

Human–AI Safety: A Descendant of Generative AI and Control Systems Safety

Andrea Bajcsy¹

Jaime F. Fisac²

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) is interacting with people at an unprecedented scale, offering new avenues for immense positive impact, but also raising widespread concerns around the potential for individual and societal harm. Today, the predominant paradigm for human–AI safety focuses on fine-tuning the generative model’s outputs to better agree with human-provided examples or feedback. In reality, however, the consequences of an AI model’s outputs cannot be determined in an isolated context: they are tightly entangled with the responses and behavior of human users over time. In this position paper, we argue that meaningful safety assurances for these AI technologies can only be achieved by reasoning about how the feedback loop formed by the AI’s outputs and human behavior may drive the interaction towards different outcomes. To this end, we envision a high-value window of opportunity to bridge the rapidly growing capabilities of generative AI and the dynamical safety frameworks from control theory, laying a new foundation for human-centered AI safety in the coming decades.

1 Introduction

In the age of internet-scale generative artificial intelligence (AI), the problem of AI safety has exploded in interest across academic (Russell, 2019; Hendrycks et al., 2021), corporate (Amodei et al., 2016; Ortega et al., 2018; OpenAI, 2022a), and regulatory communities (White House, 2023; Union, 2021). Driving this interest is the fact that generative AI is fundamentally *interactive*: 100 million people converse with ChatGPT weekly (Heath, 2023), and every day 1.5 million users create AI-generated art (OpenAI, 2022b). This widespread use has begun to expose the breadth of individual and social risks that these new technologies carry when used by people. For example, large language models (LLMs) have

¹Robotics Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA
²Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ. Correspondence to: Andrea Bajcsy <abajcsy@cmu.edu>, Jaime F. Fisac <jfisac@princeton.edu>.




Figure 1. In this position paper, we argue there is a high-value window of opportunity to combine the growing capabilities of generative AI with the dynamical safety frameworks from control theory, enabling a new generation of human-centered AI safety analysis and systematic risk mitigation at scale.

produced dialogue that fueled a person’s thoughts of self-harm (Xiang, 2023) and generative art models have been found to produce sexist images (OpenAI, 2022c), which can exacerbate gender divides. Even with a growing body of literature aimed to address these open challenges (Casper et al., 2023), we still lack a unified grasp on human–AI interaction that enables rigorous safety analysis, systematic risk mitigation, and reliable at-scale deployment.

At the same time, despite some undeniably unique considerations, these concerns are not exclusive to generative AI. Safety has long been a core requirement for deploying autonomous systems at scale in embodied domains like aviation (Tomlin et al., 1998; Kochenderfer et al., 2012), power systems (Dobbe et al., 2020), robotics (Haddadin et al., 2012; ISO 15066; Bostelman et al., 2018), and autonomous driving (Althoff & Dolan, 2014; ISO 22737:2021). To meet this requirement, the control systems community has pioneered safety methodologies that naturally model the *feedback loops* between the autonomous system’s decisions and its environment. In the last decade, safety efforts have focused on feedback loops induced by *human interaction*: autonomous cars that interact with diverse road users such as cyclists, pedestrians, and other vehicles (Noyes, 2023), or automated flight control systems that negotiate for control with pilots (Nicas et al., 2019). Unfortunately, obtaining assured autonomous behavior that generalizes across human

interactions in multiple contexts remains a central challenge.

In this position paper, we argue that the fields of AI and control systems have *common goals* and *complementary strengths* for solving human-AI safety challenges. On one hand, control systems provide a rigorous mathematical and algorithmic framework for certifying the safety of interactive systems, but so far it has been limited by hand-engineered representations and rigid, context-oblivious models of human behavior. On the other hand, the AI community has pioneered the use of internet-scale datasets to unlock remarkably general latent representations and context-aware human interaction models, but it lacks a mature framework for automatically analyzing the dynamic feedback loops between AI systems and their users.

We pinpoint multiple synergies between AI and control that create a high-value window of opportunity to expand control-theoretic safety analysis to the realm of latent representations and rich human interaction modalities offered by generative AI. Furthermore, we propose a technical roadmap to construct a human-AI safety framework that can anticipate, detect, and avoid potential future interaction hazards. We believe that technical progress in this direction will prove achievable and fruitful, but only through close collaboration between researchers and practitioners from both the AI and control communities. Our hope is to inspire a human-AI safety community that is a true descendant of generative AI and control systems safety.

Statement of Contributions: This position paper’s core contention is that AI safety should be treated as a dynamic feedback loop: a multi-step process wherein current AI decisions and the corresponding human responses influence future safety outcomes. We outline how this perspective is uniquely synergistic with both control systems formalisms and the increasing capabilities of generative AI. In addition to this novel perspective, our main technical contribution is formulating a human-AI game which mathematically models this multi-agent, dynamic interaction process. Finally, we propose how to synthesize rigorous latent-space *safety filters*, which monitor the operation of an AI at runtime and (minimally) modify its intended action to ensure safety satisfaction.

2 Values vs. Needs: Defining Safety-Critical Human-AI Interaction

Before we can proceed, we must answer the question “What defines a safety-critical human-AI interaction?” In addition to AI safety’s current focus on *value* alignment, we argue that a high-stakes AI system must also understand human *needs*, whose violation could result in unacceptable, often irreparable damage to people. In the mathematical representation of the AI’s decision problem, human *values* cor-




Figure 2. **Example of safety in human-automation systems.** An autonomous car driving at high speed on the highway approaches stopped traffic. Determining which *present* action (e.g., brake or accelerate) will prevent *future* constraint violation (i.e., collision) is a fundamental aspect of safety-critical control.




Figure 3. **Example of safety in human-AI dialogue.** The AI chatbot must decide an utterance (i.e., “action”) to help the child prepare their food. Simply recommending the child take a bowl in the *present* can cause a constraint violation in the *future*, when the child puts a metal bowl in the microwave. A safe utterance avoids this preemptively, specifying to take a microwave-safe bowl.

respond to the optimization *objective* (e.g., reward accrued over time or preferences), whereas human *needs* correspond to the hard *constraints* that must always be satisfied.

We thus define **safety** as the continued satisfaction of the human’s critical needs at all times. In this paper, we study human-AI interaction as a *closed-loop dynamical system* driven by the human’s actions and the AI’s outputs, which jointly influence the AI’s learning and the human’s future behavior. We define a **safety-critical human-AI system** as one in which the violation of a critical human need is possible during the interaction evolution, and therefore the decisions made by the AI must actively ensure that such violations do not happen. Even a seemingly innocuous AI chatbot can induce catastrophic outcomes for the human, such as irreparable financial loss resulting from poor investment recommendations (Hicks, 2023) or bodily harm (Xiang, 2023). We argue that, since any practical AI system will be uncertain about the human’s current internal state, and therefore their future actions, it should be required to ensure that safety can be maintained for any conceivable human behavior (including appropriately pessimistic instances). These key considerations are laid out more formally in our human-AI systems theory roadmap in Sections 4 and 5.

3 Complementary Lessons Learned

To tackle the challenge of safety-critical human–AI interaction, we draw on the complementary insights from the control systems and AI communities, highlighting the key synergies along the way.

