



## **GLOBAL SOUTH ALLIANCE**

### **PRIORITIES FOR THE UNITED NATIONS GLOBAL DIALOGUE ON AI GOVERNANCE**

#### **1. What should be the main message from Global South civil society at the Dialogue?**

The United Nations Global Dialogue on AI Governance should move beyond general principles and deliver concrete outcomes that emphasize that AI governance must be people-centered, rights-based, environmentally sustainable, and globally inclusive, ensuring that technological development serves the public interest rather than reinforcing existing power asymmetries. This requires stronger accountability mechanisms for major technology corporations, alongside robust labour protections in the context of AI-driven economic transformation. The Dialogue should prioritize financing and capacity-building measures that enable Global South countries to meaningfully participate in AI development and governance, fostering a fairer redistribution of power in the global digital ecosystem. This could include dedicated funding for regional context-adaptable audit infrastructure across developing countries. Human rights must be embedded throughout the entire AI lifecycle, from design to deployment and use. At the same time, governance frameworks should advance climate justice, social inclusion, democratic values, and the reduction of global inequalities through international cooperation.

#### **2. For the thematic cluster(s) most relevant to your organization, what specific topics, policy questions, practical challenges, or opportunities should be included to make the discussions comprehensive and action-oriented? Please mention the cluster(s) in your answer.**

##### **Cluster 1 - AI opportunities and implications: social, economic, ethical, cultural, linguistic and technical dimensions**

Discussions under this cluster should address the complex socio-cultural implications of AI in Global South contexts, including how AI systems affect historically marginalized communities, reproduce structural inequalities, and reshape access to public services, social protection and economic opportunities. Particular attention should be given to the implications of AI for historically marginalized languages, including the lack of adequate models, data sets, benchmarks and moderation systems for the linguistic communities.



The Dialogue should also include the labour impacts of AI across the entire value chain, especially the precarious conditions faced by data workers, content moderators and platform workers, many of whom are based in the Global South. These labour concerns should be connected to gendered and racialized forms of exploitation, as well as to the broader economic inequalities intensified by AI-driven transformations.

Environmental impacts should also be treated as central to the discussion. The Dialogue should move beyond narratives that frame AI only as a sustainability tool and address the energy and water consumption of data centers, the extraction of critical minerals, electronic waste, and the disproportionate environmental burdens placed on communities in the Global South.

### **Cluster 2 - Bridging AI divides: capacity-building, access and digital foundations**

This cluster should focus on the structural inequalities that shape the global AI divide, including unequal access to computing infrastructure, research funding, technical expertise, local innovation ecosystems, multilingual resources and independent audit capacity. Discussions should move from general commitments to concrete implementation pathways, including financing mechanisms, regional capacity-building, and support for locally grounded AI governance institutions.

The Dialogue should prioritize concrete funding for multilingual evaluations, locally relevant benchmarks, independent audits and regional testing infrastructures led by institutions and civil society organizations from developing countries. These mechanisms should enable Global South actors to evaluate AI systems before they are deployed in high-impact areas such as welfare, health, education, migration, policing and public services.

### **Cluster 3 - Safe, secure and trustworthy AI: interoperability and compatibility of approaches**

The cluster should include the need for interoperable but rights-preserving governance approaches, ensuring that compatibility between frameworks does not lead to regulatory dilution or the export of weaker safeguards to Global South countries. Interoperability should be grounded in human rights, transparency, accountability, data protection, cybersecurity, and public integrity.



Discussions should also address how safety and trustworthiness can be assessed in practice, especially in contexts where regulatory capacity may be limited. AI safety claims should be supported by transparent testing conditions, known limitations, and failure rates disaggregated by language, gender, and other relevant markers.

#### **Cluster 4 - Human rights, transparency, accountability and human oversight**

This cluster should focus on how to operationalize human rights protections across the AI lifecycle, from design and development to procurement, deployment, use and cross-border transfer, drawing AI red lines.

A central discussion should be the operationalization of moratoriums for AI systems incompatible with international human rights law, including systems used for mass surveillance and AI-enabled gender-based violence, such as non-consensual intimate deepfakes. The Dialogue should examine how such moratoriums can apply to development, sale, procurement, deployment and cross-border transfer, and how to prevent companies from testing or deploying harmful systems in jurisdictions with weaker protections.

The cluster should also address AI-enabled disinformation, synthetic content, platform accountability, electoral integrity and political violence, especially gender-based political violence. Particular attention should be given to differentiated impacts on women, Indigenous Peoples, Afro-descendant communities, migrants, LGBTQIA+ people, human rights defenders and environmental defenders.

Gender should be a cross-cutting priority across all clusters, but this cluster should specifically address how AI systems can enable or intensify technology-facilitated gender-based violence, including deepfakes, non-consensual intimate image abuse, political violence against women and harms against gender-diverse individuals.

**Cross-cutting priority:** additionally, gender should be mainstreamed across all clusters of the Dialogue, treated as a cross-cutting priority, recognizing how AI systems reproduce and intensify existing inequalities and intersecting forms of discrimination for women and gender-diverse individuals.

