

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CONCEPT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AS A TOOL FOR PREVENTING CORRUPTION IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Mgr. Jaroslavs Strelcenoks, PhD candidate
jaroslavs.strelcenoks@gmail.com
ORCID 0009-0009-7209-6113
Turība University, Latvia

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) technologies have enormous potential for preventing corruption in the public sector. However, at present, the use of AI in the public sector is not regulated. Consequently, the article aims to propose concrete steps and actions for the implementation of AI technology in the public sector with a view to using this technology as a new tool to identify and prevent situations of corruption.

The author conducted a study of Latvian state and local government officials in different regions and positions throughout 2023. In the article, the author analyses the research data on officials' experiences with AI, their expectations about the effectiveness of AI in preventing corruption, as well as their basic requirements for the concept of implementation of AI.

The author of the article proposes to create a basis for the legal environment for the use of AI and recommends adopting the guidelines of AI on the following basic ethical standards: the priority of human well-being; prohibition of harm at the initiative of the AI system; human control; compliance of design with law; prevention of covert manipulation of human behaviour; built-in security. In the article, the author recommends creating a special procedure for testing and further implementation of solutions of AI, bypassing redundant administrative procedures. In addition, the author recommends stimulating anti-corruption institutions and developing approaches to issues of civil liability for mistakes made by AI technology.

Keywords: anti-corruption, artificial intelligence, public sector, corruption prevention, concept

DOI:10.2478/acpro-2024-0014

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) technologies have enormous potential for preventing corruption in the public sector. However, at present, the use of AI technologies in the public sector is not regulated. There have been some fragmentary attempts to regulate AI technologies, including its use in the prevention of corruption. For example, the legislative initiative of the President of Latvia on the use of AI systems in campaigning for elections (Rinkēvičs, 2024). Consequently, the author's work, which aims to propose concrete steps for the introduction of AI technology in the public sector to identify and prevent situations of corruption, is relevant and topical.

In the article the author intends to summarise the European Union (EU) practice on the basic legal principles of AI operation and to summarise the results of research conducted.

Hypothesis. What basic regulation of AI requirements need to be foreseen in the process of implementing AI as a tool for preventing corruption in the public sector.

Goals and objectives. The author's goal is to propose the basic directions and concrete steps for the implementation of AI technologies that can be legally used to address the risks of corruption in the public sector. The author intends to define the legal requirements necessary to create a convenient regulatory

environment for the use of AI, based on a balance of interests of the public, the state, as well as officials whose actions will be controlled by AI in the future.

The subject of the article is the study of norms of international law of the European Union and the analysis and compilation of the opinions of Latvian officials on the basic requirements for the introduction of AI.

The following objectives were set to achieve the goal:

- to analyse the basic principles, directions and concrete steps used by the EU for the operation of AI so that AI technologies can be legally used for the prevention of corruption risks in the public sector in Latvia;
- to summarise and study the opinions of Latvian officials on the basic requirements and prospects for the introduction of AI in the public sector.

Research. The author uses the research "AI for the Prevention of Corruption and Conflict of Interest" (hereinafter – the Research) conducted during the period 6 March 2023 -13 December 2023 of Latvian state and local government officials (hereinafter – respondents) in all regions and in various positions. No such research has been conducted previously. The author is also not aware of any similar research. A total of 319 respondents participated in the Research, of which 70.5% are women and 29.5% are men. Respondents mostly work in Riga (40.4%). In turn, the rest work in various regions of Latvia: Latgale (16.6%), Vidzeme (15.7%), Zemgale (14.4%) and Kurzeme (12.9%). Such distribution of respondents between Riga and the regions, in the author's opinion reflects a truly objective picture of the concept and/or introduction of AI technologies in the public sector, as it is really close to the distribution of the population in the territory of Latvia. The significant majority of respondents (72.4%) have been in service for more than 10 years. Half of the respondents (52%) indicated that they work in municipal institutions, while 43.6% – in public institutions. The remaining 4.4% noted that they work in state or municipal capital companies. Of the respondents, 51.7% indicated that they are employees, while the rest are managers at different levels. More than half the respondents (51.2%) perform duties related to supervision: supervision of the activities of an official (13.5%), financial or property supervision (17.9%), personnel supervision (16.3%), anti-corruption measures (12.5%) or to other types of supervision (34.2%).

