

RAW COPY

AI FOR GOOD GLOBAL SUMMIT
Michael Moller
MAY 15, 2018

Services Provided By:
Caption First, Inc.
P.O. Box 3066
Monument, CO 80132
1-877-825-5234
+001-719-482-9835
www.captionfirst.com

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings. This text, document, or file is not to be distributed or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

>> Please take your seats. We'll begin in a few short seconds. Good afternoon. It is nice to see everyone back again in plenary. Here we are, at the -- almost at the end of day one. We're hoping that with all of the keynotes, the different storytellers and the five panels that we have had just now that these served to film issues and get everyone on the same page. As we explained earlier, the purpose of the storytellers was to make AI relatable to non-AI experts and to make the Sustainable Development Goals related to non-U.N. people. Basically we're privileged to have our fourth, final storyteller of the day, so could we have a big round of applause for Mr. Michael Moller, director of the United Nations office in Geneva. Please welcome him to the podium. Thank you.

>> MICHAEL MOLLER: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm not quite sure I qualify as a storyteller, I'll do my best.

What I do want to tell you is I'm delighted to be with you today. Thank you very much for the invitation.

You have heard incredible stories about AI today, some of it inspiring, some cause for serious concern and all of it insightful and worthwhile. I'm sure there is much more to come in the next few days. As I thought about what I could add to

this impressive panel of experts in the room, I knew I wouldn't be -- it wouldn't be to venture deep into technical aspects, I'm certainly not an expert on AI, but rather I have spent the best part of the last 40 years in the United Nations working in a range of countries and on an even wider range of issues. Along the way I have learned a thing or two about how to deal with change. About the ways in which it offers tremendous opportunities, but also poses equally formidable challenges and risks. What I thought I would do with you in the next 15 minutes is to try to open up a space for reflection, take a step back, maybe take a bird's eye view of what it is we're doing. I'll share some insights and -- insights that I think we would do well to keep in mind as we grapple with to quote the title of the conference how to ensure that AI is a force for good. So let me start with the first story. In 2003 on the eve of the Iraq war the defense secretary famously developed a systemology about the relationship between the known and the unknown and here is what I -- he said, it is a little convoluted, there are no knowns, there are things we know that we know, then there are the known unknowns, that is to say that there are things that we know we don't know, but there are also unknown unknowns, they are things we don't know that we don't know. There is a fourth dimension, which he forgot to add. It is a crucial one. It is the unknown knowns. The things we don't know that we actually do know. These are the disavowed beliefs, superstitions and practices we pretend or don't know about even though they're in the background of our values and belief system. It is the same logical that pertains around our conversations on AI at times. AI will be as important to humanities progress as electricity or fire our friend, Google said, AI is a priority, the founder of it.

Uslaw says it is probably going to be the outbreak of World War III. We are looking at -- don't get me wrong, we should explore implementations as far ahead as we can and we have to strive to identify the areas that we don't know yet anything about. We should not lose sight over what is right in front of us. We all know that AI is on the march for good and for bad. The AI that makes self driving cars possible and diagnosis diseases more accurately than doctors will save lives. The AI that does jobs better than workers, maybe more of a mixed blessing. The AI that allows machines to decide how wars are fought and who gets killed is probably a problem. From the times of the league of nations to the present we have had to craft responses to innovations gone wrong. From Albert Einstein regretting his role in the development on nuclear bombs and the development of dynamite and others and others that developed agent orange initially a herbicide to grow crops. It was said

towards the end, of a life, you know nothing you do in science is guaranteed to result in benefits for mankind, any discovery I believe is morally neutral and can be turned to either constructive ends or destructive ends. That is not the fault of science.

Tackling the unknown knowns also means recognizing some fundamental truths about technology in general and Artificial Intelligence in particular. Nothing about it is external to human action. We develop the technology, we write the codes, we configure to the algorithms, we deploy the drones. At its best, technology can be an extension of the common humanity. At its worse, it is a reflection of the ruthlessness that human history knows too much of. In either case, technology will always mirror our own imperfections and biases. Here is one of the best ways I heard someone explain what we're dealing with when talking about AI. Idiot silence, they can easily do jobs that humans find mind boggling such as finding detected flaws in goods or categorizing millions of photos of faces but they have trouble with things that people find easy such as basic reasoning. All the way back to 1956 when academic researchers held the first gathering to discuss AI they were looking for a way to look at machines with human like general intelligence, including complex reasoning. That crucially remains a distant aspiration to the state. The fact that human action is irreplaceable center for all technology for the foreseeable future implies both good and bad news. I'm thinking about AI, I think we can draw a couple of insights. At least I am.

One, that it is naive to assume that we can outright ban, prohibit, prevent the worse of AI technology, the diffusion of power in the world, above all in cyberspace means there are too many actors rushed too many places where the governments, startups, corporations, and the only way to avoid catastrophe is to envision every scenario and to plan against it. The good news is, this is possible and it has to do with the point that all technology can never be independent of human action. Clearly, we need more public conversations like this one about the impact of the transformative technologies and their impact on our lives. If dealing with AI is essentially about dealing with human action and not about some completely novel external and autonomous force, all we really need to do is to tackle it like we should all over questions of change. There are three imperatives that have guided us well in the past, one, be inclusive and interactive. Everyone needs to be at the table in the discussions about AI. The scientists developing the technologies, the multinationals that own and sell them, the government that regulates them, tries to, and the every day consumer that uses and shapes them.

Second, be people and value-centered, whether that's the integrity of our data, whether it is equality of access, the job losses and opportunities of the future, our view of AI must hinge on how it benefits and how it harms people. Everything else is secondary.

Three, take a holistic view and ask unexpected questions. The challenges of today are interconnected, environmental degradation triggers refugee flows and inequality categorizes conflict and this must be mirrored in the way we respond to them. That means not silos, but collaboration. Not blinkered perspectives and wide and systematic views, bringing everyone to the table is a prerequisite first step and asking each others unexpected questions, the necessary follow-up. If all of that sounds familiar to some of you, it is because it is exactly the way that the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals and the goals o operate, they're indivisible and irreversible, they leave no one behind and they are everyone's responsibility. That's why ultimately I'm an optimist, I'm optimistic because the ways in which the 17 goals are broadening our perspective, promoting collaboration, driving exclusivity and holistic thinking is exactly right. It is right for the issues of peace and security that we have traditionally dealt with and equally right for disruptive change that's the focus today. This is also why ultimately this conference to me is so valuable. Therefore, I would like to encourage you to make the most of it by really challenging each other by asking unexpected questions and by really Rev. leveraging the combined knowledge and resources that all of us bring to the table.

Our overarching goal must be to combine technology and public policy to ensure that innovation works for the good of human kind, whether we succeed in humanizing technology rather than technologizing humanity, it is ultimately up to us, to our actions, to our creativity and to our collective commitment. Thank you, I wish you a productive, an interesting discussion.