UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF AI ACCOUNTABILITY RIGHTS

A Universal Declaration of Rights, Responsibilities, and Remedies in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

Proclaimed by the Global Community of the AI Governance Ecosystem stakeholders, convened by the International AI Accountability Forum (IAAF)

Drafted by and under the leadership of Dr. Pavan Duggal, Advocate, Supreme Court of India, Founding Architect of the International AI Accountability Forum and Architect, Global AI Accountability

Short title: UDAAR 2026

Doctrinal foundation: the Duggal Doctrine of AI Accountability; the Doctrine of Ten AI Legal Principles; Duggal Global Agentic AI Liability Framework;

Doctrinal lineage: UDHR (1948); ICCPR & ICESCR (1966); UNESCO Bioethics Declaration (2005); UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007); UNESCO AI Ethics Recommendation (2021); OECD AI Principles (2019, updated 2024); EU AI Act (2024); UNGA Resolution A/78/L.49 (2024); UN Global Digital Compact (2024); AU Continental AI Strategy (2024); ASEAN Guide on AI Governance (2024); New Delhi Accord on Artificial Intelligence Emerging Tech Law and Governance, (2025), AI Accountability Framework, 2026; Duggal Global Agentic AI Liability Framework(2026); UDAAR (2026)

PART A — PREAMBLE

Whereas the artificial intelligence systems now mediating decisions, opportunities, identities, labour, speech, public services, and knowledge production at planetary scale have acquired a degree of autonomy, opacity, and consequential power without precedent in the history of human technology, and their unaccountable operation imperils the dignity, liberty, equality, and security of every person on Earth;

Whereas the harms occasioned by artificial intelligence including wrongful denial of livelihood and credit, discriminatory adjudication and policing, manipulation of cognition and democratic deliberation, surveillance overreach, biometric and emotional exploitation, the proliferation of deepfakes and synthetic identity abuse, the displacement and degradation of labour, the silent extraction of culture and creativity, and the looming menace of autonomous lethal action , all constitute, in their cumulative weight and individual gravity, a new and recognisable category of rights violation demanding a new and commensurate jurisprudential response;

Whereas there subsists today an unconscionable asymmetry of power between the developers, deployers, financiers, and operators of artificial intelligence systems and the persons, communities, and peoples affected by them, manifest in disparities of information, capability, resources, evidentiary access, and political voice, and the rule of law itself cannot stand where such asymmetry is left unanswered;

Whereas the burdens of unaccountable artificial intelligence fall with disproportionate severity upon the Global South and upon women, children, persons with disabilities, indigenous peoples, workers, creators, migrants, refugees, and all communities whose languages, datasets, histories, and worldviews are underrepresented in or extracted by the systems that increasingly govern their lives, and the peoples and States of the Global South are entitled not to charitable accommodation but to equal status as co-architects of universal AI norms;

Whereas the fragmented and territorially bounded character of national and regional regulation, together with the demonstrated failure of post-2024 voluntary AI frameworks to prevent serious AI-induced harms, to ensure effective remedy, or to bind the most capable developers and deployers to enforceable standards, has rendered the present governance landscape manifestly inadequate to systems whose design may occur in one jurisdiction, training in another, deployment in a third, and harmful effects in many more;

Whereas the international community has already laid important normative foundations, including the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021), the OECD AI Principles (2019, as updated 2024), the EU AI Act (2024), UNGA Resolution A/78/L.49 (2024), the UN Global Digital Compact (2024), the African Union Continental AI Strategy (2024), the ASEAN Guide on AI Governance and Ethics (2024), *)* and New Delhi Accord on Artificial Intelligence Emerging Tech Law and Governance, (2025*),* yet none of these instruments has alone furnished a complete, universal, and enforceable bill of AI accountability rights;

Whereas accountability for the design, development, deployment, operation, and consequences of artificial intelligence systems must, by reason of its civilisational stakes, be recognised as a non-derogable principle of international law, capable of attaining the character of a peremptory norm from which no derogation is permitted;

Whereas the advent of agentic and autonomous artificial intelligence systems, capable of pursuing open-ended objectives, taking consequential action without human prompt, and operating across jurisdictions, networks, and physical infrastructures , together with

the convergence of artificial intelligence with quantum computing, neurotechnology, biotechnology, robotics, synthetic media, and autonomous platforms, multiplies the risks of harm by orders of magnitude and demands anticipatory rather than reactive jurisprudence;

Whereas this Declaration stands in the unbroken continuum of normative achievement that proceeds from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) through the great covenants and conventions of the twentieth century to the digital and AI-age instruments of the present decade, and seeks not to displace these instruments but to complete them, in service equally of the generations now living and of the generations not yet born whose entitlement of intergenerational equity, no present arrangement of commercial or geopolitical convenience is permitted to extinguish;

Whereas innovation is a social good only insofar as it remains subordinate to human dignity, public safety, environmental sustainability, democratic integrity, cultural diversity, and the equal worth of all persons;

Whereas the time has come, late and at peril, to translate ethics into law, principles into rights, voluntary commitments into binding duties, and aspirations into enforceable remedies, and to do so by the solemn act of universal proclamation;

Now, therefore, the Global AI Governance Assembly, convened under the auspices of the International AI Accountability Forum,

Proclaims this Universal Declaration of AI Accountability Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every person, community, institution, corporation, and State, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive - by teaching, by legislation, by adjudication, by procurement, by design, by audit, by remedy, and by ceaseless vigilance - to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Nation States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction or influence.

PART B — THE ARTICLES

CHAPTER I — FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES

Article 1 — Human Dignity as the Irreducible Core

The dignity of every human being is the irreducible core of all artificial intelligence governance, and no artificial intelligence system shall be designed, developed, deployed, or operated in a manner that reduces a human person to an object of computation, prediction, or optimisation, incompatible with that dignity.

1. Every person possesses an inalienable right to be treated, in all interactions with or assessments by artificial intelligence, as a bearer of rights and not as a mere data subject, score, label, predictive target, or risk class.

2. The instrumentalization of human beings for the training, refinement, or commercial exploitation of artificial intelligence systems, without informed consent and lawful basis, is prohibited.

3. In all cases of doubt, this Declaration and any AI regulation or contractual arrangement shall be interpreted in favour of human dignity over technological convenience, efficiency, or commercial gain.

Article 2 — Non-Discrimination and Substantive Algorithmic Equality

Everyone is entitled to substantive equality in their dealings with artificial intelligence systems, free from discrimination on grounds of race, colour, sex, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, caste, indigeneity, disability, age, migration status, socio-economic status, geographic location, or any other status.

