

# **A FAIR, SOVEREIGN AND INCLUSIVE AI GOVERNANCE**

*Perspectives and recommendations from civil society and academia in Latin America and the Caribbean in the framework of the Third Ministerial and High-Level Summit on AI Ethics in LAC, ahead of the United Nations Global Dialogue on AI Governance*

## **Preamble**

The civil society organizations and academic institutions of Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) that endorse this document present our collective position ahead of the first Global Dialogue on AI Governance, convened by the United Nations in Geneva on 6 and 7 July 2026.

We speak from a region that is home to exceptional cultural and linguistic diversity, that concentrates some of the deepest inequalities in the world, and that has historically occupied a peripheral place in the forums where the rules of the global digital economy are defined. We also speak from a position of active commitment to providing a substantive contribution drawn from knowledge built over years of work at the intersection of technology, human rights and democracy.

This contribution stems from a shared conviction: the governance of artificial intelligence will be legitimate and effective only if it is inclusive in its design, grounded in human rights, oriented toward sustainable development, and responsive to the realities, capacities and priorities of different regions.

This document brings together contributions from 30 civil society organizations and academic institutions from ten countries in the region, plus organizations with regional and international reach and an active presence in LAC, consulted through a regional survey, a preparatory webinar held on 19 June 2026, and an in-person meeting on 24 June 2026 within the framework of the Third Ministerial Summit on AI Ethics in LAC. This consultation process was organized by the Globethics Regional Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Finally, this document is situated within the relevant regional and international processes and references, including the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021), the OECD Principles (2019), the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law (2024), United Nations General Assembly resolution A/78/L.49 on 'Seizing the opportunities of safe, secure and trustworthy artificial intelligence systems for sustainable development' (2024), the report Governing AI for Humanity (United Nations High-Level Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence, 2024), and the Santiago (2023) and Montevideo (2024) Declarations, all grounded in international human rights law.

## **Summary of recommendations**

As endorsing organizations, we put forward the following cross-cutting recommendations, addressed to States and international organizations, which synthesize the perspectives developed under each track of the Global Dialogue:

1. Reorient international cooperation toward technological sovereignty, with four measurable lines of action: regional computing infrastructure, independent audit capacity, talent training and retention, and use of UNESCO's RAM Methodology as a common diagnostic tool.
2. Place connectivity deployment, the transformation of work, and digital literacy at the center of the governance agenda, with measurable mechanisms and dedicated financing.

3. Recognize linguistic and cultural diversity as a digital right, with progressive coverage targets for official and indigenous languages, and create a Multilateral Fund for the Development of Low-Resource Language Corpora.
4. Establish the participation of civil society and academia in AI governance processes as a binding procedural condition, with genuine access to information, protection against reprisals, and the power to request audits or independent review when serious risks exist.
5. Guarantee algorithmic transparency, independent auditing, and meaningful human oversight throughout the entire life cycle of AI systems.
6. Adopt binding international instruments and promote ratification of the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence.
7. Establish clear red lines, with no exception for purpose or actor, regarding AI systems that are incompatible with human rights.
8. Address artificial intelligence as an amplifier of gender-based and child violence, with safety-by-design obligations.
9. Incorporate environmental sustainability — water, energy and carbon footprint — as a trustworthiness criterion for Artificial Intelligence.
10. Support the creation of a United Nations Special Rapporteur on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights.

## CLUSTER 1 · GLOBAL DIALOGUE

### Opportunities and implications of AI

#### Regional perspective

For Latin America and the Caribbean, the main promise of artificial intelligence lies in its capacity to address the structural gaps that have constrained the region's inclusive and sustainable development. The opportunities we identify most consistently are concentrated in expanding access to quality education and healthcare, through adaptive tutors in Spanish, Portuguese and indigenous languages, assisted diagnosis in areas without specialists, and predictive epidemiological surveillance; in strengthening public management and the targeting of social policies; in climate adaptation and the sustainable management of natural resources; and in increasing the productivity of the micro, small and medium enterprises that sustain regional employment. In all of these areas, the value of technology is measured by its contribution to equity.

