Who Governs Artificial Intelligence: The Role of the Private Sector, Government, and Ethical Oversight

Yasser El Batal

Silk Road International University of Tourism and Cultural Heritage Department of International Business Management

*****Corresponding author:** Yasser El Batal, Silk Road International University of Tourism and Cultural Heritage Department of International Business Management, Egypt.

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become a cornerstone of global innovation, transforming industries and reshaping public life. With its growing influence, critical questions arise regarding who governs and controls its development, especially from an ethical standpoint. This paper examines the complex interplay between the private and public sectors in managing AI, highlights the ethical challenges that emerge from their collaboration and competition, identifies existing governance gaps, and proposes actionable strategies to foster a balanced and responsible AI ecosystem. Drawing on real world case studies and emphasizing the importance of international cooperation and consumer participation, this study offers a comprehensive perspective on the evolving landscape of AI ethics and governance.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), AI Ethics, Private Sector, Government Regulation, AI Governance, International Collaboration

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is regarded as one of the most transformable technologies in the 21st century. The government and private sector are investing substantial sums of money into AI to serve humanity in better ways, reducing costs, and increasing overall economic activity. Due to the rapid execution of AI systems, however, ethical dilemmas have arisen and include algorithmic bias, a lack of transparency, privacy violations, and accountability. These issues have led to a worldwide debate on whether AI should be governed by the innovation-driven private sector or a regulatory-focused government? This paper studies activities done by both the above entities, evaluates current governance models, and provides a pathway toward an inclusive, transparent, and accountable AI future.

2. Private Sector Dominance in AI Development
2.1 Investment and Innovation

Today the private sector dominates in AI research, development, and commercialization. Major technology companies such as Google, Microsoft, Amazon, and Baidu spearhead AI innovation, sinking billions every year into research on natural language processing, machine learning, computer vision, and robotics.

Their offerings range from virtual assistants such as Siri and Cortana to technology for recommendation engines, predictive analytics, and autonomous systems.

This combination of developing state-of-the-art AI models and applying them to any programmed scope, be it consumer-facing through ChatGPT or large-scale AI-based supply chain optimization and customer-service automation, really sets them apart.

2.2 Economic Impact

According to the UK Department for Science, Innovation & Technology, over 3,000 AI companies operate in the United Kingdom, creating revenues in excess of £10 billion and livelihoods for over 60,000 individuals. These effects are global, and McKinsey foresees that AI could add three times more to the economic growth before 2030 compared with the coming five years, following an S-curve adoption model whereby early adopters gain big-time advantage.

But very concerning are the implications that come from the private sector leading AI, such as being able to control data; the

decision-making power going into private hands; availability of profit versus public interest.

3. Ethical Concerns in Private Sector AI Use

To compete in an increasingly open market, most private sector companies emphasize the importance of efficiency of operations and competitive performance at the expense of fairness, transparency, and access. The following are critical ethical issues related to:

- **Algorithmic Harm:** Such systems constructed by private vendors have been found to contain racial and gender biases by generating wrongful arrests and discrimination 8.
- **Lack of Transparency:** Many AI-driven decisions made regarding hiring, lending, and criminal justice lack any explanation, neither of which could help users contest outcomes.
- **Data Misuse:** Companies have amassed large amounts of personal data and concerns surrounding problems with consent, surveillance, and commercial use of this data.

Countrywide internal AI ethics guidelines were adopted in some firms, introducing fairness-aware algorithms, but enforcement practice remained patchy. Most voluntary measures lack legal enforceability and will often be overridden by corporate interests against ethics.

4. Government Roles in AI Regulation and Application
4.1 Policy and Regulation

Governments are significant players in molding the legal and regulatory boundaries where AI activities may operate. AI should, however, be a tool towards realizing collective goals for the public rather than being permitted to be construed purely as innovative commercial opportunities by the private sector.

They also started developing national AI strategies to promote their responsible development with minimum risks. India's NITI Aayog has defined a targeted approach to AI application by addressing specific sectors that would yield most significant social impact 9. For example, China promotes the development of AI "for the people and for good," and so ethical issues are placed in the wider context of its national AI 10 agenda.

4.2 Use of AI in Public Administration

Governments have gone ahead and used AI apart from regulation in its public service offering. AI is now being employed in governance and service delivery, whether through smart cities, healthcare diagnostics, or administrative automation. However, such dualism-in use and regulation-brings about some tension. One area of tension arises when AU types systems developed by private vendors are installed within governments-that is, balancing operational effectiveness with the laudable ambition

for citizen safeguards and algorithmic fairness.

Such an example is using large language models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT in public administration, which promises efficiency gains but raises concerns in terms of accuracy, bias, and transparency.

5. International Cooperation and Ethical Standards

International cooperation is needed to set up common ethical and regulatory frameworks because AI is a boundless domain. Several organizations such as the UNESCO, OECD, and the European Commission have initiated activities to encourage dialogue among stakeholders.

