

COMMENTS OF THE ELECTRONIC PRIVACY INFORMATION CENTER (“EPIC”)

To the NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Request for Information on Update to the 2016 National Artificial Intelligence Research and
Development Strategic Plan (83 FR 48655)

October 26, 2018

By notice published September 26, 2018, the National Science Foundation (“NSF”) requested information from interested parties on the National Artificial Intelligence Research and Development Strategic Plan (“NAI Strategic Plan”), following a public petition from EPIC and leading scientific societies requesting the opportunity for public comment on national policies for AI.¹ EPIC submits these comments to encourage NSF to formally adopt the Universal Guidelines for Artificial Intelligence (“UGAI”) and to promote and enforce these Guidelines across funding, research and deployment of AI systems.

I. Introduction

EPIC is a public interest research center in Washington, D.C. EPIC was established in 1994 to focus public attention on emerging civil liberties issues and protect privacy, the First Amendment, and constitutional values.² In 2014, EPIC launched a campaign for “Algorithmic Transparency” and has subsequently worked with national and international organizations to improve accountability for AI systems.³ In May 2018, following a closed White House meeting on AI policy, EPIC and leading scientific societies called for public input on U.S. Artificial Intelligence Policy.⁴ As we reported at the time:

¹ National Science and Technology Council Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Subcommittee, *The National Artificial Intelligence Research and Development Strategic Plan*, (October 2016), https://www.nitrd.gov/pubs/national_ai_rd_strategic_plan.pdf.

² EPIC, *About EPIC* (2018), <https://epic.org/epic/about.html>.

³ EPIC, At OECD Global Forum, EPIC Urges “Algorithmic Transparency” (Oct. 3, 2014), <https://epic.org/2014/10/at-oecd-global-forum-epic-urge.html>; EPIC, At UNESCO, EPIC’s Rotenberg Argues for Algorithmic Transparency (Dec. 8, 2015), <https://epic.org/2015/12/at-unesco-epics-rotenberg-argu.html>; *See generally* Letter from EPIC to Senate Committee on the Commerce, Sci., and Trans. (Aug. 21, 2018), <https://epic.org/testimony/congress/EPIC-SCOM-OSTPnominee-Aug2018.pdf>; Letter from EPIC to House Comm. on Sci., Space, and Tech. (Jun. 25, 2018), <https://epic.org/testimony/congress/EPIC-HSC-AI-June2018.pdf>; EPIC, *Algorithmic Transparency* (2018), <https://www.epic.org/algorithmic-transparency/>; EPIC, *Algorithms in the Criminal Justice System* (2018), <https://www.epic.org/algorithmic-transparency/crim-justice/>; Comments of EPIC, *Consumer Welfare Implications Associated with the Use of Algorithmic Decision Tools, Artificial Intelligence, and Predictive Analytics*, Federal Trade Commission (Aug. 20, 2018), <https://epic.org/apa/comments/EPIC-FTC-Algorithmic-Transparency-Aug-20-2018.pdf>.

⁴ EPIC, *EPIC, Scientific Societies Call for Public Input on U.S. Artificial Intelligence Policy* (2018), <https://epic.org/2018/07/epic-scientific-societies-call.html/>.

In a petition to the Office of Science and Technology Policy, EPIC, leading scientific organizations, including AAAS, ACM and IEEE, and nearly 100 experts urged the White House to solicit public comments on artificial intelligence policy. The Open AI Policy petition follows a White House summit on "AI and American Industry" that was closed to the public and ignored issues such as privacy, accountability, and fairness. EPIC has filed a Freedom of Information Act request seeking records about the establishment of the Select Committee. In advance of a recent hearing on Artificial Intelligence, EPIC also told the House Science Committee that Congress must implement oversight mechanisms for the use of AI by federal agencies. In 2014, EPIC led a similar petition drive for a White House initiative on Big Data.⁵