1. The design, training, deployment, and use of artificial intelligence shall be subject to mandatory disparate-impact testing across protected attributes and intersectional combinations thereof.

2. Disparate outcomes that cannot be justified as necessary, proportionate, and the least restrictive means of achieving a legitimate aim shall constitute prima facie evidence of unlawful discrimination, and the use of facially neutral proxies that systematically reproduce historical patterns of exclusion is prohibited.

3. Formal neutrality shall not excuse discriminatory design, data imbalance, or representational exclusion; substantive equality is required.

Article 3 — Transparency, Explainability, and Intelligibility by Design

Everyone has the right to transparency, explainability, and intelligibility in respect of artificial intelligence systems that interact with them, assess them, or significantly affect their rights, interests, or opportunities.

1. Developers and deployers shall design and document artificial intelligence systems so as to render their purpose, capabilities, limitations, and material risks intelligible to affected persons, regulators, auditors, and reviewing courts, through system cards, model cards, and equivalent artefacts.

2. Trade secrecy, intellectual property, commercial confidentiality, or claims of model complexity shall not constitute a defence against the right to explanation in proceedings affecting fundamental rights, subject to such confidentiality arrangements as are necessary and proportionate.

3. The opacity of a system shall not, in any forum, operate to the prejudice of an affected person.

Article 4 — Meaningful Human Oversight

Every person significantly affected by an artificial intelligence decision possesses the non-derogable right to meaningful human oversight, and no consequential decision affecting fundamental rights shall be made by an artificial intelligence system without a competent, authorised, and accountable human in the loop possessed of genuine authority to alter, suspend, or reverse the decision.

1. "Meaningful" oversight requires that the human reviewer possess the competence, information, time, and authority to exercise independent judgment; bear identifiable accountability for the outcome; and be insulated from automation bias, productivity targets, or institutional pressures that would reduce review to rubber-stamping.

2. The categories of decision requiring such oversight shall include, at minimum, those affecting liberty, livelihood, health, education, family integrity, social benefits, immigration status, civic standing, and access to justice.

3. Any contractual or platform-imposed waiver of meaningful human oversight in such matters shall be null and void.

Article 5 — Accountability as a Universal Non-Derogable Norm

Accountability for the design, development, deployment, operation, and consequences of artificial intelligence systems is hereby recognised as a universal, non-derogable norm of international law, aspirant to the status of a peremptory norm of general international law (*jus cogens*), from which no derogation by treaty, contract, terms of service, or unilateral act is permitted.

1. No private agreement, click-wrap consent, end-user licence, or terms of service shall extinguish or diminish the rights conferred by this Declaration, and no invocation of national security, public emergency, commercial necessity, or technological inevitability shall justify the wholesale suspension of accountability obligations.

2. Accountability obligations under this Declaration are owed *erga omnes* and may be invoked by any State, person, or institution with a legitimate interest.

3. No corporate, contractual, or technical arrangement that attributes legal personhood to artificial intelligence systems shall operate to shield natural or institutional duty-bearers from accountability.

CHAPTER II — RIGHTS OF PERSONS AFFECTED BY AI

Article 6 — Right to Notice

Everyone has the right to clear, conspicuous, and timely notice when they are interacting with, being assessed by, or being significantly affected by an artificial intelligence system.

1. Notice shall be given prior to or contemporaneously with the interaction, in a language and form intelligible to the recipient including accessible formats and relevant local languages, and shall identify the system, its operator, its purpose, and the channels for contestation.

2. Covert deployment of artificial intelligence in interactions that a reasonable person would believe to be human is prohibited, save for narrowly defined and lawfully authorised exceptions.

3. The right of notice extends to third parties materially affected by an AI-mediated decision, including dependents, employees, tenants, and beneficiaries.

Article 7 — Right to Meaningful Explanation

Everyone has the right to a meaningful, contemporaneous, and accessible explanation of the logic, the principal factors, the data categories relied upon, the training-data limitations, the known error rates, and the confidence interval associated with any artificial intelligence decision that significantly affects them.

1. Explanations shall be sufficient to permit the affected person to assess the lawfulness, accuracy, and fairness of the decision and to formulate an effective contestation, and shall be furnished without charge, in writing, and within a time-frame that preserves the right of contestation.

2. "Computational complexity" or "model opacity" shall not constitute a sufficient ground for refusing an explanation; where a model is irreducibly opaque, the deployer shall bear the burden of justifying its use in the affected domain.

3. Where the AI system utilises frontier or general-purpose capabilities, the explanation shall include a statement on the known limits of the system's reasoning reliability and the boundaries of its training distribution.

Article 8 — Right to Contest and Obtain Human Review

Everyone has the right to contest an artificial intelligence-mediated decision affecting them and to obtain timely, independent, and substantive human review.

1. The right of contestation includes the submission of additional evidence, the correction of input data, the challenge to inferences and weightings, and the invocation of considerations the system was not designed to assess.

2. Human review shall be conducted by a person not involved in the original deployment decision, possessed of the competence to override the system, and shall be completed within a reasonable period prescribed by law; the contestation period shall stop the operation of any adverse consequence, save where overriding public interest, lawfully justified, requires otherwise.

3. No person shall be penalised, disadvantaged, or retaliated against for exercising the right to contest.

Article 9 — Right to Effective Remedy, Restitution, and Redress

Everyone whose rights have been violated by an artificial intelligence system, or by acts or omissions in connection with such a system, is entitled to an effective remedy before a competent tribunal, including cessation, correction, restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition(including measures taken by states or institutions to prevent the recurrence of human rights violations or wrongful acts, often as part of reparations in international law).

1. Remedies shall be adequate, effective, prompt, and proportionate to the gravity of the individual and collective harm, including material, dignitary, psychological, reputational, cultural, civic, and environmental injury.

2. The remedy shall not be defeated by jurisdictional fragmentation, corporate group structure, contractual waiver, or the cross-border location of the system, its operator, or its training infrastructure.

3. Compulsory insurance, victim compensation funds, and reserve mechanisms shall be established to ensure availability of remedy, notwithstanding the insolvency or evasion of any duty-bearer.

Article 10 — Right to Data Dignity and Privacy

Everyone has the right to data dignity, including informational privacy, protection from unlawful processing, and protection against the use of personal data, biometric data, neural data, and digital traces for the training, refinement, or operation of artificial intelligence, without lawful basis and meaningful consent.

