



General Assembly

Distr.: General
13 May 2026

Original: English

Human Rights Council

Sixty-second session

15 June–10 July 2026

Agenda items 3 and 5

**Promotion and protection of all human rights, civil,
political, economic, social and cultural rights,
including the right to development**

Human rights bodies and mechanisms

Impact of artificial intelligence systems on good governance

Study of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee*

Summary

In the present study, submitted pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution 57/5, the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee examines the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) systems on good governance.

The Advisory Committee identifies how AI may enhance public service delivery, strengthen transparency and anti-corruption efforts and promote inclusive participation. It examines the human rights risks arising from AI deployment in public governance, notably mass surveillance, algorithmic discrimination, opacity in automated decision-making, manipulation of the information environment, labour displacement and environmental harm. It also examines how the concentration of AI development among a limited number of actors risks entrenching patterns of digital dependency and underscores the imperative of inclusive and equitable participation by all States in the formulation of applicable norms and standards.

The Advisory Committee sets out recommendations to ensure that AI deployment in public governance remains consistent with international human rights obligations and the principles of good governance.

* Agreement was reached to publish the present document after the standard publication date owing to circumstances beyond the submitter's control.



I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Human Rights Council, in its resolution 57/5, requested the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee to prepare a study on the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) systems on good governance, indicating in particular the areas in which AI systems could contribute to promoting and protecting human rights through good governance and those in which such systems posed a challenge to good governance and human rights, highlighting good practices around the globe on ways to develop, deploy, use and govern AI systems to promote and protect human rights through good governance and identifying necessary safeguards.

2. At its thirty-second session, the Advisory Committee established a drafting group composed of Miznah Omair Alomair, Nicole Ameline, Joseph Gérard Angoh, Edward Amoako Asante, Buhm-Suk Baek (Rapporteur), Rabah Boudache, Ignacio de Casas, Riva Ganguly Das, Alessandra Devulsky, Veronika Fikfak, Jewel Major, Afsaneh Nadipour, Ren Yisheng, Patrycja Sasnal, Vassilis Tzevelekos (Chair) and Frans Viljoen.

B. Scope of study

3. This study examines the integration of AI into public governance and its implications for human rights. Accordingly, the focus is not on the governance of AI as such, but rather on how AI systems may advance or impede human rights when deployed by public authorities. The study explores the conditions that must be present for AI to support governance in fulfilling its promise of efficiency and transparency. It posits that AI deployment, if not grounded in human rights obligations, risks creating new avenues for systematic human rights violations that transcend traditional remedial mechanisms.

4. The analysis traces the evolution of the Human Rights Council's framework linking good governance and human rights from its resolution 7/11 (2008) to its resolution 57/5 (2024), demonstrating growing recognition that the two are not merely complementary, but mutually constitutive. It examines how AI challenges the adaptability of this established framework. While AI and algorithmic systems can enhance the capacity of States to fulfil their obligations under international human rights law, notably by improving healthcare delivery, expanding access to education and strengthening social protection mechanisms, such systems simultaneously enable unprecedented surveillance capabilities and risk entrenching discriminatory patterns. Moreover, the replacement of transparent administrative procedures with opaque computational processes may impede effective administrative and judicial review and undermine the right to an effective remedy.

5. The present study incorporates United Nations discussions and stakeholder contributions, including 32 responses to the Advisory Committee's questionnaire from States, regional organizations, national human rights institutions, civil society and academic institutions.¹ The analysis develops a comprehensive, rights-based framework grounded in the principles of effective remedy and accountability, underscoring throughout the imperative of integrating human rights due diligence into the procurement, design and deployment of AI in public administration, ensuring algorithmic transparency that affords affected individuals meaningful opportunities to understand and challenge automated decisions and upholding robust institutional safeguards capable of detecting and addressing discriminatory bias, privacy violations and procedural irregularities. It examines the disproportionate impact of AI on vulnerable populations and analyses how the absence of proactive measures to ensure inclusive design and meaningful participation risks amplifying existing inequalities. Overall, the study reflects on realizing the transformative potential of AI for good governance that has human rights, human dignity and accountability at its core.

¹ Available at <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/advisory-committee/impact-artificial-intelligence-systems-good-governance>.

C. Good governance and human rights

6. OHCHR defines good governance as the process whereby public institutions conduct public affairs, manage public resources and guarantee the realization of human rights in a manner essentially free of abuse and corruption.² This understanding emerged when the Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 2000/64, formally recognized the nexus between governance, development and human dignity, establishing that transparent and accountable governance responsive to people's needs is essential for promoting human rights. Accordingly, as affirmed by the Human Rights Council, good governance is understood as participatory, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and guided by the rule of law and human rights principles.³

7. The Human Rights Council has progressively developed the normative framework linking good governance and human rights since 2008, recognizing that transparent, accountable and participatory government is the foundation for human rights promotion, emphasizing the fight against corruption and calling for a professional, merit-based public service that upholds the highest standards of integrity.⁴ More recently, the Council has addressed digital-era challenges, recognizing access to the Internet and digital technologies as essential for accessing information, public services, education and justice, while welcoming technological innovations to prevent, detect and combat corruption, when accompanied by proper data protection and privacy safeguards.⁵

8. The Human Rights Council, in its resolution 57/5, marked a milestone by formally putting AI on the good governance and human rights agenda. It acknowledged that AI presented both opportunities and risks, offering benefits such as combating corruption and improving public service delivery while introducing challenges, including disinformation, that can undermine democratic processes. The Council urged States, civil society, the media and other stakeholders to develop strategies to mitigate risks while promoting the full enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Crucially, it called upon States to promote safe, secure, and trustworthy AI systems in an inclusive and equitable manner, and for the benefit of all, reflecting the principle that AI development should be guided by good governance and human rights principles, including transparency, fairness and accountability. In parallel, the Secretary-General convened the High-level Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence in 2023.⁶ The Global Digital Compact reflects the urgency of ensuring that AI strengthens rather than undermines human rights, equality and the rule of law.

II. Artificial intelligence-supported good governance: opportunities and risks for human rights

A. Positive contributions of artificial intelligence to human rights and good governance

1. Enhancing public service delivery and fulfilling economic, social and cultural rights

9. A frequently recognized potential of AI in governance lies in its capacity to transform public service delivery, thereby advancing the realization of all rights, including economic, social and cultural rights. AI systems can process large volumes of data and automate complex tasks, which may render administrative services more efficient, accessible and responsive to individual needs. Several States and international observers have expressed

² See <https://www.ohchr.org/en/good-governance/about-good-governance>.

