

Generative AI Needs Adaptive Governance

Anka Reuel^{1*}, Trond Arne Undheim^{1*}

¹Stanford University
anka@cs.stanford.edu, trondun@stanford.edu

Abstract

Because of the speed of its development, broad scope of application, and its ability to augment human performance, generative AI challenges the very notions of governance, trust, and human agency. The technology's capacity to mimic human knowledge work, feedback loops including significant uptick in users, research-, investor-, policy-, and media attention, data and compute resources, all lead to rapidly increasing capabilities. For those reasons, adaptive governance, where AI governance and AI co-evolve, is essential for governing generative AI. In sharp contrast to traditional governance's regulatory regimes that are based on a mix of rigid one-and-done provisions for disclosure, registration and risk management, which in the case of AI carry the potential for regulatory misalignment, this paper argues that generative AI calls for adaptive governance. We define adaptive governance in the context of AI and outline an adaptive AI governance framework. We outline actors, roles, as well as both shared and actors-specific policy activities. We further provide examples of how the framework could be operationalized in practice. We then explain that the adaptive AI governance stance is not without its risks and limitations, such as insufficient oversight, insufficient depth, regulatory uncertainty, and regulatory capture, and provide potential approaches to fix these shortcomings.

Introduction

Generative AI, like GPT-4, is already capable of producing convincing real-world content, including text, code, images, music, and video, based on vast amounts of training data (Feuerriegel et al. 2023). It automates and scales up information processing, significantly augmenting human creative and cognitive expression. As a result, generative AI not only tangibly impacts the tasks (knowledge-)workers perform, but also impacts the workflow and the quality of work, transforming the human-AI relationship (Pflanzer et al. 2023). The impacts seem to extend even to advanced office work conducted by highly educated, skilled knowledge workers with years of experience (Dell'Acqua et al. 2023).

For these reasons, generative AI is rapidly evolving into a general-purpose technology that may have a distinct, aggregate impact across industry and society, possibly in short

order. Because of the speed of improvement, an emergent AI anxiety vexed even AI experts (Heaven 2023a), and the awareness for the capabilities and risks of these AI systems increased across technical experts, policymakers, and the general public. However, the inherent complexity and speed of what is going on challenges AI policymaking. Major governmental actors such as China, the EU, the UK, and the US have taken notice, and are formulating or updating their AI policy initiatives to try to effectively govern the new technology (Roberts et al. 2023; The White House 2023b). One-and-done regulatory regimes based on a mix of disclosure, registration, and risk management provisions are being discussed (European Parliament 2023; Sheehan 2023; The White House 2023a), each carrying the potential for regulatory misalignment, where proposals may distract, fail, or backfire (Lawrence et al. 2023). As a whole, those proposals and responses can be characterized as fast-fix sound bites caught in slow-moving legislative processes and top-down implementation. In short, they are traditional governance responses.

In this paper, we argue that such a traditional approach is not sufficient to deal with generative AI. We specifically explore what is different about generative AI that warrants an adaptive governance approach and how such an approach could look like. We make the following contributions:

- We define traditional and adaptive approaches to AI governance
- We justify the need for adaptive AI governance for generative AI
- We define a framework for adaptive AI governance and show examples of how it can be operationalized
- We outline the limitations of such an approach and provide suggestions what can be done to overcome them

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, we explore in more detail what's different about generative AI that warrants an adaptive governance approach. We then describe in Section 3 the traditional AI governance approach, before we explain the adaptive AI governance approach in Section 4. We describe a general framework for such an approach in Section 5 and provide examples how it can be operationalized in Section 6. We conclude with Section 7, where we

*These authors contributed equally.

outline downsides and limitations of such an adaptive AI governance approach.

What's Different About Generative AI

In 2017, researchers found that generative pre-trained transformers (GPTs) could simplify language model tasks such as machine translation and text summarization (Wang et al. 2023; Vaswani et al. 2017). Since then, progress has been rapid (Maslej et al. 2024). In 2022, OpenAI's chatbot, ChatGPT, brought generative AI to the general public. OpenAI managed to (1) scale GPTs, making them capable of addressing a wide range of requests by users, which made them seem to have some level of intelligence (Al Lily et al. 2023) and (2) provide non-technical people with an interface to interact with AI and experience it first-hand. With that, AI moved from an abstract concept and expert tool, to something that everyone could play around with and use.

As a result, ChatGPT and similar AI systems like Claude by Anthropic (Anthropic 2023) have seen unprecedented adoption (Hu 2023) as a supplement to search engines, turning searches into conversations (Stokel-Walker 2023), transforming customer conversations (Ramesh and Chawla 2022), boosting digital content production (Davenport and Mittal 2022), and potentially laying the foundations for a metaverse (Lv 2023). Other, more inconspicuous use cases, such as patient triage, risk management, songwriting, test preparation, and voice acting are emerging (Ray 2023), in part due to the systems' increasing multi-modal capabilities (Maslej et al. 2024).

Immediate risks of such applications include copyright infringement (Appel, Neelbauer, and Schweidel 2023; Brittain 2023; Murray 2023), exposure of (sensitive) training data (Carlini et al. 2020), and impersonation (Tariq, Jeon, and Woo 2022), while longer term concerns include uncontrolled ('unaligned') artificial general intelligence (Turchin 2019; Jungherr 2023). However, given the general-purpose nature of generative AI – and foundation models in particular –, and their increased usage across a wide variety of applications and contexts, new risks are constantly emerging, manifesting in an increase in harms and incidents (Maslej et al. 2024).

Within the ranks of big tech, OpenAI's initial success with ChatGPT created a race to the top and has meant the tech industry has put far greater resources behind generative AI than they did for previous generations of AI (Goldman Sachs 2023). Sector- and firm-specific versions of generative AI models outside big tech are also in rapid development. Notable examples include finance, healthcare, life sciences, and marketing with their respective associated risks (Bommasani et al. 2021). Big companies that have made major generative AI announcements include AWS, Google, IBM, Microsoft, NVIDIA, OpenAI, and Oracle (Leone 2023), and notable startups working in the fields include OpenAI, Anthropic, Synthesis AI, and Stability AI (Hiter 2023). In addition, a rise of perceived market

value and opportunities of generative AI led to significantly increased investments and talent attraction. AI investment is forecast to approach \$200 billion globally by 2025 and the AI market is expected to grow twentyfold by 2030, up to nearly two trillion U.S. dollars (Goldman Sachs 2023; Roser 2023; Thormundsson 2023).

