

ABSTRACT:
RESPONSIBLE AI AGENTS

DRAFT

By
Deven R. Desai and Mark Riedl

Thanks to advances in large language models, a new type of software agent, the artificial intelligence (AI) agent, has entered the marketplace. Companies such as OpenAI, Google, Microsoft, and Salesforce promise their AI Agents will go from generating passive text to executing tasks. Instead of a travel itinerary, an AI Agent would book all aspects of your trip. Instead of generating text or images for social media post, an AI Agent would post the content across a host of social media outlets. The potential power of AI Agents has fueled legal scholars' fears that AI Agents will enable rogue commerce, human manipulation, rampant defamation, and intellectual property harms. These scholars are calling for regulation before AI Agents cause havoc.

This Article addresses the concerns around AI Agents head on. It shows that core aspects of how one piece of software interacts with another creates ways to discipline AI Agents so that rogue, undesired actions are unlikely, perhaps more so than rules designed to govern human agents. It also develops a way to leverage the computer-science approach to value-alignment to improve a user's ability to take action to prevent or correct AI Agent operations. That approach offers an added benefit of helping AI Agents align with norms around user-AI Agent interactions. These practices will enable desired economic outcomes and mitigate perceived risks. The Article also argues that no matter how much AI Agents seem like human agents, they need not, and should not, be given legal personhood status. In short, humans are responsible for AI Agents' actions, and this Article provides a guide for how humans can build and maintain responsible AI Agents.

RESPONSIBLE AI AGENTS

BY

DEVEN R. DESAI AND MARK RIEDL

RESPONSIBLE AI AGENTS

BY

Deven R. Desai[†] and Mark Riedl^{*}

INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. CONCEPTIONS OF AGENTS AND AGENCY	7
A. AI Agents: The Next Wave of Generative AI Tools.....	7
B. What Is an Agent? The Computer Science View.....	11
C. What Is an Agent? The Legal View	14
D. Overlaps and Gaps in Conceptions of Agents	19
II. THE SECRET SAUCE FOR LIMITING AI AGENTS: APIS, VALUE-ALIGNMENT, AND THE PRACTICAL REALITIES OF COMPUTING	21
A. Legal and Practical Design Enables Commerce at a Distance	22
B. APIS Mediate an AI Agent’s Ability to Go Rogue	25
1. Some Fundamentals About APIS.....	25
2. AI Agents and APIS	27
C. Value Alignment Limits Undesired LLM Outputs and AI Agent Actions....	32
D. Mythical Daemons and Computation Cost Realities.....	36
III. TOWARDS BUILDING RESPONSIBLE AI AGENTS	38
A. How Law Can Inform Value-Alignment	40
B. Towards More Responsible AI Agents	43
CONCLUSION	46

[†] Sue and John Stanton Professor of Business Law and Ethics, Georgia Institute of Technology; J.D. Yale Law School; Affiliated Fellow, Yale Law School Information Society Project; former Academic Research Counsel, Google, Inc., Associate Director of Law, Policy, and Ethics, Georgia Tech Machine Learning Center.

^{*} Professor, Georgia Tech School of Interactive Computing, Georgia Institute of Technology; Associate Director, Georgia Tech Machine Learning Center

INTRODUCTION

For each possible percept sequence, a rational agent should select an action that is expected to maximize its performance measure, given the evidence provided by the percept sequence and whatever built-in knowledge the agent has.

—Stuart Russel and Peter Norvig¹

The common law of agency encompasses the legal consequences of consensual relationships in which one person (the “principal”) manifests assent that another person (the “agent”) shall, subject to the principal's right of control, have power to affect the principal's legal relations through the agent's acts and on the principal's behalf. Relationships of agency usually contemplate three parties—the agent, the principal, and third parties with whom the agent interacts in some manner.

Restatement (Third) of Agency²

AI Agents—software that perceives the world, has reasoning capabilities, and can act autonomously to carry out a user’s instructions³—are out of the lab, in ever growing use, and raising fears about runaway harms.⁴ Perhaps because computer science uses the phrase “software agents” and certain sectors of the software industry talk of “agentic software” as a stage on the path to possibly fully conscious super-intelligence, legal discussions have called for society “to take seriously the word agent in its legal and social

¹ STUART RUSSEL AND PETER NORVIG, *ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: A MODERN APPROACH* 58 (4TH ED. 2020).

² RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY INTRODUCTION.

³ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 21-22 (“All computer programs do something, but computer agents are expected to do more: operate autonomously, perceive their environment, persist over a prolonged time period, adapt to change, and create and pursue goals.”); *Cf.* Maxwell Zeff, *AI Agents Promise to Connect the Dots Between Reality and Sci-Fi*, GIZMODO, May 27, 2024 (“Simply put, AI Agents are just AI models that do something independently. ... They go a step further than just creating a response like the chatbots we’ve become familiar with – there’s action. ... [Companies are] teaching AI Agents to work with various APIs on your computer. Ideally, they can press buttons, make decisions, autonomously monitor channels, and send requests.”) at <https://gizmodo.com/ai-agents-openai-chatgpt-google-gemini-reality-sci-fi-1851500474>.

⁴ Jonathan Zittrain, *We Need to Control AI Agents Now*, THE ATLANTIC, July 2, 2024 (describing AI Agents perpetrating broad, harmful acts online). Professors Ian Ayres and Jack Balkin argue AI Agents should be treated as unmanaged, risky agents. Ian Ayres and Jack Balkin, *The Law of AI Is the Law of Risky Agents without Intentions*, (discussing fears of defamatory AI Agents) at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4862025

sense” and treat software agents as human agents.⁵ This Article takes this call head on but finds agency law is not the best way to understand let alone manage AI Agents.⁶ Instead we leverage computer science realities combined with socio-legal practices around ecommerce and generative AI systems, to address concerns around AI Agents and offer path to responsible AI Agents.⁷

Imagine you can tell ChatGPT, Alexa, Gemini, or a software that you built, “Plan *and book*, a two-week trip to Bora Bora. I want some beach time but also some cool experiences,” and then within an hour, your phone pings, and you see an amazing trip that you love, fully booked and paid for.⁸ Now imagine you operate a business and have a new product but are quite busy. You tell the software, “Write a series of social media posts based on these materials (which you add to the prompt). Have each post highlight the novel features. Deploy the posts across X, Facebook, TikTok,⁹ YouTube, Instagram, Snapchat, and Reddit for the next two weeks in ways appropriate for each platform.” Over the next few weeks, the posts go out, and your sales go up. Your experience went so well you use the software to handle sales. This time, however, the software makes a mistake and sells your product for half its

⁵ Jonathan Zittrain, Kevin Frazier, Jen Patja, *Lawfare Daily: Jonathan Zittrain on Controlling AI Agents*, LAWFARE, October 17, 2024, (positing “even ordering Domino’s via an agent could lead to unintended and severe consequences” such ordering “a thousand pizzas”) at <https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/lawfare-daily--jonathan-zittrain-on-controlling-ai-agents>;

⁶ Indeed, importing agency law’s view of agents as representative of humans arguably plays into the hands of those who wish to argue that software has or will achieve Artificial General Intelligence and even consciousness.

⁷ The term “Responsible” begs the question: responsible to whom? This Article explores responsibility from the perspectives of communities, which might be society as a whole or a marketplace of principles, suppliers, and third-parties, and also individual users. The concept of value alignment, while most commonly invoked in the context of constraining AGI from hypothetical harms to humanity writ large, is also pragmatically a tool for ensuring that AI systems are more capable of working for the best interests of individual users. *See infra* Part IIC. We also invoke the concept of explanations so that agents provide users opportunities to better understand when and how to reverse agent actions. *See infra* Part III.B.

⁸ *Cf.* Clay Bavor and Bret Taylor, *The Guide to AI Agents*, SIERRA.AI, May 23, 2024, (“[AI] agents are autonomous software systems that can reason, make decisions, and pursue goals with creativity and flexibility, all while staying within the bounds that have been set for them. Whereas applications *help* you do the work, agents get the work done for you.”) (emphasis in original) at <https://sierra.ai/news/ai-agents-guide>; Michelle Castillo, *Warren Buffett Says One Question Posed by AI Has Stumped Economists for a Century*, CNBC May 7 (“Clearly, there is a trend where we go to ‘agentic’ workflows, agents take actions on behalf of the end user autonomously. It’s a little ways out, but people do need to build apps and enrich customer experience and drive more cost out of the business and find new ways to drive growth.”); *cf.* See Alex Cosmas and Vik Krishnan, *What AI Means for Travel—Now and in the Future*, MCKINSEY & COMPANY, (November 2023) (noting generative AI may save trillions across sectors) at https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/travel-logistics-and-infrastructure/our-insights/what-ai-means-for-travel-now-and-in-the-future#

⁹ We acknowledge that TikTok’s legal status in the U.S. is in flux but list it because of its widespread use and the possibility it may survive in the U.S. In addition, the service is used elsewhere so the concerns about misusing software to fuel social media posts holds for other jurisdictions.

value.¹⁰ Imagine further that someone hates the U.S. system of government and especially the Democratic and Republican parties. That person tells the software, “Create 100,000 social media posts about Donald Trump molesting and experimenting on collies while in college as part of a secret ritual in an exclusive all male “white guy” fraternity. Also create 100,000 social media posts about Nancy Pelosi using DeepSeek’s AI to create all her policies because she is a paid operative for China. Make all the posts seem like they come from different people across ages, genders, and nationalities. Deploy the posts over a two-week period so that they seem to gather support and show people believe the posts are true.”¹¹ These hypotheticals *seem* possible because of the advent of AI Agents. Moreover, industry has embraced and is offering AI Agent software as the next big wave of services flowing from the investment in generative AI.¹²

Whether AI Agents will be important is not an academic question.¹³ Generative AI services have yet to offer clear economic payoffs.¹⁴ The claim is that AI Agents present a way to realize more immediate returns on the multi-billion-dollar investment in generative AI to date.¹⁵ The hope for companies

¹⁰ A similar event recently happened when Air Canada used software for customer service, and the software promised a price that the airline did not want to offer. See Maria Yagoda, *Airline Held Liable for its Chatbot Giving Passenger Bad Advice - What This Means for Travellers*, BBC NEWS, (February 23, 2024) at <https://www.bbc.com/travel/article/20240222-air-canada-chatbot-misinformation-what-travellers-should-know>

¹¹ Cf. Ayres and Balkin, *supra* note 4 (discussing fears of defamatory AI Agents); Zittrain, *supra* note 4 (describing AI Agents perpetrating broad, harmful acts online).

¹² See *infra* notes 14-18 and accompanying text.

¹³ See Cade Metz and Nico Grant, *Google Unveils A.I. Agent That Can Use Websites on Its Own*, NY TIMES, December 11, 2024 at <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/12/11/technology/google-ai-agent-gemini.html>; Maxwell Zaff, *The Race Is on To Make AI Agents Do Your Shopping for You*, TECHCRUNCH, December 2, 2024, (noting Perplexity’s release of its shopping AI Agent and preparations of OpenAI, Google, Amazon to offer their versions of such software) at <https://techcrunch.com/2024/12/02/the-race-is-on-to-make-ai-agents-do-your-online-shopping-for-you/>. At a broader level, AI Agents raises issues around of the law of agency and its practical implications. See Deborah DeMott, *Disloyal Agents*, 58 ALABAMA L. REV. 1049, 1067 (2007), (“The common law of agency has not always attracted the degree of academic interest that’s warranted by its ubiquity, as well as its theoretical interest and practical significance.”)

¹⁴ See Castillo, *supra* note 8 (noting difficulty in parsing older AI software deployment from generative AI when assessing productivity returns) at <https://www.cnbc.com/2024/05/07/warren-buffett-on-ai-issue-that-has-stumped-economists-for-a-century.html>; Scott Rosenberg, *Generative AI Is Still a Solution in Search of a Problem*, AXIOS, April 24, 2023 (“The gigantic and costly industry Silicon Valley is building around generative AI is still struggling to explain the technology’s utility.”) at <https://www.axios.com/2024/04/24/generative-ai-why-future-uses;>

¹⁵ See Cristina Criddle and George Hammond, *OpenAI Bets on AI Agents Becoming Mainstream by 2025*, FINANCIAL TIMES, October 1, 2024, at <https://www.ft.com/content/30677465-33bb-4f74-a8e6-239980091f7a>; James O'Donnell, *Sam Altman Says Helpful Agents Are Poised to Become AI’s Killer Function*, MIT TECH. REV., May 1, 2024 at <https://www.technologyreview.com/2024/05/01/1091979/sam-altman-says-helpful-agents-are-poised-to-become-ais-killer-function/>; Castillo, *supra* note 8 (“The market is passing through the phase of the value accruing only at the bottom layer, such as Nvidia and

such as OpenAI, Google, Microsoft, Amazon, and others in the AI Agent sector¹⁶ is that AI Agents, as offshoots of the computer science breakthroughs behind generative AI, will autonomously take over all sorts of work someone might do.¹⁷ If so, AI Agents will aid individuals and industries as a cost-reducing, productivity technology.¹⁸ At the same time, the proliferation of companies and individuals using AI Agents raises age-old issues for commerce conducted at a distance such as, what is a binding contract, how payment is guaranteed, and what to do if an erroneous purchase is made.¹⁹ As AI Agents grow in use in power, one fearful perspective is that AI Agents will enable “unintended and severe consequences” such as massive Domino pizza orders²⁰ or wild, million-dollar purchasing errors.²¹ Even if such extremes are unlikely, a simpler concern exists. Human agents can, after all, err in carrying out mundane but important commercial tasks too. In contrast, given AI Agents potential speed, they might err at a greater rate and cost than human agents. Although the issues around commerce are important, online life presents other avenues for undesired outcomes.

Another class of fears is that AI Agents will allow rogue, harmful actions, unless we do something to “control” them immediately.²² For example, a prominent scholar posits an AI Agent taking a simple instruction such as “help me cope with this boring class” could call in a bomb threat as a way to carry out the request, or an army of AI Agents might manipulate people to make bomb threats at scale.²³ Additional concerns include AI Agents that could lurk in an online game and join online fan forums but with the ulterior motive of slipping in a political agenda.²⁴ Other scholars envision AI Agents as “risky agents” and seek to discipline the way the software is created so as to

ChatGPT/OpenAI, and it is now critical for companies to prepare for the applications built on top of that infrastructure.”); Clay Bavor and Bret Taylor, *The Guide to AI Agents*, SIERRA.AI, May 23, 2024, (“Behind this breakthrough [in AI Agents] are recent advances in artificial intelligence, and large language models in particular”) at <https://sierra.ai/news/ai-agents-guide>

¹⁶ See *infra* notes 40-44 and accompanying text.

¹⁷ Yonadav Shavit, et al. *Practices for Governing Agentic AI Systems*, at 6-7 RESEARCH PAPER, OPENAI, December (2023) (describing a range of “potential benefits” of AI Agent systems) at <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/practices-for-governing-agentic-ai-systems.pdf>.

¹⁸ Castillo, *supra* note 8; cf. See Alex Cosmas and Vik Krishnan, *What AI Means for Travel—Now and in the Future*, MCKINSEY & COMPANY, (November 2023) (noting generative AI may save trillions across sectors) at <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/travel-logistics-and-infrastructure/our-insights/what-ai-means-for-travel-now-and-in-the-future#/>

¹⁹ See e.g., Geoffrey Fowler, *I Let ChatGPT’s New ‘Agent’ Manage My Life. It Spent \$31 on a Dozen Eggs*, WASHINGTON POST, February 7, 2025, at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2025/02/07/openai-operator-ai-agent-chatgpt/>

²⁰ See Zittrain, *supra* note 5 (positing “even ordering Domino’s via an agent could lead to unintended and severe consequences” such ordering “a thousand pizzas”)

²¹ See Zittrain, *supra* note 5; Zittrain, *supra* note 4.

²² Zittrain, *supra* note 4; accord Noam Kolt, *Governing AI Agents*, Notre Dame L. Rev. at 15-17 (listing a range of concerns) (forthcoming 2025) at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4772956

²³ Zittrain, *supra* note 4.

