
A CASE FOR COMPETENT AI SYSTEMS – A CONCEPT NOTE

Kamalakar Karlapalem
IIIT Hyderabad
India
kamal@iiit.ac.in

ABSTRACT

The efficiency of an AI system is contingent upon its ability to align with the specified requirements of a given task. However, the inherent complexity of tasks often introduces the potential for harmful implications or adverse actions. This note explores the critical concept of capability within AI systems, representing what the system is expected to deliver. The articulation of capability involves specifying well-defined outcomes. Yet, the achievement of this capability may be hindered by deficiencies in implementation and testing, reflecting a gap in the system's competency (what it can do vs. what it does successfully).

A central challenge arises in elucidating the competency of an AI system to execute tasks effectively. The exploration of system competency in AI remains in its early stages, occasionally manifesting as confidence intervals denoting the probability of success. Trust in an AI system hinges on the explicit modeling and detailed specification of its competency, connected intricately to the system's capability. This note explores this gap by proposing a framework for articulating the competency of AI systems.

Motivated by practical scenarios such as the Glass Door problem, where an individual inadvertently encounters a glass obstacle due to a failure in their competency, this research underscores the imperative of delving into competency dynamics. Bridging the gap between capability and competency at a detailed level, this note contributes to advancing the discourse on bolstering the reliability of AI systems in real-world applications.

1 Introduction

The Glass Door Problem

Scott V. Liebman, 404 S.W.2d 288(1966) is a legal case involving James Liebman, who walked through a glass door at the Motor Inn and injured himself. The key aspect of why James Liebman walked through the glass door – as quoted from Scott V. Liebman, 404 S.W.2d 288(1966) is:

"We regard the evidence as being undisputed that Liebman did not see the glass door in its closed condition. There is no suggestion that he did see it and nevertheless deliberately proceeded to walk through it anyway. One of the plaintiff's witnesses, a business associate who was on the inside of Liebman's room, testified that he and Liebman were looking at each other, eye to eye, as Liebman returned to the room; and Liebman proceeded as though the door were open. Pictures introduced into evidence demonstrated that at night with the lights turned on inside the room, it

is difficult from the darkened outside to detect the presence of the glass door in a closed position. There was evidence that there was a small amount of imperfection or warping in the glass; but it, too, is not easily detected. In short, this clear glass door in a closed position at night, under the circumstances here present, would not be regarded by us, in an abstract proposition, as an open and obvious danger of which we would charge people with knowledge."

Competent AI Systems

Liebman possessed the capability to avoid injuring himself while walking through the glass door, and he believed he had the competency to navigate the potential dangers successfully. However, despite his perceived competency, he failed to detect the glass door, resulting in an injury. Legal cases arising from such incidents have prompted premises to adopt preventive measures, emphasizing the need to warn individuals about glass doors and potentially enhance people's competency to identify and avoid such hazards.

Metaphorically, individuals encounter various "glass doors" in their daily lives despite their understanding (and ability to avoid mishaps) of the environment and associated risks. Human competency, often implicit, is determined by successful outcomes of actions taken, supported by external recognition or certifications as proof. Although individuals may perceive and deduce their surroundings accurately, actions driven by these perceptions can sometimes lead to harm or injury.

Human competency is dynamic, evolving through experiences gained from performing various acts. Labels such as "most competent surgeon, carpenter, lawyer, or President" are attributed to the competency demonstrated in performing respective roles. Competency is a crucial criterion for task assignments, with any lapses, especially by those deemed competent, resulting in potential legal consequences. Leveraging competency certification enables individuals to offer services at a cost, shaping the narrative around the acts performed by individuals or systems.

Applying the same principles to AI systems is imperative, acknowledging that competency remains a critical concern despite good intentions and moral considerations. The following sections provide an overview of an AI system, exploring micro-competency, macro-competency, the Glass Door Problem, strategies for enhancing competency, and considerations of moral competency. Subsequent sections delve into discussions, related work, and conclusions.

