Dear Friends of CPDP,

Are there better reasons to enforce change than culture? Who can say, but Les Halles de Schaerbeek, the venue where CPDP was hosted for many years will from now on only focus on its cultural program. In May the cultural temple has programmed the infamous KunstenFestivalDesArts. The CPDP community was compelled to find a new home. A new home to further develop the conference as the crucible for critical discourse around legal, regulatory, academic, and technological developments affecting privacy and data protection. We are extremely happy about the new conference location – the historic Tour & Taxi site – offering more space, more possibilities to organize events and panels, more silent corners and more parking space.

For once, CPDP has amended its acronym and became CPDP.ai making it the Computer, Privacy & Data Protection and Artificial Intelligence conference. Of course we draw inspiration from the pulse of the times. The dichotomy of governance—whether to govern or to be governed—has never been more pertinent. CPDP.ai!

The graphic design of the conference also needed an update. As with the title, we stay loyal – visually – to the past while embracing the future. Alongside, we tried to improve the structure of this brochure: the program grid still provides a full overview of each day, and the detailed pages with full descriptions and speaker names are now gathering all simultaneous tracks beyond different rooms. At times we have up to 11 simultaneous panels, workshops and culture club activities. The new grid will be an indispensable guide for this year’s participant.

Privacy Salon, the organization behind CPDP’ai, has invited many creatives. Returning is the CODE project. We show parts of the Privacy Salon exhibition “Peeking beyond the Ending”. We invite you to a soundwalk and, again, the Book Club. We re-invite podcast creators and, for the first time, the IViR science fiction and information law writing competition honors its winners at CPDP’ai. Avatar.fm is the radio show streaming daily live from CPDP’ai in collaboration with Dublab radio, calling out to junior professionals and students in the privacy and data protection realm and beyond. Stay tuned...

All things considered, of course, it is the people that make CPDP what it is. (That and, perhaps, our caterer, who has moved with us to the new venue.) In that spirit, while CPDP’ai adapts to developments, it certainly does not change its priorities: to create a unique multi-stakeholder formula where academics, lawyers, practitioners, policymakers, industry and civil society from all over the world come together in an atmosphere of inclusivity, independence, mutual respect and creativity.

Join us as we navigate the tumultuous waters of AI governance, charting a course toward a more equitable and informed digital future, where topics of privacy and data protection continue to be ever more important. Welcome to the 17th edition of the conference.

Thank you for being here.
Registration & Name Badge
Registration opens on Tuesday 21 May at 16:00 in Gare Maritime, situated in front of Maison de la Poste. From Wednesday 22 May to Friday 24 May, registration is in Gare Maritime from 7:30. You will receive a name badge with the dates of attendance.

Information Desk
We provide general information about the conference and inquiries about Brussels at the information desk which will be located in Gare Maritime located just inside the main entrance of Gare Maritime.

Internet Login and Password
Select Network: Maison de la Poste – Password: Gathering.

Venues
CPDP takes place simultaneously in two venues on the Brussels’ Tour & Taxis site. Four tracks of sessions will be held at the main venue: Maison de la Poste. Here, Grande Halle is located on the ground floor, Maritime Room on level 1 and Class Room and Orangerie on level 2. All the workshops are organised at Maison de la Poste, as well as the CPDP Culture Club and CPCP Book Club.

Two tracks of sessions from the main program will be held at Herman Teirlinck on 22 and 23 May. The two panel rooms – HT Aula and HT Petite – are situated on the left-hand side of the building. HT Aula can be accessed on the ground level (front entrance) and on level 1 (back entrance), while access to HT Petite is on level 1. There will be signposts and a CPDP info desk will be available on the ground floor. Herman Teirlinck is situated on the same site as Maison de la Poste, with a walking distance of 5 minutes between the two venues. Signposts will be in place and volunteers will assist with navigation between the two venues.

Lunch and Coffee Breaks
All lunches and coffee breaks will be held in the foyers at Maison de la Poste. Catering will not be provided at Herman Teirlinck. The early lunch will start at 12:30 near the info desk of Maison de la Poste. Regular lunch will start at 13:05 in the foyers. Please note that CPDP is providing a vegetarian and vegan menu for this year’s conference.

Networking and Side Events
Cocktails will take place in Maison de la Poste starting at 18:40 on Wednesday and Thursday and at 19:10 on Friday. Don’t forget to follow the workshops and check out the art installations, scheduled on level 1 and 2 of Maison de la Poste. The official party on Thursday evening will take place in Brasserie de la Senne.

Please Respect Silent Times & Areas
During the sessions the foyers are closed (silent areas). Please switch off your phone during all sessions.

Video Recording and Photography at CPDP
Is CPDP watching you? Well... a bit. A professional photographer will be taking photos at the conference venues, including crowd shots, which will then be used for publicity. Please let us know during registration if you do not wish to be in these photographs. Panels will be filmed at the Conference venue and uploaded to the archive after the event (in case the speakers give consent for the recording).

Shuttle bus from/to Brussels North station
A free shuttle service travels back and forth from Brussels North station. Every 5 to 10 minutes, a bus leaves at the Tour & Taxi site (see “6” on map page 6) or the station (temporary stop underneath the station where buses of the company “De Lijn” also stop). Around midday, buses also go to the Rogierplein. Find the schedule here

Taxi
Please do not ask the information desk to call a taxi for you, please do this yourself. Companies like to know your name and phone number to avoid other people getting into the taxi you ordered. Taxi Verta: +32 2 3494949

Updates and Congress News
Please keep a close eye on email updates from us throughout the conference and contact the registration and information desks if you have questions. Our wonderful volunteers will also be at both venues to help find your way around the venues.
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TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION

1. MAISON DE LA POSTE
Maison de la Poste
Rue Picard 7, 1000 Brussels
CPDP.ai main venue
Entrance via Gare Maritime

2. HERMAN TEIRLINCK BUILDING
Herman Teirlinck
Av du Port 88, 1000 Brussels
Congress Venues: HT Aula & HT Petite

3. GARE MARITIME
Gare Maritime
Covered public space with shops, restaurants and cafés

4. BRASSERIE DE LA SENNE
Brasserie de la Senne
Mozilla Party

5. AVATAR.FM
Avatar.fm
Through Gare Maritime

6. SHUTTLE BUS STOP
Every 5’ to 10’ between the site and Brussels North station (until 22.00)

LOCATION

1. MAISON DE LA POSTE
- Rue Picard 7, 1000 Brussels
- CPDP.ai main venue
- Entrance via Gare Maritime

2. HERMAN TEIRLINCK BUILDING
- Av du Port 88, 1000 Brussels
- Congress Venues: HT Aula & HT Petite

3. GARE MARITIME
- Covered public space with shops, restaurants and cafés

4. BRASSERIE DE LA SENNE
- Brasserie de la Senne
- Mozilla Party

5. AVATAR.FM
- Avatar.fm
- Through Gare Maritime

6. SHUTTLE BUS STOP
- Every 5’ to 10’ between the site and Brussels North station (until 22.00)
TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION
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- Paul De Hert (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, LSTS, Tilburg University TILT)
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- Dennis Hirsch (Ohio State University Moritz College of Law)
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- Rosco Bellewena, Vrije Universiteit Brussel LSTS (BE)
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- Claudia Diaz, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (BE) and Nym Technologies
- Michael Friedewald, Fraunhofer Institut für System- und Innovationsforshung (ISI) (DE)
- Mariel Hansen, Independent Centre For Privacy Protection ULD (BE)
- Minelle Hildebrandt, Radboud University Nijmegen (NL) & Vrije Universiteit Brussel LSTS (BE)
- Dennis Hirsch, Ohio State University Moritz College of Law (US)
- Gus Hosein, Privacy International (UK)
- Kristina Ihon, Institute for Information Law (IViR), University of Amsterdam (NL)
- Tiltz Kenil, KU Leuven - CTIP (BE), Universiteit Leiden - eLaw (NL) & EAB (European Association for Biometrics)
- Eleni Kosta, Tilburg Institute for Law, Technology and Society TILT (NL)
- Ronald Leenes, Tilburg Institute for Law, Technology and Society TILT (NL)
- Dave Leurs, ADAPT Centre (IE)
- Eva Lieven, Ghent University (BE)
- Jo Pierson, Hasselt University (BE)
- José-Luis Pilar, Universidade CES/Ufal (BR)
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- Marc Rotenberg, CAIDP (US)
- Ivan Szelény, Central European University (HU)
- Frederik Zuiderveld Borgesius, Hub, Radboud University Nijmegen (NL)
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- Nano Ansys (Brussels School of Government, BritsGo)
- Jonas Breuer (Privacy Salon)
- August Bourgeous (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, imec/SMIT)
- Alessandra Cavil (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, LSTS)
- Cristina Codro (Vrije Universiteit Brussels, LISTS)
- Isabäla Xaver-Göntzes (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, LISTS)
- Guillermina Sánchez (CIBERer of Rare Diseases CIBERER-IISDIIO)
- Wrenki Lu (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, LISTS)
- Achim Kleinburg (Hochschule Bann-Rhein-Sieg)
- Maria Magierska (European University Institute)
- Eleonora Nestola (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, LISTS)
- Suzanne Nusselder (Tilburg University TILT)
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- Aiman Taimur (Tilburg University TILT)
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- Ine van Zeeland (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, imec/SMIT)

Logistics and Registration

Medicongress Services
Norweegstraat 49 • 9040 Evergem Belgium
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www.medicongress.com

Medicongress Services
Suikerkaai 40d • Zone 3e • SIO Halle
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Phone: +32 2 2380 10 44
www.avuicom.be

Privacy Salon
Thierry Vandensombroucke, Dara Hallinan, Karin Neukommans, Diana Dimitrova, Justin Van Strydonck, Tabea Wagner, Jonas Breuer, Birte Vingerhoets, Hila Harschau and Farre Vander Elst
www.privacy沙龙.org

Design © Nick Van Hee
www.rickvanhee.be

Organisation of CPDP.ai

18.00 - Opening CPDP.ai 2024

18.05 - CAIDP Europe AI Policy Leader Awards

The awards honor individuals and organizations for their outstanding contributions to human-centric AI policies. The Center for AI and Digital Policy (CAIDP) is a civil society organization dedicated to fostering a fairer, more just society, where technology advances broad social inclusion based on fundamental rights and democratic principles. With the EU transitioning from AI policymaking to implementation, CAIDP is launching its European branch in Brussels. CAIDP Europe will collaborate with like-minded partners to ensure rights-based governance of AI in Europe. At the CPDP.ai Opening Night, CAIDP Europe will recognize those who have championed human-centric AI by establishing necessary safeguards.

The recipients of the CAIDP Europe 2024 AI Policy Leader Award are:
- The Italian Data Protection Authority (AI Policy Leader Government Award) for its pioneering investigations on generative AI systems with a view to ensure human oversight, algorithmic transparency, data protection and contestability.
- Prof.s Gianclaudio Malgieri and Alessandro Mantelaro (AI Policy Leader Academic Award) for their collective call on EU policy-makers to include a fundamental rights impact assessment in the EU AI Act.
- European Digital Rights (EDRi) (AI Policy Leader Civil Society Award) for their “Reclaim your Face” campaign against biometric mass surveillance.
- Luca Bertuzzi (AI Policy Leader Business Award) for his high quality journalism ensuring democratic transparency in European negotiations regarding the EU AI Act or the Council of Europe Convention on AI, Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law.

18.40 - Conquer - Enclose - Extract - Exploit. Territories and resources in the age of AI
Keynote Speech by Vladan Joler, SHARE Foundation/University of Novi Sad (YU)

19.15 - The global challenge of Governing AI. What’s the role of individuals?
Moderator: Gianclaudio Malgieri, Brussels Privacy Hub (BE)
Speakers: Vladimir Joler, SHARE Foundation/University of Novi Sad (YU); Margot Kaminski, Colorado University (US); Clarisse Girst, OECD (FR); Karine Caunes, CAIDP Europe (FR)

Vladan Joler’s work intersects with pressing inquiries into the language, definitions, and scope pertinent to AI governance. Within this domain, the intimate relation among individual rights, particularly autonomy, and systemic risk regulation takes center stage. Balancing the scales requires a nuanced understanding of how human vulnerability intertwined with regulatory endeavors, forging pathways toward equitable outcomes. Moreover, transparency, explanation, and representation emerge as indispensable in the AI regulatory milieu. Articles such as EU, ensuring the right to explanation, and AI, advocating for human oversight, underscore the pivotal role of end-users in this narrative. Here, Joler’s concept of data extractivism unveils in a creative and powerful way potential avenues for empowerment and scrutiny. Can participative AI governance become a beacon in this context, based on inclusivity and collective agency. Embracing group participation and contestation, it charts a course toward a more democratized AI landscape, where the voices of stakeholders resonate in the decision-making and governance.

20.15 - Cocktail offered by Privacy Salon/CPDP.ai & The Brussels Privacy Hub
Location: Brasserie de la Senne, see “4” on map page 6. Till 21:00
WEDNESDAY 22ND MAY 2024
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10.00
Coffee break

10.30
Council of Europe Model Contractual Clauses (Code MCV)
organised by Council of Europe

11.45
The Impact of Online Content Regulation and Censorship on Fundamental Rights: How to Assess, Mitigate and Monitor Systemic Risks on Online Platforms?
by By

13.05
Lunch

14.15
Realising the New Digital Framework: How to Fix the EU-US Privacy Quagmire?
organised by CEPD Brussels and TIZ Karlsruhe

15.30
Coffee break

16.00
The Evolution of Data Sharing in a Complex World
organised by Microsoft

17.16
As an Existential Threat to Privacy and Data Protection?
organised by CEPD

18.40
CPDP Cocktail offered by EDPB

COFFEE BREAK

10.30
Welcome and Introduction
by Paul de Hert

10.45
Will Chief Privacy Of cers Become Chief AI Officers?
organised by International Association of Privacy Professionals (IAPP)

11.00
Diy Governance! Trick ie-Down Policy Meets Bottom-up Activism
organised by Unitec University

11.15
Fundamental Rights Protection and Artificial Intelligence
organised by ENSCP

11.30
Cental Topics in AI Regulation: In Search for Regulatory Interoperability
organised by Data Privacy Brasil

11.45
Beyond Failures: Repairing the Future of AI with Public Values
organised by University of Helsinki

12.00
B2B data sharing within the DACT
organised by Brussels Privacy Hub

12.15
The AI Act Conformity Assessment
organised by Universiti ty of Turin

12.30
Decoding AI Privacy
organised by Luxembourg University GUB

12.45
Open for co-working organised by CEPD

13.30
How to Ensure Fairness and Non-discrimination in Algorithmic Hiring?
organised by FINDHR

13.45
A Reality Check: The European Commission’s Proposed Regulation on Combating Child Sexual Abuse
organised by LSTS, VUB

14.00
How to Ensure Fairness and Non-discrimination in Algorithmic Hiring?
organised by FINDHR

14.15
CPDP ACADEMIC SESSION I
organised by CEPD

14.30
Beyond Failures: Repairing the Future of AI with Public Values
organised by University of Helsinki

14.45
SafeSafeguarding AI Systems: Challenges and Regulatory Approaches
organised by SBIghts foundation

15.00
Beyond Failures: Repairing the Future of AI with Public Values
organised by University of Helsinki

15.15
A Reality Check: The European Commission’s Proposed Regulation on Combating Child Sexual Abuse
organised by LSTS, VUB

15.30
Beyond Failures: Repairing the Future of AI with Public Values
organised by University of Helsinki

15.45
CPDP ACADEMIC SESSION I
organised by CEPD

16.00
Navigating the Maze of Overlapping Roles and Emerging Authorities in the “New” EU Data (Protection) Framework
organised by ALSEP D-P Project, VUB

16.15
The Problems with Client-Side Scanning
organised by Meiji University (CBIE)

16.30
The Governance of Quantum Computing
organised by CEPD

16.45
The Ultimate Data Protection CDPubs Quiz
Organised by Data Protection Law Scholars Network

17.00
We will not protect data, but fundamental rights!
organised by Nexus Institute, Humboldt Institute for Internet and Society: Law & Innovation (DE)

17.15
AI and the Brain: Towards an EU Approach to Governing Neurotechnology
organised by International Center for Future Generations

17.30
Data portability’s new horizons: AI, the DMA, and the quest for online sovereignty
organised by Data Transfer Initiative

17.45
Responsible AI – Ensuring Privacy, Fairness and Transparency of AI in Practice
organised by VIA + Center for Responsible AI

18.00
Responsibility AI and the New AI for Privacy: Isn’t it Time to Switch Per spectives?
organised by CRIDS

18.15
The AI Act Conformity Assessment
organised by Universiti ty of Turin

18.30
Decoding AI Privacy
organised by Luxembourg University GUB

18.45
Open for co-working organised by CEPD

19.00
CPDP Cocktail offered by EDPB

20.20
Coffee break

21.20
Coffee break
Will Chief Privacy Officers Become Chief AI Officers?

Academic *** Business *** Policy

Organised by UCL (UK)

Moderator: Anthony Thompson, UCL (UK)
Speakers: Yves Dautcourt, GDPR & Data Protection Lawyer (FR); Linsay Prouty, GDPR, Data Protection & Privacy Lawyer (US); Laura Schertel Ferreira Mendes, Data Protection Officer, University of Turin (IT); Andrea Aloisi, Privacy Officer, University of Bologna (IT); Claudia Ficini, Privacy Officer, University of Turin (IT); Sara Valente, Privacy Officer, University of Bologna (IT)

To what extent will the role of the Chief Privacy Officer evolve or support a new role like a Chief AI Officer? What are the challenges posed by AI to the current rights protection? What are the key components of the Brazilian approach to AI regulation? How can AI regulations support the protection of fundamental rights?

