

**Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts (Category II) related to a Draft
Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence**

Online, 26 – 30 April and 21 – 25 June 2021

Distribution: Limited

SHS/IGM-AIETHICS/2021/JUN/INF.5 Rev.

25 June 2021

Original: English

**FINAL REPORT BY THE RAPPOREUR
OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING
RELATED TO A DRAFT RECOMMENDATION ON THE ETHICS OF ARTIFICIAL
INTELLIGENCE (26 – 30 APRIL and 21-25 JUNE 2021)**

SUMMARY

The General Conference of UNESCO decided at its 40th session in November 2019 ([40 C/Resolution 37](#)) that “it is timely and relevant for UNESCO to prepare an international standard-setting instrument on the ethics of artificial intelligence (AI) in the form of a recommendation”, and invited the Director-General to submit the draft text of a recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence to the General Conference at its 41st session in 2021.

In accordance with General Conference Resolution ([40 C/Resolution 37](#)) and the Executive Board decision ([210 EX/Decision 35](#)), the intergovernmental meeting of the Special Committee of technical and legal experts nominated by Member States was held from 26 to 30 April and 21-25 June 2021 with the participation of around three hundred participants representing one hundred and two Member States and forty-nine observers, including two Non-Member States (The Holy See, the United States of America).

**Final Report by the Rapporteur of the Intergovernmental Meeting of Experts
(Category II) related to a Draft Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial
Intelligence (26 – 30 April and 21-25 June 2021)**

1. The intergovernmental meeting of the Special Committee of technical and legal experts nominated by Member States was held online from 26 to 30 April (First Session) and 21-25 June 2021 (Second Session), for the preparation of a Draft Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. It was convened by the Director-General of UNESCO, in accordance with the Resolution of the General Conference of UNESCO adopted at its 40th session ([40 C/Resolution 37](#)) and the decision of the Executive Board at its 210th session ([210 EX/Decision 35](#)). Around three hundred participants represented one hundred and two Member States, forty-nine observers, including two Non-Member States (The Holy See, the United States of America). The Netherlands and the State of Kuwait provided financial support for the First Session of the intergovernmental meeting, with Arabic interpretation supported by the Sultan Bin Abdulaziz Al Saud Foundation. Japan provided financial support for the Second Session of the intergovernmental meeting.
2. The work was based on a first draft of the Recommendation prepared by the Ad Hoc Expert Group (AHEG) appointed by the UNESCO Director-General in March 2020. The AHEG was composed of 24 independent experts, appointed on a geographical balance basis from all UNESCO regions. From March to May 2020 the AHEG conducted its work over a period of six weeks and produced a first version of the draft Recommendation. The AHEG then revised it based on a comprehensive global and regional multi-stakeholder consultation process that was conducted from June to August 2020, and the first draft of the Recommendation was transmitted to Member States in September 2020, requesting their comments and observations before 31 December 2020. Forty-eight Member States and two observers submitted their comments and observations, including concrete proposals on how to change the text, and the Secretariat devoted the months of January and February 2021 to addressing and integrating the comments. As a result, the final report and the attached draft text of the Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence have been prepared (SHS/IGM-AIETHICS/2021/APR/INF.1) and submitted to this intergovernmental meeting.
3. The draft text envisioned a Recommendation containing four values, ten principles and eleven policy areas as an ambitious yet policy-friendly blueprint to guide the development of AI technologies, providing an overarching ethical framework that includes existing human rights, while extending ethical reflection to new issues arising from AI technologies that have yet to be addressed in the current legal architecture.
4. The substance and results of the First Session of the Intergovernmental Meeting are outlined in the [Preliminary Report by the Rapporteur](#) (SHS/IGM-AIETHICS/2021/JUN/INF.5) (for the composition of the Bureau see also Annex I). Generally, most Member States expressed their strong support for the draft text, including its timeliness and historical importance as the first global ethical framework on AI. It was noted that UNESCO with its almost universal membership, longstanding experience in ethics of science and human rights-centric approach is the right forum for discussion of AI and its ethical issues. The global mandate of UNESCO was underlined as the strength for this instrument, and Member States highlighted the importance of ensuring that the Recommendation complements and does not duplicate existing instruments. Many States commended the inclusive and multi-stakeholder manner in which the draft text of the Recommendation was developed. It was noted that global collaboration and multi-stakeholder engagement were key in this area.