Simultaneously, AI research and development (R&D) has also skyrocketed. There has been a significant increase in AI papers at computer science conferences, many of them from industry due to the associated costs and required compute, given the size of the models (Maslej et al. 2024). The research explores both improvements and extensions to current models, as well as risks and potential mitigation strategies. These shifts make it hard to keep up with research trends because they happen extremely quickly, even for academics in the field (Arnold, Goldschmitt, and Rigotti 2023). In addition, given the speed of development of generative AI, scientific uncertainty is exacerbated (Wallach and Marchant 2019). Generative AI can itself be used to make scientific discoveries, such as in the case of AlphaFold's protein predictions, and has yet uncertain drug discovery potential (Arnold 2023).

Increased attention has shaped the public and media's understanding and attitudes towards AI. The risks of particularly generative AI are now a topic high on the agenda. There are calls for policymakers to prioritize AI governance with urgency, although there is disagreement about whether the most significant risks that need to be addressed are current (Smith 2023), emergent (O'Brien and Nelson 2020), or future risks (Price and Connelly 2023), and whether to pursue seemingly quick fixes such as centralized oversight bodies, which China has done (Cheng and Zeng 2023), pause AI development (Metz and Schmidt 2023) or shut it down (Yudkowsky 2023) until we figure it all out. This has led to the worry that policies don't show the needed sophistication, that bad policies would backfire, and that risk mitigation approaches might become counterproductive (Hagendorff 2023).

The broad economic implications of generative AI are also uncertain. The estimated annual value of generative AI to the US GDP is \$1.043 trillion by 2032 (Cognizant 2024). Predictions for job market impacts include wide-spread job alterations and worker displacements; for example, one study predicts that as much as 90% of jobs will be impacted by generative AI, and 9% of worker will be displaced by the technology (Cognizant 2024).

To summarize, generative AI is different or surpasses previous generations of AI in the following ways:

- It's more accessible to technical and non-technical users, significantly increasing its adoption across a wider user population
- It's at least as complex as previous AI, given the increasing size and complexity of the models
- It's significantly more expensive, pricing independent

actors like academia out of research and independent scrutiny

- The speed of research in the field is at unprecedented levels
- It's predicted to have an exceeding impact on the workforce and the economy

These characteristics raise the following issues that are key for policymakers to understand in the context of generative AI governance: (1) understanding the capabilities and limitations of generative AI requires extensive technical background knowledge, (2) this expertise and state-of-the-art knowledge mostly resides with industry players that have their own interests, the reason being that massive computing resources are necessary often inaccessible to academia (Maslej et al. 2024), and (3) the rapid speed of development and research often causes expert knowledge to be outdated or irrelevant within months.

Traditional AI Governance

Legislative stability is a staple of political thought and seen as preconditions of due process, the quality of law making, and legal certainty (Sebők et al. 2022). As a result, today, policymakers often treat laws as a one-off thing where you write a law and then don't touch it for another five to ten years (or ever). This causes a significant mismatch between the speed of new developments and discoveries in AI versus the speed of legislative processes, creating a "pacing-problem" of "cumbersome procedural and bureaucratic procedures and safeguards" (Wallach and Marchant 2019) where regulatory systems "fail to put in place appropriately tailored regulatory measures by the time new applications of fast-moving technologies begin to affect society" (Wallach and Marchant 2019).

Traditional approaches to governance are characterised by "top-down directives or command-and-control policies" (Chaffin, Gosnell, and Cosens 2014) and inflexibility with respect to changing, uncertain situations, along with a tendency to "fall short in efforts to coordinate governance across large-scale ecosystems that cross multiple jurisdictional boundaries" (Lemos and Agrawal 2006; Chaffin, Gosnell, and Cosens 2014).

Take the EU AI Act, for example. It was first proposed by the European Commission on 21 April 2021 and approved in March 2024, and it will come into effect between six and 36 months after it has officially been published (European Parliament 2023; Council of the EU 2023). While some adjustments have been made in the past three years, it will likely be an emergent case study in attempting to regulate a rapidly changing emergent technology using traditional regulatory mechanisms. The AI world was vastly different three years ago; transformers were just discovered in 2017, AlphaFold was yet to be released, ChatGPT didn't exist yet, and generative AI was not a widely known term. During the process of designing the EU AI Act, foundation models took off and had an increasing impact across sectors. However, foundation models did not fit – and hence could

not be addressed – in the EU's original risk-tier approach to AI because they only enable downstream applications but in themselves don't necessarily cause direct harm (yet); hence, mid-way through the legislative process, an extra clause had to be added to account for these models. Such a change was only possible because the negotiations for the law were ongoing; if foundation models would have taken off post-enactment of the AI Act, they may have rendered it largely ineffective for this type of AI.

Another example of traditional governance in the context of the EU AI Act is the classification of systems with systemic risk. The EU will measure systemic risk of general purpose AI (GPAI) models, outside of policy circles more commonly known as foundation models, and other AI systems based on how much computation it took to train these systems. The metric used is whether the training required greater than 10^{25} floating-point operations per second (FLOPS), where FLOPS is a measure for how many arithmetic operations a computer can perform in one second. While the exact number hasn't been disclosed, it is estimated that GPT-4 handled on the order of 10^{25} FLOPS of operations. Using that threshold makes sense today, but what if improvements in algorithmic approaches drastically reduce the need for FLOPS but retain advanced capabilities? For example, the regulation could have added language on adjustments to the metric over time, or specified criteria that would have triggered revisiting the definition of systemic risk. Moreover, reliance on a single metric gives some level of regulatory certainty for vendors but is not sufficient to ensure safety because it encourages experimentation around the 10^{25} threshold and will simply split models into several distinct products trained to near threshold. Yet, the criteria is part of the final regulatory text, without provisions to update or revisit it.

Adaptive AI Governance

In contrast, adaptive governance is a concept that originated in the environmental governance space "for the holistic management of complex environmental problems" (Sharma-Wallace, Velarde, and Wreford 2018)(see also Dietz, Ostrom, and Stern (2003), Folke et al. (2005) and Walker et al. (2004)), following "the failure of previous management regimes to implement governance structures robust enough to achieve ecological sustainability and build community capacity under conditions of uncertainty" (Sharma-Wallace, Velarde, and Wreford 2018). It's characterized by "flexibility, resilience, and capacity for change in the planning and implementation process" (Sharma-Wallace, Velarde, and Wreford 2018).

Adaptive governance is – ideally – fast, flexible, responsive, and iterative (Janssen and van der Voort 2020). Considering the uncertainty, it must simultaneously still be deliberative (Nordström 2022; Innerarity 2023). For that reason, it is informed by normative policy shapers (Smith and Miller 2023), and learning is a key value (Janssen and van der Voort 2016), alongside firm but gentle

coordination of stakeholders and policies that results in comprehensive monitoring (Wallach and Marchant 2019). At best, adaptive governance is an approach where learning from change makes the governance model better and better so it never risks being outdated. Adaptive governance has been successfully implemented in other domains, such as public health around COVID-19 (Janssen and van der Voort 2020; Khan et al. 2021), and sustainability governance in the context of climate change (Schultz et al. 2015; Linkov et al. 2018; May 2022; Mourby et al. 2022).

