Global AI Legislation Tracker

By IAPP Research and Insights
Countries worldwide are designing and implementing AI governance legislation commensurate to the velocity and variety of proliferating AI-powered technologies. Legislative efforts include the development of comprehensive legislation, focused legislation for specific use cases, and voluntary guidelines and standards.

This tracker identifies legislative policy and related developments in a subset of jurisdictions. It is not globally comprehensive, nor does it include all AI initiatives within each jurisdiction, given the rapid and widespread policymaking in this space. This tracker offers brief commentary on the wider AI context in specific jurisdictions, and lists index rankings provided by Tortoise Media, the first index to benchmark nations on their levels of investment, innovation and implementation of AI.

As individual jurisdictions press ahead with their own frameworks and approaches, they have also doubled down on multilateral efforts to coordinate and cohere different approaches. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's AI principles have been reaffirmed in many different contexts, including by digital and technology ministers of the G7 countries during the 2023 Hiroshima Summit. UNESCO, the International Organization for Standardization, the African Union and the Council of Europe are all working on multilateral AI governance frameworks. The U.K. government is organizing the first AI Safety Summit for government and industry stakeholders to agree upon, evaluate and monitor the most significant risks from AI.

Tracking, unpacking and governing the complex field of global AI governance law and policy has quickly become a top tier strategic issue for organizations. The IAPP AI Governance Center will provide AI governance professionals with the content, resources, networking, training and certification needed to respond to the field's complex risks. We welcome feedback and insights from the community of AI governance professionals.
This map shows which jurisdictions are in focus and covered by this tracker. It does not represent the extent to which jurisdictions around the world are active on AI governance legislation.

**Jurisdictions in focus**

Australia | Brazil | Canada | China | EU | India | Israel | Japan | New Zealand

| Saudi Arabia | Singapore | South Korea | United Arab Emirates | U.K. | U.S. |

*Click on the country names above to navigate to its location in the tracker.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Specific AI governance law and policy</th>
<th>Relevant authorities</th>
<th>Other relevant laws and policies</th>
<th>Wider AI context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Australia | There are no laws and policies specific to AI governance in Australia, but the government highlighted the application of existing regulatory frameworks for AI. The Human Technology Institute at the University of Technology Sydney recently released The State of AI Governance in Australia. See Australia’s [discussion paper](https://www.eats.unsw.edu.au/ai辩论) on safe and responsible AI and its [AI Roadmap](https://www.eats.unsw.edu.au/aidebate). The roadmap sets out the focus on AI development in high potential areas, such as natural resources and infrastructure. | - Department of Industry, Science and Resources  
- Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation  
- Office of the eSafety Commissioner  
- Office of the Victorian Information Commissioner  
- Competition and Consumer Commission | - Patents Act (in force)  
- Copyright Act (in force)  
- Privacy Act (in force)  
- Data Availability and Transparency Act (in force)  
- Consumer Data Right (in force)  
- Competition and Consumer Act (in force) | - Ranked No. 15 on Tortoise’s [Global AI Index](https://www.tortoise.com/ai-index).  
- The Human Technology Institute at the University of Technology Sydney recently released [The State of AI Governance in Australia](https://www.eats.unsw.edu.au/aidebate). |
| Brazil | Brazil has a proposed comprehensive AI Bill, which emphasizes human rights and creates a civil liability regime for AI developers. The proposed AI Bill would:  
- Prohibit certain “excessive risk” systems.  
- Establish a regulatory body to enforce the law.  
- Create civil liability for AI providers.  
- Require reporting obligations for significant security incidents.  