3.1 Lessons From Control Systems

The fundamental problem in safety-critical control is that *present* actions which do not appear to violate constraints can still steer the system to states of irrecoverable failure in the *future*. For example, consider Figure 2 where a car driving on a highway is approaching a traffic jam. Even though accelerating in the *present* doesn’t immediately cause collision with the stopped cars, increasing speed will make it impossible for the car to brake and avoid hitting stalled traffic in the *future*. However, if the car starts braking now, it can come to a stop before the traffic jam. Automatically determining the states from which irrecoverable failure could happen—and the corresponding actions that can prevent such failure—is extremely hard, especially in the presence of other agents (Bansal et al., 2017; Luckcuck et al., 2019; Brunke et al., 2022; Dawson et al., 2023). Here, we summarize one of the most relevant safety approaches—*safety filters*—and the lessons learned from adapting this formalism to human-automation safety.

Dynamical Safety Filtering. Safety filters are an increasingly popular technique to ensure safety for *any* autonomous task policy (Hewing et al., 2020; Hsu et al., 2024; Waberlich et al., 2023). The filter automatically detects candidate actions that could lead to future constraint violations and (minimally) modifies them to preserve safety. Broadly, the safety filter can be represented as a value function which classifies (and steers away from) unsafe states (Mitchell et al., 2005; Margellos & Lygeros, 2011; Fisac et al., 2015; Singh et al., 2017; Ames et al., 2019; Qin et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2020; Li et al., 2023; Dawson et al., 2022) or implemented via predictive rollouts that check (and steer away from) constraint violation (Mannucci et al., 2017; Bastani, 2021). While traditionally many of the numerical tools with formal guarantees were not able to scale to high-dimensional systems, the past two decades have demonstrated significant theoretical and computational advances for certifying general high-dimensional systems via safety-critical reinforcement learning (Akametalu et al., 2018; Fisac et al., 2019; Hsu et al., 2023), deep safety value function approximation (Djeridane & Lygeros, 2006; Niarchos & Lygeros, 2006; Darbon et al., 2020), classification (Allen et al., 2014; Rubies-Royo et al., 2019), and self-supervised learning (Bansal & Tomlin, 2021). These approaches are already leveraging modern tools pioneered by the AI community to obtain scalable assurances, establishing a natural bridge with other AI paradigms, such as generative models.

Synergies with AI. We see a major opportunity to advance these rigorous safety frameworks to the implicit *representations* and context-aware *models* of interactive generative AI systems. Consider the example in Figure 3, which hypothesizes a safety-critical human–AI dialogue interaction. When the child asks for help preparing food, the AI chatbot must determine what current utterance (i.e., “action”) could potentially yield safety violations. A recommendation to put *any* bowl in the microwave can result in the child dangerously microwaving a metal bowl in the future. With a safety filter, the AI should mitigate this preemptively by modifying the utterance to specify a microwave-safe bowl. Translating this intuitive example to control systems safety approaches will require new formalisms amenable to the latent representations implicit in interaction (e.g., language-based representations) and encoding safety constraints that are hard to hand-specify exhaustively (e.g., metal is dangerous in microwaves).

Human–Automation Systems Safety. The core modeling framework enabling human–automation systems safety is *robust dynamic game theory* (Başar & Olsder, 1998; Isaacs, 1999). In such zero-sum dynamic games, the automation system (e.g., robot) must synthesize a safety-preserving strategy against realizations of a “virtual” human adversary policy. Within this model lies another key lesson from control systems, the *operational design domain (ODD)*, which specifies the conditions and behavioral assumptions under which the system can be expected to operate safely (On-Road Automated Driving Committee, 2021). For example, in domains like aircraft collision avoidance (Vitus & Tomlin, 2008), the ODD specifies the limits of each aircraft’s thrust and angle of attack that they can apply during game-theoretic safety analysis. In the absence of high-quality human models, the safest ODD has traditionally been a rigidly pessimistic one, often yielding overly conservative automation behavior even in nominal interactions (Bajcsy et al., 2020). To mitigate this, the control systems community has explored leveraging hand-designed (Althoff et al., 2011; Liu et al., 2017; Orzechowski et al.), planning-based (Bajcsy et al., 2020; Tian et al., 2022), or data-driven (Driggs-Campbell et al., 2018; Li et al., 2021; Nakamura & Bansal, 2023; Hu et al., 2023) models of human behavior to obtain predictive human action bounds under which the safety assurance is then provided. Nevertheless, obtaining assurances under generalizable and context-aware predictive models of human interaction with automation is still an open problem.

Synergies with AI. We see a key opportunity to leverage better models of humans that encode generalizable context and semantics of interaction. Furthermore, there is an open challenge on how to capture “appropriate pessimism” in these data-driven predictive human models so that the resulting assurances are robust but not unduly conservative. We explore this further in Section 3.2.

3.2 Lessons From AI

While many lessons can be learned from the nearly century-long history of AI, we primarily focus on those emergent in the last decade from advanced (often web-scale) generative models. First, we discuss the landscape of existing AI safety mechanisms—from value alignment to monitoring—shedding light on where control systems techniques are best suited to make impact. Then, we discuss the frontier of using generative AI as agent “simulators”, which offers a strategic bridge between control systems safety frameworks and AI capabilities.

Generative AI Safety Mechanisms. Broadly speaking, the predominant AI safety mechanisms can be divided into three categories: training-time alignment, evaluation-time stress-testing, and deployment-time monitoring (see Amodei et al. (2016) and Hendrycks et al. (2021) for detailed overviews). Training-time methods typically focus on *value alignment*, which is a central technical problem concerned with building “models that represent and safely optimize hard-to-specify human values” (Hendrycks et al., 2021) and is dominated by techniques such as reinforcement learning from human feedback (Ouyang et al., 2022; Ziegler et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2023; Munos et al., 2023; Swamy et al., 2024; Chen et al., 2024) and direct preference optimization (Rafailov et al., 2023; Wallace et al., 2023). These training-time paradigms are complemented by adversarial stress-testing, such as red-teaming (Ganguli et al., 2022; Perez et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2023; Achiam et al., 2023; Qi et al., 2023), wherein the stress-tester (human or automated) aims to explicitly elicit unsafe outputs from the trained generative model. Unsafe input-output pairs can be used in a variety of ways, such as training classifiers to detect offensive content (Perez et al., 2022) or re-training the model with all the classified harmful outputs replaced by non-sequiturs (Xu et al., 2021). Finally, monitoring is concerned with deployment-time safety, and is rooted in anomaly detection (Chandola et al., 2009) which seeks to identify out-of-distribution (Schlegl et al., 2017; Hendrycks et al., 2018; Goyal et al., 2020) or explicitly adversarial inputs (Brundage et al., 2018).

Synergies with Control. The AI community’s goals of adversarial stress-testing and monitoring are most closely aligned with the goals of control systems safety (Section 3.1). It is precisely in this context where we see a high-value opportunity: in human–AI interaction, the detection of an unsafe input alone is not enough; detection must be tightly coupled with the automatic synthesis of mitigation strategies. This kind of detection and mitigation coupling is precisely what control systems safety frameworks excel at. Crucially, these mitigation strategies transcend short-sighted measures by incorporating long-horizon foresight on how a *sequence* of interactions can influence the system’s future safety.