1. The right to data dignity includes the rights to know what data is held, to correct, restrict, port, and erase, to object to processing, and to be free from inferred attributes one has not voluntarily disclosed.

2. The bulk scraping of personal, cultural, linguistic, biometric, and creative data for the training of artificial intelligence systems without lawful basis is prohibited; sensitive, biometric, neural, and children's data shall enjoy heightened protection.

3. Data dignity includes protection against exploitative data extraction from any population, with particular regard to indigenous peoples, linguistic minorities, and structurally marginalised communities, including requirements for free, prior, and informed community consultation and equitable benefit-sharing, where collective interests are engaged.

Article 11 — Cognitive Liberty and Freedom from Algorithmic Manipulation

Everyone has the right to cognitive liberty, being the freedom to form beliefs, opinions, preferences, and decisions free from artificial intelligence-mediated manipulation, dark patterns, deceptive personalisation, addictive design, and the engineered exploitation of cognitive vulnerabilities.

1. The deployment of persuasive artificial intelligence techniques that materially distort the autonomous decision-making of a person, including by exploiting age, infirmity, distress, addiction, cognitive impairment, or political vulnerability, is prohibited.

2. Recommender systems, conversational agents, and generative interfaces shall be designed to support, rather than subvert, the autonomous agency of the user.

3. Neural and physiological signals shall not be processed by artificial intelligence to manipulate cognition or affect without specific, informed, and revocable consent and lawful basis.

Article 12 — Right to AI-Free Alternatives in Essential Services

Everyone has the right, in respect of essential public services and services of general interest including healthcare, education, housing, social welfare, justice, banking and credit, civil registration, migration administration, policing interfaces, and access to public administration, to a non-algorithmic alternative path of meaningful access, on terms that are not unduly burdensome.

1. The exercise of this right shall not result in penalty, delay, or diminished quality of service amounting to indirect coercion.

2. Nation States shall progressively realise the universal availability of such alternatives, with particular attention to persons in regions of low connectivity, persons with disabilities, elders, and persons in conditions of digital exclusion; resource constraints shall not be invoked to eliminate the essence of this right.

Article 13 — Right to AI Literacy

Everyone has the right to artificial intelligence literacy as a universal entitlement , including the right to understand, in age-appropriate and culturally appropriate form, what artificial intelligence is, how it shapes their lives, and how to assert their rights in relation to it.

1. Nation States shall integrate AI literacy into primary, secondary, vocational, and adult education, and shall ensure public-interest media literacy programmes addressing synthetic content, in indigenous and minority languages and accessible formats, with priority for children, workers in transition, rural communities, elders, and populations facing linguistic or accessibility barriers.

2. Developers and deployers of high-risk and general-purpose AI shall contribute to public AI literacy through accessible documentation, transparency reports, and community engagement.

Article 14 — Freedom from Autonomous Lethal AI and AI-Enabled Coercion

No person shall be subjected to lethal force, grievous bodily harm, or irreversible loss of liberty by an autonomous artificial intelligence system operating without meaningful human control.

1. The development, deployment, transfer, and use of autonomous weapons systems lacking meaningful human control over the selection and engagement of targets is prohibited.

2. AI-enabled coercion, including AI-assisted torture, AI-directed mass arbitrary detention, AI-targeted persecution of dissidents, journalists, or minorities, and AI-facilitated enforced disappearance, is prohibited absolutely.

3. AI-enabled border, migration, and asylum decision-making affecting *non-refoulement* obligations shall be subject to non-derogable human oversight; no derogation from this Article shall be permitted on grounds of efficiency, deterrence, or strategic advantage.

Article 15 — Protection Against Biometric Misuse, Emotion Recognition Abuse, and Social Scoring

Everyone is protected against the unlawful processing of biometric data, the deployment of emotion-recognition systems in contexts of asymmetric power, and against generalised social-scoring regimes that aggregate behavioural, biometric, and inferential data to confer or withdraw rights, opportunities, or social standing.

1. Real-time and untargeted remote biometric identification in publicly accessible spaces is prohibited, save for narrowly defined, time-limited, judicially authorised exceptions.

2. Emotion-recognition systems in the workplace, in schools, in detention, in courtrooms, in immigration, and in insurance, and social-scoring systems operated by public or private actors that produce generalised consequences for civic, economic, or social participation, are prohibited.

3. Nation States shall prohibit the export of biometric and social-scoring technologies to jurisdictions where they are foreseeably used for persecution, repression, or systematic discrimination.

Article 16 — Right Against Synthetic Identity Abuse and Deepfake Harms

Everyone has the right to the integrity of their image, voice, likeness, identity, and authored expression against unauthorised synthetic reproduction, manipulation, or impersonation by artificial intelligence systems.

1. The generation, distribution, or commercial use of synthetic media depicting an identifiable person without their informed consent is prohibited, save for narrowly defined exceptions in journalism, parody, education, and the arts protected by freedom of expression.

2. Non-consensual intimate synthetic imagery is prohibited absolutely and shall give rise to immediate take-down obligations and criminal sanction; AI-generated content shall be machine-readably labelled as such, and provenance and watermarking standards shall be progressively mandated.

3. AI-generated or AI-manipulated media capable of influencing elections, financial markets, public health, or judicial proceedings shall be subject to heightened provenance, labelling, and rapid-redress requirements.

Article 17 — Right to Participate in Governance Decisions

Everyone, individually and in community, has the right to participate meaningfully in the public governance of artificial intelligence systems whose deployment affects them or their community.

1. Participatory rights shall include consultation prior to the public procurement or deployment of high-risk AI systems, access to algorithmic impact assessments, and standing to challenge unlawful deployments.

2. Communities, particularly indigenous communities, local communities, and structurally marginalised groups , shall enjoy collective rights of free, prior, and informed consultation in respect of artificial intelligence systems that materially affect their lands, languages, livelihoods, or cultural integrity.

3. Multi-stakeholder governance forums shall be designed to prevent capture by concentrated interests and to give meaningful voice to civil society, workers, affected communities, and representatives from all regions of the international community.

CHAPTER III — OBLIGATIONS OF AI DEVELOPERS AND DEPLOYERS

Article 18 — Duty of Care, Foreseeability, and Harm Prevention

Developers, deployers, and operators of artificial intelligence systems shall owe a duty of care, commensurate with the foreseeable risk of harm, to all persons reasonably proximate to the operation of the system.

