Lawmaking and Oversight: International Examples

This handout provides you with an understanding of the global landscape of AI regulation; and different practices parliaments are using in their oversight role. *Source: Inter-Parliamentary Union: Parliamentary Actions on AI Policy*

PART 1: LAWMAKING

UNESCO's "*Consultation Paper on AI Regulation: Emerging Approaches Across the World*" identifies **nine emerging approaches to AI regulation worldwide**:

Approach	Parliamentary Example
Principles-Based Approach: Establishes fundamental ethical principles and values (like UNESCO's AI Ethics Recommendation) to guide AI development and use without imposing specific obligations.	**Republic of Korea** The National Assembly reviewed 19 bills related to the development of AI, with a focus on enhancing social responsibility and improving trustworthiness. In December 2024, these bills were consolidated and adopted as a single piece of legislation. The new law established the government's AI development plan, created the National AI Committee, set up the AI Safety Research Institute, and formulated AI ethics principles that encompass safety, trustworthiness and accessibility. The law also includes regulations for high-impact AI and generative AI.
Standards-Based Approach: Delegates regulatory powers to standard-setting organizations to develop technical standards that guide implementation of mandatory rules (eg. EU AI Act's reliance on harmonized standards).	**Austria** In January 2024, a law was passed to establish an AI Service Centre. This centre is tasked with analysing AI regulatory frameworks, conducting research, holding expert discussions, and providing consulting and support to both public and private institutions. It is also expected to play a key preparatory role in implementing the EU AI Act.
Agile and Experimentalist Approach: Creates flexible regulatory schemes like sandboxes and testbeds that allow organizations to test AI innovations under relaxed regulatory conditions with government oversight.	**Lithuania** In January 2025, parliament approved a proposal by the Ministry of Economy and Innovation to accelerate the development of AI in Lithuania, which became one of the first countries in the EU to launch a pilot regulatory environment for AI, the so-called "AI sandbox". The provisions adopted by parliament are enshrined in the Law on Technology and Innovation and the Law on Information Society Services.
Facilitating and Enabling Approach: Focuses on building enabling conditions for responsible AI through capacity	**United Arab Emirates** In December 2024, the Federal National Council adopted a set of recommendations related to AI policy. The recommendations include revisions to data governance and personal data protection

building, infrastructure development, AI literacy programs, and research support.	laws, the establishment of a unified open data platform between the public and private sectors, support for AI startups, the development of AI-based performance indicators for public services, and the expansion of public-private partnerships for AI research and development.
Adapting Existing Laws Approach: Modifies sector-specific regulations (health, finance, education) and cross-cutting laws (criminal codes, data protection, labor laws) to address AI-specific challenges incrementally.	**Colombia** In July 2025, Law No. 2502 was enacted, amending the Penal Code to strengthen penalties for AI-based digital identity fraud, and in particular for crimes involving deepfakes. In addition, the law mandates the establishment of a public policy framework to combat AI-driven identity fraud and includes provisions on ethical standards, cybersecurity training, detection technology development, algorithm transparency, international cooperation and emergency response protocols.
Access to Information and Transparency Mandates Approach: Requires disclosure of information about AI systems, including how they work, what data they use, and how decisions can be contested.	**Tunisia** A bill to comprehensively overhaul the country's existing data protection law was submitted to the Assembly of People's Representatives in July 2025. The proposal focuses on strengthening the personal data protection framework through measures such as the creation of an independent data protection authority and the designation of data protection officers in public institutions. In particular, it introduces four new articles regulating the use of AI, emphasizing the principles of transparency, purpose limitation and proportionality in both the public and private sectors.
Risk-Based Approach: Tailors obligations and requirements based on assessed risk levels of AI systems in specific contexts (exemplified by the EU AI Act's categories of unacceptable, high, limited, and minimal risk).	**Brazil** More than 40 AI-related bills are currently under discussion in both chambers of the National Congress. One of these, Bill no. 2338/2023, approved by the Senate in December 2024, is a comprehensive legislative framework inspired by the EU AI Act that adopts a risk-based approach to AI regulation. The bill seeks to impose strict regulations on high-risk AI systems that could impact public safety or fundamental human rights. It also calls for the establishment of a new regulatory authority to oversee AI governance and enforce compliance. The Chamber of Deputies established the Special Committee on Artificial Intelligence in May 2025, where this bill is expected to be a key focus of discussion.
Rights-Based Approach: Establishes obligations specifically to protect individuals' fundamental rights and freedoms throughout the AI system lifecycle.	**India** In July 2024, the National Artificial Intelligence Technology Regulatory Authority Bill was introduced in the Council of States. The bill aims to establish a National Artificial Intelligence Technology Regulatory Authority to regulate and monitor the use of AI and related technologies. In February 2025, the Artificial Intelligence (Protection of Rights of Employees) Bill was introduced to safeguard employees' rights in the context of AI adoption and implementation in the workplace. The bill seeks to