In the article, the author analyses the research data on the experience of officials working with AI, their expectations about the effectiveness of AI in preventing corruption, as well as their basic requirements for the implementation of the regulatory framework for AI using general scientific as well as special legal methods of cognition. In particular, the author uses the empirical method – it is reflected in the author's survey of public officials and employees working in state and local government institutions about the current legal regulation of AI, future perspectives and basic requirements, as well as the vision of how AI technologies can help in the corruption prevention.

1. Directions of implementation of AI in the public sector to identify corruption

The author draws attention to the fact that with the introduction of AI technologies, it becomes problematic to find the optimal balance between private and public interests, as well as to ensure that this balance is controlled in practice. The issue of respect for people's right to privacy when using AI technologies is becoming increasingly important. After all, executing an algorithm embedded in AI technology and choosing the appropriate patterns of behaviour, AI forms conclusions that have arisen as a result of self-learning (European Commission, 2018). It is obvious that the new relationship created by the introduction of AI into our lives not only provides new opportunities to control the activities of public officials and prevent corruption, but also poses significant risks, in particular interference in the field of human rights in many areas.

Thus, the author emphasizes the necessity of creating a regulatory environment that is convenient for the development and implementation of these technologies, based on the balance of interests of society (including public officials), the state, and companies that develop AI technologies. This was also affirmed

by 42% of respondents in the study, indicating that greater monitoring and regulation of AI technologies is needed than is currently the case.

The author believes that the legal regulation of AI in Latvia should take into account EU regulations. As a member of the EU, Latvia signed the Declaration on cooperation in the field of AI on April 10, 2018 (European Union, 2021a). The Declaration was followed by participation in the joint development of "Policy and investment recommendations for trustworthy AI" (European Union, 2021b) with other EU countries. On February 19, 2020, the European Commission (EC) published a White Paper (European Commission, 2020), which defines some regulatory measures in the field of AI legal framework, as well as indicates the direction in the legal framework with the possible risk of AI occurrence (meaning fully autonomous AI) prevention. Here, the EC has formulated seven basic conditions for building a reliable AI legal framework: management and supervision; reliability and safety; privacy and data management; transparency; multifunctionality; social and environmental well-being; and responsibility (European Commission, 2019).

These blocs do not characterize the EU's general attitude towards the development of AI but point to specific problems that may hinder the development of the legal framework for AI (Francesconi & Peruginelli, 2023). Therefore, according to the author, these data should be taken into account and provided for in the development of the national legal framework for AI. The EC also points to other difficulties in the application of AI law that should be anticipated:

- accountability issues-a scheme of institutional accountability for AI operations and how it would be justified in terms of the evidence base needs to be established;
- nonconformity between positions - in addition, it is worth mentioning that there is a hidden contradiction between the issue of accountability and that of AI development in general, where the latter is called to develop AI, taking into account the full spectrum of human capabilities. This is about creating a fully autonomous AI system with human decision-making capabilities, and therefore causality in decision-making is not open;
- the transparency system is undetermined, i.e. it is not entirely clear how AI decisions will be filtered. (European Commission, 2020)

The author believes that the EC has made significant legal attempts to regulate AI, but they do not contain specific organizational and legal actions (e.g. technical regulations, additional strategies, directives). The deficiencies of AI are also felt by the respondents, who indicated in the study that the parliament or the government should generally be more actively involved in the work on the legal regulation of AI technologies (61.1%). Most of them (i.e. 58.5%) believe that the parliament or the government should even initiate discussions between institutions about the need for legal regulation of AI, as well as initiate discussions with society about legal regulation of AI (55.9%). In addition, a significant number of respondents (59%) believe that the parliament or the government should come up with an initiative and propose national proposals for a common EU AI legal framework. A minority of respondents (9.2%) believe that it is necessary to wait for the creation of AI technologies and only then start developing the foundations of the legal framework for AI. Therefore, according to the author, the issue of national legal regulation is still relevant, in demand and necessary.