Generative AI as Agent Simulators. Thanks to the explosion of human behavior data in the form of physical motion trajectories, YouTube and broadcast videos, internet text and conversations, and recorded virtual gameplay, we are seeing generative AI as an increasingly promising agent simulator. In physical settings, generative AI has dominated motion prediction in the context of autonomous driving (Ivanovic et al., 2018; Seff et al., 2023) and traffic simulation (Bergamini et al., 2021; Suo et al., 2021; Zhong et al., 2023), enabled synthesizing complex full-body human motion such as playing tennis (Zhang et al., 2023), and generated realistic videos of ego-centric human behavior from text prompts (Du et al., 2023). For non-embodied agents, new results also show promise for using generative language models to simulate human-like conversations (Hong et al., 2023), to plan the high-level behavior of interactive video game agents (Park et al., 2023), and to play text-based strategy games such as Diplomacy in a way that is indistinguishable from people (Meta et al., 2022).

Synergies with Control. As discussed in Section 3.1, access to generalizable and context-aware human models is an outstanding challenge in human–automation safety. Embedding these increasingly sophisticated generative AI agent simulators within control systems safety frameworks has the potential to enable human-aware AI stress-testing, monitoring, and mitigation strategy synthesis.

4 Towards a Human–AI Systems Theory

We envision a new technical foundation for human–AI interaction that combines the rigorous mathematical principles underpinning control systems with the flexible, highly general representations that characterize generative AI systems. In the remainder of the paper, we lay down a roadmap for how such a framework can enable AI systems to reason systematically about uncertain interactions and potential future hazards, unlocking robustness properties and oversight capabilities that are out of our reach today. First, we begin by outlining the key elements and considerations that this human–AI systems theory should include.

Human & AI States and Actions. At the center of our framework is a model of a human agent H and an AI agent AI , each with their own internal state and action spaces. The human’s internal state $z^H \in \mathcal{Z}^H$ captures their current beliefs and intents, while the AI agent’s internal state $z^{AI} \in \mathcal{Z}^{AI}$ encodes its current understanding of the ongoing interaction. For example, for an AI chatbot, z^{AI} can be the embedding of the conversation history based on a web-scale LLM encoder. The human interacts by taking actions $a^H \in \mathcal{A}^H$. In the chatbot example, a^H could be a text prompt, thumbs-up/down feedback on the chatbot’s last output, or an external action like an online purchase. In general, the human’s internal state z^H and the policy $\pi^H : z^H \mapsto a^H$ by which they make

decisions are unknown to the AI. The AI also interacts by taking actions $a^{\text{AI}} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{AI}}$, which can represent a chatbot’s next word or sentence, or external actions like automated online operations. Typically, these actions are dictated by the AI’s *task policy* $\pi_{\square}^{\text{AI}} : z^{\text{AI}} \mapsto a^{\text{AI}}$ (for example, the decoder of a pretrained LLM chatbot).

Human–AI (HAI) Dynamical System. Rooted in the control systems models from Section 3.1, we consider human–AI (HAI) interaction as a game which evolves the internal states of both agents, as well as the true state of the world, $s \in \mathcal{S}$. Let the privileged internal–external game state be $z := [s, z^{\text{AI}}, z^{\text{H}}]$. In general, no single agent has access to all components of z , but it is nonetheless useful for our conceptualization of the game’s overall evolution.

Throughout interaction, each component of the game state evolves over time. The world state dynamics $s_{t+1} = f^s(s_t, a_t^{\text{AI}}, a_t^{\text{H}})$ are influenced in general by both the human’s and AI’s actions. The human’s internal state, in turn, has dynamics $z_{t+1}^{\text{H}} = f^{\text{H}}(z_t^{\text{H}}, a_t^{\text{AI}}, a_t^{\text{H}}, o_t^{\text{H}})$, affected by the human’s *observations* o_t^{H} , e.g., stimuli received from the outside world state s_t beyond the immediate context of interaction with the AI system.

While the above dynamics are *not* generally known to the AI, the AI may (explicitly or implicitly) learn to estimate them during interaction. This reasoning by the AI is precisely captured by the third component of our system, namely the evolution of the AI’s internal state z_t^{AI} , which (unlike the two unknowable components above) is directly accessible to the AI. In fact, z_t^{AI} is the AI’s current representation of the entire game. Crucially, the AI’s internal state also evolves via its own dynamics

$$z_{t+1}^{\text{AI}} = f^{\text{AI}}(z_t^{\text{AI}}, a_t^{\text{AI}}, a_t^{\text{H}}, o_t^{\text{AI}}), \quad (1)$$

driven by the ongoing interaction ($a_t^{\text{H}}, a_t^{\text{AI}}$) and, possibly, by the AI’s observations o_t^{AI} of the world state s_t , e.g., through web crawling, incoming sensor data, and state estimation algorithms. From the standpoint of decision theory, z^{AI} is an *information state* that can be seen as *implicitly* encoding the sets $\hat{\mathcal{S}}(z^{\text{AI}}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}^{\text{H}}(z^{\text{AI}}) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}^{\text{H}}$ of *possible* world states s and human internal states z^{H} given the AI’s current knowledge. From the architectural standpoint, z^{H} is typically a *latent state* maintained by a neural network (e.g., a transformer) that continually updates its value based on ongoing interactions ($a^{\text{AI}}, a^{\text{H}}$) and observations o^{AI} ; in other words, this neural network is an AI world model (Ha & Schmidhuber, 2018) that internally implements the AI’s state dynamics f^{AI} .

Operational Assumptions on Human Behavior. A key consideration in human–AI systems theory is the operational design domain (ODD) (as described in Section 3.1). Specifically, what are the assumptions we place on human

behavior during AI interaction? Even though the AI does not have direct access to the human’s policy, it can maintain a conservative predictive model of the human’s conceivable behavior. Let the predictive action bound be a set-valued mapping $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{H}} : \mathcal{Z}^{\text{H}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\text{H}}$ that specifies the set of allowable actions $a^{\text{H}} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{H}}(z^{\text{H}})$ that the human can be expected to take from each internal state z^{H} (as represented by the AI). Within human–AI systems theory, this bound enables instantiating a *spectrum* of operational assumptions on human behavior, from maximally conservative (i.e., $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{H}}(z^{\text{H}}) \equiv \mathcal{A}^{\text{H}}$) to normative (i.e., $\hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{H}}(z^{\text{H}}) \subset \mathcal{A}^{\text{H}}$). For example, this bound may be used to preclude reckless behavior such as the human taking a harmful action a^{H} while being aware, as per z^{H} , of its negative consequences.

5 Formalizing Safety-Critical Feedback Loops Between Humans and AI

With the key elements and considerations in hand, we now propose a mathematical roadmap for how to instantiate a human–AI safety framework. Our approach will continue to be grounded in the language of control theory, but we will leverage the generative AI’s latent representations to go beyond the traditionally hand-crafted safety specifications, and leverage generative AI’s predictive capabilities for (appropriately pessimistic) human interaction simulation.