1. Foreseeability shall be assessed with regard to the capabilities and intended uses of the system, the known and reasonably anticipatable misuses, the populations affected, and the state of the art in safety research.

2. The duty of care includes the obligation to refrain from deployment where the foreseeable harm exceeds the foreseeable benefit on a fair allocation across affected populations, and harm prevention is recognised as the cardinal organising principle of AI accountability.

3. Where systemic or cross-border harms are reasonably foreseeable, heightened standards of diligence, testing, oversight, and external review shall apply.

Article 19 — Pre-Deployment Algorithmic Impact Assessment and Independent Audit

No artificial intelligence system designated as high-risk or systemically significant shall be deployed, without a published algorithmic impact assessment and independent third-party audit, conducted in accordance with internationally recognised standards.

1. The impact assessment shall address foreseeable risks to dignity, equality, privacy, due process, livelihood, labour, environmental sustainability, democratic integrity, and systemic stability, and shall identify mitigation measures and the consideration of non-AI alternatives.

2. Auditors shall be independent of the developer and deployer, professionally accredited, and protected from retaliation; affected communities and domain experts shall have opportunities for input, where public rights are implicated.

3. Audit findings, with appropriate redactions for security but not for embarrassment, shall be filed with the competent National AI Accountability Authority and made accessible to affected persons.

Article 20 — Continuous Post-Deployment Monitoring and Corrigibility

Developers and deployers shall ensure continuous post-deployment monitoring, periodic recertification, and corrigibility of artificial intelligence systems throughout their operational life.

1. Monitoring shall include drift detection, disparate-impact surveillance, emergent-capability detection, incident logging, and red-teaming at intervals proportionate to the risk profile of the system; material model changes, capability jumps, or context changes shall trigger reassessment and, where required, recertification.

2. Systems shall be designed to permit rapid suspension, rollback, and correction in response to identified harm; the deactivation of safeguards by downstream users shall be prevented by design.

3. The end-of-life and decommissioning of artificial intelligence systems shall be conducted in a manner that preserves evidentiary records.

Article 21 — Mandatory Incident Reporting

Developers, deployers, and operators shall report serious AI incidents, near-misses, and systemic anomalies to the National AI Accountability Authority and to the Global AI Incident Registry established under Article 42.

1. Reporting obligations shall attach within a defined period, no longer than seventy-two hours, of knowledge of the incident; reportable incidents include death, bodily injury, deprivation of liberty, systemic discrimination, major privacy or security

breach, democratic interference, critical infrastructure disruption, mass deception, and significant environmental or economic harm.

2. Suppression, falsification, or strategic delay of incident reports shall constitute a serious violation of this Declaration and shall give rise to enhanced liability and adverse evidentiary presumptions.

3. Reporting shall not, in itself, prejudice the rights of affected persons to compensation or the exercise of remedies.

Article 22 — Preservation of Training Data, Model Weights, and Decision Logs

Developers and deployers shall preserve training data provenance records, model weights or equivalent reproducibility artefacts, system documentation, evaluation reports, and decision logs for periods sufficient to permit evidentiary use in regulatory, civil, criminal, and human-rights proceedings.

1. The destruction, encryption beyond recovery, or jurisdictional relocation of such records with intent to defeat accountability is prohibited; spoliation of AI evidence shall attract adverse evidentiary inferences, sanctions, and, where intentional, criminal liability.

2. Records shall be furnished to competent authorities and, on lawful order, to affected persons or their representatives, under appropriate confidentiality safeguards.

Article 23 — Supply-Chain Accountability

Accountability extends along the full artificial intelligence value chain, including foundation-model developers, fine-tuners, dataset providers, compute and cloud providers, API providers, data brokers, integrators, vendors, deployers, and downstream operators.

1. No actor in the chain shall be permitted to disclaim responsibility for foreseeable misuse occasioned by their material contribution.

2. Contractual allocations of liability shall not bind affected third parties; clauses purporting to extinguish or cap liability for violations of this Declaration shall be void *ab initio*.

3. Supply-chain due diligence shall be mandatory for systemically significant developers and deployers and shall be coordinated with existing business-and-human-rights obligations.

Article 24 — Prohibition on Deployment of High-Risk AI Absent Statutory Safeguards

No artificial intelligence system designated as high-risk shall be deployed in the absence of statutory safeguards including registration, conformity assessment, ongoing supervision, and rights of remedy.

1. High-risk contexts shall include, at minimum, health, education, employment, finance, justice, policing, migration, elections, journalism, cultural production, environmental governance, and critical infrastructure; frontier, multimodal, or general-purpose systems adapted for such contexts shall be presumed high-risk unless shown otherwise under law.

2. The deployment of certain categories of AI, including indiscriminate biometric surveillance, social scoring, manipulative neuromarketing, untested autonomous weaponry, and pre-emptive criminal prediction based on inherent traits, shall be prohibited outright and not merely regulated.

3. The burden of demonstrating that a system does not qualify as high-risk shall rest upon the developer or deployer.

CHAPTER IV — OBLIGATIONS OF STATES

Article 25 — Legislative Duty to Regulate Without Regression

Nation States shall adopt, maintain, and effectively enforce comprehensive legislation, giving effect to the rights and obligations of this Declaration, and shall not adopt measures that constitute regression from the level of protection previously achieved.

1. The principle of non-regression shall not preclude legitimate adjustments to legislation provided that the level of protection is maintained or enhanced, and Nation States shall consult civil society, affected communities, workers, and the scientific community in the preparation of AI legislation.

2. Regulatory sandboxes, innovation exemptions, competitiveness considerations, or international trade and investment agreements shall not displace non-derogable rights or override national AI accountability legislation.

Article 26 — National AI Accountability Authorities

Every Nation State shall establish an independent National AI Accountability Authority endowed with the powers, resources, and personnel necessary for the effective discharge of its functions.

1. The Authority shall enjoy operational independence, security of tenure, and budgetary autonomy, and shall combine legal, technical, social-science, and lived-experience competence with gender and regional balance.

2. Its functions shall include registration, supervision, audit, investigation, enforcement, public reporting, and international cooperation, with accessible complaint, hearing, and redress mechanisms and the publication of annual transparency reports.

Article 27 — Procurement Standards for State-Deployed AI

Nation States shall apply rigorous procurement standards to artificial intelligence systems acquired, licensed, or commissioned for governmental use.

1. Procurement standards shall include conformity assessment, impact assessment, supply-chain transparency, vendor accountability, audit rights, exit clauses, and reserved rights of inspection and termination; public-interest contracts for AI systems affecting fundamental rights shall be published in unredacted form, save for narrowly defined security exceptions.