³ See, for example, Human Rights Council resolutions 7/11, 19/20, 25/8, 31/14, 37/6, 45/9, 51/5 and 57/5.

⁴ See Human Rights Council resolutions 7/11, 19/20 and 25/8.

⁵ See Human Rights Council resolutions 45/9 and 51/5.

⁶ Governing AI for Humanity: Final Report (New York, United Nations, 2024).

measured optimism that, when designed, deployed and regulated appropriately, AI can substantially support governmental capacity in areas such as healthcare, education and social protection.⁷

10. The right to health can be advanced by AI-driven innovations in medical diagnosis and public health management,⁸ illustrating the ability of AI to bolster the availability and quality of health services, a core obligation under the right to the highest attainable standard of health.⁹ AI can enhance diagnostic precision, optimize hospital operations and streamline patient triage, thereby making healthcare systems more effective and equitable.¹⁰

11. In education, AI may bridge educational divides and enhance institutional management.¹¹ AI-enabled educational platforms can address inequalities by tailoring instruction to individual learning styles and needs in real time, thereby better including those who struggle in standardized systems, regardless of age, language or disability.¹² Applications converting educational materials into alternative formats serve as assistive tools for persons with disabilities. AI can also support educational administration by identifying students at risk of discontinuing their studies and enabling targeted interventions, while allowing teachers to devote greater attention to individual student needs. When underpinned by a human-centred approach that prioritizes equitable access, such tools hold the potential to narrow disparities in educational outcomes and advance the good governance principle of inclusive, people-centred service delivery. However, the uncritical adoption of AI risks exacerbating digital divides and eroding human agency, ultimately compromising the right to inclusive and equitable education.¹³

12. AI can improve the administration of social welfare programmes, thereby supporting the right to social security and an adequate standard of living.¹⁴ Machine-learning algorithms can quickly analyse household data to identify those most in need of assistance or to detect errors in benefit distribution. Automating language translation and interpretation can support individuals in accessing justice and public services. Such automation, if transparent, helps ensure that limited resources reach the right beneficiaries quickly, creating more effective pathways for the realization of socioeconomic rights.

13. The automated processing of applications can improve institutional efficiency and responsiveness, which are essential for good governance. Integrating AI into administrative processes such as filing taxes and calculating benefits may yield improvements in efficiency and allow human officials to concentrate on more complex and judgment-intensive work.¹⁵

14. Beyond individual services, the predictive analytics capacity of AI can facilitate a transition from reactive to proactive governance. For instance, integrating AI into disaster management can help forecast crises such as floods or disease outbreaks before they occur, allowing authorities to take preventive measures.¹⁶

15. AI technology may be applied to support certain functions of law enforcement, national security and border control. AI-enabled systems may assist in criminal investigations, for instance through licence-plate recognition, and may contribute to efforts to detect illicit activities. However, it must be emphasized that the deployment of AI in these domains raises

⁷ Submissions from Brazil, Singapore, Uzbekistan and People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy.

⁸ Submissions from Chile, Cuba and Ecuador.

⁹ Submission from Comisión de Derechos Humanos de la Ciudad de México (Human Rights Commission of Mexico City).

¹⁰ Submissions from Chile and Ecuador.

¹¹ See [A/79/520](#).

¹² Submissions from Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) and Myanmar National Human Rights Commission.

¹³ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), *Global Education Monitoring Report 2023: Technology in Education – A Tool on Whose Terms?* (Paris, 2023).

¹⁴ Submission from Spain.

¹⁵ World Bank, *Artificial Intelligence in the Public Sector: Maximizing Opportunities, Managing Risks* (Washington, D.C., 2020).

¹⁶ Submissions from Cuba and Geneva Human Rights Platform.

some of the most significant human rights concerns. Such technologies require robust legal frameworks ensuring transparency, accountability and full compliance with international human rights standards.¹⁷

16. In practice, such applications of AI contribute to good governance by strengthening evidence-based policy formulation. AI technologies enhance the capacity of public authorities to make fast, informed decisions and allocate resources in accordance with anticipated needs, thereby embodying the principle of responsiveness, which is central to people-centred governance. While predictive models must be designed, deployed and governed with due regard for the right to privacy, non-discrimination and other human rights considerations, they hold significant potential to transform public administration in ways that advance the realization of economic, social and cultural rights.

2. Promoting transparency, accountability and anti-corruption

17. AI can serve as an important tool to strengthen transparency in public administration, thereby fostering public trust and reinforcing the accountability of governmental institutions. By reducing the scope for individual discretion in routine decision-making and by generating auditable digital records, well-designed AI systems can reduce opportunities for corruption and make it easier to detect wrongdoing.¹⁸ Digital government innovations can contribute to the prevention of corruption and the promotion of accountability, provided that personal data and privacy are adequately respected.¹⁹ More broadly, digital and emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence, can facilitate international cooperation to prevent and combat corruption, provided that their development and use remain consistent with applicable international human rights law.²⁰

18. AI can also reinforce accountability through enhanced record-keeping and data analysis. Public sector AI systems typically record each action taken and the data inputs underlying decisions, creating a comprehensive audit trail. This can deter misconduct by ensuring that decisions are traceable and provide a basis for review in the event of appeal or complaint. Initiatives in some jurisdictions now seek to design transparent AI systems capable of explaining algorithmic reasoning, thereby ensuring that algorithmic governance complements rather than undermines the rule of law.²¹

19. AI can further amplify civic participation and independent oversight, consequently reinforcing accountability. Open data policies, when combined with AI-driven analytics, enable civil society, the media and other stakeholders to scrutinize large volumes of public information for indications of malpractice or rights violations. The United Nations Development Programme has underlined the value of using AI in this way, including for the monitoring of procurement and illicit financial flows in support of broader governance.²²

20. While AI does not constitute a comprehensive solution to governance challenges, it offers new avenues to advance the principles of transparency and accountability. Through such applications, public authorities can take significant steps toward strengthening institutional integrity, combating corruption and upholding the rule of law.

3. A tool for inclusion, participation and equality

21. A further positive aspect is the potential of AI to promote inclusion and equality in governance. Good governance demands that institutions be inclusive, giving voice and access to all segments of society, including marginalized groups. AI can assist in overcoming

¹⁷ See [A/HRC/60/45](#).

¹⁸ Business at OECD, “Harnessing AI for integrity: opportunities, challenges, and the business case against corruption” (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Paris, 2024).

¹⁹ See Human Rights Council resolution 51/5.

²⁰ Conference of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention against Corruption, resolution 11/1.

²¹ See <https://e-estonia.com/estonia-and-automated-decision-making-challenges-for-public-administration>.