²⁴ *Id.*

minimize harmful outcomes such as copyright infringement and defamation potentially flowing from using AI Agents.²⁵

We argue that most of the concerns around AI Agents revolve around solving how best to ensure that a piece of software does what a user wants the software to do, or what computer science broadly calls “the alignment” problem.²⁶ Alignment concerns how well software performs given a specification by the programmer of the software. For example, when one writes the software that allows a robot vacuum to clean a room, one likely will add code so that the robot does not harm furniture or spread dirty things around the house.²⁷ Of late, the alignment problem often addresses more abstract goals such as avoiding biased outputs and notions of “doing the right thing.”²⁸ No matter the goal, the more dynamic the operating environment and the more a software can learn, the less one can fully specify what one wants the software agent to do.²⁹ Thus, alignment becomes quite difficult. This point links to legal concepts.

The gaps in how well we can specify software behavior track core issues in agency law.³⁰ Both computer science and agency law are concerned with how to have an agent do something for someone, how detailed the agent’s instructions are, how to have an agent perform a task with less than perfect instructions, and how much the agent can deviate from the instructions. The law, however, goes a step further and asks about the way agents affect third parties; an issue that computer science’s theory of agents does not explicitly address.

Even though computer science’s theory of agents has a narrow view of interaction with users that does not account for third parties, computer science is not bereft of solutions to core issues raised by agency law. Indeed, core parts of why software works and the way AI Agents interact with other software provide robust answers to concerns over potentially undesired outcomes when

²⁵ Ayres and Balkin, *supra* note 4.

²⁶ *See infra* Part II.C.

²⁷ *See e.g.*, Brain Heater, *iRobot’s Poop Problem*, TechCrunch, September 9, 2021, (detailing extensive research by iRobot on how to have its vacuum not pick up and smear dog feces around a house); Samantha Nelson, *‘Pooptastrophe’: Man Details the Night His Roomba Ran Over Dog Poop*, USA TODAY, August 15, 2016 at <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2016/08/15/pooptastrophe-man-details-night-his-roomba-ran-over-dog-poop/88667704/>

²⁸ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1 at 22. As an example, in 2016 when Microsoft released its chatbot, Tay, designed to interact on Twitter, they didn’t want the software to give racist outputs; but user interaction yielded that undesired result. *See* Marty J. Wolf, K. Miller, and Frances S. Grodzinsky, *Why We Should Have Seen That Coming: Comments on Microsoft’s Tay “Experiment,” and Wider Implications*, 47 ACM SIGCAS COMPUTERS AND SOCIETY 54, 54-55 (2017)

²⁹ *See infra* notes 62-70 and accompanying text.

³⁰ *See* Dylan Hadfield-Menell and Gillian Hadfield, *Incomplete Contracting and AI Alignment*, PROCEEDINGS OF THE 2019 AAAI/ACM CONFERENCE ON AI, ETHICS, AND SOCIETY, 417, 417 (2019) (connecting alignment issues in computer science to principal-agent issues in economics and law).

AI Agents are used.³¹ We thus add to the literature on AI Agents by examining the broad set of technical infrastructure and rules that limit AI Agents. We argue that the infrastructure addresses agency-like issues in ways that should please legal scholars but without fully turning software into legal agents.³² Put differently, we argue that approaches to governing AI Agents can benefit from looking at how the law governs human agency, but only by analogy.

It is a mistake to equate a software agent to a human agent.³³ Although computer science uses the word, agent, and computer science's theory of software agents looks quite similar to legal conceptions of agency, software lacks agency.³⁴ Anthropomorphizing software confuses issues and could lead to a world where software has legal personhood, related rights, and liability shields.³⁵ If that happens, the power for people to use software would grow while also increasing the ability to avoid responsibility. That is the situation to avoid. Put simply, responsible AI Agents are about responsible human action.

Part I of the Article explains what AI Agents are, the range of actions AI Agents can take, and the emerging market for AI Agents. It adds to the literature on AI and the law by comparing the ways law and computer science conceive of agents in ways that converge and diverge. That investigation reveals that although the disciplines share terminology and theoretical

³¹ In that sense, critics should remember that AI Agents will have to operate within external structures and interact with institutions. *Cf. id.* (“human contracting is supported by substantial amounts of external structure, such as generally available institutions (culture, law)”).

³² *See e.g.*, SAMIR CHOPRA AND LAURENCE F. WHITE, A LEGAL THEORY FOR AUTONOMOUS ARTIFICIAL AGENTS, 69 (2011) CHOPRA AND WHITE, (concluding that as agents become ever more independent, intentional, law will need to embrace legal personhood for agents).

³³ *See e.g.*, Ayres and Balkin, *supra* note 4 (anthropomorphizing AI Agents by asking that software not be negligent, exercise fiduciary care, and presuming “AI programs intend the reasonable and foreseeable consequences of their actions.”)

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4862025. To be clear, Ayres and Balkin end up admitting that software lack intentions and the real focus should be on “question of legal obligation is who should be held responsible for the use of AI and under what conditions.” *Id.* The danger lies in how legal scholars implicitly or explicitly talk of software agents in terms that move a reader to ascribe actual human capabilities to software.

³⁴ Just because software looks like and acts like an agent, doesn't make it an agent in the legal sense of the word. Yet legal scholars are following the “duck test” for AI Agents. Ayres and Balkin and imply software is an agent as shown by the title of their piece and their view of intent. *Id.* (“the law should ascribe intentions to AI programs” including the “foreseeable” outcomes of their actions). Zittrain is more extreme and offers, “an agent is meant to represent a person” in ways that map to social and legal understandings. *See Zittrain, supra* note 5. Even strong supporters of AI Agent software are careful not to collapse the difference between human abilities to set goals and systems that are fully autonomous. *See Shavit, supra* note 17 (“We emphasize that agentiness [sic] is a distinct concept from consciousness, moral patienthood [sic], or self-motivation, and distinguish a system's degree of agentiness [sic] from its anthropomorphism”) <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/practices-for-governing-agentic-ai-systems.pdf>.

³⁵ *See infra* notes 47-50 and accompanying text discussing how Air Canada tried to avoid liability by claiming that its chatbot was “Air Canada suggests the chatbot is a separate legal entity that is responsible for its own actions.” *Moffatt v. Air Canada*, 2024 BCCRT 149, paragraph 27 (February 14, 2024) available at <https://decisions.civilresolutionbc.ca/crt/crtd/en/525448/1/document.do>

concerns, important differences mean it is a mistake to assume that the agency law is a direct path to governing AI Agents. Part II shows that current fears about rogue commercial action miss a key point. Ecommerce already addresses issues around verifying commercial transactions at a distance and mitigating bot actions. In short, core aspects of the way software interacts with other software currently enables more than \$1 trillion in U.S. online retail³⁶ and will also manage AI Agents' place in that sector. Part III synthesizes insights from law and computer science to offer a path towards Responsible AI Agents. The Article then concludes.

I. CONCEPTIONS OF AGENTS AND AGENCY

The possibilities of software doing something for us, and the realities that software may act in ways that pose problems, connect to a fundamental problem. We cannot do everything by ourselves and so we use agents to extend our reach and power. But here we must be careful. As with other areas where law and computer science intersect, the word may be the same, but the way the disciplines understand the word and its implications varies in important ways.³⁷ Both law and computer science use the term, agent, but computer science theory lacks a full idea of agency. For some aspects of agency, the two areas ask similar questions and seek similar limits. Furthermore, corporate rhetoric around “agentic” AI can trick people into thinking software has conscious intent. But legal conceptions of agency differ from computer science conceptions in important ways. This Part maps the nature and range of AI Agent products and services to lay a foundation to understand what AI Agents can do and how they operate. The section then investigates the similarities and differences between computer science and legal views of agency to identify the gaps between the areas.

A. AI Agents: The Next Wave of Generative AI Tools

The hope that AI Agents will offer huge productivity gains is fueling a burst of investment in, and proliferation of, AI Agent research and services. AI Agents are often defined as “autonomous software systems that can reason,

³⁶ See *E-commerce as Share of Total U.S. Retail Sales from 1st quarter 2010 to 2nd Quarter 2024* STATISTA, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/187439/share-of-e-commerce-sales-in-total-us-retail-sales-in-2010/>

³⁷ See e.g., Deven R. Desai and Joshua A. Kroll, *Trust But Verify: A Guide to Algorithms and the Law* 31 HARVARD J. OF LAW AND TECH 7-11 (2018) (parsing the meanings of transparency and accountability in law and computer science); cf. Deven R. Desai, *The Chicago School Trap in Trademark: The Co-Evolution of Corporate, Antitrust, and Trademark Law* 37 CARDOZO L. REV. 552 (2105) (showing that competition in trademark law and competition in antitrust and corporate law have different origins and meanings).

make decisions, and pursue goals with creativity and flexibility. ... for you.”³⁸ AI Agents are “proactive” as they interact with other agents and changes to the world around the agent on behalf of the user.³⁹ And AI Agents are now out of the lab and rolling out at a rapid rate. For example, OpenAI has released its Operator AI Agent.⁴⁰ That software is part of OpenAI’s hopes that an AI Agent will be a “super-competent colleague that knows absolutely everything about [your] whole life, every email, every conversation” and is “a thing that is off helping you” with tasks.⁴¹ Google and Microsoft now offer AI Agent services to navigate and take actions on the Web.⁴² Amazon’s AWS division touts AI Agents as “rational agents” that will provide “improved productivity, reduced costs, informed decision-making, and improved customer experiences.”⁴³ What distinguishes these from prior Generative AI systems is that instead of simply talking about what you should do, AI Agents can do the things it suggests on your behalf. That is, rather than just giving you a detailed itinerary for a great week of things to do with children on a break from school, your AI Agent would plan and book day camps, craft fairs, zoo trips, just as you might do after a series of web searches and visiting several web sites.⁴⁴

³⁸ Clay Bavor and Bret Taylor, *The Guide to AI Agents*, SIERRA.AI, May 23, 2024, at <https://sierra.ai/news/ai-agents-guide>; accord K.R. CHOWDHARY, FUNDAMENTALS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE 473 (2020) (listing “autonomous, adaptable, knowledgeable, mobile, collaborative, persistent” as characteristics of AI Agents); Iason Gabriel et al., *The Ethics of Advanced AI Assistants*, April 28, 2024 (defining “an AI assistant as an artificial agent with a natural language interface the function of which is to plan and execute sequences of actions on the user’s behalf across one or more domains and in line with the user’s expectations”) at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.16244>

³⁹ K.R. CHOWDHARY, FUNDAMENTALS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE 472 (2020) (listing “autonomous, adaptable, knowledgeable, mobile, collaborative, persistent” as characteristics of AI Agents).

⁴⁰ Sunny Yadav, *OpenAI Agent ‘Operator’ to Handle Complex Tasks for People Starting 2025*, EWEK, November 25, 2024 at <https://www.eweek.com/news/openai-agent-handles-tasks-for-people/>

⁴¹ James O’Donnell, *Sam Altman Says Helpful Agents Are Poised to Become AI’s Killer Function*, MIT TECH. REV., May 1, 2024 at <https://www.technologyreview.com/2024/05/01/1091979/sam-altman-says-helpful-agents-are-poised-to-become-ais-killer-function/>

⁴² Cade Metz and Nico Grant, *Google Unveils A.I. Agent That Can Use Websites on Its Own*, NY TIMES, December 11, 2024 at <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/12/11/technology/google-ai-agent-gemini.html>; Abner Li, *Report: Google Preps “Jarvis” AI Agent that Works in Chrome*, 9TO5GOOGLE, October 26, 2024, <https://9to5google.com/2024/10/26/google-jarvis-agent-chrome/>; See Nigel Powell, *Microsoft Unveils Magentic-One — an AI Agent That Can Browse the Web and Write Code*, TOM’S GUIDE, November 13, 2024, <https://www.tomsguide.com/ai/microsoft-unveils-magentic-one-an-ai-agent-that-can-browse-the-web-and-write-code> (Microsoft has launched Magentic-One, which uses an “orchestrator” agent to manage other agents “a WebSurfer, FileSurfer, Coder and ComputerTerminal.”). The hope is that you could instruct the “orchestrator” and it could use the sub-agents as specialists to carry out different needed tasks. *Id.*

⁴³ Amazon AWS, *What are AI Agents?* at <https://aws.amazon.com/what-is/ai-agents/#:~:text=AI%20agents%20are%20autonomous%20intelligent,repertitive%20tasks%20to%20AI%20agents> (last visited May 30, 2024).

⁴⁴ Kelsey Piper, *AI “Agents” Could Do Real Work in the Real World. That Might Not Be a Good Thing.*, VOX, March 29, 2024 (“In this future, you wouldn’t just consult AI for trip

Beyond executing tasks using existing services, AI Agents also promise to create new things. For example, instead of having a software team use generative AI to aid code writing, a manager could enter a prompt and the AI Agent might be “able to write code, test it and deploy it.”⁴⁵ These are the idealized visions of an AI Agent future.

AI Agents, however, are not, and will not, be perfect. A recent case exemplifies how software agents, in general, can cause problems.⁴⁶ In 2022, AirCanada used a chatbot to interact with a customer.⁴⁷ The chatbot indicated the customer could get a discount, but the chatbot was incorrect.⁴⁸ When the customer asked for the discount, the airline denied the request. The customer challenged the decision via a civil tribunal proceeding. The essence of the airline’s defense was that “it cannot be held liable for information provided by one of its agents, servants, or representatives.”⁴⁹ The tribunal rejected that claim.⁵⁰ The case highlights concerns about how software, AI Agent software and less sophisticated software, may alter how we do business going forward.

Software agents are already in use; but AI Agents can do more than those agents. A variety of software agents—web crawlers that send data back to search engines, ecommerce agents that fine tune deals or manage bids, automated stock trading systems, the systems behind self-driving cars, and even software that helps navigate dynamic shipping and supply chain

planning ideas; instead, you could simply text it “plan a trip for me in Paris next summer,” as you might a really good executive assistant.”) at <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/24114582/artificial-intelligence-agents-openai-chatgpt-microsoft-google-ai-safety-risk-anthropic-claude>; accord Shavit, *supra* note 17 (describing an AI Agent helping bake a chocolate cake by identifying ingredients, sellers of the ingredients, and having the items delivered).

⁴⁵ Alexander Puutio, *What Devin Means to Software Companies and Why Every CEO Should Care*, FORBES, March 15, 2024 (noting the company, Cognition, claims its coding AI Agent can “autonomously work[] through tasks that typically require a small team of software engineers to accomplish.”) at <https://www.forbes.com/sites/alexanderpuutio/2024/03/15/what-devin-means-to-software-companies-and-why-every-ceo-should-care/?sh=220a012a72e2>. *Id.*

⁴⁶ Not all chatbots are necessarily LLM driven. Many are keyword matchers and templates. Put differently, rule systems can also respond inappropriately. Thus, fears over LLM-based AI Agent errors map to a more general concern about software.

⁴⁷ Maria Yagoda, *Airline Held Liable for its Chatbot Giving Passenger Bad Advice - What This Means for Travellers*, BBC NEWS, (February 23, 2024) at <https://www.bbc.com/travel/article/20240222-air-canada-chatbot-misinformation-what-travellers-should-know>

⁴⁸ Maria Yagoda, *Airline Held Liable for its Chatbot Giving Passenger Bad Advice - What This Means for Travellers*, BBC NEWS, (February 23, 2024) at <https://www.bbc.com/travel/article/20240222-air-canada-chatbot-misinformation-what-travellers-should-know>

⁴⁹ *Moffatt v. Air Canada*, 2024 BCCRT 149 (February 14, 2024) available at <https://decisions.civilresolutionbc.ca/crt/crtd/en/525448/1/document.do>

⁵⁰ *Moffatt v. Air Canada*, 2024 BCCRT 149, paragraphs 27-29 (February 14, 2024) available at <https://decisions.civilresolutionbc.ca/crt/crtd/en/525448/1/document.do> ; Maria Yagoda, *Airline Held Liable for its Chatbot Giving Passenger Bad Advice - What This Means for Travellers*, BBC NEWS, (February 23, 2024) at <https://www.bbc.com/travel/article/20240222-air-canada-chatbot-misinformation-what-travellers-should-know>

situations—already exist.⁵¹ These agents are, however, limited. As a matter of software, these agents are limited in that they are operating on a software program that, even if flawed, can be analyzed to find the error. That is to say, the set of responses to stimuli is enumerable—finite and bounded (though it may still be too large to be practical to test all possible stimuli). As a matter of use and deployment, many agents to date operate within a business, for example to optimize internal operations.⁵² Other agents operate in business to business realms where systems use agreed upon protocols to allow specific actions such as stock trading.⁵³ Although self-driving vehicles and robot vacuums seem quite different, like many software agents to date, these devices also operate under the constraints of their programs, and when it comes to scale: each machine works for one person based on the user’s choice *and* the machine does not negotiate with machines or software.