On September 26, 2018, the National Science Foundation ("NSF") requested information on the NAI Strategic Plan.⁶ In October, over 250 organizations and experts, representing more than 30 countries and including the American Association for the Advancement of Science, endorsed the Universal Guidelines for Artificial Intelligence ("UGAI").⁷ The UGAI are intended to maximize the benefits of AI, to minimize the risk, and to ensure the protection of human rights.⁸ An Explanatory Memorandum provides interpretive guidance for the UGAI.⁹ The Universal Guidelines for AI are:

1. **Right to Transparency.** All individuals have the right to know the basis of an AI decision that concerns them. This includes access to the factors, the logic, and techniques that produced the outcome.
2. **Right to Human Determination.** All individuals have the right to a final determination made by a person.
3. **Identification Obligation.** The institution responsible for an AI system must be made known to the public.
4. **Fairness Obligation.** Institutions must ensure that AI systems do not reflect unfair bias or make impermissible discriminatory decisions.
5. **Assessment and Accountability Obligations.** An AI system should only be deployed after an adequate evaluation of its purpose and objectives, its benefits, as well as its risks. Institutions must be responsible for decisions made by an AI system.
6. **Accuracy, Reliability, and Validity Obligations.** Institutions must ensure the accuracy, reliability, and validity of decisions.
7. **Data Quality Obligation.** Institutions must establish data provenance, and assure quality and relevance for the data input into algorithms.
8. **Public Safety Obligation.** Institutions must assess the public safety risks that arise from the deployment of AI systems that direct or control physical devices, and implement safety controls.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *The National Artificial Intelligence Research and Development Strategic Plan.*

⁷ The Public Voice, *Universal Guidelines for Artificial Intelligence: Endorsement* (2018), <https://thepublicvoice.org/AI-universal-guidelines/endorsement/>

⁸ The Public Voice, *Universal Guidelines for Artificial Intelligence* (2018), <https://thepublicvoice.org/AI-universal-guidelines/>

⁹ The Public Voice, *Universal Guidelines for Artificial Intelligence Explanatory Memorandum and References* (2018), <https://thepublicvoice.org/ai-universal-guidelines/memo/>.

9. **Cybersecurity Obligation.** Institutions must secure AI systems against cybersecurity threats.
10. **Prohibition on Secret Profiling.** No institution shall establish or maintain a secret profiling system.
11. **Prohibition on Unitary Scoring.** No national government shall establish or maintain a general-purpose score on its citizens or residents.
12. **Termination Obligation.** An institution that has established an AI system has an affirmative obligation to terminate the system if human control of the system is no longer possible.

The Universal Guidelines for AI directly address the seven strategies set out in the NAI Strategic Plan.

II. Universal Guidelines for Artificial Intelligence

Strategy 3: Understand and address ethical, legal, and societal implications of AI

The twelve Guidelines call upon institutions funding AI, such as the NSF, to confront the ethical, legal, and societal implications of these systems. The NAI Strategic Plan recognized that AI poses risks to human rights, and that one risk is discrimination based on race, gender, age, or economic status. This risk persists; since 2016, AI systems have been found to perpetuate bias. AI used by law enforcement agencies and courts to perform “risk assessments” of individuals charged with crimes have raised substantial concerns about accuracy and fairness.¹⁰ One report found that the Correctional Offender Management Profiling for Alternative Sanctions (“COMPAS”), which scores people on their likelihood of committing crime, produced racially biased outcomes.¹¹ The report found that the algorithm overestimated the rate at which black defendants would reoffend, and it underestimated the rate at which white defendants would.¹² Another study found that COMPAS was “no better at predicting an individual’s risk of recidivism than random volunteers recruited from the internet.”¹³ AI perpetuates bias at the investigation stage of the criminal justice system, too: facial recognition software is employed by law enforcement agencies at all levels of government, but the technology frequently misidentifies nonwhite faces.¹⁴ These are not the only risks. “Modern data analysis produces significant outcomes that have real life consequences for people in employment, housing, credit, commerce, and criminal sentencing. Many of these

