

NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

REGULATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Joao Guerreiro
Sergio Rebelo
Pedro Teles

Working Paper 31921
<http://www.nber.org/papers/w31921>

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH

1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
November 2023

We thank Rodrigo Adao, Mark Aguiar, Marco Bassetto, Luis Garicano, Alessandro Pavan, and Pascual Restrepo for their comments and Ramya Raghavan for excellent research assistance. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2023 by Joao Guerreiro, Sergio Rebelo, and Pedro Teles. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Regulating Artificial Intelligence
Joao Guerreiro, Sergio Rebelo, and Pedro Teles
NBER Working Paper No. 31921
November 2023
JEL No. H21, O33

ABSTRACT

Advances in AI promise substantial benefits but pose societal risks. We analyze optimal AI regulation when there is uncertainty about societal costs, disagreement over their likelihood, and experimentation, via beta testing and red teaming, can reduce uncertainty. Pigouvian taxes fail to implement the first-best allocation because there is heterogeneity in expectations about societal risks, and the beliefs of AI developers are unobservable to the regulator. We characterize a regulation policy that implements the first best. This policy has two stages. First, the regulator decides whether to release the algorithm or require experimentation. Second, using the information obtained, the regulator determines whether the algorithm should be made available to the public or withdrawn.

Joao Guerreiro
Department of Economics
University of California Los Angeles
Los Angeles, CA
jguerreiro@econ.ucla.edu

Sergio Rebelo
Northwestern University
Kellogg School of Management
Department of Finance
Leverone Hall
Evanston, IL 60208-2001
and CEPR
and also NBER
s-rebelo@northwestern.edu

Pedro Teles
Banco de Portugal
R. Francisco Ribeiro 2
1150 Lisboa
Portugal
and Univ Catolica Portuguesa and CEPR
pteles@ucp.pt

1 Introduction

In 1950, Isaac Asimov published *I, Robot*, a collection of short stories about the dilemmas of a world where robots powered by artificial intelligence (AI) interact with humans. Recent advances in AI have brought these dilemmas from the realm of science fiction to the pages of newspapers and the halls of parliaments.

AI algorithms outperform humans in tasks such as playing games (Silver et al., 2017, Silver et al., 2018), recognizing images (Langlotz et al., 2019), and predicting protein structures (Jumper et al., 2021). They have also made great strides in generating content (Eloundou et al., 2023) and in business forecasting (Agrawal, Gans, and Goldfarb, 2022). These breakthroughs promise great benefits but also pose substantial risks.

Some risks stem from the alignment problem (Wiener, 1960), where AI systems optimize narrowly defined objectives while neglecting broader human values. For example, social media algorithms may maximize user engagement at the cost of user well-being (Russell et al., 2015, Amodei et al., 2016). Other dangers arise from AI's potential to facilitate harmful activities, such as generating deepfakes for fraud, automating cyberattacks, manipulating users through hyper-personalization, and aiding the design of biological or chemical weapons.

There is substantial uncertainty about these risks. In a recent interview (Tyran-giel, 2025), Sam Altman, the CEO of OpenAI says "I still expect that on cybersecurity and bio stuff we'll see serious, or potentially serious, short-term issues that need mitigation. Long term, as you think about a system that really just has incredible capability, there's risks that *are probably hard to precisely imagine and model*. But I can simultaneously think that these risks are real and also believe that the only way to appropriately address them is to ship product and learn."

There is also considerable disagreement about AI's societal risks, even among AI pioneers. Geoffrey Hinton resigned from Google to openly discuss the potential

threats AI poses to humanity (Heaven, 2023). In contrast, Yann LeCun, Meta’s Chief AI Scientist, and Richard Sutton, a professor at the University of Alberta and, like Hinton and LeCun, a Turing Award recipient, have both dismissed these concerns as overblown (Hart, 2024, Scott, 2025).

This paper studies the optimal AI regulatory policy under uncertainty and disagreement about its societal costs. We classify these costs into two categories. The first is negative externalities, such as fueling political polarization, facilitating fraud, disseminating false information, jeopardizing financial stability, and weakening democracies (see, e.g., Acemoglu, 2021, and Beraja, Kao, Yang, and Yuchtman, 2023). The second is “internalities,” where individuals make harmful choices due to cognitive biases or misinformation (Herrnstein et al., 1993).

Beta testing and red-teaming can help identify AI risks before deployment. Beta testing exposes the AI algorithm to a limited group of users to assess societal costs. Red-teaming involves hiring experts to actively probe for vulnerabilities.¹ To simplify, we use the expression beta testing to encompass both approaches. In our model, beta testing emerges endogenously as a response to uncertainty. Under certain circumstances, developers are willing to sacrifice short-term profits to gain information that informs their decision on whether to release the algorithm to the broader population.

