Comparative Analysis Of Ai Governance In Africa Relative To Global Standards And Practices

Joy Wanjiku Njoroge
Lawyer and IT Law Specialist,
Kenya
Email:wanjikujoy1997@gmail.com

Abstract
Africa as a continent recognizes the need for Artificial Intelligence (AI) governance frameworks. However, despite initiatives like the African Union's Continental AI Strategy, African nations grappled with challenges in formulating comprehensive AI policies, while established global frameworks provided advanced benchmarks for comparison. To address this disparity, this study conducted a comparative analysis of AI governance in Africa relative to global standards and practices. Employing a comprehensive document analysis methodology, the research examined key policy documents, strategic frameworks, and regulatory guidelines across African, European, American, and Asian contexts. The findings revealed that while the African Union demonstrated commitment to coordinated AI governance, African approaches generally lagged behind global benchmarks in comprehensiveness, formalization, and ethical integration. The study identified a notable fragmentation in AI governance across African nations, contrasting with more unified approaches in other regions. African frameworks emphasized leveraging AI for socio-economic development, diverging from the risk mitigation focus seen in EU regulations. The integration of indigenous African ethical perspectives in AI governance frameworks was limited, presenting both challenges and opportunities. Significant disparities in digital infrastructure and AI capacity between Africa and other regions were found to affect governance implementation. The study concluded that despite these challenges, there was potential for Africa to develop innovative, context-specific AI governance models that could contribute valuable insights to the global discourse on responsible AI development. Recommendations included accelerating the implementation of the Continental AI Strategy, prioritizing investment in digital infrastructure, developing Africa-centric AI ethics frameworks, establishing mechanisms for regular benchmarking against global standards, fostering increased collaboration, and implementing AI literacy programs across the continent.

I.   Introduction

The proliferation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems, as defined by Nieminen et al. (2019), is characterized by their capacity to emulate human cognitive functions including learning, reasoning, problem-solving, perception, and natural language processing. This technological advancement has ushered in a paradigm shift across diverse sectors of contemporary society (Eke et al., 2023). These advanced computational systems, underpinned by machine learning algorithms and neural network architectures, are rapidly permeating multiple domains of human activity, from healthcare and education to finance and transportation, catalyzing transformative changes in operational paradigms and decision-making processes (Stahl et al., 2023; Okolo et al., 2023). The exponential growth and ubiquitous adoption of AI technologies have engendered a dichotomous response within the global community: a palpable enthusiasm for their transformative potential juxtaposed against growing apprehension regarding their ethical implications and societal ramifications (Eke et al., 2023; Mensah et al., 2023).

The imperative for robust AI governance stems from its pivotal role in safeguarding fundamental rights, promoting equitable outcomes, protecting individual privacy, mitigating inherent biases in AI systems, enhancing digital security protocols, and addressing the evolving dynamics of labor markets in an increasingly AI-driven economic landscape (Stahl et al., 2023). As AI systems become more sophisticated and autonomous in their decision-making capabilities, the potential for unintended consequences and ethical dilemmas increases exponentially, necessitating comprehensive governance frameworks to guide their development and deployment (Eke et al., 2023; Mensah et al., 2023). Xu et al. (2024) define AI governance as "the development and implementation of policies, regulations, and guidelines that aim to ensure the responsible development and use

of AI technologies" (p. 275), encompassing a wide range of activities from research and development to deployment and use of AI systems.

The global landscape of AI governance is characterized by diverse approaches reflecting the unique priorities and contextual factors of different regions. The United States has adopted a multifaceted strategy that emphasizes innovation, economic competitiveness, and ethical considerations. As reported by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP, 2020), the American Artificial Intelligence Initiative, launched through Executive Order 13859 in February 2019, marked a significant milestone in U.S. AI policy. This initiative delineates several key focus areas: substantial investment in AI research and development, optimization of AI resources, mitigation of barriers to AI innovation, development of an AI-ready workforce, fostering of an international environment conducive to American AI innovation, and the integration of trustworthy AI systems in government services and missions (EPRS, 2024). The U.S. government has implemented concrete measures to actualize this initiative, including the formulation of the inaugural strategy for Federal engagement in AI technical standards and the publication of the first comprehensive report on government-wide non-defense AI R&D expenditure (OSTP, 2020; EPRS, 2024).