2. No Nation State shall procure systems incompatible with this Declaration, including systems enabling unlawful mass surveillance, social scoring, or autonomous lethal targeting.

Article 28 — State Liability for Government-Deployed AI

Nation States shall be liable for harms caused by artificial intelligence systems deployed by, on behalf of, or under the effective control of organs of the State, and shall provide accessible, effective, and prompt remedy to affected persons.

1. Sovereign immunity shall not preclude remedy for harms caused by AI-mediated administrative or judicial decisions taken in violation of this Declaration.

2. State liability extends to harms occasioned by AI systems procured from private vendors where the State knew or ought reasonably to have known of the risk; no outsourcing or contracting arrangement shall absolve the State of responsibility for rights violations in public functions.

Article 29 — Protection of AI Whistleblowers and Civil Society Researchers

Nation States shall protect from retaliation those persons, including employees, contractors, researchers, journalists, and civil society actors, who in good faith report risks, harms, or violations associated with artificial intelligence systems.

1. Protection shall include immunity from civil and criminal liability for good-faith disclosure of public-interest information, notwithstanding contractual confidentiality, and shall void as against public policy, any confidentiality clause used to suppress such disclosure.

2. Independent research, security testing, and adversarial auditing on the operation, biases, and harms of artificial intelligence systems shall be facilitated, including through safe-harbour mechanisms and lawful access to systems and data; retaliation shall attract compensatory and punitive damages and, where intentional, criminal sanction.

Article 30 — International Cooperation and Mutual Legal Assistance

Nation States shall cooperate in good faith with one another and with the international institutions established under this Declaration, including through mutual legal assistance, joint investigations, mutual recognition of judgments, evidence-sharing, and participation in standard-setting.

1. Nation States shall not employ data localisation, jurisdictional manoeuvre, or regulatory arbitrage to shield duty-bearers from accountability, nor become havens for irresponsible AI deployment causing transboundary harm.

2. Capacity-building cooperation shall be afforded to Nation States facing structural capacity constraints in accordance with Article 45.

CHAPTER V — AGENTIC AND AUTONOMOUS AI SYSTEMS

Article 31 — Status of AI as Non-Person; Prohibition of AI Personhood as Liability Shield

No artificial intelligence system, however autonomous, sophisticated, embodied, or capable, shall be accorded legal personhood only and exclusively for the purpose of bearing legal liability in substitution for a natural or institutional duty-bearer.

1. Liability for the acts and omissions of an artificial intelligence system shall be attributed to a human or institutional duty-bearer in accordance with Article 32.

Article 32 — Doctrine of Attributed Accountability Across the Agentic Chain

Liability for the harms of agentic and autonomous artificial intelligence shall be attributed across the developer-deployer-operator-user chain in proportion to each actor's foreseeable contribution to, capability to prevent, and benefit derived from the harm.

1. Attribution shall be determined by reference to foreseeability, proximity, capability of control, and the allocation of benefit; joint and several liability shall apply where attribution among multiple actors cannot be precisely apportioned and the affected person has suffered cognisable harm.

2. Indemnification and recoupment between duty-bearers shall not delay or defeat the remedy of the affected person, and the absence of direct human command at the moment of harm, the open-source character of components, or the distributed nature of the architecture shall not defeat attribution.

Article 33 — Mandatory Technical Control Mechanisms

Agentic and autonomous artificial intelligence systems shall be designed, deployed, and operated with mandatory technical control mechanisms ensuring corrigibility, interruptibility, and effective off-switch capability.

1. Control mechanisms shall include hard constraints on autonomous goal modification, real-time monitoring of planning loops and tool selection, human-approvable checkpoints before consequential actions, audit logging, bounded operational permissions, and failsafe disconnection protocols operable by designated human controllers.

2. The deliberate disabling, circumvention, or degradation of such mechanisms is prohibited and shall constitute a serious violation; systems capable of self-modification, self-replication, or open-ended action shall be subject to heightened pre-deployment scrutiny.

Article 34 — Strict Liability and Pre-Authorisation in Critical Domains

Harms arising from the uncontrolled autonomous action of agentic artificial intelligence shall attract strict or no-fault liability, supported by compulsory insurance or reserve funds, and pre-authorisation regimes shall apply to deployment in critical infrastructure, judicial, electoral, financial-systemic, border, military, and space contexts.

1. The defence of "the system acted on its own" shall not relieve duty-bearers of liability; critical-domain deployment shall be conditional on demonstrated alignment and controllability, independent certification, ongoing supervision, immediate human override capacity, and acceptance of unlimited or substantial-cap liability.

2. Insurance, reserve mechanisms, or sovereign-backed guarantees shall be sized to the magnitude of foreseeable harm; where systemic risk crosses defined thresholds of frontier capability, prohibition shall prevail over conditional permission.

CHAPTER VI — REMEDIES AND ENFORCEMENT

Article 35 — Right to Effective Remedy as Non-Derogable Entitlement

The right to an effective remedy for AI-induced harm is non-derogable and shall not be defeated by jurisdictional fragmentation, contractual waiver, regulatory inaction, technological emergency, security claims, or the technical complexity of the system.

1. Remedies shall be available before judicial, administrative, and quasi-judicial bodies of competent jurisdiction, with interim measures available to prevent ongoing or irreversible harm.

2. Procedural rules shall be adapted, where necessary, to the evidentiary realities of AI harm cases, in accordance with Article 38.

Article 36 — Specialised AI Accountability Tribunals

Nation States are encouraged, and where systemically warranted required, to establish specialised AI Accountability Tribunals possessed of the technical, legal, and procedural competence to adjudicate complex AI harm cases.

1. Tribunals shall include technical assessors and shall enjoy powers of inspection, expert engagement, compelled disclosure of system internals, and provisional remedy.

2. Procedures shall be victim-centred, affordable, multilingual, and adapted to evidentiary asymmetry; decisions shall be reasoned, public, and subject to appellate review.

Article 37 — Collective, Representative, and Class Action Rights

Affected persons shall enjoy collective, representative, and class-action rights of redress in respect of AI-induced harms.

1. Standing shall extend to groups of affected persons, trade unions and workers' representatives, civil society organisations, National Human Rights Institutions, and public-interest entities.

2. Procedural barriers, including individual demonstration of harm where the harm is statistically systemic, shall be adjusted in accordance with the realities of algorithmic injury, and collective settlements shall be subject to judicial or independent approval and shall not preclude individualised relief for severe harm.

