3.9 Deputy S.Y. Mézec of St. Helier South of the President of the Scrutiny Liaison Committee regarding the use of Artificial Intelligence by contributors to Scrutiny reviews (OQ.135/2025):

Will the president advise what experience, if any, Scrutiny Panels have had of artificial intelligence being used by contributors to their reviews, and what consideration, if any, is being given to how A.I.-generated submissions can be identified and assessed?

Deputy I. Gardiner of St. Helier North (President, Scrutiny Liaison Committee):

Thank you to the Deputy for this question. I am mindful that the use of A.I. in research and the formulation of written materials, including submissions, is not inherently negative, and the range of uses to which it can be put is extremely wide. Scrutiny members and our officers are extremely mindful of the importance of establishing and understanding the context and origin of any evidence or submission that is received. Indeed, any submission received anonymously, for example, will be inadmissible. The weighting or credibility given to any submission is determined by several factors, which might include how well source material is referenced within it. We might ensure that it is not a bot, it is not an automatic submission. We need to ensure that the real person, the person made the submission and expressed views. In respect to the second part of the question, as part of work of the department in this area, the States Greffe's current business plan, R.45, contains an objective which reads: "To continue investigating and implementing opportunities to integrate advances in technology and software, including artificial intelligence, into the work of the department." Specific to the scrutiny, the team of officers supporting us has established a working group to explore developments in A.I. and technology in parliamentary committee settings and to learn how such developments are being approached in other jurisdictions. Learning from this group will give us advice and I ask also, following the question from the Deputy, to add working with submissions and influence of A.I. to our next Scrutiny Liaison Committee meeting, which will take place next week.

3.9.1 Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

I thank the president for that answer. Part of my question was about what experience, if any, Scrutiny Panels had had of A.I. being used by contributors to their reviews. The president is obviously right to say that A.I. can be a very useful tool. I am aware of at least one instance that I could identify of a submission that looked to be almost wholly written by A.I. and contained numerous points of misinformation in them. Could I ask the president if she could confirm if this is something the panels have reported experience of, or if it is any more widespread than at least I have been able to identify?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

First of all, there was one particular submission. When the Deputy submitted the question I definitely checked with all chairs and with officers, and it was one particular submission that raised concern. Saying this, that when we looked through this particular submission - we can discuss the quality of the submission and maybe some contradictions - but if we are talking about the same submission, I am happy to discuss with the Deputy. There are 4 members of the particular organisation signed the submission so it is an official submission. Regarding the misunderstanding or misconceptions, I believe if it is factually incorrect, 2 is 2, 5 is 5, which is facts and numbers, I would be welcoming if somebody found the factual mistakes to raise it with the Scrutiny. Saying this, we always receive submissions from the members of the public that are based on an article from the newspaper, from the book, and from the internet, and their

own views and their own interpretations. It is very important that we will look at all various interpretations and views from the public.

3.9.2 Deputy K.L. Moore of St. Mary, St. Ouen and St. Peter:

Will the president agree that, if used correctly, A.I. can be a vital tool in developing work and conducting research? In fact, is vital in helping Islanders to enhance their productivity, which is, of course, a matter that I believe forms part of the common strategic priorities of this Government?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I believe that we all are learning how to work with A.I. In my opinion, going forward, the speed and the depth of research possible with A.I. gives almost equal research capabilities, for example, to Scrutiny compared to the Government, with no extra cost, which can only be good for democracy. I believe that we all need to work together to understand how we are managing new technology coming into our life, which we must balance the strong human oversight and possible risks of bias and misconceptions that can come from A.I. But this is why it is important to still have human oversight.

3.9.3 Deputy R.J. Ward of St. Helier Central:

May I ask the president of the panel, does she support the creation of a register of lobbyists ,which may include guidance on the use of A.I.?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

First of all, thank you for the question, because the work with lobby groups has been raised at the Scrutiny Liaison Committee. It is another theme that Scrutiny Liaison Committee are looking into that. We also need to define, I think all Parliaments are looking how to work, but at the end of the day we work with individual parishioners and we work with all groups. We need to make sure that we are engaging with a variety of public views.

