Regulation Matters:
a CLEAR conversation

Episode 97: Principles Before Practice - How CLEAR Is Shaping Responsible AI Use

January 13, 2026

Line Dempsey: Welcome back to our podcast, Regulation Matters: a CLEAR conversation. Once again, I'm your host, Line Dempsey. I am currently the Chief Compliance Officer with Riccobene Associates Family Dentistry. We have practices in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, and I've also been a board member and past president for CLEAR.

Now, as many of you are aware, the Council on Licensure, Enforcement and Regulation, or CLEAR, is an association of individuals, agencies, and organizations that comprise the international community of professional and occupational regulation. This podcast is an opportunity for you to hear about important topics in our regulatory community.

Today, we're exploring the newly released *CLEAR Principles for Ethical and Effective AI in Professional Regulation*, a framework that is designed to help regulators navigate the rapidly evolving world of artificial intelligence while safeguarding public trust, competence, and ethical oversight. We'll talk with members of the working group who developed these principles to understand why they matter, and how they were shaped, and what they can mean for regulators moving forward. I'd like to welcome Paul Byrne, Kelly Parker, and Candice Alder. Thank you all for speaking with me today.

Kelly Parker: Thank you for having us.

Candice Alder: Thank you.

Paul Byrne: Thanks for having us, Line.

Line: Of course. Well, Paul, let me start straight with you here on this. What prompted CLEAR to develop these principles, and how did the working group approach this task of creating a framework that could work across different professions and jurisdictions? Because it’s a global thing. . .

Paul: It is a global thing, Line, and AI was already entering regulatory work, and often that was entering quietly and unevenly. Regulators across all professions across the globe were asking the same questions, often in isolation. And the real risk that we were facing as regulators was not AI itself, but it was the fragmented adoption without these shared guardrails. We were building systems on shifting sands. And the intention with CLEAR was that we would step up to fill this vacuum. CLEAR exists to convene collective judgment and knowledge and centralize it, and it was a unique opportunity for us, especially when change arrives faster than consensus in this space. So, the idea of the working group was to build a collective understanding, to build on our collective knowledge, and how we could adopt a principle-based approach that is agnostic to legislation. And that's what these principles were designed to do—to offer that clarity before practice is hardened by accident rather than intention.

Kelly: I also think this comes at a really good time. AI is super exciting for regulators, but at the same time, it can also bring real challenges, to Paul's point, in this new and unchartered space when it comes to implementing in a regulatory setting or for regulatory purposes. For instance, we think often how we will use AI in a regulatory setting, but then what about regulating AI for someone that we license? It just gets very complicated and complex, and so I think it all boils down to how to use AI responsibly without eroding public trust and ensuring fair and safe practices. And it's very much top of mind for everyone, so to echo Paul's point, I think the workgroup just really came together to present principles that give practical realities of regulatory environments with aspirational best practices. Just wanting to make sure that we had some meaningful guidance, regardless of the jurisdiction or profession, because we're all being faced with it today.

Candice: I think the only piece that I would add to that is really just highlighting pieces that have already been stated in that this really is a global conversation. This is a global conversation within the CLEAR AI Working Group, but this is a global conversation as a general statement, and has been for a little bit. I've long said that AI is a humanity-impacting technology. I don't think that comes as a surprise or as a revolutionary statement to anyone. But the implications of that is that this is going to impact everyone, no matter where you are on the planet. And when I think about the principles that really sit at the heart of the work that has been done—professional competence, human-centered ethics, and trust through oversight—those really are consistent with some of the high-level ethical principles and considerations that have been put forward in the global community, when we're thinking about broad AI frameworks such as the OECD principles and the principles that are coming out of UNESCO as well. So I think that the AI working group with CLEAR is really well aligned with some of the conversations that have already been taking place on the global scale.

Line: Well, Candice, you mentioned those three commitments. The first is professional competence – AI should only be used within the scope of professional knowledge, skills, and expertise. The second is human-centered ethics – AI must support ethical standards and human judgement. And the third commitment is trust and oversight – AI systems must be explainable, auditable, and secure.
Why were these chosen as the foundation, and how do they work together to guide responsible AI use in regulation particularly?