DIY Governance! Trickle-Down to Incorporate New Requirements

Academic *** Business *** Policy

Organised by Polytechnic University of Turin (IT)

Panel

Speakers: Piero Socioli, University of Padua (IT); Matteo Zoppasi, Bocconi University (IT); Danilo Giannini, University of Milan (IT); Antonio Fontana, University of Turin (IT)

How can AI be regulated? How can AI be used to incorporate new requirements? Or will we work? Will the role of the Chief Privacy Officer evolve or support a new role like a Chief AI Officer?

DIY Governance! Trickle-Down to Incorporate New Requirements

Academic *** Business *** Policy

Organised by Polytechnic University of Turin (IT)

Panel

Speakers: Piero Socioli, University of Padua (IT); Matteo Zoppasi, Bocconi University (IT); Danilo Giannini, University of Milan (IT); Antonio Fontana, University of Turin (IT)

How can AI be regulated? How can AI be used to incorporate new requirements? Or will we work? Will the role of the Chief Privacy Officer evolve or support a new role like a Chief AI Officer?
One of the main objectives of Convention 108b is to facilitate the free flow of data between Parties to the Convention and from Parties to non-Parties while at the same time ensuring an appropriate level of protection for data transferred. The Convention is a country of destination. Pre-approved, standardized clauses provided by legally binding and enforceable contracts can ensure an appropriate level of protection guaranteed by Convention 108b in cases of transborder data flows. The Council of Europe will have a complete set of MCC covering transfers from data controller to data controller, from controller to processor and from processor to processor. The panel will explore their relation to other existing similar instruments and their potential in a global framework.

What are the specifics of the CoE MCC?

What is the scope of application of the CoE MCC?

Are the CoE MCC meant only for Parties?

What role can the CoE MCC play at a global level?

In the quantum technology innovation landscape, quantum sensing technology (QST) gets relatively little attention. However, QSTs have a more advanced technology-readiness and wider possible applications, ranging from defence, intelligence, space, biomedicine, mining, and environmental monitoring systems and their potential applications, which could significantly impact several societal actors, such as of military, intelligence services, law enforcement, and governmental entities. This panel will include initial dives into two processes to regulate Artificial Intelligence (AI) development and deployment that have recently been adopted by both EU and the pending legislation being pushed in Brazil. The panel will explore main features of the two processes and the related implications of quantum technologies and what are their potential applications, how to interact with other relevant legal instruments, it will also provide information and updates on the Brazilian lawmaking process, what different approaches Brazil has on the table (as of the time of the panel) and what the current discussions are. The panel will explore how both of these instruments interact with the patchwork of international, regional, and bilateral initiatives to globalize AI at different levels and instances, as well as the panellists’ take on the way forward towards a just, equitable and fair AI global framework, what different approaches Brazil has on the table (as of the time of the panel) and what the current discussions are.

What are the main features of the approved AI Act and how do they interact with other relevant legal instruments?

What are some of the key features of quantum sensing technologies and what are their potential applications?

What opportunities do they bring and what are the challenges for deploying them outside of the lab?

What are some of the notable investment developments and who are the key actors in the quantum sensing space?

What are some of the current issues, from a privacy and surveillance studies perspective, of advanced sensing technologies?
Our panel deals with the topic “AI for privacy”, and discusses how AI technology could be used to enhance privacy and data protection. Radical views consider that AI can only threaten these fundamental rights. Questioning this perspective, we explore how AI, including its regulation (through the AI Act), may be used as a tool to protect personal data and ensure compliance with privacy rules. To achieve this purpose, our renowned panelists bring in expertise from industry, regulators, and academia. On top of that, our participants to the panel also have varied backgrounds, including law, economics and IT.

• AI Act: a regulatory tool for privacy enhancement?
• Privacy by design: what’s new with AI (and with the latest policy orientations)?
• Automation of data subjects’ rights: where do we stand?
• AI for enforcement and for compliance.

Machine Room | Workshop
Data portability’s new horizons: AI, the DMA, and the quest for online sovereignty
Organised by Data Transfer Initiative (USA)
Facilitator Tommaso Crespa, Sant’Anna School of Advanced Studies & UHP | ALS/TUS/VT (IT/NZ); Delara Derakhshani, Data Transfer Initiative (US)

This workshop will approach governance and AI questions from the perspective of the Data Transfer Initiative’s mission, which is to empower users among competing interests and perspectives with the end goal of providing broad take-aways for audience members and building upon.

• In-depth discussion around how AI and GDPR can co-exist
• Best practices for promoting digital sovereignty
• Challenges and opportunities for data portability in the age of AI

Living Room | Workshop
Hackathon Workshop on Adversarial and Assisted Living: A Human-Centered Approach to Dark Patterns
Organised by Publicis Groupe (DE)
Facilitator Tina Treibel, Publicis (DE); Peter Craddock, Keller & Heckman (BE); Mikołaj Barczente-Wiklind, University of Surrey (UK); Vanessa Ling, Proxicode, Keller & Heckman (BE); Mikołaj Barczente-Wiklind, University of Surrey (UK); Vanessa Ling, Proxicode, Keller & Heckman (BE); Mikołaj Barczente-Wiklind, University of Surrey (UK); Vanessa Ling, Proxicode, Keller & Heckman (BE)

Join this hackathon to address burning AI topical issues, including personalisation, profiling, and privacy. The workshop will explore the delicate balancing act and tensions among competing interests and perspectives with the end goal of providing broad take-aways and actionable insights for the emerging AI landscape. This interactive session will engage audience members through:
• The use of technologies that solicit real-time feedback in response to polls, questions, and hypotheticals.
• Hands-on demonstrations of data portability services.
• Brainstorming sessions and group exercises designed to appeal to the varying perspectives and disciplines of audience members (e.g., academics, lawyers, technologists, and economists).

VOLUME 16
Data Protection and Privacy
Ideas That Drive Our Digital World
Edited by Hideyuki Matsumi, Dana Hallinan, Diana Dimitrova, Eleni Kosta and Paul De Hert
May 2024 | 304pp | Hbk 9781509979603 | RRP: £55
PDF 9781509975983 | RRP: £49.50
EPUB 9781509975990 | RRP: £49.50

What are the privacy implications of AI? How can we approach this broad and pressing question?
This workshop is organized by Privacy Studies Journal based at the Danish National Research Foundation Centre for Privacy Studies, University of Copenhagen. We take a comprehensive and interdisciplinary view at privacy and the private in past, present, and future as we zoom in on instances, negotiations, regulations, disruptions, and protections of privacy across different contexts. The workshop involves an open discussion, fresh ideas and contributions for the journal, to inspire communication between approaches and disciplines and to motivate the ‘networking of privacy’ of scholars, practitioners, and others interested in privacy. This workshop is moderated by editor of the Centre for Privacy Studies, chief editor of Privacy Studies Journal Professor Mette Birkedal Bruun. The discussion is initiated by authors of the forthcoming Privacy Studies Journal position paper ‘Artificial Intelligence and Privacy: Causes for Concern’, Mataszewicz and Natacha Klein-Keller.

Join this session to explore the latest policy orientations on synthetic data, the ethical implications of secondary use of publicly available personal data, and automating GDPR compliance. The second half of the book shifts focus to novel issues and ideas that drive our digital world. The chapters offer analyses on social and environmental sustainability of smart cities, reconstructing states as information platforms, stakeholder identification using the example of video-based Active and Assisted Living (AAL), and a human-centric approach to dark patterns.

This interdisciplinary book takes readers on an intellectual journey into a wide range of issues and cutting-edge ideas to tackle our ever-evolving digital landscape.
The Impact of Online Content Moderation and Curation on Fundamental Rights: How to Assess, Mitigate and Monitor Systemic Risks on Online Platforms?

Academic ** Business ** Policy
Organised by EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (EU)
Moderator: David Reichel, EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (EU)
Speakers: Daria Dergacheva, Center for Media, Communication, and Information Policy, University of Bremen (DE); Elika Efekhari, European Commission (EU); Erika Pirkova, Access Now (BE); Valentina Gallun, University of Turin (IT);
Under Articles 34 and 35 of the Digital Services Act (DSA), very large online platforms (VLOPs) and very large online intermediaries (VLOIs) face a range of systemic risks to fundamental rights stemming from the design, functioning or use of their services with a view to adopt reasonable, proportionate and effective mitigation measures. When doing so they need to consider among other things how their content moderation and curtailment systems influence these systemic risks to fundamental rights, including but not limited to, the rights to privacy and data protection. At the same time, Article 40 of the DSA provides for new possibilities for researchers to look into such systemic risks and mitigation measures taken. While efforts to further streamline these possibilities continue, developing methodologies for assessing risks to fundamental rights on online platforms and progress over time will be crucial for the effective implementation and enforcement of the DSA.

What do we already know about existing systemic risks to fundamental rights on online platforms?
What are the key elements that fundamental rights impact assessments methodology should include under the EU framework?
How can content moderation and curtailment systems in particular be assessed and, where needed, adjusted to respect fundamental rights?
AI and Children’s Privacy: Challenges and Regulatory Approaches
Academic ** Business ** Policy
Organised by SILIGHTS foundation (UK)
Moderator: Leandra Barrington-Leech, SILIGHTS Foundation (UK)
Speakers: Elisabeth Dehanger, Baker & McKenzie (UK); Nicole Gregory, GDPR Guardian, UK Information Commissioner’s Office (UK); Ansgar Koene, PT (DE); Xavier Delport, CNIL (FR)
AI is increasingly omnipresent and shaping children’s digital development and online experiences – from education and learning to relationships and play. However, AI regulation and governance is often lacking, which can negatively impact many fundamental rights, including the rights to privacy and data protection.

Beyond Failures: Repairing the Future of AI with Public Values
Academic ** Business ** Policy
Organised by University of Helsinki (FI)
Moderator: Iris Muis, Utrecht University (NL)
Speakers: Mirko Tobias Schäfer, Data School (NL); Minna Ruckenstein, University of Helsinki (FI); Anni Ojajärvi, Kela - the Social Insurance Institution of Finland (FI); Diletta Huyskes, University of Milan / Privacy Lab (IT)
Failures in AI implementations and flawed data practices have not only raised public concern but also significantly shaped policymaking processes within the EU. Beyond the realm of policymaking, a multitude of repair efforts have emerged to address the use of flawed, failing, or poorly designed AI systems. This often involves a revaluation of governance strategies and a renewal of data practices in order to develop the potential of AI-related expertise and practices crucial for both informing policy and translating into impactful actions. This panel delves into the practices and commitments aimed at strengthening public values in the realm of AI, starting from studies from the UK, Denmark, and Italy. The discussed cases span diverse sectors, including media, energy, health, social work and social security, highlighting various interventions for transversal aspects of AI usage. Through this discussion, the panel aims to pinpoint critical elements for the design of future beneficial public values and pathways to support responsible data practices and uses of AI. By fostering a deeper dive into these critical issues, the goal is to connect with past scholarly and policy work and transform them into valuable opportunities for the future.

What have we learned from failures so far?
How do we design and enforce checks and balances to safeguard that AI practices support public values?
How do specific local strengths contribute to the development of beneficial AI and data practices, and related policies?
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Wednesday Panels and Workshops that start at 14:35 and end at 16:30

Realising the New Digital Framework
Academic ** Business ** Policy ** Organised by CPDP
A Reality Check: The European Commission's Proposed Regulation on Combating Child Sexual Abuse
Academic ** Business ** Policy ** Organised by LSTS, VUB (BE)
How to Ensure Fairness and Non-discrimination in Algorithmic Hiring
Academic ** Business ** Policy ** Organised by FNR (LU)

Pay or Ok? Law & Economics Meets Privacy
Organised by International Center for Law & Economics (US)
Moot Court – AI Liability in Health Organised by LUISS, Università di Roma (IT)

Wednesday 22nd May 2024 • 14.15

How to Fix the EU-US Privacy Quagmire?
Academic ** Business ** Policy ** Organised by CESPS Brussels and FIZ Karlsruhe (DE/BE)
Table 1. How to coordinate the rules of the new digital framework?

Realising the New Digital Framework
Academic ** Business ** Policy ** Organised by CPDP
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TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION

The spectacular development of generative AI has triggered a global thinking about how best to regulate its technology and its impact. When it comes to regulating AI technologies related to data protection, privacy and security, however, generating AI is already regulated by the GDPR and the e-Privacy Directive (ePD). Led by the German EU, the current discussion regarding the use of generative AI technologies is taking place against the backdrop of the upcoming ECJ case C-547/21, which will determine whether the products of generative AI, such as Deepfake videos, are covered by the GDPR or the ePD. If the ECJ rules in favor of the GDPR, it will have far-reaching implications for the control of AI technologies and the protection of personal data. If, on the other hand, the ECJ rules in favor of the ePD, it will pave the way for EU regulation of AI technologies. In this context, the workshop will focus on the implications of the ECJ decision and the ongoing discussions in the EU and beyond.

The workshop will bring together experts from academia, industry, and civil society to discuss the following questions:

- Which problems does the EU-US DPF in line with fundamental rights, particularly to the rights to privacy and autonomy, trigger a global thinking about how best to regulate its technology and its impact.
- What are the affordances and limitations of current techniques for child protection, assessing the feasibility and implications of integrating such technologies into the envisioned legal framework.
- Is the new EU-US DPF in line with fundamental rights?
- What is the view of policy and business on the new DPF?
- How will the CJEU decide on a possible Schengen?
- Will the Commission come up for a future EU data laws?
- The EU data protection code is in line with fundamental rights. Which problems do panelists see in the effective realization of the framework? Which problems do panelists see in the effective realization of the framework?
- Is the new EU-US DPF in line with fundamental rights?
- What is the view of policy and business on the new DPF?
- How will the CJEU decide on a possible Schengen?
- Will the Commission come up for a future EU data laws?
- The EU data protection code is in line with fundamental rights. Which problems do panelists see in the effective realization of the framework?
- Which problems do panelists see in the effective realization of the framework?
- Is the new EU-US DPF in line with fundamental rights?
- What is the view of policy and business on the new DPF?
- How will the CJEU decide on a possible Schengen?
- Will the Commission come up for a future EU data laws?
- The EU data protection code is in line with fundamental rights. Which problems do panelists see in the effective realization of the framework?
- Which problems do panelists see in the effective realization of the framework?
TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION

Moderator
Microsoft
Complex World
Grande Halle

A discussion on how recent developments and trends in data sharing, privacy and security are reshaping the way data is shared across borders. Panelists will examine the impact of new technological advancements on global data flows, and discuss the implications for privacy, public safety and national security with the need for global cooperation to ensure the free flow of information. How has the landscape evolved as new kinds of technology, such as generative AI are reshaping the technological landscape. How do we ensure the right balance as we seek to ensure the need for global cooperation to ensure the free flow of information.

How has the landscape evolved as new kinds of technology, such as generative AI are reshaping the technological landscape. How do we ensure the right balance as we seek to ensure the need for global cooperation to ensure the free flow of information while protecting national interests, public safety and the protection of fundamental rights. Panelists will discuss recent developments in the data sharing landscape and issues yet to be addressed concerning the prosperity, safety and protection of human rights amongst like-minded democracies.

How can we strike the right balance between the trusted flow of information while protecting national interests, public safety and the protection of fundamental rights. Panelists will discuss recent developments in the data sharing landscape and issues yet to be addressed concerning the prosperity, safety and protection of human rights amongst like-minded democracies.

Creating (Open) Data Commons in the Age of AI and Big Data

Academic Business * Policy *
Organised by: Internet and Society (FR)
Moderator: Gianfranco Sanna, Digital Freedom Fund (NL)
Speakers:
Anna Marie Komina, European University Institute
Ainara Bordes Perez (Uni Malta)
Maria Magierska, European University Institute
Mathias Gauger, University of East Anglia
Mayra Senyós, University of Eastern Ontario
Ainara Bordes Perez (Uni Malta)

We do not protect data, but fundamental rights! What’s really at stake in Policyization, then? An essential aim of the data protection regulation is to protect the fundamental rights of data subjects. We need to focus on the rights to these rights and weigh them against other fundamental rights positions in various assessments. This includes data protection risk in privacy laws in the US. Which is the best of the two, privacy concerns in each region? What do these advancements discuss about the commonality and shared values that exist between the US and EU when it comes to trusted sharing and access to data? Do we do better in the world events to further shape/define these issues?

What unresolved issues exist in the data sharing landscape, and how can they be addressed to promote economic prosperity and protect human rights among like-minded democracies?

In the context of rapidly evolving technological landscapes, what strategies can we employ to effectively manage the immediate demands of data sharing and future challenges?

Creating (Open) Data Commons in the Age of AI and Big Data

Academic Business * Policy *
Organised by: Internet and Society (FR)
Moderator: Gianfranco Sanna, Digital Freedom Fund (NL)
Speakers:
Anna Marie Komina, European University Institute
Ainara Bordes Perez (Uni Malta)
Maria Magierska, European University Institute
Mathias Gauger, University of East Anglia
Mayra Senyós, University of Eastern Ontario
Ainara Bordes Perez (Uni Malta)

Facilitating an extractive data political economy. While regulation and established tools for data protection is a topic of frequent discussion. How does the GDPR has emphasised the critical components of effective enforcement, its current practical impact to be seen in close correlation with the "new" AI Act. This panel explores the implications of a system in which roles can be closed and with evolving into a preventive state, where predictive technologies potentially infringe by data protection.

What are the critical components of effectively guaranteeing a coexistence in enforcing data protection and the AI Act in the "new" EU digital landscape?

What does the AI Act impact the GDPR enforcement and application? How do we need to evaluate the risks to these rights and weigh them against other fundamental rights positions in various assessments. This includes data protection risk in privacy laws in the US. Which is the best of the two, privacy concerns in each region? What do these advancements discuss about the commonality and shared values that exist between the US and EU when it comes to trusted sharing and access to data? Do we do better in the world events to further shape/define these issues?