¹⁰ Madeline Carlisle, *The Bail-Reform Tool That Activists Want Abolished*, The Atlantic (Sept. 21, 2018), <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/09/the-bail-reform-tool-that-activists-want-abolished/570913/>; Joi Ito, *AI Isn’t a Crystal Ball, But It Might Be a Mirror*, Wired (May 9, 2018), <https://www.wired.com/story/ideas-ai-as-mirror-not-crystal-ball/>; *EPIC v. DOJ (Criminal Justice Algorithms)*, <https://epic.org/foia/doj/criminal-justice-algorithms/>

¹¹ Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, & Lauren Kirchner, *Machine Bias*, ProPublica (May 23, 2016), <https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing>.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ Ed Yong, *A Popular Algorithm Is No Better at Predicting Crimes Than Random People*, The Atlantic (Jan. 17, 2018), <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2018/01/equivant-compas-algorithm/550646/>.

¹⁴ Steve Lohr, *Facial Recognition Is Accurate, if You’re a White Guy*, N.Y. Times (Feb. 9, 2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/09/technology/facial-recognition-race-artificial-intelligence.html>; *EPIC Face Recognition*, <https://epic.org/privacy/facerecognition/>.

techniques are entirely opaque, leaving individuals unaware whether the decisions were accurate, fair, or even about them.”¹⁵

The UGAI speaks to these risks. The **fairness obligation (UGAI-4)** states that institutions must ensure that AI systems do not reflect unfair bias or make impermissible discriminatory decisions. The fairness obligation recognizes that all automated systems make decisions that reflect bias, but such decisions should not be normatively unfair or impermissible. There is no simple answer to the question on what is unfair or impermissible. The evaluation often depends on context, but the fairness obligation makes clear that an assessment of objective outcomes alone is not sufficient to evaluate a system. Normative consequences must be assessed, including those that preexist or may be amplified by an AI system.¹⁶

Strategy 1: Make long-term investments in AI research

NSF’s long-term investment priorities should recognize that there are challenges and limits to AI as outlined in the UGAI. Investing in research and development on the ethical, legal, and social implication of AI that reflect the UGAI framework will further the stated goal to “understand theoretical capabilities and limitations of AI.” Further, by investing in AI systems that strive to meet the UGAI principles, NSF can promote the development of systems that are accurate, transparent, and accountable from the outset. Ethically developed, implemented, and maintained AI systems can and should cost more than systems that are not, and therefore merit investment and research.¹⁷

Strategy 2: Develop effective methods for human-AI collaboration

The 2016 Strategic Plan says that the balance between a human and AI performing a function in a system can usually be categorized one of three ways: AI performs function alongside human; AI performs function when human encounters high cognitive overload; or AI performs function in lieu of human.¹⁸ Regardless of the division of labor between humans and machines in the execution of a task, individuals, not machines, are responsible for the consequences of automated processes. The UGAI’s second principle on the **right to human determination (UGAI-2)** reflects this requirement. The principle states that all individuals have a right to a final determination made by a person, rather than an automated system. This principle ensures that humans remain accountable for AI outcomes. Further, a right to human determination provides a form of redress to individuals impacted by an automated decision. Mistakes in final outcomes of automated processes can affect individuals significantly. For example, an incorrect piece of information traded between data brokers can affect a person’s ability to get a job, receive credit, or obtain affordable health insurance.¹⁹ Automated processes cannot be reviewed at every stage, but where an automated system fails, this principle should be understood as a requirement that a

¹⁵ UGAI.

¹⁶ UGAI Explanatory Memo.

¹⁷ dana boyd, *Beyond the Rhetoric of Algorithmic Solutionism*, Data & Society (Jan. 11, 2018), <https://points.datasociety.net/beyond-the-rhetoric-of-algorithmic-solutionism-8e0f9cdada53>.

¹⁸ *National Artificial Intelligence Research and Development Strategic Plan* at 22.

