David Pembroke:

Hello everyone and welcome to Work with Purpose, a podcast about the Australian public sector and how it serves the Australian people. My name is David Pembroke. Thanks for joining me.

As we begin today's programme, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which we are meeting today, the Ngunnawal and Ngambri people, and pay my respects to elders past, present, and emerging, and acknowledge the ongoing contribution they make to the life of our city and this region. I'd also like to pay my respects to the custodians of all the lands from where anybody listening to this podcast today is joining us from.

So welcome to 2024 and another year of Work with Purpose. I do hope you enjoyed the highlights episodes that were run over Christmas and the New Year, and I'm sure you're looking forward to another year of challenging, thought-provoking debate and discussion about the important issues relevant to the Australian public sector.

In last year's IPA ACT member survey, the application of artificial intelligence technology in the public sector with a particular focus on the ethical use of AI was nominated by you, the audience, as the number one topic you wanted to learn more about. So as we start 2024, we are discussing the ethical use of AI in the Australian Defence Force with two of Australia's leading artificial intelligence academics. Joining me in the studio is Professor Toni Erskine. Toni is a professor at the Coral Bell School of Asia Pacific Affairs at the Australian National University. Her current research is into the use of AI in automated systems and future use of force decision-making. Her research interests include the moral agency and responsibility of formal organisations in world politics, the ethics of war, the responsibility to protect joint purpose of action and informal coalitions and the impact of new technologies on organised violence.

Toni, welcome to Work with Purpose.

Toni Erskine:

Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here.

David Pembroke:

Our second guest is Dr. Kate Conroy and she joins us on the line from Queensland. Dr. Conroy is an artificial intelligence expert who specialises in trustworthy robotics and autonomous systems in both military and civilian domains. She has a PhD in philosophy and graduate certificates in cognitive science from Rutgers University. She's an adjunct professor at the Queensland University of Technologies Centre for Robotics, an adjunct associate professor for human-centred computing at the University of Queensland and a fellow of the Australian Security Leaders Climate Group. And from the 1st of March, she will begin a stint as a specialist reservist artificial intelligence scientist working with the Australian Air Force Air Capability Enablers branch.

Kate, welcome to you.

Dr. Kate Conroy:

Thank you, David. Quite a mouthful. Pleasure to be with you both.

David Pembroke:

So where to begin? It's a huge subject, it's a topical subject, critically important subject. But Toni, if I might start with you, you define AI as the evolving capability of machines to imitate aspects of intelligent human behaviour. When discussing AI driven systems currently used in operational environments, can you give us a few examples?

Toni Erskine:

Oh, of course. I'd also like to acknowledge and celebrate the Ngunnawal and Ngambri peoples and pay my respect to elders past and present. So in my current research, including as part of a project funded by the Australian Department of Defence, I look specifically at AI enabled military tools, those currently used by different countries around the world, which are directly relevant to Australia as we contemplate our position on what constitutes the ethical and legal use of these tools. AI is a general term that's used to refer to a diverse range of technologies. When discussing AI-driven systems used in war, what I'll refer to as AI-enabled military tools, we can talk about entities from algorithmic systems to automated robots. So these include decision support systems, which rely on big data analytics and machine learning to make predictions and recommendations that really aid human decision making. So machine learning algorithms, which analyse huge amounts of data quickly, uncovering patterns of correlation and data sets that are beyond human cognition are used to recommend targets for drone strikes.

For example, they've been used by the United States for drone strikes in Yemen and Pakistan, and reportedly by Israel for selecting bombing targets in Gaza, more recently. These algorithms effectively predict targets by uncovering correlations in large amounts of data drawn from individuals, text messages, web browsing, email and location, for example. Also, AI-enabled military tools include automated weapon systems, which are able to operate with various degrees of autonomy or independence from human control. So weapon systems that would be able to identify, track and shoot targets without the need for human mediation are referred to as lethal autonomous weapons systems or more colloquially and rather alarmingly, killer robots. Current AI-driven weapon systems are nevertheless generally configured to require human authorization to fire having what's called a human in the loop or have human oversight and override provisions referred to as having a human on the loop. Until relatively recently, one could say that AI-enabled weapon systems operating without human intervention or control constituted a future concern in the context of what's being called the current AI arms race.