- Guarantee various individual rights, such as explanation of AI-based decisions, nondiscrimination, rectification of identified biases and due process mechanisms. | - Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation  
- National Data Protection Authority, Autoridade Nacional de Proteção de Dados | - General Data Protection Act (in force)  
- Civil Rights Framework for the Internet (in force)  
- Brazil’s [AI Strategy](https://www.tortoise.com/ai-index) proposes to finance research projects that apply ethical solutions, establish technical requirements which advance ethical applications, develop techniques to mitigate algorithmic bias, create parameters around human intervention where automated decisions may create high-risk situations, and implement codes of conduct to encourage traceability and safeguard legal rights. Brazil also strives to encourage data sharing per its data protection law, the LGPD, create an AI observatory for measuring impact, as well as disseminate open-source codes for identifying discriminatory trends. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country (A-Z)</th>
<th>Specific AI governance law and policy</th>
<th>Relevant authorities</th>
<th>Other relevant laws and policies</th>
<th>Wider AI context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Canada**   | Canada’s anticipated *AI and Data Act*, part of *Bill C-27*, is intended to protect Canadians from high-risk systems, ensure the development of responsible AI, and position Canadian firms and values for adoption in global AI development. The AIDA would:  
• Ensure high-impact AI systems meet existing safety and human rights expectations.  
• Prohibit reckless and malicious uses of AI.  
• Empower the Minister of Innovation, Science, and Industry to enforce the act.  
Canada also issued a *Directive on Automated Decision-Making*, which imposes several requirements on the federal government’s use of automated decision-making systems. | • Ministry of Innovation, Science and Economic Development  
• Canadian Institute for Advanced Research  
• Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada | • Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (in force)  
• Privacy Act (in force)  
• Consumer Product Safety Act (in force)  
• Food and Drugs Act (in force)  
• Motor Vehicle Safety Act (in force)  
• Bank Act (in force)  
• Canadian Human Rights Act (in force)  
• Criminal Code (in force) | • Ranked No. 5 on Tortoise’s *Global AI Index*.  
• According to its *AI Strategy*, by 2030 Canada plans to achieve an AI ecosystem founded on scientific excellence, exceptional training and talent pools, public-private collaboration, and commitment to AI technologies which produce positive social, economic and environmental change for people and the planet. In achieving these goals, Canada has established three AI institutes: Amii in Edmonton, Mila in Montreal, and the Vector Institute in Toronto. These institutes are involved in initiatives to address the climate crisis, to develop responsible use of AI, and to promote leadership and excellence in AI. Beyond research, Canada is working to revolutionize the health care system with AI. |
| **China**    | China is one of the first countries to implement AI regulations. Chinese lawmakers are in the process of drafting a comprehensive AI regulation. Various regulations and policies apply to specific AI uses. These include:  
• Algorithmic Recommendation Management Provisions (in force)  
• Interim Measures for the Management of Generative AI Services (in force)  
• Deep Synthesis Management Provisions (draft) | • Cyberspace Administration of China  
• Ministry of Industry and Information Technology  
• Ministry of Public Security  
• State Administration for Market Regulation | • Cybersecurity Law (in force)  
• Data Security Law (in force)  
• Personal Information Protection Law (in force) | • Ranked No. 2 on Tortoise’s *Global AI Index*.  