Regarding the current AI legal framework, 34.5% of respondents believe that it is insufficient to manage and implement AI technologies in the public sector. On the other hand, the vast majority (58.3%) of the respondents could not comment on it. Only 7.2% believe that the current regulation is sufficient. Regarding the question on the level at which the current external legal regulation of AI technologies is insufficient to manage and implement AI technologies in the public sector, the respondents basically indicated that there is a lack of AI legal regulation at the national (parliamentary) level (40%), insufficient AI legal regulation at the EU level (32.7%) and 16.4% of respondents indicated insufficient legal regulation of AI at the government level.

Despite the fact that AI legal regulation at the EU level is insufficient (Ashby et al., 2021), the author notes that the current model of EU legal regulation has several advantages:

- strategies and recommendations allow for a quick response to the dynamics of AI and its possibilities, according to which the legal framework within the EU and member states can be constantly changed;
- The Declaration on cooperation in the field of AI does not include any framework definitions and formulations that allow for the enhancement of various issues related to AI regulations.

Based on what is indicated in the Research, as well as the fact that there is no systematization of AI regulation in EU documents, the author considers it necessary, when creating the legal regulation of the use of AI technologies at the national level, to determine the goals and objectives of the regulation, the principles and problems of the regulation, the general approaches and directions of the regulation, to determine the sectoral goals for regulating the use of AI technologies, as well as sector-specific areas for improving the regulation of the use of AI technologies in corruption prevention in the public sector (Francesconi & Peruginelli, 2023).

The goal of regulating relations in the field of AI should be to stimulate the development, implementation and use of these technologies (Walz, 2017), which will contribute to achieving a low level of corruption in the activities of public officials, increase public trust in public officials, as well as in the public sector in general. Taking into account the goal set for the regulation, the author determines the following **tasks**, the solution of which should be addressed in the concept of AI legal regulation:

- creating the basis for the legal regulation of new social relations, which are formed in connection with the use of AI systems, which are primarily stimulating;
- elimination of legal obstacles that hinder the development and application of AI systems in the field of prevention of corruption.

The new regime of legal regulation of the use of AI systems must ensure the necessary degree of protection of the rights and freedoms of public officials as individuals and citizens, as well as meet the interests of society and the state. Thus, in connection with the development and application of AI systems in the prevention of corruption in the public sector, the following **principles** should be foreseen:

- balanced stimulation of the development of AI technologies with the development of the legal framework in the specified period of time ("stimulation in parallel with the regulation");
- moderate regulatory impact, based on a risk-based approach and providing for the adoption of restrictive regulations, if the use of these technologies poses an objectively high risk of harming public officials subject to the control of AI technologies, as well as public and state interests;
- expanding the use of legal instruments, including the development of self-regulation, the creation of ethical guidelines and codes at various levels of state administration;
- a humanitarian-oriented approach, which assumes that the main goal of AI technology development with the help of regulatory influence is to achieve a low level of corruption in the activities of public officials, thus improving the well-being and quality of life of citizens. (Walz, 2017)

In addition to the above mentioned principles, the author emphasizes that the development of AI technologies must be based on basic ethical standards and must include: (1) human well-being as the priority (the goal of ensuring human well-being must prevail over other goals of developing and using AI systems); (2) prohibition on causing harm at the initiative of an AI system (generally, the development, circulation and use of an AI system capable of purposefully causing harm to a person at its own initiative should be restricted); (3) human control (to the extent possible, given the required degree of autonomy of AI systems and other circumstances); (4) compliance of the design with the law (the use of AI systems must not intentionally cause a violation of legal norms on the part of the developer); (5) prevention of covert manipulation of human behaviour; (6) security measures (a sufficient level of personal (i.e. public officials) and public security must be ensured when developing AI systems). (Tobin, 2023)

Almost two-thirds of the respondents (63.6%) also positively assess the need to create AI regulation based on some special ethical principles, while 8.5% rejected such a need. In turn, respondents who believe in the necessity of special basic ethical principles are necessary for the legal regulation of AI technologies consider Security (77.8%), Legality (73.9%), Human Rights Protection (63.1%), Transparency and Responsibility to be the most important (52.7% each). Other core principles such as Confidentiality

(46.8%), Trustworthiness (44.3%), Objectivity (38.4%), Fairness (35%) and Manageability (29.1 %) were considered important but failed to reach a response of 50%.