Yet, a 2021 report from the UN Security Council alleges that the Kargu-2 drone, a small loitering munition with facial recognition systems embedded on the platform, attacked and killed a human target in fully autonomous mode in Libya in 2020, so without human control or mediation. I should note that the Kargu-2 is generally configured to require a human in the loop so that a human operator authorise targets and engages the attack mode. But this doesn't mitigate all the concerns that we have with its use. Just to say that here, there's been a lot of attention to Australia's Loyal Wingman, an unmanned combat vehicle, which incorporates AI and is capable of collaborating with the next generation of manned combat aircraft. So this is really an example of what's been called smart human machine teaming. So that's just to give you a few different examples in the military sphere that I look at.

David Pembroke:

That is a vast...

Toni Erskine:

It is. There's so much more that I could say.

David Pembroke:

... landscape of application of artificial intelligence.

Kate, before we come to you and your views on what are the ethical challenges and implications of this vast array. Toni, as you go through that, how do you start to think about ethics and the application of ethics in this environment enabled by artificial intelligence?

Toni Erskine:

Sure. I think for me and my background is in the ethics of war, that's one of the areas that I've looked at for a long time, I think. So one of the things that I'm concerned with is to look at what are the ethics and laws of war that have been established, and then when we bring in these new AI-enabled technologies, how does that bring new conundrums that we have to face and how do we then address these new technologies within these existing frameworks? And sometimes I think that we can't. I think that we have to think of new responsibilities in order to address these new technologies, but that's something we can come back to.

David Pembroke:

Sure.

And, Kate, your views as you listen to that vast array of AI-enabled, strengthened capability, what are some of the ethical issues that strike you and particularly I suppose as you start to now you're joining the Royal Australian Air Force to start to work as a specialist reservist in artificial intelligence?

Dr. Kate Conroy:

Yeah, thanks so much. Look, I concur with everything that Toni said so far on the topic. Her background and my background are a little bit different. So what I'll try to do is to complement what Toni's speaking to from my background and expertise and some of the work that I've researched. So when it comes to the ethics of a military operating, one of the things we found when I co-wrote a report for defence science and technology group called a Method for Ethical AI in Defence, this was a technical report where we asked a lot of different stakeholders in the industry, military NGOs, academics, we tried to invite a lot of different... and government officials into the room to try and map out the ethical space for militaries. And in that process, quite a useful taxonomy I think was developed that separated the combat and war fighting ethical considerations from the enterprise level and rear echelon functions.

And we actually had people sitting at different tables to consider each of those aspects of ethics for military AI because we did want to avoid the entire conversation being taken up by the very interesting killer robots discussion, but to consider artificial intelligence throughout the military decision-making enterprise. And we were very mindful at that time of Australia's approach to systems of control, which was a non-paper published at the UN in 2019. And when you look at Australia's systems of control when it comes to regular weapons, you think about the insertion of artificial intelligence into weapons systems and you say, well, how controlled is the development decision to use, decision to deploy aspects of weapons in the Australian defence force as it is currently that we think is lawful and ethical? And then we suppose, well, what happens if we bring AI into any of those weapons systems at the design phase, at the test and evaluation phase? How does AI change the way we control weapons and what we allow weapons to do when they're out on the field?

So that the process of understanding AI, some of it is actually being very clear on the way the military is structured already and the degree to which things are constrained already. So where are the specific risks around the introduction of AI? Well, as Toni said, if we imagine that the particular opportunity of AI being about achieving cognitive capabilities that are normally the remit of human beings, the ability of weapons systems to perceive their environments at a very high level of fidelity, to be able to be discerning in the way they act. So for example, if you had a loitering munition and it was capable of perceiving, in the environment, children in a place where people didn't think that they were children and that that weapon could actually pause and stop its operations because it detected civilians, that would be a human level of intellectual engagement that might get a better ethical end, but it would be an unprecedented level of cognition within the weapon itself.