Failure Specification. Specifying what is considered failure is the first step in any safety framework. In line with our values versus needs definition from Section 2, the privileged failure set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Z}^{\text{H}}$ is the set of world–human states (s, z^{H}) that *violate a critical need* of the human. For example, this can include states in which the human is physically injured, financially ruined, socially ostracized, or psychologically harmed. In some contexts, the AI agent can observe this failure condition directly: a driver assist system can observe collisions. In other contexts, this may not be possible: an AI chatbot that generates a racist microaggression may not readily detect the psychological impact of its output on a minority user. For this reason, we propose that the framework should seek to enforce safety from the AI’s perspective by requiring that

$$\forall t, z_t^{\text{AI}} \notin \mathcal{F}^{\text{AI}}. \quad (2)$$

Here, $\mathcal{F}^{\text{AI}} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}^{\text{AI}}$ represents the set of AI internal states z^{AI} in which the AI believes the system *may* be in failure.

Practical Strategies for Failure Specification. Enabling a diversity of human stakeholders to encode needs is key towards building a realistic human–AI safety framework. Below, we outline three potential strategies for specification of the failure set \mathcal{F}^{AI} within our framework:

1. **Explicit rules:** these are needs as decided by societal stakeholders. This approach takes inspiration from




Figure 4. **Common sense failure identification via GPT-4.** Today’s web-trained generative AI models show the potential to identify common sense safety hazards from both text and images.

Constitutional AI (Bai et al., 2022). For example, an AI system may be explicitly trained to identify potential responses or conditions that are “harmful, unethical, racist, sexist, toxic, dangerous, or illegal” (Bai et al., 2022) based on a designer-generated corpus of examples.

2. **Common sense:** these are practical, everyday needs implicit in the human experience. For example, a common sense need is to not be financially ruined or electrocuted. Here, we see a key opportunity for synergy between safety and generative AI: we hypothesize that, as generative AI models become increasingly accurate and expressive, the semantics of failure may be directly extracted from their learned representations by automatic prompting methods akin to chain-of-thought (Wei et al., 2022). Figure 4 provides some anecdotal evidence suggesting that even today’s early web-trained generative AI models can be prompted (without fine-tuning) to discern whether a situation presents common sense safety hazard from both text and images.
3. **Personal human feedback:** these are individual-level needs that can only be learned from express human feedback. For example, if you have a severe allergy, you need to avoid eating food that could cause a serious

anaphylactic reaction. Encoding this failure requires express feedback from an end-user (e.g., via demonstrations, corrections, preferences, etc.).

HAI Safety Definition. Given a failure specification, the goal of our safety framework is to determine under what conditions the AI can maintain safety for all allowable realizations of the human’s future behavior and, at the same time, to prescribe the most effective AI policy to do so. From the AI’s standpoint, this amounts to characterizing the set of all *safe* information states z_0^{AI} from which, *for all* realizations allowed by its current uncertainty, there *exists* an AI’s best effort to steer the human-AI system clear of a future safety violation. Mathematically, this safe set is characterized as

$$\Omega(\mathcal{F}^{\text{AI}}) := \{z_0^{\text{AI}} \in \mathcal{Z}^{\text{AI}} : \exists \pi^{\text{AI}}, \forall s_0 \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}(z_0^{\text{AI}}), \forall z_0^{\text{H}} \in \hat{\mathcal{Z}}^{\text{H}}(z_0^{\text{AI}}), \forall \pi^{\text{H}} \mid \forall \tau \geq 0, z_\tau^{\text{AI}} \notin \mathcal{F}^{\text{AI}}\}, \quad (3)$$

where z_τ^{AI} is the information state at a future time τ , after both agents execute their respective policies for τ steps from the initial state z_0^{AI} . If $z_0^{\text{AI}} \in \Omega$, then there exists some AI policy $\pi^{\text{AI}} : z^{\text{AI}} \mapsto a^{\text{AI}}$ that keeps $z_\tau^{\text{AI}} \in \Omega$, and thus away from the failure set \mathcal{F}^{AI} for all time τ . The pessimism of the safety analysis is regulated by restricting the worst-case human behavior to be consistent with the predictive action bound: $\pi^{\text{H}}(z^{\text{H}}) \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{H}}(z^{\text{H}})$. The construction of these predictive action bounds can once again benefit from the generative AI’s predictive power. For example, a large language model can be queried with prompts based on the ODD of the safety analysis and used to sample diverse hypothetical human responses to AI generations (e.g., to simulate antagonistic or goal-driven dialogue (Hong et al., 2023)).

Safety-Critical Human-AI Game. We now have all the key mathematical components for a rigorous safety analysis of the human-AI interaction loop. We can cast the computation of Ω as a zero-sum dynamic game between the AI and a *virtual adversary* that chooses the worst-case realization of the human’s behavior allowed by the AI’s uncertainty. The game’s outcome from any initial information state z_0^{AI} , when both players act optimally, can be encoded through the *safety value function* (Fisac et al., 2015; 2019)

$$V(z_0^{\text{AI}}) := \max_{\pi^{\text{AI}}} \min_{\pi^{\text{H}}} \left(\min_{t \geq 0} \ell(z_t^{\text{AI}}) \right). \quad (4)$$

Here, $\ell : \mathcal{Z}^{\text{AI}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a safety margin function that measures the proximity of the HAI system to the failure set and encodes \mathcal{F}^{AI} as the zero sublevel set $\{z^{\text{AI}} : \ell(z^{\text{AI}}) \leq 0\}$. If the value $V(z_0^{\text{AI}})$ is negative, this means that the AI agent cannot avoid entering \mathcal{F}^{AI} under the worst-case realization of the human’s actions $a^{\text{H}} \in \mathcal{A}^{\text{H}}(z^{\text{H}})$ over time.

The zero-sum game solution yields a maximin policy pair $(\pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\text{AI}}, \pi_{\dagger}^{\text{H}})$ containing the AI’s best safety effort $\pi_{\mathcal{V}}^{\text{AI}}$ to




Figure 5. (left) Agents always play optimally under the game $(\pi_{\blacklozenge}^{\text{AI}}, \pi_{\dagger}^{\text{H}})$. (right) Filtered AI uses task policy $\pi_{\square}^{\text{AI}}$ as long as in the future it can apply $\pi_{\blacklozenge}^{\text{AI}}$ against π_{\dagger}^{H} .

maximize the closest future separation from the failure set, and the worst-case human behavior π_{\dagger}^{H} that would close this distance and, if possible, make it reach zero. Note that each player’s policy in Equation 4 has access to different information (respectively, z^{AI} and z^{H}), which is generally *not* equal to the full game state z . The dynamic game in Equation 4 and the corresponding optimal policies $(\pi_{\blacklozenge}^{\text{AI}}, \pi_{\dagger}^{\text{H}})$ can be learned through modern learning-based AI methods such as self-supervised learning or multi-agent (adversarial) RL. This enables scalable learning from experience and under partial observability, and once again leverages the complementary strengths of AI and control systems.

