

IGF 2017 Reporting Template

- Session Title: **Artificial Intelligence and Inclusion**
- Date: 18/12/2017
- Time: 11:50
- Session Organizer: Celina Bottino, Institute of Technology and Society of Rio
- Chair/Moderator: Carlos Affonso Souza
- Rapporteur/Notetaker: Celina Bottino
- List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations:

Ms. Chinmayi Arun, Centre for Communication Governance (CCG) at National Law University, Delhi
Malavika Jayaram, Digital Asia Hub
Sandra Cortesi, Berkman Klein Center
Urs Gasser, Berkman Klein Center

- Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue):

AI and Inclusion: how developing countries may play a role in this discussion.

User vs consumer perspectives: AI systems and how this issue is being framed by the market perspective.

Ownership of AI: how to reconcile the benefits of AI and make it inclusive.

- If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each presentation:

All speakers shared the same presentation. This panel was a follow-up to the AI and Inclusion Symposium held in Rio de Janeiro about the future of AI and how developing countries can play a role.

Carlos Affonso: Described the format of the event. On day one we built a shared understanding, with two key notes. And then we had panels. On day 2 we explored opportunities and challenges, with a panel and breakout sessions and day 3 presented opportunities for research.

Sandra Cortesi: Presented the infographics of the event and brought the discussion about youth and AI. How AI based technology impact young people regarding education and well being. She pointed to the question about future of work questioning which skills young people should be equipped with.

Malavika Jayaram: Described the conceptual framework of the event. There is all the hype, a lot of the talk about discrimination since discrimination can take place in different levels: of algorithm, data and training. She described the 4D framework presented by Ansaf Salleb-Aouissi to achieve inclusive AI: 4D of AI: develop, de-identify, decipher, de-bias. She also made reference to the fact that the GDPR is requiring right to explanation but no one knows how to implement this. Since people are behind data set, there is no anonymity in the data set so we need to treat bias in data.

She also mentioned how the framing of AI and inclusion can be contested as presented by Nishant Shah. There is always a tension between real and fiction being represented in the data. So he proposes that you need to denaturalize unit of measurement and move from living from with AI to within AI.

Chinmayi Arun: Presented the research questions that arose from the event. She mentioned that internet governance narratives are useful to discuss AI governance. One issue is if the architecture has been created in the global north and does not address issues of the global south.

Urs Gasser: Questioned what is the right perspective to adopt, we need to look at it at the ecosystem level. The shifts are at structural level. Government and nation states are needed. Look at it as a problem as big as our environment.

(b) how hard is to talk about it cross-disciplines. We were struggling even basic vocabularies. The term citizenship is great, but means little to other disciplines.

(c) there is sometimes social solutions for technical problems, and vice-versa. Taking unemployment as an example, we should take into account the idea of a solidarity fund or robot taxes. The different sources of AI bias were in the dataset or people creating the system, or in society, and how we deal with it. One technical solution was to focus on bias on the dataset and try to de-bias it.

(d) Timing and speed. We have to be really fast as a society not to lose this window of opportunity making sure technology includes everyone. But how we should do this when we have uncertainties? We need to act on conditions of complexity and uncertainty and we will try and learn different mechanisms of governances.

- Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session (3 paragraphs):

One of the discussions that took place during the workshop was regarding the perspective of user vs. consumer. How companies that develop AI should treat the end users. Participants claimed that the debate was framed from the market perspective. Notions like inclusion and agency are political notions.

Others discussed the ownership of AI. Who owns the actual AI and when we talk about inclusion, inclusion to what? We have major corporations that are fighting for consumers, and they are the ones who develop AI. Is it a new marketing, finance, for reaching that goal? People in university also use AI developed by these companies, and might be manipulated. The question is how do we reconcile the benefits of AI and all the information that we provide to AI to the owner of AI to make us do things we don't actually want to do.

- Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways (3 paragraphs):

- Encouraging participatory design, shaping standards around Autonomous System for example.
- IGF can live up to its mandate and be the hub who brings people together and convene everyone to discuss about this issue.

- While only specialists are working with AI, everyone should be working with AI.
- Involve young people to discuss AI but we should ask them how they want to participate. We need to protect children from exploratory experimentation and use storytelling to communicate with them.
- Use technical solutions to technical problems. E.g. IPv6 and not social solutions to technical problems.
- AI is a very disruptive technology and there is still time to make intervention.

Gender Reporting

- Estimate the overall number of the participants present at the session: 110
- Estimate the overall number of women present at the session: 40%
- To what extent did the session discuss gender equality and/or women's empowerment? We had two questions from the audience about gender related topics. One on inequality (i.e. access to AI has a gender unbalance) and one related to youth.
- If the session addressed issues related to gender equality and/or women's empowerment, please provide a brief summary of the discussion: Questions were mentioned, but the discussion was brief.