So the ethical issues we've got is to what degree can we offload these cognitive functions to things like weapon systems deployed by the Australian Defence Force in a way that we retain responsibility and the obligations under just war theory and international humanitarian law to retain command responsibility for the deployment of these AI-enabled systems. Now, it turns out in law it's not illegal to have autonomy. So autonomous functions are not illegal or unlawful, but there is a particular obligation of responsibility that we need to maintain between these systems and human beings, and that arrangement of accountability and responsibility and understanding about the way these systems operate and ensuring that they operate in accordance with human will and intent is where a lot of the ethical conversation exists, because on the one hand, we might be able to get something cleverer and better to achieve military and societal outcomes by incorporating AI, such as the way Ukraine, at the moment, is utilising artificial intelligence through the Palantir system.

So Alex Karp brought in Palantir and has a military intelligence system in the Ukraine to help the Ukraine fight just war against the Russian aggressors. And in that information gathering and decision augmentation, it's helping Ukraine conform to ethical behaviours and just behaviours because their intelligence that they're getting from these AI systems is helping them make smart decisions in the way they deploy effects.

David Pembroke:

So what are we learning from Ukraine in terms of this movement from theoretical into practical application of exactly both what Toni outlined before and what you've just discussed? What are the lessons at the moment and how are we seeing people's behaviour change and indeed warfare change as a result?

Dr. Kate Conroy:

I'll give you a concrete example that really struck me and refers back to that cargo drone example that was just brought up. So in Libya, the concern was a drone attacking autonomously fleeing combatants, right? That was the concern about killer robots. And what we found in the Ukrainian war against Russia is that the public perception of what is okay and not okay is highly connected to the sense of just action and just behaviour. And I remember seeing a video of a drone camera flying over a Russian tank and dropping ammunition into the Russian tank, and the Russian tank and those combatants exploding. And this was just passed around on social media like it was no big thing. There was no discussion of the level of autonomy in the drone by the Ukrainians. And I believe that the reduction of the focus on the mechanism of AI autonomy is directly proportional to the degree to which the human beings witnessing these acts, perceived them as acting in a way that is concordant with an ethical approach.

They think, yes, the Russian combatants were justly killed in that circumstance for the sake of the protection of the Ukraine. And when we look at media enterprises like PBS in America, the sort of reflection, they started changing the way they talked about autonomy and weapon systems because they acknowledged that some of this autonomy was helping the Ukraine fight a just war, and they started to realise the nuance of autonomy and that it isn't a black and white, it's okay or not okay, it's very contingent on the political and social environment in which these systems are deployed.

David Pembroke:

Toni, your work focuses on how human behaviour changes when employing intelligent machines. You speak about this concept of risk abdication. Can you explain what that means?

Toni Erskine:

Yeah. So I talk about the risk of the abdication of responsibility. I'll say a little bit about that research. So I argue in some of my recent work that a neglected threat that existing AI enabled military tools pose is that they change how we, as citizens, as soldiers, even as states, deliberate how we act and how we view ourselves as responsible agents. I talk specifically about the risk of what I call misplaced responsibility in war. When we rely on AI-enabled military tools, whether decision support systems or automated weapons systems with humans in the loop, and identify a number of factors that I argue contribute to this misplaced responsibility. So these factors that contribute to what I call misplaced responsibility in war include our desire to shrug off responsibility for what are our decisions and actions or our tendency to deflect or redirect blame. Also, what's referred to as algorithmic capacity, whereby the outputs of AI-enabled military tools can often neither be audited nor accurately interpreted by those who deploy, operate, or are guided by them.

