Volume 4, No. 6 | November–December 2021

The Journal of Robotics, Artificial Intelligence & Law

Editor's Note: Robotics and Tort Liability
Victoria Prussen Spears

Defining Autonomy in the Context of Tort Liability: Is Machine Learning Indicative of Robotic Responsibility? Part II
Katherine D. Sheriff

FTC Orders Destruction of Algorithms Created From Unlawfully Acquired Data
Randi W. Singer and Michael P. Goodyear

Negotiating the Use of Technology Assisted Review/Artificial Intelligence in Document Review
Tracy Ickes

International Developments

European Commission Proposes Regulation on Artificial Intelligence
Karen L. Neuman, Hilary Bonaccorsi, Michael P. Tierney, Alec Burnside, Olaf Fasshauer, and Dorothy Cory-Wright

European Commission's Proposed Regulation on Artificial Intelligence: Requirements for High-Risk AI Systems
Karen L. Neuman, Hilary Bonaccorsi, Michael P. Tierney, and Madeleine White

Privacy and the EU's Draft AI Regulation: What's New and What's Not?
Marijn Storm and Alex van der Wolk

European Data Protection Board's Guidelines on Connected Vehicles: Key Takeaways
Alja Poler De Zwart

The Ethical Workplace and Artificial Intelligence
Rachael Cage and Theo Cooper

Safeguarding the Use of AI in the Insurance Sector
Ashley Prebble and Emma Eaton

fastcase FULL COURT PRESS

RAIL
The Journal of Robotics, Artificial Intelligence & Law
Volume 4, No. 6 | November–December 2021

399 **Editor's Note: Robotics and Tort Liability**
Victoria Prussen Spears

403 **Defining Autonomy in the Context of Tort Liability: Is Machine Learning Indicative of Robotic Responsibility? Part II**
Katherine D. Sheriff

423 **FTC Orders Destruction of Algorithms Created From Unlawfully Acquired Data**
Randi W. Singer and Michael P. Goodyear

429 **Negotiating the Use of Technology Assisted Review/Artificial Intelligence in Document Review**
Tracy Ickes

International Developments

433 **European Commission Proposes Regulation on Artificial Intelligence**
Karen L. Neuman, Hilary Bonaccorsi, Michael P. Tierney, Alec Burnside, Olaf Fasshauer, and Dorothy Cory-Wright

441 **European Commission's Proposed Regulation on Artificial Intelligence: Requirements for High-Risk AI Systems**
Karen L. Neuman, Hilary Bonaccorsi, Michael P. Tierney, and Madeleine White

451 **Privacy and the EU's Draft AI Regulation: What's New and What's Not?**
Marijn Storm and Alex van der Wolk

459 **European Data Protection Board's Guidelines on Connected Vehicles: Key Takeaways**
Alja Poler De Zwart

467 **The Ethical Workplace and Artificial Intelligence**
Rachael Cage and Theo Cooper

475 **Safeguarding the Use of AI in the Insurance Sector**
Ashley Prebble and Emma Eaton

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Steven A. Meyerowitz
President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

Victoria Prussen Spears
Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Miranda Cole
Partner, Covington & Burling LLP

Kathryn DeBord
Partner & Chief Innovation Officer, Bryan Cave LLP

Melody Drummond Hansen
Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Paul B. Keller
Partner, Allen & Overy LLP

Garry G. Mathiason
Shareholder, Littler Mendelson P.C.

Elaine D. Solomon
Partner, Blank Rome LLP

Linda J. Thayer
Partner, Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner LLP

Edward J. Walters
Chief Executive Officer, Fastcase Inc.

John Frank Weaver
Attorney, McLane Middleton, Professional Association

THE JOURNAL OF ROBOTICS, ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE & LAW (ISSN 2575-5633 (print) /ISSN 2575-5617 (online) at $495.00 annually is published six times per year by Full Court Press, a Fastcase, Inc., imprint. Copyright 2021 Fastcase, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact Fastcase, Inc., 711 D St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20004, 202.999.4777 (phone), 202.521.3462 (fax), or email customer service at support@fastcase.com.

Publishing Staff
Publisher: Morgan Morrissette Wright
Journal Designer: Sharon D. Ray
Cover Art Design: Juan Bustamante

Cite this publication as:

The Journal of Robotics, Artificial Intelligence & Law (Fastcase)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

Copyright © 2021 Full Court Press, an imprint of Fastcase, Inc.

All Rights Reserved.