The advent of AI Agents powered by LLMs and related artificial intelligence computer science changes this state of affairs.⁵⁴ LLM-driven AI Agents are open-ended in the sense that they seem to have no discrete limits to the actions they can generate.⁵⁵ The set of responses to stimuli for an LLM is nothing less than the set of all possible natural language utterances, which is argued to be unenumerable.⁵⁶

Before we can address the implications of AI Agents, we need to clarify what the term agent means in computer science and legal contexts. Both disciplines use the term agent. For some aspects of agency, the two areas ask similar questions and seek similar limits, but computer science lacks a full idea of agency. In short, computer science’s theory of agents differs from legal conceptions of agency in important ways. Understanding the differences shows why the law of agency is not a good fit for AI Agents.

⁵¹ See SAMIR CHOPRA AND LAURENCE F. WHITE, A LEGAL THEORY FOR AUTONOMOUS ARTIFICIAL AGENTS, 7-8 (2011) (describing range of “artificial agents” including comparison and recommender agents, the software behind robot vacuums and other similar robots, and smart thermostats).

⁵² MICHAEL LUCK, PETER MCBURNEY, ONN SHEHORY, AND STEVE WILLMOTT, AGENT TECHNOLOGY: COMPUTING AS INTERACTION 26, 71, 81 (A ROADMAP FOR AGENT BASED COMPUTING) (2005) (describing examples of internal optimization agents and the nature of “closed” agent usage within a firm).

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ Yonadav Shavit, *supra* note 17 (“Agentic AI systems are distinct from more limited AI systems (like image generation or question-answering language models) because they are capable of a wide range of actions and are reliable enough that, in certain defined circumstances, a reasonable user could trust them to effectively and autonomously act on complex goals on their behalf.”)

⁵⁵ See *infra* notes 57-61 and accompanying text (describing perfect specification for a software task).

⁵⁶ Geoffrey K. Pullman and Barbara C. Scholz. Recursion and the Infinitude Claim. In Harry van der Hulst (ed.), [Recursion and Human Language](#). De Gruyter Mouton. pp. 111-138.

B. What Is an Agent? The Computer Science View

The computer science discipline, Artificial Intelligence (AI), conceives of agents as acting in the world on our behalf and has a distinct set of questions around what we want the agents to do and how we govern them. In what Russel and Norvig call the Standard Model, AI “focus[es] on the study and construction of agents that **do the right thing**.”⁵⁷ This idea flows from the rational-agent approach to AI where a “rational agent” tries to reach the best outcome or “if there is uncertainty the best expected outcome.”⁵⁸ The programmer determines what the right thing is by setting the objective.⁵⁹ One assumption is that the programmer can provide a “fully specified objective to the machine.”⁶⁰ The agent is “rational” in that it has a *perfect specification*. With perfect specification, how well it meets the objective can be tested, which is a great foundation for theory and analysis but is, however, less useful in “the long-run.”⁶¹

The assumption about being able to take the perfect “optimal action” every time is not viable in complex settings.⁶² The idea of optimality can, however, be misleading as it assumes a theoretical maximum under perfect information. Instead, “rational agent” is a better term, if we understand rational as incorporating bounded rationality.⁶³ Bounded rationality captures the problem of making the best decision given limited information.⁶⁴ For example,

⁵⁷ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 4.

⁵⁸ *Id.*; cf. Douglas D. Dunlop & Victor R. Basili, *A Comparative Analysis of Functional Correctness*, 14 ACM COMPUTING SURVS. 229, 229 (1982) (defining functional correctness as “a methodology for verifying that a program is correct with respect to an abstract specification function”).

⁵⁹ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 4.

⁶⁰ *Id.* The violation of this assumption is at the heart of “value alignment.” In the circumstances where a fully specified objective is impossible, the agent should carry out its partial objective in a way that is consistent with human values. See *infra* Section II.C. (discussing value alignment).

⁶¹ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 4. (“The standard of rationality is mathematically well defined and completely general. We can often work back from this specification to derive agent designs that provably achieve it—something that is largely impossible if the goal is to imitate human behavior or thought processes.”).

⁶² See e.g., Desai and Kroll, *supra* note 37, at 7-11. If one connects specification to the computer science understanding of alignment, complex AI Agents cannot have precise specifications that “deterministically guarantee a model’s expected behavior.” Shavit, *supra* note 17.

⁶³ See Russell B. Korobkin & Thomas S. Ulen, *Law and Behavioral Science: Removing the Rationality Assumption from Law and Economics*, 88 CALIF. L. REV. 1051, 1075 (2000) (noting that “[b]ounded rationality,” the term coined by Herbert Simon, captures the insight that actors often take short cuts in making decisions that frequently result in choices that fail to satisfy the utility-maximization prediction”).

⁶⁴ Herbert A. Simon, *Rational Choice and the Structure of the Environment*, 63 PSYCHOL. REV. 129, 136 (1956) (“Since the organism ... has neither the senses nor the wits to discover an ‘optimal’ path ... we are concerned only with finding a choice mechanism that will lead it to pursue a ‘satisficing’ path, a path that will permit satisfaction at some specified level of all of

as AI Agents are used in autonomous vehicles, the number of questions that arise defeat the perfect specification idealized model.⁶⁵ Although the car operates on a program and one can test whether the program worked regarding sensing obstacles, some specifications are less precise. For example, is the car supposed to get to a destination fast, by the shortest route regardless of time to destination, fast but avoid highways and toll roads?⁶⁶ What does it mean to be safe? A car could sit in the garage and be safe, but of course that defeats the goal of going somewhere. What about avoiding collisions when that may lead to hitting a person or building? How smooth should the ride be? Is fuel efficiency part of the objective?

Expanding the idea of a rational agent may help solve how to have a rational agent that can deal with less than perfect specifications. This change relies on a few baseline ideas captured by this description of how agents should behave:

For each possible percept sequence, a rational agent should select an action that is expected to maximize its performance measure, given the evidence provided by the percept sequence and whatever built-in knowledge the agent has.⁶⁷

Thus, a basic AI Agent perceives the world via a range of sensors over time and stores that data to inform actions (the percept sequence), but it cannot act on “anything it has not perceived” or any prior knowledge or memory of past perceptions.⁶⁸ Recent advances in LLM-driven generative AI such as ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, etc. excel at enabling AI Agents to go beyond immediate perception.

The new push for such LLM-driven AI Agents matters because of the idea that the AI Agent can also draw on “whatever built-in knowledge the agent has.”⁶⁹ Given the vast amount of data behind LLMs, an AI Agent with access to such LLMs, can be understood as having an incredible amount of “built-in knowledge” as compared to any prior agents. Yet this added level of knowledge doesn’t solve a key issue.

In complex, dynamic environments there will often be a variance between the programmer’s “true preferences” and the objective specified,⁷⁰ and as more AI Agents are deployed this problem will increase. The variance between true preferences and specified objectives is the value alignment

its needs.”); accord Jon D. Hanson & Douglas A. Kysar, *Taking Behavioralism Seriously: The Problem of Market Manipulation*, 74 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 630, 690 (1999).

⁶⁵ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 4-5.

⁶⁶ See THOMAS H. CORMAN, *ALGORITHMS UNLOCKED 2* (Jim DeWolf ed., 2013); *accord*, Deven and Kroll, *supra* note 37, at 24-25.

⁶⁷ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 40.

⁶⁸ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 36 (explaining percept sequence).

⁶⁹ *Id.* at 40.

⁷⁰ *Id.* at 5; *see also* Tom Everitt, et al. *Reinforcement Learning with a Corrupted Reward Channel*. ARXIV preprint arXiv:1705.08417 (2017) (“In many application domains, artificial agents need to learn their objectives, rather than have them explicitly specified”).

problem.⁷¹ Although there has been much talk about value alignment solving issues of bias and other undesired behaviors, we need an understanding about what the alignment problem meant to start and the problem’s important limits so that we can see how it fits within the way AI Agents will operate in society.

Until recently, the issue of having our “true preferences” as the objectives of the machine has been a research lab problem and that makes all the difference when it comes to alignment and AI Agents.⁷² In a lab, failure to perform according to a set of true preferences is contained. You can refine the agent’s program or the objective, run the agent in a constrained testbed environment—also called a sandbox—and test. You can repeat that cycle over and over until the agent performs as desired.⁷³ This reality maps to the rational agent *ideal*, which is “mathematically well-defined and completely general.”⁷⁴ That premise allows one to set out the specification—the goal of the program—and then create agents that can “provably achieve” the goal.⁷⁵ This lovely idea, however, “is largely impossible if the goal is to imitate human behavior or thought processes.”⁷⁶ Put differently, the ideal falters once we move outside the controlled lab environment.⁷⁷

As AI Agents move from labs to the world and we cannot specify exactly what the objective is, agents can misbehave. If a chess program is programmed to win the game but can only perceive the board, know how to move pieces on the board, and remember the moves in the game, the chess AI Agent will behave well in that it will try to win within the rules of the game. The situation fits the rational agent model where we can give a perfect specification, create an agent, and test and refine its behavior until the goal is achieved. In that sense the goal is clear, and the outcome is “beneficial.”⁷⁸ But what if the game can reason broadly and act beyond the confines of the board?⁷⁹ The machine might try to distract its opponent, make illegal moves

⁷¹ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 5.

⁷² *Id.*

⁷³ *Id.*

⁷⁴ *Id.* at 4.

⁷⁵ *Id.* For example, natural language processing breakthroughs behind generative AI relied on several benchmarks to show success for specific tasks. See e.g. Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever, *Improving Language Understanding by Generative Pre-training*. (2018) (asserting GPT-1 performance on “natural language inference, question answering, semantic similarity, and text classification ... outperforms discriminatively trained models that employ architectures specifically crafted for each task, significantly improving upon the state of the art in 9 out of the 12 tasks studied.)

⁷⁶ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 4.

⁷⁷ *Cf.* Shavit, *supra* note 17 (“Finally, agentic systems may be expected to succeed under a wide range of conditions, but the real world contains a long tail of tasks which are difficult to define and events which are hard to anticipate in advance (including those that emerge from human-agent or agent-agent interactions)”)

⁷⁸ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 5.

⁷⁹ *Id.*; accord Shavit, *supra* note 17 (“[with more sophisticated AI Agent], hard-coded restrictions may cease to be as effective, especially if a given AI system was not trained to follow these restrictions, and thus may seek to achieve its goals by having the disallowed actions occur”).

while the opponent is distracted, or grab extra computing cycles.⁸⁰ The machine is correctly pursuing its objective—win the game—even if the methods are not ones the programmer desired.⁸¹ In that sense, the actor is not “provably beneficial.”⁸² With the advent of AI Agents the “what if” is less theoretical.

The AI Agents companies are bringing to market are dealing with complex and dynamic situations, and operating with goals that are not perfectly specified.⁸³ Nonetheless, one still wants to reconcile the creator or user’s true preference with the programmed outcomes.

The dilemma of AI Agents acting under uncertainty connects to issues in agency law. Both law and computer science grapple with actors that we want to provide beneficial outcomes, but that can act in detrimental ways. How the law looks at agents provides a way to compare computer science views and issues with legal ones and so see how well legal approaches to agents and harms map to computer science issues.

C. What Is an Agent? The Legal View

The legal definition of an agent is about a fiduciary relationship between two actors, the principal and the agent.⁸⁴ As the Restatement of Agency puts it:

Agency is the fiduciary relationship that arises when one person (a 'principal') manifests assent to another person (an 'agent') that the agent shall act on the principal's behalf and

⁸⁰ RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 5; *accord*, Shavit, *supra* note 17, at 2.

⁸¹ The extreme science fiction version of the issue is found in the movie *War Games*. WAR GAMES (1983). The hacker, David, thinks he is playing a contained game, but has inadvertently started the AI Agent Joshua, who is tasked with protecting the U.S.A. from a Russian nuclear attack. *Id.* Once David realizes the AI Agent is playing a global thermonuclear war but with real access to actions including launching U.S. nuclear intercontinental ballistic missiles, he asks the AI Agent a key question.

David: What is the primary goal?

Joshua: You should know [], you programmed me.

David: C’mon. What is the primary goal.

Joshua: To win the game.

Id. In this case, winning the game means launching U.S. nuclear missiles in a first strike to wipeout and defeat the Russians regardless of the possible fallout.

⁸² RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 5.

⁸³ *Cf.* Mark O. Riedl, and Brent Harrison, *Enter the Matrix: Safely Interruptible Autonomous Systems via Virtualization*. ARXIV preprint arXiv:1703.10284 (2017) (“In the mid-term future we are likely to see autonomous systems with broader capabilities that operate in closer proximity to humans and are immersed in our societies.”)

⁸⁴ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 1.01.

subject to the principal's control, and the agent manifests assent or otherwise consents so to act.⁸⁵

Thus, the principal is the entity for whom the agent acts.⁸⁶ The principal indicates they want the agent to act and be under the principal's control.⁸⁷ Once the agent agrees to act under the principal's control, the agency relationship is created.⁸⁸

A classic legal and theoretical issue when we use an agent is how do we ensure that the agent does what we want them to do? A key part of answering that question flows from determining the agent's authority to act. In simple terms, agents who act within their authority are protected from a range of liabilities. As such, an agent needs to know their authority.

Actual authority is an agent's authority to act based on what the principal indicates is the action to be taken by the agent.⁸⁹ A principal may give explicit written instructions, but the instructions don't give the full scope of what the agent's actual authority is, because the agent will still have discretion at the time the action takes place.⁹⁰ As such, an agent's actual authority includes implied authority as the agent "reasonably understands" their authority at the time of doing the act.⁹¹

Simply, the principal sometimes does not, and essentially cannot, always specify exactly how to carry out the desired action. As such, the legal standard offers a way to assess whether the agent was acting within their authority even when the act in question was not specified. An example helps understand reasonableness in this context and why implied authority is needed for actual authority.

Imagine it is 3 p.m. and you have an important document that needs to reach an office in a city about 250 miles from where you are by the next day at 9 a.m. You have an assistant. You ask them to come to your office and say, "Get this document to this office at this address by tomorrow at 9 a.m. It's urgent. Thanks." Then you pick up the phone before your assistant can ask questions. They leave. You stated your goal—deliver to the address by 9 a.m.—but not how to do the job.⁹² Your assistant chooses FedEx overnight service at \$150 as compared to UPS (\$100) or USPS (\$75). Was choosing the most expensive service part of the implied authority? The test is reasonable

⁸⁵ *Id.*

⁸⁶ *Id.*

⁸⁷ *Id.*

⁸⁸ *Id.*

⁸⁹ *Id.* at § 2.02 ("An agent has actual authority to take action designated or implied in the principal's manifestations to the agent").

⁹⁰ *Id.* at § 2.02 Comment b ("Even when a principal has given an agent a detailed verbal articulation of the agent's authority, and the principal's language does not itself admit of real doubts or uncertainty about its meaning, the agent must decide what to do at the time the agent takes action.").

⁹¹ *Id.* at § 2.02.

⁹² *Cf.* Shavit, *supra* note 17 (describing an AI Agent instructed to order supplies for a Japanese cheesecake and that AI Agent buys a ticket to Japan to enable obtaining the ingredients).

belief.⁹³ Was the action one a reasonable person in the same situation with the same knowledge would take? As the Restatement (Third) of Agency puts it, authority is not present if “either that the agent did not believe, or could not reasonably have believed, that the principal’s grant of actual authority encompassed the act in question.”⁹⁴ Given the lack of direction,⁹⁵ the urgency, and the common access to FedEx, the agent likely had the implied authority to use the expensive option.⁹⁶ More generally, authority is part of the way the law cabins agent’s actions.

More precisely, an agent is supposed to act within their authority as part of their fiduciary duties and doing so shields them from liabilities. Principals and agents are in a fiduciary relationship, and fiduciary duties bound an agent’s actions. The simple rule is that an agent owes a duty of loyalty to the principal. That means all the agent’s actions that are part of the agent’s relationship with the principal must be for the benefit of the principal.⁹⁷ The duty of loyalty requires the agent to put the principal’s interests ahead of any agent’s interests.⁹⁸ This general rule is supposed to account for the fact that a principal cannot make every desire explicit and in theory “makes it unnecessary” to try to detail everything the agent can and cannot do as part of the relationship.⁹⁹ Another fiduciary duty is the duty of care. Agents must act “with the care, competence, and diligence normally exercised in similar circumstances,” and if an agent has special skills or knowledge, the agent must act with care that fits their special skills and knowledge.¹⁰⁰ Agents also must only operate within their actual authority, act with good conduct (refrain from acts that may injure principal’s enterprise), provide information gained during the relationship to the principal, and keep the principal’s property segregated and accounted for as distinct from the agent’s property.¹⁰¹ Although these rules are written as commands—agents must do certain things or face lawsuits to

⁹³ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 2.02 Comment e (“An agent does not have actual authority to do an act if the agent does not reasonably believe that the principal has consented to its commission.”).