5. To advance discussions during the First Session, the Chairperson proposed to adopt a methodology, which was agreed on by all Member States, to discuss only amendments which are in line with the following criteria:

1. Of high importance for the countries;
2. Focusing on the substance of the Recommendation;
3. Preserving the effectiveness of this non-binding instrument;
4. Avoiding issues that were already debated or issues that might be addressed elsewhere in the text, as well as issues regarding specific language, style, or other details that are not related to the substance of the instrument.

6. Given that the First Session covered only a very small part of the Recommendation and the amount of work still ahead, and in line with the Resolution of the General Conference of UNESCO adopted at its 40th session ([40 C/Resolution 37](#)) requesting the Director-General to ensure a sufficient number of intergovernmental consultations for the elaboration of the instrument for the consideration by its 41st Session in November 2021, it was decided that Intersessional Consultations will be held to advance the work. The consultations sought to provide ample time for debate and to reach consensus on the parts of the draft text of the Recommendation that were not considered during the First Session. Given the amount of amendments, and the time that it took during the First Session, the Chairperson proposed a methodology to facilitate the negotiations that were widely supported by Member States. He called on open-ended working groups to deal with complex issues where members were divided.

7. The Intersessional Consultations followed the same methodology that was agreed upon during the First Session. This involved establishing an open-ended working group, led by the Chairperson of the intergovernmental meeting, supported by its Bureau and with balanced geographical representation of members. The outcomes of the Intersessional Consultations were shared with all Members States regularly. The consultations did not have decision-making capacity, which is the prerogative of the plenary, and Members States were always in control.

8. In preparation for the Intersessional Consultations, the draft text of the Recommendation (preamble and paragraphs 26 onwards) with amendments proposed during the First Session, aligned with the agreed upon criteria (outlined above) was circulated to Member States on 17 May. Member States were then invited to submit amendments which they felt were in line with the criteria but not already reflected in the document. Every additional amendment submitted by Member States in response to the 17 May correspondence was integrated into the document [SHS/IGM-AIETHICS/2021/INT-JUN/1]: Draft Text of the Recommendation with Proposed Amendments (Preamble & Paras 26-141), which was circulated on 31 May. This document was used to inform discussions during the Intersessional Consultations.

9. During the Intersessional Consultations which took place over 3 weeks, 12 days and more than 40 hours, Member States considered paragraph 26 to paragraph 134 (inclusive) of the draft text of the Recommendation. Over 300 amendments were received for these 108 paragraphs, and each of these amendments were discussed and addressed during the Consultations, with each country having the opportunity to explain the rationale behind their proposed amendments. Some paragraphs dealing with very complex issues resulted in lengthy debates over many hours. Nevertheless, the meeting was able to advance on a substantial portion of the draft text because many delegates showed flexibility, agreed to withdraw their amendments if they received no support, or did not insist on them during the debates.

10. In the First Session, a discussion emerged regarding paragraph 2, and the question of whether AI systems addressed in this document are technological systems or socio-technological systems. This paragraph was left bracketed, and during the Second Intergovernmental Session a consensus was reached by deleting the word “technical” and remaining with “AI systems” in order to cover the broadest range of systems, and not limit the Recommendation only to one type of AI systems.

11. Other paragraphs left bracketed in the First Session are 13 and 19, due to the list of grounds for non-discrimination. While a working group was formed regarding this issue in the First Session, its outcome was not approved in the plenary. During the Intersessional Consultations, Member States agreed to return to the list produced by the working group and approved it in paragraphs 28 and 74. This language was then adopted in paragraphs 13 and 19, and the list reads as follows: “regardless of race, colour, descent, gender, age, language, religion, political opinion, national origin, ethnic origin, social origin, economic or social condition of birth, or disability and any other grounds.”

12. Paragraph 14 also triggered significant discussions in the First Session and was left bracketed due to debate about the way harm to human beings and human communities was addressed. During the Second Intergovernmental Session, the text was approved as in its original form, and Member States highlighted the importance of using AI to enhance the quality of life of human beings.

13. During the discussion on paragraph 23 under the value of *Living in peaceful, just and interconnected societies*, one Member State (UK) requested to clarify the source on which the content of the paragraph was based. Paragraph 23 was inspired by the Ubuntu philosophy. In particular, Moeketsi Letseka directly translates it as “a human being is a human being because of other human beings”,¹ while Samuel Mbiti translates it as “I am, because we are; and since we are, therefore I am”.² In this regard, one cannot affirm one’s personhood or in fact the humanity of one’s being if one does not first acknowledge actively the humanity of others and everyone’s shared humanity. Further, Ramose writes that “[n]either the single individual nor the community can define and pursue their respective purposes without recognising their mutual boundedness; their complementarity”.³

14. Paragraph 25 regarding proportionality was also left bracketed in the First Session. However, Member States withdrew their amendments on it during the Second Intergovernmental Session, so it was approved as original.