- 3. Which existing policy and technical approaches, experiences, and best practices would be most valuable to highlight at the Dialogue to inform discussions and support shared learning?**



The Dialogue should highlight rights-based approaches to AI governance, including mandatory Data Protection Impact Assessments and Human Rights Impact Assessments before deployment, independent oversight by data protection authorities and sector regulators, and transparency requirements for procurement, data-sharing agreements, and algorithmic systems.

Existing references can provide important starting points for implementation-oriented discussions, such as: the EU AI Act; the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI; reports by the UN's High-level Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence and the Independent International Scientific Panel on AI; UN human rights standards and regional mechanisms; GPAI's Policy Guide for Implementing Transformative AI Policy Recommendations; calls by the OHCHR and UN Special Rapporteurs for moratoriums on AI systems incompatible with international human rights law; the Guiding Principles for Law and Policy Reform to Address Technology-Facilitated Gender-Based Violence (Derechos Digitales & UNFPA); WSIS processes; the UN Global Digital Compact, and the Data Governance Working Group, established under the Compact.

It would also be valuable to share concrete experiences from the Global South, including opportunities and challenges derived from Digital Public Infrastructures (DPIs); the implementation of legislations on data protection (such as Brazil's General Data Protection Law); transparency initiatives on political advertising platforms, independent audit mechanisms, civil society-led monitoring initiatives, public interest research on AI harms, and multistakeholder governance models. These experiences can support shared learning on inclusion, consent, grievance redress, cybersecurity, interoperability, safeguards against surveillance and function creep, and accessible remedies for affected users.

The Dialogue should also draw from existing processes and methodologies on meaningful participation and inclusive governance, including WSIS, the Internet Governance Forum, NETmundial and NETmundial+10, as well as regional IGF networks and intersessional working models. Best practices should include careful and non-rushed policy development, open standards, privacy-by-design, public audits, meaningful civil society participation, environmental reporting frameworks for AI companies, and the inclusion of less-represented perspectives, including grassroots organizations and local communities of natural language processing researchers and developers.



4. **Looking ahead, how can the thematic discussions help identify practical experiences, lessons learned, relevant initiatives or areas for voluntary cooperation that could inform continued engagement between the 2026 and 2027 editions of the Dialogue?**

Looking ahead, the thematic discussions can serve as a bridge between the 2026 and 2027 editions of the Dialogue by surfacing practical experiences, lessons learned, and existing initiatives that point toward concrete areas for cooperation. To inform continued engagement, the discussions should focus on how the Dialogue can advance rights-based approaches to global AI governance.

Thematic discussions should identify practical cooperation around:

**Cluster 1 - AI opportunities and implications: social, economic, ethical, cultural, linguistic and technical dimensions**

- Mandatory environmental reporting for AI companies;
- Support for public interest research on AI harms.

**Cluster 2 - Bridging AI divides: capacity-building, access and digital foundations**

- Financing mechanisms for regional capacity-building, access to infrastructure and oversight of AI systems;

**Cluster 3 - Safe, secure and trustworthy AI: interoperability and compatibility of approaches**

- Data governance, including work on open standards, privacy-by-design and mandatory Data Protection Impact Assessments;

**Cluster 4 - Human rights, transparency, accountability and human oversight**



- Technology-facilitated gender-based violence;
- Development of mechanisms for independent audits and Human Rights Impact Assessments;
- Accessible remedies for those harmed by AI systems.

Cooperation on these areas should involve coordination with existing spaces, including the Data Governance Working Group established under the GDC, the Internet Governance Forum (IGF), and its regional networks (NRIs); and draw lessons from IGF's intersessional work. Finally, beyond Internet Governance, this coordination should also involve and be inspired by the global governance architecture that has emerged to address climate change, including the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

**5. What key ideas, recommendations, or elements should inform the Co-Chairs' Summary to ensure it accurately reflects priorities emerging from the Dialogue and provides a way forward?**

The Co-Chairs Summary should:

1. Capture the need for practical safeguards such as mandatory impact assessments, independent audits, clear grievance and remedy mechanisms, strong data protection enforcement, and safeguards against surveillance, exclusion, and function creep;
2. Capture the urgency of addressing AI-related harms in democratic and electoral contexts;
3. Emphasize the need for human oversight for high-risk AI systems;
4. Recognize the differentiated impacts of AI on historically marginalized communities and the importance of addressing structural inequalities in access to infrastructure, data, computing resources, research, and financing, and highlight the need for gender mainstreaming across AI governance discussions and AI value chains, including the development and use of gender-specific indicators to assess impacts, participation, and accountability;
5. Reflect discussions on AI red lines and moratoriums, building on existing recommendations from the United Nations and regional human rights bodies, and identify pathways for their operationalization across the AI value chain;
6. Ensure that side events outcomes are also captured, within the above priorities; and



7. Present documentation of country experiences and good practices, foreseeing concrete outcomes that can be advanced between the 2026 and 2027 Dialogues;
8. Include recommendations for continued engagement and multistakeholder cooperation, follow-up actions and clear next steps for implementation emerging from the Dialogue.