Pigouvian taxes are commonly used to align private and social incentives. These taxes can be levied ex-ante, based on expected external costs, or ex-post, determined by actual social damages. Applying these taxes to AI faces a key challenge: developers and regulators may have different expectations about AI’s risks. When developer expectations are private information, Pigouvian taxes fail to implement the first-best allocation. We show that charging developers for the realized external damages (ex-

¹The term “red teaming” originated in Cold War military strategy, where red teams simulated adversarial attacks to test defenses. It has since been adopted in cybersecurity and AI safety to describe efforts to uncover vulnerabilities.

post taxes) is insufficient to align incentives both in the short-run (beta testing) and in the long-run (deployment). Ex-ante taxes can be used to align incentives in the long run but may induce excessive experimentation in the short run.

The social optimum can be achieved through a two-stage regulatory policy. In the first stage, the regulator either approves the AI algorithm for release or requires beta testing, specifying the sample size used in the test. In the second stage, based on the information obtained in the first stage, the regulator decides whether to permit full deployment or withdraw the algorithm.

This precautionary regulatory framework is similar to the one used in pharmaceuticals, medical devices, chemicals, and autonomous vehicles. Our analysis shows that this approach is optimal in environments characterized by uncertain external effects, divergent expectations between industry and society about these effects, and unobservable industry beliefs about potential risks.

Our paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the related literature. Section 3 introduces our benchmark model and 4 discusses optimal policy. In Section 5, we analyze scenarios where AI algorithms create externalities. Finally, we conclude with a discussion on the implications of our model for the regulatory proposals under consideration in the U.S. and the European Union.

2 Related literature

Our paper relates to four important strands of research. The first is a nascent economics literature on AI regulation. Blattner, Nelson, and Spiess (2021) explore a delegation game where an agent designs a prediction algorithm under regulatory constraints set by a principal. They show that restricting agents to fully transparent, simple algorithms is inefficient when the divergence with the regulator is limited, and complex models offer significantly better performance. Acemoglu and Lensman (2023) analyze optimal AI adoption when uncertainty about potential disas-

ters resolves over time, creating incentives for delayed adoption. [Gans \(2024\)](#) argue that learning-by-doing about AI’s social costs may justify accelerating adoption, provided it remains reversible. [Callander and Li \(2024\)](#) show that when firms have superior knowledge about a technology’s impact, increased competition weakens regulators’ ability to extract reliable information, reducing the likelihood of approving beneficial innovations.

Our work makes three key contributions to this literature. First, we examine how uncertainty about AI’s internal and external effects, and disagreement about their likelihood, shape optimal regulation. Second, we highlight the role of beta testing in mitigating AI’s downside risk. Third, we assess the effectiveness of regulatory approaches currently under consideration in the U.S. and the European Union.

Our results also relate to [Weitzman \(1974, 1978\)](#)’s classic work on whether a planner should use prices or dictate quantities to regulate production under uncertainty. In his model, firms observe cost shocks, but the planner does not. He shows that dictating quantities is preferable when marginal costs are flatter than marginal benefits because small price errors cause large, undesirable quantity fluctuations. In our model, price incentives fail to implement the first best allocation for a different reason. Firms’ expectations about external effects are unobservable to the planner, which can only set prices based on its expectation of the firms’ beliefs about external effects.

A second related literature examines the impact of AI and automation on the labor market (e.g., [Burstein, Morales, and Vogel, 2019](#), [Martinez, 2021](#), [Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2022](#), [Guerreiro, Rebelo, and Teles, 2022](#), [Costinot and Werning, 2023](#), [Ide and Talamas, 2023](#), and [Thuemmel, 2023](#)), the critical role of data in AI algorithms (e.g., [Jones and Tonetti, 2020](#), and [Farboodi and Veldkamp, 2021](#)), and the potential existential risks associated with AI ([Jones, 2024](#)). Our contribution relative to this literature is to characterize optimal policy responses to AI’s externalities and internalities.

A third strand of research investigates the value of experimentation (e.g., Callander, 2011). We contribute to this literature by analyzing an environment in which beta testing emerges endogenously as a preliminary stage preceding the full product launch. In this setting, firms not only decide whether to engage in beta testing but also optimize the sample size used in these trials.

Finally, a fourth related area is clinical trial design, often modeled as a multi-armed bandit problem (e.g., Thompson, 1933 and Gittins, 1974). We contribute to this literature by considering settings where private and social incentives diverge and offering policies that equate these incentives in settings with heterogeneous expectations about social costs.