2 The AI System

The AI system comprises integrated software modules and hardware components that emulate human intelligence in performing specific tasks. Its primary objective is to enhance human capabilities and, in some instances, outperform them. Tasks such as providing live commentary at sports events, managing traffic coordination, aiding in domestic chores through robot assistance, achievements like Watson winning Jeopardy, and the development of self-driving cars exemplify the diverse competencies of AI systems.

The AI system's definition and the extent of its capability are shaped by the environment and the system's embodiment within it. The AI system involves (i) modeling the environment, (ii) sensing or collecting data from the environment, (iii) decision-making based on its task at hand, and (iv) iterative execution of (i), (ii), and (iii) until the goal, defined by the successful completion of the task, is achieved. The competency of the AI system is delineated through these four key aspects.

The AI system (in a simplistic manner) can be structured into modules or hardware components, including a world module (i), sensing module (i, ii), machine learning module (iii, iv), planning module (iii, iv), action module (iii, iv), and interfacing module (i, ii, iii, iv). It is essential to note that an AI system can function as a part of each module, resulting in an intricate system of integrated AI systems (subsystems). Some are explicit, while others remain implicit, concealed within a software module or a hardware component. For instance, the control module governing hand manipulator movement may contain an implicit, inaccessible machine learning module. In contrast, the machine learning module for determining the optimal robot path might be explicit and visible. Such a framework aids in comprehending the competency of the AI system.

Each module represents the environment and a set of algorithms embodying the AI system's functionality as tools. These tools, operating cohesively, can be considered autonomous agents (the AI system) or specialized tools for specific tasks. Consequently, each module or component contributes to the competence of tools and AI subsystems, ultimately shaping the overall competency of the entire AI system.

3 Micro-Competence

Micro-competence pertains to the proficiency of discrete components within the AI system, focusing on tools or subsystems executing minute, atomic actions. These tools, operating as standalone modules, exhibit a certain level

Competent AI Systems

of competency. Examples include Natural Language Processing (NLP) stemmers, image segmentation algorithms, manipulator arm motors, scenario analysis modules, communication protocols for agents, decision tree algorithms, and data-collecting sensors. Each module or component encompasses a representation, data, algorithms, and a specific competency level.

3.1 Representation Competency

Representation competency is pivotal as the AI system, or its tools leverage the world model to assess the system's state and plan subsequent actions. The representation of the world model, be it through facts and predicates or geographical coordinates like longitude and latitude, significantly influences AI systems processing. While different tools and components may employ diverse representations, the chosen representations dictate the competency of the tools and components.

3.2 Data Competency

Sensed data fundamentally drives the AI system, and the competency of the tools and components revolves around the data's source, quality, relevance, and fitness. Issues concerning data competency encompass (a) the integrity of the data source, (b) ensuring data quality, (c) relevance to the task at hand, and (d) fitness for use by the tools and components. Secure and trustworthy data sources, proper data flow, and consideration of contextual relevance are imperative to maintain data competency.

Data quality is contingent on the mode of data collection, whether from human or automatic sources. It involves ensuring accuracy, mitigating noise, addressing transfer errors, and approximating data when needed. The impact of data quality lapses on the AI system's competency is unpredictable and necessitates careful measurement.

Relevance of the data is critical in determining the competency of the AI system, requiring the data to align with the tool's functionality and generate the desired output. Techniques like feature extraction, although designed to identify relevant data, may have limitations, such as the suitability of Principal Component Analysis (PCA) for specific machine learning tasks.

The fitness of the data can occur at multiple levels (1) the core algorithm expects some data with some features, and it is unavailable, (2) the data needed for the core algorithm is not available. In this case, the system will not be able to function. For example, the tool expects the world model as facts and predicates, but the world model is available only in OpenStreetMap format. Fitness can be more critical in natural language processing when there is a mismatch in vocabulary, dictionary, or even the expected parsing level. For example, for an Amazon Echo to entertain a four-year-old toddler with some puzzles, there must be a language match between Echo and toddler and vice-versa.