15. An issue that triggered substantial discussions during the Intersessional Consultations was the classification of certain prerogatives as rights, with some Member States preferring to adhere to the list of rights defined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). A consensus was reached to remove the rights terminology when referring to access to information and being informed about algorithmic processing, while maintaining the recognition of privacy as a right. However, two Member States (UK and Singapore) requested to reflect that it would have been preferable to include the formulation as it appears in the UDHR: “No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence”. Similarly, during the Second Intergovernmental Meeting, Member States agreed to remove such terminology from the phrase ‘barriers of rights to information’ in PP22, and instead adopted the language of ‘barriers to access to information’.

¹ Letseka, M. (2012). In defence of Ubuntu.

² Mbiti, J. S. (1971). African traditional religions and philosophy. New York: Doubleday.

³ Ramose, M.B. (2009). Ecology through ubuntu. In Munyaradzi Felix Murove (ed.), African Ethics: An Anthology for Comparative and Applied Ethics. University of Kwazulu-Natal Press.

16. During the Intersessional Consultations Member States agreed on the need for a multi-stakeholder approach in establishing data protection frameworks and governance mechanisms (paragraph 33). In this regard, one Member State (Iran) requested for it to be reflected that their understanding of the multi-stakeholder approach stems from the WSIS Tunis Agenda for the Information Society, which was adopted in 2005. The said Member State (Iran) also wanted to add a reference to this agenda in PP16, however since this amendment was not submitted within the deadline, in line with the agreed upon methodology, the Chairperson could not put this amendment for discussion. In the same paragraph, one Member State (Iran) also wanted to remove the reference to the Internet Universality Indicators as there is no consensus on them, however Member States opposed and the said Member State (Iran) asked for their position to be reflected in the report.

17. When discussing the principle on transparency and explainability, Member States perceived it important to retain the following statement: “in cases of serious threats of adverse human rights impacts are foreseen, transparency may also require the sharing of code or datasets” (paragraph 39). In this regard, a Member State (Singapore) asked to clarify that without clear indications of who the code or datasets should be shared with, such a general requirement might infringe upon privacy and IP rights and compromise cybersecurity. One Member State (Iran) also requested to reflect their perspective that ‘States’, in addition to ‘People’, should be informed when a decision is being made on the basis of AI algorithms (paragraph 38), given their responsibilities for establishing security and stability at the national level.

18. During the Intersessional Consultations, Member States agreed to retain the phrase ‘whistle-blowers protection’ given that whistle-blowers could be identified as a threat in some countries. However, two Member States (Russia and Iran) requested to note their concern that there was no such distinction under their legislation, which would make this provision meaningless in the national context.

19. There was also a strong consensus among Member States during the Intersessional Consultations to retain the provision that ‘AI systems should not be given legal personality themselves’ (paragraph 68) to uphold the principle of human oversight and determination. In this regard, one Member State (Japan) commented that it is important not to close the door on discussions related to legal personality of AI, as there is no international consensus on such issues and they may be pertinent in the future.

20. Discussions also ensued during the Intersessional Consultations regarding whether resources for AI ethics education should be developed in local, indigenous or minority languages (paragraph 106). Eventually, the phrase ‘local languages, including indigenous languages’ was retained by consensus, with ‘minority languages’ believed to be encompassed within the term ‘local languages’. In this regard, one Member State (Russia) asked to reflect their concern that leaving out the term ‘minority languages’ may risk excluding language minorities and undermine their ability to access AI ethics education.

21. During the Second Session of the intergovernmental meeting the plenary approved, one by one, the majority of paragraphs as proposed by the Intersessional Consultations. This progress was made possible because of the methodology introduced by the Chairperson and approved by the Member States. It was also possible as the same participants in the formal Category II meeting were present at the Intersessional Consultations. Indeed, participation in the Intersessional Consultations was high, with 130 experts from 70 countries. The majority of participating countries presented also the majority of draft amendments. Each one of them were considered by the group, and the

Chairperson provided ample room for countries to present their arguments, and to find consensus positions. Nevertheless, given that the intersessional meetings had no decision-making capacity, the Chairperson respected the right of Member States to reopen the issues for discussion whenever such a request was made, and some did so.