3 Benchmark model

We consider a two-period model with a continuum of identical households and a single AI developer. We interpret the first period as the short run and the second as the long run.² In our model, using AI carries inherent risks, as it can create misalignments or facilitate activities that generate significant social costs. When the algorithm is deemed too risky for full initial release, the developer may choose to conduct beta testing by distributing the algorithm to a limited subset of the population. Based on the outcome of this beta testing, the developer can then decide whether to release the algorithm in the second period.

We allow for disagreement between society and AI developers about the likelihood of societal risks. This disagreement can arise because developers may be overly optimistic, expecting negative external effects to be small.

We now discuss the household problem, the AI developer’s problem, and the unregulated equilibrium. Then, we characterize the social optimum and compare it with the unregulated equilibrium.

²We omit time subscripts throughout the text whenever doing so does not compromise clarity.

3.1 Unregulated equilibrium

Household problem The economy has a continuum of households indexed by $j \in [0, N]$, where N denotes the total number of households in the population. Each household lives for two periods.

Household j 's momentary utility in period t , $v_{j,t}$, has a quasi-linear form:

$$v_{j,t} = y_t + [u - \mathbb{E}_t^s(i_t^2) - p_t] \times \mathcal{I}_{j,t} - \mathbb{E}_t^s(e_t^2), \quad (1)$$

where y_t is the exogenous income earned in period t , u is the utility of using the algorithm and p_t is the price of the algorithm in period t . The indicator function $\mathcal{I}_{j,t}$ takes the value one if household j buys the AI license and zero otherwise. The mass of AI users at time t is $\mu_t \equiv \int_0^N \mathcal{I}_{j,t} dj$. We now discuss the variables i_t and e_t .

Alignment and other problems In the introduction, we classify AI risks and misalignments into two types. Internal risks and misalignments arise when AI algorithms manipulate households into making decisions that reduce their welfare. This effect, i_t , decreases momentary utility by i_t^2 .

External risks and misalignments occur when an AI algorithm affects a household indirectly through the use of the AI algorithm by other households. For example, AI-driven social media may polarize public opinion and distort election outcomes. This effect, e_t , reduces momentary utility by e_t^2 , with the reduction increasing in the number of users, μ_t .

Households can control internal risks and misalignments by choosing not to purchase the algorithm. We assume they account for the expected welfare reduction from the internal effect ($\mathbb{E}^s(i_t^2)$ in equation (18)) when making their purchase decision. In Section 5, we examine a scenario where behavioral biases lead households to overlook these internal effects when deciding whether to adopt the algorithm.

In contrast, households have no control over external misalignments and risks, as these depend on the adoption decisions made by other households.

Expectations of short- and long-run risks and misalignments We assume that the short-run impact of internal and external risks and misalignments on utility is equal to the long-run impact, ϕ_x^2 , plus a mean-zero random variable, ξ_x for $x \in \{i, e\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} i_1^2 &= \phi_i^2 + \xi_i, & i_2^2 &= \phi_i^2, \\ e_1^2 &= (\phi_e^2 + \xi_e)\mu_1, & e_2^2 &= \phi_e^2\mu_2. \end{aligned}$$

Positive and negative values of the random variable ϕ_x represent undesirable risks and misalignments. The random variables ξ_x capture the idea that the full consequences of AI usage may not be fully realized in the short run but emerge over the long run.

We allow developers to have different beliefs over the likelihood of misalignments than the rest of society. We assume that developers and society hold these different beliefs dogmatically. The superscript d denotes the developer's beliefs, $E_t^d(\cdot)$, and the superscript s denotes societal beliefs, $E_t^s(\cdot)$. For each $k = d, s$, we assume that the expected value of ϕ_x is zero for $x \in \{i, e\}$:

$$\mathbb{E}_1^k(\phi_x) = 0.$$

Let $\sigma_{k,x}^2$ denote uncertainty at time one about the algorithm's potential misalignment:

$$\sigma_{k,x}^2 = \mathbb{E}_1^k(\phi_x^2).$$

To assess internal and external risks and misalignments, the developer can release the algorithm to a sample of μ_1 users in period one. The outcomes from this partial release inform the developer's decision about a full-scale release in the second period.

We assume the probability of generating information from the initial release, denoted by $\pi(\mu_1)$, depends on the number of licenses μ_1 ,

$$\pi(\mu_1) = \begin{cases} (\mu_1/\kappa)^\alpha & \text{if } \mu_1 < \kappa, \\ 1 & \text{if } \mu_1 \geq \kappa. \end{cases}$$

Here, κ denotes the minimal number of participants required to obtain information with certainty. If $\kappa = N$, information is generated with probability one only when the algorithm is released to the whole population. The parameter α determines the effectiveness of information generation. As $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, $\pi(\mu_1) \rightarrow 1$ if $\mu_1 > 0$ and $\pi(\mu_1) = 0$ if $\mu_1 = 0$. In this limiting case, testing on an infinitesimally small sample generates information with certainty.