What unresolved issues exist in the data sharing landscape, and how can they be addressed to promote economic prosperity and protect human rights among like-minded democracies?

In the context of rapidly evolving technological landscapes, what strategies can we employ to effectively manage the immediate demands of data sharing and future challenges?

Facilitating an extractive data political economy. While regulation and established tools for data protection is a topic of frequent discussion. How does the GDPR has emphasised the critical components of effective enforcement, its current practical impact to be seen in close correlation with the "new" AI Act. This panel explores the implications of a system in which roles can be closed and with evolving into a preventive state, where predictive technologies potentially infringe by data protection.

What are the critical components of effectively guaranteeing a coexistence in enforcing data protection and the AI Act in the "new" EU digital landscape?
AI as an Existential Threat to Privacy and Data Protection

Academic ** Business ** Policy **

Organised by CPDP

Moderator: Daniel Hallinan, ITF Karlsruhe (DE)

Speakers: Fanny Hendig, AI Collaborative (BE); Bart van den Slot, Tilburg University (NL); Zoi Kardasiadis, DG Just (EU); Eduardo Ustaran, Hogan Lovells (UK)

The EU – among others – is busily legislating adequate measures to secure privacy and data protection in the face of the AI revolution. The resulting legal frameworks are thus at the heart of heated discussions to determine to what degree privacy and data protection might be effectively protected in the face of a socio-technically increasingly defined by the development and deployment of AI. Beyond these discussions, however, a more ominous idea appears: that AI might pose an existential threat, or a set of existential threats, to the ideas of privacy and data protection – let alone their effective protection. The nature of such threats, and what might be done about them, are core topics to be discussed in this panel.

What is an existential threat to privacy and data protection?

Is such an idea apposite in relation to AI?

How might we go about identifying, and describing, such threats?

How might we address such threats?

The Problems with Client-Side Scanning

Academic ** Business ** Policy **

Organised by CBIE, Meiji University (JP)

Moderator: Kris Shishirah, Irish Council on Civil Liberties (IE)

Speakers: Andrew A. Adams, Centre for Business Information Ethics Meiji University (JP); Eric Bouancheaux Zuckermandl, Topic: Communication Design; Fabian Schmitt, Health Apps; Gema Fernández-Blanco Martín, Topic: Mental Health Apps; Claudio Agosti, Topic: Palestine and shadow banning; Tabea Wagner (Privacy Salon)

On February 15, 2024 the Irish High Court authorised Max Schrems to pursue his meta challenge to the OPC’s data transfers suspension decision. This could lead to a new referral of the case to the CJEU and to Schrems II: in light of the expected legal challenges to the Data Privacy Framework, it is vital to move past slogans and summary discussions of the key issues, to add academic, theoretical, and informed legal perspectives to the public discussions. In its Schrems II decision, the CJEU found two flaws in protections of personal data, the lack of an effective redress remedy and a failure of competent intelligence agencies to respect the principle of proportionality in relation with access to personal data by such agencies. The European Union’s response considered that the recent reforms operated by the US government permitted to be raised by the CJEU and adopted a new adequacy decision in July 2023. This panel will examine the EU-US Data Privacy Framework, and present expert views on both issues. The panel will focus on the main reforms operated by the US in 2022-2023 and will try to assess if the new adequacy decision could pass, this time, the CJEU test. With robust yet respectful debate, this panel will try to clarify the dialogue by trying to clarify points of both agreement and disagreement.

What is the strongest criticism of the new adequacy decision in the EU-US Data Privacy Framework?

What justification may exist for aspects of the restructured array that have been criticized?

What are the strongest criticisms of whether the Data Privacy Framework permitted to fix the CJEU criticism related to the principle of proportionality?

Are these criticisms justified?

Panelists

Responsible AI in Law Enforcement

Academic ** Business ** Policy **

Organised by Europl Data Protection Experts Network (EU)

Moderator: Jan Ellermann, Europl Data Protection Experts Network (EU)

Speakers: Daniel Drewer, Europl Data Protection Experts Network (EU); Maximilian Zschoch, Europl (TBC); EU: AI-EU Anti-Corruption Coordinator (P); Sofie de Kirmse, VUB (BE); Ellis Lannus, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA)(EU)

In the evolving landscape of law enforcement, the interaction of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and data protection presents a critical juncture. The panel convenes experts from various perspectives to unravel the complexities of this intersection from investigations to border security, AI technologies offer unprecedented opportunities to enhance the efficiency of internal security operations. Yet, as these technologies permeate law enforcement practices, the question regarding data protection becomes paramount. With representatives from the EU Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA), the EU: AI-EU Anti-Corruption Coordinator, an esteemed academic from Vrije Universiteit Brussels, and the Head of the Europl Innovation Lab, the panel promises a constructive exploration of perspectives. Amidst calls for transparency, accountability, and fairness, the discussion will navigate the ethical terrain while addressing the intricate details of data protection. By examining the delicate balance between leveraging AI for operational efficiency and safeguarding individual privacy rights, the panel seeks to chart a path towards responsible AI integration in law enforcement, join us we delve into the ethics and data protection, forging a future where AI serves as a force for justice, safety, and privacy preservation.

How can law enforcement agencies ensure that AI algorithms used in investigative processes are fair, unbiased, and respect fundamental rights, particularly regarding data protection and privacy?

What frameworks and mechanisms can be implemented to promote transparency and accountability in the deployment, and use of AI technologies within law enforcement, while simultaneously upholding data protection principles?

In what ways can AI be leveraged to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of law enforcement operations without compromising individual privacy rights or exacerbating existing biases and discrimination?

What role do stakeholders, including government, regulatory bodies, civil society organizations, and the private sector, play in shaping policies and ensuring that the responsible use of AI in law enforcement, with a focus on ensuring compliance with data protection regulations?

The Problems with Client-Side Scanning

Organised by CBIE, Meiji University (JP)

Moderator: Kris Shishirah, Irish Council on Civil Liberties (IE)

Speakers: Andrew A. Adams, Centre for Business Information Ethics Meiji University (JP); Eric Bouancheaux Zuckermandl, Topic: Communication Design; Fabian Schmitt, Health Apps; Gema Fernández-Blanco Martín, Topic: Mental Health Apps; Claudio Agosti, Topic: Palestine and shadow banning; Tabea Wagner (Privacy Salon)

A number of jurisdictions, including the EU, UK and Australia, are seriously considering imposing an unprecedented requirement on providers to end-end encryption for client-side scanning. These proposals raise numerous technical, ethical and human rights concerns which will be presented and discussed by the panel.

What is client-side scanning?

Why are governments considering mandating client-side scanning?

What technical problems does client-side scanning present?

What ethical and human rights problems would a client-side scanning mandate create?

The Governance of Quantum Computing

Organised by CPDP

Moderator: Joris van Hoboken, University of Amsterdam (NL)

Speakers: Matthias Troyer, Microsoft (US); Christian Schaffrath, QuSoft (NL); Aparna Surendra, RIKZ (UK); Marike Hoon, Geneva Science and Diplomacy Assistant (CH)

Quantum computing has attracted increased attention in the last years, with significant private and public investment going into the development of fault-tolerant quantum computers. While it is undisputed that achieving this goal would be a major scientific breakthrough for the 21st century, questions about the practical applications and benefits in relation to classical (super)computing remain. What applications of quantum computing should be anticipated in the current development phase of this new technology and what governance questions and approaches would be in place to steer the use of the technology towards the common good? In this panel, we will take stock of current and planned work in quantum computing research and development and discuss some of the main governance challenges related to this new technology.

What are realistic expectations with respect to the development of fault-tolerant quantum computers?

What are the most promising use cases for quantum computing?

What are possible and appropriate governance responses to address the risks and benefits of this new technology?

How can we ensure equitable access to this technology globally?
Interest objectives. In addition to exploring these risks, the panel will discuss how competition policy and other tools can be used to rein in monopoly power in AI, and ensure the technology works towards the public interest. Topics speakers will discuss include:

Is AI competitive or concentrated? If the latter, what is driving this concentration and how?

What are the harms we should worry about, both today and in future, from concentration in AI?

What role, if any, does AI regulation such as the EU’s AI Act have to play in promoting an open and diverse AI ecosystem?

How can competition policy and related tools help us tackle monopoly power in AI?

### Global Challenges, Global Solutions: Case Studies for International Enforcement Cooperation in Data Protection

**Academic ** Business ** Policy **

**Organised by** Dig Just (LU)

**Moderators**

- Luca Bertuzzi, independent (BE)
- Cristina Caffarra, Centre for Economic Policy Research (UK)

**Speakers**

- Anna Lytra, EDPB (EU); Malte Beyer Katzenberger, European Commission (EU)
- Anna Borghesi, EDPB (EU); Katharina Cseh, Generali Europe (DE)
- Wim Hardyns, Ghent University (BE); Jordan L. Smith, University of Illinois (US)
- Pip Hartley, EDPB (EU)
- Marco Furlotti, EDPB (LU)
- Marta Mocarelli, EDPB (IT)
- Jason Kowarski, European Commission (EU)
- Irene Kamara, Office for the Information Commissioner (KE)
- Mounir Elouadi, General Data Protection Commissioner (LK)
- Immaculate Kassait, Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (AU)
- Camille Gervais, Office of the National Data Protection Authority (CA)
- Marie-Josée Gagnon, Office of the Information Commissioner of Ontario (CA)
- Isabel Barberá, Rhine (NL)
- Christen Köppen, European Commission (EU)
- Michele Amato, Superintendente di Informativa e Libertà (IT)

The EU has adopted a host of new digital laws – including the Data Act, the Data Governance Act, the Digital Markets Act, and the AI Act – that are impacting beyond just its borders and on legislation and its function – as those tasked with, on a day-to-day basis, using and monitoring these specific outcomes. Accordingly, this panel offers a discussion between practicing lawyers as to the significance, consequences, and implications of these new digital laws, and, in this regard, will consider:

- What lawyers are advising their clients on in relation to these new laws?
- Which shifts and consequences lawyers see resulting from these new laws?
- What problems are arising in using these new laws/lawsyers see in these new laws?
- What solutions legal practice offers to these problems?

### Introduction by the AI Act

**Moderator**

- Luca Bertuzzi, independent (BE)

**Speakers**

- Francesco Paolo Levantino, Sant’ Anna School of Advanced Studies (IT); Johan van Banning, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (NL)
- Laurence Karakousis, European University Institute (IT); Nicole Vavoula, University of Luxembourg (LU)
- Francesco Paolo Levantino, Sant’ Anna School of Advanced Studies (IT)
- Johan van Banning, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (NL)

With this panel, the Open Market Institute aims to bring together two debates that have largely been kept separate. The first is the debate on how to counter the growing dominance and co-opting potential risks to control of artificial intelligence. This is enthroning their market power even further, while undermining our ability to create an open, fair, and competitive digital society. This concentration of power in AI not only undermines growth and innovation, but also threatens our privacy, freedom of expression, security and other crucial public interest objectives. In addition to exploring these risks, the panel will discuss how competition policy and other tools can be used to rein in monopoly power in AI, and ensure the technology works towards the public interest. Topics speakers will discuss include:

Is AI competitive or concentrated? If the latter, what is driving this concentration and how?

What are the harms we should worry about, both today and in future, from concentration in AI?

What role, if any, does AI regulation such as the EU’s AI Act have to play in promoting an open and diverse AI ecosystem?

How can competition policy and related tools help us tackle monopoly power in AI?

### Global Challenges, Global Solutions: Case Studies for International Enforcement Cooperation in Data Protection

**Academic ** Business ** Policy **

**Organised by** Dig Just (LU)

**Moderators**

- Luca Bertuzzi, independent (BE)
- Cristina Caffarra, Centre for Economic Policy Research (UK)

**Speakers**

- Anna Lytra, EDPB (EU); Malte Beyer Katzenberger, European Commission (EU)
- Anna Borghesi, EDPB (EU); Katharina Cseh, Generali Europe (DE)
- Wim Hardyns, Ghent University (BE); Jordan L. Smith, University of Illinois (US)
- Pip Hartley, EDPB (EU)
- Marco Furlotti, EDPB (LU)
- Marta Mocarelli, EDPB (IT)
- Jason Kowarski, European Commission (EU)
- Michele Amato, Superintendente di Informativa e Libertà (IT)
- Christen Köppen, European Commission (EU)
- Michele Amato, Superintendente di Informativa e Libertà (IT)

The EU has adopted a host of new digital laws – including the Data Act, the Data Governance Act, the Digital Markets Act, and the AI Act – that are impacting beyond just its borders and on legislation and its function – as those tasked with, on a day-to-day basis, using and monitoring these specific outcomes. Accordingly, this panel offers a discussion between practicing lawyers as to the significance, consequences, and implications of these new digital laws, and, in this regard, will consider:

- What lawyers are advising their clients on in relation to these new laws?
- Which shifts and consequences lawyers see resulting from these new laws?
- What problems are arising in using these new laws/lawyers see in these new laws?
- What solutions legal practice offers to these problems?
Co-governing AI at Work. Insights from Collective Agreements on AI, Affirming Rights, Setting Boundaries

Academic ** Business *** Policy **
Organised by European Trade Union Institute (EU)
Moderator Aida Ponce Del Castillo, European Trade Union Institute (EU)
Speakers Lisa Krieger, UC Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education (US); Clara Helming, AlgorithmWatch (DE); Claudia Agosti, Reversing Works/Verkehrsclub Deutschland (VCD); Rekha Smith IBM Europe (EU); Isabella Barthels, IndudsAI-European Trade Union (EU)

The AI Act will be a key instrument that will impact all workplaces. However, it is important to recognize that there are other mechanisms and instruments, notably collective agreements signed between employers and employees. These agreements, which often predate the AI Act, play a crucial role in governing the deployment and use of AI technologies in the workplace.

The most recent agreement is the Hollywood actors and writers agreement signed with industry players, governing the use of generative AI at sectoral level, setting limits on its use, and establish specific rights. Other agreements also contain concrete examples of how to negotiate the introduction of AI at work. Our panel focuses on extracting valuable insights about what we can learn from the UK and the EU, particularly in terms of negotiating AI-related issues in the workplace.

Speakers will discuss beginning agreements shaping AI governance:

What collective agreements protect workers' rights beyond data privacy laws?
To what extent is technical standardization (or the AI Act) can bring forward the provisions from collective agreements?
What collective bargaining agreements remain for trade unions to incorporate in negotiations?

European AI-powered Solutions to Combat Dengue – How to Implement AI in the Health Sector?

Academic *** Business ** Policy ***
Organised by Department of Innovation and Digitalisation at University of Maastricht (NL) and Healthcare Eastern Flanders (BE)
Moderator Claudia Kwiatkowska, University of Vienna (AT); Daphné Lamirel, Alzheimer Europe (LU); Richard Rak, DIGITALBEIT (BE)

AI is particularly useful in neuroscience because data-driven AI models can analyse complex data to help researchers and health practitioners in diagnosing, treating and preventing brain diseases.

As we speak, researchers are developing health data platforms and AI models to predict whether a person is likely to develop dementia. This enables early treatment, which is crucial in cases of neurodegenerative diseases. However, because of the complexity of AI Governance and the need to ensure that the insights from research and development are accessible to everyone, there is a pressing need to define what exactly the position of researchers is, how they are protected, and how they can participate in the decision-making process.

In this panel, we will look at some of the hard questions that are raised by AI and how our understanding of these questions may evolve as technologies develop. Our speakers will discuss the potential to elevate digital content experiences, for example, by using AI to enhance the immersive experience of online meetings or by creating engaging virtual tours. However, there are also important ethical considerations to be addressed, such as how to ensure that AI systems are fair and transparent and how to protect user privacy.

In this solutions-oriented panel, we will reflect on the operational challenges for implementing AI governance, including EU AI Act compliance. Specific examples will highlight successful practical solutions that can be learnt from sectors such as finance and health where regulation of automated processes and algorithmic systems is established.

Model Risk Management is an established requirement in Financial Services, what are the key practices that can be transferred to AI governance in other sectors?

How will the Harmonised Standards for the EU AI Act build on existing sectoral standards in areas such as medical devices?

Looking beyond purely technology focused discourses, what can we learn from other sectors to help guide how to facilitate mutual recognition of regulatory cooperation practices?

Archives and Data Protection

Academic *** Business ** Policy **
Organised by Open Society Archives (NL)
Speakers Michael Friedrich, Fraunhofer ISI (DE); Al- exander Kashumov, Access to Information Program (CA); Lisa Aaltonen, Loughborough University (UK); Lu- isa Patta, ESPP (EU)

Public archives play an important role in our society by identifying, assessing and preserving documentary materials of long-term value, ensuring accountability of government and other organisations. One of the most important responsibilities of public archives is to preserve and make accessible personal information about individuals, and protection of personal data is one of the most important reasons why recent archive holdings are not accessible. Obviously, there is a fine balance between the objectives of the fundamental value and desire for transparency and accountability on the one hand and the right to privacy and the right to protection of personal data on the other. There are still important uncertainties regarding the practical im- plementation of the GDPR on the ground. The aim of the panel is to explore the perspectives of different interest groups and to discuss how an appropriate balance of interests and rights can be realised.

What experience has gained with practical measures taken to identify and process personal data in archives?
What are the individual responsibilities of the researchers exploring archival documents?
Have there been court cases for violation of data protection rights in archives and how lessons can be learnt from them?

What are the differences between paper-based, audiovisual and electronic documents in this regard and how can AI be used to identify and decide on the accessibility of personal data in archival documents?