We also start from a solid foundation. The region contributes exceptional cultural and linguistic diversity, a renewable energy matrix present in several countries, a roadmap grounded in the ethics of artificial intelligence — expressed in the Ministerial Summits and in the Santiago (2023), Montevideo (2024) and Santo Domingo (2026) Declarations — and situated knowledge, built by its academia and civil society, which is essential for legitimate governance. These strengths constitute the leverage point from which the region can turn promise into effective development.

The materialization of these opportunities depends on conditions that today show uneven progress. The Latin American Artificial Intelligence Index (ILIA 2025), prepared by the National

Center for Artificial Intelligence (CENIA) based on more than one hundred sub-indicators across nineteen countries in the region, confirms a heterogeneous ecosystem: pioneer, adopter and explorer countries coexist with very different degrees of maturity. ILIA 2025 pinpoints the gaps the region intends to close: investment that barely reaches 1.12% of the global total in artificial intelligence and research concentrated in a few countries, alongside talent that is trained more broadly in basic literacy than in specialized, frontier capabilities. Added to this are still insufficient connectivity and computing infrastructure, limited availability of open, quality data, and still scarce representation in the bodies where technical standards are defined.

This heterogeneity is corroborated by independent international assessments: the 2026 Artificial Intelligence and Democratic Values Index from the Center for AI and Digital Policy (CAIDP) ranks the countries of the region at markedly disparate performance levels — from Uruguay (10 points, Level II) and Argentina (9), followed by Colombia (8.5) and Brazil, Chile and Peru (8), down to the Dominican Republic (5), Ecuador (4.5) and Venezuela (3) — which confirms the coexistence of highly unequal governance capacities across the region.

These opportunities coexist with concrete costs that form part of the artificial intelligence value chain and that the region bears disproportionately. Latin America and the Caribbean supply data-labeling and content-moderation work under frequently precarious conditions, without labor protection or psychosocial support in the face of exposure to harmful content, and increasingly host physical computing infrastructure, with its demand for energy, land and water for cooling in territories already under water stress. Added to this pressure is dependence on infrastructure and models developed outside the region, as well as the concentration of market power. An honest assessment of the opportunities internalizes these costs and demands decent working conditions for data work and environmental assessment of the computing infrastructure installed in the region.

On this basis, we distinguish between risks that can be managed through safeguards and practices that are structurally incompatible with human rights. Certain applications require prohibition, because their harm originates in their very nature and persists regardless of any technical adjustment; the full set of these red lines is developed in Cluster 4.

The cultural and linguistic dimension defines much of the region's distinctiveness in this debate. Latin America and the Caribbean are home to hundreds of living indigenous languages, in addition to creole languages and varieties of Spanish, Portuguese, French and Caribbean English. The models that currently dominate the market are trained predominantly in English and on corpora that reflect Global North contexts, and they perform unevenly in the region's languages. We therefore call for the highest priority to be given to preserving and strengthening this cultural heritage for humanity: deliberate intervention allows artificial intelligence to operate as an instrument of linguistic vitality and cultural affirmation.

We also recognize that these implications are distributed unequally across the population. Women and girls, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendant communities, rural communities, people living in poverty, persons with disabilities, migrants, older persons, and the LGBTIQ+ population are among the most exposed groups. Children and adolescents occupy a singular place, as early and intensive users of these systems; the enhanced standard of protection we demand for their data and rights is developed in Cluster 4. In all cases, we maintain that uses

in sensitive sectors — health, education, justice and migration — require specific frameworks and reinforced safeguards.

To diagnose capacities and guide investment, we urge the States of Latin America and the Caribbean to make use of the available tools, in particular UNESCO's Readiness Assessment Methodology for Artificial Intelligence (RAM). Regional progress in this area is already significant: the CAIDP's 2026 Artificial Intelligence and Democratic Values Index documents that, between April 2025 and the report's closing date alone, eight countries in the region — including Peru, Paraguay, Jamaica, Ecuador, Curaçao, Cuba, Colombia and Antigua and Barbuda — published their RAM reports, adding to those already completed by Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Mexico, Uruguay and the Dominican Republic. We call on States that have not yet carried it out to do so, and on those that have already completed it to publish their results and implement their recommendations, with priority given to strengthening institutional capacities, data governance, and the training of public servants, for the development and use of artificial intelligence that is safe, inclusive and respectful of human rights.