In contrast, the European Union has positioned itself at the vanguard of AI regulation with its proposed AI Act, introduced in April 2021. Gasser (2023) elucidates that this landmark legislation aims to establish a comprehensive regulatory framework for AI, employing a risk-based approach that categorizes AI systems according to their potential societal impact. The EU's model, as described by the European Parliamentary Research Service (EPRS, 2024), delineates four risk categories - unacceptable, high, limited, and minimal - each associated with specific regulatory requirements. This nuanced approach seeks to prohibit AI systems deemed to pose unacceptable risks while imposing stringent obligations on high-risk AI systems prior to their market entry. These obligations encompass a range of requirements, including the utilization of high-quality datasets, implementation of robust data governance measures, provision of detailed documentation, assurance of human oversight, and maintenance of high standards in accuracy, resilience, and cybersecurity (Gasser, 2023; EPRS, 2024).

The Asian continent presents a diverse landscape of AI governance approaches, reflecting the region's heterogeneous political and economic contexts. Xu et al. (2024) report that China, as a global leader in AI development, has implemented significant measures in AI governance, including the issuance of official regulations for generative AI in 2023 - the Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence. This regulatory framework aims to guide the development and deployment of generative AI technologies, addressing concerns related to content generation, data privacy, and ethical considerations. China's approach to AI governance, as outlined in various State Council documents (China State Council, 2015, 2017), prioritizes the technology as a tool for enhancing economic prowess and military competitiveness on the global stage (Allen, 2019). Other Asian nations are also making significant strides in AI governance. Xu et al. (2024) note that Japan is moving towards comprehensive AI legislation, with the Liberal Democracy Party pushing for AI legislation within 2024. In South Korea, the AI Responsibility Act was proposed to the National Assembly for discussion in 2023, reflecting a growing trend across Asia towards more formalized AI governance frameworks (Xu et al., 2024).

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has taken a collaborative approach to AI governance, as evidenced by the ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics published in 2024 (ASEAN, 2024). This comprehensive document provides a framework for AI governance in Southeast Asia, defining AI governance as the establishment and implementation of structures and processes designed to align AI systems with ethical principles and societal values. The guide outlines several key initiatives for AI governance, including establishing guiding principles, developing a governance framework, implementing internal structures, determining appropriate levels of human involvement in AI-augmented decision-making, managing AI operations throughout the system lifecycle, and fostering stakeholder interaction and communication (ASEAN, 2024, pp. 11-45). Singapore is highlighted as a leader in AI governance within ASEAN, with references to its Model AI Governance Framework and AI Verify Foundation as examples of proactive approaches to AI governance (ASEAN, 2024, pp. 7, 51).

The African continent presents a complex mosaic of AI governance initiatives at various stages of development. The African Union (AU) has taken significant steps towards fostering a coordinated approach to AI governance across the continent. As reported by the African Union (2020), in October 2019, the AU established a dedicated Task Force, mandating member states to form a working group on Artificial Intelligence. This group was assigned the responsibility of crafting a unified African stance on AI, developing a continent-wide capacity-building framework, and establishing an AI think tank to align technological initiatives with the objectives of Agenda 2063 and the UN Sustainable Development Goals. The AU's efforts culminated in the adoption of the Continental AI Strategy in 2024, which aims to provide a comprehensive framework for African countries to harness the benefits of AI while promoting ethical use and minimizing potential risks (African Union, 2024a, 2024b).

Complementing the Continental AI Strategy, the AU has introduced several other initiatives to strengthen AI governance at the continental level. The African Digital Compact, endorsed alongside the Continental AI Strategy in 2024, represents Africa's unified vision for its digital future, including AI technologies (African Union, 2024d). Recognizing the crucial link between data governance and AI governance, the AU developed the AU Data Policy Framework in 2022, aiming to strengthen and harmonize data governance across Africa, addressing critical issues such as data sovereignty and cross-border data flows (African Union, 2022). Another significant initiative is the establishment of the African Research Centre for Artificial Intelligence (ARCAI) in the Republic of Congo in 2022, focusing on providing technical training and skills, fostering job creation, bridging the digital divide, and promoting inclusive economic growth in the field of AI (African Union, 2024b).