	regulate the use of AI technologies in professional environments while ensuring transparency throughout the integration process.
Liability Approach: Assigns responsibility and sanctions (criminal, administrative, or civil) for problematic uses of AI systems.	**United States of America** the "Take it Down Act" legislative process was completed by April 2025 and was signed into law by the President in May. The law addresses non-consensual intimate imagery and AI-generated deepfakes, requiring social media platforms to remove explicit content and imposing criminal penalties for violations.

The research paper "Comparing Apples to Oranges: A Taxonomy for Navigating the Global Landscape of AI Regulation" provides an 11-metric framework for systematically comparing AI regulatory frameworks across jurisdictions.

Metric	Description
1. Status	Whether AI legislation has been formally adopted as law
2. Novelty	Whether the legislation is specifically developed to govern AI (new legislation) or adapts existing legal frameworks
3. Maturity of Digital Legal Landscape	Overall advancement and robustness of a jurisdiction's digital and AI governance framework, including comprehensive AI strategies and AI-adjacent regulations
4. Reach	Sectors subject to AI regulations: • Industry: private sector companies and their AI applications • Government/Federal Agencies: AI use within public sector entities • Individuals/Citizens: use of AI systems by individuals
5. Enforcement	Mechanisms to monitor and enforce compliance: • Continued Reporting: periodic updates to monitor compliance • Third-Party Audits: independent assessments by external organizations • Existing Agency or New Agency: enforcement handled by existing regulatory bodies or new agencies • Liability: legal responsibility when AI systems cause harm • Regulatory Sandboxes: controlled environments for testing AI systems
6. Sanctions	Legal powers to ensure compliance and impose penalties: • Criminal Charges: prosecution for unlawful actions or harm • Fines: financial penalties for non-compliance • Temporary Injunctions: legal orders to halt AI system operations

Metric	Description
7. Operationalization	• Standard Setting: technical and procedural benchmarks for AI development • Auditing: internal or external audits to evaluate AI system performance • Technical Expertise: whether frameworks mandate technical expertise within regulatory bodies
8. International Cooperation	Alignment with global frameworks such as OECD AI principles
9. Stakeholder Consultation	• Civil Society Inclusion: engagement with non-governmental organizations • Private Sector Inclusion: whether industry stakeholders contribute to the legislative process
10. Regulatory Approach	• Ex Ante: preventive approach addressing risks before they arise, emphasizing pre-market approval • Ex Post: reactive approach evaluating AI systems after deployment, focusing on retrospective assessments and legal remedies
11. Regulation Layer	• Technology-Focused: regulations target AI infrastructure (e.g., dual-use foundation models) • Application-Focused: legislative focus on specific AI use cases (e.g., social scoring, biometric identification)

The paper analyzes five early-mover jurisdictions:

Jurisdiction	Key Characteristics
European Union	**EU AI Act** "The E.U. AI Act exemplifies an ex ante emphasis, which enforces detailed, risk-based obligations—like pre-market conformity assessments—for high-risk applications." "The E.U. AI Act, officially adopted in 2024, is considered the most holistic horizontal regulation of AI systems and has influenced global AI legislation."
United States	**Executive Order 14110 (Revoked January 2025)** "At the technology level, the U.S. EO 14110 introduces binding obligations for private-sector entities either developing dual-use foundation models or controlling critical compute infrastructure. These include reporting requirements for systems exceeding 10^{26} FLOPS."