#### Regional SWOT

<p><b>Strengths (internal +)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural and linguistic diversity as an asset</li> <li>• Renewable energy matrix in several countries</li> <li>• Regional roadmap on AI ethics (Summits; Santiago, Montevideo and Santo Domingo Declarations)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Opportunities (external +)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AI in education, health, public management, climate adaptation and MSME productivity</li> <li>• Regional institutional framework (eLAC/ECLAC)</li> <li>• AI as public infrastructure and digital public goods</li> </ul>
<p><b>Weaknesses (internal –)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient connectivity and infrastructure</li> <li>• Regulatory immaturity and limited access to computing</li> <li>• Bottleneck in advanced talent training</li> <li>• Limited data availability; restricted financing</li> </ul>	<p><b>Threats (external –)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural homogenization and risk of digital language extinction</li> <li>• Precarious data-labeling and moderation work</li> <li>• Environmental footprint in water-stressed territories</li> <li>• Dependence on external infrastructure and models; market concentration</li> </ul>

## 1. Recommendations to the Global Dialogue on Cluster 1

We address the following recommendations to States and international organizations.

- 1.1. Recognize artificial intelligence as public, strategic infrastructure, and govern it as a digital public good through public investment, equitable access, open standards, democratic governance and orientation toward the public interest.
- 1.2. We recommend recognizing linguistic and cultural diversity as a digital right, operationalized through: (1) a regional observatory that measures the performance of AI by language; (2) mandatory reporting of language coverage by frontier model developers; (3) progressive coverage targets for official and indigenous languages with the largest numbers of speakers; and (4) minimum operation of AI-enabled digital public services in the predominant official and indigenous languages of each territory, within the framework of the International Decade of Indigenous Languages 2022–2032.
- 1.3. Establish a regime of indigenous and community data sovereignty: use of linguistic and cultural heritage in AI subject to free, prior and informed consent (ILO Convention 169,

UNDRIP), the CARE Principles for data governance, and benefit-sharing when such use generates economic value. Prohibit its collection without consent and adopt a regional community-licensing model managed by the communities themselves.

- 1.4. Incorporate intersectional perspectives — with emphasis on gender, socioeconomic status, ethnic origin and disability — in all impact assessments and in the design of governance frameworks.
- 1.5. Establish global standards for the responsible reuse of data that commit commercial model developers to provide clear attribution, verify the provenance of information, and sustain the infrastructures from which knowledge is extracted.
- 1.6. Place the transformation of work at the center of the governance agenda, recognizing labor rights throughout the AI value chain, ensuring decent conditions and psychosocial support for data-labeling and moderation work, guaranteeing the transparency and accountability of algorithmic management systems, and preserving human oversight of systems that affect employment.
- 1.7. Promote regional education and digital literacy strategies that strengthen the responsible, ethical and safe use of technologies across different sectors of society, with particular attention to communities historically excluded from access to training.
- 1.8. Produce periodic reports and share lessons learned on the progress of governmental and business cooperation on AI in the countries of the region, so that accumulated experience translates into collective learning.

## CLUSTER 2 · GLOBAL DIALOGUE

### Closing AI gaps

#### Regional perspective

For Latin America and the Caribbean to seize the opportunities of artificial intelligence, the region needs to close a set of structural gaps that we identify with notable consistency: still insufficient connectivity and digital infrastructure, regulatory frameworks still maturing, a shortage of specialized talent, limited access to computing capacity, data availability and quality, and financing constraints. ILIA shows that research is concentrated in a few countries and that data, although abundant, remain poorly available due to limited openness and standardization. This heterogeneity is repeated within the index's own leading and accelerating countries alike: consolidated scientific and academic capital (CONICET in Argentina, ANID in Chile, CONACYT in Paraguay, or MESCYT in the Dominican Republic) coexists with persistent gaps in computing infrastructure, sustained financing, and comprehensive regulatory frameworks. It is this combination of strengths and lags, present even in the region's most advanced cases, that regional cooperation must address as a priority.