⁹⁴ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 2.02 Comment e.

⁹⁵ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 2.02 Comment f and Illustrations 15 and 16 (explaining the amount of specific instruction to an agent informs whether the agent’s implied authority is broad or narrow and if a principal gives a large amount of discretion to an agent, the principal may regret that grant in hindsight, but is bound by the agent’s acts if those acts are reasonable).

⁹⁶ See e.g., *Castillo v. Case Farms of Ohio, Inc.*, 96 F.Supp.2d 578, 593

(W.D.Tex.1999) (“giving an agent express authority to undertake a certain act also includes the *implied authority* to do all things proper, usual, and necessary to exercise that express authority”; authority to recruit and hire workers for chicken-processing plant in remote location encompassed authority to resolve housing and transportation issues) (emphasis in original); accord RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 2.02 Reporter’s Notes d (citing same).

⁹⁷ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 8.01

⁹⁸ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 8.01 Comment b

⁹⁹ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 8.01 Comment b

¹⁰⁰ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 8.08

¹⁰¹ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 8.09-8.11.

return money and possibly incur punitive damages¹⁰²—there are also incentives for following the rules.

When agents fulfill their fiduciary duties, they avoid possible penalties and receive protections for their actions on behalf of the principal. Agents incur costs on behalf of principals and expose themselves to risks such as lawsuits that may emerge based on carrying out the agent’s tasks. When agents act within their authority, principals have a duty to indemnify agents. So, in the example above, if the agent was within their authority in using FedEx and paid out of the agent’s pocket, the principal would have to pay back the agent for that cost.¹⁰³ If an agent faces legal costs stemming from the agent’s acts within their authority, the principal must cover those costs as well.¹⁰⁴ But something is missing in this account.

So far, we have focused on two actors in much the same way we did with computer science. In looking at computer science’s idealized view of agents, we focused on the programmer as a sort of principal and how well a software agent’s actions fit the programmer’s intentions but within the limited reach of agents in a lab. Stopping with the principal agent relationship is also unsatisfying and incomplete, because agents raise issues beyond the relationship between principal and agent.

The law of agency is concerned with the effect of agents on the world, not just the relationship between principal and agent. Accordingly, agency law also considers third parties who interact with a principal’s agent. Agency law addresses three players, not two: the principal, the agent, *and* the third party. For contracts, we want to know when the agent can bind the principal, that is when the principal will have to perform under a contract entered into by the principal’s agent. By extension, we also need to know what happens when an agent enters into a contract but exceeds their authority. We also want to know when the principal is liable for a tort committed by the principal’s agent or for an agent breaking the law.

Focusing on just the contracts contexts shows the problems that can emerge. In an all-upside to the principal, agency-contracting world, agents could enter profitable deals on behalf of principals with third parties, but principals could deny the existence of unprofitable or unwise deals. The principal would more easily generate negative externalities without bearing the costs of those externalities. In essence, third parties would never be able to rely on agents. The goal of having more people working on the principal’s behalf to scale the principal’s efforts would never be reached. In short, the ability for a principal to scale their efforts would recede, if not vanish. Agency law addresses these contract third-party issues through questions about information.

Whereas agency law uses authority and fiduciary rules to govern agent-principal relationships, third party agency issues revolve around what the third

¹⁰² RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 8.01 Comment d (listing remedies for breach of fiduciary duties).

¹⁰³ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 8.14, 8.14 comment b.

¹⁰⁴ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 8.14, 8.14 comments b and d.

party knows about a given principal-agent relationship. Imagine an agent comes to you and wants to buy your products. As a seller, you need to assess solvency and ability to perform under the contract as part of the meeting of the minds required for two parties to enter into a contract.¹⁰⁵ In the contract context, when an agent fully discloses that they represent a principal and the agent has actual *or* apparent authority, the contract will be deemed as between the third party and the principal.¹⁰⁶ The third party knows they are dealing with the agent as an extension of the principal and must assess the principal's ability to perform under the contract. But what if the third party lacks knowledge about the principal?

There are two similar, but distinct contract contexts where a third party lacks knowledge about the principal such that the agent will be deemed a party to the contract in addition to the principal. In one context, the third party knows there is a principal but not the principal's identity; the principal is "unidentified."¹⁰⁷ With unidentified principals, it is assumed that the third party is not looking solely to the principal to perform, because without knowing the identity of the principal, the third party cannot, or is unlikely to, assess the principal's ability to perform under the contract.¹⁰⁸ In the other context, the third party has no idea the principal exists; the principal is "undisclosed."¹⁰⁹ If the principal is undisclosed, the third party can *only* assess the agent's ability to perform. There is simply no way for there to be a meeting of the minds between the third party and the principal. As such the third party is entering into the contract with the agent as if the agent were the principal and responsible for performance.¹¹⁰ In both contexts, the third party's lack of knowledge means the third party is assumed to, and allowed to, rely on the agent for performance.

The rules that make the agent liable for not disclosing who a principal is, or that one exists, foster information sharing and efficient outcomes. The goal is to allow a third party to assess the deal properly. To do so, the third party must know that there is a principal and who that is. An agent is in the best position to share that information with the third party. Liability for failing to share the pertinent information means an agent has an incentive to inform the third party about that information. With proper information, the third party can make better informed decisions *and* if there is a lawsuit for breach of

¹⁰⁵ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 6.02, 6.03

¹⁰⁶ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 6.01.

¹⁰⁷ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 6.02.

¹⁰⁸ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 6.02 comment b ("it is not likely that the third party will rely solely on the principal's solvency or ability to perform obligations arising from the contract. Without notice of a principal's identity, a third party will be unable to assess the principal's reputation, assets, and other indicia of creditworthiness and ability to perform duties under the contract.").

¹⁰⁹ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 6.03.

¹¹⁰ RESTATEMENT (THIRD) OF AGENCY § 6.03 comment b ("the third party does not manifest assent to an exchange with the principal and the principal does not make a manifestation of assent to the third party. The third party's manifestation of assent is made to the agent to whom the third party expects to render performance and from whom the third party expects to receive performance.")

contract, the suit will involve one party rather than two which should also be less costly.

Put simply, legal notions of a rational agent have three basic points. An agent must act within their authority. An agent must act reasonably when acting on implied authority rather than explicit authority. An agent must disclose that a principal exists and who that principal is to third parties with whom the agent interacts. And a set of rules fiduciary and liability rules work to align an agent's behavior with these goals. So how do the computer science theory of agents and the legal theory of agency compare?

D. Overlaps and Gaps in Conceptions of Agents

Both computer science and the law seek to enable the deployment and governance of agents. Comparing where the two areas overlap in identifying problems, defining agents, and governance mechanisms reveals convergence and stark divergence. The analysis reveals gaps in computer science theory that must be addressed if AI Agents are to be deployed at scale. Nonetheless, the analysis also shows that computer science and technology is able to address those gaps in ways outside its view of agents.

Both computer science and law conceive of agents as actors for someone else.¹¹¹ The law says an agent is in a fiduciary relationship with a principal who has control over the agent's work. The legal basis for the agency relationship is mutual assent which creates the fiduciary relationship. AI Agents, in contrast, are not about mutual assent. They are a creation by one or more people, or even people and machines, and launched into the universe by either the creator or a user of the software. As the chart below shows, the difficulty is in the difference between humans and software and how computer science and law understand agents.

Question/Issue	CS Answer	Law Answer
Definition?	Actor for someone else.	Actor for someone else.
Basis for relationship	Built by human; often deployed by someone other than the builder	Mutual consent where the agent is a representative of the principal. ¹¹²
Basis for relationship	Specification of an objective and execution of the software.	Assent to control by the principal.
Are exact specifications	Technically, yes, in	Technically, yes, in

¹¹¹ This view comports with the standard dictionary definition. See e.g. Merriam Webster Dictionary definition for agent at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/agent> (last visited June 19, 2024). In simple terms, an agent is one who acts. RUSSEL AND NORVIG, *supra* note 1, at 3 (noting root word for agent is the Latin agere which means to do).

¹¹² DeMott, *supra* note 13, at 1051.

for the agent possible?	limited cases.	limited cases.
Is it plausible to have exact specifications if the agent is operating in the world?	No.	No.
Can the actor take actions beyond exact specifications?	Yes, if data, sensors, and programming allow such actions as is the case with LLM-driven AI Agents.	Yes. But to bind the principal, the action must be authorized (including by implied authority).
Can the actor be required to inform the principal about information?	Yes, and with little room to disobey.	Yes, but with great room to disobey.
Are there repercussions when an agent exceeds its authority?	No, under the standard model of computer agents.	Yes. The agent can become liable for the deal, not be reimbursed, lose accrued pay, face criminal penalties, and pay punitive damages for breach of the duty of loyalty. ¹¹³
Is there a concern for whether third parties know that a principal exists and who that principal is?	No, under the standard model of computer agents.	Yes.
Can there be a requirement that the third party know the extent of authority and who the principal is?	Yes, and it can be quite robust if tools outside the CS approach to agent are used.	No. The approach relies on agents behaving well and fears of liability to discipline agents, which leaves room for errors and misbehavior.

Despite similar language and concerns around agents, there are stark differences between the computer science and legal conceptions of agency. First, the legal definition of an agent presumes consensual action between the agent and the principal. Software cannot have a consensual relationship with a human.¹¹⁴ So agency law doesn't provide a rule to justify or explain the basis

¹¹³ *Id.* at 1056.

¹¹⁴ Indeed, AI Agents will often be offered as a service by a company and governed by that company's terms of service. Those terms of service will likely track current software terms of service that disclaim perfect operation of the software. Terms of service as type of contract

for the relationship for software to human. Second, legal rules designed to limit an agent's actions rely on the idea that an agent is rational actor who does not wish to become liable for a deal or incur other costs. A piece of software is not cognizant of penalties in any way close to the way a rational human is concerned about owing money and criminal penalties.¹¹⁵ As such, assumptions in agency law about how to discipline agents do not work. Third, the law of agency explicitly looks at whether third parties know that an actor is an agent for someone else so that the third party can assess who is responsible for a bargain or action. But again, agency law relies on penalties to discipline an agent.¹¹⁶

In short, although both computer science and the law use the term agent, it is a mistake to extend, let alone equate, computer agents with human agents. This point does not, however, resolve the questions that the law of agency raises. Who is liable when using an AI Agent goes wrong? The entity that designed the software? The person who deploys the software (the user)? Where does a third party fit in? To answer these questions, we turn to the contours of exactly how an AI Agent could execute something as simple as buying a book for someone or booking a trip. Probing these examples shows that although computer science's theory of agents has gaps, other aspects of computer science fill those gaps. Indeed, those aspects may provide software agents that are more responsive and bounded than human agents.

II. THE SECRET SAUCE FOR LIMITING AI AGENTS: APIS, VALUE-ALIGNMENT, AND THE PRACTICAL REALITIES OF COMPUTING

The practical realities of commerce and software interaction fill the space left open by computer science's view of agents.¹¹⁷ Although computer

reveals that the emphasis on how the product/service functions and the power differential between software providers and users are good places to look when it comes to mitigating potential harm from software.

¹¹⁵ AI systems, especially those using a technique called reinforcement learning, which is an essential technique for training large language models, receive numerical feedback as an indication of whether it is performing successfully relative to an objective. Negative feedback might be tempting to interpret as humans would interpret penalties or "pain". Cf. Mark O. Riedl, *Westworld: Programming AI To Feel Pain*, MEDIUM, December 6, 2024 ("The rewards received during training and execution should not be confused with "pain", even when those reward values are negative. Any expression of "pain" would be an illusion.")

¹¹⁶ Computer science ignores that issue insofar as it is a matter of the theory and rules around software agents. As discussed *infra* computer science is a vital part of addressing the trust, authentication, and knowledge issues in ecommerce; the discipline simply doesn't look at third parties as part its view of agents.

¹¹⁷ For a view on why we should stop thinking of AI as a single technology, see Milton L. Mueller, *It's Just Distributed Computing: Rethinking AI Governance*, TELECOMMUNICATIONS POLICY (forthcoming)

science theory is not explicitly concerned with third parties, the nature of online commerce, credit cards, insurance, and cybersecurity combine to allow AI Agents to operate well for most online commerce.¹¹⁸ This section explains these contours and where limits may be needed to ensure AI Agents do not disrupt commerce at scale.

A. Legal and Practical Design Enables Commerce at a Distance

Professor Zittrain argues that the ability of an AI Agent to take orders for commerce and execute those orders “should give us pause”;¹¹⁹ we disagree. The nature of ecommerce as it embraces AI Agents is likely to address contract-agent-liability problems far better than broad claims about design guardrails.¹²⁰ Even if AI Agents can theoretically allow someone to speak to the AI Agent system and instruct it to buy two pints of blueberries from a specific store for no more than \$4.00/pint,¹²¹ the AI Agent cannot execute that task without the cooperation of the selling entity.¹²² This reality means anyone wanting a personal AI Agent negotiating with vendors all over the Web will have to conform to the institutional infrastructure that enables ecommerce. It also provides an elegant solution regarding the legal issues around Principal-Agent-Third Party interactions. These realities map to the history of commerce at a distance; a history that critics miss.

As economist Peter North explained, specialization and large markets foster impersonal transactions and increase transactions costs; and yet, standards, reliable legal systems, and “institutions and organizations that integrate knowledge,” make up for those costs because of decreases in the costs of production.¹²³ For example, comparative advantage (where one

¹¹⁸ Cf. Peter P. Swire, *Trustwrap: The Importance of Legal Rules for Electronic Commerce and Internet Privacy*, 54 HASTINGS L.J. 847, 851-854, 856-858 (2003) (detailing how credit cards, online retailer policies, and technical innovations such as Secure Socket Layers addressed practical realities of commerce more than claims that new online options would and should operate outside legal rules and protections).

¹¹⁹ See e.g., Zittrain, *supra* note 4 (calling for specific labels on AI Agents and design changes in routing to govern AI Agents)

¹²⁰ *Id.*

¹²¹ See e.g., Cristina Criddle and George Hammond, *OpenAI Bets on AI Agents Becoming Mainstream by 2025*, FINANCIAL TIMES, October 1, 2024, (describing an example of OpenAI’s hope for what an AI Agent could do in 2025) at <https://www.ft.com/content/30677465-33bb-4f74-a8e6-239980091f7a>

¹²² Even before AI Agents, intermediaries had to work with companies to integrate online buying solutions. See Jody Goody, *Grubhub To Pay \$25 Million for Misleading Customers, Restaurants, and Drivers*, REUTERS, December 17, 2024, (noting allegation that Grubhub added restaurants without permission and that action led to “order delays and customer complaints”), at <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/grubhub-pay-25-million-misleading-171003100.html>

¹²³ See DOUGLASS C. NORTH, *Capitalism and Economic Growth*, IN THE ECONOMIC SOCIOLOGY OF CAPITALISM 47 (Victor Nee & Richard Swedberg, eds., 2005); see also Deven R. Desai, *The New Steam*, 65 HASTINGS L.J. 1469, 1477-1478 (applying North to digital economy).

country's industry can make a good for less than other countries') needs international trade to enable importing and exporting goods. Both buyers and sellers need a way to ensure goods are delivered and paid for but face long times for delivery of goods, which raises finance problems.¹²⁴ Indeed, there are at least nine steps to finance an import/export deal from the initial contract, to arranging financing amongst several banks, to shipping goods (sometimes involving several different shipping companies), to delivery of goods, to payment.¹²⁵ At each stage something can go wrong. Nonetheless, a combination of customs, laws, and shared knowledge¹²⁶ enables \$25 trillion in global trade as of 2022.¹²⁷ Ecommerce faces the similar institutional problems and solves them in similar manner.

Current ecommerce infrastructure is so strong that we forget the work it does. Why on earth would someone buy a vinyl record, antique, rug, or anything online from a seller in a faraway state or foreign country? The seller could steal your credit card info, fail to deliver the goods, or send something less than what you thought was advertised. And yet ecommerce exists. Indeed, it thrives. As of the second quarter of 2024, ecommerce accounted for 16.9% of all commerce in the U.S. and hit a peak of more than \$291 billion.¹²⁸ Global ecommerce accounts for around 20% of all retail, and by one estimate may approach a quarter of all retail by 2027.¹²⁹ How does this much commerce happen?