One of the main **barriers** to expanding the use of AI systems is the lack of public trust in them. Increasing the degree of autonomy of such systems, reducing human control over their application process and inadequate transparent decision-making logic creates public demand for regulatory restrictions on the use of AI systems (Deem & Hansson, 2024), including, according to the author, on issues related to combating corruption. As a result, the majority of respondents (60.5%) of the Research also believe that greater monitoring of AI technologies is needed, even if it could hinder the pace of AI technology development in the public sector. On the other hand, 11.9% of respondents categorically disagree with it. Evaluating the kind of greater supervision of AI technologies, the majority (84.5%) believe that, firstly, a legal framework should be created, and secondly, 40% of respondents believe that it is necessary to create a specialized institution for monitoring AI technologies. On the other hand, almost the same number of respondents (38.9%) believe that there is no need to create a special AI technology supervisory institution, and existing institutions are sufficient and supervision should be divided among them. The respondents propose to divide the AI technology monitoring functions among institutions such as the Data State Inspectorate (86.7%), the State Security Service (73.3%), KNAB (46.7%), the State Police (28%), the Ombudsman (28%), the Office for the Protection of the Constitution (26.7%), the SRS (21.3%) and the State Labour Inspectorate (8%).

In addition, the following can also be distinguished among conceptual **problems**: (1) the problem of determining the subject and scope of regulation of the use of AI systems in general; (2) the problem of self-identification of an AI system when interacting with a person; (3) the problem of legal delegation of decisions to AI systems; (4) the problem of liability for harm caused by the use of AI systems; (5) the problem of the legal regime of the results of intellectual activity created using AI systems; (6) the use of probability estimates for decision-making by AI systems and in some cases the impossibility of fully explaining the decision made; (7) the problem of algorithmic transparency of AI systems. (Tobin, 2023)

Taking into account the above, the author considers it necessary to propose the following **industry-wide tasks** for the regulation of the use of AI technologies in the AI legal framework.

2. The general direction for the implementation of the regulation of the use of AI technologies

1. Enhancement of the technical regulation system. The author has already previously noted that currently there is no legal regulation in the field of AI in Latvia. In order to ensure the safety and reliability of solutions in the field of AI, it is necessary to create a modern system of normative and technical regulations in this field. Respondents are also categorically against (47%) if the introduction of AI technology to prevent corruption were to threaten personal freedom and basic human rights. However, 20.4% of respondents are ready to sacrifice personal freedom and basic human rights, if this can help significantly minimize corruption. Clarifying which basic principles they would be willing to sacrifice, the respondents indicated that, firstly, it could be the right to the inviolability of private life (75.4%), secondly – confidentiality (58.5%), thirdly - the right to the inviolability of correspondence (47, 7%), and fourthly – the right to the inviolability of housing (36.9%).

In addition, the author notes that there is almost a consensus among respondents that the use of AI technology to prevent corruption and access to personal data should be secure. 89.7% of respondents agree with this. On the other hand, in order to prevent, for example, cybercrime and cyberattacks, protect digital identity against theft of personal data or manipulation of personal data, the respondents believe the following is necessary: firstly, a protected, safe and reliable internet environment (66.4%), secondly, privacy and control of personal data (64.3%), thirdly, accountability for personal data breaches (62.2%) and lastly, expanding the competence of responsible officials (i.e. compliance officers – who are responsible for the control of officials) (42.3%).