3.3 Algorithmic Competency

Algorithmic competency is determined by the algorithms steering the AI system. These algorithms process data, and generate outputs driving decision-making, action-taking, or planning. The algorithm's competence can range from optimal solutions to confidence-driven outcomes influenced by evaluation parameters generated within the algorithm. Considerations include processing time, fine-tuning with explicit parameter values, and balancing optimality and fairness. Each algorithm contributes to the overall competency of the AI system.

3.4 Functional Competency

Functional competency-primarily applies to hardware components, delineating their capabilities. For instance, a wheeled robot's functional competency might encompass specifications for maximum torque and efficient energy utilization. Explicit utilization of functional competency is crucial for macro-level decision-making and actions by the AI system. Agents within multi-agent or larger AI systems also possess explicit functional competency. Micro-competency underscores the competence of individual components and modules, necessitating articulation through formal methods conducive to reasoned understanding.

4 Macro-Competency

Macro-competency denotes the comprehensive proficiency of the AI system at a broader scale, reflecting its loosely integrated yet occasionally tightly bound structure influenced by data and control flows across modules and compo-

Competent AI Systems

nents. The multi-agent system paradigm provides a fitting representation where explicit knowledge of each agent's behaviors may not always be available. The overall competency at the macro level encompasses flow, action, and solution competencies.

4.1 Flow Competency

Flow competency ensures the smooth operation of the AI system, requiring seamless data and control event flows. In many production AI systems, these flows are often either hard-coded or not explicitly disclosed, complicating the identification of system failures. The lack of explicit data and algorithmic competency disclosure for tools and components further hampers understanding. Articulating flow competency at the macro level is crucial, and it can be accomplished through workflows and formal models such as Petri-Nets or temporal logic.

For optimal functionality, data must be available to the right tool at the right time to meet processing deadlines and facilitate decision-making. Articulating flow competency includes specifying time-related constraints necessary for the AI system to perform effectively.

4.2 Action Competency

Action competency involves the independent generation and execution of actionable outputs by the AI system. It is pivotal for systems with numerous actionable components. Understanding the range of possible actions and evaluating the viability of actions taken is critical. Dependencies among modules and interdependent actions must be explicit to determine the combined competency of the system at the macro level.

For instance, in a humanoid football team, not only must actions be decided in real-time, but there must also be sufficient time for actions to be completed. Explicitly outlining dependencies and interdependencies is essential for evaluating the combined competency of the system.

4.3 Solution Competency:

The AI system acts as a solution generator and implementer, fulfilling specific goals despite being composed of modular components. Solution competency is influenced by micro-level competency aspects. It is limited by the least competent module or component, often referred to as the weakest competent link, participating in the solution.

Explicitly articulating solution competency enables architects to enhance the overall competency by addressing the weakest link. This articulation considers the AI system's achievable goals and how different modules and components collaborate to achieve solutions. If the AI system comprises other AI systems, solution competency is the cumulative competency, incorporating solution dependencies among the constituent AI systems.

In summary, articulating macro-competency is essential to comprehensively understand the AI system's effectiveness, considering its intricate interplay of flows, actions, and solution-generation capabilities.

5 The Glass Door Problem

The Glass Door Problem introduced metaphorically through an incident where an individual attempt to walk through a glass door, underscores a systemic challenge within the AI system. This predicament arises when a person possessing the necessary capability encounters difficulties comprehending the environment or processing sensed data, leading to inadvertent collisions with the glass door (showing a lack of competency). Similarly, an AI system, exemplified by scenarios like accidents involving a self-driving car, may struggle to competently process solutions, potentially harming others, such as a robot failing to achieve its goal or causing unintended harm.

Precisely articulating the system's competency is pivotal in defining the Glass Door Problem. Subsequently, as the solution is executed, instances of failures or accidents prompt the system to identify deficiencies in its competency within modules or components across numerous solution executions. Through ongoing audits, the competency of these modules and components is assessed, unveiling shortcomings in the overall AI system. The audit becomes a crucial step in fortifying the system's competency.

