+simmons

Artificial Intelligence & Expert Evidence

Minesh Tanna

Partner and Global AI Lead, Simmons & Simmons Chair, Society for Computers and Law (SCL) AI Group Chair, Membership Vetting Committee, The Academy of Experts

21 March 2023

Agenda

1 Overview of AI

- 2 Use cases
- Generative AI v predictive AI
- 4 Impact of AI on expert witness work

+simmons +simmons

Alaman Ann

1. Overview of AI

What is AI?

- Traditional computing = rule-based
- Limitation humans. Consider a rule-based autonomous driving system.
- AI = computer autonomy
- Why now? Computer processing power and "big data"



Big data, but how big are we talking?

How much data do we use in 2023?



How does this compare to 2013?

S





Source: https://www.domo.com/datanever-sleeps

Machine learning

The AI system learns from data and can make decisions which are not based on preprogrammed human rules



Autonomy vs automation

Automation

Human-made rules Simplicity Transparency

Symbolic Al

Symbolic AI relies on translating human knowledge and logical statements into explicitly programmed rules. For example, 'if a financial transaction is above £10,000, then flag it for human review.' Many of the early chess programmes fall within the category of symbolic AI. They are programmed in a top-down manner, encoding human knowledge about chess in software rules, and they identify playing strategies by searching through possible moves. Symbolic AI was the predominant approach in AI research between the 1950s and 1980s.

Statistical AI

Statistical AI, in contrast, refers to the development of bottom-up, data-driven systems. The capabilities of such systems are not the result of the rule-based application of encoded human knowledge but instead arise from the analysis of data. AlphaZero, a computer programme which can play highly complex games, is an example. Rather than relying on hard-coded rules, AlphaZero learns how to master games from the data it generates by playing itself.

Ostmann, F., and Dorobantu C. (2021). AI in financial services. The Alan Turing Institute. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4916041

- Still no consensus on definition of AI does it encompass rule-based automated systems?
- "Algorithmic decision-making" likely to encompass rule-based systems and AI
- "Automated decision-making" under GDPR, confusingly, probably also includes AI

Machine-made rules

Complexity

Opacity

Deterministic v non-deterministic systems

B2C2 v Quoine Pte [Singapore courts]

"The algorithmic programmes in the present case are deterministic, they do and only do what they have been programmed to do... Accordingly, in my judgment, in circumstances where it is necessary to assess the state of mind of a person in a case where acts of deterministic computer programs are in issue, regard should be had to the state of mind of the programmer of the software..."

(Thorley J at first instance; [2019] SGHC(I) 3 at [208] and [211])

"A deterministic computer program or algorithm is bound by the parameters set by the programmer..."

(Menon CJ on appeal; [2020] SGCA(I) 02 at [98])

In contrast, it is helpful to consider AI as being non-deterministic i.e. not bound by the parameters set by the human programmer

Risks arising out of sophisticated AI

AI models are becoming increasingly complex and opaque

Source: 'New Theory cracks open the black box of deep neural networks', Wired (10 August 2017): https://www.wired.com/story/new-theory-deep-learning/

Key AI features to keep in mind

Data

Data, including personal data, vital to AI in both training and deployment

Opacity

Complex AI systems cannot be fully understood, interpreted or explained by humans

Unforeseeability

S

AI systems have the ability to act autonomously and unpredictably

+simmons

3. Generative AI v discriminative AI

The explosion of ChatGPT...

A powerful large language model (LLM) capable of generating language ("generative AI")

When was The Academy of Experts founded?

The Academy of Experts was founded in 1987, in the United Kingdom. It was established with the aim of promoting excellence and professionalism among expert witnesses and to provide a platform for education and training for those involved in dispute resolution. Since then, the Academy has grown into a respected organization with a membership that includes experts from a wide range of disciplines, including law, engineering, medicine, finance, and more.

How does it work?

Pre-trained Model

Trained Model

What is generative AI?

Generative

Discriminative

Source: https://vitalflux.com/generativevs-discriminative-models-examples/ User What is funny about this image? Describe it panel by panel.

Source: hmmm (Reddit)

GPT-4 The image shows a package for a "Lightning Cable" adapter with three panels.

Panel 1: A smartphone with a VGA connector (a large, blue, 15-pin connector typically used for computer monitors) plugged into its charging port.

S

Panel 2: The package for the "Lightning Cable" adapter with a picture of a VGA connector on it.

Panel 3: A close-up of the VGA connector with a small Lightning connector (used for charging iPhones and other Apple devices) at the end.

The humor in this image comes from the absurdity of plugging a large, outdated VGA connector into a small, modern smartphone charging port.

The risks of generative AI

Inaccuracy in generative AI

S

What is an English law case that says parties don't readily give up their common law rights

One example of an English case that addresses the issue of parties not readily giving up their common law rights is the case of Parker v Taswell. In this case, the court held that a clause in a contract that purported to exclude or limit the parties' rights under common law would be subject to a strict interpretation and would only be enforced if it was clear and unambiguous. The court held that parties should not be taken to have readily given up their common law rights unless it was clear from the wording of the contract that this was their intention. This case is often cited as an example of the principle that parties should not be taken to have given up their common law rights unless it is clear from the wording of the contract that this was their intention.