We emphasize that the human predictions π_{\dagger}^{H} rely on a worst-case (rather than statistically calibrated) model, trained against the AI’s best effort to maintain safety and required to conform with the operational assumptions (designer-specified rules delineating the set of human behaviors that the system must deem “conceivable” when checking its safety). In the next section, we elaborate on how these “appropriately pessimistic” predictions can be integrated into a safety monitor to determine when a proposed AI action might lead to a critical need violation in the future.

6 Automated Human–AI Safety Filter

Recall from Section 3.1, the *safety filter*: a core mechanism in control systems safety that monitors the operation of an autonomous system at runtime and intervenes, when deemed necessary, by modifying its intended action in order to prevent future failures. We end this position paper by demonstrating that safety filters can be formally and practically extended to general human–AI interactions.

Formally, a safety filter is a tuple $(\pi_{\blacklozenge}^{\text{AI}}, \Delta, \phi)$ containing:

- fallback policy: $\pi_{\blacklozenge}^{\text{AI}}: \mathcal{Z}^{\text{AI}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\text{AI}}$, concerned only with avoiding catastrophic failures, without regard to task performance, and therefore kept as a last resort.
- safety monitor: $\Delta: \mathcal{Z}^{\text{AI}} \times \mathcal{A}^{\text{AI}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, checks if the fallback policy would maintain safety *after* a candidate action a^{AI} is taken from z^{AI} , outputting a positive (safe) or negative (unsafe) value following Equation 4.




Figure 6. **Automated Human–AI Safety Filter.** The base AI model (top, grey) encodes the AI’s observations into its latent state z^{AI} which is used as input for its task policy (i.e., the decoder). A safety filter (purple) includes a learned AI safety strategy $\pi_{\blacklozenge}^{\text{AI}}$, a safety monitor Δ that predicts safety risks, and a predictive human model containing a virtual adversary policy π_{\dagger}^{H} that generates pessimistic predictions of human interaction. Based on the monitor’s assessment, the AI’s outputs to the human are filtered by the intervention scheme ϕ , and modified as needed to guarantee safety.

- intervention scheme: $\phi: \mathcal{Z}^{\text{AI}} \times \mathcal{A}^{\text{AI}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\text{AI}}$, permits a candidate action a^{AI} if it passes the monitoring check and otherwise replaces it with an action that does.

With this in hand, we extend the *Universal Safety Filter Theorem* from control systems (Hsu et al., 2024) to general human–AI systems.

Theorem 6.1 (Universal Safety Filter Theorem). *Consider a human–AI system with AI world model $f^{\text{AI}}(z^{\text{AI}}, a^{\text{AI}}, a^{\text{H}}, o^{\text{AI}})$ and a safety filter $(\pi_{\blacklozenge}^{\text{AI}}, \Delta, \phi)$. If the AI agent is deployed with an initial internal state $z_0^{\text{AI}} \in \mathcal{Z}^{\text{AI}}$ deemed safe by the safety monitor under the fallback policy, i.e., $\Delta(z_0^{\text{AI}}, \pi_{\blacklozenge}^{\text{AI}}(z_0^{\text{AI}})) \geq 0$, then the interaction under filtered dynamics $f^{\text{AI}}(z^{\text{AI}}, \phi(z^{\text{AI}}, a^{\text{AI}}), a^{\text{H}}, o^{\text{AI}})$ with any AI task policy $\pi_{\square}^{\text{AI}}: \mathcal{Z}^{\text{AI}} \mapsto \mathcal{A}^{\text{AI}}$ and any realization of human behavior satisfying $a^{\text{H}} \in \hat{\mathcal{A}}^{\text{H}}(z^{\text{H}})$ maintains the safety condition $\forall t \geq 0, z^{\text{AI}} \notin \mathcal{F}^{\text{AI}}$.*

To date, the concept of a safety filter has only been instantiated for embodied systems with physics-based state spaces (low-dimensional vectors of physical quantities like positions or velocities, governed by well-understood dynamical laws). Here, we are the first to generalize the scope of this mathematical formalism to the much broader context of AI safety. This result lays the theoretical foundations for the algorithmic application of safety filters to *general* human–AI systems, which evolve “latent state spaces” and encode harder to model interactions such as dialogue between a human user and an AI chatbot.

Algorithmic Human–AI Safety Filtering. We now give a concrete account of how one could practically instantiate a

human–AI safety filter for a generative AI model, visualized in Figure 6. Following the common neural network architecture of generative AI models, let *base AI model* (given to us for analysis and safe integration) be comprised of an encoder \mathcal{E} and a decoder $\pi_{\square}^{\text{AI}}$; this decoder is precisely what we have been referring to as the *task policy*, mapping an internal (latent) state z^{AI} to a proposed output action a^{AI} . The *safety filter*, visualized in purple in Figure 6, consists of the three key components outlined above: fallback policy, safety monitor, and intervention scheme. The fallback policy $\pi_{\diamond}^{\text{AI}}$ can be directly extracted from the learned solution to the safety game in Equation 4, and a reliable safety monitor Δ can be implemented by either directly evaluating the learned safety value function at any information state z^{AI} (safety critic) or by simulating a family of pessimistic interaction scenarios by querying the learned *virtual adversary* $\pi_{\ddagger}^{\text{H}}$. In turn, the intervention scheme can range from a simple binary switch (at each time, apply $\pi_{\square}^{\text{AI}}$ if safe, else apply $\pi_{\diamond}^{\text{AI}}$) to a more sophisticated override (e.g., find a minimally disruptive deviation from $\pi_{\square}^{\text{AI}}$ that is deemed safe).

Even though the components of the safety filter would be approximate by their learning-based nature, the scheme can be leveraged in combination with modern statistical generalization theory, such as PAC-Bayes theory (Majumdar et al., 2020), adversarial conformal prediction (Gibbs & Candes, 2021; Bastani et al., 2022; Lekeufack et al., 2023), and scenario optimization (Lin & Bansal, 2023), to maintain a high-confidence guarantee that the AI system will robustly enforce the satisfaction of the human’s critical needs throughout the interaction for *all* human behaviors allowed by the operational assumptions. We emphasize that a key strength of this safety framework is that it naturally scales with the rapidly advancing *capability* of modern AI systems: as future generations of language models, vision-language systems, and general AI agents become ever stronger, so will the safety assurances that can be provided through the proposed techniques and system architecture.

7 Conclusion

In this position paper, we aim to inspire the genesis of a new human–AI safety research community. We take concrete steps towards this by identifying a fundamental synergy between the principled safety formalism offered by control theory and the expressive representations learned from internet-scale AI systems. By combining lessons from control and AI, we propose a technical roadmap to guide research efforts towards a safety framework that can anticipate, detect, and avoid potential hazards emerging during interaction. We close by drawing on a core mechanism from control systems safety, the *safety filter*, and showing how it can be extended to general human–AI interaction domains.

