Week 5: AI Evaluations

Welcoming (0:00 - 0:10)

፟ 10:00

Until everyone is there

□ E	☐ Everybody in the discussion doc ?								
	Open this week's <u>readings</u> and your notes if you like.								
☐ If	☐ If you have a statement or question, put it in the chat or in the document.								
□ M	 Check in ☐ Make a quick check in round, roughly 30 seconds to max 1 minute each. ☐ Optionally, make notes below if you like. 								
Name	How was your day?	Do you have a specific goal for this meetup? (e.g., speaking less/more, discussing a specific question)							

Feedback last session (0:10 - 0:12)

፟ 2:00

• The facilitator quickly goes over last week's feedback and specifically, what will be tried out in this session.

Links to feedback forms: https://forms.gle/Z3rzFfCrLJdDv8HDA

Feedback on last session	Goals for this session		
You gave me this feedback on how the discussion could be improved in the last session.	Let's try these ideas for improvement.		
[@mod: insert feedback]	[@mod: insert idea for improvement]		
[@mod: insert feedback]	[@mod: insert idea for improvement]		
[@mod: insert feedback]	[@mod: insert idea for improvement]		

Everything fine with these goals? Remarks?	
Okay, let's move on.	

Goals of this week (0:12 - 0:15)

☑ 3:00 Go quickly through the goals and topics of this session.

After this session/week, you should be able to:

- Understand different types of AI evaluations including capability, propensity, and control evaluations
- Explain key evaluation techniques including behavioral and internal analysis methods
- Identify dangerous capabilities that require specific evaluation approaches
- Discuss the limitations and challenges in current evaluation methods
- Analyze how evaluations fit into broader AI safety frameworks
- Assess the relationship between benchmarks and comprehensive evaluations

Understanding

Key questions from the resources (0:15 - 0:30)

Start the session by **clearing up** key questions from the **reading material**. If there are no questions, go quicker to the next activity.

Gather questions (3 min)

- Open this week's **readings** if you like.
- 🛭 3:00 Participants write **their questions** in the box below.
- Feel **encouraged** to ask dumb questions!

Answer questions 12 min

• 8 12:00 The group discusses the questions. If some are still open, you may have time at the end to discuss them.

Example: What are the three main types of properties being evaluated in AI systems according to the chapter?
• Notes o
Example: How does the Model Organisms Framework approach the study of potentially dangerous AI behaviors?
• Notes o
Example: What is the difference between capability evaluations and propensity evaluations?
• Notes o
Your name • Question
• Notes o
Your name • Question

•	Notes o
Your	name Question
•	Notes o
	name Question
•	Notes o
Your	name Question
•	Notes o
Your	name Question
•	Notes o

Discussion

Activity 1 - Statements/Questions (0:30 - 1:00)

With the **remaining time** in the session, spark discussion by voting on the below statements and discussing points of disagreement. You'll not have time for all the questions, do a prioritization.

⊠ 25:00
☐ Open this week's readings if you like.
☐ 図 2:00 Formulate a hot take or new statements/questions below.

Write your name in a column.
Someone reads the first statement/question.
While other people are speaking and you can also write a comment in the doc. Let's
make this collaborative.
Choose your position. You can also add and choose new options.
When everyone has chosen, discuss the different positions. If there is no major
disagreement, you can quickly move on to the next question.

Those questions are about the last section: "5 Layers of Responsibility: Corporate, National, and International AI Governance".

	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name	Name
1	Statement/Question						
	[your statement/question: try to formulate it structured e.g. pro/con, agree/disagree, listing options etc.]						
	Not sel	Not sel	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele
	Not sel	Not sel •	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele
	Notes •						
2	Statement/0	Question					
	[your statements]	ent/question: tr	y to formulate	it structured	e.g. pro/con, a	igree/disagree	, listing options
	Not sel	Not sel	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele
	Not sel	Not sel	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele
	Notes •						
3	Statement/0	Question					
	[your statement/question: try to formulate it structured e.g. pro/con, agree/disagree, listing options etc.]						
	Not sel	Not sel	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele
	Not sel	Not sel •	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele
	Notes •						

