

**The AI Ethics And Integrity Officer (AEIO):  
a new guardian for human rights and responsible AI governance**

**Ofițerul de etică și integritate în AI (AEIO):  
Un nou gardian al drepturilor omului și a guvernantei  
responsabile în ai**

*Alexandru Daniel Crișan\**

**Abstract**

*The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) necessitates the creation of a specialized governance role to ensure ethical integrity and human rights compliance. This paper proposes the establishment of the AI Ethics and Integrity Officer (AEIO) as a dedicated oversight figure within both public and private entities utilizing AI technologies.*

*The AEIO would serve as a generator of good practices and a guardian for AI ethics, fulfilling three key responsibilities:*

- (1) reviewing and advising on all AI-related activities to align with ethical and legal standards;*
- (2) ensuring organizational compliance with human rights frameworks and industry regulations; and*
- (3) overseeing whistleblower channels while reporting severe or repeated infractions to the appropriate authorities.*

*Methodologically, this paper examines existing AI governance frameworks, evaluates gaps in ethical oversight, regarding how the AEIO could reinforce accountability, transparency, and public trust. The findings highlight the necessity of a structured, independent role to mitigate AI-related risks and promote responsible innovation. This study concludes that the institutionalization of the AEIO would enhance ethical governance, safeguard fundamental rights, and foster a more sustainable and equitable AI ecosystem.*

**Keywords:** Human Rights; Artificial Intelligence, European Union; AEIO, Governance, Ethics.

**JEL Classification:** [ K23 ]

---

\* PhD student in Administrative Science, National School of Political Studies and Public Administration

## 1. The Need for Ethical AI Governance

“On Artificial Intelligence, trust is a must, not a nice to have. With these landmark rules, the EU is spearheading the development of new global norms to make sure AI can be trusted”

Margrethe Vestager,  
European Commission Executive Vice-President

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) has raised significant concerns regarding ethics, accountability, and regulatory compliance. As AI systems become increasingly sophisticated and deeply embedded in both public and private decision-making, their transformative potential is matched by the ethical challenges they pose. These challenges demand not only technical solutions but also robust institutional responses to uphold democratic values and protect fundamental rights.

AI technologies are increasingly deployed across critical domains such as hiring processes, healthcare delivery, law enforcement, and financial services. While these applications promise improvements in efficiency, scalability, and predictive accuracy, they simultaneously expose society to a range of ethical risks. These include algorithmic bias, discrimination, loss of autonomy, lack of transparency, and a growing asymmetry of power between technology providers and affected individuals. For instance, AI-based hiring tools have been shown to replicate historical biases in recruitment data, and predictive policing algorithms may reinforce systemic inequalities in law enforcement.

UNESCO's 2021 Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence<sup>1</sup> warns that, in the absence of regulatory enforcement, the adoption of ethical AI principles remains largely aspirational. It argues that AI governance should move beyond voluntary compliance, calling for the creation of binding legal and institutional frameworks that align with human rights law, democratic values, and the rule of law. The document also stresses the importance of oversight mechanisms that ensure transparency, accountability, and redress.

Similarly, the OECD's Principles on AI<sup>2</sup> explicitly affirm that AI systems must be designed to respect democratic values and the rule of law, with a clear imperative to include human intervention safeguards. The OECD highlights accountability as a foundational principle, stating that actors involved in developing, deploying, or operating AI systems should be held accountable for their functioning, particularly in contexts where AI impacts public welfare.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>

<sup>2</sup> OECD. (2019). *OECD principles on artificial intelligence*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. <https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles>

At the European level, the recently adopted EU Artificial Intelligence Act (2024) represents a historic step in codifying these concerns into binding law. The regulation introduces a risk-based classification of AI systems and mandates human oversight for high-risk applications, such as those used in law enforcement, border control, employment, and critical infrastructure. The AI Act also prohibits AI practices considered to present an “unacceptable risk” to individuals’ rights and safety, such as biometric surveillance in public spaces or manipulative behavioral scoring. Furthermore, the Act establishes the European Artificial Intelligence Board and mandates each Member State to designate national supervisory authorities, thereby formalizing the need for independent oversight structures and harmonized enforcement across the EU.

Despite these advances, challenges persist in translating legislative mandates into effective organizational practice. Many institutions lack the internal expertise or ethical infrastructure required to ensure day-to-day compliance and responsible innovation. This has led to a growing recognition of the need for internal governance roles that are both knowledgeable and empowered.

In response, this paper proposes the introduction of the AI Ethics and Integrity Officer (AEIO): a specialized governance role embedded within institutions deploying AI. The AEIO would be tasked with advising on ethical compliance, ensuring conformity with human rights standards, reviewing AI systems from a moral and legal perspective, and overseeing internal accountability mechanisms such as whistleblower channels and redress systems. The AEIO's role would not be limited to risk mitigation, but would also serve as a catalyst for cultivating an internal culture of ethical AI use and innovation.

Institutionalizing the AEIO would address existing oversight deficiencies while bridging the gap between abstract regulatory goals and concrete implementation. It would also provide a consistent point of contact for regulators, civil society, and affected individuals. As AI continues to evolve rapidly, the AEIO could serve as a critical actor in aligning organizational practices with societal values, reinforcing public trust, and protecting fundamental rights.

## **2. The Role of the AI Ethics and Integrity Officer (AEIO).**

As artificial intelligence becomes increasingly embedded in our societies, economies, and institutions, the urgency of proactive and responsible governance continues to grow. The EU AI Act has laid important legal foundations for a risk-based approach to AI deployment, yet operationalizing these principles at the organizational level remains a substantial challenge. This is where the role of the AI Ethics and Integrity Officer (AEIO) becomes critical.

The AEIO is not merely a regulatory compliance officer, nor a symbolic ethics consultant. Rather, it is a strategic and independent governance function

that integrates ethics, human rights, and legal accountability into the development and deployment of AI systems. The AEIO ensures that organizations, whether in the public or private sector, build AI not only to be efficient and innovative but also to be fair, transparent, lawful, and socially sustainable.