The Global AI Ethics and Governance Observatory of UNESCO serves as a platform for policymakers, industry, and civil society to work together on best practices and policy guidance. Moreover, the European AI Alliance unites over 4,000 diverse members and forms the continent's AI strategy. All these efforts indicate the growing recognition that no single country or entity can effectively govern AI in isolation.

6. Power Dynamics and Ethical Governance in AI
6.1 Innovation vs. Regulation

One of the principal problems for AI governance is the dichotomy between innovation and regulations. The industry leans towards fast experimentation and intensive development, while governments tend to work under much slower processes that are deliberative. This difference can create problems for regulation or allow the possibility of regulatory lag, where the law is not able to keep up with advancing technology. Furthermore, regulations too restrictive may eat away at innovations, while regulations that do not come in time will have harms.

Finding the right balance should come from a better understanding of such capabilities and constraints of AI and require flexibility within poorly defined governance regimes that need to change as the technology changes.

6.2 Control over Ethics

Neither private nor public sectors exert full control over AI ethics, though both strive to. Most private establishments have been known to set internal ethical guidelines and principles; still, these guidelines are made as per their corporate interests instead of global moral standards. The government, in contrast, would set laws and regulations to define acceptable behavior; however, the enforcement mechanisms for such laws differ remarkably across jurisdictions.

Civil society organizations, academia, and international actors also have a significant say in the art of making AI ethical, carrying out research, and holding the most powerful people accountable.

However, the fragmented nature of AI ethics governance means there is no central authority to oversee compliance or arbitrate disputes.

7. Gaps in Current Governance Models

Several key gaps hinder effective AI governance:

1. **Lack of transparency:** AI systems act like ''black boxes'', making it difficult to ascertain how the system arrives upon a decision. This lack of transparency results in a lack of trust and hinders efforts to hold developers liable for any unintended consequences.
2. **Weak enforcement mechanisms:** Even for existing ethical guidelines, there is an absence of clear enforcement mechanisms. Regulatory agencies may not have the technical capacity, or human or financial resources, to monitor compliance with such guidelines.
3. **Regulatory fragmentation:** AI systems do not know boundaries! However, ethical standards vary wildly across regions. This creates leeway for regulatory arbitrage and complications with multinational operations.
4. **Limited public inclusion:** Most discussions on AI governance are closed-door affairs with scant input from the communities affected. This exclusion risks entrenching historical inequalities by failing to account for the interests of marginalized groups.
5. **Dual-use ethical questions:** Some AI applications serve the purposes of both civilian and military interests, thereby posing ethical dilemmas regarding their deployment. For example, autonomous weapons systems evoke major moral challenges that need to be explored and built upon with a joint effort.

8. Strategies for Responsible AI Development
8.1 Strengthening Regulatory Institutions

Investments by governments in regulatory capacities are essential for the bridge between innovation and regulation. These capacity-building measures include the hiring of technical experts who could assess AI systems, the preparation of standardized testing protocols, and the establishment of independent oversight mechanisms with real enforcement capacity.

8.2 Promoting Transparency

Transparency is at the core of ethical AI. Developers and deployers would be expected to provide information regarding sources of training data, model performance metrics, and potential biases. Algorithmic audits and explainability tools that could serve to elucidate AI decision-making processes will serve to empower users making use of them to challenge outcomes they perceive to be unfair.

8.3 Establishing Global Norms and Harmonization

International agreements and treaties would serve to set the lowest ethical standards for AI development and use. For example, the OECD AI Principles and the UN ongoing conversation on AI governance could provide useful launch pads. The global endeavor should harmonize regulatory approaches and minimize fragmentation such that protection is uniform for all individuals, irrespective of their location.

8.4 Encouraging Public Engagement

Public engagement must be embedded in AI governance. Policymakers should work with a variety of stakeholders, including workers, consumers, ethicists, and representatives of communities, to co-develop ethical frameworks that demonstrate broad societal values.

8.5 Encouraging Ethical Corporate Practices

Companies must become proactive in implementing ethics in their AI activities. These include developing internal processes for review to be mandated, investing in fairness aware machine-learning methodologies, and nurturing a culture of responsibility among employees.