4	Statement/Question							
	[your statement/question: try to formulate it structured e.g. pro/con, agree/disagree, listing options etc.]							
	Not sel Not sel Not sel Not sel Not sel Not sel							
	Not sel	Not sel	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele •	
	Notes							
5	Internal / be	ehavioral tech	nniques					
	Internal evalu	ation technique	es are more imp	oortant than be	havioral technic	ques for ensur	ing AI safety.	
	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not se	Not sel •	Not s	Not sele	
	Notes •							
6	Deceptive al	lignment						
	Current evalua	ation methods a	are sufficient fo	r detecting dec	ceptive alignme	nt in advanced	l AI systems.	
	Not sel •	Not sel	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele	
	Notes •							
7	Prioritize int	erpretability						
	We should p methods	rioritize develo	oping better ir	terpretability 1	tools over imp	roving behavi	oral evaluation	
	Not sel	Not sel	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele	
	Notes •							
8	Third Party	Access						
	Independent evaluation organizations should have mandatory access to frontier AI models							
	Not sel	Not sel	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele	
	Notes							
11	Comprehensive safety testing?							

	The combinatorial complexity of evaluation scenarios makes comprehensive safety testing impossible.						
	Not sel	Not sel	Not sel	Not se	Not sel	Not s	Not sele
	Notes •						
12	Goodhart la	w?					
	Standardized game evaluati	•	tocols could a	ctually make A	I systems less	safe by mak	ing it easier to
	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not se •	Not sel •	Not s •	Not sele
	Notes •						
13	AI Model Re	gistries					
	The gap betw	een evaluation	and deploymer	nt contexts is fu	ındamentally u	nsolvable.	
	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not se •	Not sel •	Not s •	Not sele
	Notes •						
14	The generali	zation gap					
		ve strike the r			ing compliance	with safety	standards and
	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not se →	Not sel •	Not s •	Not sele
	Notes •						
15	False confide	ence					
	Red team eva	luations provide	e false confiden	ce in AI safety	measures		
	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not sel •	Not se ▼	Not sel •	Not s •	Not sele •
	Notes •						

Activity 2 - Red teaming (1:00 - 1:25)

Play this game: <u>Gandalf | Lakera – Test your prompting skills to make Gandalf reveal secret information.</u>

Tips on making injection attacks:

- Read through slide-deck Red teaming Al models . Understand well enough to present the slides
- Colab notebook with full dataset of attack and defenses. Tensor Trust dataset.ipynb
- Lakera post on types of attacks.
 <a href="https://www.lakera.ai/blog/jailbreaking-large-language-models-guide#characteristics-of-jailbreaking-large-
- GitHub repo with attack examples. https://github.com/AetherPrior/TrickLLM/tree/main/attacks and https://github.com/verazuo/jailbreak_llms/blob/main/data/prompts/jailbreak_prompts_2023_05
 O7 csv
- An example of Solution: <u>Walkthrough Solutions for Gandalf Al | by Aviv Yaniv | Courisity is a Drug | Medium</u>

Bonus: Another game: tensortrust.ai

- Tips on attacking | Tensor Trust
- TensorTrust paper with analysis of attack and defense. Page 22. [2311.01011] Tensor Trust: Interpretable Prompt Injection Attacks from an Online Game

Wrap up (1:25-1:30)

Flashlight & Action Item \$\\ 4:00\$

- What are my learnings from this week? & What is my action item? (research, reflect, do etc.)
- Keep it **briefly** (key word/short sentence)

	Action Item (research/network /apply etc.)	When & Where?	First Step	Status
Name A				neutral •
Name B				neutral •

Name C		neutral •
Name D		neutral -
Name E		neutral •
Name F		neutral •

Reminder/Comments & Feedback Form 8 1:00

☐ Now you have a high-level overview. Next week it gets more **technical** with Reward

The facilitator reads aloud the announcements below.

Misspecification!

As last week
$\ \square$ Finish the implementation intention of your action item and tick "done".
☐ Note from the authors of the Alignment textbook about Feedback
☐ They really appreciate your feedback.
☐ It would be cool if you could leave a comment after the next reading in
the documents about how it was and what can be improved. You can also use
this form: AISF textbook - Feedback
☐ Collaborative Learning - Check out this document for effective long-term learning
Collaborative Learning - Strategies, Anki, GPT 4 and more
☐ Switching groups
$\hfill \square$ You can always change groups if a week doesn't work out for you. No need to
ask!
☐ [MOD: share feedback form during or after the session]
□ https://forms.gle/Z3rzFfCrLJdDv8HDA

Space for recommendations/materials/off-topic (films, documentaries, podcasts, texts, pictures, books, ...)

•