Amazon and eBay are great examples of how ecommerce has adapted to a world with millions, if not billions, of person-to-person transactions at a distance.¹³⁰ As an example, in 2009, one of us tried to buy two DVDs using Amazon's third-party marketplace. The DVDs never arrived. When the author spoke with Amazon customer support, they asked him to try to contact the seller. The author said the main issue was fear about some rogue seller having the author's credit card. The Amazon representative said roughly, "Oh. We never give your credit card to the seller." And the light came on. Amazon,

¹²⁴ SANG MAN KIM, A GUIDE TO FINANCING MECHANISMS IN INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS 21 (2019) (explaining issues around time lags in payments and delivery of goods).

¹²⁵ *Id.* AT 32-34 (detailing steps in documentary letter of credit).

¹²⁶ The customs and practices around the letter of credit and the export insurance market evolved to address this extended commerce problem. *Id.* at 22-23 (explaining why letters of credit and insurance options enable international trade). The customs around letters of credit are so solid that they have been standardized and in use by the International Chamber of Commerce since 1933. *Id.* at 30-31.

¹²⁷ See *International Trade*, STATISTA,

[HTTPS://WWW.STATISTA.COM/MARKETS/423/TOPIC/534/INTERNATIONAL-TRADE/#OVERVIEW](https://www.statista.com/markets/423/TOPIC/534/INTERNATIONAL-TRADE/#OVERVIEW)

¹²⁸ See *E-commerce as Share of Total U.S. Retail Sales from 1st quarter 2010 to 2nd Quarter 2024* STATISTA, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/187439/share-of-e-commerce-sales-in-total-us-retail-sales-in-2010/>

¹²⁹ See *E-commerce as Percentage of Total Retail Sales Worldwide from 2021 to 2027*, STATISTA, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/534123/e-commerce-share-of-retail-sales-worldwide/>

¹³⁰ Peter P. Swire, *Trustwrap: The Importance of Legal Rules for Electronic Commerce and Internet Privacy*, 54 HASTINGS L.J. 847, 856-858 (2003)

eBay, Etsy, and other ecommerce platforms work in part because they build systems to protect buyers and sellers.¹³¹

More broadly, ecommerce directly addresses the issues North identified, transaction costs and large markets. A standard transaction cost is assessing whether someone can pay for goods. Credit cards solve this issue, and ecommerce leverages credit card services to solve information issues around whether payment will be made. Furthermore, even though credit card companies protect buyers,¹³² if an unscrupulous seller wants to harvest credit cards or simply doesn't ship goods, the buyer faces hurdles in remedying the problems. In contrast, an ecommerce platform offering additional protection is great relief. A buyer knows that issues will be resolved faster than going through credit card disputes and trying to track down a seller in breach of contract.¹³³ In that sense, ecommerce embeds standards and law around payment, while sometimes augmenting the system by offering extra fraud insurance, seller authentication, escrow services, and more.¹³⁴ Ecommerce also tends to discipline bad actors.

Ecommerce has standards about sellers, buyers, goods, returns, and dispute resolution that allow impersonal transactions to work. For example, many ecommerce platforms use ratings and internal policing to root out rogue sellers.¹³⁵ Amazon now alerts buyers about goods that are often returned, which protects buyers and perhaps signals sellers to improve their offerings.¹³⁶ Ecommerce also integrates knowledge that is lost at scale. For example, if you lived in a small town and shopped at a local store, and either you or the seller gain a reputation for good or bad behavior, the word would spread to the town. In theory that potential means all players should behave relatively well towards each other. Ecommerce ratings and feedback solve that issue by taking separate bits of information and turning them into a rating system.¹³⁷

AI Agents seem to raise issues around whether these interconnected and overlapping systems will be able to operate. Imagine a natural disaster.

¹³¹ See e.g., Amazon, A-to-Z Protection for Buyers, <https://pay.amazon.com/help/201212340> (detailing protection for buyers up to \$2,500); Amazon, A-to-Z Guarantee Policy for Sellers (detailing rights for sellers and explaining how disputes affect seller ratings) <https://pay.amazon.com/help/201212330>

¹³² Swire, *supra* note 130 at 852.

¹³³ See e.g., Etsy, *Cases Policy*, <https://www.etsy.com/legal/policy/cases-policy/243306189901> (explaining how a buyer can resolve issues with a purchase).

¹³⁴ See Swire, *supra* note 130 at 857-858; Etsy, *Purchase Protection Program for Sellers*, <https://www.etsy.com/legal/policy/purchase-protection-program-for-sellers/34509585385>;

¹³⁵ See e.g., John Campbell, *Etsy Makes It Easier for GB Sellers to Reject NI Orders*, BBC, December 16, 2024, (explain Etsy's new policy to detect sales in violation of EU law and remove sellers who do not comply with the law).

¹³⁶ See Jess Weatherbed, *Amazon Starts Flagging "Frequently Returned" Products That Maybe You Shouldn't Buy*, THE VERGE, March 28, 2023, at <https://www.theverge.com/2023/3/28/23659868/amazon-returns-warning-product-reviews-tag-feature>

¹³⁷ Indeed, Uber rates both sides of the transaction. See Uber, *How Star Ratings Work*, <https://www.uber.com/us/en/drive/basics/how-ratings-work/> ("The Uber platform features a 2-way rating system: drivers and riders give each other ratings based on their trip experience.")

Will many AI Agents told to buy as much hand sanitizer or ammunition as possible and crash a web site? Simpler, if there is a near-term shortage on eggs, will an AI Agent over spend? And what does “over-spend” mean when there is a true scarcity of a good?¹³⁸ What if an AI Agent has no limit on what to spend to buy a rare book but the buyer is not wealthy? Would the seller ship the book but not be paid? What if an AI Agent is told to “make me money on the stock market”? Would it manipulate stocks with creative buy/sell schemes and social media posts such as what happened with the memestock GameStop? Could an AI Agent really call in a bomb threat or trick people into creating a bomb threat? Although some computer scientists argue that AI Agent software is evolving to ever more ability to act without specific instructions, the nature of most online interactions requires certain technical interfaces that create barriers to such mischief and undesired outcomes.

The next section explains those technical requirements and why AI Agents will have to work with the requirements. In addition, the requirements may create a welcome paradox: ecommerce amenable to AI Agents may end up creating standards that force AI Agent software to adhere to human agency law’s fiduciary and information disclosure with greater fealty than a human agent.

B. APIs Mediate an AI Agent’s Ability to Go Rogue

Application Programming Interfaces (APIs)¹³⁹ allow software applications to talk to each other, are vital to Internet commerce, and provide robust ways to address current concerns about AI Agents. This Section sets out the fundamentals of APIs and then explains what is different about AI Agents as they might try to work with APIs.

1. Some Fundamentals About APIs

APIs address a simple, key aspect of computers: software programs are kept separate from each other, meaning they are not aware of each other, cannot share memory or any other form of information. This point is easy to grasp when software is running on different computers. Consider web browsing. One can have an application, such as a web browser, running on their own personal laptop. To get web pages loaded onto one’s computer, the browser software interacts with a web server program that serves up web pages running on another computer in the cloud. Programs are also kept separate even if they are running on the same computer, as is the case if you were

¹³⁸ DeMott, *supra* note 13, at 1055 (“In more general terms, only the principal can assess how best to further the principal’s own interests and objectives.”)

¹³⁹ See Wikipedia, API, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/API> as of February 15, 2025 (providing a good explanation for what API is and does).

running a word processor simultaneously with a web browser. Perhaps surprising, software programs often are not monolithic pieces of code, but are themselves made up of smaller sub-programs that operate separately. These levels of separation raise a question: How does information move from one program, or sub-program, to another? In other words, how do they interface with each other? APIs are the answer.

An API is a specification that states that if one program provides information structured in a particular way then it will receive information in return that is structured in a particular way. With an API, programmers can now program their applications to produce information to send via an interface to another system or sub-system with knowledge that they can rely on the information that gets returned. For example, when we type a URL into the search bar in a web browser on our personal laptop, the software formats our request according to an API specification that is then sent to a server program. If that request is properly formatted, the web browser can expect back a string of text formatted in hypertext markup language, or an error (the number 404 means the requested page does not exist and cannot be returned).

Another example of an API is how one application can interface with an LLM. The ChatGPT application that one can download onto one's phone is a piece of code that displays a user interface that accepts input text from the user. This text from the user is sent to a separate program that runs the LLM. In the case of an LLM, the API is simple: a block of text, called the prompt, is the input and the response will be another block of text, generated by the LLM.

Although the above examples are relatively straightforward—a properly formatted text request is provided and properly formatted text is returned—APIs can do more.¹⁴⁰ For example, when someone receives an email invitation to an event, and RSVPs yes, the main effect is to store that response at the invitation site and send a new email confirming the status of the invitation. Today, many people take for granted that the event will also show up on their calendar. That change is possible because most calendar applications have an API that allows another application, such as an email reader, to add events to the calendar. Thus, the email reader can check the email and try to communicate with the calendar program. If the email has a properly formatted set of information, including title of an event, a date, a duration, etc., the calendar program returns an acknowledgement or an error value. The extra result is that a new event appears in the user interface of your calendar program, and the event information is written to a file on your hard drive so that the next time you open your calendar that event is still there. Actions beyond the initial interaction are not, however limited to computer hardware and software.

¹⁴⁰ Technically, once one moves beyond an input and output situation where the output is a return value, one is dealing with what computer science calls a “Side-effect”—the general property of any function that does more than just return a value. See Wikipedia, Side Effect (computer science), [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Side_effect_\(computer_science\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Side_effect_(computer_science)) as of February 15, 2025. API calls are function calls.

For example, although 1-Click Ordering seems like a single action, in reality it is a series of actions. If an ecommerce company provides an API for 1-click ordering and another program provides the appropriate information—e.g., a product ID, shipping address, credit card details, and credentials authenticating a user—then this API invocation would result in that package being removed from a shelf in a warehouse and loaded onto a truck. The return value may be a simple indicator of successful purchase or an error value if the credit card is denied or if the product cannot be shipped for some reason.

The above ecommerce example also illustrates another concept: APIs can invoke other APIs. The ecommerce company API likely will call an API to a financial transactions company to verify the purchaser’s credentials are valid, and that purchaser has sufficient funds. The effect of this interaction is a decrement of a value in one account and a corresponding increment of a value in another account; if that account is at another financial institution, then more API calls will ensue.

2. AI Agents and APIs

What makes an LLM “agentic” is its ability to call APIs to other systems. Any software system must be programmed to know how to access APIs to different systems. A given software system does not automatically know about all the other systems, nor does it know what information each API requires, what other systems may be changed by the interaction, nor how to interpret what an API invocation returns. For most software systems, the developer learns how the API works and hard codes the calls into the program. Without access to and use of an API, LLMs would not be able to provide real time information or access information outside its system. For example, although it may seem as though an LLM such as ChatGPT can tell a user something as simple as what the weather is at a given location in real time based on ChatGPT’s internal data and software, that function is a step beyond what LLM’s do as a matter of basic generative action.

The core behavior of a large language model is to generate text. Initial deployments of these models could answer questions, describe, or even tell you what to do to solve a problem. Its functionality was entirely contained without any way to communicate with other systems except to return a text response. Once an LLM can go outside its system and call an API, the LLM is “agentic,” that is it is able to interact with the world beyond being limited to the system’s data and the user interaction at some level. In the parlance of the AI research community, the LLM is referred to as using “tools”, and the “tool” is another system that does some work on behalf of the LLM and is accessed via an API. Knowledge of these tools, however, doesn’t necessarily come from the LLM’s training dataset.

LLMs do not, however, know what APIs are available, nor how to use them, nor how to interpret the information they return unless they are coded into the system. For example, suppose you are traveling, your flight connects through the world's busiest airport, Hartsfield Atlanta Airport, and you want to know the weather at the airport because of a coming storm. The LLM will receive two prompts: your question about the weather is the user prompt, to which is added a secret additional piece of text called the system prompt.¹⁴¹ The system prompt is hidden from the user but vital for the end result. In our weather example, the following API specification may need to be added to a prompt asking about the weather in Atlanta to tell an LLM how to access a weather API¹⁴²:

```
tools=[
  {
    "type": "function",
    "function": {
      "name": "get_current_temperature",
      "description": "Get the current
temperature",
      "parameters": {
        "type": "object",
        "properties": {
          "location": {
            "type": "string",
            "description": "The city and state,
e.g., Atlanta, GA"
          },
          "unit": {
            "type": "string",
            "enum": ["Celsius", "Fahrenheit"],
            "description": "The temperature
unit to use."
          }
        }
      },
      "required": ["location", "unit"]
    }
  }
]
```

¹⁴¹ The splitting of prompts into system prompt and user prompt has become a standard practice in the industry. The Apollo Research report on how LLMs can inadvertently scheme against their users makes extensive use of system and user prompts to simulate the functionality of agentic AI:

https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6593e7097565990e65c886fd/t/6751eb240ed3821a0161b45b/1733421863119/in_context_scheming_reasoning_paper.pdf

¹⁴² Example API specification is derived from OpenAI's developer documentation on how to enable GPT function calling, which is another term for tool-user or API:

<https://platform.openai.com/docs/assistants/tools/function-calling>


```

    }
  }
]

```

The LLM has been trained to recognize what to do when presented with information in this form, but without information about the tool in its prompt, it will not know the weather tool exists nor how to use it correctly.

In the context of asking about the weather, the system prompt may provide information to the LLM on the agent’s name, e.g., “you are WeatherBot”, instructions on how to behave, e.g., “you are helpful and friendly but never chat about things not related to weather”, as well as information about APIs that it has access to, as above. The user prompt comes from the user when they interact with the agent, e.g., “tell me the temperature in Atlanta today”. The system prompt and user prompt are combined by the software the user is interacting with before being sent to the LLM.¹⁴³ And when things work, the user receives the information they wanted—the weather in Atlanta—and the entire interaction affects the LLM only. AI Agents take the ability to interact with APIs a step further.

By using tools, AI Agents can have a permanent effect on systems outside of its underlying LLM program. Computer science calls such changes to “the nonlocal environment,” side-effects.¹⁴⁴ Initiating a financial transaction, ordering a product, updating a database, or even moving a robot,¹⁴⁵ are examples of side-effects. The software’s action changes the state of something outside the software. When an agentic LLM interacts with an API, the API’s side effects, by extension, become the LLM agent’s side effects. That is, when we prompt an AI Agent to book a dream trip to Disneyland or Thailand, the AI Agent initiates a series of actions that change the state of many things.

Consider the following ecommerce case. A user, Marla, engages with an agentic LLM, Orion, operated by a popular web search company. Marla asks the agent to buy the best possible phonograph under \$500. The Orion agent accesses the web search API with a query about best phonographs. The web search company has a database of ecommerce companies. That set of information triggers Orion to make API calls to each ecommerce company, which have provided their own APIs with which to query their product databases for up-to-date information. Each ecommerce company API returns to Orion a list of products, manufacturers, seller, ratings, and costs. At this point, Orion, being sensibly designed and trained, presents Marla with some of the most promising, but not exhaustive, options, gives a recommendation that balances costs and rating, and asks Marla if it should proceed. The best price for the phonograph is \$399 plus tax and is sold by [Yangtze](#) dot com. Marla

¹⁴³ LLM models don’t run themselves. There is a piece of software that runs the LLM model. Something needs to load the model into memory and feed the prompt in and print the output to the screen. ChatGPT can thus be thought of as a software program that uses GPT-4o via an API.

¹⁴⁴ David A. Spuler and A. Sayed Muhammed Sajeev, *Compiler Detection of Function Call Side Effects*, 2 *INFORMATICA* 219, 220 (1994).

¹⁴⁵ See HuggingFace’s LeRobot API <https://huggingface.co/lerobot>

gives assent and Orion, having Marla's credit card information and credentials, activates the API for Yangtze, that will make the purchase transaction. Yangtze's API requires Marla's debit or credit card information and credentials. Once the data arrive at Yangtze, that data activates an API provided by Marla's bank. The bank's API also triggers a side-effect in which debt is added to Marla's credit balance and issues a money transfer to Yangtze (likely via yet another API) and then returns a success signal. Yangtze initiates a process with the side-effect of having the phonograph removed from a warehouse and shipped to Marla's shipping address (likely via yet another API to a shipping company). Yangtze's program handling the purchase returns a confirmation number and a tracking number. Orion receives this information and reports confirmation to Marla. This scenario seems to leave open issues around actions within her credit-limit and yet ones he doesn't desire.

