ORBICOM Contribution to the Global Dialogue on Artificial Intelligence Governance

Submission to the Informal Stakeholder Consultation

April 2026

I. Introduction

ORBICOM, a global network of UNESCO Chairs in communication, brings together interdisciplinary expertise across regions and is strongly committed to advancing knowledge, capacity-building, and international cooperation, particularly with countries of the Global South. This document is a collective submission from members and UNESCO Chairs of the ORBICOM Network in response to the Informal Stakeholder Consultation on the Global Dialogue on Artificial Intelligence (AI) Governance, convened pursuant to United Nations General Assembly resolution 79/325. The Chairs behind this document are:

- UNESCO Chair in Communication, Media Literacy & Citizenship (*Comunicação, Literacia Mediática e Cidadania*, ESCS-Politécnico de Lisboa)
- UNESCO Chair in Communication and Technologies for Development (*Communication et technologies pour le développement*, Université du Québec à Montréal).
- UNESCO Chair in Communication (*Comunicación*, Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid).
- UNESCO Chair in International Communication (*Communication internationale*, Université Grenoble Alpes).
- ORBICOM Network, Committee of Governance.

The Global Dialogue is a timely and important initiative to foster inclusive, transparent, and multilateral engagement in AI governance. As noted in the Concept Note, the Dialogue aims to support international cooperation, address capacity gaps, promote human rights, and advance trustworthy AI systems to help achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Across the five contributions presented herein, a shared perspective emerges: Artificial Intelligence should be understood as a transformative infrastructure that shapes communication, knowledge production, and decision-making systems, with profound implications for development, governance, and global power dynamics.

The proposals converge around four cross-cutting priorities aligned with the objectives of the Global Dialogue:

- **Bridging AI capacity gaps and addressing structural asymmetries**, particularly affecting developing countries;
- **Ensuring respect for human rights, transparency, accountability, and meaningful human oversight** in AI systems;
- **Promoting inclusive, participatory, and knowledge-based governance frameworks**, including education and Media and Information Literacy (MIL);
- **Advancing open, interoperable, and sustainable AI ecosystems** that support innovation while reducing technological dependency.

Taken together, these contributions aim to support the Global Dialogue in moving from normative discussion to practical, cooperative, and actionable outcomes, consistent with the United Nations' mandate and multilateral principles.

II. ORBICOM Policy Contributions

1. Structuring the Global Dialogue and Advancing Actionable Outputs

ORBICOM recommends that the Global Dialogue be organized around thematic clusters that reflect the most urgent priorities in AI governance, while ensuring alignment with the SDGs and international human rights law.

Proposed thematic clusters include:

1. **AI capacity and infrastructure gaps**, including equitable access to high-performance computing, data resources, and technical expertise;
2. **Transparency, auditing, and public accountability of algorithmic systems**, including mechanisms for independent oversight;

3. **Open technological ecosystems**, including open-source software, open data, and interoperable AI frameworks;
4. **Human rights, democratic governance, and accountability**, including the identification of **normative red lines** in areas such as mass surveillance and autonomous weapons systems.

Policy recommendations:

- Encourage Member States and stakeholders to develop a **global mapping of AI governance capacities and gaps**, to inform targeted international cooperation;
- Establish a **multilateral knowledge-sharing platform** under UN auspices to disseminate best practices and regulatory approaches;
- Promote **capacity-building partnerships**, including technical assistance and infrastructure access for developing countries;
- Support the development of **open and interoperable AI ecosystems** to reduce dependency and promote equitable participation in the global digital economy.

2. Integrating Media and Information Literacy (MIL) into AI Governance

ORBICOM emphasizes that effective AI governance requires not only regulatory frameworks but also **informed, empowered, and participatory societies**.

AI systems increasingly shape access to information, public discourse, and democratic processes. In this context, Media and Information Literacy (MIL) should be recognized as a cross-cutting enabler of ethical and inclusive AI governance.

Policy recommendations:

- Integrate MIL into **national education systems, public administration training, and lifelong learning frameworks**, in alignment with SDG 4 (Quality Education);
- Promote **inclusive and participatory governance processes**, ensuring meaningful engagement of civil society, academia, and underrepresented communities;

- Develop policies to strengthen **resilience against misinformation, disinformation, and algorithmic bias**, supporting SDGs 16 and 17;
- Foster international cooperation to share **best practices in digital citizenship and AI literacy**, particularly across Global South contexts.