3.9.4 Deputy R.J. Ward:

I noted that the president of the committee earlier referred to an official submission. Does she think that a register of lobbyists would help us define what we mean by "official" in those terms? Because there are different levels, if you like, of organisations of groups that lobby our Scrutiny and indeed all parts of Government, quite frankly.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Thank you for the question. I think it is important to understand what is a lobby group, and we all work with lobby groups. We need to understand, for example, if the Chamber of Commerce can see the lobby group, or the union can see the lobby group. From both ways, we have lobby and we work with it. These groups are presenting views of specific groups of the members of the public, and we have a variety of them.

3.9.5 Deputy K.F. Morel of St. John, St. Lawrence and Trinity:

Continuing from Deputy Mézec's question about the potential misinformation. Deputy Mézec in his question said that the responses seem to contain misinformation. Whether it is from a machine learning tool or whether it is by a human being, would the Scrutiny Liaison Committee and the Scrutiny Panels seek to call out misinformation where it is stated in a response to review?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

I think it is important that the Scrutiny work together with the Government because sometimes what we consider as misinformation or different interpretation. If we are thinking about the law, the same law can be interpreted by different lawyers in different ways. So, the members of the public, what was presented to them, can be interpreting things in different ways. If the Ministers consider there is specific misinformation was put towards the Scrutiny, it is important to raise it with the Scrutiny, and we will look into this if it is misinformation or interpretation. Another thing, when Scrutiny put in the reports, the first thing that Scrutiny does before any report publication, it is fact checked with the Government. It is, I think, another stop to ensure that misinformation is not cascaded to the public. The fact check from the Government coming back to the Scrutiny, saying these facts are wrong, and we can talk about the fact.

3.9.6 Deputy K.F. Morel:

Tying this to lobby groups, as in Deputy Ward's question, where misinformation is not about interpretation, but is just about incorrect facts, and the portrayal of incorrect facts as real facts, something which lobby groups sometimes do, or have been seen to do at least in other jurisdictions, is that something that Scrutiny would seek to call out, to highlight the fact that some groups try to masquerade non-facts as facts?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Yes. We would consider what are the facts, and this is why I am saying that Scrutiny look into this, and Scrutiny might not have the same knowledge as the government official who put it forward. This is why it is important the oral submission published, and our officers are looking through them. It is important to emphasise the submissions that contradict existing facts in the public domain would be considered in different way, and the submitter would be questioned about the facts. It is really important to emphasise the separation between facts and different views of the submitter.

[10.30]

3.9.7 Deputy M.R. Scott of St. Brelade:

Just to clarify, given that there can be submissions that contain misinformation, whether or not that is the result of the use of A.I. or not, can the president simply confirm whether the reports produced by Scrutiny Panels, bearing in mind that the submissions have been made public, whether the reports themselves will identify whether submissions contain misinformation or not?

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Before the report is published it will be checked by us and also checked by the Government. Before the report published, it is coming back to the Scrutiny with Government notes, and this is another option for the Government to ensure that if we can miss some misinformation, this should be raised with us.

3.9.8 Deputy M.R. Scott:

Maybe my question was not understood. I do not believe that it is Government's responsibility in terms of the submissions. I am asking whether Scrutiny itself, in publishing reports, will identify submissions that contain misinformation so that can be published in the reports to inform the public better.

Deputy I. Gardiner:

Absolutely. I mean it is the Scrutiny, once we receive submission, looking through them, and our officers looking through them and making sure that we do have correct information. It is

completely Scrutiny role to ensure that the submission that we receive is a submission that express the views of specific people and not the bots if you are talking about A.I., and factual information is correct. I am not putting responsibility on the Government. What I said, Scrutiny do it most to ensure that misinformation is not published, and if we miss something there is another stop before the report published, which calls fact check. This is normal engagement process between Scrutiny and the Executive.

The Bailiff:

Final supplementary, Deputy Mézec.

Deputy S.Y. Mézec:

No, thank you.