At the national level, Okolo et al. (2023) report that several African countries have made notable progress in developing AI strategies tailored to their specific contexts and needs. Nations such as Mauritius, Egypt, Zambia, Tunisia, and Botswana have initiated the formulation of national AI strategies, recognizing the technology's potential to stimulate economic growth and address societal challenges. Egypt, for instance, has established the National Council for AI, a collaborative initiative bringing together government institutions, academic experts, and industry leaders (MCIT, 2020). Other countries, including South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya, have enacted data protection laws which, while not specifically targeting AI, have significant implications for AI governance within their jurisdictions (Okolo et al., 2023).

Despite these promising developments, AI governance in Africa faces substantial challenges that require urgent attention. Mensah et al. (2023) highlight the fragmentation of AI governance approaches across the continent as a significant concern, with many countries grappling with disjointed regulations and policies that fail to provide a cohesive framework for AI development and deployment. This fragmentation results in notable gaps, redundancies, and inconsistencies in AI governance across various sectors and jurisdictions, potentially hindering the effective and responsible utilization of AI technologies (Okolo et al., 2023). Moreover, the rapid pace of AI adoption in many African countries has outstripped the development of comprehensive regulatory frameworks, creating a pressing need for more robust governance structures (Eke et al., 2023). Infrastructure deficits present another major challenge to continental AI governance, with the Digital Transformation Strategy for Africa 2020-2030 noting the lack of widespread availability of high-speed internet and the need for massive scaling-up of investment in digital infrastructure (African Union, 2020).

In conclusion, AI governance is a complex and evolving field with diverse approaches across different regions. As Xu et al. (2024) observe, "The trend is clear that Asian countries are moving from 'soft regulation' through strategies and guidelines to 'hard regulation' through rule-setting and laws on AI" (p. 283). This trend is mirrored in other regions, with varying degrees of progress and emphasis. The OSTP (2020) emphasizes that continued American leadership in AI "can only be realized by continually building upon our progress and pursuing a strategic, forward-looking approach in partnership with industry, academia, nonprofit organizations, and other non-Federal entities" (p. iv). As AI technologies continue to advance, the development and refinement of effective governance strategies remain crucial challenges for policymakers worldwide, necessitating ongoing collaboration, innovation, and adaptation to address the complex and evolving landscape of AI governance.

II. Statement Of Problem

The development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) governance frameworks in Africa has been marked by several key initiatives. In October 2019, the African Union (AU) established a dedicated Task Force, mandating member states to form a working group on Artificial Intelligence (African Union, 2020). This effort culminated in the adoption of the Continental AI Strategy in 2024, which aims to provide a framework for AI development and use across the continent (African Union, 2024a, 2024b). At the national level, countries such as Mauritius, Egypt, Zambia, Tunisia, and Botswana have initiated the formulation of national AI strategies (Okolo et al., 2023). Additionally, nations including South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya have enacted data protection laws with implications for AI governance (Okolo et al., 2023).

Despite these initiatives, statistical data reveals significant disparities in AI readiness across African nations (Gwagwa et al., 2021). The Digital Transformation Strategy for Africa 2020-2030 reports a lack of widespread availability of high-speed internet and identifies a need for substantial investment in digital infrastructure (African Union, 2020). This infrastructure deficit is quantified in various national reports, indicating a direct impact on the implementation of AI technologies and governance measures (African Union, 2024b). Furthermore, a survey of AI policies across the continent reveals a fragmentation of governance approaches, with varying degrees of comprehensiveness and implementation stages among different nations (Mensah et al., 2023).

In the global context, several established AI governance frameworks provide benchmarks for comparison. The European Union passed the AI Act in March 2024, representing the world's first major legislation to regulate AI (EPRS, 2024). This Act includes a risk classification system for AI applications. In

contrast, the United States has focused on investment in AI research and development, with the fiscal year 2021 budget proposal allocating over $850 million for AI activities at the National Science Foundation, a 70% increase from the previous year (OSTP, 2020). In Asia, China issued official regulations for generative AI in 2023, titled "Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence" (Xu et al., 2024).

The disparity between these global initiatives and the current state of AI governance in Africa necessitates a comparative analysis. This study will examine documented AI governance initiatives, quantifiable challenges, and measurable outcomes within African context relative to the global practices.