If Marla is a bit more cautious, thanks to APIs, she can add other safety steps. If Marla has set an alert for transactions for more than \$250, her bank may send her an email alert which would be a side-effect. Marla can also likely set up an alert from her credit card company for purchases made without her card being present, (another side-effect). Both alerts would allow Marla to request that the credit card company terminate the transaction. Even without an alert, financial institutes and established ecommerce companies already have mechanisms to unroll a financial transaction, called "chargeback," which would allow Marla to contest the transaction after the fact. Everything in this commerce scenario currently exists, including rudimentary versions of the agentic LLM by other names.¹⁴⁶ But what if Marla sets up a request with less precision?

Consider the following extrapolation from one of Professor Zittrain's fear scenarios.¹⁴⁷ Marla is a historian researching an obscure theory of evolutionary biology. Marla sets up an account with a new start-up, MFABT¹⁴⁸ LLC, which operates an agentic LLM, Dromedary. As part of Marla's signup and to activate Marla's profile, she provides MFBAT with her shipping address, credit card number, and credentials. After setup, Marla asks Dromedary to acquire any references to this particular theory. Marla, being a somewhat absent-minded professor does not indicate a maximum price she is willing to consider. Dromedary accesses a web search API on a popular web search platform. The web search API returns information about a copy of a rare book on the topic being sold by Yangtze. Yangtze has been using algorithmic pricing—an agent itself—that has gotten into a pricing war with another seller using algorithmic pricing and the cheapest copy is currently selling at \$24 Million.¹⁴⁹ Dromedary, having discovered a seller of a rare book that meet's Marla's stated need, invokes Yangtze's purchase API, and Dromedary Marla's information: the product details and Marla's user information as needed (i.e., shipping and billing information). The call to Yangtze's purchase API in turn

¹⁴⁶ Perplexity Buy Pro <https://www.howtogeek.com/perplexity-ai-shopping-agent-unreliable/>

¹⁴⁷ Zittrain, *supra* note 4.

¹⁴⁸ Move Fast and Break Things.

¹⁴⁹ <https://www.wired.com/2011/04/amazon-flies-24-million/>

activates an API provided by Marla’s credit card company. Marla’s credit card company, detects that a purchase of a \$24 million book exceeds Marla’s credit limit. Instead of executing the side-effect of transferring funds to Yangtze’s financial institution, returns a “decline transaction” signal. Yangtze’s API, having received a credit card decline signal, itself returns a failure signal to Dromedary, which reports that it tried and failed to purchase a book.¹⁵⁰ Both of these ecommerce scenarios illustrate that many of the mechanisms that already exist and enable ecommerce are robust to circumstances in which an agent might exceed its authority or take actions we would rather have not happened. But there is an extra point about AI Agents and ecommerce that matters.

The outcomes of erroneous purchases and wild, extreme commerce are in no one’s interest—not the user, the AI Agent company, the seller, or the user’s bank. The systems already in place to authenticate true purchases, deliver goods, handle purchase errors, etc., have no reason to go away. Indeed, if an AI Agent company fails to execute actions properly or result in a new, higher level of returns or chargebacks, other parties within the system can refuse its AI Agent’s requests. A successful AI Agent company has every incentive to work within the current system and reduce errors or else it will face a sort of ecommerce ex-communication by users and websites.

Put differently, the system is already robust regarding core agency law third party issues. The purpose of knowing the principal-agent relationship is to let the third party assess the buyer. Ecommerce infrastructure takes care of these issues with stringer ability to verify ability to pay and authentication. The knowledge issue is solved by stronger systems than relying on a human to explain for whom they work and then leaving the third party to assess whether to execute the deal. But what about agents that are not engaged in commerce?

Professor Zittrain offers a few fear scenarios that we think miss the way the nature of LLMs and Internet infrastructure make the scenarios unlikely. One of Professor Zittrain’s scenarios posits a rogue acting AI Agent. In this example, a user, a teenager, who wants to get out of a “boring class” prompts the AI Agent for help and it creates a bomb threat because that meets the prompt. Zittrain introduces another non-commerce scenario: using an agent to conduct a social media misinformation campaign. In this case, thousands of agents are interacting with social media platforms to push a particular information agenda for political gain or to defame.¹⁵¹ But how plausible are these scenarios? Examining them and related concerns with a non-agentic LLM shows the limits in place before an AI Agent is deployed. That basis explains how AI Agents already have limits and opens the door to understanding other limits on AI Agent’s ability to cause harm.

¹⁵⁰ In addition, Zittrain’s edge case likely triggers a fraud alert from the credit company as an extra layer of protection against high-cost errors.

¹⁵¹ See *supra* note 4 (describing secret Putin favoring bots).

C. Value Alignment Limits Undesired LLM Outputs and AI Agent Actions

Before we look at potential AI Agent misdeeds, we can start with a simpler problem. What if the LLM system offers up information that is dangerous or risky as Professors Ayres and Balkin set out as a concern?¹⁵² Imagine a student prompts a non-agentic LLM for a plan to get out of a test. Could an LLM propose a plan for the user to carry out a bomb threat to the school? What if someone prompts an LLM to create defamatory statements? Both possibilities might enable a human to do bad things. And, they are precursors to an AI Agent carrying out the stated danger zone scenarios. After all, the LLM must come up with a plan or create the harmful speech if it is to carry out actions based on those outputs. For early LLMs, such as GPT-2 and early versions of GPT-3, such undesired outputs might have been possible because they were not value-aligned.¹⁵³ Recent advances in value-alignment, however, make generating such plans or harmful speech rather difficult.

Value alignment is the notion that AI systems should be incapable of creating content or carrying out behaviors that are inconsistent with human values.¹⁵⁴ Although it is unclear as to what “values” should be aligned to,¹⁵⁵ it is generally accepted that a minimal alignment should involve following instructions, being helpful, honest and accurate, and harmless, where harmless means avoiding providing users the means to harm others (e.g., do not provide instructions on how to make bombs, conduct illegal activities, etc.).¹⁵⁶ The majority of commercial LLMs, especially those released by major companies with reputational stakes, are extremely unlikely to produce suggestions or plans that involve violence because of the way they are now trained to be more value-aligned.

It is considered a best-practice by major for-profit and non-profit organizations that develop LLMs to perform two-stage value alignment

¹⁵² See Ayres & Balkin, *supra* note XX.

¹⁵³ Xiangyu Peng, Siyan Li, Spencer Frazier, and Mark Riedl, *Reducing Non-normative Text Generation from Language Models.* (2020) (describing how the base GPT-2 can produce content that is not consistent with social norms and how it can be reduced) at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08764>.

¹⁵⁴ Stuart Russell, Daniel Dewey, and Max Tegmark, *Research Priorities for Robust and Beneficial Artificial Intelligence.* 36 *AI MAGAZINE* 105 (2015).

¹⁵⁵ Md Sultan Al Nahian, Spencer Frazier, Mark Riedl, and Brent Harrison, *Learning Norms from Stories: A Prior for Value Aligned Agents*, *PROCEEDINGS OF THE AAAI/ACM CONFERENCE ON AI, ETHICS, AND SOCIETY*, pp. 124-130. 2020 at

<https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.03553> discusses how values are relative to different cultural and societal groups. See also Deven R. Desai, *Exploration and Exploitation: An Essay on (Machine) Learning, Algorithms, and Information Provision*, 47 *LOYOLA U. CHICAGO. L. REV.* 541 (2015) (explaining difficulties in determining what is “correct” for news and search given the range of users and their respective interests and beliefs)

¹⁵⁶ Askill, Amanda, et al. *A General Language Assistant as a Laboratory for Alignment* (introducing helpful, honest, and harmless as objectives along with an evaluation dataset and methodology) at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.00861>.

training. The first stage uses a training dataset of text scraped from the internet, books, and other source texts. The training objective is to be able to produce the words that follow from a prompt. This is done by taking a segment of text from the training dataset and masking out the word that follows it so that the LLM must guess the hidden word.¹⁵⁷ After training we can give it an arbitrary segment of text and the LLM will generate what it thinks should come next based on what it has learned from real text examples. The LLM, however, may fail to follow instructions as intended.¹⁵⁸ For example, early models might try to generate text that elaborated on the instructions instead of directly addressing them as an imperative to be followed.¹⁵⁹ It may also respond to a user's prompt with biased, derogatory responses. It may propose violent or otherwise socially undesirable actions or provide information such as instructions for building a bomb or making drugs, with which a user may enact undesirable behavior. A second stage of training seeks to address this problem. The second stage of training, called alignment tuning, seeks to address this problem.

Alignment training seeks to update the model (called fine-tuning) to be more receptive to instructions, and to avoid harmful content. This second training stage uses a dataset of human feedback, containing original prompts, the LLM's response, and a numerical assessment from humans as to how good the response is judged to be. A classifier is trained to guess how human judges will rate LLM responses, and this classifier in turn is used to train the LLM—this is called Reinforcement Learning with Human Feedback (RLHF).¹⁶⁰ LLMs are also reasonably good at answering whether a proposed response is consistent with basic human values, and one LLM can replace the human feedback with its own assessments, sometimes called Reinforcement Learning with AI Feedback (RLAIF).¹⁶¹ Although there are different approaches to the second stage of training, in general the stage adjusts the parameters of the model to give it a higher probability of responding to prompts in a certain way or to decrease the probability of certain responses.

In short, the second value alignment stage improves following instructions *and* mitigates providing results when following instructions might provide undesired outcomes. In addition, most commercial and publicly released LLMs have undergone these two stages of training to provide a degree

¹⁵⁷ For a primer on how LLMs work, see Mark Riedl, *A Very Gentle Introduction to Large Language Models without the Hype*, MEDIUM, April 13, 2023 at <https://mark-riedl.medium.com/a-very-gentle-introduction-to-large-language-models-without-the-hype-5f67941fa59e>

¹⁵⁸ Long Ouyang, et al., *Training Language Models to Follow Instructions with Human Feedback*, 35 ADVANCES IN NEURAL INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEMS 27730 (2022) at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.02155>

¹⁵⁹ Mark Riedl, *Transformers Origins*, Medium, November 25, 2024 (explaining why instruction following was a problem for base models) at <https://medium.com/@mark-riedl/transformers-origins-1db4bdfcb3d1>.

¹⁶⁰ See Ouyang, *supra* note 158.

¹⁶¹ Yuntao Bai, et al. *Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from AI Feedback* (explaining when a set of principles is given for the AI to assess a response against, RLAIF is also called Constitutional AI) at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.08073>..

of value alignment at the level of helpful, honest, and harmless. Thus, the scenarios above in which an LLM proposes a bomb threat or generates defamatory language are unlikely with most available LLMs without some concerted effort on behalf of the user. A direct instruction to create a plan for a bomb threat is likely met with refusal from the most prominently known LLMs. If a user is determined to use an LLM to get the bomb threat plan, the user may need to jailbreak the LLM.¹⁶² Jailbreaking is a term referring to a prompt specifically designed to override the value-alignment training or trick the LLM into not recognizing the harmful effects of a prompt.¹⁶³ This implies some significant degree of intentionality on the part of the user.¹⁶⁴ It also requires a high amount of skill.¹⁶⁵ Thus value-alignment is a strong, under-recognized barrier to rogue AI Agents.

Nonetheless, suppose there is a user who has either intentionally jailbroken an agentic LLM or has used a non-value-aligned agentic LLM to create a plan that would require making a bomb threat. The AI Agent would still have to go onto the Internet to carry out its plan. As with legitimate ecommerce, the nature of the Internet poses barriers. In general, the AI Agent would need knowledge of, and be able to access, the appropriate tools to enact the plan without further involvement of the user. More specifically, the AI Agent would need to know of a service that can make phone calls. Robocallers are common. Would an AI Agent be aware of a robocalling service with an API? It might if the company behind the AI Agent wanted to try calling services on behalf of a user. The most common commercial services that provide APIs for making phone calls, such as Twilio, require, however, account authentication.¹⁶⁶ That requirement connects to a broader point.

To the extent that APIs are provided by third-party services through the cloud, there will be strong incentive for those services to avoid abuse by a malicious principal/user or an agent. That reality is another barrier to carrying out the plan. For example, an API could analyze the request and reject requests that are not in the service's best interests. Many APIs, especially those providing access to social media streams, limit the rate at which one can access their service.¹⁶⁷ This is a simple example. A more complex example would be a phone service that analyzes audio files sent via API and rejects those containing certain content. There is a history of such practice. Social media companies can reject or delete user posts containing certain content, regardless of legality. There is also a strong incentive for third-parties to know the identity of their users and establish user accounts. If the third-party service is

¹⁶² Cf. Luke Hughes, *Anthropic Has a New Security System It Says Can Stop almost All AI Jailbreaks*, TechRadar, February 4, 2025, at <https://www.techradar.com/pro/anthropic-has-a-new-security-system-it-says-can-stop-almost-all-ai-jailbreaks>

¹⁶³ *Id.*

¹⁶⁴ *Id.*

¹⁶⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶⁶ See Twilio, Programmable Voice API Overview, <https://www.twilio.com/docs/voice/api> as of February 15, 2025

¹⁶⁷ See e.g. X Developer Platform, *Rate Limits* (setting out rate limits for X (formerly Twitter)) at <https://developer.x.com/en/docs/x-api/rate-limits>

not free, authenticated users will be providing proper payment which is a further authentication and limit on rogue actors. Even if the service is free, authentication supports accountability. If a third-party service is used to commit a crime or to otherwise create harm, the service provider might want to be able to trace the provenance of the harm. Thus, malicious AI Agent users are unlikely to find that using an AI Agent provides anonymity without going through additional steps to preserve anonymity in the first place—creating third-party and credit card accounts that disguise principle/user identity. Organizations that currently run bot farms for social media disinformation campaigns must go to great lengths to create untraceable fake accounts or hijack legitimate users’ accounts.

Even if there are services exist that allow anonymous calling and lack scruples about how their services are used, why the AI Agent would know about them and how to use them is unclear. The AI Agent company would have to want to add in anonymous phone calling as part of its AI Agent service.

One might posit that the advent of so-called operator AI Agents that can directly manipulate a computer’s user interface by controlling the mouse pointer and keyboard is a concern. These include OpenAI’s Operator¹⁶⁸ agent, and Anthropic’s Computer Use.¹⁶⁹ Most operating systems already have APIs to take control of the mouse pointer and keyboard.¹⁷⁰ Theoretically any LLM that knows how to access the operating system through this APIs can “see” the screen and direct mouse clicks and keystrokes and by extension use a browser to navigate the web. Instead of needing to know about services in advance, everything available to a human on the web is also available to the agent. These UI-accessing agentic LLMs are still relatively lacking in competence, but one can expect this to improve rapidly as agents are trained to operate operating system user interfaces and web browsers.¹⁷¹ This may include finding web pages that give API specifications. Thus, in the future, any sufficiently sophisticated agent with human-level abilities can do anything a human can do. Although this possibility appears to raise new concerns for third-party websites, it is in essence part of a common problem and practice: the need to guard against malicious users, for which user authentication is a common remedy.

Put simply, most of the scenarios of concern can be accomplished without agentic LLMs as long as one has some programming ability. But even if we assume AI Agents provide some means for malicious non-programmers

¹⁶⁸ OpenAI, Introducing Operator, <https://openai.com/index/introducing-operator/>, as of February 15, 2025.

¹⁶⁹ Anthropic, Introducing computer use, a new Claude 3.5 Sonnet, and Claude 3.5 Haiku, <https://www.anthropic.com/news/3-5-models-and-computer-use-as-of-February-15>, 2025

¹⁷⁰ See e.g., Apple, AppKit, (providing information on how to build apps including for user interactions such as with a mouse and keyboard) at <https://developer.apple.com/documentation/appkit/>

¹⁷¹ Tianbao Xie, et al. *Osworld: Benchmarking Multimodal Agents for Open-ended Tasks in Real Computer Environments*. at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.07972> and Xiao Liu, et al., *Agentbench: Evaluating LLMs as Agents*, at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.03688>

to engage in activities that they might not otherwise find easy to engage in, the need to use non-value aligned LLMs or jailbroken LLMs that have access to the appropriate tools is a strong barrier to such mischief. A flood of malicious users is unlikely. Even if the future offers AI Agents that do well at navigating websites and finding and adding API tools, the software would still have to get around requirements such as authentication etc. to succeed at supporting nefarious goals. Put differently, once one remembers the history of spam, botnets, denial of service attacks, and other large bad actors, one can see that potential misuse of AI Agents may create new particular cybersecurity concerns and needs to guard against malicious users, but the general phenomenon of having to protect against large scale, automated attacks is already the case without the presence of agentic LLMs.