The AEIO operates at the intersection of legal compliance, ethical reflection, and practical implementation. They are involved in the review of all AI-related activities across the AI system's lifecycle, from ideation and design to deployment and post-market monitoring. This includes conducting ethical impact assessments, providing guidance on responsible data usage, and ensuring that AI development aligns with principles such as fairness, non-discrimination, and human autonomy. Rather than serving as a last-minute auditor, the AEIO is embedded early in strategic and technical decision-making processes. They participate in AI procurement decisions, algorithmic design consultations, and policy-setting meetings. Their presence helps prevent ethical oversights, avoid future litigation, and safeguard public trust. By raising critical questions such as whom a model may exclude or whether a system could reinforce existing inequalities, the AEIO elevates ethical inquiry to the operational level.

At the same time, the AEIO is a guardian of compliance, ensuring that AI systems adhere to the European Union's human rights frameworks, including the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), and the EU AI Act. They monitor adherence to legal obligations regarding transparency, explainability, redress mechanisms, and documentation. Acting as a bridge between AI teams and external regulators, the AEIO helps organizations prepare for audits and inspections, and serves as a liaison for dialogue with national supervisory authorities. They ensure that risk classification procedures are correctly applied, that high-risk AI systems are subject to rigorous documentation, and that appropriate human oversight mechanisms are in place.

Given the stakes of AI misuse, from discrimination in credit scoring to human rights violations in biometric surveillance, the AEIO is also responsible for overseeing secure internal reporting systems. They ensure that individuals within an organization can raise ethical concerns safely, without fear of retaliation.

Additionally, they are empowered to escalate severe or systemic infractions to the appropriate oversight bodies, including Data Protection Authorities or national AI supervisory authorities, thereby enhancing transparency and fostering a culture of accountability.

The effectiveness of the AEIO hinges upon their ability to operate independently from undue influence, whether it originates from corporate leadership, technical teams, or external stakeholders. This independence must be formalized in the organizational structure, with the AEIO reporting directly to a board of ethics, a compliance committee, or an independent oversight council. Without such structural autonomy, the AEIO risks becoming a performative role lacking genuine impact.

Simultaneously, integration with existing governance roles is essential. The AEIO must collaborate with Data Protection Officers, extending the scope from data privacy to broader ethical concerns; with compliance officers, ensuring ethical issues are not sidelined in favor of narrow legal checklists; and with chief technology officers and product teams to embed ethical considerations into technical architecture.

To fulfill this role, the AEIO must possess a multidisciplinary skillset. Legal expertise in EU digital law, human rights, and AI legislation is essential. Ethical acumen is equally important, particularly in applied ethics domains such as technology and biomedical innovation. Technical literacy enables the AEIO to understand the mechanics of AI models, algorithmic decision-making, and data processing pipelines. Strong communication and mediation skills allow for engagement across diverse stakeholders, from engineers and designers to executives and external regulators. Ideally, AEIOs will have been trained in multidisciplinary programs combining law, ethics, and technology, and may come from backgrounds in policy advocacy, regulatory affairs, or public interest technology.

The AEIO's influence extends beyond compliance into the realm of institutional culture. Their presence helps cultivate a shared ethical framework within organizations. By organizing ethics workshops and training programs, leading scenario planning sessions to anticipate potential harms, encouraging inclusive design practices that involve marginalized communities, and developing internal ethical codes of conduct, the AEIO contributes to transforming ethics from a peripheral concern into an organizational value.

However, the establishment of the AEIO role is not without challenges. Institutional resistance may arise from a perception that ethics hampers innovation. Ethical principles may also lack clear operational definitions, creating ambiguity in application. Smaller organizations may face resource constraints that hinder their ability to fund and support a dedicated AEIO. Nevertheless, the potential benefits are significant. A properly empowered AEIO helps mitigate legal and reputational risks, enhances public trust in AI systems, and positions organizations as leaders in responsible innovation. In a regulatory context like the EU's, where scrutiny is intensifying and societal expectations are high, adopting the AEIO model offers both ethical and strategic advantages.

The AEIO is a novel and essential response to the ethical dilemmas posed by AI. By integrating legal oversight, ethical analysis, and operational authority, this role fills a critical gap in the governance of emerging technologies. As the EU transitions from ethical aspiration to legal obligation through the AI Act and related instruments, embedding AEIOs across public and private institutions will be vital for turning principles into practice. Empowering this role is central to building an AI future that is not only intelligent but also just, inclusive, and human-centered.

### 3. The Need for AEIO.

In the contemporary digital landscape, where artificial intelligence permeates virtually every aspect of social, economic, and political life, the need for robust ethical governance mechanisms has become increasingly urgent. The rise of AI has brought with it a host of transformative benefits, from improving diagnostic accuracy in healthcare to streamlining public administration and enhancing consumer experiences. Yet alongside these advancements lie profound risks, particularly when AI is deployed without adequate oversight. The AI Ethics and Integrity Officer (AEIO) emerges as a necessary institutional response to these challenges, filling a critical gap in existing governance structures across both the private and public sectors.

Big Tech companies, which have historically positioned themselves as vanguards of innovation, are particularly in need of AEIOs. Over the past decade, numerous scandals have emerged surrounding algorithmic bias, misinformation, lack of transparency, and the exploitation of user data. Companies like Google, Facebook (Meta), and Amazon have faced widespread criticism and regulatory scrutiny due to ethical lapses in AI applications, ranging from flawed hiring algorithms that reinforce racial and gender stereotypes to content recommendation systems that have facilitated the spread of extremism and misinformation. In such environments, the presence of an AEIO is not simply desirable but essential. It would enable early detection of ethical vulnerabilities, ensure that product development is subject to value-based scrutiny, and reinforce public trust through transparent, principled oversight. The dismissal of prominent AI researcher Timnit Gebru<sup>3</sup> by Google in 2020 exemplifies the urgent need for structured ethical oversight within large tech companies.

