, auditors, domain experts, ethicists, and the public will be essential. Flexible institutions able to coordinate with all of these groups, rather than a narrow standards process, seem well suited to the challenges - both those which are anticipated, and those which will inevitably arise in the future.

4.4 Safety-washing and industry dynamics

An incentive structure for AI auditing needs to be utilized that ensures not only high fidelity audits of frontier models, but high rigorous and robust audits at a more granular level, specific to different classes of risks, as evaluating and red teaming different classes of risks may involve quite different and unique skill sets and experience. (Frase 2023) Despite the many unique challenges, the concerns mentioned parallel those in other industries, and therefore share some failure modes.

The default for many modern industries is some degree of regulatory capture, competition creating races to the minimum standards, asymmetric assignment of responsibility to avoid culpability, and audits that provide more reputational to substantive benefits. We see this everywhere from chocolate production and modern slavery (Gutierrez-Huerter et al, 2023) to mining (Gold et al 2015, Nygren 2018), and expect similar dynamics to continue to frustrate efforts in AI safety (Guest et al 2023) and in AI ethics (van Maanen, 2022).

Current efforts to build standards will fall prey to both the appearance and reality of corporate pressures towards failure. Given the widespread damage caused by current use of algorithmic decisionmaking, (O’Neil 2017) and the rapid and ongoing near-universal adoption of AI systems with even less transparency and more critical tasks, industry capture would be disastrous. The challenge of regulation is worsened by the rush towards investments and focus on profits, which will ultimately hurt the industry. Failures, even reasonable ones, would lead to public pushback against even beneficial AI, and such failures are inevitable, especially if standards are dictated by narrow interests.

It makes sense, then, that there are also efforts underway to preempt regulation, and not just via lobbying. For example, efforts like “Responsible AI Maturity Models” which are promoted by Microsoft (Vorvoreanu et al, 2023) and industry-led groups such as Responsible.AI (2024) are nearly explicit attempts to preempt regulation by creating voluntary industry standards. However, its inability to serve the necessary role is obvious given the concept of a maturity model – common in unregulated industries and those where standards do not exist or are not enforced. In addition, we view the narrowness of the scope of what responsibility means, and the non-participatory nature of their development, which excluded regulators and the public, as clear indications of their purpose.

The world has seen both more and less successful approaches for building safety and ethical standards. Given the expected importance of AI in the industry, it is in the enlightened self-interest of industry to ensure that robust, open, and neutral auditing standards are developed. And given the concern about the criticality of auditing frontier models against larger future risks,, it is imperative that auditing’s rigor is prioritized with redundancy and robust standards and certification procedures for auditors.

5 Conclusion

An audit standards board would address many issues with AI audits highlighted in the paper which seem problematic, and efforts in this direction seem valuable. As noted initially, standards boards for safety and similar audits are common across many industries, in various forms. Despite the many differences between AI and those in other fields, the essential reason for needing such a group is unchanged; audits must be fair, trusted, and fit to the purpose of enabling stakeholders to make determinations about the facts. None of those goals can be accomplished without having the standards set independently. A proliferation of individual standards seems unlikely to accomplish this goal, whereas a board of people actively building auditing systems and performing audits, with cooperation from regulators and industry, seems far more promising.

Such a board would not, in and of itself, solve problems with regulatory capture, much less with the fundamentally difficult problems of building artificial intelligence that doesn't exacerbate current harms or the threatened future risks. Open work by such a board would, however, make it clearer to everyone what progress was or was not occurring. To the extent that AI governance is an information problem, (Anderljung 2023b) a standards board can help remediate that problem. And to the extent that ethical and safe AI can be enhanced by wider sharing of best practices, standards, and methods, this seems like the right direction to move.

However, the groups which need to push for such a standards body are not the academics studying the problem, but a coalition of the companies building these systems, the auditors performing evaluations, and the regulators, government bodies, and international agencies who are charged with oversight. Consensus about AI audit as one important path forward is a promising recent development, and we are hopeful that this next step, of having an active standards board that sets audit standards and provides resources for performing them, also becomes a widely-accepted next step in building safer and more fair AI systems.