• See China’s *AI development plan*. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country (A-Z)</th>
<th>Specific AI governance law and policy</th>
<th>Relevant authorities</th>
<th>Other relevant laws and policies</th>
<th>Wider AI context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>The EU AI Act moved to the trilogue stage, where a final version will be debated, June 2023. Passage of the act is expected by the end of 2023 or in early 2024. The three positions in the trilogue discussions are put forward by the commission, council and European Parliament. In brief, some of the proposals being debated in trilogue include measures that: • Prohibit certain types of AI systems, i.e., those that are manipulative, exploitative, perform social scoring or use &quot;real-time&quot; biometric ID systems. • Classify high-risk AI systems and set out requirements with which these systems and their providers must comply. • Delegate regulatory and enforcement authorities. • Prescribe standards of conformity which may be applied by high-risk systems. • Ensure transparency obligations for AI systems which interact with natural persons. • Provide innovation measures. • Set out a governance framework divided between the EU AI Board and national authorities. • Create a database for high-risk systems. • Requires an iterative process of review after-market deployment. • Prompt the formation of codes of conduct for AI systems which are not high-risk. • Stipulate confidentiality requirements for authorities dealing with proprietary data. • Afford the power to adopt delegated acts to the European Commission.</td>
<td>• Proposed future EU AI Board • European Data Protection Board • Member state AI authorities, for example: - Spain's AI supervision agency, the Agencia Española de Supervisión de la Inteligencia Artificial • Member state data protection authorities, for example: - France's Commission nationale de l'informatique et des libertés - Germany’s Federal Commissioner for Data Protection and Freedom of Information - Italy's Garante - Spain's Agencia Española de Protección de Datos - Belgium's Data Protection Authority - Poland's Urząd Ochrony Danych Osobowych - Austria's Data Protection Authority - Hungary's National Authority for Data Protection and Freedom of Information</td>
<td>• General Data Protection Regulation (in force) • Digital Services Act (in force) • Digital Markets Act (in force) • AI Liability Directive (draft)</td>
<td>• Some EU member states have national AI strategies, many of which emphasize research, training and labor preparedness, as well as multistakeholder and international collaboration. For example: - France's national AI strategy lays out three main objectives: improve the AI education and training ecosystem, establish an open data policy for implementing AI applications and pooling assets, and develop an ethical framework for fair and transparent use of AI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country (A-Z)</td>
<td>Specific AI governance law and policy</td>
<td>Relevant authorities</td>
<td>Other relevant laws and policies</td>
<td>Wider AI context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| India        | There are no laws and policies specific to AI governance in India. A proposed [Digital India Act](#) would replace the IT Act of 2000 and regulate high-risk AI systems. The Indian government has advocated for a robust, citizen-centric and inclusive "AI for all" environment. A task force has been established to make recommendations on ethical, legal and societal issues related to AI, and to establish an AI regulatory authority. | • NITI Aayog  
• Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology  
• Ministry of Commerce and Industry  
• AI Task Force | • Information Technology Act (in force)  
• Information Technology Rules (in force)  
• Competition Act (in force)  
• Motor Vehicles Act (in force)  
• Digital Personal Data Protection Act (in force) | • Ranked No. 14 on Tortoise's [Global AI Index](#).  
• According to its [National Strategy for AI](#), India hopes to become what it calls an "AI garage" for emerging and developing economies, where scalable solutions can be easily implemented and designed for global deployment. |
| Israel       | There is no comprehensive AI regulation in Israel. Based on a [draft policy](#) for regulation and ethics in AI, the country wants to form a uniform risk management tool, establish a governmental knowledge and coordination center, and maintain involvement in international regulation and standardization. In general, voluntary standardization, sector-based self-regulation and modular experimentation tools, e.g., sandboxes, will be favored over a lateral framework. The following resources are available for policy guidance:  
  • [Israeli AI Regulation and Policy White Paper: A First Glance](#)  
  • [Harnessing Innovation: Israeli Perspectives on AI Ethics and Governance](#) | • Ministry of Innovation, Science and Technology  
• Ministry of Justice  
• Privacy Protection Authority | • Basic Law: Human Dignity and Liberty (in force)  
• Privacy Protection Law (in force)  
• Data Security Regulation (in force)  
• Credit Data Law (in force)  
• Copyright Act (in force) | • Ranked No. 7 on Tortoise's [Global AI Index](#). |
<table>
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<th>Country (A-Z)</th>
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</table>
| Japan        | There is no comprehensive AI regulation in Japan. Japan promotes the notion of "agile governance," whereby the government provides nonbinding guidance and defers to the private sector's voluntary efforts to self-regulate. The following white papers have been issued for policy guidance:  
  • AI Governance in Japan Ver. 1.1  
  • Governance Guidelines for Implementation of AI Principles | • Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry  
  • Council for Science, Technology and Innovation  
  • Personal Information Protection Commission | • Improving Transparency and Fairness of Digital Platforms Act (in force)  
  • Financial Instruments and Exchange Act (in force)  
  • Protection of Personal Information Act (in force)  
  • Antimonopoly Act (in force)  
  • Product Liability Act (in force)  
  • Copyright Law (in force) | • Ranked No. 12 on Tortoise's Global AI Index.  