Governments, too, are increasingly deploying AI in critical sectors such as law enforcement, border security, public benefits administration, and healthcare. These domains carry a heightened risk of human rights infringements when AI tools are inadequately monitored. Predictive policing systems, for example, have been shown to disproportionately target marginalized communities, while algorithmic decision-making in welfare distribution or health triage can have life-altering consequences for vulnerable individuals. The introduction of AEIOs into public institutions can serve as a safeguard against such harms by embedding ethical review into procurement, deployment, and monitoring processes. The AEIO would not only ensure alignment with constitutional and international human rights norms but also support civil servants in navigating the complex legal and ethical terrain of AI usage.

---

<sup>3</sup> Wakabayashi, D., & Metz, C. (2020, December 3). Google researcher Timnit Gebru says she was fired after criticizing company. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/03/technology/google-researcher-timnit-gebru.html>

Concrete examples of past AI failures further underscore the need for AEIOs. Amazon's AI-powered hiring tool, which was discontinued after demonstrating systemic bias against women<sup>4</sup>, highlights the persistent danger of encoding and amplifying societal biases. Surveillance tools, facial recognition technologies, and biometric systems have also raised alarms, especially when deployed without clear accountability mechanisms. Scholars such as Cathy O'Neil have extensively documented the societal impacts of opaque and biased algorithms in fields like finance, education, and criminal justice, labeling these as "Weapons of Math Destruction"<sup>5</sup>. Similarly, Virginia Eubanks<sup>6</sup> has shown how automated decision-making tools in public services often exacerbate inequalities and perpetuate systemic injustices. The AEIO would act as a crucial counterweight to such risks, ensuring that technical ambition does not outpace moral responsibility.

The European Commission's proposed Artificial Intelligence Act<sup>7</sup> explicitly recognizes these ethical challenges and establishes legal foundations for mandatory oversight and accountability mechanisms. In a world increasingly governed by algorithmic decision-making, the AEIO is not a luxury but a necessity. The public's growing awareness of AI risks, coupled with a broader demand for corporate responsibility and governmental transparency, places new pressures on institutions to act decisively. By institutionalizing the AEIO, both private enterprises and public bodies can demonstrate a serious commitment to ethical governance, proactive risk management, and the defense of democratic values in the age of artificial intelligence.

#### 4. Whistleblower Protections & Ethical Safeguards.

The increasing integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into organizational operations amplifies the importance of robust whistleblower protections and ethical safeguards. Whistleblowing mechanisms provide essential channels for the detection, reporting, and rectification of ethical infractions, misconduct, and misuse of AI technologies, thereby serving as a cornerstone of responsible AI governance.

---

<sup>4</sup> Dastin, J. (2018, October 10). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/article/world/insight-amazon-scraps-secret-ai-recruiting-tool-that-showed-bias-against-women-idUSKCN1MK0AG/>

<sup>5</sup> O'Neil, C. (2017). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing Group.

<sup>6</sup> Virginia Eubanks (2018) *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. New York: Picador, St Martin's Press

<sup>7</sup> European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and amending certain Union legislative acts (COM/2021/206 final)*. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/proposal-regulation-laying-down-harmonised-rules-artificial-intelligence>

A secure and effective whistleblowing mechanism is crucial in preventing AI misuse and ensuring organizational accountability. Such mechanisms empower employees and stakeholders to confidentially report ethical concerns or breaches without fear of retaliation. This protection is critical, especially given the sensitive nature of ethical issues related to AI, including algorithmic bias, privacy violations, misuse of data, and unjust or discriminatory outcomes. These risks have grown increasingly prominent with high-profile incidents such as biased hiring algorithms, unauthorized surveillance activities, and privacy invasions by major technology firms and government entities alike.

Historically, whistleblowing has been instrumental in uncovering organizational wrongdoing and systemic failures. Effective whistleblower programs have uncovered malpractice in industries ranging from healthcare and finance to technology and governance, prompting crucial reforms and improved regulatory frameworks. By offering safe, confidential, and anonymous channels for disclosure, organizations not only enhance their ethical standards but also mitigate potential reputational harm and legal liabilities.

In this governance ecosystem, the AI Ethics and Integrity Officer (AEIO) plays a pivotal role. The AEIO is responsible not only for the establishment and oversight of whistleblowing channels but also for ensuring that reports of severe or repeated infractions are thoroughly investigated and promptly escalated to relevant regulatory authorities. The AEIO thus serves as both an ethical watchdog and a liaison between internal whistleblowers and external regulators, reinforcing a culture of accountability and ethical vigilance. To effectively fulfill this role, AEIOs must be equipped with clear mandates and sufficient authority to independently pursue investigations and implement corrective actions.

Establishing trust in whistleblowing mechanisms requires transparency and demonstrable independence from organizational hierarchies. Whistleblowers must be assured that their reports will lead to impartial and meaningful investigations rather than dismissal or retaliation. Consequently, organizations must invest in training programs to educate employees about their rights, the importance of reporting misconduct, and the protections available to them. Effective communication strategies, including regular awareness campaigns and training sessions led by AEIOs, can significantly enhance employee engagement and confidence in these reporting mechanisms.

The role of the AEIO in AI governance closely mirrors that of Data Protection Officers (DPOs) under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). DPOs are tasked with ensuring organizational compliance with data protection laws, serving as a key point of contact with data protection authorities, and managing internal data governance processes. Similarly, the AEIO oversees ethical compliance regarding AI deployment, maintains direct communication channels with regulators, and ensures internal adherence to ethical AI standards.

Comparative analysis with DPO practices under GDPR illustrates how AEIO roles could be structured. DPOs have successfully leveraged their statutory roles and responsibilities to significantly influence corporate practices related to data handling and privacy. Drawing from this model, AEIOs can advocate for stronger internal policies around AI ethics, guide technical teams in ethically sensitive algorithm development, and ensure proactive regulatory compliance.