Competent AI Systems

Enhancing the system's competency necessitates systematic competency analytics, aligning users' understanding of its capabilities with its actual competency. This process mirrors how individuals identify a competent mechanic or doctor based on personal experiences or the experiences of others. The comparison between perceived competency and actual system competency is a foundational aspect for ongoing improvement and development of the AI system.

6 Enhancing Competency

The ongoing improvement of the AI system necessitates a feedback loop dedicated to monitoring and enhancing its competency. This involves a comprehensive analysis of the system's macro-level and micro-level competencies. Modules and components susceptible to failures, errors, and accidents undergo scrutiny at the micro-competency level to pinpoint causes for the lack of competency. Further investigation determines the root causes of issues and establishes safe operational zones for the module. If a non-safe region is identified, either the module is deactivated or must undergo enhancement for continued use, requiring cautious consideration of decisions or results within the AI system.

In machine learning, constant evolution and non-deterministic changes in competency are inherent. AI systems with multiple machine learning modules dynamically evolve their competency based on the context of the world model, sensed data, and system accuracy levels. Consequently, the solution competency's evolution must align with individual modules' evolving competencies. The critical challenge lies in explicitly defining solution competency for end-users to comprehend and make informed decisions.

Formulating and computing micro-competency and macro-competency present inherent complexities. The inside-out paradigm for AI system competency establishes the competency of modules and components based on their inherent capabilities, determining the overall competency of the AI system. Conversely, the outside-in paradigm first establishes the overarching competency of the AI system and then selects modules and components to meet these competency requirements.

Crucially, competency articulation at a detailed level and continuous reasoning during system operation are essential. The enhancement of system competency relies on reflective processes conducted by the AI system. The system identifies flaws in modules or components through ongoing audits, rectifying them to improve the overall competency. Explicit articulation of micro-competency and macro-competency is the foundation for creating a robust framework for contemplation, facilitating the continuous enhancement of the system's competency. Consequently, there is room for meta-level processing to guide the system in contemplation and utilize feedback to improve its competency iteratively.

7 Moral Competency

In the present landscape, concerns loom over the potential for an AI system to exhibit rogue behavior, harming society. Moral competency in this context implies a deficiency in the AI system's ability to align with its intended goals while simultaneously possessing an acquired (or unintentional) competency to cause harm. The lack of competency often stems from the inherently open nature of the operational world and gaps in competency at both micro and macro levels. Consequently, the acknowledgment persists that the Glass Door Problem exists within AI systems, risking harm to themselves or others. In specific scenarios, the AI system is compelled to act, and any chosen action results in harm, with inaction also having detrimental consequences. Thus, a competent AI system should proactively avoid entering such predicaments.

The nuanced examination of micro and macro competency, coupled with an audit trail documenting actions and their contextual details, facilitates the identification of the sequence of events leading to morally challenging situations. Consequently, a prospect exists for conducting competency-level analytics to discern cause-and-effect relationships. Simultaneously, as the solution executes, preemptive measures are taken to prune actions that might lead to potential moral dilemmas. The system leverages contemplation on prior solution runs to preprocess and enhance the competency of modules and components. Therefore, a competency-driven articulation of the AI system offers both scope and direction in tackling the issue of the system going rogue due to a deficiency in overall moral competency.

8 Discussion

The Glass Door problem, akin to a person (due to lack of competency) being distracted and inadvertently injuring oneself, can manifest in AI systems when they become distracted or fragile due to environmental factors, context, action outcomes, and sensed data. Deliberate distractions, such as introducing false sensor data, could exploit the lack of competency in opposing AI systems, creating unintended consequences. With the proliferation of AI systems, adversaries may exploit these vulnerabilities for strategic advantage. Meta-level contemplation-driven analytics and audits can play a pivotal role in identifying and averting such possibilities.