We define an indicator function \mathcal{B} such that $\mathcal{B} = 1$ if information is generated and $\mathcal{B} = 0$ otherwise. If information is generated, a public signal about the algorithm's risks and misalignments becomes available. Rather than detailing the distributions of the random variables ξ_x , we model the effect of this information directly on posterior beliefs. In particular, the posterior beliefs about ϕ_x at the beginning of the second period become:

$$\mathbb{E}_2^k(\phi_x) = \hat{\phi}_{k,x}, \quad \text{VAR}_2^k(\phi_x) = \hat{\sigma}_{k,x}^2 < \sigma_{k,x}^2.$$

Thus, while uncertainty is reduced, some residual uncertainty ($\hat{\sigma}_{k,x}^2 > 0$) persists, requiring decisions to be made under incomplete information. Posterior beliefs satisfy the consistency conditions:

$$\mathbb{E}_1^k[\hat{\phi}_{k,x}] = 0, \quad \mathbb{E}_1^k[\hat{\phi}_{k,x}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{k,x}^2] = \sigma_{k,x}^2.$$

If no information is generated ($\mathcal{B} = 0$), initial priors remain unchanged for both the developer and society.

Developer optimism We make the natural assumption that developers are more optimistic than society about the external effects of the AI algorithm:

$$\mathbb{E}_t^d(\phi_x^2) \leq \mathbb{E}_t^s(\phi_x^2). \tag{2}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}_1^d[\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_x^2)] \leq \mathbb{E}_1^s[\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_x^2)]. \quad (3)$$

Household decisions Household j chooses whether to purchase an algorithm license in each period to maximize their expected lifetime utility, given by

$$\mathcal{U}_j = (1 - \beta)v_{j,1} + \beta\mathbb{E}_1^s(v_{j,2}). \quad (4)$$

The household buys an AI license in period t if the expected private benefits, net of the expected internal effects caused by the algorithm, exceed the price of the algorithm. In period one, this condition is

$$u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 \geq p_1.$$

A similar condition applies in period two:

$$u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) \geq p_2.$$

The expected negative welfare consequences of internal misalignments reduce the price households are willing to pay for the algorithm in both periods.

The AI developer's problem There is a single AI developer who has designed an algorithm. In period one, the developer releases the algorithm to a subset of the population, $\mu_1 \in [0, N]$. We assume that the decision to deploy the algorithm in period one can be reversed in period two. If this reversal occurs, the algorithm does not impact period two utility.

The developer's problem in period two At the beginning of period two, the developer decides whether to release the algorithm to the population, choosing the number of AI licenses to offer for sale (μ_2) and the price of each license (p_2). At the end of period two, uncertainty about internal and external misalignments is realized.

The developer's utility in the second period is,

$$\mathcal{V}_2 = \begin{cases} p_2\mu_2 - \mathbb{E}_2^d(\phi_e^2)\mu_2, & \text{if } p_2 \leq u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) \text{ and } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ p_2\mu_2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2\mu_2, & \text{if } p_2 \leq u - \sigma_i^2 \text{ and } \mathcal{B} = 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We assume that the developer is immune to the algorithm's internal effect but experiences disutility from the externality in the same way households do.

If the developer markets the algorithm, the optimal license price is

$$p_2 = \begin{cases} u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2), & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ u - \sigma_{s,i}^2, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0. \end{cases}$$

The developer, acting as a monopolist, sets the price to capture the expected consumer surplus.³

In period two, the developer releases the algorithm if the maximum price the household is willing to pay is greater than the reduction in the developer's utility caused by the externality associated with the algorithm, i.e., if $p_2 \geq \mathbb{E}_2^d(\phi_e^2)$.

If new information is generated in period one ($\mathcal{B} = 1$) the posterior means of ϕ_x^2 , for $x \in \{i, e\}$, are given by $\mathbb{E}_2^d(\phi_x^2) = \hat{\phi}_{d,x}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,x}^2$. The developer releases the algorithm in the second period if the maximum price it can charge exceeds the reduction in utility caused by the external effect on the developer,

$$u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) \geq \hat{\phi}_{d,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,e}^2.$$

Otherwise, the algorithm is not released ($\mu_2 = 0$).

In the unregulated equilibrium, household expectations regarding internal risks and misalignments matter because they determine their willingness to pay for the algorithm, while the developer's expectations are inconsequential.

³This pricing strategy extracts all the consumer surplus but does not generate deadweight losses. It simply redistributes resources from the households to the monopolist.

Conversely, household expectations about external risks and misalignments have no impact. Instead, the developer's expectations about external effects matter because they determine the release decision.