And a third point is importantly what is called automation bias or a tendency to ignore or fail to seek contradictory information when faced with a computer-generated solution that we unquestioningly accept as correct. So discussing the implications of introducing automation to decision support systems embedded in computer interfaces. Mary Cummings, a researcher who is particularly concerned with the design of military weapons, argues that we tend to see an automated system as an independent agent capable of willful action. And that's a quote from Mary Cummings. She warns of the resulting creation of what she calls a moral buffer, which allows, she says, people to ethically distance themselves from their own actions. So through this combination of factors, there's a risk I argue that the AI-driven military tools that we have now, which ostensibly maintain a human in the loop, allow human actors to see themselves as off the moral hook when their decision-making appears to be displaced by sophisticated military machines is simply we adjust our self perception of our own roles and responsibilities. I argue that there's a risk that our tools thereby become our moral proxies, our moral guides and compasses, but also our scapegoats.

So moral responsibility is thereby misplaced and we are somehow diminished. The problem is not the unavoidable human machine teaming that the prevalence of AI brings to the practise of war, but rather the avoidable abdication of responsibility that I argue threatens to accompany it.

David Pembroke:

Kate, your response to that?

Dr. Kate Conroy:

Oh, it's a grey area. I've also researched in this area, so I'll just try to complement our Toni's perspective on misplaced responsibility. So in a recent paper I talked about there's three different ways that operators can engage with decision-making when they're working with AI systems. And you can have sort of appropriate moral engagement so that where people do take appropriate responsibility for decisions they make with these systems, and that's what we are looking for for responsible military operators that they don't fall into automation bias, the interface between what they're doing and the system is sufficiently nuanced and allows for human autonomy and agency, that the system's really enhancing and augmenting human decision making. And that human definitely feels like this was their decision, but that was their decision with a kind of smart teammate. This is what we want from the loyal wingman combat aircraft environment. We want it to be humans leading a mission with support like having a dog or a horse to support you. Okay. So that's the middle line, that's the virtuous line.

Then only two other sides. You have either moral disengagement on the one hand, which I think is some of what Toni's referring to, where there's a kind of offloading of responsibility. It was the machine. I went with its recommendations. It's always been right in the past. I sort of just did what I've normally done. So people sort of shirk responsibility. And that can often occur if the interface between the human and the AI system doesn't allow enough engagement of the human being where they flourish, where they feel wellbeing and connected. And there's actually some good work by New South Wales government, a workplace health and safety AI risk scorecard, which really highlights this potential to disengage from the work.

And anyone who's played chess or go or played a board game on their iPad and they found that the AI started getting better and better and they started thinking to themselves, I don't even know if I want to play this game anymore because so much worse. I'm just so much worse at this game, like this board game called Patchwork, I used to love it, but now the AI is just so smart and I stopped playing. I thought, I'm not bringing anything to this game. I'm just a toy of the AI and not even a good toy. So disengagement is very, very real. But I'd also like to point at the other side of the vice end, right? So we've got engagement, disengagement, and let's just take a moment to talk about moral injury because another problem with these AI systems, and I'm going to use the example of the pedestrian who was killed by an Uber self-driving car.

And the problem with the legal case after that occurrence was that it put all of the blame for the self-driving car incident on the test driver of the self-driving car who was found to be on their phone at the time. So there's a good legal argument to say that person shouldn't have been on the phone. They basically became the moral crumple zone of the death of that pedestrian because people are looking for a person to blame. But when you unpack that incident, there's a number of systemic problems that led to the death of that pedestrian, including turning down the safety margins on the alert system of a car which precluded a human from successfully intervening on the alert system. The AI misclassified the pedestrian as different objects as the pedestrian walked across the road with their bicycle. So the AI was not smart enough to know that it was a pedestrian.

In the end of the day, there was no legal consequence or indeed ethical consequence on Uber for the death of this pedestrian, but the human being who had been on their phone because Uber changed the policy from having two test drivers working together, which is a workplace health and safety nice thing to saving costs, having a singular operator in its responsibility position. And so yeah, that human ended up doing the wrong thing, but they sort of got trapped. They got trapped by a system of poor human design. So moral injury can occur by human beings using these systems. They actually can feel more responsible than perhaps they should. So if we think about drone operators working over the last 20 years, some of the research on the moral injury that occurs with them is actually that even though they might be physically distant from their targets and stationed far away from potential harms in their own person, their obligations in long surveillance cycles using AI-assisted information and intelligence means actually get to know their targets incredibly well as family members and work with their children.