Added to this is the challenge of training and retaining specialized talent, since basic AI literacy is advancing more broadly than technical and frontier capabilities. These gaps reflect power

asymmetries in the global digital economy and condition the region's position in any discussion on governance.

These gaps rest on inequalities that predate artificial intelligence and that should be addressed simultaneously: still incipient digital education, unequal access to connectivity in rural and peripheral areas, and the need for training policies with a gender and human rights perspective. The region also faces technology-facilitated gender-based violence, whose substantive treatment we develop in Cluster 4.

Given this diagnosis, we maintain that the most effective response combines national efforts with coordinated regional cooperation. We propose moving toward shared high-performance computing infrastructure, accessible to countries with lower installed capacity; a regional innovation fund with multi-stakeholder governance and territorial equity criteria; talent training, exchange and retention programs; the collaborative development of open models trained on the region's data and realities; and networks of centers of excellence with a knowledge-transfer mandate. In a cross-cutting way, we value the role of digital diplomacy, insofar as coordinating common positions increases the region's negotiating weight in international forums.

This cooperation builds on existing regional institutions, such as the Digital Agenda for Latin America and the Caribbean (eLAC), coordinated by ECLAC, and on subregional integration spaces. We recommend aligning computing, data and talent initiatives with these frameworks to gain scale and continuity, avoid duplication of efforts, and provide the region with stable multi-stakeholder governance, sustained beyond external financing cycles.

Open models constitute a first-order contribution enabling the region to participate in the development of artificial intelligence. Their full potential depends on simultaneous investment in infrastructure, human capacities, community governance and the sustainability of digital public goods, so that openness is accompanied by the material conditions that make it effective. The success and sustainability of these models rest on solid mechanisms of governance, maintenance and financing, and on strengthening the communities that develop them through participatory, democratic governance schemes oriented toward the common good.

Likewise, closing the gaps requires predictable, long-term financing models. We propose combining regional public funds, development banking, and co-financing commitments from frontier model developers that benefit from the region's data and markets. The computing infrastructure that is built should be energy-sustainable and make use of the renewable energy matrix of several LAC countries; the environmental criteria governing that infrastructure are developed in Cluster 3.

The gap-reduction agenda has a direct bearing on the region's technological sovereignty and its participation in international governance. To this end, we identify the barriers that need to be overcome to influence the definition of technical standards: the still-scarce institutional representation of Latin America and the Caribbean in the main standard-setting bodies — which ILIA 2025 identifies as a factor that reduces the region's influence over global rules —, still-incipient regional coordination, resource asymmetries relative to the countries leading development, the complexity of technical processes requiring continuity, and documentation

available almost exclusively in English. Given this scenario, we maintain that technological sovereignty is built through South-South cooperation and the joint creation of knowledge among Global South countries, enabling capacities, data and lessons to be shared on equal terms, sustaining a common negotiating position, and developing the region's own frameworks and infrastructure. International cooperation is most valuable when it is oriented toward the region's autonomy and when knowledge generated in the region comes to shape international standards.

## 2. Recommendations to the Global Dialogue on Cluster 2

We address the following recommendations to States and international organizations:

- 2.1. Create a Multilateral Fund for the Development of Low-Resource Language Corpora that commits frontier model developers to co-finance the digitization and preservation of indigenous and creole languages, managed by local institutions and community leadership.
- 2.2. Guarantee mechanisms for the effective participation of Latin America and the Caribbean in the bodies and panels governing artificial intelligence technical standards, such as ISO, ITU and IEEE, through public funding for sustained representation, linguistic support, transparency in decision-making processes, and the presence of the region's civil society and academia in the corresponding technical groups.
- 2.3. Reorient international cooperation toward technological sovereignty with four measurable lines of action: (1) financing of regional computing infrastructure; (2) independent audit and evaluation capacity for AI systems; (3) training, exchange and retention programs for talent in AI ethics and governance, with scholarships and return schemes that mitigate brain drain; (4) use the Readiness Assessment Methodology (RAM) of UNESCO as a common diagnostic tool to identify and prioritize each country's gaps.
- 2.4. Strengthen South-South cooperation mechanisms that allow knowledge on AI governance generated in the region to flow horizontally and help shape international standards.
- 2.5. Encourage multidisciplinary research and open spaces for technology development by indigenous communities and different social sectors, from their own perspective.
- 2.6. Accompany investment in artificial intelligence with education and digital literacy policies that incorporate a gender and human rights perspective, comprehensively addressing the region's structural inequalities.
- 2.7. Align international support with existing regional institutions (eLAC/ECLAC and subregional integration) and orient new computing infrastructure toward energy and water sustainability criteria, developed in Cluster 3.
- 2.8. Develop regional and national AI literacy programs for citizens, teachers, public officials, civil society, journalists and vulnerable communities, with a focus on human rights, gender, accessibility, cultural relevance and local languages.

- 2.9. Create regulatory frameworks that incentivize and establish solid mechanisms for the governance, maintenance and financing of projects for the development of open-source systems aimed at achieving sovereignty objectives and closing gaps in each and every country of the region.

## CLUSTER 3 · GLOBAL DIALOGUE

### Safe, trustworthy and interoperable AI

#### Regional perspective

For Latin America and the Caribbean, the trustworthiness of an artificial intelligence system must be a property verified in its deployment context and throughout its entire life cycle. We consider that this trustworthiness rests on a set of principles — transparency, privacy, non-discrimination, accountability, human oversight and explainability — and that its assessment takes on full meaning when it incorporates the region's linguistic, social and environmental realities and the participation of affected communities.

The region strengthens its trustworthiness when it develops its own testing, evaluation and certification capacity. We propose moving toward testbeds using data that is representative of the region and disaggregated by language and gender, and toward audit laboratories with mutual recognition among countries. This capacity allows a system's trustworthiness to be determined using evidence generated in the region and reduces dependence on the self-assessment of model developers, so that verification rests with independent bodies that have contextual knowledge.

Data security and data sovereignty constitute a central dimension of this agenda, and regional evidence confirms its urgency. Artificial intelligence systems broaden the risk surface with regard to data breaches, disinformation, *deepfakes*, voice cloning, identity theft and fraud. In Latin America and the Caribbean, identity fraud grew by 137% during 2024, driven by the proliferation of deepfakes, and deepfake incidents in the region increased by 255% between 2023 and 2024, according to Sumsub's Identity Fraud Report. Globally, deepfakes already account for one in five biometric fraud attempts. We therefore call for robust cybersecurity controls, data quality requirements, regulatory compliance mechanisms, and enhanced protection of sensitive information. The adoption of recognized technical standards — including the ISO 42000 family and the NIST frameworks — offers a common basis for these safeguards, provided that their definition and application involve the participation of the region's civil society and academia.

Environmental and climate sustainability is a cross-cutting dimension of trustworthiness. The pressure that computing infrastructure places on water, energy and carbon emissions forms part of a system's assessment and calls for verifiable disclosure requirements. We therefore maintain that the Global Dialogue should align its work with environmental governance processes — including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Commission on Science and Technology for Development (CSTD) — so that artificial intelligence governance and planetary governance advance in a coordinated manner. The region also starts from an

advantage: a renewable energy matrix that makes it possible to orient computing infrastructure toward sustainability criteria.

The interoperability the region promotes raises the standard of protection. We understand international harmonization as a process that strengthens safeguards and takes international human rights law as a common reference, so that no convergence process lowers existing safeguards, particularly for Global South countries. International cooperation gains its greatest value when it recognizes that different legal traditions and development contexts can coexist and mutually enrich one another; the Global Dialogue represents a relevant opportunity to build bridges between them while preserving that diversity. Along the same lines, we recommend its alignment with the Global Digital Compact and the WSIS+20 process, so that the different digital agendas advance convergently and avoid fragmentation.

This agenda draws on a body of standards in which the region is an active participant: the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021), the OECD Principles (2019), the Ibero-American Charter of Principles and Rights in Digital Environments, the Council of Europe Framework Convention (2024), the United Nations General Assembly resolution on safe and trustworthy AI, and the report Governing AI for Humanity. These instruments provide the foundation on which interoperability can be built without diluting safeguards.