Jurisdiction	Key Characteristics
	"Although the U.S. traditionally leans strongly toward ex post avenues, Biden's Executive Order 14110 introduces significant ex ante features, particularly for high-compute AI models."
Canada	**AI and Data Act (AIDA) - Pending** "Canada, similarly, couples ex ante obligations—such as impact assessments and an AI and Data Commissioner tasked with monitoring high-impact AI systems—with reliance on established privacy and consumer laws for ex post enforcement."
China	**Interim Measures for Generative AI Services** "China manifests a more centralized ex ante philosophy: its Interim Measures for Generative AI require developers to register models, conduct security assessments, and abide by content and national security guidelines before public release." "China's regulations, such as Provisions on Deep Synthesis Internet Information Services (2022) and the Interim Measures for Generative AI Services (2023) target technologies, such as Generative AI, and particularly deepfakes."
Brazil	**AI Bill 2338/2023 - Pending** "Brazil has taken inspiration from the E.U.'s risk-based model: its proposed AI legislation mandates classification of AI systems, risk assessments, transparency requirements, and includes regulatory sandboxes." "If enacted, it will be Latin America's first comprehensive AI law." "The E.U., Canada, and Brazil updated their regulatory proposals to include provisions for GPAIs, aligning with the E.U.'s hybrid approach."

PART 2: OVERSIGHT

A: Actions Parliaments are Taking in their Oversight Role

Parliaments are employing a range of oversight tools to address the specificities of AI and challenges around oversight of AI Policy.

Committee Inquiries
Ecuador The Education, Culture, Science and Technology Committee has been reviewing both bills and holding expert hearings. In the November 2024 hearing, government and private-sector specialists were invited to provide technical feedback on the AI bill. In the February 2025 hearing, entertainment industry experts emphasized the need to strengthen creators' rights as AI tools become more widespread.
Finland The Committee for the Future has also maintained a strong focus on AI, particularly with regard to anticipating future developments and promoting proactive policy responses. In December 2024, the Committee held a public hearing on the future challenges and knowledge needs of Finnish society, gathering insights from academic and industry experts on the opportunities and risks associated with AI advancements.
Specialized Committees on AI
Australia The Senate established the Select Committee on Adopting Artificial Intelligence (AI) to investigate and report on the opportunities and impacts arising from the adoption of AI technologies in Australia. The committee collected submissions from individuals sharing their experiences and opinions on AI and conducted six public hearings. The Committee's final report, submitted in November 2024, includes recommendations for introducing legislation to regulate high-risk AI uses, enhancing financial and non-financial support to strengthen AI capabilities, protecting workers' rights, and managing environmental costs associated with the growth of AI infrastructure.
Poland In January 2024, the Sejm Committee for Digitalization, Innovation and Modern Technologies established the Standing Subcommittee on Artificial Intelligence and Algorithm Transparency. The subcommittee has engaged in discussions on the ethical aspects of creating, implementing and using AI systems and has examined EU AI Act in relation to the Polish justice system.
Thailand In early 2024, the House of Representatives established the Ad-hoc Committee on Considering and Studying the Control and Promotion of the Use of AI. The Committee has addressed a range of

policy recommendations, including the development of a national AI strategy, the strengthening of public-private partnerships and the establishment of specialized regulatory agencies. In March 2025, the Committee organized a workshop on generative AI. The event provided an opportunity to share knowledge on generative AI technologies, as well as to discuss their advantages and disadvantages, and the associated ethical risks. Participants also explored strategies for effectively integrating AI into daily life and organizational operations.

Budget Scrutiny

Singapore

In November 2024, the Estimates Committee submitted its report on the budget for the 2024–2025 financial year to parliament. This report included the findings of an inquiry into the National Artificial Intelligence Strategy 2.0 (NAIS 2.0). It provided recommendations on areas for improvement in the government's AI workforce development support programmes, as well as suggestions for further enhancing the country's AI research pipeline.

