**CURMUDGEON CORNER**

# The global AI framework: navigating challenges and societal impacts

**Lakshmanan Sethu Sankaranarayanan**[1]

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence brings both immense potential and daunting challenges. Machine learning models, particularly deep learning algorithms, could help solve global issues like climate change by improving predictive climate models and enhancing energy efficiency, while AI-driven genomic analysis could revolutionize medicine by accelerating drug discovery and personalized treatments for complex diseases. We can envision personalized medicine, self-driving vehicles navigating hazardous roads flawlessly, and adaptive learning tools tailored to students. In education, personalized AI agents, such as intelligent tutoring systems, are increasingly important for offering customized learning experiences, addressing individual student needs, and providing real-time feedback that traditional methods cannot achieve. These agents uniquely adapt to learning styles and pace, thus closing gaps that conventional classroom settings often leave unaddressed. However, this powerful technology casts an ominous shadow. Privacy erosion is a major worry as some surveillance-based AI algorithms, including facial recognition systems and behavioral analysis tools, could meticulously analyze our daily digital lives, collecting data that could be used without our consent. Furthermore, biases ingrained in AI models, particularly those trained on unbalanced datasets, risk embedding societal inequalities into systems that influence vital societal functions, such as hiring practices, credit scoring, and law enforcement. Most concerningly, we may face autonomous AI systems, such as those used in military drones or autonomous vehicles, making life-or-death decisions without human intervention. As we strive to harness AI's transformative capabilities, it becomes evident that a dynamic governance framework is needed—one that can evolve in tandem with the technology. The allure of universal rules ensuring accountable AI use and fairly distributed benefits is undeniable. However, the path to achieving this is fraught with immense challenges that create a double-edged impact on society.

A major obstacle is the vast diversity across national contexts regarding culture, ethics, and technological landscapes. For instance, regulating autonomous vehicles, which rely on advanced AI-driven decision-making systems like reinforcement learning and computer vision, illustrates this complexity. A densely populated city-state like Singapore may prioritize stringent vehicle safety over mobility, restricting autonomous cars in crowded areas. Conversely, a vast rural nation like Australia could desperately need self-driving cars to improve mobility for remote communities, deprioritizing some safety protocols. In the past, the United States faced clashing state and federal autonomous vehicle regulations. California, a tech hub, loosened rules to accelerate testing and development. But after high-profile accidents, safety concerns prompted stricter federal oversight, highlighting the challenges of unified governance for varied regional priorities.

The divisive case of facial recognition provides real-world evidence of this governance quandary. When the EU enacted the Artificial Intelligence Act, specifically targeting the use of facial recognition technologies in public spaces due to privacy and civil liberties concerns, China announced plans for a nationwide public facial recognition system to boost social monitoring and control. Such polarizing stances underscore the difficulty of crafting universally palatable rules. Facial recognition, which relies on deep convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to analyze and match faces, raises significant ethical dilemmas. In my opinion, AI progresses at a blistering pace, creating a perpetually moving target for static global governance frameworks. By the time carefully crafted international regulations launch, the technology may have advanced enough to require revisions. Nimble local governance, such as the GDPR's adaptability through localized enforcement mechanisms, allows societies to iteratively update policies as new AI issues emerge. A potential model for AI governance could mirror the structure of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), which oversees the global standards for the Olympic Games while allowing individual

✉ Lakshmanan Sethu Sankaranarayanan
  lakshmanan.sl@gmail.com

1   Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc: IEEE, Burbank, CA, USA

countries to adapt those standards to their unique cultural and regulatory environments. Similarly, an international AI oversight body could be established to monitor and review AI advancements annually, collaborating with local governments to ensure that global principles are implemented with regional relevance.

Why? Because an absence of unified global AI principles breeds unrestrained regulation with hazardous societal implications. For example, AI-driven investment decisions that rely on biased machine learning models may enact rules overlooking crucial ethical factors like fairness and accountability. Once again, we saw an example of insidious racial bias being baked into algorithms that influence major health decisions and outcomes. The Vaginal Birth After Cesarean (VBAC) algorithm, which utilizes predictive analytics, initially painted African American and Hispanic women with a broad brush, flagging them as higher-risk candidates simply based on their race rather than individual medical factors. This perpetuates dangerous stereotypes and can lead to women of color being unnecessarily pushed towards more invasive surgical deliveries.

While local oversight offers flexibility, a purely nationalistic approach also risks catastrophic pitfalls. The development of potentially existential technologies like advanced bioengineering or dangerously unstable forms of artificial general intelligence (AGI) requires a unified global stance. Individual nations may implement certain safeguards and protocols, but the existential risks posed by such world-altering innovations demand unified international cooperation, ethical governance, and preventative regulatory frameworks. To leave something with global-level impact entirely to local control invites a race to the bottom that may spell adversity for society as a whole.

Another pressing concern is the concentration of resources among a handful of dominant AI players shaping AI algorithm development and implementation. While individual data privacy protections emerge from local policies, ensuring equitable competition and preventing monopolistic AI control demands coordinated global economic pressure and antitrust measures. The dominance of a few nations or corporations in AI research and development could exacerbate global socioeconomic inequalities, making it crucial to enforce antitrust regulations on an international scale.

The ideal solution blends global principles with local implementation. International bodies could establish broad ethical baselines for AI development around core issues like fairness, transparency, and accountability. Individual nations would then have the flexibility to tailor specific regulations fitting their particular legal systems and cultural values. This balanced approach allows consistent guidance with regional adaptability. However, these global governance frameworks must represent a genuinely inclusive array of international voices and priorities—not just those of a few powerful nations. Developing economies lacking resources to keep pace with AI must have an equal seat at the table to ensure the equitable reaping of benefits from this transformative technology worldwide. To ensure that AI governance remains relevant, these frameworks must include continuous feedback loops, allowing policies to be regularly updated based on input from diverse stakeholders across sectors. This iterative approach will help maintain the delicate balance between global consistency and local adaptability.

To effectively navigate AI's ethical complexities requires a multifaceted approach founded on international collaboration, responsible innovation, and inclusivity across cultures and economies. By bridging societal divides, we can responsibly unleash AI's potential to create an ethical, innovative, and shared prosperous future for all humanity. The stakes are existential—we must cooperatively define human-centric boundaries for AI's power over our civilization and societies. This ethical concern will be immensely complex, but the potential consequences of abdicating responsible stewardship are too severe to ignore. We stand at a crucial crossroads that will reverberate across generations to come. Unified and principled global AI governance is both a moral and pragmatic necessity to uphold human agency in our increasingly artificial age. If we neglect to establish unified global guardrails, we risk inflaming socioeconomic inequalities, institutionalizing harmful biases, and potentially transferring autonomous control over human life to biased AI systems used in critical areas like law enforcement or healthcare. Conversely, inefficient universal standardization would disastrously ignore crucial regional and cultural contexts necessary for pragmatic AI governance. The only judicious path forward requires a nuanced balance—flexible localized policy making within the safety rails of consistent, inclusive international ethical frameworks. Just as the IOC serves as a global governing body for the Olympics while respecting local customs and regulations, a similar model could guide the development and implementation of AI governance on a global scale. The ambitious global cooperation and representation defying geopolitical divisions and economic disparities must be the bedrock principle.