Candice: Well, I think Kelly can probably speak a little bit more clearly to why those were specifically worded the way they were, but when I look at those, what I will say is I will again highlight the fact that these are pretty consistent with the global frameworks that are in place. So thinking about human-centered ethics, that's really that human-in-the-loop kind of thing that a lot of folks talk about. And then trust through oversight, that really speaks to transparency and accountability. And I don't think you can find a single framework that has been developed, whether it's the OECD, or it's UNESCO, or any of the other frameworks, the broad global frameworks that are put out there, that don't refer to those sorts of pieces. And of course, professional competence really sits at the heart of regulation, but I think I'll hand it over to Kelly to speak a little bit further to what the process was in really choosing those.

Line: Perfect. Kelly?

Kelly: Yeah, I think you outlined that greatly, Candice, so I appreciate that. I would just simply add that, similar to what Candace said, these three commitments really reflect the core requirements for safe and reasonable, responsible AI in regulation. To her point, when we look to others, we want to learn from others as to what they're doing. This is kind of core to what we're seeing elsewhere as well, and it makes a lot of sense for regulation. It really forms a balanced approach. I think that balanced approach means that it empowers regulators to innovate responsibly while maintaining trust and confidence in the regulated communities. It's about thinking through a lens of enabling innovation, but there needs to be some clear practical guidance that includes that balanced approach of these three commitments. And I think we can easily adapt that to our regulatory world. I'm not sure if Paul wants to add anything to it, but for me, these are basic commitments and components and just core requirements when we think about the safe and reasonable use of AI.

Paul: Yeah, thanks, Kelly, and I think the challenge is the current global environment. One of the things that I said recently at the Chicago Annual Education Conference was it is a time of global change and challenge, and in that time of change, we have vastly different approaches on how different countries, for example, the United States, or even areas like the European Union, are approaching how this technology should be regulated and deployed. And even the legislative structures that are in place are shifting, where there's been some state measures put in in the US that have then been replaced by some federal decisions. And even with the EUAI Act, where they're now looking to maybe revisit elements of that, too.

So for us as regulators, there's a huge challenge in how can we regulate when we're seeing such wide pendulum swings globally. So, when looking at how we'd approach this, it was, how could we design something akin to a digital Hippocratic Oath? And what I mean by that is that the Hippocratic Oath has been around since about the 5th century, and it hasn't really changed over time, despite significant changes in technology from the pestle and mortar to nuclear medicine. So how could we design a principle-based approach to the deployment of artificial intelligence in professional regulation that would be mindful of licensing, of monitoring accreditation exams and complaints, but not constrain the regulators, act as a guardrail that you'd be allowed to flex. And in doing that, that's where we've reached these three strands. Professional competence, because that ensures decisions remain grounded and defensible; the human-centered ethics keeps the focus on individuals that are effective, not just on the efficiencies this technology allows us to gain; and trust through oversight, because it protects the public confidence in regulatory outcomes. Together, I think AI strengthens regulation rather than erodes its authority, but to make sure that we keep that line, we need a principle-based approach to achieve it.

Line: Thanks, Paul. Now, looking at those three principles, in particular, one of the things that stood out was that no decisions affecting someone's rights or livelihood should ever be done by AI alone, that there should be a human component to that. How did the working group define the appropriate balance between what AI can assist and do, and human judgment?

Kelly: I'd love to kick this one off. As someone who has spent at least the last year engaging with numerous regulatory boards from different professions in different states and hearing a wide range of perspectives on this issue, I've seen and heard firsthand the dilemma that we're hearing about AI, leveraging AI capabilities, but then preserving human judgment. I think AI in a regulatory setting is meant to enhance government and operational efficiencies, not replace human oversight. So, when I think about this, I think about a regulator's job, and it's super important. A regulator is responsible for overseeing activities that determine whether someone can earn a living and work safely in the community. Therefore, I think we all felt pretty strongly that an individual's rights or livelihoods should never be made solely by a machine. So, in summary, I would say definitely embrace the use of AI to do more effectively, but it doesn't replace the duty to regulate. You still leave that to the trained professionals. And so I feel like with this approach, it really respects the expertise and accountability of the regulators, while still ensuring fairness for those affected, and maintains that public trust in the regulatory processes. I'm not sure if Candice has anything else to add, but I've seen this a lot, I've heard this a lot, so I wanted to share those insights based on numerous conversations I've been having.