Speakers Petr Ritter, Charnitli, eBALKIN-Health Project (DE); Hsin Haraldsen, Daley University Hospita- l (NOS); Lukas Paymann, University of Vienna (AT); Daphné Lamirel, Alzheimer Europe (LU); Richard Rak, DIGITALBEIT (BE)

European AI-powered Solutions to Combat Dengue – How to Implement AI in the Health Sector?

Academic *** Business ** Policy ***
Organised by Department of Innovation and Digitalisation at University of Maastricht (NL) and Healthcare Eastern Flanders (BE)
Moderator Claudia Kwiatkowska, University of Vienna (AT); Daphné Lamirel, Alzheimer Europe (LU); Richard Rak, DIGITALBEIT (BE)

As virtual worlds become more prevalent, we witness another stride in the digital transformation of human interactions. This additional step results in an increased processing of personal data, both in volume and significance. The use of ‘avatars’ within the Metaverse introduces various privacy concerns due to their profound impact on human lives and identities. Avatars may become a full digital identity, overcoming the idea of mere virtual representation, and transition, more or less abstract. From a governance perspective, certain issues warrant further discussion, namely: Is anonymity really possible in the Metaverse? Examining the interactions between users, users and AI and AI and the law, the notion of digital identity in the virtual world and the legal framework surrounding it (e.g. e-IDas). What happens when your avatar lives without your supervision? Personal data created automatically should be located in this legal regime.

The Rise of Avatars: Should We Care About Their Privacy in the Metaverse?

Organised by MetaversaAL Chair (SP)
Facilitator Aurilio Lepiccioni, University of Alicante (ES)

This workshop will be an opportunity to get familiar with the fundamentals of AI governance and get an overview of the current regulatory landscape. In this hands-on workshop, we will learn why it is necessary to implement checks and balances for algorithms to work with AI and privacy in a realistic use case. Share tips and tricks on how to implement FRKA within your organization; Have a Q&A with the developers of FRKA.
How to Audit Algorithmic Risks
Academic ** Business ** Policy
Organised by AlgorithmWatch (DE)

Moderator: Erika Pikvor, Access Now (BE)
Speakers: Natalia Giorgi, ETUC (BE); Thierry Bouvard, HEC Paris (FR); Harry Halpin, Nym Technologies (UK); Jaya Klair Berekke, NyM Technologies (UK); CNIL-India privacy award winner

What should actually be measured, and how? To balance collaboration and independence during audits?

How to fill the gap between a right-based and a risk-based approach? How to foster concrete synergies between data protection, AI regulation and content management to avoid confusion and discrimination or manipulation? How to curb AI-powered surveillance practices? How to navigate the governance maze to achieve effective enforcement? How to activate awareness and engagement via online design?

Moderator Bianca-Ioana Marcu, Future of Privacy Foundation (AT)

Full description

CPDP Academic Session on AI
Academic ** Business ** Policy
Organised by CPDP
Moderator: Jo Pierson, Hasselt University (BE)
Speakers: Filip Ogunde, Governor of Saskatchewan (CA); Eunice Casares, Brunel University (UK); Alanas Wies, HEC Paris (FR); Pablo Marcello Baquero, HEC Paris (FR); David Restrepo Amarillas, HEC Paris (FR); Harry Halpin, NyM Technologies (UK); Jaya Klair Berekke, NyM Technologies (UK); CNIL-India privacy award winner

What should actually be measured, and how? To balance collaboration and independence during audits?

How to capture social, as well as technical, issues? What are thresholds for unacceptable risk? How to balance collaboration and independence during audits?

What are the challenges posed by transnational AI systems, and do current regulatory frameworks help to address them?

What can we learn from international and regional data protection law to facilitate a global approach to AI regulation?

What should actually be measured, and how? To balance collaboration and independence during audits?

How can diverse stakeholders effectively collaborate to balance AI advancement with data protection in smart cities?

How can data governance in smart cities support inclusive and sustainable urban development?

How can we train content ranking algorithms to prioritise content that respects responsible use of AI?

Through a Canadian Lens
Organised by Data Valley/DVIT
Facilitator: Carla Rossi Chauvenet, Data Valley/DVIT (IT)
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Panel on Personal Data in the times of AI

Academic ** Business ** Policy ***

Organised by EDPS

Fanny Coudert, EDPS (EU); Patrick Breyer, MEP (DE)

As Intelligent Artificial Intelligence (AI) continues to advance, it is important to reflect on the role of data protection in the times of AI. The void appetite of AI systems for information, including but not limited to personal data, combined with their ability to perform complex calculations on these data, calls for the need to apply data protection to AI tools. The EDPS aims to ensure the integration of AI into day-to-day lives in a manner that is centered with the rights and freedoms of individuals. Therefore, it is essential to reflect on how data protection can contribute to achieve the desired human-centric AI approach, including the meaningful involvement of personal data in the context of AI. The concept was shaped on the basis of the assumption that anonymisation or the basis of the assumption that anonymisation or the anonymisation of data is necessary for the proper functioning of some AI systems, which have to be developed to govern and control AI and algorithms.

How to interpret the concept of ‘identifiable data’ when AI is involved in governing and controlling AI and algorithms?

What tools and instruments can already be used and which ones need to be developed to govern and control AI and algorithms?

How to start preparing for new legislation when the technology is advancing rapidly?

Understanding AI’s impact on society and ensuring that we are held accountable requires conditions of openness and transparency. The current lack of transparency in the market and the lack of insight into how data systems work is one of the world’s largest tech companies to share data with researchers, and the AI Act follows this with a requirement that these companies provide documents for AI. This is a first step in enabling more far-reaching scrutiny of general-purpose AI models.

What are the ethical implications and dilemmas related to AI-driven offensive cybersecurity, including the potential for automated attacks, accuracy, and responsible use?

What are the technical challenges associated with the use of AI in offensive cybersecurity, including the potential for automated attacks, accuracy, and responsible use?

What is the current state of research into establishing reliable performance-based evaluations?

Cybersecurity is an ever-evolving field, with artificial intelligence (AI) becoming a pivotal player in both offensives and defenses. The use of AI in offensive cybersecurity has the potential to revolutionize the tactics and strategies employed by malicious actors, while also enhancing the capabilities of security professionals in detecting and combating cyber threats. The promises and pitfalls associated with the integration of AI and offensive cybersecurity are the central focus of this panel. This panel aims to bring together a diverse group of experts, including academics, practitioners, and policymakers to discuss the multifaceted landscape of offensive cybersecurity empowered by AI. The discussion will delve into the ethical, legal, and practical challenges and technical challenges associated with the use of AI in offensive cybersecurity, including the potential for automated attacks, accuracy, and responsible use.
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What is the current state of research into establishing reliable performance-based evaluations?
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What are the ethical implications and dilemmas related to AI-driven offensive cybersecurity, including the potential for automated attacks, accuracy, and responsible use?

What is the current state of research and development in the field of AI-driven offensive cybersecurity?

What are the technical challenges associated with the use of AI in offensive cybersecurity, including the potential for automated attacks, accuracy, and responsible use?

What is the current state of research into establishing reliable performance-based evaluations?
The Intersection of AI and Regulation: How Organisations and Regulators Should think about Innovation, Compliance & Users’ Rights

Academic * Business ** Policy ***

Organised by (Org.

The papers will be discussed by the jury made up of: Facilitator Sophie Stalla-Bourdillon, Brussels Privacy Hub & Brussels Institute for Advanced Research (CA), Sophie Stalla-Bourdillon, Brussels Privacy Hub (BE); Svetlana Yakovleva, De Brauw (NL); Burcu Kilic, Kardasiadou, EU Commission (EU); Sibylle Pouillaude, University Paris-Panthéon-Assas (FR). The EPDP Young Scholar Award, organised by the European Data Protection Review (EDPR), is an annual award given to students and young researchers in the early stages of their career. The panel will feature the authors of two of the 2023 competition's most promising research papers, and discuss it with the Award's Jury of renowned data protection experts. The panel will conclude with the arrival of the winner of the award ceremony.

Bilgezu Sumer, Ku Leuven (BE): AKA’s Exclusion of Biometric Verification: Minimal Risk by Design & Default?

Sibylle Pouillaude, University Paris-Panthéon-Assas (FR): Harmonising the AKA's Right to Be Forgotten: Navigating New Speech Regulation?

Moderators: Rafaela Nicolazzi, Google (IT); Speakers Yann Padova, Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Chance (US); Natascha Geiger-Kirschbaum, CEP (DE); Saedvand Le Grand, European Data Protection Board Secretariat (FR); Grégoire Girardin, OECD (FR); David Sacco, Governor General of Canada (NL);

This workshop aims at engaging the CPDP community in order to flag the different privacy issues that arise when interacting with artificial intelligence technologies. This CPDP activity is organized by the Brussels Institute for Advanced Research (CA) in cooperation with Lexxion Publisher (DE), and will feature contributions from industry, research and regulatory experts. The panel will discuss: ‘How can we design and assess decentralized architectures?’. This includes identifying possible risks, opportunities, and challenges, comparing technologies to support such architectures. It includes designing a scorecard that can provide insights on how to design and assess decentralized architectures.

This workshop aims at engaging the CPDP community in order to flag the different privacy issues that arise when interacting with artificial intelligence technologies. This CPDP activity is organized by the Brussels Institute for Advanced Research (CA) in cooperation with Lexxion Publisher (DE), and will feature contributions from industry, research and regulatory experts. The panel will discuss: ‘How can we design and assess decentralized architectures?’. This includes identifying possible risks, opportunities, and challenges, comparing technologies to support such architectures. It includes designing a scorecard that can provide insights on how to design and assess decentralized architectures.

General Session Panel

TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION

How to build decentralized data architectures for federated data governance

Organised by Brussels Privacy Hub (BE)

Moderated by Sophie Stalle-Bourdillon, Brussels Privacy Hub (BE)

A recent industry trend favours decentralized data architectures over the centralized data lakes and warehouses built for AI and analytics. This creates challenges, but also opportunities for data governance and data management practitioners. This panel will discuss the use of a new Canadian software analyzing medical images with AI techniques could raise.
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Victims’ Rights in the Digital Age...

Data subjects. In order to give greater weight to the interests of the data controller and not the controllers, i.e. in case of doubt their legal design follows... Consent forms are usually formulated by the data controller. In order to explore the future of data governance, policymakers, and digital rights advocates to address... These sensitive issues are often treated as opposing age-based abuse, child sexual exploitation, and trafficking... can ongoing workers’ resistance connect with, and empower those workers and the local communities affected.

What is the current state of legal protection for individuals vis-a-vis the state in administrative procedures. AI should not be used to the detriment of individuals and their rights without their ability to effectively challenge decisions disadvantaging them. Within this context, the panel will discuss various critical perspectives on the use of AI in administrative procedures, including human rights and principles of good administration...

What is the current state of legal protection for individuals vis-a-vis the state in administrative procedures by policy law?

What are the limits of the right to good administration in respect to public administrations, including human rights and principles of good administration?

What should we do about these limits?

Can individual legal explanations be transferred to data transfers is embedded in the language of controllers and processors. But the reality of the digital economy is increasingly driven by the need to manage vast volumes of data flows, with the data and tech economy. Who and how do we build data transfers, this panel will discuss how to maintain continuity of service whilst mitigating risk over current norms. And with AI involving similar complexity - from training data developers, to application designers, to business deploying those applications the panel will consider the lessons arising from the GDPR and data governance more generally.

What are the accountability lessons arising from the GDPR and data governance regarding data transfers?

How can these lessons be transferred to AI?

The AI-act and GDPRs enforcement mechanism have similarities, such as national supervisory authorities, a European Artificial Intelligence Board (similar to the GDPR) and corrective measures such as high turnover based fines and bans on processing. Against this background this panel asks which lessons should be learned for effective enforcement of the AI-act?

Can synergies be found between the GDPR and the AI-act contribute to a better system of enforcement in the AI-act?

Is a risk-based approach the way to go for enforcing the AI-act?

What are the key elements of an effective system of enforcement?

What does the experience of GDPR enforcement teach us about effectively enforcing open norms?
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AI Act Regulatory Learning and Standards: Sufficient to Protect Fundamental Rights?
Academic ** Business ** Policy **
Organised by ADAPT Centre at Trinity College Dublin
Moderator Dave Lewis, ADAPT Centre (IE)
Speakers David Filip, Huawei (CZ); Tatjana Evas, DG CNECT (EU); Siebre Ahern, Trinity College Dublin (IE); Sven Schads, Joint Research Centre (EU)

With the political agreement on the AI Act now in place, the spotlight shifts to its technical implementation. Technical standards need to be quickly established, harmonised and adopted by all developers and the certification and market surveillance authorities that will oversee them. The Act requires harmonised standards be put in place, and European standards bodies such as CEN/CENELEC JTC2, are examining systems of emerging AI standards from bodies such ISO/IEC JTC1 SC42. This must be done in a way that can accommodate the accelerating change in AI technologies and applications and the wide variety of learnings that may come from regulatory experimentation through sandboxed and field trials in different high-risk areas. This panel will begin to explore how the complex network of standards and regulatory bodies can cooperate with stakeholders to build a reliable regulated market for AI.

- Which forms of regulatory learning, such as sandbox boxes, will be the most useful in understanding how technical standards can effectively protect fundamental rights?
- How will horizontal technical standards harmonised to the AI Act be adapted to the varying health, safety and fundamental rights protection of the different vertical high-risk areas?
- How can stakeholder-led regulatory learning from AI act sandboxed and user tests be fed back effectively into the standardisation revision process where stakeholders are often absent?
- Will the regulatory learning on fundamental rights protections from different domains and states risk fragmenting the consensus underpinning standards and disrupting the free movement of certified product across and into the single market?

Exploring AI Red-Teaming: an Open Loop Policy Prototyping Workshop
Organised by Meta (EU)
Facilitator Laura Galinda, Meta (IE); Maarja Nugteren, Meta (UK)

Over the past years, there has been increased regulatory emphasis on the role of red-teaming in AI risk management. The EU AI Act requires adversarial testing of general purpose AI, the UK identifies red-teaming as an emerging process for frontiers AI safety, and the INOAI-MA-Process recommends red-teaming as part of AI risk management programs. But while awareness around the potential of AI red-teaming practices is rising, there is still a lack of standardized best practices to design and implement red-teaming efforts. This workshop presents a unique opportunity to explore the concept of generating AI red-teaming and its applications in mitigating privacy and security risks associated with AI systems. Through a collaborative policy prototyping approach and sector-specific use cases, participants will engage in “hands on” design and in-depth discussions to identify real-world challenges and ideate potential solutions leveraging AI red-teaming approaches.

AI and Data Protection in the Rising Voices of the G20
Academic ** Business ** Policy **
Organised by CPDP Latin America
Moderator Filipe Medon, CST-FGV (BR)
Speakers Luca Belli, Center for Technology and Society at FGV Law School (BR); Smitra Parshera, CyberBRICS Project (IN); Melody Musoni, ECDPM/Facilitator Online Policy Prototyping and Cooperation Organization (SA)

The rapid growth of Generative Artificial Intelligence is posing numerous challenges to Data Protection legislations and to their enforcement in the Rising Voices of the G20 countries, which include members of the BRICS+ grouping of countries. Despite providing significant advantages, these technologies also present enormous risks. Regarding data protection, there are several concerns, notably about the training of Large Language Models, which remain unsolved. The panel plans to address normative initiatives regarding the regulation of AI, focusing also on the current responses given by Data Protection Authorities, and exploring challenges from the perspectives of the rising voices of the G20 countries. The speakers will address the ongoing regulatory efforts of the grouping, including the Brazilian AI bill, the Indian approach to data governance and digital public infrastructure, the African Union approach to AI, and the emergence of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf countries as key AI players.

- How are the “rising voices” of the G20 countries addressing GenAI?
- How are Data Protection Authorities responding to violations?
- What strategies can regulators and stakeholders adopt to promote the development of AI without jeopardising fundamental rights?
- To what extent can risk-based AI regulatory frameworks help address current regulatory deficiencies?

Full description on page 61-63
TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION

Digital devices technologies (DDTs), such as wearable sensors, video and voice recordings, bear strong potential for monitoring symptoms of chronic diseases, including those as Parkinson’s Disease (PD). This could facilitate a more personalized and higher quality treatment in the future. As part of the EU-wide project DGDPI, we confirmed this potential using data from three different cohort studies in Luxembourg, Finland, and Germany. Data processing using artificial intelligence allows inferring disease symptoms and their progression. We found that DDTs, which collect large amounts of data during use, are highly capable of providing information for diagnostic purposes. We explored the interplay between the LED and the GDPR and is going to examine challenges in the application of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) that those already raised in current cases in front of or in the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU). How can the rules of the LED be implemented and transposed in the EU Member States? How can the LED ensure respect for the rule of law despite the lack of a transparency obligation? Is the LED equipped to tackle the challenges brought by the digital transposition? How does the EU approach data processing for law enforcement purposes in light of post-Brexit developments?

Panel: Data Protection: Legal Uncertainty Despite EU Regulation

Organised by University College London (UK)
Facilitator: Dr Michael Veale & Nahide Basri, University College London (UK)
Speakers: Darian Meacham, Maastricht University (NL); Monica J. McDaniel, Visual Law (IViR), University of Amsterdam (NL); Laurids Nymann, Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens (NL); Felix Reda, MPlegal (GR); Vagelis Papakonstantinou, MPlegal (GR); Indra Spiczer Gun, Döhnmann, University of Co- legue (DE); Juliano Marrahan, EU (IT); Sophie Stal- is-Bourdillon, Brussels Privacy Hub (BE)

The future of EU’s AI Act being secure by now, even if in the risk of now, it is moment to sol- emnly, assess where it stands, particularly in rel- ation to personal data protection. The relationship of AI with data protection is a tense one by defi- nition, AI being essentially protective while data protection restrictive: AI increases exponentially data processing, and it is currently deserted by it, while data protection rules places limitations and restrictions.