References

- [1] R. Akula and I. Garibay. Audit and assurance of AI algorithms: a framework to ensure ethical algorithmic practices in artificial intelligence, 2021. arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14046.
- [2] M. Anderljung, J. Barnhart, J. Leung, A. Korinek, C. O'Keefe, J. Whittlestone, and K. Wolf. Frontier AI regulation: Managing emerging risks to public safety, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03718.
- [3] M. Anderljung, E.T. Smith, J. O'Brien, L. Soder, B. Bucknall, E. Bluemke, and R. Chowdhury. Towards publicly accountable frontier llms: Building an external scrutiny ecosystem under the aspire framework, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.14711.
- [4] R. Anil, S. Borgeaud, Y. Wu, J.B. Alayrac, J. Yu, and J. Ahn. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805.
- [5] Anthropic. Anthropic's responsible scaling policy, 2023.
- [6] S. Avin. Frontier AI regulation blueprint. center for the study of existential risk, 2023. Available online:.
- [7] R.K. Bellamy, K. Dey, M. Hind, S.C. Hoffman, S. Houde, K. Kannan, and Y. Zhang. AI fairness 360: An extensible toolkit for detecting, understanding, and mitigating unwanted algorithmic bias, 2018. arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01943.
- [8] S. Bhaumik, S. Rana, C. Karimkhani, V. Welch, R. Armstrong, K. Pottie, and R.D. Amico. Ethics and equity in research priority-setting: stakeholder engagement and the needs of disadvantaged groups. *Indian J Med Ethics*, 12(2):110–3, 2015.

- [9] M. Biene-Hershey. It security and it auditing between 1960 and 2000. In *The History of Information Security*, page 655–680. Elsevier Science BV, 2007.
- [10] R. Bommasani, D.A. Hudson, E. Adeli, R. Altman, S. Arora, S. Arx, M.S. Bernstein, J. Bohg, A. Bosselut, E. Brunskill, and E. Brynjolfsson. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models, 2021. arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258.
- [11] D. Carpenter. Corrosive capture? the dueling forces of autonomy and industry influence in fda pharmaceutical regulation. In *Preventing Regulatory Capture: Social Influence and How to Limit It*, page 2228–2232. 2013.
- [12] S. Casper, X. Davies, C. Shi, T.K. Gilbert, J. Scheurer, J. Rando, and D. Hadfield-Menell. Open problems and fundamental limitations of reinforcement learning from human feedback, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15217.
- [13] P. Christiano. Three levels of threat obfuscation, 2018. Archived version available here:.
- [14] A. Corso, D. Karamadian, R. Valentin, M. Cooper, and M.J. Kochenderfer. A holistic assessment of the reliability of machine learning systems, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10586.
- [15] S. Courville, C. Parker, H. Watchirs, S. Costanza-Chock, I.D. Raji, and J. Buolamwini. Introduction: Auditing in regulatory perspective. *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 25(3):179, 2003. ISSN: 0265-8240.
- [16] Department for Science Innovation & Technology DSIT. Introducing the AI safety institute, 2023.
- [17] S. Ee, J. O’Brien, Z. Williams, A. El-Dakhakhni, M. Aird, and A. Lintz. Adapting cybersecurity frameworks to manage frontier AI risks: a defense-in-depth approach, 2023.
- [18] Khalid F., Hanif M. A., Rehman S., Ahmed R., and Shafique M. Trisec: Training data-unaware imperceptible security attacks on deep neural networks. In *2019 IEEE 25th International Symposium on On-Line Testing and Robust System Design (IOLTS), Rhodes*, pages 188–193., Greece, 2019.
- [19] S. Filyppova, B. Kholod, L. Prodanova, L. Ivanchenkova, V. Ivanchenkov, and I. Bashynska. Risk management through systematization: Risk management culture, 2019.
- [20] H. Frase. *One Size Does Not Fit All: Assessment, Safety, and Trust for the Diverse Range of AI Products, Tools, Services, and Resources*. Center for Security and Emerging Technology, Georgetown University, 2023.
- [21] P. Gade, S. Lermen, C. Rogers-Smith, and J. Ladish. Badllama: cheaply removing safety fine-tuning from llama 2-chat 13b, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.00117.
- [22] S. Gold, A. Trautrim, and Z. Trodd. Modern slavery challenges to supply chain management”. *Supply Chain Management*, 20(5):485–494, 2015.
- [23] Ross Gruetzemacher, Alan Chan, Kevin Frazier, Christy Manning, Štěpán Los, James Fox, and José Hernández-Orallo. An international consortium for evaluations of societal-scale risks from advanced ai, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.14455.
- [24] O. Guest, M. Aird, and S.Ó. hÉigeartaigh. Safeguarding the safeguards: How best to promote AI alignment in the public interest, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08039.
- [25] O. Gutierrez-Huerter, Gold G., S., and A. Trautrim. Change in rhetoric but not in action? framing of the ethical issue of modern slavery in a uk sector at high risk of labor exploitation. *Journal of business ethics*, 182(1):35–58, 2023.
- [26] J.A. Hall and J. Cengage Learning.Hazell. *Information technology auditing*. Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford, Centre for the Governance of AI, 2015.