Expert Hearings

Bahrain

In October 2024, the Shura Council, in collaboration with the Nasser Artificial Intelligence Research & Development Centre (NAIRDC), held a discussion session entitled Future trends and adopting AI opportunities and expanding parliament's role in addressing them. The session focused on the future applications of AI and strategies for developing laws to ensure ethical use and transparency.

Establishing Specialized Bodies

Austria

In January 2024, a law was passed to establish an AI Service Centre. This centre is tasked with analysing AI regulatory frameworks, conducting research, holding expert discussions, and providing consulting and support to both public and private institutions. It is also expected to play a key preparatory role in implementing the EU AI Act.

Türkiye

The Parliamentary Research Commission on AI was established in January 2025. The Commission is expected to examine the impacts of AI on individuals and society, gather insights from experts in relevant institutions and discuss the development of a legal framework. The report currently being prepared by the Commission is anticipated to make a key contribution to shaping the country's AI economy and guiding its policy direction.

Resolutions and Motions

Belgium

In October 2024, a resolution was proposed urging the government to establish policies on workplace AI usage. The resolution, which addresses working conditions, labour law, privacy protection, the

adoption of new technologies and data processing, seeks to protect workers' rights amid AI-driven workplace changes and to promote a balanced, efficient digital transition.
Kenya In April 2023, a motion was introduced in the National Assembly to formulate a regulatory framework for AI. The motion urges the government to establish a governance framework and ethical guidelines to prevent the potential misuse of AI and to develop a public awareness programme to enhance understanding of the technology.
Working Groups/Caucuses
Mongolia A parliamentary group on AI and big data was established in August 2024. The group's objective is to support the development of legal and regulatory frameworks for emerging technologies and to enhance the efficiency of government operations through AI and data-driven solutions. As part of the group's outreach work, members held discussions with teachers and students to explore how AI could be applied to make public administration smarter and to address key social challenges.
Morocco Within the House of Representatives, a working group of MPs dedicated to AI is actively engaged in work on this subject. Multiple workshops and meetings have been held in 2025 on topics such as the AI regulatory framework, the social impact of AI, and international cooperation and the sharing of best practice. In its May 2025 report, the group highlighted the benefits of AI, while stressing the need for a legal and ethical framework to govern its use. The report also noted that AI could enhance the analysis and communication of public opinion, potentially reshaping how parliament responds to societal needs. It is expected to inform future AI-related legislation.

B: Specialized Oversight Mechanisms/Bodies

The characteristics of AI systems have led to the introduction of specialized mechanisms in certain countries with connections to parliament. These include impact assessments, public registers, independent audits and specialized oversight bodies.

Public Algorithm Registers
Finland/City of Helsinki Public AI Register Helsinki has developed a public AI register to improve transparency and facilitate civic participation in audits of government AI systems. This register contains detailed documentation about deployed AI systems, their intended purpose, risks, mitigation measures, and feedback channels for stakeholders. The register is positioned as a key governance tool for transparency and operational oversight of government AI.
Netherlands

The Netherlands has implemented a national Algorithm Register. It provides standardized information on the goal, data, and risks of each system.
Impact Assessments
United Kingdom UK regulatory bodies have published standardized impact assessment templates for use of AI by public authorities, especially around high-impact uses in sectors like healthcare and social welfare.
Independent Audits
EU AI Act – Registry Obligations & Third-Party Audits The EU AI Act mandates independent third-party audits for high-risk AI systems (such as those used in credit scoring, law enforcement or critical infrastructure). Organizations must register such systems in an EU-wide database and perform conformity assessments, including entity-level governance reviews, operational documentation, and non-substantive code review.
Canadian Regulatory Proposals Canada's proposed approach empowers an independent commissioner (reporting to parliament) to order audits of high-risk or harmful AI deployments, thus ensuring robust parliamentary independence in oversight
Specialized AI Oversight Bodies
Spanish Agency for the Supervision of Artificial Intelligence (AESIA) As the first dedicated AI supervisor in the EU, AESIA's effectiveness depends entirely on its budget. It requires funds to hire highly specialized technical staff who can inspect algorithms. Parliament must ensure that regulators and oversight bodies are adequately funded.