A Full Court Press, Fastcase, Inc., Publication

Editorial Office

711 D St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20004
https://www.fastcase.com/

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE JOURNAL OF ROBOTICS, ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE & LAW, 711 D St. NW, Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20004.

Articles and Submissions

Direct editorial inquiries and send material for publication to:

Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541.

Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, corporate compliance officers, government agencies and their counsel, senior business executives, scientists, engineers, and anyone interested in the law governing artificial intelligence and robotics. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:

Morgan Morrissette Wright, Publisher, Full Court Press at mwright@fastcase.com or at 202.999.4878

For questions or Sales and Customer Service:

Customer Service
Available 8 a.m.–8 p.m. Eastern Time
866.773.2782 (phone)
support@fastcase.com (email)

Sales
202.999.4777 (phone)
sales@fastcase.com (email)
ISSN 2575-5633 (print)
ISSN 2575-5617 (online)

Safeguarding the Use of AI in the Insurance Sector

Ashley Prebble and Emma Eaton*

The authors of this article discuss a recent report on governance principles for ethical and trustworthy artificial intelligence in the insurance sector published by the European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority.

The European Insurance and Occupational Pensions Authority ("EIOPA") has published a report on governance principles for ethical and trustworthy artificial intelligence ("AI") in the insurance sector. The report sets out six governance principles that have been developed by EIOPA's Consultative Expert Group on Digital Ethics in Insurance. The principles cover:

1. Proportionality;
2. Fairness and non-discrimination;
3. Transparency and explainability;
4. Human oversight;
5. Data governance and recordkeeping; and
6. Robustness and performance.

These principles are accompanied by non-binding guidance for insurance firms on how to implement them in practice throughout the AI system's life cycle. It is worth noting that environmental aspects of AI were not examined in the paper.

Background

There have been a number of papers on ethics and AI published by a variety of stakeholders in recent years at the national, European, and international levels. Just days before the EIOPA report, the Alan Turing Institute published a paper commissioned by the Financial Conduct Authority ("FCA"), considering the challenges and benefits of AI in Financial Services. Given the volume of literature on AI and ethics, this report is a welcome addition for its focus on the insurance sector.

Robotics, Artificial Intelligence & Law / November–December 2021, Vol. 4, No. 6, pp. 475–479.
© 2021 Full Court Press. All rights reserved.
ISSN 2575-5633 (print) /ISSN 2575-5617 (online)

Currently, there is no universal consensus on ethical issues in AI, as, among other matters, much depends on the use case of the AI and the stakeholders involved (e.g., customer, regulator). The significant role of the insurance sector for businesses and individuals makes digital ethics in insurance an important aspect of regulatory oversight. The EIOPA report seeks to assist firms to reflect on the ethical issues associated with Big Data ("BD") and AI and to organize their governance arrangements to safeguard the "sound use of AI."

The Report

The report notes that the adoption of BD analytics and AI in the European insurance sector has accelerated during the COVID-19 pandemic. There are multiple use cases for AI across the entire insurance value chain, from product design, through to claims management. The ability to micro-segment risks with increasing accuracy is a particular concern to regulators, for the implications it has on pricing, competition, and access to cover for higher-risk customers. The insurance sector should take ethical concerns of BD and AI seriously in order to build and retain customer trust in products and services and avoid invasive regulation.

Although public interest and ethical standards and outcomes already underpin some important conduct of business regulatory principles (e.g., treating customers fairly), the report explains that the ethical use of data and digital technologies requires firms to look beyond regulation or legislation and expressly "take into consideration the provision of public good to society as part of the corporate social responsibility of firms." Firms should think about the impact of AI on different categories of customer, with special attention given to vulnerable customers, and determine whether or not the fair treatment of customers is put at risk by the applicable AI.

This means that firms need to understand the design of the AI system, the sources and quality of data used in its processes, how the outcomes (decisions) are reached by the AI and how those decisions are implemented from the end user's point of view. By developing, documenting, implementing, and reviewing appropriate governance systems and arrangements, insurers and intermediaries will establish a culture that ensures appropriate ethical considerations are considered when making decisions about AI and BD.

The Six Governance Principles

The six governance principles and accompanying guidance are summarized in the accompanying chart.