The distinction between competency and system specifications (limitations and capabilities) is a crucial issue. System specifications outline parameters within which the system can operate, while competency represents accumulated knowledge about the interconnected capabilities of modules and components. For instance, a stemmer with 92% accuracy has competency defined by the circumstances under which it performs optimally. Competency evolves, necessitating a meta-level guidance system to generate diverse scenarios for evaluating micro and macro-level competency.

Computational competency emerges as a promising research domain, compelling exploration of models, methods, and procedures to gauge the competency of individual modules, components, and entire AI systems. Audit trails, competency requirements specifications, and contemplation, facilitated by competency analytics, contribute to computational competency. This process unveils insights into the moral and ethical functioning of the AI system.

An AI Systems requirement is the thorough evaluation and upgrading of the system under realistic and anticipated scenarios to achieve the desired level of competency. Policymakers can mandate the execution of the system under specific scenarios, akin to clinical trials conducted by regulatory bodies such as the FDA, accompanied by competency analytics and a rigorous approval process for the production use of an AI system. Comprehensive documentation of these trials should be subject to public scrutiny, paving the way for an open approval process for public AI system use. The inherent value of a competent AI system can be leveraged to seek additional financial benefits for its implementers.

9 Related Work

(Horovitz 2016) at the US Senate hearing, the note stated the concept of 'Integrative Intelligence' and 'democratization of AI' in the presentation of the AI system. Our AI system handles both these aspects by considering an AI system as system-integrated software modules and hardware components, and open disclosure of the system's competency is a move towards democratizing AI. The moral competency of robots, robots interacting with humans, and multi-agent systems were proposed and studied by (Scheutz and Malle, forthcoming, Malle 2014; Mallem Scheutz, Forlizzi, and Voiklis 2016; Scheutz 2016). The key aspects studied by them are to (i) present scenarios where moral competency is apparent, (ii) bring in vocabulary and constructs to communicate about moral competency, (iii) develop norms for formalizing moral competency, and (iv) empirically study nature of asymmetry in moral judgments. (Brooks et al. 1998) present an architecture and key capabilities of an AI system having the essence of human intelligence.

Our AI system, built using similar architecture, is useful in evaluating micro and macro-level competency. There is still much work to be done to develop a framework that ensures the seamless integration of disparate and different AI components from the perspective of competency analytics. (Scassellati 2002) delves into the nature of a robot when it must interact with humans through sensors. Data and algorithmic competency issues occur because of sensor data dependencies. (Domingos 2012) has clarified what a machine learning system is. Our use of clarity in representation competency and other micro and macro competency aspects is based on it. (Asaro 2016) introduces the liability problem but has yet to be able to formally reason about how to identify the cause of the liability systematically. Our notion of micro and macro competency and relevant audit trails will provide a basis for judging the system's liability (in terms of competency). (Kafah, Ajmeri, and Singh 2017) study normative multi-agent systems from the context of liveness and safety that can contribute to the data competency of the AI system. (Rossi 2017, Conitzer et al. 2017) worked on moral preferences and decision-making. However, articulating preference regarding values and pay-offs provides competency in terms of the implicit and explicit rationale for selecting these values and then manipulating them to decide on moral actions.

The system's competency is different from each instance of the working of the AI system, wherein different optimizations could occur. Therefore, even though much work has been done at algorithmic or technique levels of moral

Competent AI Systems

and ethical behavior, but still needs to develop the work to determine the accumulated competency from applying the methods and techniques over many different scenarios.

(Gaur, Sangal, Bagaria 2010, chapter 8) presents how to articulate and reason about trust based on intention and competency. Our approach for determining and reasoning about competency is along similar articulation of trust.

In (Johnson and Bullock, 2023), the authors present the notion of fragility in AI systems, especially those based on neural networks. Fragility and competency are interrelated concepts, a fragile AI system implies an incompetent AI system, as it can fail often. A competent AI system can become fragile and fail under certain circumstances. Fragility, if it can be properly formulated and measured (like sensitivity studies in optimization problems (Yeung et al. 2010)), can be used to quantify the level of competency of an AI system at a micro and macro level.