Is there a more recent case which says the same thing?

. . .

Yes, there are more recent cases in England that have reaffirmed the principle established in Parker v Taswell that parties should not be taken to have given up their common law rights unless it is clear from the wording of the contract that this was their intention.

Another example is the case of Attrill v Dryad Maritime Corp. [2019] UKSC 43, where the Supreme Court held that a clause in a contract that purported to exclude or limit the parties' rights under common law would be subject to a strict ¹⁵ interpretation and would only be enforced if it was clear and unambiguous.

Which paragraph in Attrill says this?

In the case of Attrill v Dryad Maritime Corp. [2019] UKSC 43, the relevant paragraph that addresses the issue of parties not readily giving up their common law rights can be found in the judgement of Lord Hodge, in paragraphs 19 and 20.

In paragraph 19, Lord Hodge stated that "English law has long recognised the principle that parties should not be taken to have given up their common law rights unless it is clear from the wording of the contract that this was their intention." He also referred to the Unfair Contract Terms Act 1977 (UCTA) which state that a term of a contract is void in so far as it would exclude or restrict liability for death or personal injury caused by negligence, or for fraud or fraudulent misrepresentation.

In paragraph 20, Lord Hodge went on to state that "the principle that parties should not be taken to have given up their common law rights unless it is clear from the wording of the contract that this was their intention applies to clauses that seek to exclude or limit liability. Such clauses are subject to a strict interpretation and will only be enforced if they are clear and unambiguous."

+simmons

-

2. Use cases

Use cases of discriminative AI

Use cases of generative AI

+simmons

4. Impact of AI on expert witness work

How could AI impact expert work?

Various scenarios

1. Subject of expert opinion impacted by AI

i.e. opinion on state of affairs, process, decision etc. incorporates elements of AI when previously solely human involvement

2. Using AI in expert work

e.g. analysing information, distilling information (but hopefully not to write report or make decision!)

S

3. Instructing solicitors using AI

e.g. to filter/identify relevant evidence

4. Courts using AI (?)

Perhaps not yet, but may do in future

What does ChatGPT say about this?

S

How is AI likely to impact the work of expert witnesses?

- Al is likely to have a significant impact on the work of expert witnesses in a number of ways. Here are some possible ways:
 - Augmenting Expert Analysis: AI could be used to assist expert witnesses in analyzing and processing large amounts of data, potentially making their work more efficient and accurate.
 - Automation of Tasks: AI could also automate certain tasks that expert witnesses currently perform manually, such as document review, data extraction and analysis, and report generation.
 - Improved Accuracy and Consistency: AI has the potential to improve the accuracy and consistency of expert witness testimony by providing objective and evidence-based analysis.
 - Increased Speed: AI could also help expedite the litigation process by quickly analyzing data and producing reports, allowing cases to be resolved more quickly.
 - Challenges in Admissibility of Evidence: As AI becomes more prevalent in the legal industry, expert witnesses may need to grapple with the admissibility of evidence generated or analyzed by AI systems.

Overall, the impact of AI on the work of expert witnesses is likely to be significant, with both potential benefits and challenges. Expert witnesses will need to adapt and evolve their practices to keep up with the changing legal landscape.

What are the risks?

S

Various scenarios

What does ChatGPT say about this?

What are the risks of relying on AI in expert witness work?

Ľ

While there are potential benefits to using AI in expert witness work, there are also several risks that should be considered:

- Reliability: AI systems are only as reliable as the data they are trained on, and if the data is biased or incomplete, the AI system's analysis may be flawed. This could lead to inaccurate conclusions and potential legal liability.
- Lack of Contextual Understanding: AI systems may not have the same level of contextual understanding as human experts, which could result in errors or misunderstandings when analyzing complex data or providing expert opinions.
- 3. Transparency and Interpretability: It may be difficult to understand how an AI system arrived at a particular conclusion, especially if the system uses complex algorithms or machine learning techniques. This lack of transparency could make it difficult to challenge or evaluate the validity of the AI system's analysis.
- 4. Admissibility of Evidence: There may be legal challenges to the admissibility of evidence generated or analyzed by AI systems. The court may require that expert testimony be provided by a human with specialized knowledge and experience rather than relying solely on an AI system.
- 5. Ethical Considerations: There are ethical considerations associated with using AI in expert witness work, such as ensuring that the AI system is used in a manner that is consistent with professional standards and does not compromise the integrity of the legal system.

Overall, the risks associated with relying on AI in expert witness work should be carefully evaluated, and the use of AI should be done in a responsible and transparent manner.

Final thoughts

25

+simmons +simmons

antagatis mitam

Questions

+simmons +simmons

and the second second

simmons-simmons.com

STRICTLY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

© Simmons & Simmons LLP and its licensors. All rights asserted and reserved. This document is for general guidance only. It does not contain definitive advice. Simmons & Simmons LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England & Wales with number OC352713 and with its registered office at CityPoint, One Ropemaker Street, London EC2Y 9SS, United Kingdom. It is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority and its SRA ID number is 533587. The word "partner" refers to a member of Simmons & Simmons LLP or one of its affiliates, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications. A list of members and other partners together with their professional qualifications is available for inspection at the above address.