Finally, the region directs its attention primarily to present, already materialized risks, without neglecting the emerging risks of frontier models and agentic systems, which operate with minimal human intervention. This prioritization channels efforts toward the harms already affecting people, while maintaining the foresight needed regarding emerging capabilities and dual-use risks.

### **3. Recommendations to the Global Dialogue on Cluster 3**

We address the following recommendations to States and international organizations.

- 3.1. Promote a binding international instrument for AI governance with a monitoring body and a periodic cycle of State reporting, taking international human rights law and the UNESCO Recommendation as a baseline. Every process of convergence or mutual recognition must be governed by a non-regression clause: take the highest applicable standard of protection as the reference and never lower safeguards, with particular attention to Global South countries.
- 3.2. Implement binding rules on algorithmic transparency that function as a security-audit and accountability mechanism, allowing independent researchers and civil society to examine systems for bias, vulnerabilities or failures, while guaranteeing a verifiable and reproducible record.
- 3.3. Develop a regional testing, evaluation and certification capacity, with testbeds that use representative, disaggregated data, and audit laboratories with mutual recognition among countries, cooperating with the International Network of AI Safety Institutes.

- 3.4. Adopt technical and cybersecurity standards with the participation of civil society and academia, so that trustworthiness rests on independent verification rather than on developers' self-assessment. These controls must expressly cover the entire AI supply chain, including data provenance and licensing, pre-trained models, libraries and dependencies, APIs, cloud services, updates, third-party providers, and safe decommissioning mechanisms, since the security of an AI system depends on its entire life cycle.
- 3.5. Incorporate environmental sustainability as a trustworthiness criterion, with binding requirements for disclosing the water, energy and carbon footprint of systems, in coordination with the UNFCCC, UNEP and the CSTD.
- 3.6. Establish meaningful human oversight as a trustworthiness principle throughout the life cycle, with accountability frameworks appropriate for frontier systems and agentic systems, as well as for dual-use risks.
- 3.7. Align the Global Dialogue with the Global Digital Compact, the WSIS+20 process and environmental governance processes, so that digital and environmental agendas advance in a coordinated manner and regulatory fragmentation is avoided.

## CLUSTER 4 · GLOBAL DIALOGUE

### Human rights, transparency and accountability

#### Regional perspective

Human rights are the binding framework for all artificial intelligence governance. For Latin America and the Caribbean, the development and use of these systems gain legitimacy when they are subordinated to international human rights law and to the obligations States have already assumed. From this conviction, we maintain that AI governance translates those obligations into concrete guarantees of transparency, accountability and human oversight.

We place at the center of governance the people and communities most strongly affected by these systems: women and girls, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendant communities, rural communities, people living in poverty, persons with disabilities, migrants, and the LGBTIQ+ population. Governance centered on those who bear the greatest risks protects, by extension, society as a whole.

We recognize the value of the existing international frameworks cited above and propose refining them into binding instruments, with effective compliance mechanisms built with the region's participation. The region also has its own binding body of standards: the Inter-American Human Rights System — the American Convention, the case law of the Inter-American Court, and the standards of the Commission and its Special Rapporteurship for Freedom of Expression — constitutes a direct source of obligations for States, not a secondary reference.

On this basis, we clearly distinguish practices that are structurally incompatible with human rights, whose harm originates in their very nature and persists regardless of any technical

safeguard. In this context, we call for their prohibition through the establishment of red lines, which include:

- i. lethal autonomous weapons;
- ii. mass biometric surveillance and remote biometric identification in public spaces;
- iii. social scoring systems;
- iv. predictive policing based on profiling;
- v. biometric categorization by race, gender, sexual orientation, beliefs, health status or other protected categories;
- vi. emotion recognition and psychometric inference in employment, education, migration and law enforcement;
- vii. systems that make determinative decisions on credit, employment, social benefits, migration or justice without meaningful human oversight, transparency, or the possibility of effective recourse.