Academic ** Business * Policy ***
Organised by CDSL (BE)
Moderator: Franciscus Dumortier, CDSL-VoB (BE); Michael Veale, UCL (UK); Kristina Irion, Institute for Information Law (IViR) (NL)
Speakers: Darian Meacham, Maastricht University (NL); Laurids Nymann, Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens (NL); Monica J. McDaniel, Visual Law (IViR), University of Amsterdam (NL); Vagelis Papakonstantinou, MPlegal (GR); Indra Spiczer Gun, Döhnmann, University of Colegue (DE); Juliano Marrahan, EU (IT); Sophie Stalis-Bourdillon, Brussels Privacy Hub (BE)

The modelling of AI and data protection: legal uncertainty despite EU regulation

Organised by University College London (UK)
Facilitator: Dr Michael Veale & Nahide Basri, University College London (UK)
Speakers: Darian Meacham, Maastricht University (NL); Laurids Nymann, Autoriteit Persoonsgegevens (NL); Monica J. McDaniel, Visual Law (IViR), University of Amsterdam (NL); Vagelis Papakonstantinou, MPlegal (GR); Indra Spiczer Gun, Döhnmann, University of Colegue (DE); Juliano Marrahan, EU (IT); Sophie Stalis-Bourdillon, Brussels Privacy Hub (BE)

The future of EU’s AI Act being secure by now, even if in the risk of now, it is moment to sol- emnly, assess where it stands, particularly in rel- ation to personal data protection. The relationship of AI with data protection is a tense one by defi- nition, AI being essentially protective while data protection restrictive: AI increases exponentially data processing, and it is currently deserted by it, while data protection rules places limitations and restrictions.
Beyond ‘Solidarity with #TaylorSwift’: Checking Progress in the Fight Against Gender-based Online Violence

Organised by LeWeb

Moderator: Gloria González Fuster, LSTS/VUB (BE)
Speakers: Catherine Van de Heyning, University of Antwerp; Elisa Jakobsen, EDRI; Birgitta Francischini, European Commission (EU); Karine Melchior, European Parliament (EU)

The EU has finally adopted new rules against gen-
der-based violence, including on the non-consen-
sual sharing of intimate or manipulated material, cyber stalking, cyber harassment, and cyber in-
citement to violence or hatred. The Digital Servic-
es Act aimed to be in place, imposing obliga-
tions on very large online platforms and very large
online search engines in relation to gender-based
violence. The Act foresees transparence require-
ments for ‘deep fakes’, a phenomenon that made
Dina Journou, Vice-President of the European Com-
mission, tweet about her solidarity with Taylor Swift and all the victims of abuse and false in-
temate that is often branded as ‘despicable acts of
digital violence’. In the meantime, however, online
gender-based violence — arguably as old as the In-
ternet — remains seemingly as insidious and seri-
ous as ever. This panel will investigate recent de-
volutionary developments to assess their potential for effective change.

What will be the new Directive on com-
battling violence against women and domestic vi-

ence make?

What difference will the new Directive on com-
battling violence against women and domestic vi-

ence make?

How to strike a balance between the precautions
and the freedoms of expression?

Can we find a balance between national security
considerations and the need for transparency and
responsible AI development?

What is the current state of AI in gender-based
violence cases?

Can the new rules protect women from online
violence?

How can we ensure that women are protected from
online violence?

What role can the EU play in preventing online
violence?

What steps are being taken to address gender-based
violence online?

What can the EU do to prevent online violence?

What is the current state of AI in gender-based
violence cases?

What will the new Directive on combating
violence against women and domestic violence
make?
The panel discusses how institutional entities can actively guide AI developers to comply with, for example, existing non-discrimination regulations. From the perspective of both industry and academic institutions, legal protection, what are the implications of decentralizing decisions regarding fundamental rights, and what issues might result in or introduce?

How can normative disputes be settled when performing fundamental Rights Impact Assessments (FRIAs) in AI development?

What is the role of regulatory bodies in providing guidance for resolving normative challenges regarding AI fairness?

What is “algorithmic fairness” and how can it contribute to more fair AI decisions?

When researchers propose digital infrastructures, and research protocols deploy their results to a broader public, what are the main questions around their legitimacy, legal scope, and implications?

We reflect on two cases: COVID-19 contact tracing protocols, and their transfer to low and middle-income countries (LMICs). These regulations were centred on public money, but often surrounded by private interests. In a further example, we approach the question of data protection: how can (and should) public goods be studied, how can and should researchers, funders, policymakers think about, intra-frastructural interventions in this workshop, we invite attendees to reflect on the current state of affairs of research and policy. The aim is to identify what actions are needed by researchers, funding bodies, and policy makers, to redirect research efforts such that digital public goods public, benefiting the majority rather than the few.

The question arises, as to whether the number of cases of poor or bad AI decisions. By relying on procedural rules rather than substantive decisions, the regulator avoids making the corresponding (difficult) compliance. At the same time, these regulations perform as bureaucratic burdens? Will we achieve AI is designed and governed in ways that encourage and support our collective humanity, and we shall how grassroots, community-led and inter-sectional ideas of 1 and collective care create a possibility model for governance frameworks that move beyond punitive and excursive caseloads and towards redress, repair and healing?

What is the availability of substantial research into how deepfakes will impact Black women and explore what this reveals about governance frameworks that encourage and support our collective humanity?

How can Black women’s leadership, lived experiences, technical expertise and cultural craft help ensure AI is designed and governed in ways that encourage and support our collective humanity?

How can grassroots, community-led and inter-sectional ideas of abundant justice and collective care create a possibility model for governance frameworks that move beyond punitive and excursive caseloads and towards redress, repair and healing?

This panel will explore how legal and statistical concepts of anonymisation apply to synthetic data. Panelists will discuss whether the concept of anonymisation is a binary or a spectrum, where synthetic data fits within that, and what methods are available to quantify the identifiability of synthetic data. The panel will also explore the concept of privacy-preserving data and whether this concept has a role in reducing the risk of AI.

How can privacy be preserved in synthetic AI systems, and what are the implications for the future of AI research?

What is the concept of “algoprudence” and how can it contribute to making AI decisions more fair and just?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?

What does the AI Act entail in this respect?
TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION

This workshop presents the application of playfulness and gamification toward empowering political agency among voters and citizens taking political action. Participants will engage with these topics in three stages: theory, context, and prototyping. In the first stage, we will discuss and establish principles of playfulness and gamification, with particular interest in the distinction between these ideas. In the second stage, through tried-and-tested playful activities, participants will experience these principles, develop their own value judgments, and in particular evaluate their relevance to political, media, and digital literacy contexts. Finally, participants will apply these observations to imagine novel implementations of playfulness or gamification in their work. This interactive, stepwise process equips participants with tools to support digital, media, and political literacy initiatives, and provokes consideration on how technical research can have impact.

Where are we heading? Looking into the EU Strategy for Data through the Lens of AI and Data Protection

Organised by: Meta (US)
Moderator: Cecilia Alvarez, Meta (ES)
Speakers: Luca Bolognini, Italian Institute of Privacy (IT); Peter Criddecke, Keller and Heckman (BE); Bob van Eijk, Future of Privacy Forum (NL); Patricia Vital, Uni Menendez (ES)

The European Strategy for Data aims at creating a single market for data. The Strategy states that data is an essential resource for economic growth, competitiveness, innovation, job creation and societal progress. It points out how the availability of data is a prerequisite for the development of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Given the cross-cutting nature of AI, how can Europe foster AI-driven innovation and competitiveness, leverage data responsibly, while ensuring equitable access and benefits? Drawing on the recent regulatory developments, this panel will assess to what extent the current data protection debates are congruent with the EU’s aspirations and explores ways forward.

How can Europe foster AI-driven innovation and competitiveness, leverage data responsibly, while ensuring equitable access and benefits?

What are the conditions under which artificial intelligence may be effectively leveraged as a regulatory tool for compliance with existing and anticipated data-related regulations?

What technological, legal and normative challenges may arise in implementing such technological solutions?

To the extent AI is harnessed to regulate the development and deployment of AI technologies, what may be the impact on the interplay between public and private domains (and regulatory powers)?

What may be the interplay between AI-driven compliance and other compliance methods? What regulatory innovative solutions may emerge or resurface, as a result of such interplay?

AI and Elections: Disinformation, Deepfakes, Dystopia?

Organised by: EPIC (US)
Moderator: Calli Schroeder, EPIC (US)
Speakers: Colin Bennett, University of Victoria (CA); Cornelia Kutterer, Considerate (BE); Maria Villegas Bravo, EPIC (US); Elmar Wähe, DG CNECT (EU)

AI’s rapid development and wide-spread availability has prompted an explosion of promises about the technology’s potential and warnings of its serious risks. Those risks are increasingly feared when we look at the dangers of AI’s impact on elections. From deepfakes and dis and misinformation to security risks and scams, AI is making it nearly impossible for individuals to determine what is true and is having devastating impact on election integrity worldwide. In a year with over 64 countries holding national elections, not to mention the hundreds of regional and local elections, some key questions arise:

Is this a different kind of election crisis or an expansion of already-existing risks?

What existing legal and social protections may be useful to addressing AI election harms? Can laws, risk assessments, policies, or social pressure assist?

What new measures do we need?

Regulating AI through AI

Organised by: Center for Cyber, Law and Policy, University of Haifa (IL)
Moderator: Bülent Leblebi, University of Bologna - academia, law and AI (IT)
Speakers: Frederico Oliveira da Silva, BELUCE (BE); Jery Spanakis, Maastricht University (NL); Sofia Rincé, Tilburg University (NL); Eldar Haber, University of Haifa (IL)

The rapid developments of AI technologies and use-cases are transforming the social condition and thus challenge contemporary regulatory regimes. National and supranational authorities are in the process of devising new standards, rules, processes and institutions for governing risks in this fast-revolving environment. The panel will discuss “AI By Design”, namely the role AI may play in the assessment of AI governance. In particular, we will question the potential of AI technology in assisting evidence-based regulation, platform monitoring and automated compliance analysis.

Mindful of the unique features of AI governance, including its underlying business models, trans-jurisdictional nature, the multiple legal fields engaged and the technological challenges involved in risk assessments, the panelists will examine the arising questions from the legal, computer science, policy, and industry perspectives, in order to assess possible ways to address the challenges.
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Apple
Apple revolutionized personal technology with the introduction of the Macintosh in 1984. Today, Apple leads the world in innovation with iPhone, iPad, Mac, Apple Watch and Apple TV. Apple’s five software platforms — iOS, iPadOS, macOS, watchOS and tvOS — provide seamless experiences across all Apple devices and empower people with breakthrough services including the App Store, Apple Music, Apple Pay and iCloud. Apple’s more than 100,000 employees are dedicated to making the best products on earth, and to leaving the world better than we found it.

Microsoft
Microsoft enables digital transformation for the era of an intelligent cloud and an intelligent edge. Its mission is to empower every person and every organization on the planet to achieve more.

Google
Google's mission is to organize the world's information and make it universally accessible and useful. Through products and platforms like Search, Maps, Gmail, Android, Google Play, Chrome and YouTube, Google plays a meaningful role in the daily lives of billions of people and has become one of the most widely-known companies in the world. Google is a subsidiary of Alphabet Inc.

TikTok
TikTok is the entertainment destination where the everyday meets the extraordinary. Discover, watch, create, and share what you love with a global community. We take the privacy and security of the people who use TikTok seriously. We're working toward charting a new course for the industry when it comes to data security, and we're reflecting this in our evolving approach to European data sovereignty.

Meta
Meta builds technologies that help people connect, find communities, and grow businesses. When Facebook launched in 2004, it changed the way people connect. Apps like Messenger, Instagram and WhatsApp further empowered billions around the world. Now, Meta is moving beyond 2D screens toward immersive experiences like augmented and virtual reality to help build the next evolution in social technology.

European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS)
The European Data Protection Supervisor is an independent supervisory authority, with responsibility for monitoring the processing of personal data by the EU institutions, Member States, non EU countries and other national or international organisations.

Ernst and Young
EY exists to build a better working world, helping to create long-term value for clients, people and society and build trust in the capital markets. Powered by data, technology and an extensive partner ecosystem, our diverse EY teams in over 150 countries provide trust through assurance and help clients grow, transform and operate. Working across assurance, consulting, law, strategy, tax and transactions, EY teams ask better questions to find new answers for the complex issues facing our world today.

Mozilla
Mozilla's mission is to promote openness, innovation and opportunity on the web. We produce the Firefox web browser and other products and services, together adopted by hundreds of millions individual internet users around the world. Mozilla is also a non-profit foundation that educates and empowers internet users to be the web’s makers, not just its consumers. To accomplish this, Mozilla functions as a community of technologists, thinkers, and builders who work together to keep the Internet alive and accessible.
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Bird & Bird LLP is an international law firm which supports organisations being changed by the digital world or those leading that change. We combine exceptional legal expertise with deep industry knowledge and refreshing creativity, thinking, to help clients achieve their commercial goals. We have over 1,400 lawyers strong, we bring our personal passion and legal prowess to bear on five continents, Squire Patton Boggs provides unrivalled access to expertise.

Altius knows the Belgian and European legal scene inside-out. Pragmatic, professional and personal, every lawyer on the 30-plus team brings their own brand of passion and expertise to the job at hand. At ALTUS, we do legal differently. Going the extra mile and challenging the status quo is the way we work with every colleague, client and business partner. Our service is unique in today’s legal space. Open minds and bold ideas – that’s what makes us so much more than great lawyers.

Hogan Lovells International LLP

Straight talking. Thinking around corners. Understanding and solving the problem before it becomes a problem. Performing as a team, no matter where we’re sitting. Delivering clear and practical advice that gets your job done. Our 2,500 lawyers work together, solving your toughest legal issues in major jurisdictions. The team is embedded in our clients’ TMT practice (Technology Media and Telecoms), and, as a result, the members have a thorough understanding of information technology and data communication networks. The team is involved in data governance protection projects for national and international clients, covering a broad range sectors, such as media/entertainment, finance, communications, industry and transport, consumer goods, government and healthcare. Typical projects include privacy health checks, corporate data exchange and monitoring programs and policies.

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY partners with leaders around the world to fuel missions, knock down barriers and shape markets. With 20+ locations globally, our team works seamlessly across practices, industries and geographies to deliver highly effective—and often unexpected—solutions that propel success. More than 1,400 lawyers strong, we bring our personal passion and legal prowess to bear in every matter for our clients and the people they serve.

Squire Patton Boggs

Squire Patton Boggs is one of the world’s strongest integrated law firms, providing insight at the point where law, business and government meet. The firm delivers commercially focused business solutions by combining legal, lobbying and political capabilities and invaluable connections on the ground to a diverse mix of clients from long-established leading corporations to emerging businesses, startup visionaries and sovereign nations. With more than 1,500 lawyers in 47 offices across 20 countries.
Deep within the impressive architecture of our new location, we bring you the CPDP Culture Club. It is a place to escape to for a while, to take a break and immerse yourself in a programme of art, books, book talks, and coffee.

**WEDNESDAY 22ND MAY**

**11.50**
Movie: The Wizard of AI
organised by Privacytopia

**12.00 to 18.00**
Avatar.FM
organised by Privacytopia

**13.05**
CPDP Book Club: The Vestigial Heart: A Novel of the Robot Age

**14.15**
Artist Keynote: Rebekka Jochem

**16.00**
Feminist Book Club: Feminist AI

**20.20 - Cinema Room**
Pecha Kucha
organised by Architempo

**THURSDAY 23RD MAY**

**11.50**
Book Launch: Regulating the Synthetic Society
organised by Privacytopia

**12.00 to 18.00**
Avatar.FM
organised by Privacytopia

**13.05**
CPDP Book Club: Governing Cross-Border Data Flows: Reconciling EU Data Protection and International Trade law

**16.00**
Feminist Book Club: Feminist Cyberlaw

**20.30 - Brasserie de la Senne**
The CPDP.ai Mozilla Party: "ai" is Japanese for "love"
organised by Mozilla

**FRIDAY 24TH MAY**

**10.30**
Movie: The Computer Accent
organised by Privacytopia

**11.50**
Artist Keynote: Francis Hunger
organised by DATAUNION PROJECT

**12.00 to 18.00**
Avatar.FM
organised by Privacytopia

**13.05**
CPDP Book Club: Guardianrails: Guiding Human Decisions in the Age of AI

**16.00**
Feminist Book Club: When Rape Goes Viral: Youth and Sexual Assault in the Digital Age

**17.20**
All Tomorrow’s Laws (IViR Science Fiction and Information Law Competition)
organised by IViR & DIGICON

**20.20 - Brasserie de la Senne**
The CPDP.ai Mozilla Party: "ai" is Japanese for "love"
organised by Mozilla
TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION
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focused on organizing educational and cultural events, conferences, and festivals. The first one was held in Belgrade in 2011, revolving around technological, art, and politics. However, we soon realized that simply gathering and being inspired wasn’t enough when real issues arose. Especially in Serbia and the region, we lacked the capacity to respond effectively. So, we gradually shifted from being a mere event organization to focusing more on investigative work, monitoring, advocacy, and policy. We also formed a team capable of responding to cyber attacks and conducting cyber forensics to assist in digital investigations. Even after those years, the organization continues to play a significant role, particularly in the region, and it’s part of a larger European network of similar organizations. I’m happy with how it has evolved. Although I’m not directly involved anymore, I’m glad to have kick-started it in some way.

What do you hope the foundation achieves, like what is the main goal of the foundation?