22. During the Second Intergovernmental Session, one Member State (Iran) requested to add the term 'with extra-territorial impacts' after 'the private sector' in paragraph 61 to address private sector companies operating at international level. However, majority of Member States disagreed as this addition would limit the scope of the text and exclude other actors without extra-territorial impacts. Therefore, consensus was reached to reject this proposal, recognizing that such concerns have been covered elsewhere in the Recommendation, such as in paragraph 120, and the addition of 'extra-territorial impact' in paragraph 38 was approved.

23. Two Member States (Russia and Iran) requested to add a reference to domestic legislation in paragraph 75 during the Second Intergovernmental Session, as they believed that progress on open data has to be in line with national legislation. However, a large majority of Member States disagreed as the Recommendation is non-binding and it is understood that the legislation of each country will be respected. Furthermore, similar amendments had been discussed during the Intersessional Consultations and an understanding was reached not to weaken the text of the Recommendation. Therefore, the proposal was rejected by consensus. However, one Member State (Russia) requested to note their concern regarding this paragraph.

24. The issue of gender was discussed extensively during Intersessional Consultations, and Member States agreed to retain the emphasis on women and girls as they face particular difficulties in the field of AI, and because gender is one of UNESCO's two global priorities. During the Second Intergovernmental Session, one Member State (Russia) requested to reopen this issue as they were uncomfortable with the term 'gender diversity' in paragraph 92, proposing instead to use the term 'gender equality' or to add 'boys and men'. However, there was a strong consensus among Member States to retain the original language set out in paragraph 92. In this regard, the said Member State (Russia) requested to reflect their concern that gender diversity is not a concept that is recognized in all countries.

25. During the Second Intergovernmental Session, an observer, the International Association of University Professors and Lecturers, took the floor for paragraph 104 to express their views that in addition to encouraging research initiatives to address the use of AI technologies in education and teacher training, Member States should also directly support teachers through initiatives and empower them in the use of AI for learning.

26. One Member State (Russia) was concerned about the outcome of the Intersessional Consultations on the text on Ethical Impact Assessment (EIA) and readiness assessment methodology (paragraphs 49, 58, 131 and 132). However, since they requested to introduce new amendments, the Chairperson insisted on following the adopted methodology to reopen only the amendments that have already been submitted, and to reflect the concern in the report. Thus, the Member State (Russia) reserved their position, adding that both EIA and readiness assessment should be available 'upon request', that Ethical Impact Assessment is to be spelled in lower case (paragraph 49) and that the drafting of the Monitoring and Evaluation section (paragraphs 131 and 132) makes too much emphasis on evaluation, which is not for UNESCO to do, and such an extensive section is premature given the new character of the subject matter. Many Member States disagreed, arguing that UNESCO does carry out this kind of standard-setting, capacity-building, developing methods, etc. In addition, Member States highlighted that the term

“interested Member States” was added to paragraph 49 during the Intersessional Consultations, so that constitutes a sufficient clarification regarding the fact that UNESCO will work only with interested Member States. Moreover, the Secretariat was requested to take the floor and ADG/SHS clarified that UNESCO is here to support Member States in developing and making available practical tools and guidance for the implementation of the Recommendation. She underscored that they are part of the UNESCO mandate related to advancing better understanding of the issues at stake, capacity-building activities and developing concrete methodologies. She also underscored that UNESCO has a strong track record and many precedents of previous normative instruments, working with interested Member States to advance their full implementation.

27. One paragraph that was reopened during the Second Intergovernmental Session is paragraph 65. Two Member States (Iran and Russia) wanted to delete reference to the “precedence of human rights”, and one Member State (Russia) wanted to delete reference to “local customs and religious traditions”. Member States found that the balance that the original text struck between social diversity and human rights is very delicate and reflect a good compromise between different points of view. Eventually, the original text was accepted.

28. One Member State (Iran) proposed to refer to the Charter of the United Nations when mentioning international law in various paragraphs during the Intersessional Consultations. These proposals were rejected by consensus as majority of Member States believed that international law includes the UN Charter. However, upon strong request by the said Member States (Iran), a reference to the UN Charter had already been added in paragraph 9 following the First Session. During the Second Session, the said Member State (Iran) requested to reopen this issue in paragraph 141, believing that the UN Charter is extremely important and goes hand in hand with international law. However, the rest of the delegates believed that this was not the appropriate place for such a reference. Eventually, a consensus was reached to add a separate paragraph referring to the UN Charter after PP4 in the Preamble, which reads: “Guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations”.