¹⁹ Frank Pasquale, *Our lives in a scored society*, Le Monde (May 2018), <https://mondediplo.com/2018/05/05data>.

human assessment of the outcome be made. Ultimately, maintaining human review and authority over AI systems preserves accountability and dignity.²⁰

Strategy 4: Ensure the safety and security of AI systems

The use of autonomous systems, such as vehicles, weapons, and decision-making systems that assist with navigation, health diagnosis, employment and credit decisions, and criminal identification and sentencing, inherently raises questions about public safety and security. The UGAI indicates four key obligations for AI systems salient in ensuring safety and security: **obligations of accountability (UGAI-5), public safety (UGAI-8), cybersecurity (UGAI-9), and termination (UGAI-12).**

Accountability (UGAI-5): The obligation to assess and be accountable for AI systems speaks to the ongoing need for assessment of the risks during the design, development, and implementation of systems. Developing standard risk analysis tools for AI systems must include assessment of risks at individual, institutional, and societal levels, and defined context-specific benchmarks to indicate when a system is ready for deployment, and has evolved (or not, when societal norms have evolved) and no longer yields an acceptable benefit-cost ratio. It's essential that investments in ethics and social science research help us to address unknown questions about issues of responsibility and culpability. The institution, the designers, and the operators of AI systems retain responsibility for the consequences of AI systems.

Public Safety (UGAI-8): Safety and security are fundamental concerns of autonomous systems – including autonomous vehicles, weapons, and device control – and risk minimization is a core element of design. Less certain, however, is how to determine and set standards for levels of autonomy across broad applications, and understanding levels of autonomy (and the correlate level of human control) is an interdisciplinary research challenge. The UGAI underscores the obligation of institutions to assess public safety risks that arise from the deployment of AI systems, and implement safety controls.

Cybersecurity (UGAI-9): Institutions must secure AI systems against cybersecurity threats, particularly in the case of systems that act autonomously, such as autonomous weapons and vehicles, but also in the case of technologies that interface with or are embedded within humans. Even well-designed systems are vulnerable to hostile actors, and minimization and active management of such risks is a critical obligation.

Termination (UGAI-12): In addition, the final principle in the UGAI states that institutions that have established an AI system have an obligation to terminate the system if human control of the system is no longer possible. This ultimate statement of accountability addresses not only autonomous systems, but also decision-making or decision-support systems that have been assessed. It is essential to ensure the safety and security of people, and research strategies need to address the development of assessment tools to determine loss of autonomy, alongside understanding the underlying question of what level of autonomy is appropriate for specific applications and contexts.

²⁰ Woodrow Hartzog, *On Questioning Automation*, 48 Cumb. L. Rev. 1, 4 (2017).

Strategy 5: Develop shared public datasets and environments for AI training and testing

Good data is the foundation of fair, reliable, and valid AI systems. However, developing datasets that are shared publicly carries privacy risks for the individuals about whom the data concerns, and security risks when the data are shared widely. Techniques should be developed to make effective use of deidentified data. Also critical to successful AI development is a careful consideration of the AI testing environment. The UGAI provides four key principles for AI systems salient to the strategy of developing shared public datasets and AI training and testing environments: the **right to transparency (UGAI-1)** and **obligations of fairness (UGAI-4)**, **accuracy (UGAI-6)**, and **data quality (UGAI-7)**.

Transparency (UGAI-1): All individuals have the right to know the basis of an AI decision that concerns them. This includes access to the data, factors, logic, techniques, and human agents that produced the outcome. This principle of transparency, foundational in most modern privacy law,²¹ is grounded in the right of the individual to know the basis of an adverse determination. The obligation of transparency also serves the collective public, not only individuals who express specific harm. Assessment results should be made public to allow an opportunity for unknown biases to be made identified.