Learning from the experience of DPOs, AEIOs can leverage established frameworks for governance, reporting, and regulatory engagement. Integrating these lessons can help AEIOs quickly establish credibility, effectiveness, and independence within organizational structures, thereby enhancing their capacity to safeguard ethical integrity in AI use. AEIOs can also engage proactively with external regulators to shape best practices, policies, and guidelines that transcend organizational boundaries, fostering broader industry and public sector adoption of ethical AI practices.

Moreover, AEIOs must be equipped with the authority to impose corrective measures when breaches occur, such as suspension or modification of AI systems pending further review. This enforcement power ensures organizational adherence to ethical standards and regulatory requirements, strengthening internal accountability mechanisms. Additionally, establishing cross-organizational networks and forums for AEIOs, analogous to those developed by DPOs, could facilitate the exchange of best practices, experiences, and emerging ethical challenges, further empowering AEIOs to effectively navigate their complex roles.

Furthermore, transparency reporting, where AEIOs publicly disclose summaries of whistleblower cases and outcomes (while protecting confidentiality), could further enhance trust in organizational AI governance practices. Such transparency reports serve to demonstrate an organization's genuine commitment to ethical integrity, accountability, and continuous improvement, reassuring stakeholders, regulators, and the public alike.

Ultimately, effective whistleblower protections and ethical safeguards led by AEIOs ensure transparency, promote ethical conduct, and protect against AI-driven harms, solidifying trust in AI systems across society. By establishing robust, independent, and accountable ethical oversight structures, organizations can effectively mitigate the risks inherent in AI deployment, ensuring technology serves the public interest rather than exacerbating existing societal challenges.

## **5. Policy-Level Challenges in Implementing AI Ethics and Integrity Officer Roles.**

The idea of an AI Ethics and Integrity Officer (AEIO), a dedicated role to oversee ethical and responsible AI use, could be gaining traction in theory. In practice, however, embedding such roles into organizations faces significant policy-level

challenges. Within the EU's emerging AI governance (notably the EU AI Act) and international frameworks, policymakers and stakeholders have grappled with issues ranging from industry resistance to new oversight requirements, to a lack of standardization in enforcing AI ethics, and the complex, interdisciplinary expertise needed for effective AI ethics governance. This section outlines these obstacles and how they are being addressed or debated at the governance level, with references to legislative texts, regulatory commentary, and expert reports.

### *Industry Resistance to New Oversight Roles*

One major challenge is pushback from industry against creating roles like an AEIO. Many companies worry that appointing an ethics officer or similar oversight role will add bureaucracy, cost, and potentially slow down innovation. During the EU AI Act's development, Big Tech lobbies repeatedly warned against making AI governance "another burden for companies," urging regulators to take a lighter touch<sup>8</sup>. In fact, as the law neared adoption, the world's largest tech firms launched a "final push" to dilute the AI Act's requirements, pressing the EU for minimal oversight obligations to "fend off the risk of billions of dollars in fines"<sup>9</sup>. This resistance manifests in calls to avoid strict new mandates, for example, preferring voluntary codes of conduct over hard regulations, and skepticism toward installing independent ethics officers who might constrain business practices. European legislators have been keenly aware of these concerns. The AI Act itself took a risk-based approach (focusing on "high-risk" AI uses) partly to limit compliance burdens on industry. Even after the Act's adoption, officials signaled willingness to trim administrative requirements in response to industry feedback<sup>10</sup>. One consequence is that instead of mandating a brand-new ethics officer role by law, the compliance load is often shifting onto existing personnel. For instance, the EU AI Act has "placed substantial new operational burdens on chief privacy officers (CPOs)"<sup>11</sup> in companies, effectively pushing AI governance duties onto the data privacy officer role. Many organizations thus opt to expand the remit of their privacy, risk, or compliance officers (or form internal AI ethics committees) rather than create a standalone AEIO. This strategy addresses cost and efficiency concerns, but it can breed role overlap and resource strain, CPOs now must

---

<sup>8</sup> Cerulus, L. (2023, June 28). How the EU did a full 180 on artificial intelligence rules. *Politico Europe*. <https://www.politico.eu/article/how-eu-did-full-180-artificial-intelligence-rules/>

<sup>9</sup> Blenkinsop, P. (2024, September 20). Tech giants push to dilute Europe's AI Act. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/technology/artificial-intelligence/tech-giants-push-dilute-europes-ai-act-2024-09-20/>

<sup>10</sup> Cerulus, L. (2023, June 28). How the EU did a full 180 on artificial intelligence rules. *Politico Europe*. <https://www.politico.eu/article/how-eu-did-full-180-artificial-intelligence-rules/>

<sup>11</sup> The Parliament Magazine. (2024, January 18). The EU's AI Act has transformed the role of Chief Privacy Officer. *The Parliament Magazine*. <https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/news/article/the-eus-ai-act-has-transformed-the-role-of-chief-privacy-officer>

grapple with AI transparency, bias, and safety issues on top of privacy<sup>12</sup> a daunting expansion of scope. In short, corporate reluctance to embrace new oversight roles can slow or dilute the implementation of AEIO positions, and policymakers are negotiating this friction by phasing in requirements and offering flexibility (e.g. sandboxes, voluntary guidance) to ease industry acceptance.

### *Lack of Standardization in AI Ethics Enforcement*

Even if organizations are willing to appoint an AI ethics officer, what standards should that officer enforce? A persistent challenge is the absence of unified, enforceable ethical standards for AI. Over the past few years, dozens of AI ethics frameworks and principles have emerged across governments, companies, and international bodies<sup>13</sup> However, these tend to be high-level and “toothless”, they “lack any enforcement mechanisms and their values are easily overwritten by economic incentives, often becoming little more than marketing devices”<sup>14</sup>. In other words, there is a gulf between lofty AI ethics ideals and the reality of implementation. No universal code defines what “ethical AI” concretely means in practice, making it difficult to standardize the mandate of an AEIO across industries or jurisdictions.