- [27] E. Hubinger, C. Denison, J. Mu, M. Lambert, M. Tong, M. MacDiarmid, and E. Perez. Sleeper agents: Training deceptive llms that persist through safety training, 2024. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05566.
- [28] IAEA. Regulatory oversight of safety culture in nuclear installations. *International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)*, (1707), 2013.
- [29] Responsible.AI (Responsible AI Institute. Our responsible AI maturity model, 2024.
- [30] S. Kaufman, S. Rosset, C. Perlich, and O. Stitelman. Leakage in data mining: Formulation, detection, and avoidance. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 6(4):1–21, 2012.
- [31] L. Keyser. *Apollo Experience Report. The Role Of Flight Mission Rules*. Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, 1974.
- [32] A. Koshiyama, E. Kazim, P. Treleaven, P. Rai, L. Szpruch, G. Pavey, and E. Lomas. Towards algorithm auditing: a survey on managing legal, ethical and technological risks of ai, ml and associated algorithms, 2021.
- [33] J. Krijger, T. Thuis, and M. Ruiter. The AI ethics maturity model: a holistic approach to advancing ethical data science in organizations. *AI Ethics*, 3:355–367, 2023.
- [34] X.Y. Lawrence and J. Woodcock. Fda pharmaceutical quality oversight. *International journal of pharmaceutics*, 491(1-2):2–7, 2015.
- [35] S. Lazar and A. Nelson. AI safety on whose terms? *Science*, 381(6654):138–138, 2023.
- [36] S. Lermen, C. Rogers-Smith, and J. Ladish. Lora fine-tuning efficiently undoes safety training in llama 2-chat 70b, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.20624.
- [37] P. Liang. Holistic evaluation of language models, 2022. Published in Transactions on Machine Learning Research (TMLR), 2023; arXiv:2211.09110.
- [38] M. Lombe and M. Sherraden. Inclusion in the policy process: An agenda for participation of the marginalized. In *New Horizons for Policy Practice*, page 109–123. Routledge, 2013.
- [39] Commission L’intelligence Artificielle. Ia: Notre ambition pour la france, 2024.
- [40] G. Maanen. AI ethics, ethics washing, and the need to politicize data ethics. *DISO*, 1, 9, 2022.
- [41] D. Manheim. Building a culture of safety for ai: Perspectives and challenges, 2023.
- [42] D. Manheim. Building less-flawed metrics: Understanding and creating better measurement and incentive systems. *Patterns*, 4(10), 2023.
- [43] M. Miceli and J. Posada. The data-production dispositif. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 6(CSCW2):1–37, 2022.
- [44] M. Mitchell, S. Wu, A. Zaldivar, P. Barnes, L. Vasserman, B. Hutchinson, and T. Gebru. Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, page 220–229, 2019-01.
- [45] K. Moscou and J.C. Kohler. Pharmacogovernance: Advancing pharmacovigilance and patient safety. In *Social and Administrative Aspects of Pharmacy in Low-and Middle-Income Countries*, page 403–418. Academic Press, 2018.
- [46] C.A. Mouton, C. Lucas, and E. Guest. *The Operational Risks of AI in Large-Scale Biological Attacks: A Red-Team Approach*. RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, 2023.
- [47] J. Mökander, J. Schuett, H.R. Kirk, and L. Floridi. Auditing large language models: a three-layered approach. *AI and Ethics*, page 1–31, 2023.