There are also parallels with the condition of governing under uncertainty in other evolving technologies. One could think of nuclear technology governance as it evolved in the post World War II era (Wu et al. 2019; Khlaaf 2023), biotech regulation starting in the 1980s (Huzair 2021; Trump et al. 2022), and nanotech regulation in the 2000s (Wolinsky 2006; Guston 2014; Allan et al. 2021). Each emerging technology has different characteristics: nuclear was stable until the recent small, modular reactors (Sam et al. 2023) and its second phase of proliferation in emerging markets (Wu et al. 2019). Biotech (and its regulation) has been constantly changing for 40 years (Li et al. 2021; Sheahan and Wieden 2021; Mourby et al. 2022), and significant nanotech breakthroughs coupled with obscure and scattered risk governance tools continuously challenge nano regulation efforts (Mullins et al. 2022). Yet, they share parallels that inform our idea of adaptive governance under uncertainty.

Adaptive governance initiatives are typically coupled with ways to share good approaches with others in the regulatory network. This has been successfully done with e-government implementation case studies across the EU (EU 2023). However, just having a best practice framework for AI governance is not enough; being able to share, learn, and get inspired from each other might avoid crucial mistakes, and might stop agencies from reinventing the wheel and not wasting valuable resources.

Adaptive governance in the context of policy making in the digital realm takes inspiration from the principles of agile methodology () which originated in software development, and emphasizes adaptability, stakeholder collaboration, and rapid response to change. The idea is that software policy needs to be flexible, responsive, and iterative because that's how software is created, implemented, and modified. Specifically for adaptive AI governance, the approach also needs to be evolutionary and social in nature, plus incorporate solid processes for AI-human collaboration (Caldwell et al. 2022). Governance must also match and mimic the iterative development, speed, and collaboration patterns of the generative AI development process (Feuerriegel et al. 2023). Adaptive AI governance (Agbese et al. 2023), just like previous generations of adaptive IT governance, must be ambidextrous (Janssen and van der Voort 2016); in other words, policy organizations should be able to pursue potentially contradictory aims at the same time. For example, it should be possible to both emphasize close monitoring and yet allow for significant,

	Traditional	Adaptive
Speed	Slow	Fast
Content	Static	Dynamic
Actors	Small set	Large set

Table 1: Traditional vs. Adaptive AI Governance

disruptive innovation through careful anticipatory governance (Guston 2014; Heo and Seo 2021), allowing for uncertainty. If and when operating under particularly high uncertainty, there is the need to engage in, and feel confident about, the balancing act of tentative governance (Kuhlmann, Stegmaier, and Konrad 2019), testing things out and revising quickly if measures prove counterproductive. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) describes such an approach as triple-A governance, both anticipatory, agile, and adaptive (Ramos, Uusikyla, and Luong 2020).

Adaptive (AI) governance takes larger systems with impact on other industries and on society into account. There is early evidence that generative AI might upend even food, agriculture, financial services, mining, and telco industries across the manufacturing supply chain (Freire et al. 2023; Xu et al. 2022; Ebni, Hosseini Bamakan, and Qu 2023; Jan et al. 2023), increasing the need for said adaptive governance. A variety of stakeholders are included, not just one organization and its internal response. Subnational dynamics also cannot be ignored (Liebig et al. 2022).

To treat laws and regulations as a one-off thing only works in relatively mature industries, where developments are comparatively slow, predictable, and changes don't happen as frequently. As we've shown in Section 2, none of these characteristics apply to the field of (generative) AI yet. In addition, generative AI has two layers to it: a context-dependent one where impacts of the technology manifest in specific application contexts only, and a non-context-dependent layer that has an impact across sectors, complicating the governance process as the number of application contexts constantly increases while the impact of the non-context-dependent layer remains uncertain. Hence, adaptive governance is better suited for generative AI: It is able to keep pace with the technology's rapid development because it is faster, which reduces the pacing problem, it is more flexible which allows to easier address changes in technological capacities, and it has built-in feedback loops, which enables policymakers to proactively react to (in-)efficiencies, loopholes, or misguided legal provisions. The latter is specifically relevant since it remains an open question which governance measures are effective in the context of (generative) AI.

Summarizing the differences between them, traditional AI governance is slow, static and only encompasses a small set of actors. In contrast, adaptive AI governance is fast, dynamic, and encompasses a large set of actors (see Table 1).

A Framework for Adaptive Governance in AI

What are potential frameworks or approaches that foster adaptive governance in the field of AI? Soft laws might be one suggested approach, as they can help prepare the road to binding laws and act as test beds for what may work (?). They might signal best practices that we can incorporate into binding regulations. However, they are not sufficient. We need to get to an adaptive governance structure that ensures a high degree of bindingness while remaining flexible to future developments and changes. To put it differently, adaptive governance would mandate the implementation of reasonable (minimum) safety and responsibility standards, given the current state of knowledge, but remain flexible to iteratively improve based on new insights.

In this chapter, we're adopting the adaptive governance approach from environmental governance to the field of AI, and expand it based on insights from other fields. Building and adopting such a framework means specifying relevant actors, tasks, roles, and activities; while specific instantiations of the adaptive AI governance framework will be context-dependent, we provide specific examples of how adaptive AI governance could look in practice below.

We'll start with defining the set of actors that would fall within the scope of an adaptive AI governance approach: In a traditional triple Helix innovation model, which describes interactions between actors in a society (Cai and Lattu 2022; Leydesdorff 1997; Carayannis, Barth, and Campbell 2012), we have government, industry and academia as the three essential stakeholders. Combining Helix innovation theory with insights from actor network theory (Edwards, Gabrielle Hecht et al. 2022; Morton 2023), we derive an expanded innovation model for (generative) AI that encompasses an extended set of actors to be considered in a governance framework: governments, industry, academia, civil society, and citizens. Adaptive governance is then about the co-governance of these different actors. In this adaptive governance framework, by default, all actors are equally important or at least to the extent that no actor can be reduced to another for any purpose (Fornazin and Joia 2016).

Secondly, we define the high-level tasks that need to be fulfilled in the context of an adaptive AI governance framework. We split them into general (*SCUMIA*, the acronym of the shared activities) and actor-specific activities (the *FACTI* activities), as indicated in Table 2.