3. Toward Integrated and Operational AI Governance Frameworks

ORBICOM identifies a critical need to move beyond fragmented approaches and toward integrated, operational, and context-sensitive AI governance mechanisms.

AI governance must address the interaction between technological systems, social systems, and institutional frameworks, recognizing AI as a communicational and societal infrastructure.

Policy recommendations:

- Develop **operational validation mechanisms** to assess AI systems' alignment with human rights, societal objectives, and public interest;
- Promote the establishment of **international observatories and monitoring mechanisms** to track AI impacts and governance practices;
- Encourage **interdisciplinary approaches** that integrate technical, social, ethical, and legal expertise;
- Ensure that governance frameworks explicitly address **global asymmetries**, including disparities in access, representation, and capacity.

4. Safeguarding Human Autonomy, Ethical Integrity, and Global Equity

ORBICOM highlights the need to address the risks associated with the concentration of AI capabilities, particularly in critical domains such as security, education, and public decision-making.

AI systems raise fundamental concerns regarding human autonomy, accountability, and sovereignty, especially when decision-making processes are partially or fully automated.

Policy recommendations:

- Affirm the principle of **meaningful human control** over high-risk AI systems, particularly in military and security contexts;
- Develop international norms to **prohibit or regulate applications that pose unacceptable risks to human rights and human dignity**;
- Promote **ethical standards and transparency requirements** in academic, educational, and creative uses of AI;
- Support initiatives to **diversify AI development ecosystems**, including linguistic and cultural inclusion, to prevent technological homogenization and global polarization.

5. Advancing Human-Centered, Inclusive, and Sustainable AI

ORBICOM advocates for a human-centered and interdisciplinary approach to AI, ensuring that innovation aligns with societal needs, environmental sustainability, and ethical principles.

Policy recommendations:

- Promote **co-design methodologies**, engaging users and affected communities in AI development processes;
- Encourage the adoption of **open, accessible, and interoperable frameworks**, consistent with FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable);
- Strengthen **data protection, privacy safeguards, and ethical standards**, in alignment with international human rights law;
- Support the development of **energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable AI systems**, contributing to SDG 13 (Climate Action);
- Prioritize the inclusion of **non-expert users and vulnerable populations** in evaluating AI systems' societal impacts.

III. Conclusion

The Global Dialogue on Artificial Intelligence Governance represents a unique opportunity to advance inclusive, multilateral, and action-oriented governance frameworks. The ORBICOM Network underscores that governing AI is not solely a technical or regulatory challenge. It is fundamentally about governing the infrastructures through which societies communicate, produce knowledge, and make collective decisions.

Addressing this challenge requires international cooperation, capacity-building, and inclusive participation, ensuring that all regions—particularly the Global South—can meaningfully contribute to shaping the future of AI. ORBICOM stands ready to support this process as a partner in advancing knowledge-sharing, interdisciplinary research, and practical governance solutions that align with the principles and objectives of the United Nations.

IV. Specific questions from UN Global Dialogue

a) In your opinion, what outcomes would make the first Global Dialogue on AI Governance a success?

A successful first Global Dialogue on AI Governance should deliver concrete, actionable, and inclusive outcomes, beyond principles toward implementation, while reflecting the diversity of the international community. From ORBICOM, we present 5 suggestions.

First, success would require identifying a clear set of shared priorities and thematic clusters—including capacity gaps, human rights, transparency and accountability, and open AI ecosystems—aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals and international law. These priorities should guide future cooperation and provide a coherent framework for global engagement.

Second, the Dialogue should produce practical outputs. These may include:

- a global mapping of AI governance capacities and gaps, particularly in developing countries;

- the establishment of a multilateral knowledge-sharing platform** to exchange best practices and regulatory experiences;

- and the launch of capacity-building partnerships to support technical, institutional, and regulatory development in the Global South.