If no information is generated in period one ($\mathcal{B} = 0$), the algorithm is released in period two to the whole population ($\mu_2 = N$) if

$$u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 \geq \sigma_{d,e}^2,$$

and not released otherwise ($\mu_2 = 0$).

The optimized developer utility in period two is,

$$\mathcal{V}_2^* = \begin{cases} \max\{u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) - (\hat{\phi}_{d,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,e}^2), 0\}N, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ \max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2, 0\}N, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0. \end{cases}$$

The asterisk indicates that the value function is evaluated using the developer's optimal pricing and implementation strategy in period two.

To make the problem interesting, we assume that the distributions of ϕ_x are such that there is a strictly positive probability that both $u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) > \hat{\phi}_{d,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,e}^2$, in which case the developer releases the algorithm, and $u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) < \hat{\phi}_{d,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,e}^2$ in which case the algorithm is not released. This assumption means that the probability of the algorithm being implemented in period two is strictly positive but less than one.

The following proposition states that, from the perspective of period two, a higher μ_1 has a strictly positive value. The intuition behind this result is that the developer is better off because it can make decisions based on the acquired information.

Lemma 1 (Private benefits of releasing in period one). *The developer's expected utility in the second period increases with the number of licenses sold in period 1 if $\mu_1 < k$.*

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}_1^d(\mathcal{V}_2^*)}{d\mu_1} > 0.$$

The developer's problem in period one In period one, the developer chooses the number of licenses, μ_1 , and the price per license, p_1 . The developer's objective function is given by:

$$\mathcal{V} = (1 - \beta) \left(\begin{cases} p_1 \mu_1 - \sigma_{d,e}^2 \mu_1, & \text{if } p_1 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 \\ 0, & \text{if } p_1 > u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 \end{cases} \right) + \beta \mathbb{E}_1^d(\mathcal{V}_2^*).$$

The optimal price for the developer is the maximum price the household is willing to pay: $p = u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$.

If $u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 \geq \sigma_{d,e}^2$, it is optimal to release the algorithm to the entire population, $\mu_1 = N$. Instead, if $u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 < \sigma_{d,e}^2$, releasing the algorithm incurs a cost from the perspective of period one. But, it might still be optimal to release the algorithm to at least part of the population to obtain information that can be used in period two. We call this experimentation *beta testing*. Since $\alpha \leq 1$, the developer's utility is increasing in the neighborhood of $\mu_1 = 0$, so the optimal solution features positive beta testing: $\mu_1 > 0$. The intuition for this result is that the benefits from learning increase sufficiently fast with μ_1 to offset the costs of testing, which are given by $(u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2)\mu_1^2$.

Proposition 1 summarizes the developer's optimal release policy. To describe this policy, it is useful to define the developer's information benefit-cost ratio, Λ^d :

$$\Lambda^d \equiv \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^d [\max \{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^d(\phi_e^2), 0\}]}{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + \sigma_{d,e}^2 - u}. \quad (5)$$

This ratio compares the expected benefits of increasing the probability of learning the external effects of the AI algorithm, $\beta \mathbb{E}_1^d [\max \{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^d(\phi_e^2), 0\}]$, to the immediate cost to the developer of selling the AI algorithm to an additional person today. This cost is the external effect on the developer minus the sale price of the algorithm, $(1 - \beta)[\sigma_{d,e}^2 - (u - \sigma_{s,i}^2)]$.

Proposition 1 (Uncertainty, beta testing, and algorithm release). *In an unregulated equilibrium, the number of user licenses offered by the developer in the first period depends*

on the level of uncertainty, the effectiveness of beta testing, and the information benefit-cost ratio. The solution is as follows:

1. If uncertainty about external effects is low, $\sigma_{d,e}^2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$, the developer foregoes beta testing and immediately releases the AI algorithm to the entire population in the first period ($\mu_1 = N$).
2. If uncertainty about external effects is relatively high. $\sigma_{d,e}^2 > u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$, then the developer beta tests the algorithm on a sample of size,

$$\mu_1 = \min \left\{ \left[\alpha \Lambda^d \frac{N}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, 1 \right\} \kappa. \quad (6)$$

The developer may opt to withdraw the product from the market even when the expected misalignment, $\hat{\phi}_{k,x}$, is relatively small in absolute value, provided that the residual uncertainty, $\hat{\sigma}_{k,x}^2$, remains substantial. This outcome highlights the role of uncertainty in decision-making, as the long-term negative consequences are not immediately apparent, prompting both households and developers to exercise caution regarding the algorithm's future impact.

3.2 The first-best solution (planner's problem)

We consider a central planner who, in the first period, chooses the number of households that can use the algorithm. The planner obtains information about its internal and external effects when this number is positive. In the second period, the planner decides whether to make the algorithm available and how many licenses to issue.