These prohibitions must apply without exception, regardless of the purpose invoked or the actor operating them. The urgency of banning surveillance and biometric identification is supported by the country assessments in the CAIDP's 2026 Artificial Intelligence and Democratic Values Index, which document a recurring concern in the region over the deployment of facial recognition systems — flagged, among others, in the cases of Argentina, Uruguay and the Dominican Republic — for their potential to violate individual rights in the absence of adequate safeguards.

The right to privacy, informational self-determination and the protection of personal data constitute a critical threshold of this agenda. Artificial intelligence intensifies the capacity to infer sensitive information and shape behavior, with effects that reach the psychosocial dimension of individuals. We therefore call for firm limits on the extraction of psychometric and emotional data, and for guarantees that preserve people's autonomy over their information.

The protection of girls, boys and adolescents deserves the highest standard. Their status as early and intensive users of these systems calls for an enhanced level of protection for their data, strict restrictions on profiling and targeted advertising, and age-appropriate oversight and recourse mechanisms, in accordance with the principle of the best interests of the child.

Governance must also address artificial intelligence as an amplifier of gender-based violence and violence against children, a documented and rapidly expanding phenomenon. Current tools make it possible to generate this material from very few images and within minutes. At the same time, the International Security Report (2025, p.64) indicates that around 96% of circulating deepfake videos involving non-consensual sexual content are overwhelmingly directed at women, confirming their character as gender-based violence. In light of this reality, we call for clear prohibitions, safety-by-design obligations for those who develop models and operate platforms, and accessible mechanisms for reporting, protection and redress.

We also hold that responsibility does not rest with States alone. Businesses have a responsibility to respect human rights in accordance with the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, which includes due diligence processes to identify, prevent and mitigate the impacts of their systems throughout their entire life cycle.

Technological innovation coexists with States' obligations to protect against abuse, investigate, sanction and guarantee access to effective remedy, which remain fully in force.

Accountability makes these principles operational. We call for algorithmic and human rights impact assessments prior to deployment, independent audits, public registries of the systems used by the State, accessible channels for complaints and recourse, clear liability regimes, and the power to suspend or withdraw systems that violate rights.

Finally, the participation of civil society and academia is a condition for the legitimacy of this entire architecture. That participation takes on its full meaning when it is formal, permanent and equipped with real capacity — with concrete functions of auditing, impact assessment and documentation —, when it has the material conditions that make it effective — technical capacities, stable financing and genuine access to information — and when it offers protected, confidential channels for individuals and organizations operating in contexts of restricted civic space.

## 4. Recommendations to the Global Dialogue on Cluster 4

We address the following recommendations to States and international organizations.

- 4.1. Adopt binding international instruments anchored in international human rights law, and promote ratification of the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence, open to all States, as a reference point for enforceable obligations.
- 4.2. Establish mandatory algorithmic and human rights impact assessments prior to deployment, taking into account the due diligence set out in the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, with particular rigor in the sensitive sectors of health, education, justice and migration.
- 4.3. Establish clear red lines on AI systems that are incompatible with human rights. This is to be given effect through express, binding legal prohibition, coupled with an effective sanctions regime.
- 4.4. Create binding regulatory mechanisms that combine transparency requirements with clear institutional mandates for oversight. Independent regulators should have explicit legal authority, sufficient resources, legal powers to audit and sanction, and mechanisms for third-party and community-led audits. These instruments should include standardized reporting and evaluation templates and enforceable remediation deadlines, as well as meaningful challenge mechanisms, so that transparency, oversight and enforceability work together to protect rights and public trust.
- 4.5. Address artificial intelligence as an amplifier of gender-based and child violence, with clear prohibitions, safety-by-design obligations for developers and platforms, and accessible mechanisms for reporting, protection and redress for victims.
- 4.6. Establish the participation of civil society and academia as a binding procedural condition, with independent funding, genuine access to information, and

protected, confidential channels for contexts of restricted civic space, protection against reprisals, and the power to request audits or independent review when serious risks exist.