Candice: Yeah, Kelly, I definitely would agree with everything that you said there, of course. I think the only piece that I would really add, and it's more of a highlight than anything else, is that at the end of the day, when we think about the decisions that we are tasked with, either as professionals, as regulated professionals, as regulators, or even from the AI realm in terms of decisions made by AI, somebody needs to be responsible for those outcomes. If something goes wrong, if a decision is made that is incorrect, whether it harms someone significantly or not, there needs to be somebody who's responsible, and an AI system simply cannot be responsible, cannot be held responsible for the outcomes of the decisions that it makes. So, in thinking about this from a regulatory perspective, how do we hold anybody accountable when they're delegating their decision-making authority to a system? So when we have folks that are involved in the decision-making, it's not just about ensuring that the decisions that are made are human-centered and are ethically and professionally grounded. It's also ensuring that should something go wrong, and things do go wrong, we do know that. With the very best of intentions, things sometimes go wrong. But there needs to be somebody who is held responsible, and you simply cannot hold an AI system responsible for its decisions. There has to be a human being that sits at the heart of that decision-making in order for there to be true accountability that is included with this process.

Kelly: That's what we'd like to call the human-in-the-loop model. And I know that's one piece, or one area that we defined when we worked on additional work through the work group. We created a glossary to kind of help the regulators understand some terms, and this one really reflects that human-in-the-loop model, using AI to enhance those efficiencies, but still having that ultimate final decision and oversight with an actual human.

Paul: I fully agree with all that. There's different types of AI, and I know we've been using the term AI, but there's different types of technologies there. For example, with diagnostic imaging, the work it's doing is phenomenal at how it's augmenting and supporting the highly trained healthcare medical professionals who are working in the field, and they're using it as a tool that would augment and support their performance. And also, as regulators, there's a lot of areas we can take it on and use it to enhance efficiencies. We are under increased pressure. The healthcare system, for example, we know there's going to be a workforce crisis in the future, based on WHO data. AI can be a significant changer in that, but regulation isn't just about analysis, it's about accountability. And AI can support consistency and surface-level decision-making and really do significant data mining in how we work. But responsibility that's been entrusted to us as regulators can't be delegated to a system, or the responsibility of the professionals we regulate. I think once the outcomes remain visible, and we understand it better, there's a lot of measures that we can put in place as regulators to get those reassurances. We can do sandbox testing, we can audit the systems once there's outputs there, but ultimately, putting in place a measure like this, and maintaining human oversight protects the public, but also protects us as regulators to make sure that we're making the right decisions.

Line: Yeah, excellent points from everyone. Looking at it from the regulators that maybe don't have a lot of deep technical expertise, specifically as we look at AI with regard to professional competence, how can we ensure that both the regulators and the licensees understand the purposes and limits and risks of these AI tools? What does that look like in practice?

Candice: I think that speaks to developing professional competence, which is the first of the three principles that we've outlined as sitting at the heart of the document that we're talking about. Because at the end of the day, AI is not going away. I think that's not a revolutionary statement. At this stage of the game, we all recognize that AI is here to stay, and when we think about regulated professions, often what we're thinking about as a component of that is ongoing professional development. So really integrating the concept of lifelong learning, including tech learning, is going to be something that's going to be incredibly important. It's going to be incredibly important not just for practitioners and professionals. It's going to be incredibly important for regulators as well. Because you don't want to be walking blind into an area that has pretty serious consequences if it's mismanaged. Now, does this mean that you need to go and get a data science degree and learn how to code and do all of those things? No, probably not. But there's a lot of resources out on the internet that can really help you with being able to understand exactly what's going on, and one of the documents that the AI Working Group actually came out with was an AI glossary as well, just a glossary of terms, to be able to bring everyone together and understand the jargon, the words that are being used when folks who are in the tech sphere are talking about this technology. Having that common language or an understanding of a common language is incredibly important. And I'll leave it there and let Kelly and Paul jump in and add to this.