We define social welfare as the sum of the households' and developer's utilities, $\int_0^N \mathcal{U}_i di + \mathcal{V}$. With quasi-linear utility, maximizing this social welfare function is equivalent to maximizing efficiency. Any distribution of utilities can be achieved using lump-sum transfers.

To compute the socially optimal allocations, we describe the solution to the second-period problem, contingent upon the choices made in the first period about μ_1 .

The planner's problem in period two The expected social welfare in the second period, considering the available information, is given by:

$$\mathcal{W}_2 = \begin{cases} Ny_2 + \left[u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) - (N+1)(\hat{\phi}_{s,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,e}^2) \right] \mu_2 & \text{if } \mu_1 > 0, \\ Ny_2 + \left[u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 \right] \mu_2 & \text{if } \mu_1 = 0. \end{cases}$$

We now determine the optimal value of μ_2 . If $\mathcal{B} = 1$, the posterior expectation is given by $\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_x^2) = \hat{\phi}_{s,x}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,x}^2$. In this case, releasing the algorithm is optimal if

$$\frac{u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2)}{N+1} \geq \hat{\phi}_{s,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,e}^2,$$

ensuring that the household's utility from using the algorithm, net of expected internal effects, exceeds the external effect. If this condition is not satisfied, then $\mu_2 = 0$.

If $\mathcal{B} = 0$, then $\mu_2 = N$ if

$$\frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1} \geq \sigma_{s,e}^2,$$

and otherwise $\mu_2 = 0$.

In period two, the planner only releases AI algorithms that are expected to be socially beneficial, taking into account the expected external effects on the entire population, $(N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)$. In contrast, the developer considers only its own expected loss of utility due to the externality, $\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)$. This difference implies that the developer is willing to commercialize AI algorithms that are detrimental to society.

The social welfare in period two is given by:

$$\mathcal{W}_2^* = Ny_2 + \begin{cases} \max\{u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) - (N+1)(\hat{\phi}_{s,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,e}^2), 0\}N, & \text{if } \mu_1 > 0 \\ \max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2, 0\}N, & \text{if } \mu_1 = 0, \end{cases}$$

where the asterisk indicates that the value function has been maximized with respect to the choice of price and implementation in period two.

We assume that there is a strictly positive probability that $u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) > (N+1)(\hat{\phi}_{s,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,e}^2)$, in which case it is optimal to release the algorithm, and $u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) < (N+1)(\hat{\phi}_{s,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,e}^2)$, in which case it is not. This assumption means that the

probability that the planner releases the algorithm in the second period, given the information obtained in the first period, is strictly positive but less than one.

The equivalent of Lemma 1 for the planner is as follows.

Lemma 2 (Social benefits of beta testing in period one). *Expected social welfare in the second period increases with the size of the sample used for beta testing in the first period for $\mu_1 \in (0, N)$:*

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_1^s(d\mathcal{W}_2^*)}{d\mu_1} > 0.$$

The planner's problem in period one Expected social welfare is given by

$$\mathcal{W} = (1 - \beta) \left[Ny_1 + \left\{ u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N + 1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 \right\} \mu_1 \right] + \beta \mathbb{E}_1^s[\mathcal{W}_2^*].$$

From a static perspective, it is optimal to set $\mu_1 = N$ if $u - \sigma_i^2 - (N + 1)\sigma_e^2 \geq 0$ and $\mu_1 = 0$ if $u - \sigma_i^2 - (N + 1)\sigma_e^2 < 0$. However, beta testing in the first period ($\mu_1 > 0$) creates value by generating information that the planner can use in the second period.

Proposition 2 summarizes the planner's optimal release policy. To describe this solution, it is useful to define the planner's information benefit-cost ratio, Λ^s :

$$\Lambda^s \equiv \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^s \left[\max \left\{ u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N + 1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2), 0 \right\} \right]}{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + (N + 1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 - u}. \quad (7)$$

With homogeneous beliefs $\Lambda^s < \Lambda^d$ because the developer does not take into account external effects on the population. Because of differences in beliefs and weights assigned to external damages, the planner's information benefit-cost ratio is lower than the developer's, $\Lambda^s < \Lambda^d$.

