

**CONCOURS EXTERNE, INTERNE ET 3<sup>ème</sup> CONCOURS  
POUR L'ACCÈS AU CORPS DES ADMINISTRATEURS DE L'ÉTAT  
DÉNOMMÉS « CONCOURS D'ORIENT »  
AU TITRE DE L'ANNÉE 2024**

---

**ÉPREUVES ÉCRITES D'ADMISSIBILITÉ**

**Mercredi 6 septembre 2023**

**ANGLAIS**

Durée totale de l'épreuve : 3 heures

Coefficient : 2

Toute note inférieure à 10 sur 20 est éliminatoire

Barème de notation : composition en anglais 12 points ; traduction en français 8 points



**TRADUCTION EN FRANÇAIS**

*Traduction en français d'un texte rédigé en anglais*

TEXTE AU VERSO

## [...] What should the regulation of generative AI look like?

Nicol Turner Lee, Niam Yaraghi, Mark MacCarthy, and Tom Wheeler

Friday, June 2, 2023

[...]

*MARK MACCARTHY*

*Nonresident Senior Fellow, Center for Technology Innovation:*

### **Lampedusa on AI Regulation**

In “The Leopard,” Giuseppe Di Lampedusa’s famous novel of the Sicilian aristocratic reaction to the unification of Italy in the 1860s, one of his central characters says, “If we want things to stay as they are, things will have to change.”

Something like this Sicilian response might be happening in the tech industry’s embrace of inevitable AI regulation. Three things are needed, however, if we do not want things to stay as they are.

The first and most important step is sufficient resources for agencies to enforce current law. Federal Trade Commission Chair Lina Khan properly says AI is not exempt from current consumer protection, discrimination, employment, and competition law, but if regulatory agencies cannot hire technical staff and bring AI cases in a time of budget austerity, current law will be a dead letter.

Second, policymakers should not be distracted by science fiction fantasies of AI programs developing consciousness and achieving independent agency over humans, even if these metaphysical abstractions are endorsed by industry leaders. Not a dime of public money should be spent on these highly speculative diversions when scammers and industry edge-riders are seeking to use AI to break existing law.

Third, Congress should consider adopting new identification, transparency, risk assessment, and copyright protection requirements along the lines of the European Union’s proposed AI Act. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration’s request for comment on a proposed AI accountability framework and Sen. Chuck Schumer’s (D-NY) recently-announced legislative initiative to regulate AI might be moving in that direction.

*TOM WHEELER*

*Visiting Fellow, Center for Technology Innovation:*

### **Innovative AI Requires Innovative Oversight**

Both sides of the political aisle, as well as digital corporate chieftains, are now talking about the need to regulate AI. A common theme is the need for a new federal agency. To simply clone the model used for existing regulatory agencies is not the answer, however. That model, developed for oversight of an industrial economy, took advantage of slower paced innovation to micromanage corporate activity. It is unsuitable for the velocity of the free-wheeling AI era.

All regulations walk a tightrope between protecting the public interest and promoting innovation and investment. In the AI era, traversing this path means accepting that different AI applications pose different risks and identifying a plan that pairs the regulation with the risk while avoiding innovation-choking regulatory micromanagement.

Such agility begins with adopting the formula by which digital companies create technical standards as the formula for developing behavioral standards: identify the issue; assemble a standard-setting process involving the companies, civil society, and the agency; then give final approval and enforcement authority to the agency.

Industrialization was all about replacing and/or augmenting the physical power of humans. Artificial intelligence is about replacing and/or augmenting humans’ cognitive powers. To confuse how the former was regulated with what is needed for the latter would be to miss the opportunity for regulation to be as innovative as the technology it oversees. We need institutions for the digital era that address problems that already are apparent to all.