Paul: It's a really interesting space, and I agree with Candice's point. We are not to become technologists as regulators. The challenge here is an over-reliance on AI will create blind spots. If you operate outside your skill set, or AI allows you to reach a level where you as a professional, or you as a regulator, are operating significantly outside your skill set, you effectively begin to automate your decision-making process. Biases will appear, or biases may increase. And the errors will go undetected, and that will have negative consequences. Competence ensures that AI strengthens practice rather than weakening it. And we talk about that in the paper a bit. For me, it's understanding at a very basic term. Competence is understanding what the tool is designed to do and not designed to do, and being able to ask informed questions, whether it's from the vendor when you procure it, to say, what is the scope? How is this set up? How is this structured? And when should I use it, but also when I should not use it? So, as part of the regulation of how we are using this, or us as regulators are using this, sometimes restraint in its use is a form of competence.

Line: Awesome. So, trust and oversight require explainability, auditing, and security. How can regulators meaningfully assess AI systems, especially when vendors may offer black box tools, or when agencies have limited resources? What is the best way for them to assess these things?

Kelly: I think for regulators, it's super important to ask questions, as you just heard Paul say. Ask questions, be curious but cautious, ask what a system can do and what it can't do, and understand those fundamental pieces. I think it's super easy today to do research, to keep up, and learn on your own, but also learn and work with others. So regulators may consider things like working with other agencies, forming their own work groups. That could include other executive directors in their particular jurisdiction, or it might also include outside experts. But I think the bottom line for me and my perspective on this question is very much that regulators are not alone in this conversation. And so when they think about assessing these systems, it's always: be curious, be cautious, and also know others are in that same journey along with you, and what can you learn from them, or where can you lean in to help, or not reinvent the wheel for other purposes. I'm not sure if Paul or Candice have anything else to offer or respond to the question.

Paul: Yeah, I'd fully agree with you, Kelly. Perfect transparency is so rare, but in this space, meaningful oversight is just so essential. We sit in a world where different jurisdictions have different legislative requirements that would be mandated against us. But at a global level, when we look at this, and when you boil it down to these principles, regulators should look at explainability proportional to the risk. And what does that mean? That means the auditability, documentation, regulatory sandboxing, annual auditing, looking at how the use of the system or how humans using the system may be injecting conscious or unconscious bias, having clean data sets when these systems are constructed, and security. And all of those requirements can’t be optional. Those expectations should be hardwired into procurement processes, into regular governance processes, not added later, not reactive, but proactively addressed. And finally, to Kelly's point, collaboration here between regulators is critical. We are in shifting sands in this regulatory environment. Sharing that learning across regulators reduces that burden, and that's why CLEAR has been so powerful in stepping into this space, because we've provided a forum where we can share our strengths and our weaknesses and our learnings through the forums that have been created.

Kelly: I would also add just one other thing as well, which, Paul, you made me reflect on it for a moment, but I also think flexibility is important, because how they may assess AI systems today may be different two years from today, just with the evolution of technology. I think a lot of this is about we only know so much, but we need to continue to adapt to what may be to come.

Line: Excellent, thanks, Kelly. From the regulator perspective of things, they have to apply a lot of these principles to real-life things in their world, like exams, licensing, investigations, even just dealing with complaints, triaging complaints in that matter. From the working group, were there areas where the working group saw AI as more or less appropriate for some of these things? And what would be the practical steps that regulators would need to take to incorporate these?

Paul: Yep. I can kick that one off. What I would say, Line, is you start with low-risk, high-value applications. Initially, if you've got clean data sets in an area where you're looking to detect patterns in your case profiles, or country of origin, or area educational institution, you can map the data sets and use that to inform your own internal policies. That's typically one quick win. Administrative triage, data quality checks, pattern detection, they're all really sensible entry points that would probably be low risk. I know there are some regulators that are looking at working in tandem with complaints triaging and using publicly available models to support that. For me, my nervousness would be about where the decisions directly affect individuals, as opposed to informing policy, and I think we should move cautiously in those. I think it's testing systems in appropriate environments before scaling, so really rigorous sandbox testing, and we could do that in partnership with the vendors who are deploying these systems. Maybe it's starting to look at where there are appeal pathways where AI informs the decision, and we need to be transparent with the public on that. So, very simple first steps into this, but you'd rather step forward cautiously and then ramp up at scale, because it's those early implementations that you will learn so much from, whether it's AI literacy from your staff, AI literacy with professionals, or your audit and control programs in case something goes wrong.