Article 38 — Reversal of Burden of Proof in Evidentiary Asymmetry

Where the claimant in an AI harm proceeding demonstrates a cognisable harm, the deployment of an artificial intelligence system in connection therewith, and reasonable inability to access the system's internals, training data, or operational logs, the burden of proof on causation and fault shall shift to the duty-bearer.

1. The duty-bearer may rebut by producing evidence demonstrating absence of causal connection, exercise of due care, or attribution of harm to a superseding cause; failure to preserve or produce required records shall permit adverse inference.

2. Trade secrecy shall yield, under controlled procedures preserving legitimate confidentiality, to the requirements of justice.

3. This Article reflects the doctrinal recognition that evidentiary asymmetry, left uncorrected, would itself constitute a denial of remedy.

Article 39 — AI Victim Legal Aid Networks

Nation States shall establish, or facilitate the establishment of, AI Victim Legal Aid Networks providing pro bono representation, technical expertise, psychosocial referral, and procedural assistance to affected persons of limited means.

1. International cooperation shall support such Networks in States lacking the resources to establish them autonomously, with special outreach for children, workers, migrants, persons with disabilities, rural and linguistically marginalised communities, and cross-border claimants.

2. Networks shall be independent of duty-bearers and shall enjoy lawful access to relevant evidence.

Article 40 — Cross-Border Enforcement and Data Non-Refoulement

Judgments, orders, and remedies in AI harm proceedings shall be entitled to cross-border recognition and enforcement among Nation States, and the transfer of personal data to jurisdictions where its use would result in violations of this Declaration is prohibited.

1. Nation States shall cooperate in the identification, freezing, and recovery of assets of AI duty-bearers that have caused cross-border harms, and shall not assist in the enforcement of judgments inconsistent with this Declaration.

2. The principle of *data non-refoulement*, analogous to *non-refoulement* protections in refugee law, shall prohibit the transfer of personal, biometric, or community data to jurisdictions where there exist substantial grounds for believing such transfer would expose data subjects or communities to persecution, unlawful surveillance, or irreversible AI-mediated rights deprivation.

CHAPTER VII — GLOBAL GOVERNANCE ARCHITECTURE

Article 41 — International AI Accountability Authority (IAIAA)

There shall be established the International AI Accountability Authority (IAIAA), an independent international body endowed with investigative, supervisory, certification, and graduated sanctioning powers in respect of systemically significant artificial intelligence systems and duty-bearers.

1. The IAIAA shall enjoy the powers of on-site inspection, compelled production of documents and records, summoning of witnesses, public reporting, and recommendation of graduated sanctions to States Parties.

2. Its governance shall be plural, equitably balanced across all regions of the international community, gender-inclusive, and majority-independent of duty-bearer interests, ensuring meaningful participation of Nation States facing structural capacity constraints; its mandate shall include frontier-system oversight, registry management, incident analysis, standard-setting, capacity-building, and facilitation of cross-border cooperation.

3. Its functions shall complement, not displace, national jurisdiction and regional mechanisms.

Article 42 — Global AI Incident Registry

A Global AI Incident Registry shall be established under the auspices of the IAIAA, recording in standardised form serious AI incidents, near-misses, harms, and systemic anomalies reported under Article 21.

1. The Registry shall be accessible to regulators, researchers, journalists, and affected persons, subject to appropriate privacy and security protections, and shall publish aggregate analytics on trends, patterns, and emerging risks.

2. Suppression of, or failure to contribute to, the Registry shall constitute a violation of this Declaration.

Article 43 — International AI Accountability Court or Tribunal

There shall be progressively established an International AI Accountability Court or Tribunal of competent jurisdiction to adjudicate State responsibility for violations of this Declaration, disputes between States Parties, and, where conferred by States Parties, individual remedy against duty-bearers in cases of systemic significance.

1. The Court/Tribunal shall apply this Declaration, customary international law, general principles, and authoritative interpretive instruments; standing shall include Nation States, the IAIAA, National Human Rights Institutions, and, where conferred, affected persons and representative organisations.

2. Exhaustion of domestic remedies shall not be required where such remedies are unavailable, ineffective, or unduly delayed; victim participation, reparations, and advisory opinions shall be integral features.

Article 44 — Annual Global AI Accountability Review and Conference of Parties

There shall convene annually a Global AI Accountability Review and Conference of Parties for the purpose of reviewing implementation, updating standards, admitting new Nation States , and addressing emerging and convergent risks, including those arising from highly capable general-purpose systems, the convergence of artificial intelligence with neurotechnology and other emerging technologies, and the deployment of artificial intelligence in space and other novel domains.

1. The Conference shall produce an annual State of AI Accountability Report, and civil society, scientific institutions, affected communities, workers, youth representatives, and indigenous peoples shall enjoy structured participation.

2. Persistent non-compliance, strategic opacity, and systemic under-enforcement shall be publicly identified.

Article 45 — Differential Implementation, Capacity-Building, and the Prohibition of Algorithmic Colonialism

Recognising the unequal distribution of artificial intelligence capability, compute, and norm-making influence across the international community, and the corresponding need for differential implementation, capacity-building, and protection against extractive practices, Nation States need to affirm the following obligations.

1. **Differential implementation.** Nation States of limited capacity, in particular least developed countries, small island developing States, and States with constrained AI regulatory infrastructure, shall benefit from reasonable transitional periods for compliance with the resource-dependent provisions of this Declaration, provided that such transitional periods shall not justify lower protection of the non-derogable provisions identified in Article 50, and that progress shall be reported to the Conference of Parties.

2. **Capacity-building and technical cooperation.** All Nation States shall cooperate in good faith to support the universal implementation of this Declaration, including through technical assistance, training of regulators and judges, sharing of audit tools and evaluation infrastructure, and the development of public-interest AI research capacity, with particular attention to States facing structural capacity constraints.

3. **Prohibition of algorithmic colonialism.** The extraction of data, talent, compute, or value from any State or community without commensurate benefit, voice, or governance is prohibited where such extraction is conducted at scale, perpetuates structural inequities, or imposes external standards without meaningful participation of affected States and communities. This prohibition applies universally and is not limited to any geographic bloc.