The shared *SCUMIA* activities include

- **Share Best Practices:** Actors should openly share lessons learned, successful approaches, and innovative ideas to foster collective learning and improvement in AI governance. This could involve publishing case studies, participating in multi-stakeholder forums, etc.
- **Collaborate:** All actors should actively work together on initiatives to advance responsible AI development and deployment. This may include joint research projects, public-private partnerships, and other collaborative efforts that leverage the strengths of each group.

- **Use:** All actors should strive to adopt and implement best practices and insights from the adaptive governance process. Academia and civil society should utilize available tools to study and provide insights on AI systems. Industry and government should put key learnings into practice.
- **Monitor:** There needs to be ongoing monitoring by all parties to assess the effectiveness of current AI governance measures and identify areas for improvement. This could involve tracking key metrics, conducting impact assessments, and gathering feedback from affected stakeholders.
- **Inform:** Sharing of information is critical to enable evidence-based decision making. All actors should proactively communicate developments, concerns, and opportunities pertaining to (generative) AI and AI governance through appropriate channels.
- **Adapting:** All actors must be willing to adapt their approaches based on new learnings and changing circumstances. Governance structures need to be living documents, with clear processes for iteration and amendment as the (generative) AI landscape evolves.

In addition to the shared *SCUMIA* activities, some actors would also be involved in actor-specific activities: *Financing*, *Anticipating*, *Challenging*, *Training*, and *Innovating* (the *FACTI* activities).

- **Financing:** Government, industry and civil society should provide funding for AI governance initiatives, such as research on AI safety and ethics, public education campaigns, and multi-stakeholder collaborations. Innovative funding models like impact investing could be explored.
- **Anticipating:** Government, industry and civil society should engage in strategic foresight to anticipate future challenges and opportunities related to AI. This could involve trend analysis, scenario planning, and risk assessment to inform proactive policy and strategy.
- **Challenging:** Academia, civil society, and citizens play a vital role in constructively challenging the AI governance system to address shortcomings and spur continuous improvement. This could involve advocacy, critical analysis, and serving as watchdogs.
- **Training:** Actors like government, industry, academia and civil society should actively build AI governance capacity through education and skills development initiatives. This could target policymakers, developers, students, and the general public.
- **Innovating:** Industry, and academia are uniquely positioned to drive AI (governance) innovation by developing new technical tools or risk mitigation approaches to support AI governance (Reuel et al.).

Financing will largely be carried out by the government, industry, and civil society. Anticipating change is a shared task for government, industry, and civil society. Challenging the system is a shared responsibility between academia and civil society. Training others falls on government,

	Government	Industry	Academia	Civil Society	Citizens
Share Best Practice	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Collaborate	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Use	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Monitor	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Inform	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Adapt	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Finance	✓	✓		✓	
Anticipate	✓	✓	✓		
Challenge			✓	✓	
Train	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Innovate		✓	✓		

Table 2: Activities of different actors in an adaptive governance framework

industry, academia and civil society, while innovating largely involves industry and academia.

We explain how these activities would map to the different actors below, expanding on Table 2.

The role of government

- Governments have an expanded role in terms of anticipating change and adapting to it, as they need to future-proof and adapt (binding) AI governance measures to new and anticipated developments in the field.
- Governments have a duty to share best practices across society to/from all stakeholders and should focus on skills development and building a shared, digital commons (rules, heuristics, models, best practices, routines, ethical principles, data, interoperability principles/practices) in order to build a common pool of resources ('pasture') where benefits and harms are fairly distributed across all users (Kreienkamp and Pegram 2020).
- The government's role in AI governance is as facilitator and convenor, steering actors towards the public good and long term resilience to benefit the whole system, not as the ultimate judge.
- Governments need to further hire AI talent and build internal AI capacity, but also need to disclose any knowledge they have of AI being used within their jurisdiction and in markets regulated by them.
- Governments should be accountable for AI safety at the national and regional levels, and should produce regular reports.

The role of industry

- Industry should focus on their corporate AI governance efforts to rapidly mature and consolidate them and to deploy interoperable frameworks that can be jointly monitored, tested, and updated as AI systems evolve.
- Corporate boards of companies using AI at the core of their business should be mandated (or self-regulate) to have at least one board representative who is explicitly representing the responsible AI perspective, and that person should be armed with reporting tools to monitor progress and potential safety issues.

- AI industry leaders need to implement strong cross-industry AI governance initiatives that are standardized, interoperable, transparent, and committed to safety.
- The Chief Risk Officer (CRO) role needs to evolve into a more senior role and requires proper governance tools shared across the industry, also to be embedded in a national network of CROs.
- Cross-industry risk surveys cannot be voluntary to respond to but must be made mandatory.

The role of academia

- Academia should dedicate time and resources explaining AI to policy makers, e.g., through training sessions, in op-eds, media interviews, and in crossover journals.
- Academia needs to partner with other actors (e.g., industry or governments) to access sufficient computational resources to contribute to state-of-the-art (generative) AI research, development, innovation, and scrutiny.

The role of civil society

- Civil society needs to build credible third-party expertise that can continuously question the status quo. Very few existing actors can do this alone, so networks are crucial.
- Civil society should help bring attention to the societal implications of AI and advocate for responsible development and deployment practices by running public awareness campaigns, engage with media, and mobilize grassroots support for AI governance issues.
- Civil society should work to ensure that the perspectives of marginalized and vulnerable communities are considered in AI governance processes. They can conduct inclusive stakeholder consultations and advocate for policies that protect human rights and promote social justice.

The role of citizens

- Citizens should actively participate in debates surrounding the role of AI in government, in the workplace, at home, and in educational institutions. To do so, they need to stay informed and educate themselves, along with demanding intuitive AI interfaces not requiring special knowledge.

- Citizens should further inform other actors, such as civil societies or governments, about specific harms of AI systems they encountered.

Concrete Examples of Adaptive AI Governance

The next step in implementing an adaptive AI governance approach based on the framework above would be to clarify how these roles and activities can be operationalized. While a comprehensive, implementable adaptive governance framework is context-dependent because it needs to specify necessary budgets, parameters, data, indicators, emphasis, and processes that are shaped on a country's specific circumstances and priorities, we provide examples for adaptive AI governance in practice in this chapter. That being said, not all AI governance measures need to be made adaptive all at once; a first step could be to start with pilot programs where a select few measures are being implemented adaptively, with in-built feedback and adaptation loops into policies, and then governments could learn from these processes.