Third, success would depend on ensuring meaningful multistakeholder participation, with balanced representation from governments, international organizations, academia, civil society, and the private sector. Particular attention should be given to enabling the participation of countries and regions that are currently underrepresented in AI governance processes.

Fourth, the Dialogue should advance normative clarity, especially regarding high-risk applications, by reinforcing commitments to human rights, transparency, and meaningful human oversight.

Finally, the Dialogue should establish a forward-looking process, including a roadmap for sustained engagement, monitoring, and follow-up mechanisms.

To conclude, the success of the Global Dialogue will depend on its ability to combine normative convergence, practical cooperation, and inclusive participation, thereby strengthening global capacity to govern AI in an equitable, accountable, and development-oriented manner.

b) From your perspective, which of the following thematic areas identified by the General Assembly Resolution 79/325 for the AI Dialogue reflect your priorities for urgent action and active engagement by your entity? Please select up to 4 priorities." Based on the ORBICOM proposals, I selected the following: 1) Safe, secure, and trustworthy AI; 2) AI capacity-building; 3) Social, economic, ethical, cultural, linguistic, and technical implications of AI; and 4) Protection and promotion of Human Rights. Then, the website asks the following question that we need to answer here: "Please briefly explain your selection.

Our selection reflects a commitment to advancing AI governance that is both effective and inclusive, particularly given the structural asymmetries shaping the global AI landscape.

First, safe, secure, and trustworthy AI is a foundational priority. As AI systems are increasingly embedded in critical infrastructures and decision-making processes, ensuring their reliability, safety, and alignment with societal values is essential to maintaining public trust and preventing systemic harm.

Second, AI capacity-building is urgent. Significant disparities persist in access to technical expertise, infrastructure, and regulatory capabilities, particularly in developing countries. Without targeted capacity-building, many states will face difficulties in effectively governing AI systems that are designed and deployed elsewhere, deepening existing inequalities and limiting meaningful participation in global governance processes.

Third, the social, economic, ethical, cultural, linguistic, and technical implications of AI require comprehensive attention. AI is not only a technological issue but also a societal transformation that affects labor markets, communication systems, cultural diversity, and knowledge production. Addressing these dimensions is critical to ensure that AI development supports inclusive and context-sensitive outcomes.

Fourth, the protection and promotion of human rights must remain central. AI systems have direct implications for privacy, non-discrimination, freedom of expression, and access to information. Embedding human rights principles into AI governance frameworks is essential to safeguard democratic values and ensure accountability.

c) In your opinion, are there any cross-cutting or emerging issues not captured by the listed themes above? If so, please explain.

Yes. While the listed themes capture many core dimensions of AI governance, several cross-cutting and emerging issues deserve explicit attention.

First, the question of power concentration and dependency is central. AI capabilities are increasingly concentrated in a small number of countries and corporations, creating asymmetries in access, influence, and decision-making. This raises concerns about

technological dependency, digital sovereignty, and unequal participation in global governance, particularly for countries in the Global South.

Second, AI should be understood as a form of cognitive and communicational infrastructure. Beyond technical systems, AI increasingly shapes how information is produced, distributed, and consumed. This has profound implications for public discourse, knowledge production, and democratic processes, which are not fully captured under existing categories.

Third, there is a need to address the political economy of AI, including business models based on data extraction and attention optimization. These dynamics influence the development and deployment of AI systems and are closely linked to issues such as disinformation, polarization, and market concentration.

Fourth, the importance of Media and Information Literacy (MIL) and informed citizenship should be recognized as a cross-cutting governance dimension. Effective AI governance requires not only regulation but also the capacity of individuals and communities to critically engage with AI-mediated environments.

Fifth, emerging issues related to environmental sustainability, including the energy consumption and carbon footprint of AI systems, warrant greater attention.

According to ORBICOM, addressing these cross-cutting issues would strengthen the Global Dialogue by providing a more comprehensive and structurally informed approach to AI governance.

d) How are the governance gaps and related developments/advances in the thematic areas you selected above affecting your country, region, or sector? Please highlight the most significant challenges and opportunities.

This may vary by world region. For instance, in Latin America and the Caribbean, governance gaps in AI are shaped by a structural condition: most advanced AI systems are developed and controlled outside the region, while their impacts are experienced locally. This creates significant challenges across the selected thematic areas.