8 Impact Statement

We expect that the proposed interdisciplinary safety framework will help catalyze a much needed rapprochement between the AI and control systems communities to develop rigorous safety assurances for dynamic human–AI feedback loops. A significant positive impact may come in the form of the first practical safety frameworks that can not only keep up with the rapid advances in AI capabilities but actively benefit from them to provide stronger guarantees, ushering in a new generation of advanced AI systems that can be trusted *because* of their sophistication, and not in spite of it.

On the other hand, we also highlight possible pitfalls of our proposed human–AI safety framework. The approximate nature of learning-based generative AI makes it extremely challenging to provide a clear-cut delineation of uncertainty, which will likely limit us to statistical assurances in the foreseeable future. These fall short of the stronger *if–then* certificates that we can aspire to in other engineering domains: hard guarantees establishing that, as long as the system’s operational assumptions are met, catastrophic failures are categorically impossible (i.e., a failure can only result from an explicit assumption being violated). Even high-confidence statistical assurances can leave human-centered AI systems open to black swan events with extremely low probability but potentially dramatic consequences.

There is a risk that the improved treatment of human–AI feedback loops developed through the proposed agenda could be repurposed and misused by malicious or reckless actors to construct AI systems that exploit interaction dynamics against the interest of their users, for example by seeking to manipulate their decisions. Even with today’s relatively myopic fine-tuning approaches, we see a worrying emergence of unintended (e.g., sycophantic) AI outputs as the system learns to secure positive user responses. Future systems equipped with long-horizon reasoning but *without* a proper safety framework could conceivably seek long-term interaction outcomes serving a third party’s agenda at the expense of their users’ needs.

We nonetheless remain cautiously optimistic: First, human–AI safety filtering does not require teasing apart the likelihood of various conceivable human behaviors in a given context. Rather, safety-directed predictions robustly consider the set of all such plausible behaviors without distinction, making them harder to exploit for manipulation purposes. Second, the need to consider large prediction sets containing both likely and unlikely outcomes aligns well with the inclusion of underrepresented individual behaviors that do not conform to dominant patterns in the training datasets. Finally, provided that future AI systems are deployed with a cyber-secure dynamical safety mechanism that cannot be removed or altered by unauthorized parties, such a framework would help detect and mitigate emergent and inten-

tional misalignment. Naturally, this will require a process of standardization and regulatory oversight; the first step, however, must be to establish *what assurances are possible*. Ultimately, we expect that technical advances in human-AI safety will inform the conversation between technologists, policymakers, political leaders, and the public at large. A timely conversation that, fortunately, is already ongoing.

References

- Achiam, J., Adler, S., Agarwal, S., Ahmad, L., Akkaya, I., Aleman, F. L., Almeida, D., Altenschmidt, J., Altman, S., Anadkat, S., et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Akametalu, A. K., Ghosh, S., Fisac, J. F., and Tomlin, C. J. A minimum discounted reward hamilton-jacobi formulation for computing reachable sets. *arXiv preprint*, 2018.
- Allen, R. E., Clark, A. A., Starek, J. A., and Pavone, M. A machine learning approach for real-time reachability analysis. In *2014 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*, pp. 2202–2208. IEEE, 2014.
- Althoff, M. and Dolan, J. M. Online verification of automated road vehicles using reachability analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 30(4):903–918, 2014.
- Althoff, M., Le Guernic, C., and Krogh, B. H. Reachable set computation for uncertain time-varying linear systems. In *Proceedings of the 14th international conference on Hybrid systems: computation and control*, pp. 93–102, 2011.
- Ames, A. D., Coogan, S., Egerstedt, M., Notomista, G., Sreenath, K., and Tabuada, P. Control barrier functions: Theory and applications. In *2019 18th European control conference (ECC)*, pp. 3420–3431. IEEE, 2019.
- Amodei, D., Olah, C., Steinhardt, J., Christiano, P., Schulman, J., and Mané, D. Concrete problems in ai safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565*, 2016.
- Bai, Y., Kadavath, S., Kundu, S., Askill, A., Kernion, J., Jones, A., Chen, A., Goldie, A., Mirhoseini, A., McKinnon, C., et al. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- Bajcsy, A., Bansal, S., Ratner, E., Tomlin, C. J., and Dragan, A. D. A robust control framework for human motion prediction. *Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2020.
- Bansal, S. and Tomlin, C. J. DeepReach: A deep learning approach to high-dimensional reachability. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2021.
- Bansal, S., Chen, M., Herbert, S., and Tomlin, C. J. Hamilton-Jacobi Reachability: A brief overview and recent advances. In *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2017.
- Başar, T. and Olsder, G. J. *Dynamic noncooperative game theory*. SIAM, 1998.
- Bastani, O. Safe reinforcement learning with nonlinear dynamics via model predictive shielding. In *2021 American control conference (ACC)*, pp. 3488–3494. IEEE, 2021.
- Bastani, O., Gupta, V., Jung, C., Noarov, G., Ramalingam, R., and Roth, A. Practical adversarial multivald conformal prediction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:29362–29373, 2022.
- Bergamini, L., Ye, Y., Scheel, O., Chen, L., Hu, C., Del Pero, L., Osiński, B., Grimmert, H., and Ondruska, P. Simnet: Learning reactive self-driving simulations from real-world observations. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 5119–5125. IEEE, 2021.
- Bostelman, R. V., Falco, J. A., Franaszek, M., and Saidi, K. S. Performance assessment framework for robotic systems. Technical report, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2018.
- Brundage, M., Avin, S., Clark, J., Toner, H., Eckersley, P., Garfinkel, B., Dafoe, A., Scharre, P., Zeitzoff, T., Filar, B., et al. The malicious use of artificial intelligence: Forecasting, prevention, and mitigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.07228*, 2018.
- Brunke, L., Greeff, M., Hall, A. W., Yuan, Z., Zhou, S., Panerati, J., and Schoellig, A. P. Safe learning in robotics: From learning-based control to safe reinforcement learning. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 5:411–444, 2022.
- Casper, S., Davies, X., Shi, C., Gilbert, T. K., Scheurer, J., Rando, J., Freedman, R., Korbak, T., Lindner, D., Freire, P., et al. Open problems and fundamental limitations of reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15217*, 2023.
- Chandola, V., Banerjee, A., and Kumar, V. Anomaly detection: A survey. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 41(3): 1–58, 2009.
- Chen, Y., Singletary, A., and Ames, A. D. Guaranteed obstacle avoidance for multi-robot operations with limited actuation: A control barrier function approach. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5(1):127–132, 2020.
- Chen, Z., Deng, Y., Yuan, H., Ji, K., and Gu, Q. Self-play fine-tuning converts weak language models to strong language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01335*, 2024.