- [48] NIST. AI risk management framework: AI RMF (1.0). Technical report NIST AI 100-1., National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, 2023.
- [49] M. Nuñez. AI pioneers yann lecun and yoshua bengio clash in an intense online debate over AI safety and governance, 2023.
- [50] M. Nygren. Safety management on multi-employer worksites: Responsibilities and power relations in the mining industry, 2018.
- [51] OpenAI. *Frontier Model Forum. A joint announcement from Anthropic, OpenAI, Microsoft, and Google*, 2023.
- [52] OpenAI. Openai red teaming network, 2023.
- [53] OpenAI. Preparedness framework (beta). *December, 18, 2023*.
- [54] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Lukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Lukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O’Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selman, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin

- Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- [55] M. Peytcheva, A.M. Wright, and B. Majoor. The impact of principles-based versus rules-based accounting standards on auditors’ motivations and evidence demands. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 26(2):51–72, 2014.
- [56] Executive Office President. Executive order 14110: Safe, secure, and trustworthy development and use of artificial intelligence, 2023. Document Number: 2023-24283, 75191-75226.
- [57] I.D. Raji, I.E. Kumar, A. Horowitz, and A. Selbst. The fallacy of AI functionality. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, page 959–972, 2022.
- [58] I.D. Raji, P. Xu, C. Honigsberg, D. Ho, I. D., A. Smart, R.N. White, M. Mitchell, T. Gebru, B. Hutchinson, and P. Barnes. Outsider oversight: Designing a third party audit ecosystem for AI governance. In *Proceedings of the 2022 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, page 557–571, 2022.
- [59] J. Rasmussen and I. Suedung. *Proactive risk management in a dynamic society*. Swedish Rescue Services Agency, 2000.
- [60] L. Robb, T. Candy, and F. Deane. Regulatory overlap: A systematic quantitative literature review. *Regulation & Governance*, 17:1131–1151, 2023.
- [61] E.H. Schein. *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, CA, 1992.
- [62] K. Schipper. Principles-based accounting standards. *Accounting Horizons*, 17(1), 2003.
- [63] R. Shah, S. Pour, A. Tagade, S. Casper, and J. Rando. Scalable and transferable black-box jailbreaks for language models via persona modulation, 2023.
- [64] L. Sharkey, C. Ní Ghuidhir, D. Braun, J. Scheurer, M. Balesni, L. Bushnaq, C. Stix, and M. Hobbahn. A causal framework for AI regulation and auditing. *Apollo Research*, 2023.
- [65] T. Shevlane. The artefacts of intelligence: Governing scientists’ contribution to AI proliferation, 2022.
- [66] T. Shevlane, S. Farquhar, B. Garfinkel, M. Phuong, J. Whittlestone, J. Leung, D. Kokotajlo, N. Marchal, M. Anderljung, N. Kolt, and L. Ho. Model evaluation for extreme risks, 2023.
- [67] S. Shorrock. Shorrock’s law of limits, 2019.
- [68] S. Sonnenburg, M.L. Braun, C.S. Ong, S. Bengio, L. Bottou, and G. Holmes. The need for open source software in machine learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8:2443–2466, 2007.
- [69] L.N. Tidjon and F. Khomh. The different faces of AI ethics across the world: A principle-to-practice gap analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, 4(4):820–839, 2023.
- [70] M. Vorvoreanu, A. Heger, S. Passi, S. Dhanorkar, Z. Kahn, and R. Wang. Responsible AI maturity model. Technical report msr-tr-2023-26., Microsoft, 2023.

- [71] J. Wei, Y. Tay, R. Bommasani, C. Raffel, B. Zoph, S. Borgeaud, D. Yogatama, M. Bosma, D. Zhou, D. Metzler, and E.H. Chi. Emergent abilities of large language models, 2022.
- [72] L. Weidinger, M. Rauh, N. Marchal, A. Manzini, L.A. Hendricks, J. Mateos-Garcia, S. Bergman, J. Kay, C. Griffin, B. Bariach, and I. Gabriel. Sociotechnical safety evaluation of generative AI systems, 2023. arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11986.
- [73] xAI. Open release of grok-1, 2024.
- [74] L. Zhou, P.A. Moreno-Casares, F. Martínez-Plumed, J. Burden, R. Burnell, L. Cheke, and J. Hernández-Orallo. Predictable artificial intelligence, 2023.
- [75] K. Zhu, J. Wang, J. Zhou, Z. Wang, H. Chen, Y. Wang, and X. Xie. Promptbench: Towards evaluating the robustness of large language models on adversarial prompts, 2023.

We would like to thank two of the anonymous reviewers for their feedback.