Vladan Joler: I think our main goal is to continue existing and to play the role we have. Being based in Serbia, we face many difficulties in the political and economic sphere. I think it’s really important that in Southeast Europe, we have an organization that has the capacity to raise a flag when there’s something wrong, one that can act as a small political glue in the digital sphere. So, I think the more it exists, the more good it’s doing.

Even though you’re no longer heavily involved in Share Foundation, you find it interesting that you’re also a founder and professor, juggling between roles. How do you manage both, and do you enjoy each role?

Vladan Joler: Yes, that’s my usual position—to be in between roles, in a way, in between disciplines, in between fields. I am sometimes labeled as an artist, sometimes as an activist, and sometimes as a media theorist. I really enjoy being in such a situation in which you don’t need to put yourself in some kind of box and label your work in a certain way. That’s the idea. Being in between gives you a certain freedom and flexibility not to get stuck because each of those roles has its own rules, and being in between gives you the possibility to play with all of those rules or hierarchies to create your own space.

When you’re working on projects such as Artificial Intelligence, what inspires you and how does it affect the way you design things?

Vladan Joler: Basically, I created my own investigation methodology. I’m just trying to find a way to see through numerous opaque layers of contemporary technological systems. So, I’m usually starting with the investigation process and then I’m transforming the results of investigation into narratives. In most cases, those narratives are manifested in the form of cartography. Basically, for me, those maps are some kind of multi-dimensional storytelling devices. Sometimes they are used as educational material, sometimes exhibited in museums and galleries. I find it incredibly exciting to explore those complexities hidden behind contemporary technological planetary-scale systems and try to visualize them. One of the problems we have is that we still don’t know how to speak about those kinds of relations that exist within those systems. For example, we still don’t know how to understand labor in the age of AI or how to understand labor in the context of those new extractive practices. How can we connect the past with the present? How can we understand these new and old forms of colonial relations? This is what excites me—I try to find a way to visualize that and to create new keys to understand those realities.

Speaking of AI, have you come across specific design elements or concepts that you consider effective or captivating in conveying complex topics such as AI?

Vladan Joler: We’re situated in an accelerated present, overwhelmed with notifications and information. So, it’s really hard to even reflect on this situation. I think the maps that I was doing is really amazing to me is that this project is still one of the most exciting ones that I ever did. We tried to shift the focus from thinking about the relationship between society and technology into the thinking about the relationship between humans, technology, and nature. Once you start to include nature into the equation, the questions and issues are completely different. Then you need to think about new and old forms of exploitation, new and old forms of extractivism. And I’m really happy that I had a chance to do that. What is really amazing to me is that this project is still relevant after many years. Unfortunately, the problems that we dealt with has not changed. We’re situated in an accelerated present, overwhelmed with notifications and information. So, it’s really hard to even reflect on this situation. I think the maps that I was doing is really amazing to me is that this project is still one of the most exciting ones that I ever did. We tried to shift the focus from thinking about the relationship between society and technology into the thinking about the relationship between humans, technology, and nature. Once you start to include nature into the equation, the questions and issues are completely different. Then you need to think about new and old forms of exploitation, new and old forms of extractivism. And I’m really happy that I had a chance to do that. What is really amazing to me is that this project is still relevant after many years. Unfortunately, the problems that we dealt with has not changed.

Approximately how long does it take to do these investigations?

Vladan Joler: The last one, “Calculating Empires”, took us almost 4 years to finish, but usually it’s not less than two years.

What about the anatomy of AI?

Vladan Joler: Around two years, but it’s hard to say when the investigation begins and when it ends. For example, just the middle of the Anatomy of AI is basically something I was learning how to do five years, but then it took another two years to understand the other parts of the map. So it’s hard to say when one of those maps is ending and the other one is beginning. I’m looking now from the perspective of almost 15 years of doing those maps, and I see them as one process. For example, Anatomy of AI is basically one line in Calculating Empires, but then the one line in Anatomy of AI is also the result of the investigations before that. So for me, all of those maps together are one multidimensional story.
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Vladan Joler: I published “Anatomy of AI” in 2018, in collaboration with Kate Crawford. I think that project is still one of the most exciting ones that I ever did. We tried to shift the focus from thinking about the relationship between society and technology into the thinking about the relationship between humans, technology, and nature. Once you start to include nature into the equation, the questions and issues are completely different. Then you need to think about new and old forms of exploitation, new and old forms of extractivism. And I’m really happy that I had a chance to do that. What is really amazing to me is that this project is still relevant after many years. Unfortunately, the problems that we dealt with has not changed. We’re situated in an accelerated present, overwhelmed with notifications and information. So, it’s really hard to even reflect on this situation. I think the maps that I was doing is really amazing to me is that this project is still one of the most exciting ones that I ever did. We tried to shift the focus from thinking about the relationship between society and technology into the thinking about the relationship between humans, technology, and nature. Once you start to include nature into the equation, the questions and issues are completely different. Then you need to think about new and old forms of exploitation, new and old forms of extractivism. And I’m really happy that I had a chance to do that. What is really amazing to me is that this project is still relevant after many years. Unfortunately, the problems that we dealt with has not changed.

What about the anatomy of AI?

Vladan Joler: Around two years, but it’s hard to say when the investigation begins and when it ends. For example, just the middle of the Anatomy of AI is basically something I was learning how to do for five years, but then it took another two years to understand the other parts of the map. So it’s hard to say when one of those maps is ending and the other one is beginning. I’m looking now from the perspective of almost 15 years of doing those maps, and I see them as one process. For example, Anatomy of AI is basically one line in Calculating Empires, but then the one line in Anatomy of AI is also the result of the investigations before that. So for me, all of those maps together are one multidimensional story. 
Speaking of these maps, would you say that creativity is an important aspect when creating them, how do you balance creativity and communication especially when addressing complex topics such as AI?

Vladan Joler: Yes, nevertheless, it’s important to understand that maps are not objective. Every map carries biases; it has a projection, a language, and a classification system chosen by the cartographer or artist. So, there is no neutral or objective map. I use them to create my own story. I am creating the map from my own perspective of the world. I am defining the rules, dimensions, classification system, and visual elements. So, essentially, I am trying to narrate a story with it. However, you should always be cautious about how you do this. Going too deep into multiple dimensions can confuse the viewer. It’s a delicate balance between conveying your story and not getting lost in complexity to the point where the message isn’t transmitted. Yet, what’s fascinating about maps and cartography is that it’s not a linear narrative like a movie or essay. It’s more like creating a space. At the end, once the map is published, you don’t have control over how people will use that space.

Maybe different interpretations as well?

Vladan Joler: What I appreciate about maps as a medium is their non-linearity. They allow people to read them in their way. While you can suggest where to start and use visual language to guide them, ultimately, each viewer will interpret the maps differently. What I also enjoy is the density of information you can embed in them. For example, in a geographical map with villages, nobody will read the names of each village by one. Instead, they try to find a path or use the map for something important to them. This openness to interpretation is what I find fascinating about this medium. We always pair a map with an essay, which offers another perspective on the map but doesn’t have to be the only perspective. It’s a form of storytelling for me; it’s closer to some kind of open-world game than a movie.

Would you say they’re linked?

Vladan Joler: If I’m looking into the black box, then I’m trying to see the black box from different angles. So, for example, a technical investigation is one possible angle. But when you look at the same black box from the point of legal investigation, you get different information. So, for one map or one drawing, I’m using many different types of investigations, from strictly technical to some more abstract, artistic, or philosophical. The choice of the investigation method is directly related to the question you’re asking. So, if you’re, for example, asking what something is working, then you can probably get an answer with a technical investigation. But when the question is what kind of power is required to build and operate an Amazon Echo device, maybe there’s a different angle to it. There is no neutral way of looking at these things. Every map represents a different dimension.

Could you talk to us about your investigation process, how does it go?

Vladan Joler: It’s one thing to look into the black box, then it’s another thing to be able to see the black box. For example, a technical investigation is one possible angle. But when you look at the same black box from the point of legal, you get different information. So, for one map or one drawing, I’m using many different types of investigations, from strictly technical to some more abstract, artistic, or philosophical. The choice of the investigation method is directly related to the question you’re asking. So, if you’re, for example, asking how something is working, then you can probably get an answer with a technical investigation. But when the question is what kind of power is required to build and operate an Amazon Echo device, maybe there’s a different angle to it. There is no neutral way of looking at these things. Every map represents a different dimension.
To GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION — everybody. Only condition is we do not accept tra —

people telling us that it is a pity we could not sub —

py that they were brave enough to publish sci —

nal Internet Policy Review. So, I am incredibly hap —

y about 50. From all over the world, including con —

in the first one we go think

It's tricky. Sometimes I feel like I am liv —

ing in the middle of a sci-fi story. I mean, if we are talking at what is possible with generative AI and the discussions we are having about automated journalism, machines crawling the internet, we are in the middle of it. It is also interesting to see that some projections of sci-fi writers still must come true. For example, when we talk about AI and sci-fi authors thought about the future of journalis —

and who enjoy seeing the bigger picture and look —

ning in the middle of a sci-fi story. I mean, if we are talking about

at what is possible with generative AI.

Kimon: It’s really something. I know I'm looking forward to that too. And ideally all three winners will be going to present at

CPDP so you can meet real authors.

Tabea Wagner for CPDP: How long you been working in the writing competition? How long did you think very much in terms of feasibility. So, we must not injure a human being or, through inaction, allow a human being to come to harm. A robot must not lie except when to do so is necessary in order to achieve that which is forbidden to the robot by the First or Second Law. Asimov is a sci-fi and not in a parliament, so it is important to make this distinction.

It can be super interesting to dive into sce —

narios about the topic this year?

Natali: I think the only hard condition this year is that it must be a story that plays in the future where you develop certain characters and where there is a clear link to law and how would they change. This could be privacy law, copy —

right, law platform, governance, AI and act and pret —

ly much everything related to the production, dis —

tribution and consumption of information which in our digital age is everything. It is very broad.

What was your experience so far? What were the stories about? What was that stood out specifically? Was it difficult to de —

cide?

Kimon: This year we had really good, really beau —

ful stories. Some were in the middle of a sci-fi story. It was even harder because the diver —

sity was not recognisable anymore. All the stories were enga —

ging also from a qualitative standpoint with suspense, it was fun.

It sounds that sounds really cool. Can we ac —

cess those stories after the conference? Do you publish all of them or just the winners?

Natali: Yes, we will publish the three finalists on the SciFi 4 Law website. We also have a cooperation with the digital constitutionalist, which is an online sci —

blog. We also plan to make a little ebook from the three winning stories of all three competitions, which will be available online for free. And at CPDP we invite all three finalists to read from their sto —

ies. We invite the CPDP participants to come along and engage with our authors and in discussions about their stories, but also to talk about informa —

tion law and the future of technology.

And the winning story will also be turn into a sci-fi Mirror stories.

Kimon: Yes, yes. By our corporation partner. We do not know how we will look like yet, so it will be a super interesting reading. We will put them online on a headline and then work through the story.

Can you tell us already something about the three winners or is that still secret?

Natali: We have 3 winners, and we will announce the rank order of course at the CPDP event to have still a bit surprise. One of those stories is called "Bad bot" by Jason Fernandes (New York), ”Lagrange point shadow" by Andy Neale (New Zealand)

"I pressed the damn button, but the screen stayed black" by Leyvi Saari (Amsterdam). To give a brief summary: Good Bot is a really exciting story about a lawyer who is working with a bot called case pilot that gives legal advice for a case he is working on. The story is very well written because it has this dialogue between the main character and the bot. It runs into a multi-layer story where the person who was accused also used different AI systems that then leads to confusion. It real —

ly dives into the complex and different AI systems and how they interact. And there is a surprising end.

Then we have “Lagrange Point Shadow” which is playing in Rwanda. It tells a story about universal law. The idea here is that a universal law is intro —

duced that is applied in different countries. The idea here is that a universal law is intro —

duced that is applied in different countries. The idea here is that a universal law is intro —

duced that is applied in different countries.

The third one is a story that I pressed the damn button, but the screen stayed black" by Leyvi Saari (Amsterdam). It is a story about a robot that needs to engage with a negative consequence. If this is applied to the main character, which is then brings up this issue of looking at differ —

te perspectives and cultural perspectives. That comes into play when we deal with universal law.

The third story “I pressed the damn button, but the screen stayed black” is a vision of a divided society where we have a periphery of people not profiting from or not being included in a digital —

ized AI society. There is a certain group of people in a dystopian society which is then brings up this issue of looking at differ —

te perspectives and cultural perspectives. That comes into play when we deal with universal law.

The story then revolves around a government official who is working on. The story is very well written because it has this dialogue between the main character and the bot. It runs into a multi-layer story where the person who was accused also used different AI systems that then leads to confusion. It real —

ly dives into the complex and different AI systems and how they interact. And there is a surprising end.

The main character is in a situation when he needs to engage with a negative consequence. If this is applied to the main character, which is then brings up this issue of looking at differ —

te perspectives and cultural perspectives. That comes into play when we deal with universal law. It is a tool to think and to debate and also to bring people from different disciplines together.

For example, during the last competition we had a group discussion on a set of legal articles, which is not a typical legal article. We invite the CPDP participants to come along and engage with our authors and in discussions about their stories, but also to talk about informa —

tion law and the future of technology.

Natali: Yes, yes. By our corporation partner. We do not know how we will look like yet, so it will be a super interesting reading. We will put them online on a headline and then work through the story.

Can you tell us already something about the three winners or is that still secret?

Natali: We have 3 winners, and we will announce the rank order of course at the CPDP event to have still a bit surprise. One of those stories is called "Bad bot" by Jason Fernandes (New York),”Lagrange point shadow" by Andy Neale (New Zealand)

"I pressed the damn button, but the screen stayed black" by Leyvi Saari (Amsterdam). To give a brief summary: Good Bot is a really exciting story about a lawyer who is working with a bot called case pilot that gives legal advice for a case he is working on. The story is very well written because it has this dialogue between the main character and the bot. It runs into a multi-layer story where the person who was accused also used different AI systems that then leads to confusion. It real —

ly dives into the complex and different AI systems and how they interact. And there is a surprising end.

Then we have “Lagrange Point Shadow” which is playing in Rwanda. It tells a story about universal law. The idea here is that a universal law is intro —
duced that is applied in different countries. The idea here is that a universal law is intro —
duced that is applied in different countries. The idea here is that a universal law is intro —
duced that is applied in different countries.

The third one is a story that I pressed the damn button, but the screen stayed black” by Leyvi Saari (Amsterdam). It is a story about a robot that needs to engage with a negative consequence. If this is applied to the main character, which is then brings up this issue of looking at differ —
te perspectives and cultural perspectives. That comes into play when we deal with universal law. The third story “I pressed the damn button, but the screen stayed black” is a vision of a divided society where we have a periphery of people not profiting from or not being included in a digital —

ized AI society. There is a certain group of people in a dystopian society which is then brings up this issue of looking at different perspectives and cultural perspectives. That comes into play when we deal with universal law.

The third story “I pressed the damn button, but the screen stayed black” is a vision of a divided society where we have a periphery of people not profiting from or not being included in a digital —

ized AI society. There is a certain group of people in a dystopian society which is then brings up this issue of looking at different perspectives and cultural perspectives. That comes into play when we deal with universal law.
Avatar.fm will amplify stories and testimonies from the young and new generation of privacy, data protection, AI, and computer scientist heads. Avatar.fm will feature an amazing lineup of guests. She’ll connect fifty sets and concerts by numerous dublab favourites

For CPDP.ai, Privacy Salon and community radio station dublab are teaming up for Avatar.fm, a temporary radio project broadcasting live from CPDP.ai during three consecutive days. Giving a voice to the young and new generation of privacy, data protection, AI, and computer scientist heads, Avatar.fm will amplify stories and testimonies from the young and new generation of privacy, data protection, AI, and computer scientist heads. Avatar.fm will feature an amazing lineup of guests. She’ll connect fifty sets and concerts by numerous dublab favourites.

The radio program will be hosted by Savannah, and Interludes. The first two days will be concluded by two live acts in front of the Avatar.fm studio at Gare Maritime Brussels. The first day we have the pleasure to immerse ourselves into Ugnè Uma’s melismatic and intertextual cosmos, while the second day we’ll be enchanted by Ben Bertrand’s clarinet and countless machines.

The first day we have the pleasure to immerse ourselves into Ugnè Uma’s melismatic and intertextual cosmos, while the second day we’ll be enchanted by Ben Bertrand’s clarinet and countless machines. Tune in online at www.dublab.de or drop by for an interactive experience with up-and-coming and established artists from renowned organizations such as the Chaos Computer Club, Europe’s leading association of Computer science students.

The Digital Period is a public philosophy project by Judith Zoë Blijden. She critically examines values and principles underlying our society by looking at how these values have been translated in technologies and concrete examples in the form of creative interventions. These interventions facilitate different people to talk, think, and, more importantly, organise around solutions that help us move forward, both on the individual and on the collective level.

Judith Zoë Blijden is a legal philosopher based in the Netherlands. Her aim is to raise awareness and understanding about the impact of technology. She wants to do so by translating information into narratives in which everyone and anyone can partake. She currently works as a Senior Policy Officer Digital Transition at the Social and Economic Council of the Netherlands. Her role is to research the impact of technology and assess what policies could be enacted to mitigate risks and unlock opportunities from a societal perspective. Judith was a Landecker Democracy Fellow (2022-2023).

The impact of technology on society has been a central theme in her work. Judith has worked as a consultant, consulting on legal and policy issues regarding the use of technology while working at the Dutch consultancy firm B/P/HQ. During her time as a consultant, Judith was a board member for the digital rights organisation Bits of Freedom. She has also worked for the Dutch NGO Kennisland and the European NSG Communia Association where she focused on improving access to information and (digital) culture.