  • The Social Principles of Human-Centric AI, drafted by the Council for Social Principles of Human-Centric AI, describe AI's role in Japan's "Society 5.0" and advocates that AI should be human-centric; promote education/literacy; protect privacy; ensure security; maintain fair competition; ensure fairness, accountability and transparency; and promote collaborative innovation.  
  • Japan's technology minister Keiko Nagaoka declared the country's copyright laws cannot be enforced on materials used in AI training data sets. |
| New Zealand  | There is no comprehensive AI regulation in New Zealand. Government agencies are beholden to the Algorithm Charter which provides a risk matrix to assess the likelihood and impact of algorithmic applications. The New Zealand government generally prioritizes trustworthy and human-centric AI development.  
  • Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment  
  • Statistics New Zealand  
  • Office of the Privacy Commissioner | • Privacy Act (in force)  
  • Bill of Rights Act (in force)  
  • Treaty of Waitangi (in force)  
  • Māori Data Sovereignty Principles | • Rated No. 36 on Tortoise's Global AI Index.  
  • The New Zealand government released AI cornerstones which will inform an eventual national AI strategy.  
  • The Law, Society and Ethics Working Group published a set of guiding principles designed to provide direction for AI stakeholders. |
<table>
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</table>
| Saudi Arabia | There are no laws and policies specific to AI in Saudi Arabia. The primary legislative agenda is to enact a welcoming, flexible and stable regulatory framework, including incentive schemes, to attract AI companies, investors and talents. | • Saudi Data and AI Authority  
• National Data Management Office  
• Ministry of Communications and Information Technology | • Personal Data Protection Law (in force)  
• Data Management and Personal Data Protection Standards (in force)  
• Children and Incompetents' Data Protection Policy (in force)  
• Data Classification Policy (in force)  
• General Rules for the Transfer of Personal Data outside the Geographical Borders of the Kingdom (in force)  
• Data Sharing Policy (in force)  
• Freedom of Information Policy (in force)  
• Open Data Policy (in force) | • Ranked No. 31 on Tortoise's Global AI Index.  
• According to the national strategy for data and AI, Saudi Arabia aspires to be one of the leading economies utilizing and exporting data and AI after 2030. It is ready to leverage its "young and vibrant population" and "unique centralized ecosystem." Saudi Arabia hopes to attract outside investment by hosting global AI events and applying its influence as a tech hub within the Middle East. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</table>
| Singapore    | There is no comprehensive AI regulation, but Singapore developed voluntary governance frameworks and initiatives for ethical AI deployment, data management and sectoral implementation, including:  
  • Model AI Governance Framework  
  • Trusted Data Sharing Framework  
  • National AI Programmes in Government and Finance  
  • Veritas Initiative, an implementation framework for AI governance in the financial sector  
  • AI Verify Foundation, a governance testing toolkit  
  • IPPOS International, part of the Intellectual Property Office of Singapore that realizes customized IP solutions  
  • Proposed Advisory Guidelines on Use of Personal Data in AI Recommendation and Decision Systems | • Smart Nation Digital Government Group  
• National AI Office  
• AI Ethics and Governance Steering Committee  
• Personal Data Protection Commission | • Personal Data Protection Act  
(in force)  
• Computer Misuse Act  
(in force)  
• Copyright Act  
(in force)  
• Patents Act  
(in force)  
• Competition Act  
(in force)  
• Cybersecurity Act  
(in force)  
• Protection from Online Falsehoods and Manipulation Act  
(in force)  
• Road Traffic Act  
(in force) | • Ranked No. 3 on Tortoise's Global AI Index.  