10 Conclusions

AI systems, whether collaborating with humans, working autonomously, or supporting human activities, are increasingly pervasive, eliciting apprehension due to concerns about potential harm. Humans, recognized for their competency, are not immune to lapses, exemplified by the common occurrence of the "Glass Door problem." Analogously, AI systems inherently grapple with analogous challenges, necessitating a proactive approach to articulate and address their competency.

The primary contribution of this note lies in advocating for a 'competency-oriented' paradigm during the design, construction, and deployment of AI systems. This entails elevating competency to first-class status, whether at the micro level within individual modules or components or the macro level, spanning the entire AI system. The critical components that drive AI system functionality are examined to discern micro and macro-level competencies.

The objective is to enable competency-driven assessments by subjecting the AI system to diverse scenarios over extended periods (contemplation). Employing competency analytics models supports subsequent computational evaluations, stating and ensuring competency to prevent system-induced harm. Furthermore, these analytics serve as a valuable tool for enhancing the system's competency.

Future work will focus on developing a comprehensive framework and a systematic approach to architect and implement a competency-driven open AI system for deployment. Such a system aims to serve humanity benevolently, fostering transparency, reliability, and ethically.

References

- Scott V. Liebman, 404 S.W.2d 288(1966); Supreme Court of Texas, May 18, 1966 (<https://law.justia.com/cases/texas/supreme-court/1966/a-10939-0.html>).
- Horvitz, E; 2016. Reflections on the Status and Future of Artificial Intelligence. *Hearing on the Dawn of Artificial Intelligence*.
- Scheutz, M.; and Malle, B. F.; (forthcoming) *Moral Robots*. in K. Rommelfanger and S. Johnson (eds.), Routledge Handbook of Neuroethics. New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.
- Malle, B.F.; (2014). *Moral competence in robots?* In Seibt, J, Hakli, R., & Norskov, M. (Eds), Social robots and the future of social relations, Proceedings of Robo-Philosophy.
- Malle, B. F.; Scheutz, M.; Forlizzi, J.; and Voiklis J. (2016) Which Robot am I Thinking About? The impact of Action and Appearance on People's Evaluations of a Moral Robot. ACM/IEEE conference on Human and Robot Interaction.
- Scheutz, M;. (2016) The need for moral competency in autonomous agent architectures. In Vincent C. Muller (Ed.) Fundamentals of Artificial Intelligence. Springer.
- Brooks, R. A.; Breazeal, C.; Irie, R.; Kemp, C. C.; Marjanovic, M.; Scassellati, B.; and Williamson, M.M.; 1998. Alternative Essences of Intelligence. AAAI Conference Proceedings.
- Scassellati, B.; (2002) Theory of Mind for a Humanoid Robot. Autonomous Robots.
- Domingos, P.; (2012) A few useful things to know about machine learning. CACM pages 78-87.

Competent AI Systems

Asaro, P. M.; (2016) The liability Problem for Autonomous Artificial Agents. AAAI Symposium on Ethical and Moral considerations in Non-Human Agents, Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

Kafah, O.; Ajmeri, N.; and Singh, M. (2017) KONT: Computing Tradeoffs in Normative Multiagent Systems. AAAI Conference.

Rossi, F.; (2016) Moral Preferences. 10th Workshop on advances of Preference Handling.

Conitzer, V.; Sinnott-Armstrong, W.; Borg, J.S.; Deng, Y.; Kramer, M.; (2017) Moral Decision-Making Frameworks for Artificial Intelligence. AAAI Conference.

Gaur, R. R.; Sangal, R.; Bagaria, G.P.; (2010) A foundation course in Human Values and Professional Ethics. Excel Books. (Available on Kindle).

Johnson, J. A., Bullock D. H.; (2023) Fragility in AIs using Artificial Neural Networks, CACM, July 2023.

Yeung D. S., Cloete I., Shi D., Ng W. W. Y.; (2010) Sensitivity Analysis for Neural Networks, Springer Verlag.