Judith Zoë Blijden and Rayen Mitrovich organised the Activists of Tech podcast shifting the narrative from Big Tech to Responsible Tech by sharing & archiving the work of change makers. Activists Of Tech is a seasonal weekly podcast that amplifies and archives the work of activists, thought leaders, trailblazers, academics, and practitioners of responsible tech, and empowers guests and listeners by centralizing their voice and sharing their story. Shifting the narrative from Big Tech to responsible tech takes honesty: this is a "say it as it is" type of podcast, and no topic is too taboo not to be named and addressed. The topics covered encompass a variety of responsible tech areas and focus on social justice, AI harm, AI bias, AI regulation and advocacy, minorities in tech, gender equality tech and democracy, social media, and algorithmic recommendations, to name a few. We also talk about solutions and how to make tech inclusive and beneficial for all.

Organised by Mélissa Mradidi-Kechichian

The Activists of Tech podcast is shifting the narrative from Big Tech to Responsible Tech by sharing & archiving the work of change makers. Activists Of Tech is a seasonal weekly podcast that amplifies and archives the work of activists, thought leaders, trailblazers, academics, and practitioners of responsible tech, and empowers guests and listeners by centralizing their voice and sharing their story. Shifting the narrative from Big Tech to responsible tech takes honesty: this is a "say it as it is" type of podcast, and no topic is too taboo not to be named and addressed. The topics covered encompass a variety of responsible tech areas and focus on social justice, AI harm, AI bias, AI regulation and advocacy, minorities in tech, gender equality tech and democracy, social media, and algorithmic recommendations, to name a few. We also talk about solutions and how to make tech inclusive and beneficial for all.

Organised by Mélissa Mradidi-Kechichian

The Security Distillery is an initiative from students for students. We aim to turn complex issues into simple matters in order to provide quality, accessible information for students and researchers. In the dynamic field of security studies, we intend to differentiate the essence of complicated issues into digestible amounts of comprehensive information, without oversimplifying or losing nuances. Our content is structured regionally and thematically, ranging from cybersecurity to terrorism, and from Asian to Central American politics.

Organised by Mario Dolores Garcia Penillas

The Security Distillery is an initiative from students for students. We aim to turn complex issues into simple matters in order to provide quality, accessible information for students and researchers. In the dynamic field of security studies, we intend to differentiate the essence of complicated issues into digestible amounts of comprehensive information, without oversimplifying or losing nuances. Our content is structured regionally and thematically, ranging from cybersecurity to terrorism, and from Asian to Central American politics.

Organised by Mario Dolores Garcia Penillas
Feminist Book Club

Every Day | Cinema Room

Book: Feminist AI
Organised by LSTS
Author: Anna Goniadis, Plixavra Vogiatzoglou (UnAm)
Discussants: Almira Borbela Perez (Dini-Matta), Sarah Chandler, Elisabetta Biasin (KU Leuven)
Organised by Feminist Cyberlaw

22nd May • 10:00 • Cinema Room

24th May • 17:20 • Cinema Room

When Rape Goes Viral: Youth and Sexual Assault in the Digital Age
Organised by LSTS
Author: Chander, Elisabetta Biasin (KU Leuven)
Discussants: Anaïs Bordes Perez (Uni Malta), Sarah Chandler, Elisabetta Biasin (KU Leuven)
Organised by Feminist Cyberlaw

22nd May • 10:00 • Cinema Room

24th May • 17:20 • Cinema Room

Moderator Anastasia Karagianni

Anastasia is a Doctoral Researcher at LSTS-VUB and FARI Scholar, living in Belgium. Her research focuses on divergences of gender discrimination in AI regulatory frameworks. She holds a bachelor’s in law and a master’s degree from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki in International and European human rights law, while she spent one year as an Erasmus student at KU Leuven. She co-founded the civil society organisation DATAWO-Base in Greece- which is dealing with gender inequality issues in the digital era. Specifically providing legal counselling on digitally-facilitated gender-based violence, such as image based sexual abuse, cyber stalking, sexualised deepfakes, gender bias in AI, and access to information about health and reproductive rights.

Tabea Wagner for CPDP: Can you tell me a bit about the project you are supervising at the CPDP? How did you come to the Book Club?

Anastasia: I am very glad and thankful that I received this invitation from Thierry, from Privacy Salon! Back in 2018 and after my master’s studies at KU Leuven, I had the opportunity to be a visiting researcher at Privacy Salon. So, I have been affiliated with Privacy Salon since then- same with the CPDP (since 2019) when I was working with the Professor Rosamunde. What was the idea behind it for you? What is your motivation for joining?

I think my motivation is the reason why I was invited to this book club is because when I started my research here, I started an initiative, a reading group which is called the Gender, Law and Technology. I started this initiative because I realized that I need to gain more academic knowledge around these issues. And I thought that the university, this academic environment is the best place to interact with other researchers. I have access to books, to literature and I wanted to create this time and space to interact with other people to change my views and ideas on some topics. And of course, I wanted to raise awareness on gender issues in academia because unfortunately, not so many people are aware of feminism and gender equality etc. if you think about it, the university is a thumbnail of the society. So somehow gender stereotypes might be replicated in the university. Having said that, I think Thierry somehow detected my passion for reading books and different papers, and he invited me to moderate three sessions in the CPDP book club.

I also want to go a little bit more into detail about the sessions that you’re going to moderate.

I’ve chosen these three books because they are newly released. For instance, the “Feminist Cyber Law” will be published in June. All of them are quite fresh, let’s say. They provide a fresh view of what is happening right now in the field. To begin with, the reason why I chose the book titled “When Rape Goes Viral” is because the author is dealing with such an interesting topic of sexualised deepfakes and how deepfakes can be generated and manipulated based on youth images. She emphasises the impact that deepfakes have on the psychology and the social life of teenagers. There was a hearing in the Congress of the United States over alleged online harms to children, who unfortunately have died following sexual exploitation or harassment via social media. Unfortunately, manipulation of deepfakes based on youth images is a phenomenon in the USA. And I think not only in the USA, but also in Europe and in other geographical areas. We acknowledge that social media platforms have a huge responsibility on that. And we as a society have to deal with that. We have to address this from a regulation perspective. This is what we will discuss in the book session.

The second book I picked up is titled “Feminist Cyber Law”. I really liked its topic which is dealing with cyber law, but from a feminist perspective (Hallelujah!). It was a hallelujah moment when I discovered this book. This book addresses properly how gender, race, sexuality, disability, class, and the intersections of those identities affect cyberspace and the laws that govern it.

The third book is the “Feminist AI”. It deals more broadly with AI issues like gender bias and...
TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION

This opens a whole new space for online rights. For instance, deepfakes are generated and manipulations in this context, do you have examples here as well?

I think this is a great opportunity for someone to attend a combination of different topics in order to have an overview of what is at stake now in the area of digital (including AI) technologies, but from a feminist perspective: which is missing or not at all at the top of the agenda.

Going a little bit into the CPDP topic “to govern or to be governed, that is the question” what is your personal approach on this from a feminist point of view?

Going a bit more into deepfakes and possible regulations in this context, do you have samples here as well?

Deepfakes can be used as a kind of extortion. Their generation sometimes is based on non-consensual sharing of intimate images. For the reference, extortion is when someone is asking a sexual favor based on personal data that they hold, and threatens the person who is depicted in this audiovisual content. If the threat comes through deepfakes, it is to be aware and gain more knowledge about what is happening on deepfakes, feminist cyber law and feminist AI.

And I highly recommend our sessions, they will be informative and inclusive for all!

What made you choose the feminist approach to AI in this specific Book Club?

I remember last year attended CPDP and there were not so many panels around feminism and gender equality in AI. Of course, I don’t mean that was one year only but realised that society is raising up these issues more and more and we have to acknowledge that there are some needs that should be covered. Through the Book Club we acknowledge this need of the society. So yeah, even if they are male attendees and not feminists themselves, feminism is an issue not only for femininities and women, but for the whole society, for all us. We all have a mother, a sibling or a friend, a female colleague, a female friend. We live in this society, we co-live in this society with all these needs, so we have to listen to them, be aware of their needs, if we want to live in a better society.
CODE 2024

CODE 2024 is an international programme organized by IMPAKT [Centre for Media Culture] in Utrecht and Werktank, production platform for media art in Leuven in collaboration with international partners like NB SCHOOL NEVERS, Privacy Salon and the CPDP (Computers, Privacy and Data Protection conference).

CODE was initiated in 2021 as a response to growing concerns that we are losing agency over the digital tools and platforms we use on a daily basis. We believe in the need for better laws and legislation that will protect us as digital citizens and consumers. By creating creative and artistic interventions, our aim is to influence public policy on a national and international level and to create awareness for issues at hand. We want to inspire and facilitate cross-disciplinary collaborations, which have the potential to catalyze system change. CODE 2024 will be the fourth edition. In the past three editions we supported almost 80 artists and non-artists to work together and create projects. We also brought together national and European politicians and experts in interviews, panels and presentations, and we presented our projects at international events including Ars Electronica, transmediale, Dutch Design Week, MozFest House, Public Spaces Conference, republica, Dutch Media Week and the Computers, Privacy and Data Protection (CPDP) conference. The projects produced, the talks and the many interviews we had with politicians, policy-makers and activists can be found at code.impakt.nl

Location you’ll find CODE 2024 on the first floor of Maison de la Poste

INFLORESCENCES, 2023
Organised by Privacytopia
Artist Sabrina Ratté
Multimedia integration Guillaume Arseneault
Sounds Roger Tellier Craig

Inflorescences is an installation comprising four looping videos with sound and four sculptures. The project unfolds in a hypothetical future where plants, mushrooms, and unfamiliar creatures have undergone mutations to coexist symbiotically with long-abandoned electronic waste. These life forms emerge from what is perceived as inert and forgotten remnants but continue to evolve and foster new relationships with the ecosystem. The depicted world is devoid of humans, yet its evolution is shaped by the remains they left behind. Obsolete electronic devices discovered in various locations have been digitally scanned using 3D scanning applications and imported into animation software. Here, these fragments of reality transition into a future where nature and technology converge symbiotically. Utilizing the same software, the creatures, generated with a video synthesizer, take on three-dimensional forms. This creative process allows for the emergence of organic and unpredictable shapes reminiscent of floral or fungal mutations. These protrusions seem to emerge from the objects, occasionally borrowing their colors, textures, or materials, thus becoming a living extension of the discarded waste.

The four sculptures are crafted from electronic waste sourced from local recycling facilities. They incorporate screens and lights reminiscent of the entities depicted in the videos, offering a glimpse into the potential future of these discarded objects.

Sabrina Ratté is a Canadian artist based in Montreal. Employing a diverse set of technical tools, such as 3D scans, analog video synthesizers, and 3D animation, her formal approach serves as the foundation for creating intricate ecosystems that manifest across various platforms. This spans from interactive installations to series of videos, digital prints, sculptures, or virtual reality. Exploring the convergence of technology and biology, the interplay between materiality and virtuality, and the speculative evolution of our environment, her work is influenced by the domains of science fiction, philosophy, and theoretical writings.
Can you tell us a bit more about what really inspired the project and how truly does it fit into the wider context of the current political landscapes?

Andy Sanchez: As I mentioned, I'm a chemical engineer, and this project was a way to use technology in an effective and ethical way. We aimed to create places for audiences, whether audiences in industry sectors, to really enrich that process has been a great work. Our greater university at Inholland, as we are incredibly dedicated to affecting political opinion. And we're really excited with the final product, which has a really inspired the project and how truly does it fit into the wider context of the current political landscapes?

So Andy you'll be hosting a workshop at CPDP this year, do you also actually curate, did you ever consider curating?

Amber Macintyre: Speaking of projects, you're also involved in trying to use technology in an effective and ethical way. It's really about someone's own choice when they engage people in playful activity. This project was really an ongoing project where we were really able to own bringing up making decisions with data and who decides what we collect and whether it's ethical or not. It's really about someone's own choice when they engage people in playful activity.

Susannah Montgomery: So, Susannah, you've talked about your digital world and that influence industry. How did you become involved with Tactical Tech and how did you get into coding?

It was built on the premise that Cambridge Analyti- cal Tech, which is a project examining how private chemical engineering to utilize the history, pedago- gy, and legal frameworks of that discipline to illu- minate challenges in technology. The ultimate goal is to make those challenges more tangible, more concretely to help us understand how to approach the im- pulse. So, rather than going from a historical per- spective or a legal perspective, fabricated applies an interdisciplinary approach. Can you tell us a bit more about what really inspired the project and how truly does it fit into the wider context of the current political landscapes?

Amber Macintyre: The idea was to look at elections and the way they work in different language into this research was actually as I first started working with Tactical Tech, which is a project examining how private chemical engineering to utilize the history, pedago- gy, and legal frameworks of that discipline to illu- minate challenges in technology. The ultimate goal is to make those challenges more tangible, more concretely to help us understand how to approach the im- pulse. So, rather than going from a historical per- spective or a legal perspective, fabricated applies an interdisciplinary approach. Can you tell us a bit more about what really inspired the project and how truly does it fit into the wider context of the current political landscapes?

Amber Macintyre: The idea was to look at elections and the way they work in different languages. How did you become involved with Tactical Tech and how did you get into coding?

Amber Macintyre: The idea was to look at elections and the way they work in different language into this research was actually as I first started working with Tactical Tech, which is a project examining how private chemical engineering to utilize the history, pedago- gy, and legal frameworks of that discipline to illu- minate challenges in technology. The ultimate goal is to make those challenges more tangible, more concretely to help us understand how to approach the im- pulse. So, rather than going from a historical per- spective or a legal perspective, fabricated applies an interdisciplinary approach. Can you tell us a bit more about what really inspired the project and how truly does it fit into the wider context of the current political landscapes?
think’s important is that we bring in well-rounded perspectives. So bringing in folks from NGOs etc. Generally, social good is at the heart of what we’re trying to accomplish with projects. I think our core unifying theme is creating a sense of feel like a lot of our big partners there, there’s just something to be said for chemistry. If your reliabilities and data and you really work together, you want to keep working together well.

Andy, can you walk us through the structure and the content of the project? Like how do games, puzzles, and interactive installations truthfully illustrate the concept of transparency and tackling digital misinformation?

Andy Sanchez: It’s a really interesting approach that we’re trying to take where we’re choosing which components you want to interact with, and still really have a lot of data to review and to process, which we want to be able to filter it by the type of companies. And at some point I have a list of 500 companies, and it looks like it was a very qualitative and more in-depth review of what the participants will be able to find in this exhibit, they won’t be able to find all of them.

Susannah Montgomery: It’s a really interesting way to do this, I think. I have a lot of experience in this area. I just really want to find any one of these and that really sense, I think they don’t have a lot of information and that’s going to make a really valuable tool for your work.

Amber, what do you see as the main challenges and the main perks of working on such a project?

Amber Macintyre: I think for me, my own personal challenge is going to be the public impact. I think the final thing that I really like about transparency and accessibility and being able to make that decision that was just social dynamics, but the ways in which those components you want to interact with, and still really have a lot of data to review and to process, which we want to be able to filter it by the type of companies. And at some point I have a list of 500 companies, and it looks like it was a very qualitative and more in-depth review of what the participants will be able to find in this exhibit, they won’t be able to find all of them.

Susannah Montgomery: It’s a really interesting way to do this, I think. I have a lot of experience in this area. I just really want to find any one of these and that really sense, I think they don’t have a lot of information and that’s going to make a really valuable tool for your work.

Amber Macintyre: I think for me, my own personal challenge is going to be the public impact. I think the final thing that I really like about transparency and accessibility and being able to make that decision that was just social dynamics, but the ways in which those components you want to interact with, and still really have a lot of data to review and to process, which we want to be able to filter it by the type of companies. And at some point I have a list of 500 companies, and it looks like it was a very qualitative and more in-depth review of what the participants will be able to find in this exhibit, they won’t be able to find all of them.
The Exactitude of Maps

The project was originally initiated by Rebekka Jochem and Felipe Fonseca Schmidt. Rebekka is a designer located between Essen and Brussels, and her work often centers on the power relations around digital technologies. Felipe is a Brazilian activist turned researcher who has been involved with collaborative projects for a couple of decades. Tim Courtyn is a sound artist and performer from Antwerp who takes inspiration from symphonies, nature and the absurdity of being and turns it into new sensory experience, we invite listeners to experience the data layer connected to most urban spaces. Specifically, we worked together with the sound artist Tim Courtyn, to sonify (translate into an audio representation) user reviews and star rankings of the different pins on a digital map. By abstracting the data into sound and creating this new sensory experience, we invite listeners to consider how their individual use of navigation apps translates into a bigger picture of the city that can reveal a lot about its inhabitants and what they might do.

Looking at it from an urban planning point of view, for example, it can be really lucrative to know where the motivation came from. For a different context of cities, digital maps in particular. That’s why we chose for our attendees touch upon include cultural venues, restaurants, a playground... there is a lot to explore it seems. That’s a great metaphor you used for problem-solving. In a different feeling when they use their navigation app and need to approve their privacy settings for example. Maybe they’ll pay closer attention to who benefits from their data. This can be tricky because these results often act as a sort of plaster that can be easily instrumentalized by people in power. At the same time, root causes stay hidden and often don’t change at all. In a different sort of design practice, that I would also count this project to take a different approach. Sonifying the data points changes power relations in the way that listeners might have a slightly different feeling when they use their navigation app and need to approve their privacy settings for example. Maybe they’ll pay closer attention to who benefits from their data.

Can you go a little bit more into detail about what came out of this project? Maybe explain it to someone who has never heard of it before.