And then at a certain point, the government says, this is now an authorised strike. You may now terminate that person, that father, and also do the post battle damage assessment of that destruction or one person. So now this person may have, not in every case, but may experience moral injury because they take the burden of responsibility for this action that is, I would argue, disproportionate to the fact it was a systemic decision and this person was doing their job. And so there's too much responsibility on human beings in the use of these systems as well as a danger.

David Pembroke:

Well, so how do we take it from where it is today? What is the path from here? Let's sort of wrap it up into this warfare space because I do want to actually bring it to the relevance of more general application of AI into the work of people in the Australian public sector. But where is it? Where is the where to from here to continue this understanding, this development, this research which continues to understand these frameworks that are going to sit around future war fighting? And Kate, I'll start with you.

Dr. Kate Conroy:

The good news is we already fund work in areas like human factors and in international legal considerations. And we still consider ethics in military education, professional military education and ethical behaviours is very much a focus of the Australian Defence Force. So the good news is we have a lot of the pieces in place to study the interactions of these emerging technologies with operators. We need to not lose the focus of these groups, so human factors, researchers, those actually testing the systems carefully ahead of deployment and avoiding falling into the trap that you can radically reduce the number of human beings who are involved in the management of these systems because you get this advantage of automation.

Instead of a one-to-many relationship, let's make sure we have a many-to-many relationship, a team of humans, let's say eight human beings in a control area, all managing perhaps hundreds of autonomous assets, but human beings looking after human beings to check on each other, to provide moral support, to check to make sure that they're not stuck in an Uber test-driving environment being all by themselves and forced to contend with these new technologies without having very human levels of reflection and opportunity for questioning what they're doing and what they're up to. So we've got a lot of the good stuff in place. We do need to be proactively encouraging and funding research with that human-centric approach.

David Pembroke:

So Toni, for you a question, Australia may have a particular approach, but others may not share the same views. How do you deal with that as it comes to warfare if people aren't playing by the same ethical rules?

Toni Erskine:

Yeah, that's an incredibly good question. And there's talk about sort of we're in an AI arms race and we need to compete. And if our adversaries have certain capabilities, then we need to have them as well. I think it's incredibly important to emphasise that Australia does adhere to international law to the ethics of war, and that's important. And I think that we need to continue to make sure that what we do and the weapons that we have fit within that framework. We have international norms and international laws and we need to adhere to those. And I think there's movements to work with other countries as well to make sure that the way these new weapons are used do adhere to international norms and international law.

David Pembroke:

Now, we've spoken really about the application of AI in the war fighting space, but more broadly, the application of AI. And we did mention the Uber case there as well because not in warfare, but certainly an application and an instance of the development of AI and its impact. What about for people working in the Australian public service who may... they're behind, they're well away from warfare, just doing their normal job? Obviously we have the National AI Centre that is looking to put in place voluntary codes. What sort of advice as experts in artificial intelligence do both of you have for people who are working in the public sector as to how they should be thinking and behaving with AI and engaging with AI?

Toni Erskine:

Okay. I'll think about that. I think we all need to gain a general understanding of how particular AI-enabled tools work and also what their limitations are. I think that's incredibly important. For example, language generative models like ChatGPT, which have received a huge amount of attention recently rely on statistical inference to string together a series of words to effectively predict what is likely to come next. This tool is neither thinking nor reflecting on the best answer to a question or searching for the truth, yet users sometimes, I think, assume otherwise, and that's evident within the university setting. Our expectations need to be recalibrated appropriately. So I think that sort of general level of understanding is important. But I'd add also that we need specific people with high level expertise and ongoing training operating AI-enabled tools, including interpreting recommendations made by AI-driven decision support systems.