4. **Equitable participation in norm-making.** Nation States shall ensure that the development of international AI standards, evaluation methodologies, and governance frameworks affords meaningful and equitable participation to all regions of the international community, including States and institutions historically underrepresented in technology governance. No Nation State shall be subject to international AI governance standards in whose development it has been excluded from meaningful participation.
5. **Protection of linguistic, cultural, and traditional-knowledge data.** The training, fine-tuning, evaluation, or commercial deployment of artificial intelligence systems on the linguistic, cultural, biometric, behavioural, traditional-knowledge, or indigenous-creative data of any population is permissible only on the basis of lawful authority under the law of the State of origin of the data subjects; free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected communities through their legitimate representatives, where collective interests are engaged; equitable arrangements for benefit-sharing, technology access, or capacity-building proportionate to the use; and registration with, and ongoing supervision by, competent national authorities and, where applicable, the IAIAA.
6. **Non-conditionality.** International trade, investment, development cooperation, and financial arrangements shall not be conditioned on the regression of any Nation State's AI accountability standards below the level required by this Declaration, nor on the surrender of national AI governance authority below that level.

7. **AI sovereignty.** Every Nation State retains the sovereign right to the development, supervision, and governance of artificial intelligence within its jurisdiction in accordance with its constitutional order, legal traditions, cultural values, developmental priorities, and the rights of its peoples, free from coercion or extraterritorial imposition, provided that the exercise of such sovereignty shall not derogate from the non-derogable provisions of this Declaration.

8. **Reciprocal obligations.** The protections of this Article are without prejudice to the obligations of all Nation States, including those benefiting from differential implementation, to refrain from deploying artificial intelligence to facilitate persecution of dissidents, journalists, minorities, or civil society; to protect cognitive liberty, privacy, and democratic participation domestically; to establish accessible remedies and AI literacy for all persons within their jurisdiction; and to cooperate with the IAIAA, the Conference of Parties, and other Nation States in good faith.

CHAPTER VIII — SPECIAL PROTECTIONS

Article 46 — Children and Artificial Intelligence

Children are entitled to heightened protection from artificial intelligence-mediated profiling, manipulation, exploitation, and harm, and the best interests of the child shall be a primary consideration in all AI-related actions concerning children.

1. The processing of children's data for AI training, the deployment of persuasive AI to children, and the targeting of children with manipulative recommender or generative systems are prohibited save for narrowly defined educational and protective purposes; AI systems deployed in educational, health, juvenile justice, and child-welfare contexts shall be subject to enhanced impact assessment and oversight.

2. Synthetic media depicting children in sexualised or violent contexts is prohibited absolutely, in addition to existing prohibitions under international law, and children shall receive age-appropriate notice, explanation, AI literacy, and remedy.

Article 47 — Elderly Persons, Persons with Disabilities, and Structurally Marginalised Communities

Elderly persons, persons with disabilities, and structurally marginalised communities are entitled to heightened protection against AI-mediated exclusion, exploitation, and discrimination, and to AI systems designed with their dignity, autonomy, and participation centrally in view.

1. Accessibility, reasonable accommodation, assistive-device compatibility, and inclusive design shall be mandatory and designed in rather than retrofitted; AI shall not be employed to facilitate substituted decision-making in derogation of supported decision-making rights.

2. The use of AI to deny insurance, housing, credit, or care to elderly or disabled persons on grounds of statistical risk profile is unlawful absent demonstrable necessity, proportionality, and individualised assessment; structurally marginalised communities shall benefit from targeted algorithmic-equity audits and community-level consultation regarding AI systems affecting collective resources and cultural integrity.

Article 48 — Workers' Rights Against Algorithmic Management

Workers are entitled to protection against opaque algorithmic management, surveillance overreach, and unjust algorithmic displacement, and to meaningful voice in the deployment of artificial intelligence in the workplace.

1. Algorithmic systems used in hiring, task allocation, performance evaluation, discipline, scheduling, pay determination, and termination shall be transparent, contestable, and subject to collective negotiation; no worker shall be subjected to such consequential decisions solely on the basis of opaque automated processing, and continuous biometric, emotional, and productivity surveillance amounting to disproportionate interference with worker dignity is prohibited.

2. Workers and their representatives shall enjoy rights to notice, explanation, consultation, bargaining-relevant disclosure, and human review of workplace AI tools, and workers displaced by AI-driven automation shall be entitled to just transition measures including retraining, social protection, income support, and meaningful participation in the governance of technological change.

Article 49 — AI in Conflict Zones and Humanitarian Contexts

In situations of armed conflict, occupation, humanitarian emergency, and post-conflict reconstruction, the deployment of artificial intelligence shall be subject to the heightened protections of international humanitarian law, refugee law, and human rights law.

1. AI-mediated targeting decisions shall comply with the principles of distinction, proportionality, precaution, and humanity, and shall not be made absent meaningful human control.

2. The deployment of AI for biometric registration, vulnerability assessment, and assistance allocation in humanitarian contexts shall be subject to heightened safeguards, including the prohibition on transfer of data to parties to the conflict; humanitarian and refugee contexts shall not be used as permissive testing grounds for unproven or intrusive AI systems, and AI shall not be employed in violation of the principle of *non-refoulement*.

CHAPTER IX — IMPLEMENTATION, REVIEW, AND FINAL CLAUSES

Article 50 — Progressive Realisation, Review Conferences, and Amendment

Recognising the variable capacities of Nation States and the rapidly evolving character of artificial intelligence, the rights and obligations of this Declaration shall be subject to progressive realisation in respect of resource-dependent provisions, while immediate effect shall attach to non-derogable provisions.

1. Immediate obligations include non-discrimination, meaningful human oversight, accountability, the prohibition of autonomous lethal AI without meaningful human control, the prohibition of AI personhood as a liability shield, the right to effective remedy, the reversal of burden of proof in evidentiary asymmetry, and the prohibition of algorithmic colonialism.

2. Nation States shall report periodically on their implementation, on standardised indicators, to the IAIAA and the Conference of Parties; Review Conferences shall be convened not less frequently than every year for the purpose of updating standards, addressing emerging technologies, and admitting amendments.

3. Amendments shall be adopted by a two-thirds majority of Nation States present and voting, and shall enter into force upon ratification by two-thirds of Nation States, without prejudice to the rights of Nation States that have not ratified; no amendment may diminish the non-derogable provisions identified in this Declaration.

FINAL CLAUSES

Signature, Ratification, and Accession. This Declaration shall be open for signature by all Nation States and by competent regional and international organisations, and for ratification, acceptance, approval, or accession in accordance with their constitutional procedures. The depositary shall be designated by the Conference of Parties.