Rebekka: The Exactitude of Maps is a geo-located soundscape, which the listener can explore to experience the data layer connected to most urban spaces. Specifically, we worked together with the sound artist Tim Courtyn, to sonify (translate into an audio representation) user reviews and star rankings of the different pins on a digital map. By abstracting the data into sound and creating this new sensory experience, we invite listeners to consider how their individual use of navigation apps translates into a bigger picture of the city that can reveal a lot about its inhabitants and what they might do.

Looking at it from an urban planning point of view, for example, it can be really lucrative to know where more or less pins are, or in what part of the city lots of new ones are popping up, or where they have particularly good ratings. All kinds of conclusions can be drawn from the accumulated data and to make this more tangible is the idea.

Can you explain what the walk will be like? How long does it take?

Rebekka: It’s not a traditional audio walk where there’s a specific storyline to follow but more a soundscape that you can explore on your own terms. People can start whenever they like at whatever point on the map. For CPDP we had adapted the soundscape onto the real location around Tour&Taxis so that as you walk, you will hear the sounds corresponding to your exact surroundings.

A natural environment where you can walk through for a minute but also an hour if you want to take a break. The walking points that you chose for your attendees touch upon include cultural venues, restaurants, a playground... there is a lot to explore it seems.

That’s super interesting. I can’t wait to try that.

Rebekka: Yeah, it’s fun. Tim also did an excellent job.

The CODE2023 project ended with ABS Elektronica in Linz and the IMPAKT festival in November. Usually, this also marks the end of the individual projects. What made you decide to develop it further?

Rebekka: We liked the project, and it was great to go on the road with it during CODE2023 in its previous installation format. But then there was always this audio walk in the back of our minds that was still waiting to be made. In the end, we decided to invest the last fee that we got from the Impakt festival into working with a sound artist to make it happen. Now we have Tim, who got really excited and nearly about it too, and infused the whole concept with his composing magic - so that was awesome. After this, we were looking for an occasion to show it and CPDP seemed perfect.

Can you go a little bit more into detail about what came out of this project? Maybe explain it to someone who has never heard of it before.

Rebekka: The project was originally initiated by Rebekka Jochem and Felipe Fonseca Schmidt. Rebekka is a designer located between Essen and Brussels, and her work often centers on the power relations around digital technologies. Felipe is a Brazilian activist turned researcher who has been involved with collaborative projects for a couple of decades. Tim Courtyn is a sound artist and performer from Antwerp who takes inspiration from symphonies, nature and the absurdity of being and turns it into weird noise, dreamy dreampop, searing punk or soothing synthesizer drones.

The Exactitude of Maps

The project was originally initiated by Rebekka Jochem and Felipe Fonseca Schmidt. Rebekka is a designer located between Essen and Brussels, and her work often centers on the power relations around digital technologies. Felipe is a Brazilian activist turned researcher who has been involved with collaborative projects for a couple of decades. Tim Courtyn is a sound artist and performer from Antwerp who takes inspiration from symphonies, nature and the absurdity of being and turns it into weird noise, dreamy dreampop, searing punk or soothing synthesizer drones.

That’s a great metaphor you used for problem-solving. In a way, regulations [can also be plasters] are the plaster and the artist’s role is to tackle the root and visualize it. Or in this case, to sonify it.

Rebekka: True!

So do you think tackling privacy issues from both sides like this can provide full-functioning solutions?

Rebekka: I mean, I don’t know if I believe in full-functioning solutions but I do think we need to try! Making people have a better understanding
of what’s actually going on is critical for everyone in a democratic process. I think at the moment data protection can be extremely overwhelming to care about as a user, also because many of us are also so dependent on digital tools in our daily lives. What I think is particularly dangerous is how quickly it becomes extremely normal to share ever more intimate information with these companies. It’s crazy if you look at it in detail.

We need more people to actively listen. I really like your project and that people can emerge into it, not just look at it and walk past it, but really walk through it and experience what happens even if their geolocation is turned off.

Rebekka: As a designer, it’s an interesting challenge working with personal data because it can be quite abstract. At the same time, it is extremely characteristic of who you are. Location data is one of the hardest sorts of data to anonymize because where people go and when they go there is so characteristic that it’s really easy to trace back to individuals. That’s scary but also kind of beautiful. In a sense, the navigation app is the one where you can really see “OK my location is on.” and how granular it works, but researching geo-location data it becomes clear that even if you have your location switched off, your phone is quite easy to locate using cell tower and WiFi data. I read about an experiment where a stationary, dormant phone that ran nothing more than the basic Android system received over 12 location requests within an hour. It seems as soon as you carry a smartphone, you’re part of it.

To govern, or to be governed, that is the question. Do you have a prediction or a wish for the future when it comes to location data?

Rebekka: I mean— it’s not going to go away. It’s so embedded in digital tools that that’s clear. I just hope that, in the spirit of the CODE project, users will be able to reclaim their digital agency. It’s really about developing digital products that function on the basis of enacting power with users, rather than over them.

Every Day
13.00 – 15.00
Gare Maritime
The Exactitude of Maps – Audio Walk
Organised by Rebekka Jochem and Felipe Fonseca Schmidt in collaboration with the sound artist Tim Courtyn
The “Exactitude of Maps” is a soundscape that represents the data layer interwoven with the urban landscape. By sonifying user reviews and rankings taken from digital maps and linking them to their physical locations, the project enables listeners to wander through the virtual heat map of the city revealed by aggregated user data. When turning into this new sensory experience, listeners are invited to consider who has access and who profits from this detail-rich, live representation. What is the relationship between users, who generate data by adding their businesses, uploading their travel photos, or leaving reviews, and the platform providers that can monetize this?

The project will be accessible at the CPDP location via the echoes.xyz app throughout the conference.

1 Download & Install the echoes.xyz app. Links
2 Start the “Exactitude of Maps” audio walk. Link:
3 Explore at your own pace.

Joost Rekveld
Joost Rekveld is an artist who wonders what humans can learn from a dialogue with the machines they have constructed. In a form of media archeology, he investigates modes of material engagement with devices from forgotten corners in the history of science and technology. The outcomes of these investigations often take the shape of abstract films that function like alien phenomenologies. He has been teaching in various capacities on the intersection between interdisciplinary arts and the exact sciences since 1996. Since 2017 he has been affiliated to the School of Arts University College Ghent (KASK) as an artistic researcher.

Hiba Harchaoui for CPDP: With your roles as an artist, filmmaker, researcher, curator, and teacher, how do you balance these diverse responsibilities, and do you find fulfillment in having such a range of varied work?
Can you walk us through your thought process when making a film? How do you transform the findings from your investigations of old machines or devices into these captivating images in your films?

Joost Rekveld: From my point of view these are different aspects of one and the same thing: the fundamental nature of the technology, since developing these technologies were done in order to do mathematics. It is a composition solely consisting of these line patterns. Each line pattern is a 'transformation of line patterns' which have been involved on a research on a larger scale. It was an important project for me, spanning about four years of work, developing new programming languages, and conducted historical research. This way of working became more or less a main part of my projects and the film was widely shown in festivals. It was the first film when I was conscious of the media archaeological concept of my work, concept of technology and researching concepts like cutting motion into bits, which is relevant in a technological age and an aesthetic and political procedure related to the division of labour on an assembly line. This project made aware of the political dimension of these technologies, not just their aesthetic aspects.

I can see that a lot of work goes into making films; it’s very interesting to discover. Can we also talk about your other films, for example, “Marey ↔ Moiré”, which was the first Dutch film to feature the sun and stars, and “Machines,” could you provide a glimpse into the creation of this film, and what impact did it have on your subsequent projects?

Joost Rekveld: That’s a good follow-up to “Moiré” because there is no aesthetic or technical interest in histories, such as technological theories as well as very practical. So, I’m really interested in the physicality of our computing technologies. This brought me to thinking about electronics, which is a kind of mathematics, and here you really feel, except that you are not programming symbolically through code, but you’re programming by configuring a circuit. So, it is really about the history of analog electronics and I realized that a very important moment in history of electronic computing was at the end of the Second World War, when inventions were done in order to mathematics, electronics very quickly reappeared, as a kind of simulation technology. So, basically in a similar way to the “Moiré,” I went back to that point in time and asked myself: okay, what would have happened if this technology was developed further, and became an image-generating technology? Analog computing existed from the end of the 1940s and lasted until the 1970s in some forms, but it was never really used to generate images. So, I was curious how you can make images which really use the specific capacities of these machines? I didn’t feel that there were any of the things which analog computing is really good for. For that reason I went to look at the equations that are also used in chaos theory. Then, I got really interested in the fact that if you look at the history of these analog computing, you can see it as a side effect of the Cold War, where all these computing technologies were developed to simulate missiles. Then, I became really interested in the fact that our computing technologies are becoming more and more important. Also, with the scale of AI, questions about energy efficiency are becoming more and more important. For that reason I think it is very important that all kinds of people think about these technologies, since developing these technologies were done in order to do mathematics. It is a composition solely consisting of these line patterns. Each line pattern is a ‘transformation of line patterns’ which have been involved on a research on a larger scale. It was an important project for me, spanning about four years of work, developing new programming languages, and conducted historical research. This way of working became more or less a main part of my projects and the film was widely shown in festivals. It was the first film when I was conscious of the media archaeological concept of my work, concept of technology and researching concepts like cutting motion into bits, which is relevant in a technological age and an aesthetic and political procedure related to the division of labour on an assembly line. This project made aware of the political dimension of these technologies, not just their aesthetic aspects.

I can see that a lot of work goes into making films; it’s very interesting to discover. Can we also talk about your other films, for example, “Marey ↔ Moiré”, which was the first Dutch film to feature the sun and stars, and “Machines,” could you provide a glimpse into the creation of this film, and what impact did it have on your subsequent projects?

Joost Rekveld: From my point of view these are different aspects of one and the same thing: the fundamental nature of the technology, since developing these technologies were done in order to do mathematics. It is a composition solely consisting of these line patterns. Each line pattern is a ‘transformation of line patterns’ which have been involved on a research on a larger scale. It was an important project for me, spanning about four years of work, developing new programming languages, and conducted historical research. This way of working became more or less a main part of my projects and the film was widely shown in festivals. It was the first film when I was conscious of the media archaeological concept of my work, concept of technology and researching concepts like cutting motion into bits, which is relevant in a technological age and an aesthetic and political procedure related to the division of labour on an assembly line. This project made aware of the political dimension of these technologies, not just their aesthetic aspects.
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Joost Rekveld: From my point of view these are different aspects of one and the same thing: the fundamental nature of the technology, since developing these technologies were done in order to do mathematics. It is a composition solely consisting of these line patterns. Each line pattern is a ‘transformation of line patterns’ which have been involved on a research on a larger scale. It was an important project for me, spanning about four years of work, developing new programming languages, and conducted historical research. This way of working became more or less a main part of my projects and the film was widely shown in festivals. It was the first film when I was conscious of the media archaeological concept of my work, concept of technology and researching concepts like cutting motion into bits, which is relevant in a technological age and an aesthetic and political procedure related to the division of labour on an assembly line. This project made aware of the political dimension of these technologies, not just their aesthetic aspects.

I can see that a lot of work goes into making films; it’s very interesting to discover. Can we also talk about your other films, for example, “Marey ↔ Moiré”, which was the first Dutch film to feature the sun and stars, and “Machines,” could you provide a glimpse into the creation of this film, and what impact did it have on your subsequent projects?
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Hiba Harchaoui for CPDP: Could you please tell us a bit about yourself?

Karine Caunes: At the Center for AI and Digital Policy (CAIDP), I currently serve as Global Program Director. Together with Marc Rotenberg and Merve Hickok, we are managing our policy clinics. I am also in charge of CAIDP AI & Democratic Values (ADV) Index, evaluating the public policies of 80 countries. I have been representing CAIDP in various settings such as UNESCO expert group meetings on AI or the plenary sessions of the Council of Europe. Committee on AI for the negotiation of the Convention on AI, human rights, democracy and the Common Good in the Digital Age. The Center for AI and Digital Policy (CAIDP) aims to promote better governance of AI. We are switching gears from policy-making to the most effective way to advance our mission of making AI work. The establishment of CAIDP Europe stems from the growing number of activities we have undertaken in Europe and the rapidly evolving policy and legal landscape in the region. We believe that incorporating CAIDP into a dedicated branch is the most effective way to advance our mission of promoting human-centric AI regulation now that Europe is switching gears from policy-making to implementation.

Can you tell us a bit more about the Center for AI and Digital Policy (CAIDP)? Its goals and its rapid global spread?

Karine Caunes: The Center for AI and Digital Policy (CAIDP) aims to promote a better society that is more fair and more just; a world where technology (CAIDP) aims to promote a better society that is more fair and more just; a world where technology and the rule of law. Executive Director. As a European law scholar, currently Editor-in-Chief of the European Law Journal – which recently released a special issue on “Law and the Common Good in the Digital Age”, developing a European branch is a task I feel passionate about and I am grateful to be collaborating with a very talented team on this project. I will spearhead CAIDP Europe’s research and policy work. The establishment of CAIDP Europe stems from the growing number of activities we have undertaken in Europe and the rapidly evolving policy and legal landscape in the region. We believe that incorporating CAIDP into a dedicated branch is the most effective way to advance our mission of promoting human-centric AI regulation now that Europe is switching gears from policy-making to implementation.

TO GOVERN OR TO BE GOVERNED, THAT IS THE QUESTION
and the structure of most future national supervi-
sory authorities is still unknown. The Nether-
lands provide a good practice with the creation of a
dedicated Department for the Coordina-
tion of Algorithmic Decision Making, but it is still unclear whether it will be the competent authority with regard to the EU AI Act. This is with the exception of the Netherlands and the UK Post Office scandal. Promoting best practices such as the adoption of AI registers by European municipalities and extending and transposing this experience to public administrations will also be one of our guiding principles. But beyond multi-use AI, it needs to be acknowled-
ged that AI systems are created for the most part by private companies. Ensuring human cen-
tric innovation is thus fundamental. CAIDP Europe will advocate for a key principles such as human rights protection, which assumes at the same time that we have to achieve, and in a slippery slope human rights violations, and which is in itself a legal accountability. Advocating for a rights-based approach to AI regulation is to shed light on this pervert logic and put back the human at the start, center and end of innovation. To define our strategy, we have mapped out 3 types of AI: 1) AI in the public sphere; 2) AI in the private sphere; 3) AI in the public sphere. To face the challenges posed by AI for several rea-
sons. First, it is part of Europe’s DNA. After the Sec-
ond World War, European integration has developed to face the emerging challenges of the post-War period and the risk to protect citizens in order to defend our most fundamental values. Second, since at least the Enlightenment, European culture has been defined and measured by ref-
sence to the betterment of the human condition and to its contribution to the common good. Thus, opposing innovation to human rights protection, as a currently widespread narrative would have it, is a contradiction in terms. It is the negation of the humanistic spirit that characterizes Euro-
pian culture. Learning from the dark side of our history, and not just from the past, we seek to stop repairing an inadmissible wrong but to prevent its repetition. We aim to provide a long-term protection framework which assumes at the same time that we have to accept risks, and in a slippery slope human rights violations, and which is in itself a legal accountability. Advocating for a rights-based approach to AI regulation is to shed light on this pervert logic and put back the human at the start, center and end of innovation.

CAIDP Europe will advocate for a rights-based approach to AI regulation is to shed light on this pervert logic and put back the human at the start, center and end of innovation.

In a nutshell, we recognize the limitations of a solely risk-based approach and seek to contribute to it. Furthermore, we advocate the creation of a robust rights-based framework to AI regulation in Europe. A human-cen-
tric interpretation and application of the EU AI Act, in the form of a Europen Directive on the right to a life in sync with data protection and other AI-related legal norms, is a necessary step to meet the challenge of developing a legal framework for the digital age that is in accordance with EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and the Council of Europe’s European Convention on Human Rights, the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, the right to the protection of personal data and privacy, the right to data subject under the EU AI Act or the DSA. Structural ine-
quities, especially those which come from power relationships or societies, and the interconnections between the rights of workers, marginalized communities, people with disabilities, or children, also need to be taken into consideration. CAIDP Europe will fo-
cus on human-centric accountability and will put to the test citizens’ rights to be informed about the use of AI; the right to an effective remedy through individual and collective action and the right to a fair administrative procedure. CAIDP Europe needs to ensure the effective implementation of several fundamental rights impact assessments wheth-
er under the EU AI Act or the DSA. Structural ine-
quities, especially those which come from power relationships or societies, and the interconnections between the rights of workers, marginalized communities, people with disabilities, or children, also need to be taken into consideration. CAIDP Europe will fo-
cus on human-centric accountability and will put to the test citizens’ rights to be informed about the use of AI; the right to an effective remedy through individual and collective action and the right to a fair administrative procedure. CAIDP Europe will advocate for a rights-based approach to AI regulation is to shed light on this pervert logic and put back the human at the start, center and end of innovation.

To define our strategy, we have mapped out 3 types of AI: 1) AI in the public sphere; 2) AI in the private sphere; 3) AI in the public sphere. To face the challenges posed by AI for several rea-
sons. First, it is part of Europe’s DNA. After the Sec-
ond World War, European integration has developed to face the emerging challenges of the post-War period and the risk to protect citizens in order to defend our most fundamental values. Second, since at least the Enlightenment, European culture has been defined and measured by ref-
sence to the betterment of the human condition and to its contribution to the common good. Thus, opposing innovation to human rights protection, as a currently widespread narrative would have it, is a contradiction in terms. It is the negation of the humanistic spirit that characterizes Euro-
pian culture. Learning from the dark side of our history, and not just from the past, we seek to stop repairing an inadmissible wrong but to prevent its repetition. We aim to provide a long-term protection framework which assumes at the same time that we have to accept risks, and in a slippery slope human rights violations, and which is in itself a legal accountability. Advocating for a rights-based approach to AI regulation is to shed light on this pervert logic and put back the human at the start, center and end of innovation.
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