



AI ETHICS ADVISORY PANEL

Wednesday, 19th April 2023, 09:00 - 11:00 hrs (GMT)

READOUT and ACTIONS

Attendees:

- **Professor Nick Colosimo**, Global Engineering Fellow & Technologist, BAE systems and Visiting Professor, Cranfield University (Centre for Autonomous & Cyber-Physical Systems)
- **Dr Darrell Jaya-Ratnam**, Managing Director, DIEM Analytics
- **Richard Moyes**, Managing Director and co-founder, Article 36
- **Professor Mariarosaria Taddeo**, Associate Professor and Senior Research Fellow, Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford; Dstl Ethics Fellow, Alan Turing Institute
- **Professor David Whetham**, Professor of Ethics and the Military Profession, Kings College London
- **Professor Peter Lee**, Professor of Applied Ethics, University of Portsmouth
- **Damian Parmenter**, DG DelStrat – EAP Chair
- **Maj Gen Buczacki**, SPO MilStrat GE-ACDS (attending in place of Lt Gen Charles Walker, SPO DCDS-MSO).
- **Lt Gen Tom Copinger-Symes**, UKStratCom-DComd
- **Gareth Martin**, Director National Security (attending in place for Paul Wyatt, SPO DGSecPol-DG)
- **AVM David Arthurton**, Director Strategy and Military Digitisation
- **Dr Chris Moore-Bick**, DST Policy
- [REDACTED], MODLA
- [REDACTED] DST, DAU
- [REDACTED] DST, DAU

Absent:

- **Tabitha Goldstaub**, Founder of CognitionX and chair of the AI Council. [REDACTED]
- **Professor Gopal Ramchurn**, Director, UKRI Trustworthy Autonomous Systems Hub and the University of Southampton
- **Dr Merel Ekelhof**, Foreign Exchange Officer at the US DoD Joint AI Centre and former Lead Researcher on AI and Autonomy at UNIDIR, attending the panel in her personal capacity
- **MOD CSA**
- **Lt Gen Charles Walker**, SPO DCDS-MSO (represented by Maj Gen Buczacki)
- **Paul Wyatt**, SPO DGSecPol-DG (represented by Gareth Martin)

1	<p>Welcome and Introduction from the Chair</p> <p>Damien Parmenter (Chair) welcomed the panel to its fifth meeting, highlighting that the strategic implementation of AI was one of the Secretary of State’s biggest priorities, especially considering how digital technologies have been used effectively in Ukraine. Given that Defence uses force on behalf of the government, which incurs the risk of life, in order to protect our people, it was imperative that the department understands what we procure and how we use AI-enabled capabilities.</p> <p>With digital deterrence being an area of rising importance, the chair emphasised that the panel’s advice was crucial in informing this understanding and highlighting areas of concern to give Defence the necessary focus on taking AI forward responsibly and effectively.</p>
2	<p>Reflections on the Responsible Use of AI in the Military Domain Summit (REAIM)</p> <p>AVM David Arthurton presented a summary and reflection of the REAIM Summit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• REAIM was a flagship event for the Dutch government aiming to raise the topic of responsible military AI up the political agenda and mobilise stakeholders across government (with approx. 80 nations being represented), industry, civil society and academia to commit to concrete next steps.• The UK delegation also included Stephen Lillie (FCDO), with the objective to position the UK as a thoughtful, leading voice. We hosted a workshop on the UK’s approach to AI in Defence, based on our Ambitious, Safe and Responsible (ASR) AI ethics principles which had excellent in-person attendance (60 people, the room was at capacity) and resulted in an engaged debate.• A Dutch-led REAIM Summit Declaration and a US-led declaration on AI ‘rules of the road’ were launched during the REAIM Summit. [REDACTED] <p>[REDACTED]</p>

- [REDACTED]. With AI developments accelerating at a fast pace, we are considering demonstrating our 'one year on' progress, to further showcase UK thought leadership in this space.

In discussion, the following points were made:

- There was no specific NATO event hosted at the summit, but it was noted that, separately to REAIM, NATO has published its AI strategy and principles (with MOD ASR principles going further), as well as establishing the NATO Data and AI Review Board (DARB) which MOD representatives attend. The DARB is in the process of setting up AI subgroups.

[REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] but that the individual panels and workshops were interesting and useful.
- **Professor Mariarosaria Taddeo** noted that Spanish and Italian articles reported on the UK's approach.
- **Professor Peter Lee** commented that having a technical expert on his panel added a lot of depth to the discussion.

[REDACTED]

- **Damien Parmenter (Chair)** concluded that substantive language should be included in the Defence strategy, emphasising that the UK wants to be a thought leader in this space.

3 Implementing AI Ethics principles across Defence

Dr Chris Moore-Bick presented the draft [REDACTED] noting that this emerging policy development under ASR was characterising an idealised end state and asked panel members to provide comments with this in mind, highlighting that the draft paper will be iterated based on feedback received.

In summary:

[REDACTED]

[Redacted text]

4 Presentation on Methodology for Interpreting AI Ethics Principles

Professor Mariarosaria Taddeo presented the research on the [Redacted]:

- This research has been commissioned by Dstl and provides the conceptual approach and evidence needed to underpin the MOD's policy making.
- A plethora of AI Ethics principles exist, with a huge number of organisations creating their own, the challenge being that the principles are so high level that their application becomes difficult without meaningful guidance.

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]

[Redacted]

5 **Discussion of the presentations**

In the discussion, the following points were made:

Dr Darrell Jaya-Ratnam noted that with some AI-enabled capabilities that are being exercised across the MOD, we were moving beyond the hypothetical and highlighted the importance of grounding principles in practical examples.

On the positive side, the military already has good processes in place for using new technology and systems safely and ethically. However, even a system that is meeting the right safety requirements could still be used unethically – are the assurance requirements missing here?

Dr Jaya-Ratnam endorsed Prof Taddeo’s approach in

He also highlighted the

Professor Nick Colosimo

Richard Moyes recognised the amount of complexity and the challenge of capturing this as a panel, noting that there was not yet a distinct sense of a clear direction going forward, but that concrete case studies could help with refining the methodology.

Professor Peter Lee [REDACTED]

If the panel was to write an annual report, it would be beneficial for this to include challenging voices which highlight the independence of the panel. This might look less uniform but would be more credible. He stressed that panel members' independence had to be preserved and that they shouldn't be held accountable for the department's actions.

The Chair agreed and supported the role of panel acting as an independent, critical friend.

Professor Mariarosaria Taddeo [REDACTED]

Lt Gen Tom Copinger-Symes [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] added that from the perspective of a naturalist lawyer, International Humanitarian Law already incorporated ethics elements in its principles. A discursive ethics board might consider what might be done in policy terms.

Dr Chris Moore-Bick [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and added that the DAU will look at iterating the paper on the basis of feedback received. This needed to be done with a clear sense of where we needed to get to by the end of this year.

6 Actions and Closing Remarks

Dr Chris Moore-Bick invited the panel to feed back further thoughts on the [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and provide a report back to the EAP outlining findings and recommendations to strengthen our approach.

ACTION: Panel members to send any other feedback on the draft [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] the DAU.

The next panel meeting will be held in the Summer.