- 4.7. Create public registries of the artificial intelligence systems used by the State, and hybrid, accessible mechanisms for reporting, recourse and comprehensive redress for algorithmic harm.
- 4.8. Support the creation of a United Nations Special Rapporteur on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, with a cross-cutting mandate and an independent reporting function, contributing to the definition of international red lines.
- 4.9. Strengthen personal data protection, privacy and informational self-determination frameworks, incorporating principles of minimization, purpose limitation, security, consent, limits on sensitive inferences, enhanced protection of biometric data, and a prohibition on the extraction of psychometric and emotional data.

## **Follow-up on the recommendations**

We propose the creation of a regional follow-up mechanism led by civil society and academia in collaboration with Member States. This mechanism should have public, verifiable indicators, as well as periodic reports documenting progress toward the Global Dialogue, the next Ministerial Summit, and the Global Digital Compact and WSIS+20 processes. We also request that the Global Dialogue include formal spaces for receiving these reports and responding to them substantively.

## **Acknowledgments**

This Position Paper, submitted to the Secretariat of the United Nations Global Dialogue on AI Governance, was coordinated and edited by Paola Galvez Callirgos, AI Ethics Manager at Globethics. We particularly recognize and thank the contributions, comments and recommendations made during the drafting and review stages by Adriana Baravalle (Universidad Austral), Abdul Abner Lugo Jiménez, Amalia Toledo (Wikimedia Foundation) Carlos Cortés (Linterna Verde), Jéssica Elizabeth Morales Bonilla (Kichwa Institute of Science, Technology and Humanities, KISTH), Julio Herrera (Red Ciudadana), Natalia Alarcón Rueda (Center for AI and Digital Policy - CAIDP), Osvaldo Larancuent (Internet Society - Dominican Republic), Syra Taveras Pineda (Centro de Investigación para la Acción Femenina (CIPAF), Vladimir Cortés (Digital Action), César Peña (Librodesa International Dominican Republic), whose commitment and expertise enriched this work.

## **Endorsement**

This final version is endorsed by the following organizations:

CENIA (Centro Nacional de Inteligencia Artificial de Chile) / Chile

Center for AI and Digital Policy (CAIDP) / with a presence in Latin America

Centro de Investigación para la Acción Femenina (CIPAF) / Dominican Republic  
Digital Action / Mexico  
Diversa / Ecuador  
Fórum Integra / Brazil  
Fundación Huaira / Ecuador  
Fundación KISTH - Kichwa Institute of Science, Technology, and Humanities / Ecuador  
Globethics - Regional Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean / Argentina  
International Cooperation Group of Brazilian Universities (GCUB) / Brazil  
Instituto Panamericano de Derecho y Tecnología (IPANDETEC) / Panama  
ISOC Dominican Republic Chapter (isoc.do) / Dominican Republic  
Librodesa Internacional / Dominican Republic  
ONG Amaranta / Chile  
Red Ciudadana / Guatemala  
Semillero Artificial Intelligence and Law Research Group at Pontificia Universidad Javeriana / Colombia  
Universidad Austral / Argentina  
Usuarios Digitales / Ecuador

Likewise, this final version is endorsed by the following professionals:

Merve Hickok, CAIDP President and Policy Director  
Natalia Alarcon, Director and founder of the Artificial Intelligence and Law Research Group (Semillero) at Pontificia Universidad Javeriana and CAIDP Fellow / Colombia  
Marc Rotenberg, CAIDP Founder and Executive Director  
Christabel Randolph, CAIDP Associate Director  
Ren Bin Lee Dixon CAIDP Policy Group Associate  
Dr Grace Thomson, CAIDP AI Policy Clinic Director  
Maria Eugeina Barroso, Manager of the Regional Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean / Argentina  
Rossana Valéria de Souza e Silva, Executive Director of GCUB / Brazil  
Paola Galvez Callirgos, AI Ethics Manager at Globethics, MSCG Member of UNESCO Women for Ethical AI, Steering Committee Member of the UN Women AI School / Peru  
Jessica Morales, CEO and President of the KISTH Foundation / Ecuador  
Dayanara Antonia Reyes, Specialist in Professional Training Design and Artificial Intelligence Governance at Novaltech / Dominican Republic