29. A few Member States wished to add further references to ‘peace, security and stability’ in various paragraphs during the Intersessional Consultations. However, such proposals were rejected by the meeting as they have been sufficiently addressed in the Recommendation, particularly in paragraph 5 and under the value of *Living in peaceful, just and interconnected societies*. During the Second Intergovernmental Session, one Member State proposed to reopen this issue in PP2, believing it necessary to highlight the impacts of AI on peace, security and stability. However, majority of Member States felt that these issues were well-covered in PP3, which also mentions ‘peace and security’. Therefore, consensus was reached not to accept this proposal.

30. During the Intersessional Consultations, a few Member States proposed to add references to protect against unilateral coercive measures. However, majority of Member States disagreed as they concern issues of international law and security which fall beyond the mandate of UNESCO and this Recommendation, and hence consensus was reached to reject such proposals. During the Second Intergovernmental Session, one Member State (Iran) wished to reopen this issue and add similar references after paragraphs 80 and PP5, and in PP23 and PP24. Although few members supported these proposals, there was a strong convergence among Member States not to accept these additions. However, as a compromise, the term “including through multilateralism” was added to PP23. One Member State (Iran) requested to reflect their concern that a reference to unilateral coercive measures should be included in the Recommendation, because they negatively

affect the development and hinder cooperation in the field of AI for countries suffering from them.

31. A few references to the right to development, and development more in general were added to the preamble. Member States (notably Iran and others) have stated that an explicit mention of the right to development is very important in the context of AI, particularly for developing countries. This is especially because the right to development has been recognized as a human right, and because of the direct link between the impact of the technology on development. Debate between countries arose as for the appropriate place to add such reference, and as a compromise, a reference to development was added in PP4 and PP9, and Member States agreed to mention the Declaration on the Right to Development (1986) in PP16.

32. Some Member States were concerned about the relations between law and ethics and wished to make sure that ethical values and principles supplement existing law but do not replace or shape it (PP13). Particular worry was that human rights could be understood as not fit for purpose and ethics should supplant them. Many Member States disagreed stating that the proposed amendments completely changed the meaning of the paragraph and in the end the paragraph was drafted in a rather soft manner reflecting the importance of human rights law to inform actions, but also the contributions that ethics can make, particularly in a very dynamic technological context. The Chairperson of the AHEG Bureau took the floor explaining the intension behind the paragraph and assuring that there is no intention to replace law in any way and that ethical reflection can help in understanding the issues. Nevertheless, members insisted on a clear hierarchy, having the human rights law as the most important source, with the ethical values and principles providing guidance considering the fast pace of technological development.

33. Some Member States were concerned about the phrase 'harmonizing AI-related legal norms' in PP14, as there is no international mandate to harmonise legal norms relating to AI, and it may in fact be beneficial to have a variety of norms to allow for improvement. A few Member States also had issues with the relationship between ethical standards and international law, believing that ethical standards should be 'on the basis of' international law. Eventually, Member States reached a consensus to adopt the following language: 'ethical standards, in full respect of international law...can play a key role in developing AI-related norms'. In this regard, one Member State (Russia) requested to note their reservation for this paragraph as they felt that language referring to harmonising or developing AI-related norms is premature when international ethical standards have yet to be adopted.

34. As a general practice, Member States tried to avoid as much as possible long listings throughout the Recommendation, mainly because it is a very hard task to capture all elements, and create a comprehensive list without excluding any aspect. In addition, it has been noted that in some cases a certain list might lose its timeliness because of new developments that require adding more elements to the list or omitting existing ones. In this spirit, Member States decided to remove the listing of UN entities, international and regional organizations, that UNESCO will collaborate with in the Promotion of the Present Recommendation section (paragraphs 137-138). However, after requesting a clarification from the ADG/SHS, it was decided that it was important to retain UNESCO bodies with specific and relevant ethical mandate: the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology (COMEST), the International Bioethics Committee (IBC) and the Intergovernmental Bioethics Committee (IGBC) in paragraph 138. In addition, listing was also removed from PP17, 18 and 21, which in turn caused the full removal of those paragraphs. Member States acknowledged the importance of maintaining the list of

various documents that the experts based their work on and that existed at the time the Recommendation was produced. Hence, the listings from PP17, 18 and 21 were moved to the annex that can be found at the end of this report (Annex II). One Member State (Iran) asked to reflect in the report that the listings in PP17, 18 and 21 should be removed completely rather than moved to the annex, because there is no consensus on their content.