Proposition 2 (Uncertainty, beta testing, and algorithm release). *In the first best, the number of user licenses offered in the first period depends on the level of uncertainty, the effectiveness of beta testing, and the information benefit-cost ratio. The solution is as follows:*

1. If uncertainty is low, $\sigma_e^2 \leq \frac{u-\sigma_i^2}{N+1}$, the planner always foregoes beta testing and releases the AI algorithm to the entire population in the first period ($\mu_1 = N$)
2. If uncertainty is relatively high $\sigma_e^2 > \frac{u-\sigma_i^2}{N+1}$, the planner beta tests the algorithm on a sample of size

$$\mu_1 = \min \left\{ \left[\alpha \Lambda^s \frac{N}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, 1 \right\} \kappa. \quad (8)$$


Figure 1 depicts the optimal values of μ_1 (Panel A) and μ_2 (Panel B) chosen by the planner and the developer for various levels of uncertainty. In the first period, both the developer and the planner agree to release the algorithm to the entire population when uncertainty about the external effect is low ($\sigma_e^2 \leq \frac{u-\sigma_i^2}{N+1}$). At higher levels of uncertainty, the planner is more cautious than the developer, releasing the algorithm to fewer users. The reason is that the planner takes into account the impact of the externalities generated by the algorithm on the entire population.

In the second period, the developer and planner make the same release decisions when external effects are low or high. However, when external effects are in an intermediate range, they disagree: the developer opts to release the algorithm, whereas the planner chooses not to. This disparity occurs because the developer disregards the algorithm's external effects on the population.

4 Regulating AI

Social welfare in the unregulated equilibrium falls short of the social optimum because developers overlook AI's external impact on households. Aligning private and social incentives through Pigouvian taxes is challenging because of uncertainty and disagreement over AI's external effects.

Figure 1: Release decisions in the first and second periods



We consider two types of Pigouvian taxes: ex-post, which hold developers fully liable for realized damages, and ex-ante, which charge them based on expected external effects. Ex-post taxes work when expectations are homogeneous but fail when expectations are heterogeneous. Ex-ante taxes remain effective with heterogeneous expectations but must account for differing expectations between regulators and developers. Eliciting developers' true expectations is inherently difficult because they have incentives to feign pessimism about external effects to reduce Pigouvian taxes. When the developer's expectations are unobservable to the planner, Pigouvian taxes fail to implement the first best.

In this model, the optimal policy includes a prescription about the release in period one, which is the extent of beta testing, as well as conditional approval in period two. In particular, the regulator determines whether to release the algorithm or subject it to beta testing to assess societal risks. Second, based on the information obtained, the regulator either approves or withdraws the algorithm.

4.1 Pigouvian taxes

We first consider ex-post Pigouvian taxes in an economy with homogeneous beliefs. Throughout, we assume that any tax revenue is redistributed to households as lump-sum transfers.

4.1.1 Ex-post Pigouvian taxes

Suppose that regulators levy taxes on developers equal to the welfare cost of the realized external effects imposed on the households:

$$\tau_t = N \times e_t^2. \quad (9)$$

The developer understands that selling the AI to a larger population (higher μ_t) makes them more likely to face higher taxes: $\mathbb{E}_t^d(\tau_t) = N\mathbb{E}_t^d(\phi_e^2)\mu_t$. The welfare properties of these taxes are summarized by the following proposition.

Proposition 3 (Ex-Post Pigouvian Taxes under Homogeneous Beliefs). *Suppose that developers and society have the same beliefs. Then, ex-post Pigouvian taxes in equation (9) align private and social incentives. As a result, the developer's decisions regarding testing, implementation, and innovation coincide with the socially optimal choices.*

Proof. If beliefs are homogeneous, then $\mathbb{E}_t^d(\phi_e^2) = \mathbb{E}_t^s(\phi_e^2)$. It is still optimal for the developer to set $p_t = u - \mathbb{E}_t^s(\phi_i^2)$. Replacing this price and the expected taxes into the utility of the developer we find that $\mathcal{V} = (1 - \beta)\mathcal{V}_1 + \beta\mathbb{E}_1(\mathcal{V}_2)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{V}_1 &= [u - \sigma_i^2 - (N + 1)\sigma_e^2]\mu_1 \\ \mathcal{V}_2 &= \begin{cases} [u - (\hat{\phi}_i^2 + \hat{\sigma}_i^2) - (N + 1)(\hat{\phi}_e^2 + \hat{\sigma}_e^2)]\mu_2, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ [u - \sigma_i^2 - (N + 1)\sigma_e^2]\mu_2, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\mathcal{V}_t = \mathcal{W}_t - Ny_t$. Private and social incentives are aligned, so privately optimal decisions coincide with the social optimum. \square

Heterogeneous beliefs When the developer and society hold different beliefs about the algorithm's potential risks, ex-post Pigouvian taxes fail to align the developer's incentives with those of society. This divergence in incentives arises because the developer, being more optimistic, assigns a lower probability to negative external effects and is therefore more inclined to release the algorithm than the planner.