The EU AI Act is an attempt to move from voluntary principles to binding rules, setting a common regulatory baseline for “trustworthy AI.” Yet even this law leaves aspects of ethics enforcement unsettled. Many of the Act’s requirements (e.g. on transparency, risk management, and human oversight) will be fleshed out through harmonized technical standards developed by European and international standards bodies<sup>15</sup>. Until those standards are in place, there is uncertainty, for example, as of late 2024 it “remains unclear how strictly rules around ‘general purpose’ AI (like large language models) will be enforced”<sup>16</sup> pending further guidance and codes of practice<sup>17</sup>.

This lack of clarity can delay organizations in defining the role of an ethics officer: the officer’s responsibilities may shift as standards and regulations evolve. Moreover, not everything can be standardized. Experts caution that trying to encode ethical principles into technical checklists can trivialize moral reasoning, a purely

---

<sup>12</sup> Idem.

<sup>13</sup> Taddeo, M. (2022). Trusting AI: The challenge of regulating the digital transformation of society. *AI and Ethics*, 2(1), 261–273. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00209-w>

<sup>14</sup> Idem

<sup>15</sup> Wischmeyer, T. (2020). Regulating AI through technical standards. *Internet Policy Review*, 9(4). <https://policyreview.info/articles/analysis/regulating-ai-through-technical-standards>

<sup>16</sup> Blenkinsop, P. (2024, September 20). Tech giants push to dilute Europe’s AI Act. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/technology/artificial-intelligence/tech-giants-push-dilute-europes-ai-act-2024-09-20/>

<sup>17</sup> Idem

compliance-oriented approach could lead to “ethics washing,” where following the letter of standards masks deeper issues.

Notably, formal standards cannot dictate a company’s internal ethics governance structure, they “cannot define the internal structure to be put in place within the company – perhaps with a digital ethics officer or an ethics board, (nor) the competences required for this position, or the type of decisions they can and cannot make”<sup>18</sup>. This means that even under the EU Act, the precise role and authority of an AEIO is left to organizational discretion, with little uniformity. Internationally, the situation is even more fragmented: frameworks like the OECD AI Principles or UNESCO’s AI Ethics Recommendation set common values but rely on each country (or company) to implement them, leading to patchwork enforcement. Such lack of standardization creates friction for implementing the AEIO role, it’s hard to justify and empower a role when the rules it must uphold are still in flux or inconsistent. Governance actors are actively discussing how to address this. In the EU, a European AI Office is being established to coordinate AI oversight and share expertise, aiming for a “single European AI governance system”<sup>19</sup> that promotes consistent enforcement of the AI Act across member states. This office, along with an AI Board of national regulators, should help standardize interpretations of the law (so, for instance, all high-risk AI systems are held to similar ethical criteria, no matter the sector or country). Additionally, the EU and international standardization organizations (ISO/IEC, IEEE) are working on new standards for AI audit, risk assessment, and transparency to give ethics officers concrete tools and benchmarks. These efforts, alongside voluntary codes of conduct being co-created with industry, are meant to close the gap between abstract principles and enforceable practice. Still, it will take time for robust, widely-recognized enforcement standards to crystallize. Until then, implementing an AEIO will require navigating a still-maturing ethical compliance landscape.

### *Addressing the Challenges: Evolving Governance Approaches*

Policymakers and thought leaders are actively seeking ways to overcome these hurdles so that roles like AI Ethics and Integrity Officers can be effective. In Europe, while the EU AI Act stopped short of explicitly mandating an “AI Ethics Officer” in every company, it creates an environment that encourages internal oversight. The Act’s risk management and human oversight provisions implicitly require organizations to designate responsible persons to ensure compliance. Guidance from legal and standards groups advises companies to “create dedicated

---

<sup>18</sup> Wischmeyer, T. (2020). Regulating AI through technical standards. *Internet Policy Review*, 9(4). <https://policyreview.info/articles/analysis/regulating-ai-through-technical-standards>

<sup>19</sup> European Commission. (2024). The European AI Office. *Digital Strategy*. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/ai-office>

roles for AI risk management and ethics, such as a (Chief) AI Ethics Officer or AI Compliance Officer, and define clear lines of accountability”<sup>20</sup> Thus, even without a formal legal title, the expectation of an internal AI governance function is being set. We see early movement in industry: some large firms have appointed Chief AI Ethics Officers or formed ethical AI boards voluntarily, sending a signal that this kind of oversight is becoming a norm in responsible businesses.

To mitigate industry resistance, regulators are engaging with stakeholders through consultations and pilot programs. The EU, for example, has launched AI regulatory sandboxes and is drafting non-binding Codes of Conduct for AI in collaboration with companies and academia, by involving industry in shaping practical guidelines, authorities hope to build consensus and reduce fears that an ethics officer role would be merely punitive or obstructive. There is also attention to the needs of SMEs and startups, simplifying compliance documentation and possibly allowing shared resources (e.g. an external ethics advisor servicing multiple small firms) to ensure smaller players are not left behind in the ethics oversight trend.

## 6. Potential Solutions and Future Directions: Why AEIO Matters

The exponential integration of artificial intelligence (AI) across diverse societal, economic, and political domains necessitates the parallel evolution of robust governance structures to ensure ethical integrity, accountability, and societal trust. The institutionalization and effective operationalization of AI Ethics and Integrity Officers (AEIOs) present viable and sophisticated solutions to contemporary ethical governance challenges. The AEIO role emerges not merely as a regulatory measure but as a strategic necessity for fostering sustainable, equitable, and transparent AI ecosystems. The following discussion explores in depth the multifaceted strategies and practical frameworks required to embed AEIO roles comprehensively within organizational structures.