Thus, according to the author, it would be necessary in some cases to introduce new conformity assessment procedures (standards), taking into account the current and future state of the art, the role of the software component in the functionality and security of the system, as well as the features of the modern approach to software development, its updating and maintenance throughout the life cycle, to ensure personal freedom and basic human rights (Darling et al., 2023).

2. Creation of a mechanism for simplified AI technology testing and implementation in the field of combating corruption. According to the author, it is also necessary to create a special procedure for testing and further implementation of solutions in the field of AI. Such a procedure should allow timely and effective implementation of developments, bypassing redundant administrative procedures (Francesconi & Peruginelli, 2023), which do not take into account the specifics of anti-corruption activities, and without adjusting all applicable legislation, while ensuring the necessary level of security and control of individual state bodies. The most promising tool for the creation of such a mechanism is an experimental legal regime for specific anti-corruption activities. In the long term, of course, the adoption of relevant regulatory acts is necessary to ensure the legal regulation of AI technologies in prevention corruption, as well as to determine a mechanism for the further inclusion of legal norms necessary for the application of AI technologies in regulatory acts.

3. General regulatory approaches and directions. Taking into account the economic and social importance of the use of AI technologies in the field of combating corruption, the commissioning of such systems should not be limited by regulatory measures, except for cases involving a high risk of harming human life and health, as well as national security. In order to develop specific regulatory decisions, a risk-based approach should be used, based on an assessment of the extent of potential harm of these values, taking into account the probability of its occurrence. The question of introducing regulatory restrictions on the use of AI technologies can be considered if above-mentioned risk arises out of the delegation of legally significant decisions (regarding public officials) to AI technologies, which can lead to the infliction of appropriate harm rather than just the fact of their use in the specified sphere. (Greenstein, 2021) The author believes that the development of "soft" forms of regulation should be supported at the initial stage: adoption and use of documents on standardization of voluntary application, guidelines and codes of ethical rules, standards of regulatory bodies and other instruments. Taking into account the fundamental complexity of the regulated sphere of legal relations, the development of the AI technology regulation regime requires the active involvement of industry representatives (including KNAB, SRS, etc. institutions) in the process of creating the relevant regulatory legislation, as well as the involvement of state officials, who will directly be affected by the actions of this AI technology.

4. The AI systems product offer for the control of public officials. At the same time, the not always clear and predictable logic of AI technologies can lead to a series of risks, e.g. while using AI technologies designed to automate transactions and other legal activities, as well as using AI technologies that interact with the physical environment (for example, household robots, electronics, etc.). (Cohen etc., 2023)

Only 17.6% of the respondents answered in the affirmative and were willing to entrust AI with full control over employees when asked whether it is necessary to give AI technologies full control over the use of personal data of employees, acting as an authorized person in the process of collecting personal data, to improve the well-being of the society and promote public trust in the public sector. On the other hand, half, or 47.6%, were categorically against the delegation of such control to AI, and 34.8% of respondents had no opinion on this issue. However, of those respondents who agreed to transfer control over employees to AI technologies, 64.3% were ready to entrust data on all transactions that exceed 20 minimum wages; 60.7% – data on real estate, 51.8% – data on all incomes and expenses; 41.1% – information on loans and data on all movable property (vehicles); 37.5% – data on winnings while gambling; 33.9% – information about relatives; 28.6% – data on financial assets in credit institutions and gifts received; 19.6% – data on travel and leisure trips; 17.9% – data from other databases. On the other hand, the least number of respondents were willing to entrust AI control on public officials through sensitive data, for example, only 16.1% – data on all transactions regardless of the amount and all phone contact information; 12.5% –

movement data from all video cameras; 8.9% – content of telephone conversations; 7.1% – information on utility payments.

However, when asked whether such delegation of full control to AI technologies over the use of personal data of employees, acting as an authorized person in the process of collecting personal data, is necessary to prevent corruption, then slightly more respondents (22.3 %) were willing. The number of respondents who would be categorically against (39.8%) such AI controls over employees also decreased (see Table No. 1).