Fairness (UGAI-4): Because the use of algorithms for automated decision-making about individuals can cause harmful discrimination, institutions have an obligation to ensure that AI systems do not reflect unfair bias or make impermissible discriminatory decisions. All automated systems make decisions that reflect bias and discrimination, but such decisions should not be normatively unfair, where norms are specific to the context and application. While AI designers suggest AI systems can be modeled to detect and reduce human bias and discrimination, research demonstrates that unless modeled with valid and accurate datasets, AI systems can perpetuate human bias, more perniciously because designers and users falsely assume that AI-based decisions are better and more accurate.²²

Accuracy, Reliability, and Validity (UGAI-6): Institutions have the obligation to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and validity of AI systems. The validation and testing of AI systems requires rigorous methods to validate models and routine performance of assessments to ensure the outcomes do not generate discriminatory harm.²³ System validation must also be performed when AI systems and applications are deployed in new environmental contexts. Here, if population differences are large, learned system behaviors will reflect the norms (and biases) of the population data used during the initial training of the model. If performance does not meet expectations of the new context, systems may need to be recalibrated on new datasets, or an argument made for terminating the model or system.

Data Quality (UGAI-7): Institutions also have an obligation to establish data provenance, and assure quality and relevance for the data used to generate and refine models, algorithms, and

²¹ Fair Credit Reporting Act (1970), Privacy Act (1974).

²² Solon Barocas & Andrew D. Selbst, *Big Data's Disparate Impact*, 104 A. D. Calif. Law Rev. 671 (2016).

²³ Association for Computing Machinery, U.S. Public Policy Council, Statement on Algorithmic Transparency and Accountability (2017) -- https://www.acm.org/binaries/content/assets/public-policy/2017_usacm_statement_algorithms.pdf

autonomous technologies. Establishing data provenance and documenting the data, models, and algorithms used in the design of decision-making systems helps to ensure an institution is auditable, transparent, and can be held responsible for decisions made by an algorithm.

Strategy 6: Measure and evaluate AI technologies through standards and benchmarks

Standards and benchmarks must be incorporated into every phase of the design, development and implementation of AI systems to minimize harms while maximizing the benefits and opportunities of AI. The UGAI indicates four key principles for AI systems salient to measurement and evaluation of AI systems: **obligations of fairness (UGAI-4), accountability (UGAI-5), accuracy (UGAI-6), and data quality (UGAI-7).**

Fairness (UGAI-4): Institutions have an obligation to ensure that AI systems do not reflect unfair bias or make impermissible discriminatory decisions. All automated systems make decisions that reflect bias and discrimination, but such decisions should not be normatively unfair. Second, assessment of objective outcomes alone is not sufficient in evaluation of systems. Normative consequences must be assessed, including those that preexist or may be amplified by an AI system. For example, gender biases in hiring practices in the technology industry were perpetuated in algorithms used by Amazon, and algorithms used by court judges to determine the risk of reoffending were almost twice as likely to falsely label black defendants as high risk compared to white defendants.²⁴ Biases can disproportionately affect already marginalized populations.²⁵

Assessment and Accountability (UGAI-5): Assessment determines whether an AI system should be established. AI systems should be deployed only after an adequate assessment of its purpose, objectives, risks, and benefits. Imperatively, such assessments must include a review of individual, societal, economic, political, and technological impacts, and a determination can be made that risks have been minimized and will be managed. Individual level risk assessments might include a privacy impact assessment; societal level risk assessments might involve public health or economic impact assessments. If an assessment reveals substantial risks, especially to public safety and cybersecurity, then the project should not move forward. Accountability for the outcomes and consequences of AI systems lies with the institutions.

Accuracy, Reliability, and Validity (UGAI-6): Institutions have the obligation to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and validity of AI systems. Benchmarks should be developed against which these standards can be measured. For example, standards should demonstrate that the AI system has been tested for reliability and external validity (i.e., is valid within the population and application context in which it will be deployed). If developed using value-sensitive design,²⁶ and trained on datasets that are appropriate for a specific user population, AI algorithms and technologies embedded within those contexts will reflect its values, and perform reliably. For example, systems modeled on a dataset of young adults from the United States is likely not to have

²⁴ Julia Angwin, Jeff Larson, Surya Mattu, & Lauren Kirchner (2016). Machine Bias. ProPublica. [go.nature.com/29aznyw](https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-courts)

²⁵ Solon Barocas & Andrew D. Selbst, *Big Data's Disparate Impact*, 104 A. D. Calif. Law Rev. 671 (2016).