A foundational strategy entails embedding robust legal frameworks that explicitly support and enforce the AEIO role. Legislative clarity, such as that presented by the European Union’s proposed AI Act, is essential in delineating AEIO responsibilities, jurisdiction, and authority. Legal recognition enhances the credibility and efficacy of AEIOs by providing statutory independence, thereby effectively counteracting industry resistance and skepticism regarding the role’s perceived bureaucratic burden. Such explicit legal mandates facilitate compliance, ensure accountability, and establish clear expectations across sectors, reducing ambiguity and strengthening ethical AI governance frameworks internationally.

---

<sup>20</sup> CMS Law. (2024). EU AI Act: Questions and answers. CMS Legal Services EEIG. <https://cms.law/en/int/publication/eu-ai-act-questions-and-answers>

Incentivization is another critical dimension essential for fostering organizational adoption and compliance with AEIO roles. Policymakers and governmental bodies can strategically leverage structured incentives such as fiscal benefits, tax deductions, subsidies, or advantageous terms in public procurement processes. Such policy-driven incentives effectively motivate organizations, aligning corporate strategies with ethical AI governance priorities. Recognition programs and certification initiatives further enhance incentives, publicly acknowledging organizations demonstrating exceptional commitment to robust ethical practices in AI deployment. These tangible benefits not only encourage proactive compliance but also position compliant entities as industry leaders, thus generating reputational advantages that extend beyond regulatory fulfillment.

Addressing the inherently interdisciplinary nature of AI ethics is vital for the sustained operational success of AEIO roles. The role demands advanced competencies spanning technology, law, ethics, philosophy, and public policy. To meet these rigorous demands, comprehensive interdisciplinary training and certification programs must be developed and integrated within higher educational curricula and professional development frameworks. Such programs would equip future AI ethics professionals with essential skills, encompassing ethical reasoning, technical fluency, policy expertise, and legal acumen. Universities, research institutes, and professional bodies can collaborate to create specialized educational tracks and certifications, facilitating the continuous supply of qualified AEIO candidates adept at navigating complex ethical and regulatory landscapes. Additionally, ongoing professional development and continuous learning opportunities must be institutionalized, ensuring AEIOs maintain contemporary knowledge amidst rapidly evolving AI technologies and ethical considerations.

The establishment and global harmonization of ethical standards constitute another strategic priority. Diverse and fragmented standards across international jurisdictions complicate compliance efforts and dilute the effectiveness of ethical oversight. International cooperation among entities such as the OECD, UNESCO, and regional bodies like the EU can significantly streamline this landscape, fostering universally accepted ethical standards and regulatory harmonization. Collaborative global initiatives could articulate clear ethical guidelines, operational best practices, and comprehensive compliance benchmarks, thereby substantially simplifying AEIO responsibilities across multinational contexts. Such international collaboration would not only enhance regulatory coherence but also facilitate cross-border trust, cooperation, and mutual accountability among stakeholders.

Practical and accessible visualization tools, including clear implementation roadmaps, comprehensive toolkits, and illustrative case studies, significantly enhance organizational capability and willingness to adopt AEIO roles. These resources, developed collaboratively by regulatory bodies, industry leaders, and

academia, would provide clear, step-by-step guidance on embedding AEIO structures effectively. Roadmaps delineating incremental phases, from initial awareness and education, through structural integration and capacity building, to continuous monitoring and evaluation, would assist organizations in methodically and sustainably implementing the AEIO role. Moreover, real-world case studies and illustrative scenarios would provide practical insights, showcasing successful strategies and facilitating organizational readiness and effective AEIO integration.

The proactive institutionalization of AEIO roles holds significant potential in preempting AI-driven crises, thereby underscoring the critical importance of such roles within organizational governance frameworks. AEIOs actively ensure that AI systems align consistently with human rights standards and ethical principles, enhancing transparency, accountability, and trust. By facilitating early identification, assessment, and resolution of ethical concerns, AEIOs mitigate systemic risks and prevent escalations into broader societal, reputational, or legal crises. Their strategic presence within organizations thus transforms ethical governance from reactive compliance into proactive risk management, fostering robust and sustainable ethical cultures and practices. The comprehensive and effective institutionalization of AEIO roles represents an essential and strategic advancement toward responsible AI governance. This role not only safeguards fundamental human rights but also promotes responsible innovation, reinforcing public trust and legitimacy in AI technologies. By proactively adopting, supporting, and empowering AEIOs through robust legislative frameworks, strategic incentives, interdisciplinary training, international harmonization, and practical implementation resources, organizations position themselves as forward-thinking leaders in ethical AI governance. This strategic orientation promises a future where technological innovation aligns seamlessly with societal values, ensuring the ethical integrity, societal acceptance, and long-term sustainability of AI-driven progress.

## **7. AEIO as a Generator of Good Practices and Panacea for AI Ethics & Compliance**

The role of the AI Ethics and Integrity Officer (AEIO) extends far beyond mere compliance enforcement, representing instead a dynamic and proactive function central to advancing ethical AI practices across industries. AEIOs are uniquely positioned not just to react to ethical dilemmas, but actively to generate innovative best practices that drive continuous improvement and foster trust. By functioning as catalysts for ethical innovation and thought leadership, AEIOs elevate organizational standards, promote transparency, and strengthen societal trust in AI technologies.

Central to the AEIO approach is case-by-case learning, a principle that acknowledges the inherent diversity and complexity of AI applications. Given the varied implications across sectors, from healthcare and finance to defense and

consumer technology, AEIOs tailor their ethical oversight to the specific context, ensuring that recommendations and decisions are precisely aligned with the nuanced needs of each situation. Such context-sensitive ethical governance allows AEIOs to move beyond rigid compliance models, embracing a nuanced understanding of ethics that balances practicality with principle.

Ensuring compliance remains a foundational duty of AEIOs, who systematically bridge the gap between evolving AI technologies and existing regulatory frameworks. AEIOs play a crucial role in interpreting and operationalizing standards outlined in regulations such as GDPR, HIPAA, and the EU AI Act, thereby ensuring that AI implementations consistently meet both current and future compliance requirements. By embedding compliance within broader ethical frameworks, AEIOs minimize risk exposure, enhance regulatory readiness, and position their organizations as forward-looking leaders in responsible innovation.