²² New Technologies for Sustainable Development: Perspectives on Integrity, Trust and Anti-Corruption (New York, 2021).

barriers faced by these groups. For instance, AI-powered assistive technologies can enable persons with disabilities to access public information and services on an equal basis with others, in fulfilment of obligations under the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to ensure the accessibility of information and services. Such tools can also enhance the right of access to information for communities that have struggled to engage with government due to language or literacy barriers.

22. AI can enhance participation in democratic processes. Such applications can broaden the scope of participatory democracy by creating additional channels through which individuals, including groups historically underrepresented in policymaking, may contribute to governance. The Human Rights Council has encouraged such innovation, noting that digital technologies can facilitate inclusive participation in public life and calling upon States to bridge digital divides so that marginalized populations can participate on equal terms with others.²³ Furthermore, AI-enabled translation and language-processing tools can facilitate political participation, including access to electoral processes, for persons belonging to linguistic minorities in multilingual States. Meaningful participation through such tools, however, depends on equitable access.

23. AI can also assist in identifying and addressing inequities in service provision. By analysing administrative and other relevant data sets, public authorities can detect where services are systematically failing particular groups or areas, such as neighbourhoods with persistently lower access to healthcare or longer emergency response times, thereby advancing the principles of equality and non-discrimination.²⁴ When implemented transparently and with community input, such applications align with the right to development and the shared commitment to leave no one behind.²⁵ Affected communities should be active participants in the creation and governance of AI, not merely passive subjects of policy. Such benefits, however, are by no means automatic and require AI systems themselves to be designed and trained to guard against the reproduction of existing biases.

B. Negative impacts of artificial intelligence on human rights and good governance

24. Despite its potential, the integration of AI into public governance presents notable challenges for the protection of human rights. Without robust legal frameworks, human rights guardrails and human oversight, AI systems may enable mass surveillance, entrench systemic biases, undermine due process and distort public discourse. Such risks, if left unaddressed, can undermine the foundations of good governance and the rule of law. Characterizing AI as a neutral technology would be an oversimplification, as its design and application can reflect and amplify existing power imbalances.

1. Eroding privacy through mass surveillance and data exploitation

25. The most immediate human rights concern posed by AI in governance is its impact on privacy.²⁶ AI systems typically rely on the collection and processing of large volumes of personal data, ranging from facial images and location traces to social media content and biometric identifiers, and, when deployed by public authorities, can significantly expand surveillance capabilities. Machine-learning techniques are particularly adept at identifying patterns across vast and ostensibly unrelated data sets, enabling what has been termed the data mosaic effect, whereby comprehensive profiles of individuals can be constructed by aggregating information from disparate sources.²⁷ A defining characteristic of such systems is their capacity to infer sensitive personal information that individuals have not explicitly disclosed. Judicial bodies in multiple jurisdictions have found that certain mass-profiling systems violated fundamental rights by enabling covert and disproportionate surveillance of

²³ Human Rights Council resolution 47/23.

²⁴ See <https://stories.undp.org/bending-the-ai-arc-towards-equity>.

²⁵ High-level Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence in 2023, *Governing AI for Humanity*.

²⁶ See A/HRC/60/45.

²⁷ See A/HRC/48/31; and David E. Pozen, "The mosaic theory, national security, and the Freedom of Information Act", *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 115, No. 3 (December 2005).

vulnerable communities without adequate transparency or justification, underscoring the need for stringent safeguards to ensure that automated profiling does not infringe upon privacy or perpetuate discrimination.

26. These developments raise significant concerns regarding the right to privacy, as well as privacy's function as a gateway right that enables the exercise of the freedoms of expression, association and religion or belief. AI-enhanced surveillance risks eroding the sphere of private life free from arbitrary intrusion, as pattern recognition and large-scale data mining can produce pervasive monitoring that exceeds traditional thresholds of necessity and proportionality.²⁸ Networked video surveillance combined with facial recognition technology, for instance, enables the tracking of individuals across public spaces in real time without continuous human intervention and is particularly intrusive, requiring the highest level of justification on privacy and data protection grounds.

27. The privacy risks of AI extend beyond cameras. Authorities increasingly use machine learning to analyse combined data sets such as tax, social protection and publicly available online information to identify individuals who are deemed risky. Administrative inquiries have concluded that large-scale, automated matching of personal data can generate erroneous decisions with substantial repercussions, highlighting how automation can infringe privacy and due process.²⁹

28. More generally, AI-enabled monitoring represents a qualitative shift from targeted interception based on individualized suspicion to algorithmic filtering at scale, potentially subjecting entire populations to continuous scrutiny. OHCHR has cautioned that indiscriminate surveillance represses the exercise of freedoms of expression and association.³⁰ The chilling effect of pervasive surveillance, whereby individuals are deterred from exercising lawful rights owing to a perceived risk of sanction or adverse consequences, is well documented, particularly in relation to freedom of expression.³¹ When individuals are aware that they may be subject to monitoring, they are less likely to speak freely or assemble. Predictive analytics can compound these concerns by concentrating surveillance on particular neighbourhoods or communities on the basis of proxies correlated with race or socioeconomic status, thereby reinforcing discriminatory practices while simultaneously eroding privacy.

29. Marginalized and vulnerable groups are at particular risk. Refugees and migrants are increasingly subject to biometric data collection and algorithmic risk assessments at borders.³² Such technologies can lead to discrimination and undermine privacy and due process. Human rights defenders, journalists and political activists are similarly exposed when broad surveillance tools are deployed. In this environment, privacy becomes a collective concern. Where monitoring is ubiquitous, the democratic space for dissent narrows for all. The Human Rights Council has called for strict tests of legality, necessity and proportionality for any digital surveillance measure,³³ yet many AI-enabled practices operate under outdated legal frameworks that did not anticipate current capabilities.

30. Overall, AI has heightened the urgency of privacy protection.³⁴ The very features that render these systems valuable for governance also drive ever-wider collection and processing of personal data, constituting direct infringements of the right to privacy and inhibiting the exercise of other fundamental rights. In the absence of adequate safeguards, the automation of surveillance risks becoming the automation of censorship and social control, which is fundamentally incompatible with democratic good governance.

²⁸ See [A/HRC/41/35](#).

²⁹ Submission from Institute for Digital Rights.

³⁰ See [A/HRC/27/37](#).

³¹ Anita R. Gohdes, *Repression in the Digital Age: Surveillance, Censorship, and the Dynamics of State Violence* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2024).

³² See [A/75/590](#).

³³ Human Rights Council resolution 48/4.

³⁴ See [A/HRC/48/31](#). See also [A/HRC/61/68](#), paras. 25 and 26.