• Based on Singapore's National AI Strategy, the city-state aims to be a global hub for AI, thereby generating economic gains and improving lives. A key tenet in Singapore's AI policy is that its citizens understand AI tech and its workforce attains the necessary competencies to participate in an AI economy. |
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<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Specific AI governance law and policy</th>
<th>Relevant authorities</th>
<th>Other relevant laws and policies</th>
<th>Wider AI context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| South Korea  | There are no laws and policies specific to AI in South Korea, but the nation has a comprehensive AI Act in the works to ensure accessibility to AI technology for all developers without government approval but this requires reliability measures. South Korea is also setting new standards on copyrights of AI-generated content. | • Ministry of Science and ICT  
• Personal Information Protection Commission  
• Communications Commission  
• Internet and Security Agency  
• Financial Services Commission  
• Fair Trade Commission | • Personal Information Protection Act  
(in force)  
• Monopoly Regulation and Fair Trade Act  
(in force)  
• Copyright Act  
(in force)  
• Protection and Use of Location Information Act  
(in force)  
• Consumer Protection in Electronic Commerce Act  
(in force)  
• Promotion and Communications, Network Utilization and Information Protection Act  
(in force)  
• Credit Information Use and Protection Act  
(in force)  
• Product Liability Act  
(in force) | • Ranked No. 6 on Tortoise's Global AI Index.  
• South Korea has numerous policy initiatives regarding AI and technology under its National Strategy for AI, including the AI Research and Development Strategy, the Data Industry Activation Strategy and the System Semiconductor Strategy. The nation intends to leverage its high education level, widespread acceptance of new technology and preeminent IT infrastructure to implement these initiatives. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country (A-Z)</th>
<th>Specific AI governance law and policy</th>
<th>Relevant authorities</th>
<th>Other relevant laws and policies</th>
<th>Wider AI context</th>
</tr>
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</table>
| United Arab Emirates | There is no comprehensive AI regulation in the United Arab Emirates. In 2017, the UAE became the first country to establish an AI ministry. The nation’s Council for AI and Blockchain will oversee policies that promote an AI-friendly ecosystem, advance AI research and accelerate collaboration between public and private sectors. The following resources have been issued for policy guidance:  
  - National Program for AI  
  - AI Ethics Principles and Guidelines  
  - Generative AI guide  
  - AI coding license  
  - AI System Ethics Self-Assessment Tool | • Minister of AI, Digital Economy and Remote Work Applications Office  
• AI and Blockchain Council  
• UAE Data Office | • Personal Data Protection Law (in force)  
• Central Bank Rulebook (in force)  
• Federal Decree Law on Combating Rumours and Cybercrimes (in force)  
• Penal Code (in force)  
• Federal Law concerning the Regulation of Competition (in force)  
• Federal Law on Consumer Protection (in force)  
• Federal Decree Law on Copyrights and Neighbouring Rights (in force)  
• Health Data Law (in force) | • Ranked No. 28 on Tortoise’s Global AI Index.  