Continuous improvement is a hallmark of effective AEIO roles, driven by rigorous processes of ongoing reflection, documentation, and refinement based on real-world cases, audits, and ethical dilemmas encountered. AEIOs actively contribute to internal learning cultures, using past experiences to systematically refine governance practices, anticipate ethical challenges, and implement proactive measures. This iterative process ensures that organizations remain agile and adaptive, capable of swiftly responding to emerging ethical issues and technological advancements with informed, evidence-based practices.

The AEIO's adaptive framework is a significant strength, allowing these roles to evolve alongside rapidly changing technological landscapes and regulatory updates. Rather than being constrained by static rules, AEIOs proactively anticipate and incorporate new ethical considerations, technological breakthroughs, and shifts in public expectations into their governance frameworks. This adaptability ensures sustained ethical relevance and effectiveness, positioning AEIO roles not merely as regulatory compliance points but as visionary leaders shaping the future of responsible AI deployment.

A cornerstone of the AEIO's approach is comprehensive knowledge sharing. By documenting ethical challenges, solutions, and lessons learned, AEIOs create living repositories that act as valuable resources for organizational and industry-wide reference. These repositories enhance collective understanding and foster cross-sector collaboration, enabling organizations to share and adopt proven practices in ethical AI governance. This knowledge-sharing culture amplifies collective learning and ensures broader industry alignment on ethical standards.

In specific industry contexts, AEIO roles serve as universal panaceas for complex ethical and compliance challenges. Within defense and military contexts, AEIO oversight is crucial for navigating ethical dilemmas posed by automated decision-making systems such as Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) technologies

and unmanned weapons platforms. AEIO guidance ensures strict adherence to international humanitarian law and rules of engagement, safeguarding human rights and reducing unintended harm.

The healthcare industry particularly benefits from AEIO intervention, where AI-driven diagnostics, predictive analytics, and automated treatment recommendations must be unbiased, ethically sound, and compliant with stringent regulatory standards. AEIO roles enforce patient rights, data protection laws such as the GDPR, and medical ethics, significantly enhancing patient safety, quality of care, and public trust in healthcare technologies.

Similarly, AEIO intervention in the financial sector addresses critical issues of algorithmic discrimination in credit assessments, loan approvals, investment decisions, and hiring processes. By rigorously scrutinizing AI systems to detect and eliminate biases, AEIOs ensure fair and equitable outcomes, thereby aligning corporate practices with anti-discrimination laws and societal expectations. This ethical oversight not only mitigates compliance risk but also contributes to broader societal equity and trust.

Across industries, AEIO roles function as comprehensive compliance solutions, adept at navigating and resolving complex ethical challenges specific to diverse sectors. By prioritizing core ethical principles, regulatory compliance, and human rights, AEIOs actively contribute to building ethical organizational cultures and responsible AI ecosystems. Their capacity to tailor ethical governance to distinct industry requirements reinforces the universal applicability and critical importance of the AEIO role.

## **8. AEIO in Practice and Future Directions for Ethical AI Governance**

The effective deployment of AI Ethics and Integrity Officers (AEIOs) across various sectors necessitates a clear understanding of their practical roles and responsibilities, underscored by multidisciplinary expertise tailored to specific industry needs. In practice, AEIOs act as pivotal facilitators of ethical oversight, ensuring AI technologies remain aligned with human rights, legal compliance, and societal trust.

In the Engineering and Technology sector, AEIOs are critical in overseeing ethical considerations within software development, automation, and robotics. These professionals ensure algorithms and automated systems are designed transparently and ethically, proactively identifying and mitigating potential biases or unintended consequences. Their oversight is particularly vital in rapidly evolving technological environments, where cutting-edge innovations frequently outpace regulatory frameworks, making proactive ethical governance essential.

Law Enforcement AEIOs provide critical oversight for AI tools such as facial recognition, predictive policing systems, and surveillance technologies. These

systems pose substantial ethical challenges, including risks to civil liberties and privacy violations. AEIOs in this context must maintain a rigorous balance between enabling technological efficiency in policing and ensuring strict adherence to human rights standards, transparency, and accountability. By guiding ethical implementation, these officers reinforce public confidence in law enforcement's responsible use of powerful technologies.

Within Healthcare, AEIO roles encompass monitoring and governing AI-driven diagnostics, patient data management, medical decision-making processes, and predictive analytics. Given healthcare's sensitivity and direct impact on human lives, AEIO oversight is essential to ensure systems are unbiased, ethically sound, and compliant with stringent regulations like HIPAA and GDPR. AEIOs in healthcare safeguard patient rights, reinforce data privacy, and uphold rigorous ethical standards to maintain trust between patients, providers, and technological solutions.

In Finance and Economics, AEIO officers prevent algorithmic discrimination in crucial areas such as credit scoring, loan approvals, investment advising, and recruitment processes. They scrutinize AI tools to eliminate inherent biases that might perpetuate economic or social inequalities, thus ensuring alignment with anti-discrimination laws and ethical business practices. AEIO intervention promotes equity, transparency, and fairness in financial decision-making, crucial for maintaining public trust and market stability.

Military and Defense sectors benefit significantly from specialized AEIO oversight, particularly regarding automated decision-making in battlefield scenarios, including automated weaponry and Identification Friend or Foe (IFF) systems. AEIO officers in this domain ensure compliance with international humanitarian laws and ethical standards, navigating complex ethical dilemmas surrounding automated warfare. Their role is vital in preventing wrongful targeting and ensuring ethical adherence to the rules of engagement, directly contributing to the responsible use of military AI technologies.

Looking towards future developments, several strategic directions emerge as critical for the AEIO role. Institutionalizing AEIOs as standard roles across high-risk AI sectors, much like the precedent set by Data Protection Officers (DPOs) under the GDPR framework, is essential. Governments and regulatory bodies could mandate AEIO positions, establishing clear standards and expectations. Large corporations and public institutions would thereby be compelled to incorporate AEIOs, significantly enhancing sector-wide ethical compliance and accountability.