2. Algorithmic bias and discrimination: entrenching inequality

31. The next major concern is algorithmic bias, whereby AI systems inherit or amplify societal biases, and its implications for the right to equality and non-discrimination. Good governance requires that public services and decisions be delivered impartially, treating all individuals fairly regardless of race, gender, religion, disability or other prohibited grounds of discrimination. However, AI systems are not inherently neutral and often reflect discriminatory patterns embedded in training data or design choices. The deployment of such systems in governance may therefore produce systemic discrimination that can be more difficult to detect and to challenge through available remedies than discrimination arising from traditional human decision-making.³⁵

32. Evidence of bias in public-sector AI has been observed across domains. In criminal justice, risk assessment tools used to inform decisions on pretrial release, sentencing and parole have raised concerns about disparate outcomes. Similar issues have been noted in employment-related screening systems, where gendered or disability-related biases may be reproduced, and in financial or administrative algorithms whose proxies can inadvertently penalize gaps in employment or target certain categories of taxpayers. In governance contexts, models trained on data reflecting historical socioeconomic disparities may disproportionately flag minority-owned businesses or low-income communities for scrutiny.³⁶ In their submissions for the present study, stakeholders consistently identified the risk of AI exacerbating discrimination and accessibility gaps, with numerous cases indicating that pre-existing inequities, whether linked to race, class, sex, gender, disability or migration status, are amplified rather than reduced. This contravenes the State's duty to prevent discriminatory practices and to pursue substantive equality.³⁷

33. A core difficulty lies in opacity. Many AI systems fail to present their reasoning intelligibly, and the notion of intent is inapposite for a machine. As a result, affected persons may even struggle to recognize that bias occurred, let alone attribute responsibility or obtain redress. Traditional anti-discrimination frameworks, often oriented towards proving intentional discrimination, are ill-suited to complex, data-driven harms. Accordingly, many legal and human rights analyses advocate an effects-based approach, focusing on disparate impact.³⁸ Where statistically significant adverse outcomes are shown for a protected group, this should trigger scrutiny and obligations to modify or withdraw the system, irrespective of intent. This approach aligns with established understandings of indirect discrimination. Overall, algorithmic bias may pose a serious threat to the principle of non-discrimination, with the potential to reinforce structural inequalities under the appearance of technological objectivity.

3. The black box problem: undermining transparency, due process and the right to a remedy

34. An equally grave challenge posed by AI in governance is the opacity of algorithmic decision-making, often referred to as the black box problem. Many machine-learning and neural-network systems do not provide reasoning that is intelligible to affected persons. In governance settings, such opacity can conflict with the principles of transparency, accountability and the rule of law and endanger procedural guarantees (the right to understand and contest decisions affecting rights and obligations, the right to a fair hearing and the right to an effective remedy). The exercise of rights in the digital era requires the application of automated systems to be transparent and accountable, as a lack of

³⁵ See [A/HRC/48/31](#); and [A/HRC/54/70](#), para. 24.

³⁶ Submission from Geneva Human Rights Platform.

³⁷ Submissions from Ireland, Mexico, Singapore, Spain, Association pour la défense des droits de l'homme et des revendications démocratiques/culturelles du peuple Azerbaïdjanais, Iran – ARC, Korean Progressive Network – Jinbonet and Transparency International.

³⁸ See [A/HRC/56/68](#).

explainability can impede access to justice.³⁹ Transparency is essential for accountability, explainability for due process and clear attribution of responsibility for effective remedy.⁴⁰

35. International and domestic courts and tribunals are grappling with these issues. Regional data-protection frameworks recognize a right not to be subject solely to automated decisions with significant effects and, where such decisions occur, a right to meaningful information about the logic involved.⁴¹ What constitutes a meaningful explanation for complex models remains contested. While some advocate simplified reasons or transparency measures, others caution that, for deep-learning systems, post hoc accounts may be excessively technical or merely inferential.⁴² Notwithstanding these debates, the trajectory points toward explainability as a baseline safeguard.

36. Opacity also produces an accountability gap. When an AI system causes harm, responsibility may be diffused among developers, vendors and the public authorities that procure and deploy such systems. This uncertainty undermines the right to an effective remedy under article 2 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as affected individuals cannot readily identify a responsible party to hold accountable. This raises issues of accountability, including questions relating to the attribution of breaches of human rights obligations and the allocation of liability among the actors involved, such as State authorities deploying AI systems and the businesses designing and supplying them. The problem is aggravated when public functions are effectively outsourced to proprietary systems shielded by trade secrecy or intellectual property claims, leaving neither public officials nor members of the public with adequate visibility into the basis of decisions.⁴³ In the public sector context, such opacity may undermine established principles of administrative accountability and the duty of public authorities to provide reasons for decisions affecting individual rights. The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has emphasized the need for business enterprises to be transparent about the design and operation of surveillance and other high-risk technologies supplied to Governments.⁴⁴ The Working Group on the issue of human rights and transnational corporations and other business enterprises and OHCHR have underscored the need for explainable AI, algorithmic impact assessments and the embedding of human rights due diligence throughout the AI life cycle.⁴⁵

37. Given these stakes, systemic, ex ante preventive measures are required alongside ex post remedies. Necessary elements include mandatory human rights impact assessments, regular audits, public registries of automated decision systems and independent oversight authorities. Such a preventive approach reflects a consensus that conventional remedial mechanisms may arrive too late in high-velocity, data-driven environments.⁴⁶ In parallel, the OECD AI Principles endorse transparency, explainability and human oversight as fundamental and call for mechanisms enabling adversely affected persons to challenge outcomes (principle 1.3).

4. Threats to freedom of expression, access to information and democratic participation

38. The impact of artificial intelligence on freedom of expression and the integrity of the public sphere warrants urgent attention, since good governance presupposes an informed public and a pluralistic environment for the exchange of ideas and fair, transparent political processes. A salient issue is the proliferation of AI-generated disinformation, which threatens access to reliable information through the production of false or misleading realistic text,

³⁹ See [A/HRC/48/31](#).

⁴⁰ Human Rights Council resolution 54/18; and submission from People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy.

⁴¹ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 on general data protection, art. 22.

⁴² OECD, AI Principles. Available from <https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/sub-issues/ai-principles.html>.

⁴³ Submission from Korean Progressive Network – Jinbonet.

⁴⁴ See [A/HRC/48/31](#).

⁴⁵ See [A/HRC/59/32](#) and [A/HRC/59/53](#).