• The UAE is poised to become a hub for AI research, collaboration, innovation and education per its National Strategy for AI. Abu Dhabi hosts a growing startup community, advanced machine-learning facilities and educational institutions, like Mohamed bin Zayed University which teamed up with IBM to open the AI Center of Excellence, in addition to a new supercomputing resource for complex algorithms and large data sets. With this infrastructure in place, the UAE hopes to deploy AI in priority sectors such as energy and transportation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country (A-Z)</th>
<th>Specific AI governance law and policy</th>
<th>Relevant authorities</th>
<th>Other relevant laws and policies</th>
<th>Wider AI context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.K.</td>
<td>The U.K. does not have a comprehensive AI regulation, but the government proposed a context-based, proportionate approach to regulation and will rely on existing sectoral laws to impose guardrails on AI systems. The following resources are available for policy guidance:  • A pro-innovation approach to AI regulation  • Algorithmic Transparency Recording Standard Hub</td>
<td>• Office for AI  • Information Commissioner’s Office  • Digital Regulation Cooperation Forum</td>
<td>• Equality Act (in force)  • U.K. General Data Protection Regulations and Data Protection Act (in force)  • Consumer Protection Act (in force)  • Financial Services and Markets Act (in force)  • Consumer Rights Act (in force)  • National Security and Investment Act (in force)  • Copyright, Designs and Patents Act (in force)</td>
<td>• Ranked No. 4 on Tortoise’s Global AI Index.  • According to the AI Council Roadmap and the National AI Strategy, the U.K. aims to invest in the long-term needs of the AI ecosystem and support the transition to an AI-enabled economy, emphasizing broad public trust and the involvement of diverse viewpoints to achieve these measures. • Specific action items include launching a national AI research and insights program, developing a diverse AI workforce, enabling better data availability, creating a national strategy for AI in health and social care, applying AI systems to climate change mitigation, piloting an AI standards hub to coordinate with global AI standardization, and developing a cross-government standard for algorithmic transparency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country (A-Z)</td>
<td>Specific AI governance law and policy</td>
<td>Relevant authorities</td>
<td>Other relevant laws and policies</td>
<td>Wider AI context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. (Federal)</td>
<td>The U.S. does not have a comprehensive AI regulation, but numerous frameworks and guidelines exist. Congress has passed legislation to preserve U.S. leadership in AI research and development, as well as control government use of AI. In May 2023, the Biden administration updated the National AI Research and Development Strategic Plan, emphasizing a principled and coordinated approach to international collaboration in AI research. The Office of Science and Technology Policy issued a request for information to obtain public input on AI's impact. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration sought feedback on what policies can create trust in AI systems through an AI Accountability Policy Request for Comment. Specific AI governance law and policy includes:</td>
<td>Office of Science and Technology Policy</td>
<td>FTC Act, Section 5 (in force)</td>
<td>Ranked No. 1 on Tortoise's Global AI Index. In general, the U.S. approach to AI governance has been slow and incremental, seeking to preserve civil and human rights for Americans throughout AI deployment, as well as mobilize international collaboration which upholds democratic values and mutual advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Executive orders:</td>
<td>National AI Initiative Office</td>
<td>Fair Credit Reporting Act (in force)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Promoting the Use of Trustworthy AI in the Federal Government</td>
<td>Consumer Financial Protection Bureau</td>
<td>Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (in force)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acts and bills:</td>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act (in force)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- National AI Initiative Act (Division E, Sec. 5001; in force)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair Housing Act (in force)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AI in Government Act (Division U, Sec. 101; in force)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Genetic Information and Nondiscrimination Act (in force)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Algorithmic Accountability Act (Draft)</td>
<td></td>
<td>American Data Privacy and Protection Act (draft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- National AI Commission Act (Draft)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Equity and Accountability Act (draft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Digital Platform Commission Act (Draft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Global Technology Leadership Act (Draft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transparent Automated Governance Act (Draft)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country (A-Z)</td>
<td>Specific AI governance law and policy</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **U.S. (Federal), continued** | - Nonbinding frameworks:  
  - Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights  
  - National Institute of Standards and Technology AI Risk Management Framework  
  - Guidance for Regulation of AI Applications  
- Government initiatives:  
  - Voluntary Commitments from Leading AI Companies to Manage the Risks Posed by AI  
  - TTC Joint Roadmap on Evaluation and Measurement Tools for Trustworthy AI and Risk Management  
  - Congressional AI effort of Sen. Charles E. Schumer, D-N.Y.  
  - National Security Commission on AI | | | |
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