Grant Thornton

The role of government in regulating AI

Transcript

00:06 - 01:50
BRIAN JOHNSON:
We're tracking states that are trying to regulate AI. It's in the next, you know, probably 18 months that we're going to see a lot more activity on the state level. That's typically where policy incubates is on the state level. So that's, you know, I think you're going to see that start first. But you know, it'd be great if you had government acting to convene stakeholders and to talk this out.

And we're trying to do it in Massachusetts. The governor has announced an AI Council, and AI specifically, you know, AI for X, I think is what they call it, and it's a cross-disciplinary, cross-industry panel. A lot of CEOs on it. So I mean, I think, you know, let's hope that we get some good stuff out of that.

But you know, it's a real issue because, I mean, one of the things that you said that I want to kind of just jump back to really quick is that there are inherent biases in data right now and it is borne out in health equity and everything we look at in health equity. There (are) differences in care depending on your race and your gender. And my concern is if we don't bring these questions out, don't have these hard discussions, you know, that we're just going to basically, you know, solidify prejudice in the data. We're going to take this bad, corrupted data that's already leading to unequal outcomes, and we're going to back it with something that has people give a lot of credence and credibility to.

So, you know, I think government's role here is to convene and to listen. No, not always their best thing they do, but.

01:50 - 01:52
MATTHEW SAMPLE:
They do that?

01:52 - 02:04
BRIAN JOHNSON:
They do. And sometimes those things do create policy. But you know, as we're building these stakeholder groups, we got to get as many people to the table as possible.

02:04 - 03:09
MATTHEW SAMPLE:
I think there's a there's a common — there's like a strange sort of, gap in in modern culture, which is if you're passing a new law or you're doing a large infrastructural project like the Big Dig or something, you have lots of public hearings. And they're typically very entertaining/frustrating, depending on your perspective, because people show up and everybody has an opinion about — how they have a right to say, how this is going to affect their life and how they want it to be shaped.

But when it comes to the digital, somehow that — it gets a pass. So we can do, we can make massive changes to people's lives digitally, and there's not really a forum or expectation that they get a say in, you know, "I actually don't want this to be part of my life" or "I do want it, but I want it to be explainable in this way, or I want to have control opt-in or opt-out abilities, these types of types of things.

So, I think the conversation you're calling for is really it's in the general spirit of, of modern democracies. It's just we've we sort of lost track of that in the digital realm. I'm

not sure why that's a longer conversation. I think.

03:10 - 4:01

SAHIR ALI:

Well, one other thing I'll add to the governance question is that the nature of these sorts of technologies, like AI now, they're moving faster than typically most technologies we've seen. In fact, even if you look at the trajectory of the sequencing technologies, just 20 years ago where we finished, roughly 20 years ago, where we had the Human Genome (Project), and it took $3 billion and 11, 12 countries, and the scale has significantly shifted. In 2010, we could now, do similar stuff for $100,000 and then $10,000.

Now, I think Ultimate Genomics announced that you can do a whole life of sequence for 100 bucks, right? So that that that scale has — is significantly faster than what we have seen. What typically we described technology moving at Moore's Law. This is faster than that.