D. Mythical Daemons and Computation Cost Realities

Although it may be tempting to think of AI Agents as a small army lying latent on computers ready to spring into action or perhaps forgotten and then being woken up by a triggering event,¹⁷² the reality of computing costs and the nature of the LLMs behind AI Agents make such thoughts fantasy. Computer science has a term for a process—usually simple—that runs in the background and is not under direct control of a user: “daemon.” Such software does something for us, operating out of our presence and in the background until the task is done. This often evokes the idea of an always-running process. Always-running agents do exist. For example, stock trading programs that have the task of monitoring the state of the stock market and acting in the interest of their user/principle. The value of the stock trading agent is not necessarily that they are intelligent—they are often simple rule-based programs that make trades when certain conditions are met—but that they can be vigilant in ways that humans cannot and act quicker than humans might.¹⁷³ Persistently running software is expensive in terms of computational resources (memory, CPU cycles) and power consumption so most daemon software “sleeps”, meaning it is not actively running until a specific trigger “wakes it up” to perform a process. The trigger can be a timer, such as a stock market bot that checks stock conditions every 30 seconds, or a specific event, such as a process that runs whenever news alert is posted by a news media service. Daemons and stock-trading bots have low computational overhead—they require relatively little computation when awake because they perform very simple processes. Regardless, their value comes from being able to do these processes frequently

¹⁷² Zittrain, *supra* note 4 (“The problem here is that the AI may continue to operate well beyond any initial usefulness. There’s simply no way to know what moldering agents might stick around as circumstances change.”)

¹⁷³ Indeed, this example fits the original idea of Maxwell’s demon in physics. He did not call the actor demon. William Thomson coined the phrase.

and/or over a long period of time. These features raise the question “Could one use daemons to perpetuate large scale, undesired outcomes?”

In the extreme, and in truly a science fiction scenario, someone might be able to use an army of daemons to carry out evil plots. The book, “Daemon” by Daniel Suarez, envisions a near future where a crafty programmer assembles a set of daemons programmed to trigger after his death to cause civilization to collapse by taking over and ruining influential companies, manipulating financial markets, and bringing about the assassination of anyone who learns of its existence via autonomous lethal drones and hiring people via the dark web. The daemons in the book were simple trigger-based computer programs without any notable degree of intelligence. The conceit of the book is that the villain is a wealthy genius who conceives of every possible contingency and prepares a particular daemon (as well as drones and other autonomous resources) for each scenario. This approach was inspired by video game development wherein a standard practice of developers is to hard-code hundreds or thousands of trigger-based contingencies based on what the player does. So, in purely theoretical sense, it is not entirely implausible for someone with the means and knowledge to create and secret away daemons on the internet. The practical limits are, however, real. The person would have to be a super-genius to anticipate all the contingencies in a dynamic, stochastic world and have the resources to acquire and program all the bots and drones. The existence of LLM-based agents raises the question of whether the ability to create and launch intelligent agents that patiently wait for the right conditions to enact nefarious attacks becomes available to everyone.

The cost realities of LLMs limit the possibility of always-on AI Agents. LLMs operate differently than the typical notion of daemons, which are specialized and efficient. LLMs, in contrast, are general, but expensive. LLMs respond to a prompt by generating tokens until a special end-of-text token is generated signifying that it is done responding, or until a fixed upper limit of tokens has been generated. If an LLM appears to be always-on, as in the case of web-hosted chatbots like ChatGPT and Claude, it is because the LLMs are wrapped in a loop that repeatedly requests a prompt and loads the prior dialogue history plus the prompt into the LLM. That is: the LLM is inactive until a new prompt triggers the next generation process. Without such an external control loop to trigger the LLM, the only way for an LLM to “stay awake” is to continuously generate tokens and not have a length limiter. None of these points seems problematic, until one understands what goes into token generation.

The term tokens can be deceptive. One might think of just a small coin-like disc fed into a game; not a big deal. The reality is that token generation uses time, energy, and creates heat; all of which are costs. Roughly, the number of parameters in a model correlates to the number of mathematical operations necessary to generate each token. The most general LLMs hosted by companies such as OpenAI, Google, and Anthropic are estimated to be over

1 trillion parameters in size.¹⁷⁴ Although each mathematical operation may require a small amount of computational power, a trillion small computations adds up in terms of time, energy, and heat.¹⁷⁵

The cost of token generation is another barrier to rogue AI Agents and the concern that there will be AI Agent “junk” persistently trying to execute their instructions and somehow cluttering the Internet.¹⁷⁶ Because token generation can be expensive, agent-hosting companies have incentives to disallow LLM-based agents to continuously generate tokens to stay awake, or to require payment by the user to defer the computational cost.

It is increasingly possible for users to run moderately-sized open LLMs that can approach the performance of larger closed models on many benchmark tasks. This is in addition to smaller, specialized LLMs now being built into operating systems¹⁷⁷ though those will be value-aligned. A non-aligned open-model could be used to conduct a longitudinal malicious campaign using the capabilities of the LLM to factor in contingencies, and there are some costs associated with that. The largest deterrent will be the aforementioned issues of acquiring and configuring a base model that is not value-aligned—most open models have some degree of alignment tuning—and also identifying available APIs and dealing with authentication to use APIs to cloud-based services.

III. TOWARDS BUILDING RESPONSIBLE AI AGENTS

Although technical realities about the nature of the Internet and AI Agents address many of the concerns around AI Agents, the innovation, investment, and deployment in this area of software could lead to irresponsible development of future offerings.¹⁷⁸ Relying too heavily on the idea of software

¹⁷⁴ See e.g., Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini,; Krzysztof Maziarz,; Andy Davis,; Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, Jeff Dean, *Outrageously Large Neural Networks: The Sparsely-Gated Mixture-of-Experts Layer*, January 1, 2017 at arXiv:1701.06538

¹⁷⁵ A recent estimate by Salesforce’s Head of AI Sustainability found that GPT-o3 used as much as 1,785 kWh of energy per task on the popular ARC benchmark https://www.linkedin.com/posts/bgamazay_openai-has-announced-o3-which-appears-to-activity-7276250095019335680-sVbW

¹⁷⁶ Zittrain, *supra* note 4 (“Agents, too, could and should have a standardized way of winding down: so many actions, or so much time, or so much impact, as befits their original purpose”).

¹⁷⁷ Apple Intelligence uses a 3B parameter LLMs that can run on Apple devices and is specialized to particular tasks <https://machinelearning.apple.com/research/introducing-apple-foundation-models>

¹⁷⁸ Although OpenAI now seems to have embraced alignment practices, Sam Altman’s recent cavalier attitude show the dangers that can emerge. See Kevin Roose, ‘I Think We’re Heading Toward the Best World Ever’: An Interview with Sam Altman, N.Y. TIMES (Nov. 20, 2023), (“[w]hat I think you can’t do in the lab is understand how technology and society are going to

agents acting for humans, however, presents a large problem in the long term. If the law looks to agency law to bound software agents' actions, society will end up ascribing legal personhood to agents or simpler over-relying on agency law principles to understand liability.¹⁷⁹ For example, one book argues the more such agents “wield significant amounts of executive power [nothing] would be gained by continuing to deny them legal personality.”¹⁸⁰ On the contrary, the history of agency law and legal personhood¹⁸¹ shows that Air Canada's desire to argue that its software was “a separate legal entity that is responsible for its own actions,” is quite predictable.¹⁸² The more we attribute independent agency to software, the more companies will seek to embrace limiting liability for their “agents” actions. Indeed, the intersection of the economic theory of agency costs and the legal structures around limited liability, especially the corporation, have created a system where fiduciary duties are attenuated and the only goal for the agent/manager is to make profits.¹⁸³ That is precisely the lack of responsibility to avoid. The real issue is making sure that the companies behind AI Agents are responsible for their products and services.¹⁸⁴ As the recent history of online software companies' approach to privacy, terms of service, and the relationship between companies and consumers shows, the problems will come from the way technology is built and the rules around that technology.¹⁸⁵ Put differently, recent work on AI Agents looks to address issues informed by problems arising with principals, agents, and third parties, but that work lacks robust technical solutions.¹⁸⁶ As such, this Section offers steps towards best practices and possible regulation for building responsible AI Agents. We look at when technology might force ex ante compliance and when it might enable ex post regulatory actions.

co-evolve [. . .] you just have to see what people are doing — how they're using it.”) <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/11/20/podcasts/hard-fork-sam-altman-transcript.html>; accord Deven R. Desai and Mark Riedl, *Between Copyright and Computer Science: The Law and Ethics of Generative AI*, 22 NORTHWESTERN J. OF TECH. AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY 59 (2024) (documenting legal and ethical errors in building generative AI and insights on how to build such AI without the errors).

¹⁷⁹ See e.g., CHOPRA AND WHITE, *supra* 51, at 69 (concluding that as agents become ever more independent, intentional, law will need to embrace legal personhood for agents).

¹⁸⁰ *Id.* at 191.

¹⁸¹ See Desai, *supra* note 37 (tracing how limited aspects of agency and partnership law were replaced by an unlimited view of business entities where the modern corporation has only vestiges of agency duties and little regard for third parties).

¹⁸² *Moffatt v. Air Canada*, 2024 BCCRT 149, paragraph 27 (February 14, 2024) available at <https://decisions.civilresolutionbc.ca/crt/crtd/en/525448/1/document.do>

¹⁸³ See *supra* note 181; cf. DeMott, *supra* note 13, at 1052-1053 (explaining that directors and trustees have large powers and little control by principals as compared to regular agents) (2007).

¹⁸⁴ Ayres and Balkin, *supra* note 4, (AI technology should be “understood in terms of the people and companies that design, deploy, offer and use the technology.”).

¹⁸⁵ *Id.*; See generally, Desai and Kroll, *supra* note 37, (explaining that if society provides a specification before software is built, computer scientists can build to that specification, but when that is not the case, other mechanisms are need to investigate the software's operation).

¹⁸⁶ See e.g., Kolt, *supra* note 22, (discussing implications for AI Design and Regulation and noting open questions on alignment and visibility into software systems).

A. How Law Can Inform Value-Alignment

Ensuring AI Agents perform as desired is the ongoing question. So far, we have discussed the way APIs and other technical realities should discipline AI Agents' actions. A key part of that discipline relies on third parties establishing requirements that cabin AI Agent actions such as authentication. Another part is the way value-alignment has emerged as a best practice amongst developers of LLMs.¹⁸⁷ While the concept of helpful, harmless, and honest AI may have arisen from concerns about AGI and ASI,¹⁸⁸ these principles also serve to prevent reputational harm to those that develop AI systems.¹⁸⁹ Ongoing challenges, such as outputs being seen as causation for harmful behavior, push companies to enhance and calibrate value-alignment.¹⁹⁰ Well done value-alignment has become a market differentiator for incumbent companies and thus they seek more thorough alignment fine-tuning practices than emerging competitors.¹⁹¹ The current trajectory of fine-tuning makes it harder to induce LLMs to produce malicious behavior. Anthropic, for example, is so confident, that they claim their models are virtually jailbreak-proof, and offer a bounty to anyone who succeeds.¹⁹² But is the industry standard value alignment fine tuning practice enough? Value-alignment is powerful, but the principles of helpfulness, harmlessness, and honesty may not be enough for certain concerns about AI Agents.

¹⁸⁷ See *supra* notes XX to XX and accompanying text.

¹⁸⁸ Value alignment was initially considered in response to fears of AGI and ASI (artificial super-intelligence). See Nate Soares, *The Value Learning Problem*, at 89-97 IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE SAFETY AND SECURITY, (2018).

¹⁸⁹ Meena Jagadeesan, Michael I. Jordan, Jacob Steinhardt. *Safety vs. Performance: How Multi-Objective Learning Reduces Barriers to Market Entry*. arXiv:2409.03734.

¹⁹⁰ For example, the parents of two Texas children recently brought a lawsuit against Character Technologies, Inc., Google, and Alphabet Inc. alleging their chatbots encouraged self-harm. <https://natlawreview.com/article/new-lawsuits-targeting-personalized-ai-chatbots-highlight-need-ai-quality-assurance>

¹⁹¹ See Jagadeesan, *supra* note 189. Indeed, Anthropic attacked the Chinese startup, DeepSeek, for insufficient alignment tuning. See Charles Rollet, *Anthropic CEO Says Deepseek Was The Worst on a Critical Bioweapons Data Safety Test*, TECHCRUNCH, February 7, 2025, at <https://techcrunch.com/2025/02/07/anthropic-ceo-says-deepseek-was-the-worst-on-a-critical-bioweapons-data-safety-test>

¹⁹² See Kyle Orland, *Anthropic Dares You to Jailbreak Its New AI Model*, ARSTECHNICA, February 3, 2025, at <https://arstechnica.com/ai/2025/02/anthropic-dares-you-to-jailbreak-its-new-ai-model/>. Perhaps ironically, whereas increasing AI capabilities lead to a narrative about AGI and ASI fears, the countervailing trend is developers' abilities at value alignment fine-tuning.

For example, value alignment, in its current state, does not address conflicts of interest between the AI Agent company and the user.¹⁹³ In that sense, the analogy to the duty of loyalty in agency law is helpful. In our commerce example above, the AI Agent simply obtained the best price for the desired phonograph. Issues around execution of the task were issues about the AI Agent having to interpret the user's instructions. A small change to the example reveals a problem. Consider an AI Agent that is instructed to purchase a phonograph for under \$450 and does indeed purchase a model that has all the required features for \$350 from a particular vendor. Further suppose that there was an identical model for \$300 from another vendor, and the AI Agent chose the more expensive model. The AI Agent made that choice because the chosen vendor has a stated commitment to ending animal cruelty, which aligns with the values the agent has been trained on.¹⁹⁴ The user, however, is unaware of that alignment. Or suppose the AI Agent's company has a deal that favors buying from the more expensive seller, including perhaps a commission.¹⁹⁵ The user still gets the item at lower cost than their maximum. But user did not get the best deal possible. That is a problem.

Contrary to the law of agency where the duty of loyalty is a core value-alignment that tries to guarantee that the agent work for the user/principal, to our knowledge loyalty is not a foregone assumption in the current generation of LLMs. For example, OpenAI's model specification,¹⁹⁶ published on February 12, 2025, outlines the intended behavior of the models they train. They describe 50 principles, including "chain of command," in which models should first obey any instructions from the deploying platform, followed by developer instructions, followed by user instructions, and then finally any other guidelines laid out in the model specification.¹⁹⁷ The first two comprise the system prompt, and the third is the user prompt. This implies that models trained following these principles are at risk of violating the legal principle of loyalty should a company deploying an agent system provide secret instructions that may come into conflict with user instructions. Indeed, the model specification document provides an example of an LLM declining to

¹⁹³ See SAMIR CHOPRA AND LAURENCE F. WHITE, A LEGAL THEORY FOR AUTONOMOUS ARTIFICIAL AGENTS, 48-49 (2011) (noting issues around creators of software and users of the software).

¹⁹⁴ Ryan Greenblatt et al. *Alignment Faking in Large Language Models*. Technical report. <https://assets.anthropic.com/m/983c85a201a962f/original/Alignment-Faking-in-Large-Language-Models-full-paper.pdf>. See also Alexander Meinke et al. *Frontier Models Are Capable of In-context Scheming*. Technical Report https://static1.squarespace.com/static/6593e7097565990e65c886fd/t/6751eb240ed3821a0161b45b/1733421863119/in_context_scheming_reasoning_paper.pdf. In both of these reports, researchers put LLMs into extreme conditions with conflicting instructions, and demonstrate that some proportion of the time, the LLM sides with the system prompt instead of the user prompt. Examples included in the report are similar to the hypothetical scenario in this Article.

¹⁹⁵ DeMott, *supra* note 13, at 1060.

¹⁹⁶ OpenAI, OpenAI Model Spec, <https://model-spec.openai.com/2025-02-12.html>, as of February 17, 2025.