Kelly: I can share a really simple way from a vendor-partner perspective and how we are working with boards for the same reason. We are currently working with partners to roll out the use of AI in a documentation verification tool to ensure it is a legitimate continuing education document being submitted to the board. Again, very low risk, no final decisions being made, and this doesn't take away from a board's duty for oversight, for instance, in an audit to double-check that information, but it saves them the time from having to look at maybe initially scanning 24 documents that have been submitted and then only having to look at the ones that identify areas of possible issue. So it simplifies what they're doing, but in that scenario, it's all about creating efficiency for the regulator. Very much to Paul's point, low risk. It doesn't deal with final decision making, but it enhances operational efficiency, because using this AI documentation scanning and CE submission review, I can probably look at more licensees or more documents than I could before if I was just doing it manually.

Line: Excellent. Well, the principles acknowledge significant implementation challenges, from rapid technological change to resource constraints. What strategies or supports, whether that be training or collaboration or model testing, transparency, as Paul mentioned, do you see as the most essential for overcoming these challenges? Paul, I'd like to start with you on that one.

Paul: I think the biggest challenge you're going to face is awareness of the technology and competency from your own individual users if this is being onboarded within your organization. Training builds confidence and shares vocabulary, and there are resources that CLEAR has, like the Glossary of Terms Candice referenced, that can support that. Collaboration prevents mistakes, and it's working collectively with other regulators to see what learnings they have had from onboarding. There's no single solution that will remove the risk when you're developing these systems, but both internally and externally, transparency sustains trust when systems are questioned. From a governance perspective, it's to be very transparent that we are using this system, and these are the outputs that are AI-generated or assisted with AI. Progress in this space comes from discipline and not speed. What I would say to regulators is that, when you are onboarding these systems, do not rush. Check your data, triple check your data, make sure that you're not putting garbage in, because you don't want to be in a position six months down the line where you're generating outputs from systems that were trained on poor data sets. Have very clean, structured data going in, and your vendor would probably work with you on that. Rigorously sandbox it, stress test it, bring in red teams, make sure your people challenge it in the best way possible. I read a case recently about a regulator who last year onboarded a system that wasn't adequately trained on their website and was giving incorrect information. You don't want to be in that position. You don't want to affect public confidence in how you're working as a regulator by rushing into this. So, rigorously test it and then deploy it. But it doesn't stop there. You have to have really robust governance systems in place, put in an audit and inspection program, and make sure those safety nets are there so that when you go back and test it in X period of time, you know the outputs are consistent and that your use of the system isn't changing the outputs in a negative way.

Kelly: I think those are all excellent call-outs, Paul, and it reinforces the idea of continuous monitoring and evaluation. What you start with may not be what you end with or how you set it up. I would also add that implementing new technology and new enhancements often comes with scrutiny from the community. There's a lot of uncertainty about how you're using it or what you're doing with it. When we think about training and collaboration, that's both internal and external, and being able to really have transparent processes. Maybe you put documents out explaining how the agency is using AI, how it's being applied, managed, and overseen, to create confidence in the community. It's one thing for internal folks to understand and know it, but the community will be worried about how you're using it, so I think just as much as doing it internally, you also have to make sure you're prepared to speak about this publicly and speak to how you're using it for these processes and what it does or doesn't mean for that community.

Candice: I'm going to piggyback off what Kelly just said and speak around the informed consent piece. Coming from a context where this is a significant factor, particularly in Canada, there's a lot of informing folks that AI is being used. You can walk into doctors' offices or other practitioners' offices, and maybe there's a sign on the door, or your doctor very quickly at the beginning says, I'm using AI for our appointment today, do you consent? That is about as far from informed consent as you can possibly get, and I think when we start asking folks to ask for informed consent, what it actually does is it puts professionals—and I've used doctors here, but I'm thinking about, I work in mental health care—so I'm thinking about all folks that work in healthcare, whether it's physical healthcare or mental health care. When you're put in the position of actually having to get informed consent, where you have to explain important components of the system that you're using, you're putting the practitioner in the position of needing to understand in order to be able to explain to the client, or the patient, or however you're framing it, explain to them and be able to get that informed consent. And that's one of the pieces that I'm seeing is missing in a very big way.