⁴⁶ UNESCO, "Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence" (Paris, 2022); and Matthew U. Scherer, "Regulating Artificial intelligence systems: risks, challenges, competencies, and strategies", *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology*, vol. 29, No. 2 (spring 2016).

images and videos, at minimal cost and massive scale.⁴⁷ For example, ahead of elections in various countries, observers have documented both coordinated networks and deepfake videos aiming to discredit candidates or suppress voter turnout.⁴⁸ These dynamics are further complicated when disinformation spreads through encrypted messaging applications, making it difficult to provide reliable alternative information.⁴⁹ The malicious use of these technologies leads to an erosion of trust in the entire information environment. Once individuals realize that fake content can be convincingly fabricated, even genuine facts may be dismissed as potential fakes, affecting evidence-based policymaking and public trust in governmental communications. Moreover, political actors and other interested parties can analyse personal data to deliver tailored, persuasive content designed to influence voting behaviour or suppress participation. Such practices, particularly when based on invasive profiling, may infringe the right to privacy and impair the free formation of opinions, which constitutes a core element of freedom of thought and expression and a prerequisite for meaningful participation in public affairs.⁵⁰ Furthermore, recommendation algorithms on AI-driven platforms that consistently amplify biased narratives to maximize engagement can, over time, shape beliefs without user awareness, raising concerns regarding mental autonomy. These dynamics corrode governance by fragmenting a shared factual baseline, fostering polarization and impeding reasoned policy debate.

39. There are harms that implicate not only freedom of expression but also equality and security of the person. The Human Rights Council has expressed concern that manipulation of information, including through digital technologies, can fuel violence and conflict, and has called upon States to encourage private actors to address disinformation while upholding human rights.⁵¹ AI can also amplify hateful or discriminatory content by generating numerous variations that evade basic filters, heightening risks to the dignity, safety and equal standing of targeted communities.

40. Another dimension concerns censorship and content moderation. States may deploy AI to monitor and restrict online content at scale. While the removal of unlawful material can be legitimate, automated filters tend to remove content excessively and often fail to account for context, satire or speech in the public interest, thereby risking unjustified interference with lawful expression and producing a chilling effect. Any restriction on freedom of expression, including measures adopted to combat disinformation, must conform strictly to the requirements of article 19 (3) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, satisfying the principles of legality, necessity and proportionality. Measures to address disinformation must not serve as a pretext for the undue restriction of legitimate expression.⁵²

41. Cumulatively, these phenomena erode trust in the information environment. When individuals can no longer trust the veracity of what they read or see, or the authenticity of their online interactions, social cohesion degrades, undermining a critical foundation of good governance. Moreover, this distrust tends to extend to all forms of information, posing significant challenges for news media, research organizations and governmental bodies that rely on digital communication. Addressing these challenges requires cooperative multi-stakeholder approaches.⁵³ States, private platforms and civil society must work together to develop appropriate safeguards. These include ensuring transparency in political advertising and the labelling of AI-generated content, incorporating appropriate proofs of humanity, investing in media and digital literacy to strengthen societal resilience⁵⁴ and adopting measures that promote fairness and pluralism in recommendation systems. Any restrictions on expression introduced in pursuit of these objectives must comply with international standards of legality, necessity and proportionality.

⁴⁷ Submission from American University.

⁴⁸ Freedom House, "Freedom on the Net 2019: the crisis of social media" (Washington, D.C., 2019).

⁴⁹ A/HRC/61/68, para. 74.

⁵⁰ See A/73/348 and A/HRC/47/25. See also Human Rights Committee, general comment No. 34 (2011), paras. 9 and 10.

⁵¹ Human Rights Council resolution 55/10. See also A/HRC/61/68, para. 70.

⁵² A/HRC/61/68, para. 21.

⁵³ See A/HRC/47/52.

⁵⁴ Human Rights Council resolution 57/5.

42. The possible negative impacts of AI on freedom of expression and democratic participation are extensive and system-wide. They strike at the public's capacity to engage in informed discourse and to hold authorities to account, thereby undermining the fabric of democratic governance. These outcomes, however, are not inevitable and can be averted through sustained, multi-stakeholder efforts that preserve human agency, pluralism and trust, consistent with human rights and the rule of law. Among other means, incorporating appropriate proof of humanity safeguards is essential to preserve trust in digital public spaces, ensuring that participation in democratic processes reflects genuine human input.⁵⁵ Such measures can help protect the authenticity of civic engagement while mitigating risks related to disinformation, coordinated inauthentic behaviour and undue influence on decision-making processes.

5. Automation and the right to work: displacement and widening inequality

43. AI-driven automation may present significant challenges to the right to work as enshrined in article 23 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 6 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. While technological advances have historically displaced certain forms of employment while creating others, the speed and scope of contemporary AI deployment are unprecedented, extending beyond routine manual labour to encompass clerical, creative and decision-making functions. The impact of AI-driven displacement is distributed inequitably. Sectors at high risk of automation often employ disproportionate numbers of persons belonging to marginalized groups. Women, who are often overrepresented in clerical and administrative support roles, face substantially greater exposure to automation-related job losses.⁵⁶ Furthermore, the consequences extend beyond advanced economies. Developing countries that have traditionally relied on labour-intensive industries as pathways for economic development face particular risks, as automation may erode the labour-cost advantages upon which such development strategies depend. United Nations analyses have warned that a significant proportion of employment in developing countries may be susceptible to automation, raising concerns regarding poverty, economic stability and widening global inequality.⁵⁷

44. Beyond economic consequences, mass displacement by AI implicates human dignity and social cohesion. For most individuals, work constitutes not merely a source of income but also a foundation for identity, purpose and social participation. The abrupt rendering of willing workers redundant may generate profound psychological and social costs, including alienation and loss of self-worth. These developments necessitate proactive governance responses. Ensuring that no one is left behind requires concerted action to uphold the right to work, including access to decent work opportunities, as a foundational element of good governance in the era of AI.

6. Energy consumption and environmental rights: threats to sustainability

45. The deployment of AI systems by public authorities entails a significant, often overlooked, material footprint with implications for the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment.⁵⁸ Contrary to the perception of AI as a purely intangible technology, its infrastructure requires intensive resource consumption. The exponential growth in computational demand for training large-scale models and executing real-time data analysis has substantially increased energy consumption. Projections indicate that the energy requirements of data centres will rise sharply by 2030, with the attendant risk of increased

⁵⁵ Bryan Ford, "Identity and personhood in digital democracy: evaluating inclusion, equality, security, and privacy in pseudonym parties and other proofs of personhood" (2020).

⁵⁶ Paweł Gmyrek and others, "Generative AI and jobs: a global analysis of potential effects on job quantity and quality", ILO Working Paper No. 96 (Geneva, 2023).