9. Case Studies: Government Ethical Challenges in AI Deployment

a. Facial Recognition and Civil Liberties

The surveillance infrastructures built largely by China and the U.S. government's use of Clearview AI have seen for emerge harsh debates on the two issues; mass surveillance and civil liberties. Studies have also found that certain facial-recognition systems have been shown to yield higher error rates for people of color and women and lead to wrongful arrests or profiling.

b. Predictive Policing and Algorithmic Bias

The predictive policing tools, used in the United States and the UK, discriminate towards minority communities, enabling systemic discrimination. The opacity of such models patented and therefore not availed to the public renders challenging auditing or contesting their decisions.

c. Healthcare Data and Privacy Violations

In the UK, the NHS has very recently launched some AI tools for diagnostics and intelligence. But in the same breath, there have also been fears of how that data will be collected, used, and transferred to other bodies. Some cases where health data were shared with companies outside the trust without a specific agreement drew legal interest and made the public distrust.

d. Welfare Algorithms and Accountability Gaps

The "Robodebt" system in Australia is an example of how poorly designed AI can do real damage. The automated welfare debt recovery program issued incorrect debt notices based on the flawed income predictions, causing financial distress and even suicides among the affected citizens. The lack of human oversight and appeal mechanisms underscored the dangers of deploying AI in high-stakes decision-making without proper checks and balances.

10. Role of International Collaboration in Ethical AI Standards

a. Establishing Common Ethical Principles

These AI universal ethical principles-have been presently promoted by International bodies such as UNESCO, OECD, and UN. Fairness, transparency, accountability, and respect for human rights, etc. are included in these principles which can be used to harmonize approaches and avert regulatory fragmentation.

b. Promoting Cross-Border Research and Capacity Building

Through cooperation in research projects, knowledge may be shared and capacity distinguished among countries. By pooling technical experience and policy knowledge, especially for resource-poor nations, AI governance frameworks that are sufficiently strong for their local contexts can be developed.

c. Creating Interoperable Regulatory Frameworks

In this context, the G7 and G20 have called for governance models around AI that are interoperable with respect to cross-border compliance and regional differences. It is one such framework that would contain a set of standard testing protocols, certification schemes, and ethical impact assessments from one jurisdiction to another.

d. Facilitating Joint Oversight Mechanisms

Cooperation could foster the establishment of joint oversight or watchdog organizations that would monitor AI impact and promote ethical standards worldwide. Such mechanisms could investigate harms linked to AI, issue guidance for compliance, and mediate disputes among stakeholders.

11. Consumer Influence on Private Sector AI Ethics

Important is the influence exerted by consumers upon the private sector with respect to AI fairness. Through demand-pressure, consumer advocacy, and digital literacy, consumers can render the tech industry more ethical.

a. Market Demand for Ethical Products

Consumers increasingly demand a level of accountability, fairness, and sustainability from digital goods and services. Those companies that are perceived to be ethically more responsible---providing for instance explainable AI, data privacy, and the reduction of algorithmic bias-might be able to slip in the ranks of actual competitors.

b. Advocacy and Public Pressure

Successful consumer advocacy groups and social media campaigns have brought pressure on tech companies to rethink their unethical AI practices. The public outcry over Amazon's use of the Rekognition facial recognition tool by law enforcement caused the company to place a moratorium on the sales to police departments. Similar consumer pressure caused Google to retract on drone surveillance Project Maven-a program that used AI to classify military-owned images-after facing employee and consumer opposition to its AI ethics policy.

c. Supporting Ethical Certification and Transparency Labels

Just as consumers use certifications such as Fair Trade or ISO standards to inform their purchasing decisions, similar labeling systems for ethical AI could emerge. Consumers actively searching for products with verified ethical credentials-such as bias-free training data, explainability guarantees, or third-party audits-can create pressure for responsible AI options among firms.

d. Educating Themselves and Holding Companies Accountable

Digital literacy is essential for any real consumer engagement with AI ethics. Once users learn how AI systems function, the data they collect, and the decisions they make, they will feel empowered to question the transparency of the practices involved and push for more accountability. Projects like Mozilla's Common Voice and open-source AI repositories enable individuals to partake in shaping ethical AI ecosystems.

12. Conclusion

AI governance is a shared responsibility. Whereas the private sector steers AI innovation, governments must ensure that ethical safeguards are observed. Given the current disjointed regulatory landscape, some truly coordinated action is now required across sectors and borders. A multi-stakeholder approach, based on transparency, inclusivity, and flexibility, is key to establishing an AI ecosystem geared toward the common good.

Strengthening regulatory institutions, promoting transparency in their functioning, ensuring public participation, and encouraging ethical corporate behavior will help us work toward an AI future where dignity, equity, and justice for humankind are enriched.

References

1. UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137
2. OECD. (2019). Principles on Artificial Intelligence. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/going-digital/ai/principles
3. European Commission. (2020). White Paper on Artificial Intelligence. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/commission-white-paper-artificial intelligence-feb2020_en.pdf
4. UK Department for Science, Innovation & Technology. (2023). UK AI Ecosystem. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk
5. McKinsey & Company. (2023). The State of AI in 2023. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com
6. NITI Aayog. (2020). Responsible AI for All. Retrieved from https://niti.gov.in
7. Mozilla Foundation. (2022). Common Voice Project. Retrieved from https://commonvoice.mozilla.org
8. Clearview AI. (2020). Privacy and Ethics Statements. Retrieved from https://clearview.ai