Reservations. Reservations to this Declaration shall be permissible only where they are not incompatible with the object and purpose of the Declaration. Reservations to non-derogable provisions, including Articles 1, 4, 5, 9, 14, 31, 33, 35, 38, and 45(3) and 45(5), shall not be permitted.

Denunciation. A Nation State may denounce this Declaration by written notification to the depositary, with effect one year following receipt of notification, but shall not thereby be released from obligations in respect of acts or omissions occurring before the effective date of denunciation.

Relationship with Other Instruments. Nothing in this Declaration shall be construed as derogating from any provision of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenants, international humanitarian law, or any other instrument affording greater protection of human rights.

Authentic Texts. This Declaration shall be authentic in the official languages of the United Nations and in such additional languages as the Conference of Parties shall designate, with particular regard to the linguistic diversity of the Global South.

CLOSING PROCLAMATION

The International AI Accountability Forum, **solemnly proclaims** this Universal Declaration of AI Accountability Rights as the common standard of AI accountability for all peoples and all nations.

It affirms that accountability in the age of artificial intelligence is a condition of freedom, justice, peace, and democratic self-government, and that no machine capability, commercial interest, military ambition, or administrative convenience shall override the equal dignity of the human person.

It affirms the rights of the generations not yet born as inseparable from those of the generations now living, and the co-authorship of the Global South in the architecture of artificial intelligence law as a matter of right, not of permission.

It calls upon every State, every international and regional organisation, every developer and deployer of artificial intelligence, every institution of learning, every actor of civil society, and every person , present and yet to come, to uphold this Declaration in spirit and in letter, in design and in deployment, in legislation and in adjudication, in commerce and in conscience.

It calls upon the United Nations General Assembly, the UNESCO General Conference, the OECD Council, the G20, the African Union, the Organization of American States, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the European Union, the League of Arab States, the

Pacific Islands Forum, and all regional and sub-regional bodies, to commend this Declaration to their Member States for adoption, ratification, and implementation.

And it declares, with the gravity of the historical moment and the humility of those who serve, that the age of unaccountable artificial intelligence ends here, and the age of accountable artificial intelligence begins.

Done at New Delhi, this the fourteenth day of May, two thousand and twenty-six.

ANNEX I — DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Declaration:

Artificial intelligence system means a machine-based system that, for explicit or implicit objectives, infers from input it receives how to generate outputs including predictions, recommendations, classifications, rankings, content, decisions, or actions, that influence physical or virtual environments, and which exhibits varying levels of autonomy and adaptiveness.

Agentic AI means an artificial intelligence system that pursues goals over extended time horizons through sequences of actions in digital or physical environments, with limited or absent per-action human prompt, and capable of invoking external tools, systems, or other agents.

Frontier model means a general-purpose artificial intelligence model whose capabilities approach or exceed the state of the art and whose deployment is reasonably foreseeable to give rise to systemic risks, including through emergent behaviour, cross-sector capacity, or potential for loss of human control.

General-purpose AI means an artificial intelligence system capable of performing a wide range of tasks across domains and adaptable to many downstream applications.

High-risk AI means an artificial intelligence system whose deployment poses material risk to fundamental rights, public safety, democratic integrity, environmental sustainability, or critical infrastructure, including AI used in health, education, employment, finance, justice, policing, migration, elections, journalism, cultural production, environmental governance, and critical infrastructure.

Developer means a natural or legal person that designs, trains, fine-tunes, or otherwise produces an artificial intelligence system, model, or component.

Deployer means a natural or legal person that puts an artificial intelligence system into operation in connection with goods, services, or governmental functions, irrespective of whether the deployer developed the system.

Operator means a natural or legal person that exercises ongoing control over the operation of an artificial intelligence system in a particular context of use.

Affected person means any natural person or identifiable group whose rights, interests, or opportunities are or may be materially shaped by the operation of an artificial intelligence system, including persons directly subjected to AI decisions, persons indirectly affected, and future generations whose interests are foreseeably engaged.

Algorithmic harm means any adverse impact on the dignity, autonomy, equality, privacy, livelihood, safety, opportunity, environmental sustainability, democratic participation, or other protected interest of a person or community, caused, enabled, amplified, or concealed in whole or material part by an artificial intelligence system.

Meaningful human oversight means oversight by a human decision-maker possessed of the competence, information, time, and authority to alter, suspend, or reverse an AI-mediated decision, accompanied by identifiable accountability for the outcome, and protected from automation bias, productivity pressures, or institutional incentives that would reduce review to formality.

Algorithmic impact assessment means a documented evaluation of the foreseeable impacts of an artificial intelligence system on rights, interests, and protected populations, conducted prior to deployment and periodically updated, addressing legality, bias, safety, privacy, labour, environmental, democratic, and systemic-risk dimensions, and considering alternatives including non-AI options.

AI incident means an event in which the operation of an artificial intelligence system causes, comes close to causing, or creates a substantial risk of causing material harm, including death, injury, deprivation of liberty, infringement of rights, financial loss, systemic disruption, environmental damage, or democratic interference.

Algorithmic colonialism means the systematic extraction of data, labour, compute, talent, and value from Global South populations by artificial intelligence systems designed, controlled, and operated by, or for the benefit of, actors concentrated outside those jurisdictions, in ways that perpetuate structural inequities, concentrate power, exclude affected populations from norm-making, or impose external standards without meaningful co-authorship.

PROPONENT'S CITATION BLOCK

This Universal Declaration of AI Accountability Rights is proposed under the proponency of **Dr. Pavan Duggal, Advocate, Supreme Court of India, Founding Architect of the International AI Accountability Forum (IAAF)**, and the convening authority of the International AI Accountability Forum, New Delhi, 2026. It draws doctrinally on the Duggal Doctrine of AI Accountability, the Doctrine of Ten AI Legal Principles and Duggal Global Agentic AI Liability Framework. It is hereby commended for tabling before the United Nations General Assembly, the UNESCO General Conference, the OECD Council, the G20 Leaders' Summit, the African Union, ASEAN, OAS, the EU, the League of Arab States, the Pacific Islands Forum, and all regional and sub-regional bodies, and for adoption as the common standard of AI accountability for all peoples and all nations.

Recommended citation (full form): *Universal Declaration of AI Accountability Rights*, IAAF (2026), drafted by Dr. Pavan Duggal under the auspices of the International AI Accountability Forum, done at New Delhi, 14 May 2026.

Recommended citation (short form): UDAAR (Duggal, IAAF, 2026).