

Tab 2

United Nations Commission on Science and Technology Development (UNCSTD)

Agenda: Digital Colonialism: Developing Frameworks for Indigenous Data Sovereignty and Fair Benefit-Sharing in AI Training

Main Submitter: United States of America

Sponsors: Republic of Korea, United States of America

Signatories: Republic of Korea, United States of America

United Nations Commission on Science and Technology Development,

Alarmed by the loss of autonomy over the extraction and usage of data indigenous people are experiencing,

Encourages international cooperation and assistance of nations to make sure indigenous communities can promote their ethical AI governance,

Recognizing that global AI laws are crucial for sustainable FPIC maintenance,

Recalling the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), to ensure the protection of Indigenous Peoples' rights and consent of their cultural heritage,

Deeply concerned by the unauthorized collection of data from Indigenous Peoples for the purpose of AI training,

1. Enhance and amplify the International FPIC Standard according to the following methods, such as but not limited to:
 - a. Standardized consent forms will be approved by indigenous community governments by creating:
 - i. Independent audits conducted by the UN to track down the current digital reports of indigenous communities,
 - ii. Documentation that is accessible to anyone,
 - b. Rights to ensure that the data of these indigenous communities are protected and can be governed by themselves through global benefit-sharing funding, including but not limited to:
 - i. International funding of indigenous communities by the UN collecting pre-existing taxes from each nation so that the funding can go to the indigenous communities
 - ii. Funds from the United Nations Foundations (philanthropic organization that manages the allocation of resources) will be used to

- develop financial digital infrastructure to make sure the funds brought by the World Bank Group are being used to develop data centers,
- c. Areas of development and funding include but are not limited to:
 - i. Indigenous Schools to improve the education of the Indigenous students, especially in fields of AI education, language preservation, cultural heritage, and community development
 - ii. Digital infrastructure to improve their capacity to build their own sovereignty, especially in securing their own data center
- 2. Create a new global AI framework called the International AI Protection Standards (IAPS)
 - a. Requires Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) before indigenous data is used in AI training;
 - b. Promotes transparency in AI training datasets by:
 - i. Securing privacy and data security;
 - ii. Storing indigenous data in secured storage;
 - c. Urges equal division of benefits caused by AI developers and indigenous communities
 - i. Organize an international advisory council with the help of the Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence(GPAI) that consists of member states, indigenous representatives, AI researchers, technology companies, and civil society organizations
 - d. Recommends regular ethical audits and accountability mechanisms
 - i. Focus on transparency through AI usage
 - ii. Track down fair benefit-sharing spread through all available regions
- 3. Ethical AI Certification for companies and developed nations
 - a. Establishes international partnerships under IAPS,
 - b. Encourages developed Member states and AI companies to provide technical assistance and technology transfer,
 - c. Creates an IAPS capacity-building program,
 - i. Reviews emerging AI technologies,
 - ii. Recommends updates to IAPS guidelines every two years
 - iii. Facilitates dialogue between governments and indigenous communities
 - iv. Publishes annual reports on global progress in ethical AI,
 - v. A check-in every 3 years for technological progress regarding AI in indigenous regions by UNCSTD
 - d. Creates an IAPS Ethical AI innovation sandbox
 - e. Requests IAPS to organize an annual global AI ethics forum that discusses:
 - i. Ethical AI certification for companies
 - ii. International advisory council for governance
 - f. Punishments for irresponsible AI ethnicity
 - i. Annual regulatory fines under frameworks such as the EU AI Act
 - ii. Fines will be decided by severity of violations, scale of impact, level of negligence

- iii. The company/nation's annual revenue will also be taken into account
- iv. Severe violations of the terms will result in a complete suspension of funds until compliance is achieved.
- v. Class Action Lawsuits preventing these indigenous communities harmed by ethically biased AI algorithms.

THE END.