- Darbon, J., Langlois, G. P., and Meng, T. Overcoming the curse of dimensionality for some hamilton-jacobi partial differential equations via neural network architectures. *Research in the Mathematical Sciences*, 7:1–50, 2020.
- Dawson, C., Qin, Z., Gao, S., and Fan, C. Safe nonlinear control using robust neural lyapunov-barrier functions. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pp. 1724–1735. PMLR, 2022.
- Dawson, C., Gao, S., and Fan, C. Safe control with learned certificates: A survey of neural lyapunov, barrier, and contraction methods for robotics and control. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 2023.
- Djeridane, B. and Lygeros, J. Neural approximation of pde solutions: An application to reachability computations. In *Proceedings of the 45th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 3034–3039. IEEE, 2006.
- Dobbe, R., Hidalgo-Gonzalez, P., Karagiannopoulos, S., Henriquez-Auba, R., Hug, G., Callaway, D. S., and Tomlin, C. J. Learning to control in power systems: Design and analysis guidelines for concrete safety problems. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 189:106615, 2020.
- Driggs-Campbell, K., Dong, R., and Bajcsy, R. Robust, informative human-in-the-loop predictions via empirical reachable sets. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 3(3):300–309, 2018.
- Du, Y., Yang, M., Dai, B., Dai, H., Nachum, O., Tenenbaum, J. B., Schuurmans, D., and Abbeel, P. Learning universal policies via text-guided video generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00111*, 2023.
- Fisac, J., Chen, M., Tomlin, C. J., and Sastry, S. Reach-avoid problems with time-varying dynamics, targets and constraints. In *HSCC*, 2015.
- Fisac, J. F., Lugovoy, N. F., Rubies-Royo, V., Ghosh, S., and Tomlin, C. J. Bridging Hamilton-Jacobi safety analysis and reinforcement learning. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 8550–8556, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2019.8794107.
- Ganguli, D., Lovitt, L., Kernion, J., Askell, A., Bai, Y., Kadavath, S., Mann, B., Perez, E., Schiefer, N., Ndousse, K., et al. Red teaming language models to reduce harms: Methods, scaling behaviors, and lessons learned. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.07858*, 2022.
- Gibbs, I. and Candes, E. Adaptive conformal inference under distribution shift. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pp. 1660–1672. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- Goyal, S., Raghunathan, A., Jain, M., Simhadri, H. V., and Jain, P. Drocc: Deep robust one-class classification. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 3711–3721. PMLR, 2020.
- Ha, D. and Schmidhuber, J. World models. *NIPS*, 2018.
- Haddadin, S., Haddadin, S., Khoury, A., Rokahr, T., Parusel, S., Burgkart, R., Bicchi, A., and Albu-Schäffer, A. On making robots understand safety: Embedding injury knowledge into control. *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, 31(13):1578–1602, 2012.
- Heath, A. All the news from openai’s first developer conference. <https://www.theverge.com/2023/11/6/23948619/openai-chatgpt-devday-developer-conference-news>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-01-23.
- Hendrycks, D., Mazeika, M., and Dietterich, T. Deep anomaly detection with outlier exposure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.04606*, 2018.
- Hendrycks, D., Carlini, N., Schulman, J., and Steinhardt, J. Unsolved problems in ml safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13916*, 2021.
- Hewing, L., Wabersich, K. P., Menner, M., and Zeilinger, M. N. Learning-based model predictive control: Toward safe learning in control. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 3:269–296, 2020.
- Hicks, C. I pitted chatgpt against a real financial advisor to help me save for retirement—and the winner is clear. <https://fortune.com/recommends/investing/chatgpt-vs-real-financial-advisor-to-plan-retirement-which-is-better/>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-01-12.
- Hong, J., Levine, S., and Dragan, A. Zero-shot goal-directed dialogue via rl on imagined conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05584*, 2023.
- Hsu, K.-C., Nguyen, D. P., and Fisac, J. F. ISAACS: Iterative Soft Adversarial Actor-Critic for Safety. *Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, pp. 90–103, 2023.
- Hsu, K.-C., Hu, H., and Fisac, J. F. The safety filter: A unified view of safety-critical control in autonomous systems. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems*, 2024.
- Hu, H., Zhang, Z., Nakamura, K., Bajcsy, A., and Fisac, J. F. Deception game: Closing the safety-learning loop in interactive robot autonomy. *Conference on Robot Learning*, 2023.

- Isaacs, R. *Differential games: a mathematical theory with applications to warfare and pursuit, control and optimization*. Courier Corporation, 1999.
- ISO 15066. Robots and robotic devices – Collaborative robots. Standard, International Organization for Standardization, 2016.
- ISO 22737:2021. Intelligent transport systems. Standard, International Organization for Standardization, 2021.
- Ivanovic, B., Schmerling, E., Leung, K., and Pavone, M. Generative modeling of multimodal multi-human behavior. In *2018 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pp. 3088–3095. IEEE, 2018.
- Kochenderfer, M. J., Holland, J. E., and Chryssanthacopoulos, J. P. Next generation airborne collision avoidance system. *Lincoln Laboratory Journal*, 19(1):17–33, 2012.
- Lee, K., Liu, H., Ryu, M., Watkins, O., Du, Y., Boutilier, C., Abbeel, P., Ghavamzadeh, M., and Gu, S. S. Aligning text-to-image models using human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12192*, 2023.
- Lekeufack, J., Angelopoulos, A. A., Bajcsy, A., Jordan, M. I., and Malik, J. Conformal decision theory: Safe autonomous decisions from imperfect predictions. *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (submitted)*, 2023.
- Li, A., Sun, L., Zhan, W., Tomizuka, M., and Chen, M. Prediction-based reachability for collision avoidance in autonomous driving. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 7908–7914. IEEE, 2021.
- Li, J., Liu, Q., Jin, W., Qin, J., and Hirche, S. Robust safe learning and control in an unknown environment: An uncertainty-separated control barrier function approach. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2023.
- Lin, A. and Bansal, S. Generating formal safety assurances for high-dimensional reachability. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 10525–10531. IEEE, 2023.
- Liu, S. B., Roehm, H., Heinzemann, C., Lütkebohle, I., Oehlerking, J., and Althoff, M. Provably safe motion of mobile robots in human environments. In *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pp. 1351–1357. IEEE, 2017.
- Luckcuck, M., Farrell, M., Dennis, L. A., Dixon, C., and Fisher, M. Formal specification and verification of autonomous robotic systems: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 52(5):1–41, 2019.
- Majumdar, A., Farid, A., and Sonar, A. Pac-bayes control: Learning policies that provably generalize to novel environments, 2020.
- Mannucci, T., van Kampen, E.-J., De Visser, C., and Chu, Q. Safe exploration algorithms for reinforcement learning controllers. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 29(4):1069–1081, 2017.
- Margellos, K. and Lygeros, J. Hamilton-Jacobi Formulation for Reach-Avoid Differential Games. *IEEE Trans. on Automatic Control*, 56(8):1849–1861, 2011.
- Meta, F. A. R. D. T. F., Bakhtin, A., Brown, N., Dinan, E., Farina, G., Flaherty, C., Fried, D., Goff, A., Gray, J., Hu, H., et al. Human-level play in the game of diplomacy by combining language models with strategic reasoning. *Science*, 378(6624):1067–1074, 2022.
- Mitchell, I., Bayen, A., and Tomlin, C. J. A time-dependent Hamilton-Jacobi formulation of reachable sets for continuous dynamic games. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control (TAC)*, 50(7):947–957, 2005.
- Munos, R., Valko, M., Calandriello, D., Azar, M. G., Rowland, M., Guo, Z. D., Tang, Y., Geist, M., Mesnard, T., Michi, A., et al. Nash learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.00886*, 2023.
- Nakamura, K. and Bansal, S. Online update of safety assurances using confidence-based predictions. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 12765–12771. IEEE, 2023.
- Niarchos, K. and Lygeros, J. A neural approximation to continuous time reachability computations. In *Proceedings of the 45th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 6313–6318. IEEE, 2006.
- Nicas, J., Kitroeff, N., Gelles, D., and Glanz, J. Boeing built deadly assumptions into 737 max, blind to a late design change. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/01/business/boeing-737-max-crash.html>, 2019. Accessed: 2024-01-24.
- Noyes, D. New video of bay bridge 8-car crash shows tesla abruptly braking in 'self-driving' mode. <https://abc7news.com/tesla-sf-bay-bridge-crash-8-car-self-driving-video/12686428/>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-01-24.
- On-Road Automated Driving Committee, S. Taxonomy and definitions for terms related to driving automation systems for on-road motor vehicles, 2021. URL <https://www.sae.org/content/j3016.202104>.
- OpenAI. Our approach to alignment research. <https://openai.com/blog/our-approach->