Professor Jenny Davis based at Vanderbilt University in the US is someone who's working on this collaborative project with me. And she argues in a recent paper that it's not enough to have humans in the loop, whether we're talking about the war setting or outside that when it comes to the types of AI-enabled tools that I mentioned earlier, but also in any setting. She says we need to have experts in the loop. This requires, she says, infrastructure of ongoing professional training as well as both policies and technological design that place humans with specialist expertise at the core of the loop. And she wisely argues that we need to employ, train and sustain expert human practitioners to the highest standard when it comes to any AI driven system.

David Pembroke:

And Kate, your advice?

Dr. Kate Conroy:

Yeah, so there's a really great long-term insights briefing report published by a prime minister and cabinet last year. It says, how might artificial intelligence affect the trustworthiness of public service delivery? I think it's really important that the public service is proactive about upskilling their awareness, certainly about how these systems operate as Toni suggested, but what the findings are on the interplay between the human beings who are in the government and their stakeholders and the public. What does the public think about having public servants using artificial intelligence? What kinds of Australians, including those who are most disenfranchised or marginalised or already struggling to manage, are they going to be helped by the use of artificial intelligence or is it going to be a domino effect of continuing good things go to those who have the funding and the privilege and those who don't continue to get less services and are continually struggling to have their voices heard.

So if you're in the public service, I think start with public service values. In Queensland, for example, we have the Public Sector Ethics Act 1994, actually has ethical principles that you should work to when you work for the public service. So one fun thing you can do that is compliant with existing generative AI documents in the public service is you can actually use an open product like ChatGPT-4, and you can put an open document such as a little piece of legislation or an act into that chat, and you can ask it questions or you can say, I'm thinking about how to develop better guidance for getting the Queenslander's driver's licence renewed, could you please look at this Public Sector Ethics Act and give me some suggestions for how I could provide guidance in accordance with these principles? So you don't have any personal data or sensitive data or information about customers or any government information.

You're asking general questions about how to be a better public servant into these tools. And in that process, the level of professional development and opportunity to think differently about your job, because almost every public servant has, there's too many documents to read in the level of depth people would perhaps optimally be able to do. So AI can help bridge the gap. If you don't know what the Human Rights Act is in your jurisdiction, perhaps this is an opportunity to have a chat with an AI about that act and start to get more familiar with the different component parts. So the ways of working if you keep a values and principles centred approach can be hugely improved with the use of AI. But if you don't understand why you work the way you do or what your goals are and how that concords with your public service obligations, then AI is dangerous.

And be aware that corporate and industry players who are trying to sell their products to government are not as sensitive to the specific ethical obligations of the public service. They don't understand that relationship, particularly in Australia to Australians, we are not America, we are a different country and we have different ethical values. And remember that most of the big AI products at the moment really are biassed strongly to American ways of thinking and doing. And it is important we recognise we have hundreds of indigenous languages in Australia that are really underknown about, and we are unlikely to get the sensitivity of cultural communication to our Australian stakeholders if we depend on these generalist American-centric AI products in order to do our jobs.

David Pembroke:

Look, just a final and quick question. I know both of you are so vitally involved and deeply involved in this on a daily basis. I have to admit, it unsettles me. The whole conversation really, I find, I don't know, I often get just... I just don't know where it's going. And I think uncertainty in any sort of environment is always a challenge. But for those that you are vitally involved, and Kate, perhaps to you first, are you optimistic when you look at the whole thing, do you feel optimistic about it? Do you feel like we've got a grip on this or are there things happening that it feels like it's getting away from us a little bit?

Dr. Kate Conroy:

I have to actively meditate...

David Pembroke:

Of course.