AI is very exciting, particularly when I think about the applications that are really happening in high speed right now. It has a lot to do with the tasks that none of us really want to do, which are administrative tasks. But that doesn't change our obligation to be able to ensure that we're building trust with the public, as Kelly referenced, and in my opinion, part of that is getting informed consent from folks. And informed consent means that you, as a practitioner, need to be able to understand the technology well enough to be able to talk about how it works, where your data is stored, what data is collected, how long it's stored for, is it anonymized, is it not, is it used for training? The list goes on. But when you're in the position of being able to understand that, and being able to provide the foundation for asking for informed consent, you're actually creating a set of circumstances that not only builds trust and confidence in the public, but builds your own capacity and your own understanding as a practitioner.

Paul: Candice, it's a great point, and I think it's going to be one that's really going to come to the forefront in the next couple of years, because we are in the Model T era of AI. This is the baby AI stage; we're in its infancy. It's really going to develop. I was actually having this conversation about two weeks ago with a medical doctor who works in a hospital, and we were talking about the challenge of informed consent, because it assumes a linear treatment pathway as opposed to a dynamic one. The GP may explain it and give consent, but if the medical scientists use it, or the diagnostic imaging technician, because it's hardwired into the hardware, it can cause challenges. It's something that probably we're all going to need to explore. I know there's different approaches—the EU has a very different take on it than different areas in North America, and I know Australia has a different opinion on it. So it's an area I think we're probably going to come back and have those more complicated, wider conversations on it. That comes back to why we have a principle-based approach, because there are so many different opinions in the world that we're trying to come up with a high-level guardrail that regulators can really stick to and align to.

Line: Paul, you mentioned we're in this Model T era of AI, its infancy. With that being said, we know it's going to change, we know it's going to improve, it's going to get better. Do you expect that these principles that you guys have developed to have some evolution to them as well? We'll finish up with a two-parter here: do you intend for the principles to have some room for evolving, and what does successful adoption look like for regulators over the next several years in this infancy?

Paul: What I would say is the principles are designed to ideally be at a high level enough that they can flex as the technology changes and grows. However, if the principles need to evolve as practices mature and different technology or consequences of this technology emerge, we can certainly look at it. I think competences should remain with the human. There needs to be a human in the decision pathway. I don't think that should change. That's a valuable learning, because if we don't use that, there's a significant increase in patient risk, potentially, or an erosion in learned skill sets. Certainly, there is a counter-argument that says at a point five or six years in the future, if you've got AGIs, when you risk assess it, what is more competent, an individual or the piece of technology? I would argue an individual, but the counterargument put forward to me recently was, if you've got a calculator or an accountant, which one would you trust more? You really are getting into very difficult conversations. At this stage, I still would stand over that it's important to keep a human or a medical professional in the loop, because at least then, if there is a mistake in the technology, you can rely on it. That's why our accountants do our accounts, and it's not me at home with my calculator. The principles will evolve as needed, but they should, for the foreseeable future, be fit for purpose. What success would look like is, as with all regulators, having a boring day where nothing happens. I was saying this recently at the conference last month in New Zealand: how do regulators measure success? It's a happy day and nothing bad happens, because that's when a regulator is doing its job correctly. For me, success is where regulators adopt these guardrails, the AI systems work smoothly, and there are no negative consequences.