III. Research Objective
To compare Africa's AI governance ecosystem relative to global standards and practices

IV. Research Question
How does Africa's AI governance compare to the global standards and practices?

V. Literature Review
The literature on AI governance in Africa, when examined through the lens of comparative analysis with global standards and practices, reveals several key themes and significant gaps. Eke et al. (2023) conducted a comprehensive literature review and conceptual analysis, comparing AI governance frameworks between Africa and the Global North. Their study identified a significant lack of African-centric AI governance frameworks and limited inclusion of African perspectives in global AI ethics discourse. The research highlighted insufficient consideration of African socio-cultural contexts in AI development and a lack of integration of African values in existing AI governance frameworks. However, the study did not provide a quantitative comparison of AI readiness and governance across African countries relative to global standards. This absence of quantitative benchmarking represents a significant gap in understanding how African continental approaches to AI governance measure up to established global metrics and best practices.

Ruttkamp-Bloem (2023) focused on the ethical dimensions of AI governance in Africa, employing an in-depth conceptual analysis and comprehensive literature review. The study compared Western and African ethical traditions in the AI context and examined AI readiness assessment methodologies. It proposed dynamic and adaptive AI ethics systems for Africa and identified challenges such as "ethics dumping" and the lack of context-specific AI readiness assessments. While this research provides valuable insights into the ethical considerations unique to the African context, it lacks empirical data to support arguments for epistemic justice in AI. Moreover, the study falls short in comparing specific African AI ethics frameworks with global standards, particularly in how dynamic AI ethics systems proposed for Africa can be integrated into existing global governance structures. This gap hinders a comprehensive understanding of how African continental ethical approaches to AI governance align with or diverge from international norms and best practices.

Okolo et al. (2023) conducted an extensive literature review and analysis of AI initiatives in multiple African countries. Their methodology included compiling and analyzing data on digital literacy, infrastructure, and AI ecosystems in Africa, as well as examining the role of global tech companies in the African AI landscape. The study provided detailed findings on specific AI governance approaches in countries like Kenya, Nigeria, Ghana, and South Africa, highlighting challenges such as low digital literacy rates and inadequate infrastructure. However, the research lacks a detailed comparison between African AI policies at the continental level and global standards such as the OECD AI Principles or the EU AI Act. This gap in benchmarking African AI readiness and governance frameworks against established global indices presents a significant limitation in assessing how continental African approaches align with international best practices.

Ade-Ibijola and Okonkwo (2023) provided a pan-African perspective through a comprehensive literature review, analysis of AI readiness reports and indices, and case study analysis of AI initiatives in selected African countries. Their findings highlighted challenges such as lack of AI-specific skills and absence of comprehensive AI policies in most African countries. However, the study lacks a detailed comparison between African AI challenges at the continental level and those faced by other developing regions. Additionally, it offers limited analysis of how global AI governance frameworks could be adapted to address African-specific challenges on a continental scale. This gap in benchmarking African AI readiness against global standards and best practices is critical for a comprehensive comparative analysis of continental African approaches versus international norms.

Stahl et al. (2023) conducted a comprehensive analysis of AI strategies and policy documents in North African countries, employing a comparative study of AI ethics frameworks in North Africa versus global standards. Their findings revealed limited integration of ethical considerations in existing AI policies in countries like Egypt, Algeria, Tunisia, and Morocco. However, the study lacks a detailed comparison between North African AI policies and comprehensive global frameworks like the EU AI Act. This gap highlights the need for more extensive comparative analysis of how regional African approaches to AI governance, which could inform continental strategies, measure up to advanced global standards and practices.

The collective body of literature reveals critical gaps in the comparative analysis of AI governance in Africa at the continental level relative to global standards and practices. There is a notable absence of comprehensive, quantitative benchmarking of African continental AI governance frameworks against global indices. The research lacks detailed comparisons of African AI policies, particularly those with continental implications, with established international standards and frameworks. There is limited analysis of how global AI governance best practices could be adapted to address unique African challenges at a continental scale while maintaining alignment with international norms. These gaps hinder a thorough understanding of how African continental approaches to AI governance compare to global standards and best practices, limiting the ability to develop effective, globally aligned AI governance strategies for the African continent as a whole.

VI. Methodology

This study employs a comprehensive document analysis methodology to conduct a comparative examination of AI governance in Africa relative to global standards and practices. The research design focuses on a systematic review and analysis of key policy documents, strategic frameworks, and regulatory guidelines pertaining to AI governance across different regions. The corpus of documents includes the African Union's Continental AI Strategy (African Union, 2024a, 2024b), national AI strategies from selected African countries (Okolo et al., 2023), the European Union's AI Act (EPRS, 2024), the United States' American AI Initiative (OSTP, 2020), and AI governance documents from Asian countries, particularly China's AI regulations (Xu et al., 2024). The analysis follows a structured approach, employing thematic coding to identify key governance themes, regulatory focus areas, and implementation strategies. This methodological framework allows for a rigorous comparison of AI governance approaches, enabling the identification of areas of convergence, divergence, and unique characteristics across different regional contexts.