⁵⁷ World Social Report 2020: Inequality in a Rapidly Changing World (United Nations publication, 2020).

⁵⁸ Submissions from Chile, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Association pour la défense des droits de l'homme et des revendications démocratiques/culturelles du peuple Azerbaïdjanais, Iran – ARC, Institute for Digital Rights, Center for Advanced Study in Humanitarian Law and Geneva Human Rights Platform.

reliance on fossil fuels to meet baseload power demands.⁵⁹ Such a trajectory threatens to undermine global climate commitments and contributes to local air pollution, posing risks to public health and ecosystems.

46. Beyond carbon emissions, the thermal management of AI infrastructure places considerable pressure on freshwater resources.⁶⁰ The substantial water consumption required for cooling data centres frequently competes with the needs of local communities, particularly in water-stressed regions. A critical challenge for good governance in this context is the prevailing opacity regarding environmental data. Major technology providers often fail to disclose precise metrics on water withdrawal and consumption, impeding the ability of public authorities and civil society to ensure accountability and infringing upon the right to access information essential for effective participatory governance in resource management.

47. Furthermore, the AI life cycle perpetuates patterns of environmental injustice and global inequality. The hardware necessary for AI processing drives the extraction of critical minerals, often sourced from developing countries under conditions that may violate labour rights and environmental standards. The rapid obsolescence of such hardware accelerates the generation of electronic waste, the burdens of which are disproportionately borne by developing countries. This dynamic reflects a form of digital divide whereby the economic benefits derived from AI are concentrated in developed countries, while the environmental externalities and resource degradation are displaced to developing countries, thereby entrenching existing global disparities. Accordingly, States seeking to harness AI for the advancement of good governance must address these environmental and distributional consequences as integral to their human rights obligations.

7. AI in the justice system and detention: safeguarding fairness and human dignity

48. In the administration of justice, concerns regarding the deployment of AI are particularly pronounced. AI is increasingly embedded in judicial systems for administrative tasks, including case file management, translation, automatic anonymization of judgments, and electronic filing, as well as in legal search engines and as an aid to judges and lawyers in producing case summaries or analysing precedents.⁶¹ Courts and judicial authorities have also begun exploring AI-enabled risk assessment tools to assist decision-making in bail, parole and sentencing.⁶² While such applications may enhance efficiency in the face of heavy caseloads, they raise fundamental questions regarding the extent to which core judicial functions can be entrusted to algorithmic systems. Judicial independence may be undermined where the executive or legislative branches, rather than the judiciary itself, are responsible for the selection of training data, the design of algorithms or the oversight of AI systems deployed in courts, particularly when such functions are outsourced to private companies.⁶³ The essence of a fair trial lies in human deliberation and accountability. While AI may assist judicial processes, judges play an irreplaceable role in applying discretion and recognizing the individuality of each case. Accordingly, judicial leaders have emphasized that, in matters of justice, human beings, not machines, must remain the ultimate decision makers.⁶⁴ Strict human oversight, transparency and the ability of parties to understand and contest the role of AI are essential in all such cases. The opacity of AI systems may adversely affect the rights to liberty and security of the person and to a fair trial, as guaranteed under articles 9 and 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, when accused individuals are unable to challenge decisions affecting them. Recognizing such risks, some jurisdictions have begun to classify AI systems intended for use by judicial authorities as high risk and to prohibit the use of AI-based risk assessments that rely solely on profiling or personality traits

⁵⁹ International Energy Agency, *Energy and AI: World Energy Outlook Special Report* (2025).

⁶⁰ Joyeeta Gupta, Hilmer Bosch and Luc van Vliet, “AI’s excessive water consumption threatens to drown out its environmental contributions”, *The Conversation*, 21 March 2024.

⁶¹ See [A/79/296](#).

⁶² Council of Europe, *European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems and Their Environment* (Strasbourg, 2019).

⁶³ See [A/79/296](#); and UNESCO, *Global Toolkit on AI and the Rule of Law for the Judiciary* (Paris, 2024).

⁶⁴ UNESCO, “Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence”. See also UNESCO, “Guidelines for the Use of AI Systems in Courts and Tribunals” (Paris, 2025).

to predict offending.⁶⁵ Accordingly, the integration of AI into judicial proceedings must be approached with due caution to preserve judicial independence, procedural fairness and public trust in the administration of justice.

49. In correctional settings, the introduction of AI-driven systems has given rise to additional human rights concerns. Some newly constructed facilities, often termed “smart prisons”, employ facial recognition, biometric monitoring and predictive analytics to enhance security and operational efficiency. While such tools may contribute to reducing violence and the smuggling of contraband, they risk diminishing the humanity of the custodial environment by minimizing interpersonal contact and the exercise of professional discretion. Constant algorithmic surveillance of persons deprived of liberty can intensify feelings of isolation, and an overreliance on automation in the management of detention may undermine rehabilitation efforts by removing the human element essential to care and individualized assessment. The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules) emphasize the importance of meaningful human contact, providing that prolonged isolation without such contact constitutes a form of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment (rules 43 and 44). Accordingly, unchecked automation in places of detention may conflict with the obligation under international human rights law to treat all persons deprived of their liberty with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person.

III. Building rights-respecting artificial intelligence for good governance

A. Data bias and global imbalance in artificial intelligence development: challenges for human rights

50. One fundamental challenge is bias in data and algorithms, compounded by the concentration of AI development within a limited number of actors and contexts. AI systems often reflect the values, assumptions and limitations inherent in their design and the data upon which they are trained. The AI industry and research remain dominated by a small number of technologically advanced States and a few powerful corporations, with the consequence that these systems frequently embody a narrow set of perspectives. This raises concerns that AI technologies may fail to align with or adequately represent diverse cultural, social and regional contexts.

51. This phenomenon has been characterized as a form of digital colonialism, whereby the dominance of a few major technology providers and their normative frameworks perpetuate historical patterns of exclusion.⁶⁶ Countries with nascent AI sectors often adopt AI systems or regulatory frameworks developed outside their borders, primarily designed for technologically advanced economies. Such solutions are at times deployed with minimal input from local policymakers or affected communities. Imbalances in influence during implementation processes risk exacerbating existing inequalities. A uniform approach to AI may inadvertently override local knowledge systems, particularly those of Indigenous Peoples, when technology is not adapted to specific cultural and social contexts. In such cases, homogeneous AI frameworks imported from external sources may marginalize local values and expertise.⁶⁷ The human rights implications of data and algorithmic bias are direct and significant. Biased or discriminatory algorithms can produce unequal and unjust outcomes, effectively violating the principles of equality and non-discrimination. If left unaddressed, such systems risk entrenching what has been termed “automated injustice”, whereby opaque algorithmic decisions deny individuals fair treatment, access to services or opportunities,

⁶⁵ Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence.

