

Carmen Ng
Berkman Klein Center for Internet and Society - Research Sprint
Session 6 Assignment: Assessing Source Quality on Wikipedia

Why this article

I chose the Wikipedia article '[regulation of artificial intelligence](#)' because the topic of artificial intelligence (AI) strategy and governance is a key topic of my study in my Master's program, in which I research different national AI strategies for comparative study, as well as the law and ethical topics around AI, particularly in the areas of robotics and smart surveillance.

I noticed there is no single Wiki entry on 'artificial intelligence governance'. Rather, the overall topic of AI governance seems to be split into the '[ethics of artificial intelligence](#)' page, which focuses on the types of ethical concerns related to AI applications, and the '[regulation of artificial intelligence](#)' page, which focuses on mapping the existing policies and laws promoting the AI regulation. Noticing the former page is substantially longer in length (with eleven sections covering multi-dimensional aspects of the topic) and is available in multiple languages, I chose the latter, shorter page (with only four sections) for a more feasible review.

Main content

The article generally demonstrates a neutral point of view (NPOV) throughout its sections. It begins with summarizing the key perspectives in the public discussion domain of AI regulation, before moving on to reference the existing international (OECD), national (China, the U.K.) or regional regulations (the E.U.) in a layered structure. Substantial citations were included and mostly from academic research or official documents published online by international organizations or national governments.

What's missing

What might be missing from a content point of view though, is that **the article focuses only on the role of public sector policies and laws** in the evolving ecosystem of AI regulations or governance debates. In fact, **non-governmental actors such as the private sector, civic society, advocacy groups, academia are also active contributors** to the more bottom-up social discussions about the different potential risks of AI, real cases of benefits and harm, balancing factors to be considered when thinking of regulating AI.

I understand this very Wiki entry is titled 'regulations', which would imply binding laws, but in its lede paragraph it cites a 2020 research paper on '*a wave of AI Ethics Guidelines*' - which are not binding regulations, but a collection of much more diverse and fluid norm-setting discussion being actively shaped by many actors beyond only governments.

I think this article could **further differentiate 'regulations' and 'guidelines'**. The page can note how the former focuses on binding regulations specifically about AI (there have been increasing

regulations, but perhaps not as many as ‘a wave’, as many countries have yet to enact AI legal frameworks that are more specific than data protection laws). For the latter, it can focus on the wider ecosystem of public, private and civic actors, which would better justify the description of ‘a wave of’ (non-binding, multi-stakeholder) guidelines in a page that appears to be solely focused on public-sector laws.

There are **new sources that can also be cited** to highlight this. A 2020 report by the United Nations identified “over 160 organizational, national and international sets of AI ethics and governance principles worldwide”¹. To go deeper, the page can also cite a 2020 publication by the Berkman Klein Center for Internet and Society at Harvard University that identified eight key themes among thirty-six “especially visible or influential” AI principles documents authored by government and non-governmental actors from multiple geographical regions².

What is also slightly missing in this Wikipedia page is the **diversity of views from sources outside of Europe, the U.S., and China**. There are a handful of countries that have included regulations as either a policy or non-binding guidelines in the area of AI, such as Japan, India, Thailand, or have set up regulation oversight or advisory bodies, such as the list compiled by the OECD AI database³.

By sourcing mainly from research and incidents in the U.S. and the E.U. (e.g. Elon Musk calling for AI regulation was cited as a relevant event, but not the Japanese government’s announcement of ‘Social Principles of Human-Centric AI’⁴), I think **this page also misses the opportunity to highlight how different regions and societies may have different questions about what opportunities and risks they seek to balance in AI regulation**. For example, the very concepts of privacy and security could mean distinctly different benefits and risks to populations living in socio-political regimes with varying degrees of rule of law, particularly those in the global south.

Languages

In terms of language, this Wikipedia article is only available in English and Arabic (which is substantially shorter than the English page), which means non-English speakers (who also do not read Arabic) will be excluded from the knowledge presented in this article.

¹ United Nations, “Roadmap for Digital Cooperation”, June 2020.

https://www.un.org/en/content/digital-cooperation-roadmap/assets/pdf/Roadmap_for_Digital_Cooperation_EN.pdf

² Fjeld, Jessica and Achten, Nele and Hilligoss, Hannah and Nagy, Adam and Srikumar, Madhulika, Principled Artificial Intelligence: Mapping Consensus in Ethical and Rights-Based Approaches to Principles for AI (January 15, 2020). Berkman Klein Center Research Publication No. 2020-1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3518482>

³ OECD AI Database, Regulatory oversight and ethical advice bodies https://oecd.ai/dashboards/policy-instruments/Regulatory_oversight_and_ethical_advice_bodies

⁴ “Social Principles of Human-centric AI”, 2019, Government of Japan, <https://www8.cao.go.jp/cstp/english/humancentricai.pdf>