VII. Findings

The document analysis reveals several key thematic areas in AI governance across Africa and other regions. In the African context, a prominent theme is the emphasis on leveraging AI for socio-economic development, as evidenced in the African Union's Continental AI Strategy (African Union, 2024a, 2024b). This strategy underscores the potential of AI to address challenges in healthcare, education, and agriculture. The European Union's approach, exemplified by the AI Act (EPRS, 2024), places a stronger emphasis on risk mitigation and ethical considerations, categorizing AI applications based on their potential societal impact. The United States' AI governance framework, as outlined in the American AI Initiative (OSTP, 2020), prioritizes maintaining technological leadership and fostering innovation. In Asia, China's approach emphasizes AI as a driver of economic growth and technological advancement (Xu et al., 2024).

The degree of regulatory formalization varies across regions. The EU's AI Act represents the most comprehensive and legally binding framework (Gasser, 2023). African AI governance, while ambitious in its continental strategy, exhibits a more fragmented approach at the national level. Countries like Egypt, with its National Council for AI (MCIT, 2020), and South Africa, through its data protection laws (Okolo et al., 2023), demonstrate progress in formalizing AI governance. However, many African nations lack specific AI regulations. This contrasts with the more unified approaches seen in the EU and the targeted, sector-specific regulations observed in China (Xu et al., 2024). The U.S. approach demonstrates a coordinated federal strategy that encourages AI innovation within ethical boundaries (OSTP, 2020).

The integration of ethical considerations in AI governance frameworks emerges as a critical theme across all regions. The African approach acknowledges the importance of ethical AI development but lacks detailed implementation mechanisms (African Union, 2024b). This contrasts with the EU's explicit focus on "trustworthy AI," which mandates transparency, accountability, and non-discrimination in AI systems (EPRS, 2024). The U.S. framework emphasizes "trustworthy AI" within a broader context of fostering innovation (The Executive Office of the President of the United States, 2020). Asian approaches, particularly in China, focus on aligning AI ethics with national values (Xu et al., 2024). A notable gap in the African context is the limited integration of indigenous ethical perspectives in AI governance frameworks, as highlighted by Eke et al. (2023) and Ruttkamp-Bloem (2023).

Infrastructure development and capacity building emerge as crucial themes in AI governance, with significant variations across regions. The African Continental AI Strategy explicitly recognizes the need for substantial investments in digital infrastructure and AI skills development (African Union, 2020). This focus is less prominent in EU and U.S. documents. The Asian approach, particularly in China, emphasizes rapid infrastructure development and massive investments in AI education and research (China State Council, 2015). The disparity in infrastructure and capacity between Africa and other regions presents a unique challenge for AI governance implementation on the continent, as noted by Gwagwa et al. (2021). This challenge is further compounded by the diverse levels of technological readiness across African nations, creating a complex landscape for implementing unified governance approaches (Mensah et al., 2023).

VIII.   Discussion

The comparative analysis of AI governance frameworks reveals significant implications for Africa's position in the global AI landscape. The continent's approach, characterized by a strong focus on developmental objectives, presents both opportunities and challenges. Aligning AI governance with socio-economic goals could potentially lead to more context-appropriate and impactful AI applications in crucial sectors like healthcare, education, and agriculture (Eke et al., 2023). However, the relative lack of emphasis on risk mitigation and ethical safeguards, compared to the EU's comprehensive framework, raises concerns about potential unintended consequences of AI deployment in African contexts (Stahl et al., 2023). This suggests that African policymakers may need to strike a balance between fostering AI-driven development and ensuring adequate protections against AI-related risks.

The fragmented nature of AI governance across African nations, contrasting with the more unified approaches in the EU and China, has significant implications for the continent's ability to engage effectively in global AI governance dialogues. As noted by Okolo et al. (2023), the lack of a cohesive regulatory environment may hinder Africa's capacity to attract AI investments and participate in global AI value chains. Moreover, it could lead to a patchwork of inconsistent standards across the continent, potentially creating regulatory arbitrage and complicating cross-border AI initiatives. This situation underscores the need for enhanced coordination among African nations, possibly through strengthening the role of continental bodies like the African Union in AI governance (African Union, 2024a).

