

How can regulators maintain a sense of empathy in their work when utilizing automated systems?

- First of all you have to have a clear understanding of what empathy means. Empathy means you can put yourself in someone else's shoes, whereas compassion means you can understand human suffering. Now AI will never understand human suffering.
- Ensure your staff and stakeholders have a direct part in the process, and include the vendor/it interact with them.
- an enhancement rather than a replacement
- Reviewing the work output and editing it to be more human in its verbiage
- By ensuring review of the use of the automation.
- People need to be involved in sensitive higher risk issues
- Ensure there is human oversight.
- Maintain human oversight
- Control the use; review output of AI tool, don't completely delegate work that is generative to AI. But AI can take over rote processes.
- Rigorous overview of what Automated systems have generated as answers.
- Set it as a guiding principle informing any type of tool you create.
- Continue training sessions, discussions, and strategic planning that continues the focus on empathy.
- Build a culture that embraces this principle
- By keeping people involved in the process
- Have humans available
- The use of AI can be used to increase empathy
- Have a use policy in place that puts forward basic requirements of human needs and societal expectations.
- Establish a set of principles governing how it works with empathy and compassion and build model on that
- Empathy is one of the human adds as the copilot.
- Ensure co-pilot approach to bring human reflection to AI INPUT
- Always have human oversight of work generated by AI
- Ensuring that a human has a role in every process
- Review the response first
- Drop the automated system
- Good question

Does the use of AI in regulation increase or decrease overall risk, considering the traditionally risk-averse nature of regulatory processes?

- It depends on the use. Utilization of AI as A tool for not only regulators but licensees is one thing but it shouldn't be the ONLY option.
- Decrease
- Depends on if the government asks the regulatory bodies to use AI as a weapon ... Currently all regulatory bodies have members. Are we using AI against our members?
- It has the ability to do both. Used properly, it should reduce risk.
- Depends on the process you are talking about and how you use AI
- Both. AI has the ability to decrease risk beyond human error. AI has the ability to introduce coding biases.

CLEAR 2024 Winter Symposium – Responses to Roundtable Discussion Questions

- in its current state, increases risk
- It may not increase or decrease the risk, rather it likely will change the risks.
- It could decrease, but resistance to change from those invested in the status quo needs to be accounted for in the changeover strategy. Poor change management could ultimately increase the risk.
- Depends on if it is assistive or if it is automating decisions. It is already helpful in providing analysis of patterns, trends, and large data sets. Overall it should be beneficial and bring already under resources organizations into a more productive positions.
- Without a robust governance framework, risk is increased
- That depends on how its managed, by whom, and with what purpose
- Decrease overall risk

To what extent has the digital age contributed to equitable practices in regulation, and what steps can be taken to ensure fairness in the integration of technology?

- Could be useful for Analysis of decision making data, risk profiles, and biases.
- You would have to ensure that technology is available to everyone
- The digital age has provided additional resources to support regulating in the public interest. Ensure = guarantee; therefore, it's unlikely to guarantee fairness.
- I don't think the digital age has contributed to equitable practices in regulation.
- From ChatGPT: The digital age has both advanced equitable practices and posed challenges. Increased access to information benefits many, but disparities persist. To ensure fairness, policies promoting digital literacy, inclusive tech education, and regulatory frameworks addressing digital inequality are crucial. Collaboration between stakeholders is essential for a more equitable integration of technology.
- The digital age has allowed a greater ability to share best practices more quickly and understand the need for equity and fairness.
- Steps - international and national regulatory oversight
- The amount and velocity of information has made it easier to recognize the bias that exists, and was typically described as anecdotal, in data sets, decisions, and systems. The appetite to address, challenge, or change those system still rests with human motivation.

Has your organization conducted an impact assessment for specific technologies like artificial intelligence? What did it entail? What was the outcome?

- Concern has been how it captures data from input questions
- No
- No totally.
- Yes
- no

Considering the potential biases in AI, how can regulators promote diversity, equity, and inclusion in the development and implementation of technological solutions in their work?

- We're not there yet. That's the challenge
- I don't know how to answer this question - yet.
- Someone well versed in DEI would need to be involved in the development and implementation process
- Mandate DEI/bias testing on all models that impact citizens so certification or similar can be issued prior to a launch. Lower levels of proof established for revoking or pulling public use authorization.

CLEAR 2024 Winter Symposium – Responses to Roundtable Discussion Questions

- Further from ChaptGpt: Regulators can encourage industry-wide standards for ethical AI, emphasizing the importance of unbiased algorithms and inclusive design. Incentivizing research on fairness and diversity in AI, supporting education programs, and engaging with advocacy groups can contribute to a more comprehensive approach. Regular updates to regulations to keep pace with evolving technology are essential to address emerging challenges in this dynamic field.
- From ChatGpt: Regulators can enforce transparency in AI development, requiring companies to disclose their diversity practices. Implementing guidelines that address bias mitigation, diverse hiring, and inclusive design principles can also foster fairness in technological solutions. Regular audits and collaboration with diverse stakeholders can further ensure equitable AI development and deployment.

In what ways can collaboration across CLEAR platforms facilitate ongoing discussions about the impact of AI on regulation and the professions being regulated? (How can CLEAR support you?)

- CLEAR could become a center of excellence for regulation and AI
- Keep sharing resources, especially on the website.
- Case studies and stories about what people are doing, testing, developing
- Keep sharing the amazing information that you shared today.