One previously suggested idea of governance coordinating committees (GCCs) situated outside government but with participation from government representatives, industry, nongovernmental organizations, think tanks, and other stakeholders (Wallach and Marchant 2019) is one idea for operationalizing adaptive AI governance. However, we propose that such committees should instead be placed inside the government; each committee should have permanent government representatives that focus on AI and then invite external experts from a variety of stakeholders for regular debate and review of technological progress and potential adaptation of regulations. These deliberations should be given significant weight in the regulatory process. To address the dual-layer nature of the impact of AI, we should have both, dedicated government representatives at sector-specific government agencies while also a central AI officer (or similar) that is tasked with cross-sectoral impacts and developments of AI.

Another example of practical adaptive AI governance would be initial AI regulation that would include a passage that allows for a shorter legitimization process of new requirements based on the committees' recommendations (suggested above). Another option in the context of AI regulations could be to build in structured, pre-determined revision and update rounds of the regulation that the suggested committees would lead.

Beyond that, there is a need to invest in regulatory AI governance R&D, because the subject matter is complex, e.g., through building a national AI research resource, akin to advances by the US (Alder 2024) and the UK (UK Research and Innovation 2024). In fact, such R&D needs as significant attention as AI development itself. A percentage (for example three percent) of AI investment mandated towards AI governance and safety, matching the national R&D to GDP ratio, which in the U.S. is 3.40 percent

(NCSES 2021), could be a reasonable target in an adaptive AI governance framework.

Additionally one could create centralized repositories and mandate organizations to register AI incidents and AI development, to be able to have an objective database that can be used to oversee current practices and extrapolate trends from current trajectories. These resources could then be used to assess and attempt to anticipate how AI might reshape key regulated and unregulated sectors (and sector governance) in the years ahead and build governance to that spec, not to the current state. To expand on this, governments should additionally build and debate potential future scenarios and corresponding governance responses in multi-stakeholder sessions.

In implementing an adaptive AI governance framework, one cannot ignore the short term risks of AI, such as bias, equity, and justice (Agbese et al. 2023; Hagendorff 2023; Smith 2023; Ulnicane and Aden 2023) in the desire to protect humanity from artificial general intelligence (AGI), an extremely ambiguous term for general purpose, high achieving cognitive technologies (Heaven 2023b). Instead, we need to establish structures that allow for an objective view on risks from AI, both current and future, and design governance measures that address both current risks while anticipating future ones. Besides the above-mentioned national AI research resources and repositories/registers, governments could make (financial/compute) resources available to independent experts, e.g., academia or convened experts groups, akin to the IPCC but on a national scale and for AI, that could research and assess risks from AI systems independent of vetted interests (which is a concern with industry, along with associated regulatory capture, see Dal Bó (2006)).

Finally, if AI systems become intertwined with regular day-to-day activities of citizens, such as finance or health-care, they cannot require specialty expertise to operate, monitor, or understand. Adaptive AI governance should focus on increasing the accessibility for and AI literacy of citizens by counteracting deliberate black boxing of AI (Rudin 2019), a challenge with many facets (Brožek et al. 2023), and on implementing AI education initiatives, e.g., as part national school curricula or by providing educational resources for adults to help them understand the capabilities and limitations of generative AI. The goal of such an adaptive AI governance measure would be to empower citizens to use AI responsibly and to partake in adaptive governance efforts, especially if they are negatively impacted by the technology.

Downsides of Adaptive AI Governance

Adopting an adaptive AI governance stance is not without its risks and limitations, notably insufficient oversight, insufficient depth, regulatory uncertainty, and regulatory capture.

Adaptive governance, with its rapid iteration and flexibility, may lead to inadequate oversight and regulatory

loopholes. Given the profound impacts AI can have on society, there's a concern that adaptive approaches might not be thorough enough in assessing and mitigating risks. One fix for this shortcoming is to create layered oversight structures and impact assessment reviews by third-party boards or through extensive use of advisory committee recommendations.

Secondly, adaptive methods prioritize speed and agility, which can sometimes come at the cost of in-depth analysis and deliberation. In the context of AI, where decisions can have far-reaching consequences, this could lead to underestimating or overlooking critical issues. One potential fix might be to integrate timed phases of in-depth analysis and public consultation into the agile cycles to ensure comprehensive policy development while preventing discussions which may hinder policy design and implementation.

There is also the risk of regulatory uncertainty, the common ambiguity and unpredictability businesses face due to evolving or unclear regulations governing AI development and application. Regulatory uncertainty around innovation can work several ways; for example, for drug development, it typically favors the first mover, but in the case of medical devices, it favors the follow-on entrants (Stern 2017). This uncertainty can stem from frequent changes in policies, inconsistent enforcement, or lack of clarity about compliance requirements and future regulatory directions. A tentative fix is to encourage pilot programs to assess the effectiveness and impact of new policies in controlled environments using regulatory sandboxes (Undheim, Erikson, and Timmermans 2022; Gonzalez Torres and Sawhney 2023). This measure allows for adjustments based on practical feedback before wider implementation.

Another potential solution to this problem is the provision of transparent rationales, timelines and roadmaps for policy changes, allowing businesses (and the public) to plan accordingly. One way is to establish a structured yet flexible framework for policy updates, such as regular review periods. This helps industries anticipate when changes might occur and prepare for them. Additionally, one can implement new regulations in phases, giving industries ample time to adapt; in this context, transition periods where both old and new regulations are temporarily valid could be provided. Governments should further develop clear communication channels and decision-making protocols to streamline consensus-building among diverse stakeholders. However, mass deliberation is often ineffective, demanding, costly, and can result in stalemate or viral ideas that are populist and hard to drive to consensus (Jungherr 2023), dynamics that would need to be managed separately.

Finally, regulatory capture is usually thought of as industrial interests being over-proportionately reflected in governance or regulatory initiatives (Tai 2017), often with a profit interest from industry (Saltelli et al. 2022). Generative AI could become an extreme case where not only would big tech try to influence governance, but AI might itself do so,

either as part of human-AI hybrids (where human decision-making is augmented by AIs), or if it becomes 'agentic' and has some decision-making and influence capacity of its own. So far, such considerations are highly speculative and may not manifest. But because generative AI development moves fast, we might eventually need to integrate AI systems as independent actors in some form into adaptive governance structures. However, to consider an AI (or a human-AI hybrid) as a distinct actor needing to be governed would challenge the very notion of democracy. Can a machine vote? If it can, how would that work? If it cannot, how can it legitimately be governed? Also, how would we avoid legislative capture given that the AI would to some degree be governing itself? These are all open questions that may provide additional challenges in an adaptive governance framework, but given their speculative nature go beyond our paper. However, we predict that they will require interdisciplinary, cross-actor involvements to find a solution. Setting up flexible, integrative, adaptive governance structures now can help with fostering such discussions among stakeholders, as well as allowing the governance system to adapt should the need arise, no matter how different future iterations of AI turn out to be.