²⁶ Batya Friedman & Helen Nissenbaum, *Bias in Computer Systems*, 14 ACM Transactions on Information Systems 330 (1996).

validity if deployed in a population of aging seniors in Africa because of demographic, cultural, and biological differences.

Data Quality (UGAI-7): Institutions also have an obligation to establish data provenance, and assure quality and relevance for the data used to generate and refine models, algorithms, and autonomous technologies. Provenance includes a description of data collection and inclusion criteria. In addition, an understanding of the social and political history of the data on which AI systems are designed and trained is essential for evaluating the quality of the dataset.²⁷ For example, the algorithm used by Amazon for employee screening practices revealed the inclusion of factors predictive of successful male prospects, rather than female prospects, because the data used were based upon successful past employees, who were predominantly male.²⁸ Similarly, algorithm-generated ‘heat maps’ used in Chicago to identify people most likely to be involved in a shooting, were shown to increase the likelihood that certain populations will be targeted by the police, but do not reduce crime.²⁹

Strategy 7: Better understand the national AI R&D workforce needs

Many will comment on how to address shifting workforce needs when AI technologies change the nature of work. While there are important concerns about AI developments replacing human skill and labor in the workforce, there are other concerns about how AI technologies are integrated with, support, or otherwise supplant human labor and resources. Our comments here address implications for human resource management when AI technologies are adopted to support and augment human decision-making and labor. This includes implications for human resource management in terms of workforce recruitment, hiring, performance evaluation, and compensation. The UGAI indicates four (or five) key principles for AI systems that are salient to workforce need strategies: the **right to transparency (UGAI-1)** and **human determination (UGAI-2)**, and **obligations of fairness (UGAI-4)**, and **termination (UGAI-12)**.

Transparency: The **right to transparency**, grounded in the right of the individual to know the basis of an adverse determination, states that all individuals have the right to know the basis of an AI-based decision that concerns them. In the context of employment and human resources, algorithmic decision-making can be used to direct and influence performance evaluation and termination decisions, with compensation and job loss consequences. With such significant economic consequences of AI-based management, employees must be given sufficient due process to understand how decisions were generated.³⁰

Human Determination: Related to this is the **right to human determination** made by a person. As noted in strategy 2, this principle states that all individuals have a right to a final determination

²⁷ Kate Crawford & Ryan Calo, *There is a blind spot in AI research*, Nature (Oct. 13, 2016), <https://www.nature.com/news/there-is-a-blind-spot-in-ai-research-1.20805>.

²⁸ Jeffrey Dastin, *Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women*, Reuters (Oct. 9, 2018), <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight/amazon-scraps-secret-ai-recruiting-tool-that-showed-bias-against-women-idUSKCN1MK08G>.

²⁹ Jessica Saunders, Priscilla Hunt & John S. Hollywood, *Predictions Put Into Practice: A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of Chicago's Predictive Policing Pilot*, 12 J. S. J. Exp. Criminol. 347 (2016).

³⁰ Kate Crawford, et al. *The AI Now Report: The Social and Economic Implications of Artificial Intelligence Technologies in the Near-Term* (2016); available at <https://artificialintelligencenow.com>

made by a person, rather than an automated system. This right ensures human accountability for all machine-driven processes, and a form of redress to individuals who have been impacted by an automated decision. For example, the use of algorithms to assess teacher performance in public schools has come under criticism for its statistically flawed use of metrics³¹, narrowly chosen factors, and failure to successfully predict performance success beyond random chance.³²