35. One Member State (Russia) proposed to add 'on a voluntary basis' in PP26 to underscore that this Recommendation is a non-binding document. While several Member States believed that this was already understood and implied, a consensus was reached to accept this proposal. In the same paragraph, some Member States pointed out that the use of the term 'constitutions' is not in line with language in other UNESCO documents, and that not all countries have a formal written constitution. Therefore, members agreed to instead use the phrase 'constitutional practice', as adopted in UNESCO's Rules of Procedure concerning recommendations to Member States. However, two Member States (Poland and Morocco) requested to reflect their concern that international law should comply with constitutions and not constitutional practices, which are different, though both terms could have been retained.

36. The last discussion was intensive in terms of balancing the strength of the language regarding the role of other stakeholders, in particular business enterprises, with regard to the Recommendation (PP27). The consensus formed around not weakening the text too much given the non-binding character of the Recommendation and taking into account that 'voluntary basis' of applying its provisions was added in the previous paragraph. One Member State (Russia) asked to reflect their reservation that the text even as amended would not address their concern related to the difficulties they may face to implement certain part parts of the Recommendation.

37. During the process and all the sessions, members were supported by the Assistant Director General of Social and Human Sciences and her team.

ANNEX I

**Composition of the Bureau of the Intergovernmental Meeting /
Composition du Bureau de la réunion intergouvernementale**

*Online, 26 – 30 April and 21 – 25 June 2021 /
En ligne, 26 – 30 avril et 21-25 juin 2021*

Chairperson / Président :

From the State of Kuwait / L'État du Koweït –
H.E. Mr Adam Al Mulla

Rapporteur :

From Namibia / Namibie –
Dr. Ms Immolatrix Linda Geingos

Vice-Chairpersons / Vice-Président(e)s :

From the Kingdom of Spain / Le Royaume d'Espagne –
Mr Alberto Merchante

From the Republic of Slovenia / La République de Slovénie –
H.E. Ms Meta Bole

From Mexico / Mexique –
Dr. Mr José Cruz Pineda Castillo

From Bangladesh / Bangladesh –
H.E. Mr Kazi Imtiaz Hossain

ANNEX II

Paragraphs moved from the Preamble upon the approval of the Intergovernmental Meeting on 24 June 2021

Noting the Report of the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises (A/HRC/17/31) of 2011, outlining the “Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: Implementing United Nations ‘Protect, Respect and Remedy’ Framework” (UNGP); the Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression (A/73/348) of 2018; the Report of the United Nations Secretary-General’s High-level Panel on Digital Cooperation on “The Age of Digital Interdependence” (2019), and the United Nations Secretary-General’s Roadmap for Digital Cooperation (2020); the Report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association (A/HRC/41/41) of 2019; the Reports of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (A/HRC/44/57 and A/75/590) of 2020; the United Nations Global Pulse initiative; and the outcomes and reports of the ITU’s AI for Good Global Summits,

Noting also existing frameworks related to the ethics of AI of other intergovernmental organizations, such as the relevant human rights and other legal instruments adopted by the Council of Europe, and the work of its Ad Hoc Committee on AI (CAHAI); the work of the European Union related to AI, and of the European Commission’s High-Level Expert Group on AI, including the Ethical Guidelines for Trustworthy AI; the work of OECD’s first Group of Experts (AIGO) and its successor the OECD Network of Experts on AI (ONE AI), the OECD’s Recommendation of the Council on AI and the OECD AI Policy Observatory (OECD.AI); the G20 AI Principles, drawn from the OECD’s Recommendation of the Council on AI, and outlined in the G20 Ministerial Statement on Trade and Digital Economy; the G7’s Charlevoix Common Vision for the Future of AI; the work of the Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence (GPAI); the work of the Freedom Online Coalition including its Joint Statement on AI and Human Rights; the work of the African Union’s Working Group on AI; and the work of the Arab League’s Working Group on AI,

Conscious as well of the many initiatives and frameworks related to the ethics of AI developed by the private sector, professional organizations, and non-governmental organizations and the scientific community, such as the IEEE’s Global Initiative on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent Systems and its work on Ethically Aligned Design; the World Economic Forum’s “Global Technology Governance: A Multistakeholder Approach”; the UNI Global Union’s “Top 10 Principles for Ethical Artificial Intelligence”; the Montreal Declaration for a Responsible Development of AI; the Toronto Declaration: Protecting the right to equality and non-discrimination in machine learning systems; and the Tenets of the Partnership on AI,