



**United
Nations**

English ▼ ≡

Global Dialogue on AI Governance

[Home](#) / All Written Submissions to the AI Dialogue

All Written Submissions to the AI Dialogue



 ORGANIZATION

Phygitalytics



Reset Filters

Phygitalytics

Respondent ID: 665

 Asia and the Pacific Private Sector

1 **In your opinion, what outcomes would make the first Global Dialogue on AI Governance a success?**

A successful first Global Dialogue would produce outcomes grounded in how AI actually fails in production, not in theoretical risk frameworks.

1. Governance as Runtime, Not Policy Documents

Most organisations confuse compliance with governance. They spend six months producing a forty-page responsible AI policy that is unenforceable in the codebase. The Dialogue should establish that governance is a runtime: guardrails, observability, evaluation pipelines, and tested kill switches. Success means participating nations commit to governance that can be audited in code, not just in committee minutes.

2. The Four Questions Mandate

AI initiatives fail because four decisions were never made before deployment: Who owns outcomes? What can the system do autonomously? What is the acceptable risk threshold? Who can stop it, and how fast? A successful Dialogue would formalise these four questions as a pre-deployment standard across jurisdictions.

Written answers signed by named humans before any production system ships

quarterly. It is controlled intelligence: systems that can be trusted, audited, and corrected at scale. The Dialogue succeeds if it shifts the global conversation from "who has the most powerful models" to "who has the most reliable control surfaces." Eval pipelines, audit trails, drift detectors, escalation playbooks, and kill switches that have actually been tested.

The Practitioner Test

The Dialogue fails if it produces another aspirational declaration. It succeeds if a CIO in Bengaluru, a regulator in Brussels, and a founder in San Francisco can each point to one enforceable standard that changed how they deploy AI on Monday. Capability scales fast. Control compounds. Build both. Build control first.

☆ THEMATIC PRIORITIES

- 2 **From your perspective, which of the following thematic areas identified by the General Assembly Resolution 79/325 for the AI Dialogue reflect your priorities for urgent action and active engagement?**

AI capacity-building; Safe, secure and trustworthy AI; Social, economic, ethical, cultural, linguistic and technical implications of AI;

- 3 **Please briefly explain your selection.**

These four priorities reflect what I observe failing in production across ESG, financial operations, healthcare, and enterprise AI deployments. Safe, secure and trustworthy AI is foundational because most AI failures are not model failures. They are governance failures. Across forty enterprise engagements,

guardrails the AI itself cannot disable.

Transparency, accountability, and human oversight addresses the control gap that separates demo AI from production AI. The test is simple: at 2 a.m. on a Saturday, who can stop the production AI system and in how many minutes? If the answer involves a ticket, a meeting, or a vendor phone call, you do not have oversight. You have hope. Every AI output a human will act on needs a traceable path back to its source.

Interoperability of governance approaches matters because AI systems cross jurisdictions. A disclosure extracted in India, processed in Singapore, and filed in Brussels cannot navigate three incompatible governance frameworks.

Interoperability is not theoretical harmonisation. It is practical alignment on audit trails, evaluation standards, and incident response protocols.

AI capacity-building is urgent because the gap between organisations that talk about AI and organisations that run on it is not intelligence. It is discipline. I have trained over two thousand learners across fifty-five countries. The pattern is consistent: most stop at awareness. Very few reach the habits stage where AI-assisted decisions become default. Capacity-building must focus on operational readiness, not just technical literacy.

Capability commoditises. Control compounds. These four priorities build control.

4 In your opinion, are there any cross-cutting or emerging issues not captured by the listed themes above? If so, please explain.

Three critical issues are missing from the listed themes. Each emerges from production failures I observe repeatedly across enterprise deployments.

codebase. Guardrails are aspirational. Observability is a dashboard nobody monitors. When incidents occur, the policy does not help because it was never connected to the system. The Dialogue must address governance as executable infrastructure: eval pipelines, drift detectors, audit trails, and kill switches that have been tested under load. A forty-page policy that cannot stop a hallucinating agent at runtime is not governance.

2. The Data Foundation Problem

AI governance discussions focus on models and outputs. Most failures originate in data. ESG disclosures fail not because extraction models are weak, but because plant and supplier data is fragmented across disconnected systems. Financial operations fail because source documents arrive in inconsistent formats with no lineage. AI does not solve data problems. It amplifies them. Poor data leads to confident but incorrect outputs, exactly the failure mode that is catastrophic in regulated disclosures. Governance frameworks must address data infrastructure as a precondition, not an assumption.

3. The Multi-Layer System Reality

Users experience AI as a single output. Production AI is a ten-layer system: interface, orchestration, context handling, retrieval, validation, memory, tools, model, guardrails, and governance. Failures occur across all layers, but current frameworks focus almost exclusively on the model layer. When orchestration picks the wrong tool or retrieval returns stale data, users blame the model. Governance must span all ten layers, with observability and accountability at each.

These are not edge cases. They are the primary failure modes in production.

TERMS OF USE

[DONATE](#)

systems. Generic ESG tools do not understand sector realities in textiles, manufacturing, cement, or logistics. The result: delays, inconsistencies, and compliance risk. At SAM Corporate, document extraction accuracy was 30% before intervention. The problem was not the model. It was fragmented data foundations and no validation pipeline between extraction and disclosure.

In financial operations, enterprises adopt AI for automation but skip governance



**United
Nations**