Dr. Kate Conroy:

... in order to deal with what I take to be a very, very real existential threats to our sovereignty in some of the manners under which AI is being considered and potentially utilised by Australians. And that's in a civilian realm. And that comes under a broader strategic concern in terms of our vulnerability to cyber attacks and other things. So the concerns around AI are very real, and I do think everybody in the same way that you have civilian cyber defence where each civilian needs to take responsibility for protecting themselves against cyber attackers, I think we need civilian AI defence, which is where individuals do need to take some responsibility for upskilling themselves in both the risks and the opportunities of AI as individuals in their work and in their life with their children. Because it is an unprecedented, a bit of bingo overused word. We are in an unprecedented, innovative moment. The change in our society in one year with the public use of GPT-3.5 and four is very challenging to our society that is already under a lot of challenge.

But that being said, Australia has incredibly strong culture. We have an amazing constitution and extraordinary mechanisms to engage with our government in ways that other countries around the world actually don't have. So we are an amazing country. We should be kinder to ourselves because sometimes I think Australians give themselves a hard time because there's so many problems. But we've also got great mechanisms too. So we have an opportunity to lead in this space. And let me tell you, when it comes to the ethical behaviour of our military, it is a military advantage for the achievement of military and political ends to be more ethical with using AI.

So Michael Walzer in Just and Unjust Wars in his most recent edition of his book written in 2015, speaks to the political imperative to avoid harming citizens, civilians, because when you do that, you lose the political currency you need to win wars. We must use their technology and tools to fight for the purpose of political and victory. It is not about using harms for harm's sake, it is for a purpose. And we are incredibly well positioned to have military success if we employ these technologies in an appropriate and ethical manner.

David Pembroke:

Professor Toni Erskine, the final word to you.

Toni Erskine:

Yeah, no, I agree absolutely with Kate, and she's mentioned one of my favourite just war theorists, Michael Walzer as well. There are opportunities and risks with using AI, so that's important. I think because of the nature of my research, focusing on the risks that does tend to keep me awake at night. But as Kate said, education is incredibly important, upskilling. I think we have the opportunity to anticipate potential problems with the way that AI is developing, and really importantly, we have the opportunity to try to mitigate risks when we anticipate these problems.

David Pembroke:

Well, there you have it, audience. You asked for a discussion about artificial intelligence and you have got the start because it's a dance that can't be sat out by the sounds of things. And everyone is going to have to continue to commit to improving engagement, understanding, learning. And I'm very grateful to you, Professor Toni Erskine, and to you, Dr. Conroy, that smart people like you are leading the charge and continuing to explore, understand, put the ethical and moral frameworks around not only the war fighting, but more broadly. So thank you for joining us on Work with Purpose Today.

Toni Erskine:

Thank you for having me.

Dr. Kate Conroy:

Yeah, thanks so much.

David Pembroke:

And thank you to the audience for coming back. What a great conversation. We've gone a little bit longer than we normally do, but I don't think we could have stopped at our normal time because there was far too much to continue to discuss there. And if you do want to learn more about the ethical use of AI and the references to any of the documentation that was mentioned today in the conversation with Professor Erskine and Dr. Conroy, you can go to the show notes where there will be links to the reports and the various research, particularly the research mentioned by Dr. Conroy there, done by the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. So please, if you'd like to follow and learn more about Work with Purpose, you can follow at contentgroup or IPAA ACT on LinkedIn. And if you do have any questions or requests, please send them to events@act.ipaa.org.au.

Work with Purpose is produced in collaboration between contentgroup and the Institute of Public Administration of Australia ACT, with the support of the Australian Public Service Commission. If you do have the opportunity to give us a rating or review on your favourite podcast catcher, be it Spotify, Apple, Stitcher, and many, many more, it does help the programme to be found. And we do have so many positive reviews on there, and it's been an enormous help to us to get the message out. And it's great to know that Work with Purpose is the most popular channel for IPAA ACT. And thanks again for those of us who told us that in last year's survey.

Work with Purpose will be back with a special episode on International's Women's Day, which is the 8th of March. So make sure you tune into that. But for the moment, my name is David Pembroke, and it's bye for now.

Voiceover:

Work with Purpose is a production of contentgroup in partnership with the Institute of Public Administration Australia, and with the support of the Australian Public Service Commission.