	Principle	Key Points
1.	Proportionality	Firms should conduct AI use case impact assessments based on the severity and likelihood of harm that could occur to customers or the firm, to understand what governance measures are required for that particular use case. Governance measures could include transparency, explainability, human oversight, data management, and robustness.
		The assessment and governance measures should be proportionate to the potential impact of the specific AI use case on consumers and/or the firm.
		The combination of measures should be assessed to ensure an ethical and trustworthy use of the AI.
2.	Fairness and Non-Discrimination	Firms should adhere to principles of fairness and non-discrimination when using AI and balance the interests of all stakeholders. The principle includes some specific obligations, such as "avoiding the use of certain types of price and claims optimization practices like those aiming to maximise consumers' 'willingness to pay' or 'willingness to accept.'" The paper accepts that "fairness" is difficult to define and is context specific and the accompanying guidance looks at what firms should take into account when determining what is "fair."
		Data governance is highlighted as important to ensuring fairness and non-discrimination. Firms should think about the source of data, its accuracy and appropriateness for the purpose for which it is being used.
		Firms should monitor and mitigate biases from data and AI systems which could include developing fairness and non-discrimination metrics in high-impact AI.
3.	Transparency and Explainability	The concept of transparency in AI systems is a key part of discussions on the responsible use of AI in financial services. Firms are expected to understand how AI makes important decisions or governs important processes that affect the business and its customers. The greater the impact of the AI, the greater the level of transparency and explainability measures that the firm should adopt.

	Principle	Key Points
		Transparency helps customers trust new technology and it helps firms to explain how the outcomes of decisions are reached by AI to key stakeholders, such as customers and regulators. Explanations should be "meaningful and easy to understand in order to help stakeholders make informed decisions."
		Firms will need to adapt their explanations to the audience and the particular AI use case.
4.	Human Oversight	Firms must still involve adequate human oversight throughout an AI's life cycle. Roles and responsibilities need to be clearly allocated, documented, and embedded in governance systems. This means some form of direct human involvement in the design, operation, maintenance, adaptation or application of the AI system, by individuals with appropriate experience, skills, and knowledge.
		Firms should consider if staff require additional training in AI.
5.	Data Governance and Record Keeping	It is important to ensure data used by BD and AI is accurate, complete, appropriate, and stored securely. Bias and discrimination can originate from the data used in the AI system, so governance arrangements on the collection of data and the processing of that data are important. The provisions of the GDPR (as on- shored in the UK) form the basis of this principle.
		The same governance standards should apply to data, no matter if it is sourced internally or from external sources.
6.	Robustness and Performance	AI systems should be fit for purpose and monitored on an on-going basis, including for cyber resilience. Assessments should be on-going and sound data management will underpin the usability and suitability of the AI.
		Performance metrics should be developed.

What Does This Mean for Insurers and Intermediaries?

The paper published by EIOPA represents the views of the members of EIOPA's expert group on digital ethics, but the views in the report do not necessarily represent the position of EIOPA,

but EIOPA will use the findings to identify possible supervisory initiatives on digital ethics in insurance.

Firms operating in Europe should use the information in the report and the non-binding guidance to help them develop risk-based, proportionate governance measures around the use of BD and AI in their business. Firms should also stay abreast of further work by EIOPA and other European-level initiatives relating to AI, which includes the European Commission's Ethics guidelines for Trustworthy AI (on which this report is based) and the proposal for a regulation on artificial intelligence, published by the European Commission in April 2021.

The Prudential Regulation Authority ("PRA"), FCA, and the UK government are conducting their own activities on the safe adoption of AI in UK financial services, which includes the collaboration referred to earlier with the Alan Turing Institute and the activities of the Artificial Intelligence Public-Private Forum ("AIPPF"). The report published by the Alan Turing Institute in June 2021 includes guiding principles for the responsible adoption of AI, discussing fairness, transparency, human oversight, reliability and robustness and touching on "uninsurability," among other things. At the second meeting of the AIPPF in February 2021, participants again discussed similar points to the EIOPA report, such as the need for human oversight of AI and adequate data governance standards, while noting that any risk management guidelines need to strike the right balance to provide reassurance without hampering innovation.

So unsurprisingly, there are commonalities between the FCA and PRA's work and the report published by EIOPA. Given that the EIOPA report is sector specific and very detailed, UK insurers and intermediaries will benefit from reading the EIOPA paper and considering how the principles and guidance can be applied to their own business and governance arrangements.

Note

* Ashley Prebble is a partner at Clifford Chance LLP, where he is head of the firm's Financial Institutions Group in London and co-head of the firm's Global Insurance Sector Group. Emma Eaton is a senior associate in the firm's London office, advising on issues and risks relating to financial services. The authors may be reached at ashley.prebble@cliffordchance.com and emma.eaton@cliffordchance.com, respectively.