Fairness: We have previously discussed the principle of fairness in strategies 3, 5, and 6, and the obligation of institutions to ensure that AI systems do not reflect unfair bias or make impermissible discriminatory decisions. In the context of human resources, this obligation guides many decisions including employee recruitment, screening, hiring, compensation, performance evaluation, and termination. In each of these processes, opportunities for bias, both human and algorithmic, should be carefully monitored and corrected. For example, the case of Amazon, whose recruitment algorithm was demonstrated to be biased against female candidates³³, illustrates not only problems with the design and training of algorithms, but also the consequences of such algorithmic failures. Because Amazon is not the only company employing algorithms that contain known biases against women or other marginalized populations^{34 35}, this is a societal issue with significant consequences for workforce equity. Institutions must be held accountable for such decisions and their consequences. Lack of fairness in algorithms has also served to reinforce gender gaps in compensation. Uber used an algorithm that offered new hires to the company less pay (in exchange for more stock, which is devalued), generating inequity in compensation among employees with similar roles, and disproportionately punishing women.³⁶

Termination: The final principle in the UGAI states that institutions have an obligation to terminate established AI systems if human control of the system is no longer possible. In the context of human resources, this obligation applies to decision-making systems that have been assessed and found to be unfair, invalid, or discriminatory. Continuing to employ systems with known errors has significant equity implications, with broad societal consequences.³⁷ Algorithmic design errors affect not only specific individuals (who are not hired, not compensated well, or terminated unfairly), but also our society, when technology designs don't reflect both genders, student learning suffers, or when economic equality and full participation in our society is

³¹ Cathy O'Neil, *Here's How Not to Improve Public Schools*, Bloomberg Opinion (June 27, 2018), <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2018-06-27/here-s-how-not-to-improve-public-schools>.

³² Stecher, B.M., Holtzman, D.J., Garet, M.S., Hamilton, L.S., Engberg, J., Steiner, E.D., Robyn, A., Baird, M.D., Gutierrez, I.A., Peet, E.D., Brodziak de los Reyes, I., Fronberg, K., Weinberger, G., Hunter, G.P., & Chambers, J. (2018). *Improving Teaching Effectiveness: Final Report (The Intensive Partnerships for Effective Teaching Through 2015–2016)*. RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2242.html

³³ Jeffrey Dastin, *Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women*, Reuters (Oct. 9, 2018), <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight/amazon-scraps-secret-ai-recruiting-tool-that-showed-bias-against-women-idUSKCN1MK08G>.

³⁴ Dave Gershgorn, *Companies are on the hook if their hiring algorithms are biased*, Quartz (Oct. 22, 2018), <https://qz.com/1427621/companies-are-on-the-hook-if-their-hiring-algorithms-are-biased/>.

³⁵ Cathy O'Neil, *Amazon's Gender-Biased Algorithm Is Not Alone*, Bloomberg Opinion (Oct. 16, 2018), <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2018-10-16/amazon-s-gender-biased-algorithm-is-not-alone>.

³⁶ Anita Balakrishnan, *Uber reportedly used an algorithm to pay new hires less — reinforcing a gender pay gap*, CNBC (June 7, 2017), <https://www.cnbc.com/2017/06/07/uber-used-stock-based-comp-algorithm-paying-women-less-report.html>.

³⁷ Cathy O'Neil, *How can we stop algorithms telling lies?*, The Guardian (July 16, 2017), <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2017/jul/16/how-can-we-stop-algorithms-telling-lies>.

unequally available to certain populations. Such circumstances call for a termination of the algorithm or system in use.

I. Conclusion

Strategies for research and development in artificial intelligence should be guided by foundational principles. The Universal Guidelines for AI, now endorsed by over 200 experts and 50 NGOs, set out 12 core principles to maximize the benefits of AI, to minimize the risk, and to ensure the protection of human rights.

We urge the NSF to incorporate the Universal Guidelines in the NAI Strategic Plan.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Marc Rotenberg

Marc Rotenberg
EPIC President and Executive Director

/s/ Lorraine Kisselburgh

Lorraine Kisselburgh, PhD
EPIC 2018 Scholar in Residence

/s/ Haley Hinkle

Haley Hinkle
EPIC Fall Clerk