⁶⁶ Jake Okechukwu Effoduh and Miracle Okumu Mudeyi, “TWAIlIng AI governance: will third world countries be left behind?” TWAIl Review (7 August 2025).

⁶⁷ Submission from People’s Solidarity for Participatory Democracy.

based on flawed or prejudiced data. Such harms are likely to disproportionately affect persons belonging to marginalized and vulnerable groups, further widening existing disparities.

52. Addressing these challenges requires the integration of human rights principles, equity and diversity into all stages of AI development.⁶⁸ Technical adjustments alone are insufficient, as broader changes are needed with respect to the diversity of those who develop AI systems and the objectives that such systems are designed to serve. Ensuring diverse participation and inclusive design throughout the AI life cycle, from data collection through to algorithm design to deployment, is essential to mitigate bias and promote accountability. By incorporating a wider range of perspectives, AI systems and the governance frameworks within which they operate can better reflect diverse societal needs and values.

53. Encouraging initiatives at the grass-roots level are emerging to democratize AI. Data scientists across various regions, including in Africa and Asia, are collaborating to create data sets and tools suited to low-resource languages and local needs. Such efforts seek to render AI more inclusive and culturally appropriate, counteracting uniform approaches that fail to account for diverse contexts. International standard-setting efforts are beginning to reflect these concerns.⁶⁹ In 2021, UNESCO called upon States to ensure that AI development respected human rights, embraced diversity and upheld fairness.⁷⁰ Implementing such principles requires questioning default design assumptions and involving local experts in the development process. AI systems should be aligned with plural legal and cultural values rather than inadvertently imposing external norms. Moreover, the international human rights framework itself must be applied to AI in a culturally sensitive manner. Some scholars caution that reliance on international human rights law without due regard to local contexts may reflect an implicitly individualistic orientation that does not fully capture the collective or community-based conceptions of rights prevalent in certain cultural settings. Accordingly, global norms concerning data protection or algorithmic transparency should be interpreted and implemented in ways that uphold fundamental human rights while accommodating appropriate cultural and legal variation in accountability mechanisms at the local level.

B. Ensuring meaningful participation and inclusion

54. A critical challenge in harnessing AI for good governance is the lack of meaningful participation by diverse stakeholders in key decision-making processes. High-level AI strategies and ethical guidelines are frequently drafted by experts from a limited number of States where AI development is concentrated, with insufficient input from other regions. Those most affected by AI-driven public services or surveillance systems, including members of the general public, persons belonging to marginalized communities and smaller or less technologically developed States, are often excluded from policy formulation processes. This exclusion reflects a broader democratic deficit in the governance of information technologies. Globally endorsed AI principles will be difficult to translate into practice if they fail to incorporate the priorities of the majority of the world's population.

55. There is considerable diversity in national AI readiness and governance capacity across the world. Some Governments, particularly in developed States, have established national and regional AI frameworks and participate actively in international forums, whereas many others are only beginning to formulate AI policies or guidelines. Regional cooperation offers one avenue to amplify underrepresented voices. In some regions, States have begun to collaborate through regional organizations to develop common positions on AI ethics and their application to governance that reflect shared local values alongside universal human rights principles, demonstrating that developing countries can work collectively to influence emerging global norms concerning AI. However, such initiatives require support from the broader international community.

56. Meaningful participation is equally essential at the domestic level. When Governments deploy AI in public administration, whether in automating welfare

⁶⁸ See [A/HRC/59/32](#).

⁶⁹ See [A/HRC/53/42](#).

⁷⁰ "Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence".

determinations, implementing smart city surveillance or utilizing AI-assisted judicial tools, the individuals and communities affected should, in addition to rights to information and transparency, have meaningful input into the design and use of such systems. That individuals should be able to participate in decisions that affect their rights is a general principle of law. As such, it extends to the adoption of AI technologies in governance. Yet, in many countries, civic participation in technology policy remains limited or superficial.

57. To address this governance gap, States should establish formal consultation and oversight mechanisms whenever AI systems with significant societal impact are to be adopted. Public consultation procedures should be instituted before implementing any AI-driven system that could affect human rights or the public interest. Community and civil society representation should be ensured on oversight bodies and ethics review boards should be established for governmental AI initiatives. By including representatives from affected communities, human rights organizations and independent experts, such bodies and boards can more effectively evaluate the societal implications of AI deployment and advise on necessary safeguards. These groups offer invaluable knowledge regarding human rights impacts and cultural contexts that technocratic approaches often overlook. If AI is to serve the objectives of good governance, its application must be governed with the meaningful participation of those it is intended to serve, strengthening public trust and ensuring deployment in the public interest.

C. Defining responsibilities across stakeholders for rights-based artificial intelligence implementation

58. Achieving an AI ecosystem that upholds human rights and prevents abuses requires concerted action by all stakeholders, underpinned by the principles of equity, sovereignty,⁷¹ and social justice. States bear the primary obligation to ensure that AI development and deployment align with international human rights norms. This duty begins with establishing robust legal and regulatory frameworks, including requirements for transparency, accountability and oversight of algorithmic decision-making in the public sector.⁷² Governments should also invest in public education and digital literacy so that individuals understand how AI is utilized in governance and are aware of their rights in this context. Developing countries require sufficient policy space and support to govern AI in accordance with their specific social priorities. Given that many developing countries lack the resources to independently develop effective governance frameworks for algorithmic systems, international cooperation should focus on building substantive capacity through technology transfer, regulatory training and South-South knowledge exchange, empowering all countries to harness AI to advance good governance. Accordingly, global standards should remain principle-based and flexible, allowing States to implement them in alignment with their institutional and cultural contexts.⁷³ Governments must anchor the governance of AI firmly in universal human rights values, while actively guiding technological development to serve national and local needs.

59. When States delegate the provision of public services to private actors, including in education, healthcare and water supply, their human rights obligations remain fully engaged. When AI systems are used in the delivery of public services, human rights obligations apply in accordance with established principles, including the attribution of conduct to the State where applicable and, in any event, the duty to exercise due diligence in relation to private actors. States must ensure that such deployment does not undermine the availability, accessibility, acceptability and quality of services, nor give rise to discrimination or other adverse human rights impacts.⁷⁴ This falls under States' positive human rights obligations,

⁷¹ In this context, sovereignty refers to the capacity of States, particularly developing countries, to exercise meaningful and autonomous control over AI-related policy decisions, data governance and digital infrastructure, free from undue external dependency. On the challenges posed by the concentration of AI development and the risks of digital dependency, see paras. 50–54 above.