Conclusion

Because of the speed of development of the technology, its broad scope of application, and its ability to augment human performance and work, generative AI challenges the very notions of governance, trust, and human agency. Additionally, the technology's capacity to mimic human knowledge work poses a challenge. For these reasons, adaptive governance, where governance and AI co-evolve, maintaining deliberative methods yet increasing speed of adoption, is essential for governing generative AI.

In this paper, we have presented a comprehensive adaptive AI governance framework that offers a flexible and iterative approach to managing the rapid advancements in artificial intelligence. The framework outlines key actors, shared activities (SCUMIA), and actor-specific activities (FACTI) that are essential for effective AI governance. We have further provided concrete examples of how this framework can be operationalized. Our work aims to support governments in adopting this alternative approach to AI governance; by embracing adaptive governance, governments can create a more agile, inclusive, and responsive regulatory environment that maximizes the potential benefits of AI while mitigating its risks and negative impacts on society.

References

- Agbese, M.; et al. 2023. Governance in Ethical and Trustworthy AI Systems: Extension of the ECCOLA Method for AI Ethics Governance Using GARP. *e-Informatica Software Engineering Journal*, 17(1): 230101.
- Al Lily, A.; et al. 2023. ChatGPT and the rise of semi-humans. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1): 1–12.

- Alder, M. 2024. National Science Foundation rolls out NAIRR pilot with industry, agency support. *FEDSCOOP*. Available at: <https://fedscoop.com/nsf-launches-nairr-pilot/>.
- Allan, J.; et al. 2021. Regulatory landscape of nanotechnology and nanoplastics from a global perspective. *Regulatory toxicology and pharmacology: RTP*, 122: 104885.
- Anthropic. 2023. Introducing Claude. Available at: <https://www.anthropic.com/news/introducing-claude>.
- Appel, G.; Neelbauer, J.; and Schweidel, D. 2023. Generative AI Has an Intellectual Property Problem. *Harvard Business Review*. Available at: <https://hbr.org/2023/04/generative-ai-has-an-intellectual-property-problem> (Accessed: 8 December 2023).
- Arnold, C. 2023. AlphaFold touted as next big thing for drug discovery — but is it? Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-02984-w>.
- Arnold, M.; Goldschmitt, M.; and Rigotti, T. 2023. Dealing with information overload: a comprehensive review. *Frontiers in psychology*, 14: 1122200.
- Bommasani, R.; Hudson, D. A.; Adeli, E.; Altman, R.; Arora, S.; von Arx, S.; Bernstein, M. S.; Bohg, J.; Bosselut, A.; Brunskill, E.; et al. 2021. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*.
- Brittain, B. 2023. Google to defend generative AI users from copyright claims. *Reuters*. Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/technology/google-defend-generative-ai-users-copyright-claims-2023-10-12/> (Accessed: 6 November 2023).
- Brożek, B.; et al. 2023. The black box problem revisited. Real and imaginary challenges for automated legal decision making. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*. [Preprint] Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-023-09356-9>.
- Cai, Y.; and Lattu, A. 2022. Triple Helix or Quadruple Helix: Which Model of Innovation to Choose for Empirical Studies? *Minerva*, 60(2): 257–280.
- Caldwell, S.; et al. 2022. An Agile New Research Framework for Hybrid Human-AI Teaming: Trust, Transparency, and Transferability. *ACM Trans. Interact. Intell. Syst.*, 12(3): 1–36.
- Carayannis, E.; Barth, T.; and Campbell, D. 2012. The Quintuple Helix innovation model: global warming as a challenge and driver for innovation. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 1(1): 1–12.
- Carlini, N.; et al. 2020. Extracting Training Data from Large Language Models. *arXiv [cs.CR]*. Available at: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.07805>.
- Chaffin, B. C.; Gosnell, H.; and Cosens, B. A. 2014. A decade of adaptive governance scholarship: synthesis and future directions. *Ecology and society*, 19(3).
- Cheng, J.; and Zeng, J. 2023. Shaping AI's Future? China in Global AI Governance. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 32(143): 794–810.
- Cognizant. 2024. New work, new world. Available at: <https://www.cognizant.com/us/en/gen-ai-economic-model-oxford-economics>.
- Council of the EU. 2023. Artificial intelligence act: Council and Parliament strike a deal on the first rules for AI in the world. Available at: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2023/12/09/artificial-intelligence-act-council-and-parliament-strike-a-deal-on-the-first-worldwide-rules-for-ai/> (Accessed: 11 December 2023).
- Dal Bó, E. 2006. Regulatory capture: A review. *Oxford review of economic policy*, 22(2): 203–225.
- Davenport, T.; and Mittal, N. 2022. How Generative AI Is Changing Creative Work. *Harvard Business Review*. Available at: <https://hbr.org/2022/11/how-generative-ai-is-changing-creative-work> (Accessed: 1 November 2023).
- Dell'Acqua, F.; et al. 2023. Navigating the Jagged Technological Frontier: Field Experimental Evidence of the Effects of AI on Knowledge Worker Productivity and Quality. Technical report, Harvard Business School Technology & Operations Mgt. Unit (Working Paper). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4573321>.
- Dietz, T.; Ostrom, E.; and Stern, P. C. 2003. The struggle to govern the commons. *science*, 302(5652): 1907–1912.
- Ebni, M.; Hosseini Bamakan, S.; and Qu, Q. 2023. Digital Twin based Smart Manufacturing; From Design to Simulation and Optimization Schema. *Procedia computer science*, 221: 1216–1225.
- Edwards; Gabrielle Hecht, P.; et al. 2022. The Uncategorizable Bruno Latour (1947–2022). *The Nation*. Available at: <https://www.thenation.com/article/society/bruno-latour-obituary-science/> (Accessed: 22 February 2023).
- EU. 2023. ePractice. Available at: <https://joinup.ec.europa.eu/collection/egovernment/epractice> (Accessed: 6 December 2023).
- European Parliament. 2023. EU AI Act: first regulation on artificial intelligence. Available at: <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/en/article/20230601STO93804/eu-ai-act-first-regulation-on-artificial-intelligence>.
- Feuerriegel, S.; et al. 2023. Generative AI. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*. [Preprint] Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-023-00834-7>.
- Folke, C.; Hahn, T.; Olsson, P.; and Norberg, J. 2005. Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, 30: 441–473.
- Fornazin, M.; and Joia, L. 2016. Techno-Government Networks: Actor-Network Theory in Electronic Government Research. In *Electronic Government*, 188–199. Springer International Publishing.
- Freire, S.; et al. 2023. A Cognitive Assistant for Operators: AI-Powered Knowledge Sharing on Complex Systems. *IEEE pervasive computing / IEEE Computer Society [and] IEEE Communications Society*, 22(1): 50–58.
- Goldman Sachs. 2023. AI investment forecast to approach \$200 billion globally by 2025. Available at: <https://www.goldmansachs.com/intelligence/pages/ai-investment-forecast-to-approach-200-billion-globally-by-2025.html> (Accessed: 24 November 2023).