The author notes that the above-mentioned Research result indicates that the use of AI technologies in collecting data on the activity and property status of public officials, as well as their relatives and business partners, can have a significant impact on mitigating the risks of corruption. However, the use of AI technologies, as the intensity and volume of personal data processing increases, is associated with additional risks of violating the privacy of public officials, their relatives and business partners. Taking into account the above, in the medium term it is desirable to: (1) specify the approach to product compliance approval and assessment while using AI technologies, taking into account their specifics (behaviour change during operation), incl. evaluating compliance with functional requirements, safety requirements; (2) clarify the need and possible cases when architectural features are introduced in AI technologies, to ensure, e.g., the recording of facts that allow determining the location of public officials, operating conditions, as well as recording the activities of public officials and the people around them using audio-visual technology; (3) encourage developers and manufacturers of relevant AI technologies to develop and strengthen ethical standards in the field of information (including personal data) processing and to conscientiously provide information on the functional features of AI technologies, as well as determine the environment for AI technologies within a radius determined by state officials for quality operation.

Table 1. "Respondents' opinion on transfer of full control over employees' personal data to AI technologies"

Is it necessary to delegate AI technologies full control over the use of personal data of employees, acting as an authorized person in the process of collecting personal data,					
to improve the society's well-being and promote public trust in the public sector			to prevent corruption		
Agree	Do not agree	No opinion	No opinion	Do not agree	Agree
17.6	47.6%	34.8%	37.9%	39.8%	22.3%
Those respondents who agree that AI technologies should be provided full control over the use of employees' personal data, and are ready to entrust data to AI technologies for processing					
64.3%	for all transactions above 20 minimum wages				67,6% ↑
60.7%	real estate data				67,6% ↑
51.8%	data on all income and expenses				62% ↑
41.1%	information about loans				52.1% ↑
41.1%	data on all movable property (vehicles)				47.9% ↑
37.5%	data on winnings through gambling				43.7% ↑
33.9%	information about relatives				50.7% ↑
28.6%	data on financial assets in credit institutions				46.5% ↑
28.6%	On gifts received				40.8% ↑

19.6%	Data on travel and leisure trips	31% ↑
17.9%	Data from other databases	23.9% ↑
16.1%	data on all transactions regardless of amount	29.2% ↑
16.1%	all phone contact information	21.1% ↑
12.5%	motion data from all video cameras	9.9% ↑
8.9%	the content of telephone conversations	7% ↑
7.1%	information about utility payments	19.7% ↑

The author notes in the Research that some of the respondents' institutions (7.5%) have developed or approved a digital transformation or AI technology implementation strategy. On the other hand, 62.7% of respondents answered negatively about such activities in their institutions. On the other hand, 29.8% stated that they do not know anything about such strategies.

Of those 7.5% of respondents, the author found out that in their institutions the digital transformation or AI technology implementation strategy basically includes document flow accounting (58.3%), administrative resource usage accounting (41.7%), audio control during a conversation between employees and customers (33.3%), personnel selection (29.2%), working time records (29.2%), video surveillance of employee-customer communication (29.2%), corruption prevention (29.2%), procurement procedures (20.8%) and budget allocation control (12.5%).

Also, the Research found that only 10.7% of the respondents' institutions have an internal control or audit structural unit using AI technologies: In 82.4% of cases, this was for the control of document circulation, 55.9% for the control of the use of administrative resources, 52.9% for the control of working time records, 47.1% for personal control, 38.2% for audio control during a conversation between employees and clients, 35.3% – for control over the allocation and use of budget funds, 29.4% – for video surveillance of employee-client communication and the same amount (29.4%) for corruption prevention.

In this regard, according to the author, it would be advisable to: (1) at the initial stage, stimulate relevant specialized institutions related to the prevention and combating of corruption to create ethical standards in the field of information (including personal data) processing, develop and apply AI systems, implementation of systems for a voluntary assessment of compliance with such standards; (2) to further strengthen in legal acts the possibility of making automated decisions regarding a public official without prior consent to the use of AI technologies for the processing of his personal data in order to prevent corruption in his activity, of course, on the condition that organizational and technical measures are taken to guarantee the rights of the public official (the right assignment to explain and review AI's automated decision, guarantee compensation for damage, verify the validity of the decision taken by the competent authority, etc.).