Further expansion of AEIO jurisdiction and influence on a global scale represents another critical step forward. Inclusion of AEIO roles in international AI governance frameworks would ensure broader consistency and more effective enforcement of ethical standards across borders. The creation of intergovernmental AI Ethics Councils, comprising AEIO representatives from diverse sectors and

nations, could facilitate global collaboration, standard-setting, and effective harmonization of ethical AI guidelines.

Enhancing AI literacy and specialized training for AEIO officers constitutes another significant future direction. Developing robust certification programs, professional training courses, and advanced degree offerings in AI ethics and governance can substantially enhance the skills and preparedness of AEIOs. Educational institutions and professional bodies collaborating on these initiatives would ensure a continuous supply of well-equipped professionals capable of effectively addressing the complexities inherent in AI ethics.

Leveraging AI itself for regulatory self-auditing and compliance monitoring represents a significant innovation in AEIO roles. Advanced AI-driven compliance systems could automatically flag ethical concerns or potential violations, enabling AEIOs to respond promptly and effectively. The integration of self-regulating capabilities into AI technologies would significantly enhance transparency, accountability, and real-time compliance, streamlining the monitoring process and reinforcing ethical governance practices.

Establishing a global AI Ethics Repository represents an additional forward-looking initiative, where AEIO officers across sectors collaborate in sharing ethical case studies, lessons learned, and best practices. Such a repository would serve as an invaluable resource, fostering global cooperation, continuous learning, and consistent application of ethical standards. By pooling knowledge and experiences from healthcare, finance, military, law enforcement, and other industries, this repository would significantly strengthen global ethical oversight and governance.

AI is already deeply embedded in the fabric of society, with profound implications for how we live, work, and interact. Whether AI technologies empower or harm society depends directly on our governance choices today. The AEIO role represents more than just a compliance position, it is a proactive leadership role, essential for aligning AI applications with broader societal values of ethics, compliance, and human rights.

Regulation alone is insufficient; active ethical leadership and accountability mechanisms are critical. By institutionalizing AEIO roles, organizations proactively shape responsible AI governance, ensuring that technological advancements align positively with societal expectations and ethical principles. Acting decisively now ensures sustainable, equitable, and trustworthy AI ecosystems for future generations, firmly embedding ethical considerations at the heart of AI innovation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Binns, R. (2018). *Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy*. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 149–159.
- Cath, C., Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the 'good society': The US, EU, and UK approach. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 24(2), 505–528.
- Cerulus, L. (2023, June 28). How the EU did a full 180 on artificial intelligence rules. *Politico Europe*. <https://www.politico.eu/article/how-eu-did-full-180-artificial-intelligence-rules/>
- Crawford, K., & Calo, R. (2016). There is a blind spot in AI research. *Nature*, 538(7625), 311–313. <https://www.nature.com/articles/538311a>
- Dastin, J. (2018, October 10). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/article/world/insight-amazon-scraps-secret-ai-recruiting-tool-that-showed-bias-against-women-idUSKCN1MK0AG/>
- European Commission. (2021). Proposal for a regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and amending certain Union legislative acts (COM/2021/206 final). <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/proposal-regulation-laying-down-harmonised-rules-artificial-intelligence>
- European Commission. (2024). The European AI Office. *Digital Strategy*. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/ai-office>
- European Parliament. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence and Law Enforcement: Impact on Fundamental Rights*. Directorate-General for Internal Policies of the Union. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=IPOL\\_STU\(2020\)641507](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document.html?reference=IPOL_STU(2020)641507)
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- Fjeld, J., Achten, N., Hilligoss, H., Nagy, A., & Srikumar, M. (2020). *Principled artificial intelligence: Mapping consensus in ethical and rights-based approaches to principles for AI*. Berkman Klein Center. <https://cyber.harvard.edu/publication/2020/principled-ai>
- Floridi, L. (2018). Soft ethics and the governance of the digital. *Philosophy & Technology*, 31(1), 1–8.
- Floridi, L., Cows, J., King, T. C., & Taddeo, M. (2020). How to design AI for social good: Seven essential factors. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 26, 1771–1796.
- General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679. <https://gdpr-info.eu/>
- Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). (1996). U.S. Public Law 104-191. <https://www.hhs.gov/hipaa/index.html>
- IEEE Global Initiative on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent Systems. (2019). *Ethically aligned design: A vision for prioritizing human well-being with autonomous and intelligent systems (1st ed.)*. IEEE. <https://ethicsinaction.ieee.org>

Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). *The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate*. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679>

O'Neil, C. (2017). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing Group.

OECD. (2019). *OECD principles on artificial intelligence*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. <https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles>

Singer, N., & Metz, C. (2020, December 3). Google researcher Timnit Gebru says she was fired after criticizing company. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/12/03/technology/google-researcher-timnit-gebru.html>

Taddeo, M. (2022). Trusting AI: The challenge of regulating the digital transformation of society. *AI and Ethics*, 2(1), 261–273. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00209-w>

The Parliament Magazine. (2024, January 18). The EU's AI Act has transformed the role of Chief Privacy Officer. *The Parliament Magazine*. <https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/news/article/the-eus-ai-act-has-transformed-the-role-of-chief-privacy-officer>

UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>

Wischmeyer, T. (2020). Regulating AI through technical standards. *Internet Policy Review*, 9(4). <https://policyreview.info/articles/analysis/regulating-ai-through-technical-standards>

Blenkinsop, P. (2024, September 20). Tech giants push to dilute Europe's AI Act. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/technology/artificial-intelligence/tech-giants-push-dilute-europes-ai-act-2024-09-20/>

CMS Law. (2024). *EU AI Act: Questions and answers*. CMS Legal Services EEIG. <https://cms.law/en/int/publication/eu-ai-act-questions-and-answers>