⁷² See [A/HRC/48/31](#).

⁷³ UNESCO, "Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence".

⁷⁴ See [A/HRC/59/53](#).

which entail establishing and enforcing regulatory standards that apply equally to AI-enabled private service provision, conducting ongoing monitoring and evaluation, ensuring effective investigation where human rights violations occur and providing effective remedies for individuals whose rights are affected. State obligations in this context remain fully applicable regardless of the technological means through which services are rendered.⁷⁵

60. Much of the AI technology that Governments procure or deploy is developed by the private sector. Under the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, all business enterprises, including those that design and supply AI systems, bear a responsibility to respect human rights. In practice, companies should implement human rights due diligence throughout their AI development processes.⁷⁶ This entails consulting with stakeholders, assessing potential risks such as algorithmic bias, discrimination and other forms of misuse, and adjusting design choices to mitigate harm. Companies must also address systemic biases and the predominance of perspectives from a limited number of regions in their AI tools. This can be achieved by diversifying their workforce and the data sets used in model training to better reflect global diversity. Where such efforts are accompanied by the genuine inclusion of local researchers and due respect for local contexts, they can contribute to ensuring that AI products are more responsive to a wider range of social and cultural settings.

61. Civil society, including non-governmental organizations, academic institutions, media, community groups and youth, plays an indispensable role in ensuring that the deployment of AI in governance is grounded in human rights. These actors should be empowered and afforded formal channels of participation in decision-making processes. The expertise of civil society and academia can contribute to the development of necessary safeguards, such as requirements for independent algorithmic audits or community feedback mechanisms for AI systems utilized in the public sector. Civil society organizations also play an essential role in building public awareness and literacy concerning AI. By making the human rights implications of AI comprehensible, such organizations enable communities to understand and demand accountability.

62. International organizations, including the United Nations, bear a responsibility to establish inclusive frameworks to guide the use of AI for good governance consistent with human rights. Efforts at the global level must explicitly integrate perspectives from developing countries. Voices from developing countries and marginalized communities caution that international initiatives should avoid replicating existing power hierarchies under the guise of global governance. Accordingly, international norm-setting, whether through non-binding guidelines or potential legally binding instruments, should be carried out through inclusive and transparent processes in which all States have an equal voice. New global governance mechanisms may need to be explored to strengthen the alignment of AI with human rights.

IV. Recommendations

A. States

63. **States should adopt comprehensive legislative and regulatory frameworks governing the use of AI in public administration that mandate human rights impact assessments prior to and periodically following deployment, require algorithmic transparency and explainability, establish independent oversight bodies to audit AI systems for bias, accuracy and compliance with international human rights law and ensure effective investigation and remedies where AI deployment results in human rights violations.**

64. **States should guarantee meaningful public participation in decisions concerning the introduction of AI systems into the public sector by instituting transparent**

⁷⁵ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, general comment No. 24 (2017), para. 11; and African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, general comment No. 7, para. 43.

⁷⁶ See [A/HRC/59/32](#).

consultation procedures that actively engage civil society, technical experts and affected communities, ensuring that governance technologies reflect diverse societal needs and values.

65. States should strictly regulate the use of AI-enabled surveillance to prevent infringements of the rights to privacy, freedom of expression and freedom of association, ensuring that any deployment complies with the principles of legality, necessity and proportionality and is subject to effective, independent judicial oversight.

66. States should safeguard democratic processes and the integrity of information ecosystems by promoting media and digital literacy, requiring transparency in political advertising and the labelling of AI-generated content, exploring or allowing appropriate mechanisms for proof of humanity and supporting pluralism, while ensuring that measures to combat disinformation maintain an appropriate balance with freedom of expression and do not result in undue censorship.

67. States should ensure that the integration of AI into judicial proceedings and correctional settings preserves human oversight, procedural fairness and inherent human dignity, prohibiting sole reliance on automated systems for decisions affecting liberty, while maintaining meaningful human contact in places of detention.

68. States should proactively address the socioeconomic impacts of AI-driven automation by adapting educational systems, providing reskilling programmes and strengthening social protection mechanisms to uphold the right to work and ensure just transitions.

69. States should assess and mitigate the environmental impacts of AI deployment, including the substantial energy and water consumption of data centres and the generation of electronic waste, ensuring that the pursuit of AI-enabled governance does not undermine the right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment or shift environmental burdens to developing countries.

B. International community

70. The international community should ensure inclusive and equitable global governance of AI by guaranteeing that developing countries and representatives from the global South have meaningful participation and an equal voice in international standard-setting processes, and by guarding against the imposition of uniform regulatory frameworks that fail to reflect local contexts or perpetuate patterns of digital dependency.

71. The international community should provide capacity-building, technology transfer and financial support to enable all States, particularly low-income countries, to develop and implement effective, context-appropriate AI governance frameworks and should condition international development assistance for digital projects on the implementation of robust human rights safeguards.

72. The international community should explore the establishment of dedicated United Nations mechanisms, such as a special rapporteur or working group on new and emerging digital technologies and their human rights implications, to monitor developments and advise on protective measures. Consideration should also be given to the development of a dedicated framework under the auspices of the United Nations that would commit States to concrete obligations regarding the human rights impacts of AI.

C. Business enterprises

73. Business enterprises that design, develop or deploy AI systems should respect human rights, including by conducting human rights due diligence, throughout the AI life cycle, assessing and mitigating risks of algorithmic bias, discrimination and privacy intrusions, consulting with affected communities and establishing or participating in effective grievance mechanisms that enable individuals to report harms and obtain redress.

74. Business enterprises should promote inclusive and equitable AI by diversifying their workforce and training data sets to reflect global diversity, ensuring that AI tools are responsive to varied social, cultural and regional contexts, and by refraining from practices that entrench historical biases or exacerbate digital inequality.

D. All stakeholders

75. All stakeholders, including States, international organizations, business enterprises, civil society, academia and affected communities, should collaborate through transparent and inclusive multi-stakeholder processes to develop governance measures that uphold human rights. Such collaboration should be supported by independent monitoring of the societal impacts of AI, accessible channels for redress and common tools, such as algorithmic impact assessment frameworks and audit standards, to ensure that AI governance remains human-rights-centred and responsive to the needs of all and to human dignity.

76. All stakeholders should actively support civil society organizations, particularly in developing countries, through funding and capacity-building initiatives to enhance public understanding, monitor AI impacts and ensure that those most affected by emerging technologies can participate in shaping their deployment.