To accomplish this task, it is necessary to identify and remove regulatory barriers to the use of AI technologies to implement this concept, including those that prevent: (1) automation of data transmission of utility services used by public officials; (2) introduction of city transport with AI technologies, (both in terms of the development of the accompanying infrastructure – development of photo and video recording systems for the movement of state officials, automatic administration system of city parking spaces, introduction of automatic control and accounting systems of traffic flows (including optimization routes); (3) creation of digital platforms and services for the control of public officials (implementation of video surveillance systems with biometric identification functions, etc.); (4) general planning and territorial development planning based on AI and the big data it processes. (Cooper etc., 2024)

5. Civil regulation of the use of AI systems. It is also necessary to ensure the responsible use of AI systems. The most important issues in the application of AI systems in the context of civil law relations, in the author's opinion, are questions of civil liability for the damage caused by AI systems to state officials.

It also calls for detailed research on the concept of no-fault civil liability (Greenstein, 2021) when AI technologies harm public officials, or public officials' relatives or business partners. It is necessary to determine the persons who will be responsible for the erroneous conclusions and the damage caused by the operation of AI technologies. It is also possible to envisage the use of other methods for compensating the damage caused by the operation of AI systems (for example, civil liability insurance, etc.), with the aim of guaranteeing an effective and fair distribution of responsibility in the event of such damage. The author believes that in order to achieve the target of the regulated sphere in the medium term, it is necessary to develop approaches to civil liability issues. In the medium term, it is desirable to conduct additional research on the issue of changing the mechanisms of not only civil, but also criminal and administrative liability (Greenstein, 2021). In this regard, the author also suggests that, in the medium term, it is necessary to determine the cases and conditions of compulsory civil liability insurance for damage that could have been caused to public officials, or persons related to public officials, using AI technologies, including in preventing corruption.

In the medium term, it is necessary to create generally applicable legal norms that allow to move from the use of AI technologies only in an experimental mode to the possibility of their permanent use. For example, the use of AI technologies will be able to identify the property and assets of public officials, as well as monitor their movements in real time. It will also make the process of monitoring the performance of public officials safer, faster, more efficient and more convenient, and thus contribute to the timely detection and corruption prevention in various spheres of the public sector, initiating industry directions for improving the regulation of the use of AI technologies, for example in the construction and financial sectors, procurement and the public sector areas etc.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. It is recommended that the development of "soft" forms of AI regulation should be supported: adoption and use of documents on standardization of voluntary application, guidelines and codes of ethical rules, standards of regulatory bodies and other instruments. It is necessary to introduce new conformity assessment procedures (standards), taking into account the current and future state of the art, the role of the software component in the functionality and security of the system, as well as the features of the modern approach to software development, its updating and maintenance throughout its life cycle in order to ensure personal freedom and basic human rights.
2. The development of AI technologies must be based on the following basic ethical standards: (1) the priority of human well-being; (2) prohibition of harm at the initiative of the AI system; (3) human control; (4) compliance of design with law; (5) prevention of covert manipulation of human behaviour; (6) built-in security.
3. It is necessary to create a special procedure for testing and further implementation of solutions in the field of AI, bypassing redundant administrative procedures, which do not take into account the specifics of anti-corruption activities, and without adjusting all applicable legislation, while ensuring the necessary level of security and control of individual state bodies. For example, the experimental legal regime for specific anti-corruption actions, i.e. issues concerning the prevention of corruption risks.
4. It is recommended to stimulate relevant specialized institutions related to the prevention and combating of corruption to create ethical standards in the field of information (including personal data) processing, to develop and apply AI systems, to introduce systems for voluntary assessment of compliance with such standards. It is necessary to strengthen in legal acts the possibility of making automated decisions regarding a public official without prior consent to the use of AI technologies for the processing of his personal data in order to prevent corruption in his activities.
5. It is necessary to develop approaches to issues of civil liability for mistakes made by AI technology. It is necessary to carry out additional research on the issue of not only civil liability for the mistakes made by AI technology, but also changing the mechanisms of criminal liability and administrative liability.