- Gonzalez Torres, A.; and Sawhney, N. 2023. Role of Regulatory Sandboxes and MLOps for AI-Enabled Public Sector Services. *The Review of Socionetwork Strategies*, 17(2): 297–318.
- Guston, D. 2014. Understanding "anticipatory governance". *Social studies of science*, 44(2): 218–242.
- Hagendorff, T. 2023. AI ethics and its pitfalls: not living up to its own standards? *AI and Ethics*, 3(1): 329–336.
- Heaven, W. 2023a. Geoffrey Hinton tells us why he's now scared of the tech he helped build. Available at: <https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/05/02/1072528/geoffrey-hinton-google-why-scared-ai/> (Accessed: 8 December 2023).
- Heaven, W. 2023b. Google DeepMind wants to define what counts as artificial general intelligence. Available at: <https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/11/16/1083498/google-deepmind-what-is-artificial-general-intelligence-agi/> (Accessed: 8 December 2023).
- Heo, K.; and Seo, Y. 2021. Anticipatory governance for newcomers: lessons learned from the UK, the Netherlands, Finland, and Korea. *European Journal of Futures Research*, 9(1): 1–14.
- Hiter, S. 2023. 50 Generative AI Startups to Watch in 2023. Available at: <https://www.eweek.com/artificial-intelligence/generative-ai-startups/> (Accessed: 8 December 2023).
- Hu, K. 2023. ChatGPT sets record for fastest-growing user base - analyst note. Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/technology/chatgpt-sets-record-fastest-growing-user-base-analyst-note-2023-02-01/> (Accessed: 8 December 2023).
- Huzair, F. 2021. Risk and regulatory culture: governing recombinant DNA technology in the UK from 1970–1980. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 33(3): 260–270.
- Innerarity, D. 2023. The epistemic impossibility of an artificial intelligence take-over of democracy. *AI & society*. [Preprint] Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01632-1>.
- Jan, Z.; et al. 2023. Artificial intelligence for industry 4.0: Systematic review of applications, challenges, and opportunities. *Expert systems with applications*, 216: 119456.
- Janssen, M.; and van der Voort, H. 2016. Adaptive governance: Towards a stable, accountable and responsive government. *Government information quarterly*, 33(1): 1–5.
- Janssen, M.; and van der Voort, H. 2020. Agile and adaptive governance in crisis response: Lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic. *International journal of information management*, 55: 102180.
- Jungherr, A. 2023. Artificial Intelligence and Democracy: A Conceptual Framework. *Social Media + Society*, 9(3): 20563051231186353.
- Khan, M.; et al. 2021. An adaptive governance and health system response for the COVID-19 emergency. *World development*, 137: 105213.
- Khlaaf, I. H. 2023. How AI Can Be Regulated Like Nuclear Energy. Available at: <https://time.com/6327635/ai-needs-to-be-regulated-like-nuclear-weapons/> (Accessed: 10 November 2023).
- Kreienkamp, J.; and Pegram, T. 2020. Governing Complexity: Design Principles for the Governance of Complex Global Catastrophic Risks. *International Studies Review*, 23(3): 779–806.
- Kuhlmann, S.; Stegmaier, P.; and Konrad, K. 2019. The tentative governance of emerging science and technology—A conceptual introduction. *Research policy*, 48(5): 1091–1097.
- Lawrence, C.; et al. 2023. The AI Regulatory Alignment Problem. Technical report, Stanford University. Available at: <https://reglab.stanford.edu/publications/the-ai-regulatory-alignment-problem/> (Accessed: 8 December 2023).
- Lemos, M. C.; and Agrawal, A. 2006. Environmental governance. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, 31: 297–325.
- Leone, M. 2023. Tracking recent generative AI news from 9 big tech companies. Available at: <https://www.techtarget.com/searchenterpriseai/opinion/Tracking-recent-generative-AI-news-from-big-tech-companies> (Accessed: 8 December 2023).
- Leydesdorff, L. 1997. The Non-linear Dynamics of Sociological Reflections. *International sociology: journal of the International Sociological Association*, 12(1): 25–45.
- Li, J.; et al. 2021. Advances in Synthetic Biology and Biosafety Governance. *Frontiers in bioengineering and biotechnology*, 9: 598087.
- Liebig, L.; et al. 2022. Subnational AI policy: shaping AI in a multi-level governance system. *AI & society*. [Preprint] Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01561-5>.
- Linkov, I.; et al. 2018. Governance Strategies for a Sustainable Digital World. *Sustainability: Science Practice and Policy*, 10(2): 440.
- Lv, Z. 2023. Generative artificial intelligence in the metaverse era. *Cognitive Robotics*, 3: 208–217.
- Maslej, N.; Fattorini, L.; Perrault, R.; Parli, V.; Reuel, A.; Brynjolfsson, E.; Etchemendy, J.; Ligett, K.; Lyons, T.; Manyika, J.; Niebles, J. C.; Shoham, Y.; Wald, R.; and Clark, J. 2024. The AI Index 2024 Annual Report. Available at: <https://aiindex.stanford.edu>.
- May, C. 2022. Complex adaptive governance systems: a framework to understand institutions, organizations, and people in socio-ecological systems. *Socio-ecological practice research*, 4(1): 39–54.
- Metz, C.; and Schmidt, G. 2023. Elon Musk and Others Call for Pause on A.I., Citing "Profound Risks to Society". Available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/29/technology/ai-artificial-intelligence-musk-risks.html> (Accessed: 17 October 2023).
- Morton, J. 2023. How Actor Network Theory explains ChatGPT and the new power relationships in the age of AI - The Academic. Available at: <https://theacademic.com/actor-network-theory-explains-chatgpt-and-ai/> (Accessed: 24 November 2023).