Kelly: How often do we see those days? Probably not enough, I think as a former regulator. I would echo everything that Paul has shared. Specifically related to the continental U.S., the policy and legislation around these technologies is also going to evolve, so with that, some principles may shift. But everything we're saying here is core common sense. It's do what's right and good. Let's make sure it's fair. Let's make sure there's transparency and accountability. These are all core to the regulatory board duty and mission. Some things may not change. The principles might look a little bit different as they evolve alongside technology, but all of this is core to what we do in everyday practice as a regulator. The only other comment I would make – it'll be interesting thinking about President Trump's executive order that he issued on December 11th, which encouraged a national framework for AI in the United States, and the implications that may have on state policies that are currently in place or being considered. I know this session, we're looking at thousands of AI bills being filed in the U.S. in different jurisdictions. We will know more as it comes, but to Paul's point, the human-in-the-loop model and all of it make sense for right now. These principles are a lot of common sense when we think about being the best regulator and how we're embracing technology in general. But as with everything and anything, we always have to be prepared to remain flexible and think future-forward as needed.

Candice: Absolutely. I couldn't agree more with everything that's been said. The only valuable thing I can add is that the pieces we've been talking about really are specific to professions and sectors that are regulated. For folks listening to this podcast, it's important to remember that the AI conversation is diverse and multifaceted, and it really is sector-specific. One of the things we've talked about in our conversation today at more than one point is the human-in-the-loop piece and how important that is. I absolutely agree with everything that's been said here today, certainly as AI currently stands today. I can't imagine a circumstance yet where there wouldn't be a human in the loop, but certainly in regulated professions, that's incredibly important. This isn't the conversation that's necessarily happening everywhere else. A couple of months ago, a really interesting journal article by Jovana Davidovic came out, called Rethinking Human Roles in AI Warfare, and it really challenges the concept of human in the loop and whether that is a good idea. Those are military applications, so I want to highlight for folks listening, who might be listening to other AI conversations that are happening elsewhere, that the kinds of things being outlined by the AI working group are really related to human-serving and regulated sectors, and not to get caught up in the fray of different conversations happening outside in different sectors.

Kelly: I would just add there, too, Candice, that you reminded me of a conversation I was in last week. The American Telemedicine Association was talking about doctor-out-of-the-loop models when it comes to telemedicine moving forward. To your point, and for all that's been said, and to those listeners, it's always good to be curious but cautious, and to keep a pulse on what's happening and how it may or may not apply to you. Having trust and confidence in what you're currently doing, and thinking about your core regulatory duties and how you'll carry those out on a daily basis, with or without technology, and the other stuff will all fall into place eventually. There is a lot unknown at this point, and it will be interesting to continue to watch.

Line: Excellent. Again, the work on the CLEAR principles is laying the essential groundwork for how regulators can use AI responsibly and with integrity, especially as this technology continues to evolve. The CLEAR Principles for Ethical and Effective AI in Professional Regulation, as well as the AI Glossary of Terms that was mentioned, can be found on the CLEAR website under the Resources menu. I want to thank you all—Paul, Kelly, and Candice—for sharing the working group's initiatives with us today. Thank you again for being a part of this.

Guests: Thank you, Line. Thank you so much.

Line: It's definitely been a pleasure, and we'd love to continue this conversation with our members on the CLEAR Regulatory Network. This podcast episode will be posted there, along with some questions for our members to consider. I've got a couple I'll go ahead and give you now. Which of the CLEAR principles—professional competency, human-centered ethics, or trust through oversight—do you think would be the most challenging for regulators to implement, and why? The second question is, how do you see AI impacting your own regulatory work in the next few years, and what supports or safeguards would help you feel confident using AI tools responsibly? We greatly appreciate and thank our members for their discussion and feedback in the CLEAR Regulatory Network. If you haven't already, we invite and encourage you to join and take part in the online discussions.

I also want to thank our listeners for tuning in for this episode. We'll be back with another episode of Regulation Matters: a CLEAR conversation very soon. If you're new to the CLEAR podcast, please subscribe. You can find us on Podbean or any of your favorite podcast services. If you've enjoyed this episode, please leave a rating or comment in the app. Your reviews help us improve our ranking and make it easier for new listeners to find us. Feel free to visit our website at https://www.clearhq.org for additional resources and a calendar of upcoming programs and events. Finally, I'd like to thank our CLEAR staff, specifically Stephanie Thompson, our content coordinator and editor for this program. Once again, I'm Line Dempsey, and I hope to be speaking to you again very soon.

The audio version of this podcast episode is available at https://podcast.clearhq.org/e/AI_principles/.