So, the last session of papers, we start with Katja Meier, no further introductions, please, as always, eight minutes.

Eight minutes, okay. Good afternoon, so let me immediately start with the core message of our position paper. If we want generative AI in particular, and AI more broadly of course, to serve the public good, then it must be built on the principles of open science and digital commons. And this is not just a normative argument, it points to concrete actions, as I will show in a bit, actions towards openness that digital humanism, among others, can support in education, research, and policy, and of course in networking, where digital humanism is especially good. My talk today builds on an event we organized in Berlin earlier this year, together with my co-authors Jochen Knaus and Stefan Skupin, I didn't put the names on the slide, sorry, colleagues from the Berlin University Alliance and the Weizenbaum Institute, and other partners such as Wikimedia. More than 100 researchers, NGOs, policy makers, and data stewards worked together on the 25th of March to explore how to build generative AI that is transparent, accountable, and aligned with democratic values. The insights from that event form the backbone of what I'm going to present. So what's the problem? There's a lot of problems, I mean the whole conference here is full of problems of course, but I want to pick out one particular one, the problem space that AI runs on public knowledge, but it's captured in private infrastructures. There is not just one AI of course, but today's pressure comes from generative AI, especially large language models. In the global north, chatbots have quickly become everyday tools for information search and orientation, they will change platform economies in the next years dramatically, they are widely used before any sustainable business or governance model exists. We are part of a big social experiment here. So these systems also demand enormous data, we have heard it, compute resources, accelerating the concentration of infrastructural power, and at the same time they rely heavily on public knowledge, they rely on scientific publications, public data sets, cultural heritage, open source software, and of course Wikipedia and the open web in more general. But yet the infrastructures that are required to train and deploy these systems, data centers, model pipelines, evaluation environments, the whole stack if you want, are increasingly private and opaque. So this creates a now familiar power imbalance. AI draws from the commons, but its development is steered by private interests with limited transparency, reproducibility, or democratic oversight. There is however a counter trend, like always thankfully, public sector and open source AI initiatives releasing open models, data sets, and evaluation tools, and not just open weights as Rainer pointed to before. So these counter trends, they demonstrate that alternatives are actually possible, there are alternative visions, technology is not a destiny, but they depend on political will, stable funding, and recognition by decision making. That open resilient knowledge infrastructures are essential for democratic governance and for also economic growth. So this is my crazy slide, don't worry I will not go into detail, but every talk has one crazy slide, right? So what open science and the digital commons already offer? Fortunately of course we don't start from zero. Communities in science, culture, and civil society have spent decades, if not centuries, building what we can call the digital commons or knowledge commons today. Public libraries, free and open source software, ecosystems, research repositories, trusted data archives, and again Wikipedia. The knowledge commons have a long tradition of enabling people to access, share, and build on collective knowledge, strengthening learning, innovation, and there it is again the word

democratic participation. These communities have also deep experience in transparency, documentation, shared governance, and long-term stewardship, which is also super important. Yes they are unequally used, here we are again, and yes many contributors face personal exploitation, but they already form the basic knowledge infrastructure of what is today generative AI and a lot of other things of course. Open science then adds further elements, standards for making data findable and reusable, reproducible research practices, replication, some of you might be familiar with it, and infrastructures such as certified repositories, like yeah you might have heard about the European Open Science Cloud. So I don't want to highlight, I don't want to go into detail, just to highlight, for example there is open data, AI has large data sets, we don't know for sure what is in there, sometimes we get a glimpse and it's not so funny, but most of the time provenance and licensing are very very unclear. Open methods, so AI as we heard already, there are sometimes things like weights or something, but it's not enough, they rarely share full training pipelines, making reproducibility nearly impossible, that's actually a really big problem in scientific integrity. In the AI space open licenses, which must be the AI in there below, are also very very important, especially when they are ignored or misapplied, and in the future we need more case law to clarify the boundaries of openness. So these open dimensions are not abstract ideas, they are already working models and they are already applied, and many people around the world are building these systems that are transparent, accountable and oriented towards shared benefits. So they already embody the values we would like AI and other technologies to adopt. But there is one missing piece, and I'm very glad that Sergio was speaking before me, because the big missing piece here is education, we need more open literacy in our education and training system, because the challenges are visible already there. Openness is not structurally taught as part of the architecture of code, data or infrastructure, and I know it because I've also taught computer science students, and I work a lot with computer scientists, so in much of these fields, computer science and data science, whatever you want to call it, openness remains an ad hoc practice. Students simply download some open code or data sets from the web, often without understanding the provenance, licensing or the communities that maintain it. They learn to take, but rarely to give back, to contribute, to document and consider issues of reproducibility and long-term stewardship. So there is the call to action. You might be familiar with public money, public code, so we want to push this even a bit further. We need to think beyond that. Whenever a technology is new and the regulatory framework and safety norms are not yet established, openness becomes the only thing we have, and it should be the highest principle of governance. And transparency is definitely not a luxury, it should be the precondition. You know there is a big discussion now also on the European level about digital sovereignty, where openness is also important. So my call here, call for action, is when AI takes from the commons, it must also build for the commons. And these are our takeaways, what we have discussed in Berlin, and I have no time of course to explain them, but just the two first points are already super important. Creating collaborative knowledge spaces, that's what universities can do, in addition to what Hannes had also put there in the end, what would be fields of action. And then also we need to build better competencies in openness in AI and data literacy. So I think I have to end now, unfortunately, it could go on for a long time. So what should digital humanism do? Digital humanism, which aims to align technology with democracy and human dignity, should definitely make openness a core principle. I think what digital humanism, as I have encountered it so far, is very good at, is

putting pressure on politicians or decision makers, not also informing them, but just putting pressure on them, and also networking. I think it's really important that digital humanism takes on to connect with these communities already working on openness, whether it's in computer science or in other fields, these communities have already built some of the governance models and infrastructures that we need to move on. So digital humanism does not have to invent it, but it should work together. And I think in Europe we are well positioned to lead that, because yeah, I think we have a lot of commons and we should be proud of that. Good, thank you. Actually, almost no time for questions, but if there is one, and the promise that it will be a quick question, we are happy to do it. Please, Hans. No, a very short question, because it's a personal experience. We had a discussion with Google, and they wanted to know everything from us, but when we asked them what they do, they didn't tell us anything. So the background is also for us that Signal does not open the system to them, because they say if we open the data, our data, and we don't get anything, even if there is the digital market there. So are there limits to openness, is the question. Yes, there are many, and it's a big discussion, but this is why I think it's important to have case law, because there is a lot of theoretical discussion, speculation about this, but so far we don't have enough real cases that could fight for exactly these boundaries, and I think that's really necessary. We've got to be bold, a little bit bolder than what's in Europe about these things.

Thanks, and Katja, we continue with Erich Prem.