The limited integration of African ethical perspectives in AI governance frameworks has profound implications for the development of culturally appropriate AI systems on the continent. As highlighted by Eke et al. (2023) and Ruttkamp-Bloem (2023), this gap risks the implementation of AI technologies that may not align with African values and societal norms. The implication extends beyond the African context, potentially depriving the global AI ethics discourse of valuable diverse perspectives. This situation presents an opportunity for African scholars and policymakers to contribute uniquely to the global dialogue on AI ethics, potentially enriching international frameworks with African philosophical and ethical traditions (Stahl et al., 2023).

The stark disparities in digital infrastructure and AI capacity between Africa and other regions, particularly evident in comparison with China's massive investments in AI education and research (China State Council, 2015), have far-reaching implications for AI governance implementation on the continent. The infrastructure gap not only hinders the deployment of AI technologies but also complicates the enforcement of governance measures, as noted by Gwagwa et al. (2021). This situation implies that AI governance strategies in Africa must be closely integrated with broader digital development initiatives. The emphasis on capacity building in the Continental AI Strategy (African Union, 2024b) is a step in the right direction, but its effectiveness will depend on substantial investments and international partnerships.

IX. Conclusion

1. The African Union's Continental AI Strategy demonstrates a commitment to coordinated AI governance, aligning with global trends, but faces significant implementation challenges.
2. African AI governance approaches lag behind global benchmarks in comprehensiveness, formalization, and integration of ethical perspectives.
3. There is a notable fragmentation in AI governance across African nations, contrasting with more unified approaches in regions like the EU and China.
4. Africa's AI governance frameworks strongly emphasize leveraging AI for socio-economic development, differing from the risk mitigation focus seen in EU regulations.
5. The integration of indigenous African ethical perspectives in AI governance frameworks is limited, presenting both a challenge and an opportunity for unique contributions to global AI ethics.
6. Significant disparities exist in digital infrastructure and AI capacity between Africa and other regions, particularly affecting AI governance implementation.
7. The diverse levels of technological readiness across African nations create a complex landscape for implementing unified governance approaches.
8. There is potential for Africa to develop innovative, context-specific AI governance models that could contribute valuable insights to the global discourse on responsible AI development.
9. The alignment of AI governance with developmental goals in Africa represents an area where African approaches could significantly enrich global AI governance practices.
10. Ongoing collaboration, innovation, and adaptation are crucial for addressing the complex and evolving landscape of AI governance in Africa and globally.

X. Recommendations

1. Accelerate the implementation of the Continental AI Strategy, focusing on harmonizing national approaches and addressing the fragmentation of AI governance across the continent.
2. Prioritize investment in digital infrastructure to create a more conducive environment for AI development and governance.
3. Develop comprehensive, Africa-centric AI ethics frameworks that integrate African values and perspectives, contributing to a more inclusive global AI ethics discourse.
4. Establish mechanisms for regular benchmarking of African AI governance approaches against global standards, facilitating continuous improvement and alignment with international best practices.
5. Foster increased collaboration between African countries, academia, industry, and international partners to build capacity in AI governance and bridge the gap in AI research and development.
6. Develop and implement AI literacy programs to enhance public understanding and engagement with AI governance issues across the continent.

References

[1] Addy, A., Nyante, F., Mensah, G. B., & Frimpong, P. O. (2023). Ai-Augmented Governance Of The Ghanaian Healthcare Delivery System: Ethical And Privacy Issues In Patients' Medical Records, Access And Retrieval. International Journal Of Law Management & Humanities, 6(5), 2066–2091.

[2] African Union. (2020). The Digital Transformation Strategy For Africa (2020–2030). Https://Au.Int/Sites/Default/Files/Documents/38507-Doc-Dts-English.Pdf

[3] African Union. (2022). Au Data Policy Framework. Https://Au.Int/Sites/Default/Files/Documents/42078-Doc-Au-Data-Policy-Framework-Eng1.Pdf

[4] African Union. (2024a, June 17). African Ministers Adopt Landmark Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy. Https://Au.Int/En/Pressreleases/20240617/African-Ministers-Adopt-Landmark-Continental-Artificial-Intelligence-Strategy

[5] African Union. (2024b, August 9). Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy. Https://Au.Int/En/Documents/20240809/Continental-Artificial-Intelligence-Strategy