- Mourby, M.; et al. 2022. Biomodifying the "natural": from Adaptive Regulation to Adaptive Societal Governance. *Journal of law and the biosciences*, 9(1): Isac018.
- Mullins, M.; et al. 2022. (Re)Conceptualizing decision-making tools in a risk governance framework for emerging technologies: the case of nanomaterials. *Environment systems & decisions*, 1–13.
- Murray, M. 2023. Generative AI Art: Copyright Infringement and Fair Use. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4483539>.
- NCSES. 2021. National Patterns of R&D Resources. Available at: <https://nces.nsf.gov/data-collections/national-patterns/2021> (Accessed: 8 December 2023).
- Nordström, M. 2022. AI under great uncertainty: implications and decision strategies for public policy. *AI & society*, 37(4): 1703–1714.
- O'Brien, J.; and Nelson, C. 2020. Assessing the Risks Posed by the Convergence of Artificial Intelligence and Biotechnology. *Health security*, 18(3): 219–227.
- Pflanzer, M.; et al. 2023. Embedding AI in society: ethics, policy, governance, and impacts. *AI & society*, 38(4): 1267–1271.
- Price, H.; and Connelly, M. 2023. AI governance must deal with long-term risks as well. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03117-z>.
- Ramesh, A.; and Chawla, V. 2022. Chatbots in Marketing: A Literature Review Using Morphological and Co-Occurrence Analyses. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 57(3): 472–496.
- Ramos, J.; Uusikyla, I.; and Luong, N. 2020. Triple-A Governance: Anticipatory, Agile and Adaptive. Available at: <https://jfsdigital.org/2020/04/03/triple-a-governance-anticipatory-agile-and-adaptive/> (Accessed: 24 November 2023).
- Ray, P. 2023. ChatGPT: A comprehensive review on background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems*, 3: 121–154.
- Reuel, A.; Söder, L.; Bucknall, B.; and Undheim, T. A. ????. On The Importance of Technical Research and Talent for AI Governance. *ICML 2024*.
- Roberts, H.; et al. 2023. Governing artificial intelligence in China and the European Union: Comparing aims and promoting ethical outcomes. *The Information Society*, 39(2): 79–97.
- Roser, M. 2023. Artificial intelligence has advanced despite having few resources dedicated to its development – now investments have increased substantially. [Preprint] Available at: <https://ourworldindata.org/ai-investments> (Accessed: 24 November 2023).
- Rudin, C. 2019. Stop Explaining Black Box Machine Learning Models for High Stakes Decisions and Use Interpretable Models Instead. *Nature machine intelligence*, 1(5): 206–215.
- Saltelli, A.; et al. 2022. Science, the endless frontier of regulatory capture. *Futures*, 135: 102860.
- Sam, R.; et al. 2023. Licensing small modular reactors: A state-of-the-art review of the challenges and barriers. *Progress in Nuclear Energy*, 164: 104859.
- Schultz, L.; et al. 2015. Adaptive governance, ecosystem management, and natural capital. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 112(24): 7369–7374.
- Sebők, M.; et al. 2022. Measuring legislative stability: a new approach with data from Hungary. *European Political Science*, 21(4): 491–521.
- Sharma-Wallace, L.; Velarde, S. J.; and Wreford, A. 2018. Adaptive governance good practice: Show me the evidence! *Journal of Environmental Management*, 222: 174–184.
- Sheahan, T.; and Wieden, H.-J. 2021. Emerging regulatory challenges of next-generation synthetic biology. *Biochemistry and cell biology = Biochimie et biologie cellulaire*, 99(6): 766–771.
- Sheehan, M. 2023. China's AI regulations and how they get made. *Horizons: Journal of International Relations and Sustainable Development*, (24): 108–125.
- Smith, B. 2023. Stop talking about tomorrow's AI doomsday when AI poses risks today. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-02094-7>.
- Smith, M.; and Miller, S. 2023. Technology, institutions and regulation: towards a normative theory. *AI & society*. [Preprint] Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01803-0>.
- Stern, A. 2017. Innovation under Regulatory Uncertainty: Evidence from Medical Technology. *Journal of public economics*, 145: 181–200.
- Stokel-Walker, C. 2023. AI chatbots are coming to search engines — can you trust the results? Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00423-4>.
- Tai, L. 2017. Regulatory capture and quality. *Journal of public policy*, 37(3): 261–286.
- Tariq, S.; Jeon, S.; and Woo, S. S. 2022. Am I a real or fake celebrity? Evaluating face recognition and verification APIs under deepfake impersonation attack. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, 512–523.
- The White House. 2023a. Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence. Available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2023/10/30/executive-order-on-the-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and-use-of-artificial-intelligence/>.
- The White House. 2023b. FACT SHEET: President Biden Issues Executive Order on Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence. Available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/10/30/fact-sheet-president-biden-issues-executive-order-on-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-artificial-intelligence/> (Accessed: 30 October 2023).
- Thormundsson, B. 2023. Total global AI investment 2015-2022. Available at: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/941137/ai-investment-and-funding-worldwide/> (Accessed: 24 November 2023).

Trump, B.; et al. 2022. Governing biotechnology to provide safety and security and address ethical, legal, and social implications. *Frontiers in genetics*, 13: 1052371.

Turchin, A. 2019. Assessing the future plausibility of catastrophically dangerous AI. *Futures*, 107: 45–58.

UK Research and Innovation. 2024. £300 million to launch first phase of new AI Research Resource. *UK Research and Innovation*. Available at: <https://www.ukri.org/news/300-million-to-launch-first-phase-of-new-ai-research-resource/>.

Ulnicane, I.; and Aden, A. 2023. Power and politics in framing bias in Artificial Intelligence policy. *The review of policy research*, 40(5): 665–687.

Undheim, K.; Erikson, T.; and Timmermans, B. 2022. True uncertainty and ethical AI: regulatory sandboxes as a policy tool for moral imagination. *AI and Ethics*. [Preprint] Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00240-x>.

Vaswani, A.; Shazeer, N.; Parmar, N.; Uszkoreit, J.; Jones, L.; Gomez, A. N.; Kaiser, Ł.; and Polosukhin, I. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.

Walker, B.; Holling, C. S.; Carpenter, S. R.; and Kinzig, A. 2004. Resilience, adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems. *Ecology and society*, 9(2).

Wallach, W.; and Marchant, G. 2019. Toward the Agile and Comprehensive International Governance of AI and Robotics [point of view]. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 107(3): 505–508.

Wang, H.; et al. 2023. Pre-Trained Language Models and Their Applications. *Proceedings of the Estonian Academy of Sciences: Engineering*, 25: 51–65.

Wolinsky, H. 2006. Nanoregulation: a recent scare involving nanotech products reveals that the technology is not yet properly regulated. *EMBO reports*, 7(9): 858–861.

Wu, Y.; et al. 2019. Nuclear safety in the unexpected second nuclear era. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(36): 17673–17682.

Xu, J.; et al. 2022. A Review on AI for Smart Manufacturing: Deep Learning Challenges and Solutions. *NATO Advanced Science Institutes series E: Applied sciences*, 12(16): 8239.

Yudkowsky, E. 2023. Pausing AI Developments Isn't Enough. We Need to Shut it All Down. Available at: <https://time.com/6266923/ai-eliezer-yudkowsky-open-letter-not-enough/> (Accessed: 18 April 2023).