First, limited regulatory and technical capacity constrains governments' ability to assess risks, audit systems, and enforce standards for safe, secure, and trustworthy AI. This exposes societies to risks such as bias, opacity, and misuse, particularly in sensitive domains like public services, security, and information ecosystems.

Second, capacity-building gaps remain among the most pressing challenges. Many countries lack specialized expertise, institutional coordination, and access to high-performance computing infrastructure. These limitations hinder both effective governance and the development of local AI ecosystems, reinforcing dependence on external technologies.

Third, the social, economic, ethical, cultural, and linguistic implications of AI are particularly acute. AI systems trained primarily on data from other regions may fail to reflect local contexts, languages, and cultural diversity, potentially reinforcing inequalities and limiting inclusive development.

Fourth, with regard to human rights, governance gaps increase the risk of violations related to privacy, discrimination, and freedom of expression. Weak oversight mechanisms and fragmented institutional frameworks make it difficult to ensure accountability.

At the same time, important opportunities exist. AI can support improvements in public services, financial inclusion, and economic productivity. Regional initiatives and multilateral cooperation offer pathways to strengthen capacity, harmonize standards, and amplify the region’s voice in global governance.

Again, in ORBICOM's view, addressing these challenges requires coordinated efforts to build institutional capacity, foster regional collaboration, and develop context-sensitive governance frameworks that align with international principles while reflecting local realities.

e) What role can the AI Dialogue play in advancing international cooperation on AI governance? (Max. 300 words)

The Global Dialogue on AI Governance can play a catalytic role in advancing international cooperation by moving from fragmented initiatives toward a more coherent, inclusive, and action-oriented global framework. From ORBICOM, four suggestions are presented here.

First, the Dialogue can serve as a platform for convergence, enabling Member States and stakeholders to identify shared principles and priorities—particularly in areas such as safety, human rights, transparency, and accountability—while respecting diverse national contexts. This can help reduce regulatory fragmentation and foster greater interoperability among governance approaches.

Second, it can facilitate practical cooperation mechanisms. By bringing together governments, international organizations, academia, civil society, and the private sector, the Dialogue can support the development of joint initiatives, including capacity-building programmes, technical assistance, and knowledge-sharing platforms. This is particularly important for addressing disparities in expertise and infrastructure between countries.

Third, the Dialogue can play a key role in bridging global asymmetries. It can elevate the perspectives and priorities of developing countries, helping ensure that AI governance reflects a broader range of experiences and needs. In doing so, it can promote more equitable participation in shaping global standards and policies.

Fourth, the Dialogue can contribute to translating principles into practice by encouraging the development of actionable outputs, such as guidelines, partnerships, and monitoring mechanisms to support implementation.

f) What are some of the existing initiatives, partnerships, or mechanisms that the AI Dialogue should build upon or connect with, and what added value could the AI Dialogue bring?

The AI Dialogue should build upon existing UN-led normative frameworks, multilateral initiatives, and knowledge platforms, while adding value through coordination, inclusivity, and implementation.

First, the Dialogue should connect with the United Nations General Assembly Resolution on AI (2024), which emphasizes the need to promote *safe, secure, and trustworthy AI systems* aligned with human rights and the Sustainable Development Goals, as well as the urgency of addressing digital and AI divides through international cooperation and capacity-building.

Second, it should build on the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI (2021), which provides a globally endorsed normative framework grounded in human dignity, human rights, transparency, and fairness, and highlights the risks of bias, inequality, and exclusion if these principles are not upheld.

Third, initiatives such as UNESCO's work on AI and freedom of expression, particularly in electoral contexts, illustrate the importance of safeguarding information integrity, democratic processes, and public trust in AI-mediated environments.

Additionally, the Dialogue can connect with ongoing efforts such as the UN Digital Cooperation Roadmap, the High-Level Advisory Body on AI, and multistakeholder platforms like AI for Good, which already provide spaces for technical collaboration and policy exchange.