[6] African Union. (2024c, August 28). African Union Committed To Developing Ai Capabilities In Africa. Https://Au.Int/En/Pressreleases/20240828/African-Union-Committed-Developing-Ai-Capabilities-Africa

[7] Allen, G. C. (2019). Understanding China's Ai Strategy: Clues To Chinese Strategic Thinking On Artificial Intelligence And National Security. Center For New American Security. Https://Ndupress.Ndu.Edu/Portals/68/Documents/Prism/Prism_9-3/Prism_9-3_18-33_Hannas-Chang.Pdf

[8] Association Of Southeast Asian Nations. (2024). Asean Guide On Ai Governance And Ethics. Https://Asean.Org/Wp-Content/Uploads/2024/02/Asean-Guide-On-Ai-Governance-And-Ethics_Beautified_201223_V2.Pdf

[9] China State Council. (2015). Made In China 2025. Https://Ndupress.Ndu.Edu/Portals/68/Documents/Prism/Prism_9-3/Prism_9-3_18-33_Hannas-Chang.Pdf

[10] China State Council. (2017). A Next Generation Artificial Intelligence Development Plan. Https://Ndupress.Ndu.Edu/Portals/68/Documents/Prism/Prism_9-3/Prism_9-3_18-33_Hannas-Chang.Pdf

[11] Eke, D. O., Wakunuma, K., & Akintoye, S. (2023). Introducing Responsible Ai In Africa. In D. O. Eke, K. Wakunuma, & S. Akintoye (Eds.), Responsible Ai In Africa (Pp. 1-11). Springer.

[12] European Parliamentary Research Service. (2024). United States Approach To Artificial Intelligence (Publication No. Pe 757.605). Https://Www.Europarl.Europa.Eu/Regdata/Etudes/Atag/2024/757605/Eprs_Ata(2024)757605_En.Pdf

[13] Gasser, U. (2023). An Eu Landmark For Ai Governance. Science, 380(6651), 1203.

[14] Gwagwa, A., Kachidza, P., Siminyu, K., & Smith, M. (2021). Responsible Artificial Intelligence In Sub-Saharan Africa: Landscape And General State Of Play.

[15] Mcit. (2020). Artificial Intelligence: Egypt's Ai Strategy. Https://Mcit.Gov.Eg/En/Artificial_Intelligence

[16] Mensah, G. B., Nyante, F., Addy, A., & Frimpong, P. O. (2023). Navigating The Fragmented Landscape: A Clarion Call For The Consolidation Of Ghana's Ai Governance Framework. Researchgate Preprint. Https://Doi.Org/10.13140/Rg.2.2.31296.75526

[17] Nieminen, M., Gotcheva, N., Leikas, J., & Koivisto, R. (2019). Ethical Ai For The Governance Of Society: Challenges And Opportunities. In Proceedings Of The 30th European Conference On Information Systems (Ecis 2020). Association For Information Systems. Https://Www.Sciencedirect.Com/Science/Article/Abs/Pii/S0925527319303664

[18] Okolo, C. T., Aruleba, K., & Obaido, G. (2023). Responsible Ai In Africa—Challenges And Opportunities. In D. O. Eke, K. Wakunuma, & S. Akintoye (Eds.), Responsible Ai In Africa (Pp. 35-64). Springer.

[19] Stahl, B. C., Leach, T., Oyeniji, O., & Ogoh, G. (2023). Ai Policy As A Response To Ai Ethics? Addressing Ethical Issues In The Development Of Ai Policies In North Africa. In D. O. Eke, K. Wakunuma, & S. Akintoye (Eds.), Responsible Ai In Africa (Pp. 141-167). Springer.

[20] The Executive Office Of The President Of The United States. (2020). Promoting The Use Of Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence In The Federal Government. Https://Www.Federalregister.Gov/Documents/2020/12/08/2020-27065/Promoting-The-Use-Of-Trustworthy-Artificial-Intelligence-In-The-Federal-Government

[21] The White House Office Of Science And Technology Policy. (2020). American Artificial Intelligence Initiative: Year One Annual Report. Https://Www.Nitrd.Gov/Nitrdgroups/Images/C/C1/American-Ai-Initiative-One-Year-Annual-Report.Pdf

[22] Xu, J., Lee, T., & Goggin, G. (2024). Ai Governance In Asia: Policies, Praxis, And Approaches. Communication Research And Practice, 10(3), 275-287.