



3 Governance Regimes for AI

PREPARED BY EURASIA GROUP
AUGUST 2023

[Technoprudential](#) governance of artificial intelligence requires at least three overlapping governance regimes for different aspects of AI, each with different mandates, levers, and participants. While novel in design, all three regimes would be guided by [common principles](#) and inspired by existing policy arrangements:

1. Intergovernmental Panel on Artificial Intelligence: Artificial intelligence governance requires a global scientific body to evaluate the state of AI, impartially assess its risks and potential impacts, forecast scenarios, and consider technical policy solutions to protect the global public interest. A United Nations-convened body like the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the IPAC would seek to create a baseline of shared knowledge for policymaking and negotiations. This global and geopolitically independent fact-finding body would produce regular reports to advise stakeholders and inform multilateral and multistakeholder negotiations on AI governance.

Why? If authorities are to effectively address AI, they must accurately understand the technology and the possible scope of its harms.

2. Geotechnology Stability Board: As the Financial Stability Board, central banks, and other parts of the global financial system work in concert to stem systemic risks to financial stability, a Geotechnology Stability Board should work with global and national authorities to safeguard geopolitical stability from rapid AI-driven change – and to react when disruptions occur. Supported by national regulatory authorities and international standard-setting bodies, this technocratic body would pool expertise and resources to assess systemic vulnerabilities and coordinate the necessary actions to address them. It would also work closely with the private sector,

recognizing that in a technopolar world, [link to technopolarity] large tech companies play a critical role in maintaining geopolitical stability just as systemically important banks do in maintaining financial stability.

Why? The near certainty of AI proliferation heightens the risk of weaponization by non-state or rogue actors, making AI crisis response a problem for the global commons.

3. Arms control-style regime: As the United States and the Soviet Union cooperated during the Cold War to prevent nuclear proliferation and usage, the US, China, and their largest technology companies should establish a monitoring and verification regime to prevent the uncontrolled proliferation of AI systems that could pose existential threats to the global commons, lead to war, or imperil the authority of nation-states. Safety guardrails and verification mechanisms similar to those used to manage the Cold War arms race and avoid mutually assured destruction could be applied to the most important AI inputs, like those relating to computing hardware like advanced semiconductors and data centers.

Why? The world needs a way to contain an all-out AI race between the major AI powers and prevent the proliferation of dangerous advanced AI systems.

These three regimes would work in a complementary manner, supported by additional regulatory mechanisms and institutions. Working together, they would take a decisive step toward technoprudential management of the emerging AI world.