The added value of the AI Dialogue lies in its potential to act as a bridging mechanism:

- Between normative frameworks and implementation, translating principles into actionable cooperation;
- Between regions, ensuring that the perspectives of developing countries are integrated into global governance processes;
- Between stakeholders, fostering coordination among governments, academia, civil society, and the private sector;
- and between initiatives, reducing fragmentation and enhancing coherence across existing efforts.

g) .How can different stakeholders contribute to the AI Dialogue? Please share recommendations for the format and structure of the AI Dialogue.

In ORBICOM's view, different stakeholders can contribute by leveraging their comparative strengths within a structured, inclusive, and action-oriented Dialogue.

Governments can provide policy direction and regulatory frameworks; international organizations can ensure normative alignment and coordination; academia can contribute independent research and evidence-based analysis; civil society can represent public

interest and rights-based perspectives; and the private sector can offer technical expertise and implementation capacity.

To ensure effectiveness, the AI Dialogue could be structured around:

- Thematic working groups aligned with key priorities (e.g., capacity-building, human rights, transparency);
- Regional consultations to reflect diverse contexts, particularly from the Global South;
- Multistakeholder panels to foster dialogue across sectors;
- And output-oriented sessions focused on developing concrete deliverables.

A hybrid format combining plenary discussions and smaller, task-oriented groups would support both inclusivity and actionable outcomes, ensuring sustained engagement beyond the initial Dialogue

h) Which voices, communities, or perspectives are currently underrepresented in global discussions on AI governance? How could they be included?

It is clear that several voices remain underrepresented in global AI governance, particularly those from developing countries, the Global South, and smaller or resource-constrained states. These regions often lack the institutional capacity and technical infrastructure to participate fully, despite being significantly affected by AI systems developed elsewhere.

Additionally, civil society organizations, indigenous communities, linguistic minorities, and non-expert users are frequently excluded, even though they experience the social and cultural impacts of AI most directly. Perspectives from education, communication, and media ecosystems are also often overlooked.

To enhance inclusion, the AI Dialogue should support capacity-building, funding mechanisms, and technical assistance to enable participation from underrepresented regions. It should also promote regional consultations, multilingual engagement, and participatory formats, ensuring that diverse knowledge systems and lived experiences inform global governance frameworks.

i) What innovative engagement formats could most effectively foster meaningful and dynamic engagement during the AI Dialogue?

Innovative engagement formats should prioritize interaction, co-creation, and practical outputs over traditional panel discussions.

First, thematic co-creation labs could bring together diverse stakeholders to jointly develop policy proposals, governance tools, or capacity-building strategies. Second, scenario-based simulations (e.g., on AI risks, regulatory dilemmas, or crisis responses) can help participants engage with real-world challenges and trade-offs. Third, regional dialogue roundtables would ensure that local perspectives, particularly from the Global South, are meaningfully integrated. Additionally, multistakeholder "challenge sessions" could focus on specific problems—such as bias mitigation or regulatory capacity—encouraging collaborative solutions across sectors. Digital platforms can support continuous engagement before and after the Dialogue, facilitating knowledge sharing and follow-up.

These formats would enhance participation, foster mutual learning, and support the development of actionable and context-sensitive outcomes.

j) Please share examples of policies, practices, platforms, or approaches that promote effective AI governance or offer concrete solutions to addressing its challenges.

There are several existing policies and initiatives that offer concrete foundations for effective AI governance. At the normative level, the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI (2021) provides a comprehensive framework grounded in human rights, transparency, accountability, and inclusivity, and has been adopted by all Member States, offering a globally legitimate reference for policy development.

At the regulatory level, the European Union's AI Act introduces a risk-based approach that differentiates obligations according to levels of societal risk, combining innovation with safeguards for fundamental rights. This model has already influenced regulatory debates globally.

In terms of capacity-building and cooperation, initiatives such as the Global Partnership on AI (GPAI) and the AI for Good platform (ITU/UN) facilitate knowledge exchange, technical collaboration, and policy dialogue across stakeholders.

From a societal perspective, UNESCO and UNDP efforts on AI, freedom of expression, and information integrity provide practical guidance on addressing risks such as disinformation, particularly in electoral contexts.

Also, one should note that approaches that integrate Media and Information Literacy (MIL) into education and public policy offer scalable solutions to strengthen citizen resilience and democratic engagement in AI-mediated environments.