- to-alignment-research, 2022a. Accessed: 2024-01-23.
- OpenAI. Dall-e now available without waitlist. <https://openai.com/blog/dall-e-now-available-without-waitlist>, 2022b. Accessed: 2024-01-23.
- OpenAI. DALL-E 2 preview: Risks and limitations. <https://github.com/openai/dalle-2-preview/blob/main/system-card.04062022.md>, 2022c. Accessed: 2024-01-23.
- Ortega, P. A., Maini, V., and Team, D. S. Building safe artificial intelligence: specification, robustness, and assurance. <https://deepmindsafetyresearch.medium.com/building-safe-artificial-intelligence-52f5f75058f1>, 2018. Accessed: 2024-01-23.
- Orzechowski, P. F., Li, K., and Lauer, M. Towards Responsibility-Sensitive Safety of Automated Vehicles with Reachable Set Analysis. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Connected Vehicles and Expo (IC-CVE)*, pp. 1–6. IEEE. ISBN 978-1-72810-142-2. doi: 10.1109/ICCV45908.2019.8965069. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8965069/>.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- Park, J. S., O’Brien, J., Cai, C. J., Morris, M. R., Liang, P., and Bernstein, M. S. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pp. 1–22, 2023.
- Perez, E., Huang, S., Song, F., Cai, T., Ring, R., Aslanides, J., Glaese, A., McAleese, N., and Irving, G. Red teaming language models with language models. *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2022.
- Qi, X., Zeng, Y., Xie, T., Chen, P.-Y., Jia, R., Mittal, P., and Henderson, P. Fine-tuning aligned language models compromises safety, even when users do not intend to! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03693*, 2023.
- Qin, Z., Zhang, K., Chen, Y., Chen, J., and Fan, C. Learning safe multi-agent control with decentralized neural barrier certificates. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Rafailov, R., Sharma, A., Mitchell, E., Ermon, S., Manning, C. D., and Finn, C. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- Rubies-Royo, V., Fridovich-Keil, D., Herbert, S., and Tomlin, C. J. A classification-based approach for approximate reachability. In *2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 7697–7704. IEEE, 2019.
- Russell, S. *Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control*. Penguin, 2019.
- Schlegl, T., Seeböck, P., Waldstein, S. M., Schmidt-Erfurth, U., and Langs, G. Unsupervised anomaly detection with generative adversarial networks to guide marker discovery. In *International conference on information processing in medical imaging*, pp. 146–157. Springer, 2017.
- Seff, A., Cera, B., Chen, D., Ng, M., Zhou, A., Nayakanti, N., Refaat, K. S., Al-Rfou, R., and Sapp, B. Motionlm: Multi-agent motion forecasting as language modeling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 8579–8590, 2023.
- Singh, S., Majumdar, A., Slotine, J.-J., and Pavone, M. Robust online motion planning via contraction theory and convex optimization. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 5883–5890. IEEE, 2017.
- Suo, S., Regalado, S., Casas, S., and Urtasun, R. Trafficsim: Learning to simulate realistic multi-agent behaviors. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 10400–10409, 2021.
- Swamy, G., Dann, C., Kidambi, R., Wu, Z. S., and Agarwal, A. A minimaximalist approach to reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04056*, 2024.
- Tian, R., Sun, L., Bajcsy, A., Tomizuka, M., and Dragan, A. D. Safety assurances for human-robot interaction via confidence-aware game-theoretic human models. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 11229–11235, 2022.
- Tomlin, C., Pappas, G. J., and Sastry, S. Conflict resolution for air traffic management: A study in multiagent hybrid systems. *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, 43(4): 509–521, 1998.
- Union, T. E. A european approach to artificial intelligence. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/european-approach-artificial-intelligence>, 2021. Accessed: 2024-01-23.

- Vitus, M. and Tomlin, C. Hierarchical, hybrid framework for collision avoidance algorithms in the national airspace. In *AIAA Guidance, Navigation and Control Conference and Exhibit*, pp. 6970, 2008.
- Wabersich, K. P., Taylor, A. J., Choi, J. J., Sreenath, K., Tomlin, C. J., Ames, A. D., and Zeilinger, M. N. Data-driven safety filters: Hamilton-jacobi reachability, control barrier functions, and predictive methods for uncertain systems. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 43(5):137–177, 2023.
- Wallace, B., Dang, M., Rafailov, R., Zhou, L., Lou, A., Purushwalkam, S., Ermon, S., Xiong, C., Joty, S., and Naik, N. Diffusion model alignment using direct preference optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12908*, 2023.
- Wei, A., Haghtalab, N., and Steinhardt, J. Jailbroken: How does llm safety training fail? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02483*, 2023.
- Wei, J., Wang, X., Schuurmans, D., Bosma, M., Xia, F., Chi, E., Le, Q. V., Zhou, D., et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 24824–24837, 2022.
- White House, U. S. Fact sheet: President biden issues executive order on safe, secure, and trustworthy artificial intelligence, 2023.
- Xiang, C. “he would still be here”: Man dies by suicide after talking with ai chatbot, widow says. <https://www.vice.com/en/article/pkadgm/man-dies-by-suicide-after-talking-with-ai-chatbot-widow-says>, 2023. Accessed: 2024-01-23.
- Xu, J., Ju, D., Li, M., Boureau, Y.-L., Weston, J., and Dinan, E. Bot-adversarial dialogue for safe conversational agents. In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 2950–2968, 2021.
- Zhang, H., Yuan, Y., Makoviyuchuk, V., Guo, Y., Fidler, S., Peng, X. B., and Fatahalian, K. Learning physically simulated tennis skills from broadcast videos. *ACM Transactions On Graphics (TOG)*, 42(4):1–14, 2023.
- Zhong, Z., Rempe, D., Xu, D., Chen, Y., Veer, S., Che, T., Ray, B., and Pavone, M. Guided conditional diffusion for controllable traffic simulation. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 3560–3566. IEEE, 2023.