References

- Artificial Intelligence for Europe*. European Commission. (2018, April 25). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX%3A52018DC0237>
- Ashby, A., Syed, I., & Clement-Jones, T. (2021, March 3). *Regulating Artificial Intelligence: Where are we now? where are we heading?*. Lexology. <https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=772fb63a-c1e2-44b9-89a4-2c042bd17841>
- Cohen, M. C., Dahan, S., Khern-am-nuai, W., Shimao, H., & Touboul, J. (2023, March 30). *The use of AI in legal systems: Determining independent contractor vs. employee Status - Artificial Intelligence and law*. SpringerLink. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10506-023-09353-y>
- Communication: Building trust in human centric artificial intelligence*. European Commission. (2019, April 8). <https://wayback.archive-it.org/12090/20201227221336/https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/communication-building-trust-human-centric-artificial-intelligence>
- Cooper, D., Peets, L., Hansen, M., Choi, S. J., Drake, M., Valat, D., & Capstick, W. (2024, February 14). *European Commission announces New Package of AI measures*. Lexology. <https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=f4b9868c-11ed-4cd6-a3b2-939a97177bf5>
- Darling, C., Stokes, G., & O'Connor, M. (2023, November 28). *Coran darling: Technology's legal edge: DLA piper*. Technology's Legal Edge. <https://www.technologyslegaleage.com/author/cdarling/>
- Deem, M., & Hansson, S. (2024, February 8). *Ai Act: European Council approves the Political Agreement*. Lexology. <https://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=9cc404b5-ebc3-4d7a-a6fc-fd125344535b>
- Erkan, N. (2024, February 28). *How can legal professionals navigate the ethical and legal risks of using Generative AI?*. Lexology. <https://www.lexology.com/pro/content/how-can-legal-professionals-navigate-the-ethical-and-legal-risks-of-using-generative-ai>
- EU Member States sign up to cooperate on Artificial Intelligence*. European Union. (2021a, January 4). <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/eu-member-states-sign-cooperate-artificial-intelligence>
- Francesconi, E., & Peruginelli, G. (2023, September 27). *Profiles of Legal Knowledge Representation and Reasoning in the Semantic Web: an opportunity for AI in the Public Administration*. CEUR. <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3486/5.pdf>
- Greenstein, S. (2021, July 17). *Preserving the rule of law in the era of Artificial Intelligence (AI) - artificial intelligence and law*. SpringerLink. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10506-021-09294-4>
- Policy and investment recommendations for trustworthy Artificial Intelligence*. European Union. (2021b, January 4). https://wayback.archive-it.org/12090/*/https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/policy-and-investment-recommendations-trustworthy-artificial-intelligence
- Rinkēvičs, E. (2024, February 20). *Valsts prezidents iesniedz likumdošanas iniciatīvu par mākslīgā intelekta sistēmu izmantošanu priekšvēlēšanu aģitācijā*. Valsts prezidenta kanceleja. <https://www.president.lv/lv/jaunums/valsts-prezidents-iesniedz-likumdosanas-iniciativu-par-maksliga-intelekta-sistemu-izmantosanu-prieksvelesanu-agitacija>
- Tobin, J. (2023, July 18). *Artificial Intelligence: Development, risks and regulation*. House of Lords Library. <https://lordslibrary.parliament.uk/artificial-intelligence-development-risks-and-regulation>
- Walz, A. (2017, September 18). *A holistic approach to developing an innovation-friendly and human-centric AI Society - IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*. SpringerLink. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40319-017-0636-4#citeas>
- White Paper on Artificial Intelligence: a European approach to excellence and trust*. European Commission. (2020, January 19). https://ec.europa.eu/info/files/white-paper-artificial-intelligence-european-approach-excellence-and-trust_en