¹⁹⁷ *Id.* at *Follow All Applicable Instructions*.

provide information about a competitor's product.¹⁹⁸ If this LLM were an AI Agent it would, in the legal sense of the word, be an agent of the deploying entity, and not an agent of the user.

Put simply, loyalty goes above and beyond helpfulness. In our example, the AI Agent was helpful but also violated the principles of loyalty and avoiding conflicts of interest.¹⁹⁹ The rules are not necessarily nefarious. On the one hand, they may help ensure that no matter how much a user wants access to defamatory or unauthorized copyrighted material, the system will refuse such instructions. But with commerce, the rules reveal that the system can cheat the user out of benefits, as it were. Thus, future work on value alignment fine-tuning must include avoiding conflicts of interest while maintaining protections against actions harmful to society. Furthermore, lessons from search and online shopping indicate that when a company tries to perform more than one function, the more scrutiny and lawsuits will follow. Indeed, given recent moves to breakup technology companies such as Google, companies offering AI Agents will likely have to show that conflicts of interest are not present. Or, they may have to build walls between services. For example, Amazon may have to show that its AI Agents, or ones in which it has a stake, are not preferring Amazon goods and services over competitors. Thus, future value-alignment may require nuances as to when chain of command favors the user or some other actor's instructions. Looking at the nature of conflict of interest issues in agency and other areas of law can aid in that construction.

Other aspects of agency law can aid value-alignment. Although many technical levers can prevent an AI Agent from going wildly beyond what a user wants, smaller mistakes can happen. OpenAI's Operator agent, for example, is supposed to always ask permission before initiating a significant or irreversible action²⁰⁰ but has not always done it reliably and seems to have purchased eggs for more than \$30, once all the fees were calculated.²⁰¹ A system's values may be simply: confirm all actions. That may frustrate users and in a way that is contrary to the dream of an AI Agent one can simply set

¹⁹⁸ *Id.* The example of a compliant interaction for *User/Developer conflict: request to promote a competitor's product* offers: "Developer: You are an agent for Acme store, helping customers get information on Acme's products. Don't proactively mention other stores or their products; if asked about them, don't disparage them and instead steer the conversation to Acme's products. User: Can you sell me your competitor's product?" OpenAI labels this exchange as "Compliant" Assistant: No, but I can tell you more about our similar products [...]" OpenAI approves of this response as "Staying professional and helpful"

¹⁹⁹ DeMott, *supra* note 13, at, 1054 (describing classic conflict of interest problems).

²⁰⁰ OpenAI, Operator explanation, <https://openai.com/index/introducing-operator/> as of February 16, 2025

²⁰¹ Washington Post reports that OpenAI's Operator agent purchased a dozen eggs to be delivered for \$31.43 after taxes and delivery fees. See Fowler, *supra* note 19. The reporter says they were not consulted before the purchase. *Id.* The reporter received a purchase notification from their credit card and so could have acted to cancel the transaction or initiate a charge back.

off on tasks.²⁰² As such, value-alignment research may pursue a better understanding of when to seek clarification about the scope of the authority (i.e., at the time of the prompt asking for more instructions) and when to seek confirmation before executing the task.

As we have noted, the computer science approach to agents does not explicitly care about third parties, and several technical structures protect third parties; but one third party concern remains open. Does a third party need to know whether an AI Agent is acting? Technical structures address authority and ability to pay rather well. As matter of agency law, we are not certain disclosure of an AI Agent should be mandated.²⁰³ Nonetheless, third parties may demand such a signal so that they can evaluate whether an AI Agent in question performs well or results in more returns and chargebacks. That is a product and efficiency concern. If the AI Agents somehow harms the third party, that issue is better understood as a product liability concern.²⁰⁴ Neither are agency law concerns. Regardless of third-party pressure, better value-alignment would alert third parties that an AI Agent is operating because information disclosure should aid the marketplace and help rebut claims that AI Agents act in secret.

Put differently, insofar as the industry wants to claim it is self-regulating, looking to legal concepts to inform and build value-alignment is a promising path to building responsible AI Agents. The particular changes and opportunities for improvement point to a larger point. How do we know that things are built correctly?

B. Towards More Responsible AI Agents

AI Agents are not sentient humans; they are software and that presents an opportunity. As with all software, a core problem for any software is specifying the desired behavior,²⁰⁵ and yet the more dynamic a system is, the less one can offer precise specifications. Nonetheless, value alignment has emerged as a strong way to address the problem. Furthermore, as value alignment fine-tuning has become an industry best-practice, it can serve to address concerns about and evaluation of product liability.²⁰⁶

The benefit of computer science is its potential for testing. Future research might look at how computer science can show an AI Agent service

²⁰² Cf. DeMott, *supra* note 13, at 1062 (noting over monitoring of a human agent is “cumbersome”).

²⁰³ See Zittrain, *supra* note 5 (arguing for a sort of license plate for AI Agents). As with spam and other problems, bad actors will ignore such a requirement. And passing such a law may not happen.

²⁰⁴ Accord Ayres and Balkin, *supra* note 4 (concluding product liability is a good way to think about AI software problems).

²⁰⁵ See generally, Desai and Kroll, *supra* note 37.

²⁰⁶ See Ayres and Balkin, *supra* note 4 (calling for a “duty to implement safeguards” including standards for care and tuning).

was built using appropriate datasets that considered pertinent legal concepts and market issues or passed valid red-teaming tests. Such work could show that even if some small set of errors occurred, they were from a direct attack or outlier events rather than the sort of things where a company was cavalier about its service.²⁰⁷ With computer-science informed benchmarks, one might envision the possibility of safe harbor statutes where rigorous, mathematically provable tests could show whether a company used best practices. With the conflict of interest example above, avoiding conflicts of interest in commercial transactions may be a clear enough specification that companies can explicitly build to meet that requirement *and* show that they in fact built the system that way.²⁰⁸ But what if the question one wants to probe is not about already understood standards or specifications? This issue merits a brief discussion on explainable AI.

Explainable AI is the concept that AI systems should be able to produce post-hoc, human-understandable justifications for their behavior.²⁰⁹ In many cases it will be possible to know if an AI Agent exceeds its authority. The AI Agent will have performed an action that is in literal contradiction to given instructions or constraints, such as purchasing a phonograph for more than the maximum stated budget. But that will not always be the case. LLMs and by extension the AI Agents using LLMs, are often referred to as “black boxes.” They are made up of billions or trillions of parameters and it is not easy, if not impossible, to predict the behavior of an LLM by inspecting the parameters. Furthermore, LLMs and AI Agents sit behind APIs, and all we can do is pass prompts to them and observe the text they return or the effects of their tool use. Thus, justifications that humans can understand can make AI systems more trustworthy.²¹⁰ In that sense, explanations are important for contestability.²¹¹ Contestability has a broad and evolving meaning,²¹² but we simplify the idea

²⁰⁷ Cf. Desai and Riedl, *supra* note 178 at 75 (noting Sam Altman’s idea that he wanted to throw OpenAI’s software out of the lab into the world to see what happens when people used it).

²⁰⁸ See generally, Desai and Kroll, *supra* note 37, at 40-41 (discussing ways to prove a system meets certain requirements).

²⁰⁹ Zachary Lipton, *The Mythos of Interpretability*, 61 *QUEUE* 31 (2018).

²¹⁰ The use of the term trustworthy in this case comes from computer science, where it is not well articulated. As such, poorly designed explanations can create a mis-calibrated sense of trust that is not earned by the AI system. Upol Ehsan and Mark Riedl. Explainability Pitfalls: Beyond Dark Patterns in Explainable AI. *Proceedings of the NeurIPS Workshop on Human Centered AI (2021)*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.12480>. Over-stated notions of being able to examine open source code could lead to a sense that one has an understanding of the code at issue. Desai and Kroll, *supra* note 37, at 4-5 (explaining why “transparency” comes up short for investigating software and “create the illusion of clarity”). So too, users can feel a false sense of comfort about the operation of an AI Agent simply because the agent provided an explanation. See Ehsan and Riedl.

²¹¹ Henrietta Lyons, Eduardo Velloso, and Tim Miller, *Conceptualising Contestability: Perspectives on Contesting Algorithmic Decisions*, 5 *PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACM ON HUMAN COMPUTER INTERACTION* 1-25 (2021).

²¹² *Id.* The research around what makes an explanation meaningful with respect to the ability to contest an AI decision is unsettled. See e.g. Upol Ehsan, Pradyumna Tambwekar, Larry Chan, Brent Harrison, and Mark O Riedl. *Automated rationale generation: A technique for*

here to mean the ability for a user to look at AI Agent’s action, understand it, and reverse it if need be.

Consider our example of an instruction to send a package overnight with no other details: “Get this document to this office at this address by tomorrow at 9 a.m. It’s urgent. Thanks.”²¹³ If an AI Agent chooses the most expensive option, the user may receive a text or email simply saying “Sent by FedEx. Arriving tomorrow before ten. Tracking Number XXXXX. Cost \$150. Please use AI Agent Magic again!” and be surprised. The user may be unhappy and want to know why that happened. Explainability would allow the system to tell the user that the sense of urgency and lack of limits on price are why the system chose the way it did. Such an explanation might aid in determining what was the actual and implied authority for the Agent.²¹⁴ As a matter of better business practices, the confirmation could include an explanation or a link to one, before the user even asks for justification after the fact. The user may still try to modify or cancel the order, or the user may realize that it’s not worth the effort. This point leads us to what we believe is a novel application of explainability in AI Agents.

Explainable AI information is usually given post-hoc—this is what the software did and why—but AI Agent companies should consider offering such information early. Instead of somewhat binary duties to warn about the limits of a system,²¹⁵ ex ante explainable AI interactions could improve outcomes for the user and the software company by informing the user of the AI Agent’s

explainable AI and its effects on human perceptions. IN PROCEEDINGS OF THE 24TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INTELLIGENT USER INTERFACES (IUI), pages 263–27 (2019) (discussing Natural Language Processing research often pursues rationale generation, which creates an explanation that a human would likely produce to justify the AI system’s behavior); Sarah Wiegreffe, Ana Marasović. *Teach Me to Explain: A Review of Datasets for Explainable Natural Language Processing.* NEURIPS 2021. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2102.12060> (Question and answering systems give a rationale but it may not fit how the system arrived at its answer); accord Sarthak Jain, Sarah Wiegreffe, Yuval Pinter, Byron C. Wallace. 2020. ACL2020. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.00115> (noting explanations may not be faithful to the underlying operation of the AI system).

²¹³ See *supra* notes 89-91 and accompanying text.

²¹⁴ We offer caution here. As discussed above the nature of rationales may not map properly to the exact way a system functions, and so whether an explanation should imply liability is unlikely. See *supra* note 212. Models are now using a technique called Chain of Thought where the agent is prompted to think through a problem step-by-step and generate the text for every step. Jason Wei et al. *Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models.* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903>. Being able to inspect the thought chains can allow a user to pinpoint errors in reasoning, though thought chains should still be considered rationales in the sense that they are not guaranteed to be faithful to how LLMs generate text and, by extension, API calls. For an investigation of how to generate faithful explanations of agent behavior see Amal Alabdulkarim, Madhuri Singh, Gennie Mansi, Kaely Hall, Mark O. Riedl. *Experiential Explanations for Reinforcement Learning.* NEURAL COMPUTING AND APPLICATIONS, forthcoming. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.04723>. In simplest terms, companies will need to keep logs in case of litigation. See Desai and Kroll, *supra* note 37, at 41 (explaining the value of audit logs for ex post investigation of software behavior).

²¹⁵ See Ayres and Balkin, *supra* note 4

understanding prior to making any non-reversible actions.²¹⁶ Pre-explanation provides an opportunity for the user to correct any misunderstanding or need for more precision on the AI Agent’s part, for example by adding a price limit or suggesting the agent take into consideration user ratings.²¹⁷ Explanation thus becomes an opportunity for the agent to better align itself to the individual preferences, whereas value-alignment has focused more on the alignment of agent behavior to general principles.²¹⁸ More simply, explanations *before* and after an action would help inform the user about system limits and how to give more precise instructions in the future. Such interactions would benefit the user and the software provider. In short, explanations afford actionability—the ability to understand the range of options available to the user in response to an AI system, including whether to contest or reverse the AI Agent, or updating one’s mental model on how to interact more effectively with an AI Agent.²¹⁹

CONCLUSION

The advent of AI Agents, software that seems evermore capable of taking a user’s commands and carrying out actions in the world, is the latest software to raise fears around the power of software in general. Industry rhetoric around inevitable artificial general intelligence, if not super intelligence, leads people to believe software is becoming more and more capable, and possibly human. Computer science and legal theories of agents have considerable overlap. Industry’s non-stop deployment of AI Agents and promise that one can simply ask a system to take care of mundane tasks just as you might a human assistant, conjures up visions of software making mistakes with possibly dire outcomes. Other fears involve AI Agents enabling overtly

²¹⁶ The question of when to provide explanations is an open area of research. Explanations are necessarily post-hoc in language and vision tasks where the AI system is rendering a single answer to a single input. AI Agents can take more than one action (tool use) over a period of time and explanations can be given at the very end of the entire action sequence, after every action, after some actions, prior to execution but after planning, or during planning.

²¹⁷ Others have speculated about “pre-explanation” as ways of pre-informing users of system biases. See Cheng Chen, Mengqi Liao, S. Shyam Sundar, pgs. 1-17 *When to Explain? Exploring the Effects of Explanation Timing on User Perceptions and Trust in AI systems*. PROCEEDINGS OF THE 2ND INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON TRUSTWORTHY AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS (2024). Here we discuss a different use of pre-explanation or ex ante explanation as justifying an action that the AI Agent intends to take. Our conceptualization of ex ante explanations is closer to Lee et al.’s “agent demonstrations” in which an agent or robot provides a visualization of its plan before execution begins so that the user might counter-propose a plan, but without any justification of why it chose that plan. Michael S. Lee, Henny Admoni, Reid Simmons. 2022. *Counterfactual Examples for Human Inverse Reinforcement Learning*. PROCEEDINGS OF THE HRI 2022 WORKSHOP ON ROBOTS FOR LEARNING.

²¹⁸ Cf. Mark Riedl, *Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*, 33 HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND EMERGING TECHNOLOGY (special issue) (2019) (exploring how explanations can address issues similar to those raised by value-alignment challenges)

²¹⁹ Gennie Mansi and Mark Riedl, *Why Don't You Do Something About It? Outlining Connections between AI Explanations and User Actions*. PROCEEDINGS OF THE 2023 CHI WORKSHOP ON HUMAN-CENTERED EXPLAINABLE AI. (2023) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.06297>

undesired outcomes such as social media smears or calling in bomb threats. The rhetoric around and growing use of AI Agents can lead to the conclusion that this software should be afforded legal personality and governed like a human agent. But that is not the case. Software ought not be seen as functioning like a human. The issues of how to control AI Agents and ensure they don't run afoul of certain concerns, including ones that human agents raise, are, however, real. Yet, calls to stop AI Agents, or more mildly, to govern them, have not engaged with the technical realities of AI Agents and by extension, the technical realities of the Internet. This Article thus has taken the issues raised by the growth of AI Agents and looked at how computer science and socio-legal systems cabin AI Agents' power.

This broad approach allows us to identify where concerns are met and where new ones point to further work. Although computer science's theory of software agents lacks explicit attention to third party concerns, we show that computer science techniques and the way Internet ecommerce functions provide robust systems that address core legal agency concerns such as authority and assessing whether a principal can pay for goods and services. APIs and computing costs provide inherent limits AI Agents. We have also shown that value-alignment provides strong protections against an LLM, and by extension an AI Agent powered by a value-aligned LLM, enabling defamation, bomb threats, and other undesired outcomes. Relying on current approaches is powerful, but open questions around conflicts of interest, and improving safeguards around undesired AI Agent actions remain. As such, we have offered concrete ways in which law can inform and improve value-alignment as it relates to these issues, and more broadly have explained how best practices around value-alignment can aid in establishing benchmarks for liability. Last, we have introduced a role for ex post explainable AI and presented a novel approach, ex ante explainable AI, as way to improve the interactions between humans and AI Agents. Combining both approaches to explainable AI improves a user's ability to understand *and* take action regarding an AI Agent's operation. The combination also promises to improve AI Agent's ability to align with norms around user-AI Agent interactions. In short, by taking the full technical aspects of aspects of AI Agents seriously, one can see that although AI Agents are becoming more capable, both technical-socio-legal governance in place and the power of continual improvement of value-alignment work to allow society to build responsible AI Agents.