To see this result formally, note that in period t , the developer's expectation of their tax liability is lower than the planner's $\mathbb{E}_t^d(\tau_t) = N\mathbb{E}_t^d(\phi_e^2)\mu_t < N\mathbb{E}_t^s(\phi_e^2)\mu_t$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{V}_t = \mathcal{W}_t - Ny_t + (N + 1) \left\{ \mathbb{E}_t^s(\phi_e^2) - \mathbb{E}_t^d(\phi_e^2) \right\} \mu_t$$

This expression shows that the developer is willing to release the algorithm in cases where the planner would not. In the extreme case where $\mathbb{E}_t^d(\phi_e^2) = 0$, the developer is always willing to release the algorithm, while the planner is more cautious.

4.1.2 Ex-ante Pigouvian taxes

We now show that ex-ante Pigouvian taxes can achieve the efficient outcome even when beliefs are heterogeneous. Suppose the regulator sets taxes at the beginning of each period based on the expected external damages caused by the algorithm:

$$\tau_t^{ex-ante} = \mathbb{E}_t^s(Ne_t^2) = N\mathbb{E}_t^s(\phi_e^2)\mu_t. \quad (10)$$

When beliefs are heterogeneous, the ex-ante taxes in equation (10) do not implement the social optimum because we need to correct for differences in beliefs. For instance, the taxes in period two need to be corrected as follows:

$$\tau_2^{ex-ante} = \begin{cases} N\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)\mu_2 + [\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^d(\phi_e^2)]\mu_2 & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ N\sigma_{s,e}^2\mu_2 + (\sigma_{s,e}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2)\mu_2 & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

The first term internalizes the externality according to the regulator's expectations. The second term corrects for the difference in expectations between the developer and the regulator.

Note that the developer pays a higher tax when they are relatively optimistic (lower $\mathbb{E}_t^d(\phi_e^2)$), and a lower tax when they are relatively pessimistic (higher $\mathbb{E}_t^d(\phi_e^2)$).⁴

However, the analog of taxes (11) applied to period one fail to implement the socially optimal level of μ_1 . The reason is that the developer's information benefit-cost ratio is higher than that of the regulator,

$$\Lambda^d = \Lambda^s \times \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^d [\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_1^s(\phi_e^2), 0\}]}{\mathbb{E}_1^s [\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_1^s(\phi_e^2), 0\}]} > \Lambda^s. \quad (12)$$

To implement the first-best outcome, the period-one taxes must correct not only for differences in expectations about the externality in that period but also for differences in expectations regarding the externality in period two. The latter correction

⁴Laffont (1977) explores a similar result in a version of Weitzman (1974)'s model in which the firm and the planner have different expectations about fundamentals. When prices are used as incentives, they must correct for belief differences. As we discuss below, in our model, there is a dynamic element to the belief correction because information generated by beta testing or releasing at time one has value at time two.

is necessary because the developer's decision to beta test in period one has informational value in period two. The period-one taxes that achieve the first-best are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_1^{ex-ante} = & N\mathbb{E}_1^s(\phi_e^2)\mu_1 + \left[\mathbb{E}_1^s(\phi_e^2) - \mathbb{E}_1^d(\phi_e^2) \right] \mu_1 \\ & + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \pi(\mu_1) \left(\mathbb{E}_1^d \left[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_1^s(\phi_e^2), 0\} \right] \right. \\ & \left. - \mathbb{E}_1^s \left[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_1^s(\phi_e^2), 0\} \right] \right), \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 4 (Ex-Ante Pigouvian Taxes under Heterogeneous Beliefs). *Suppose the developer and society have different beliefs about the algorithm's potential external effects. If the regulator imposes the ex-ante Pigouvian taxes specified in equations (11) and (13), the developer's decisions regarding release, withdrawal, and the sample size used in beta testing align with the socially optimal outcomes.*

Unfortunately, this policy suffers from a significant practical problem: the developer's expectations required to construct the taxes (11) and (13) are generally unobservable. What is the optimal policy when the developer's beliefs are private information? If the regulator applies the taxes (11) and (13) to the developer's self-reported beliefs, then the developers have an incentive to pretend to be more pessimistic than they are to pay lower taxes.

4.2 Optimal policy when beliefs are private information

In this subsection, we study the optimal policy in a setting where developer beliefs are private information. Our main result is that, under these informational constraints, Pigouvian taxes fail to implement the social optimum. We show that the first best can be implemented by combining mandatory beta testing with regulatory approval.

The developer draws their belief type θ from a set $\Theta = [\underline{\theta}, \bar{\theta}]$, with cumulative density function F . We denote by $\underline{\theta}$ and $\bar{\theta}$ the most pessimistic and optimistic beliefs in the set Θ . We assume that the most optimistic developer assigns zero probability to non-zero external effects, so $\mathbb{E}_1^{\bar{\theta}}(\phi_e^2) = 0$. The most pessimistic developer has the same expectations as society $\mathbb{E}_1^{\underline{\theta}}(\phi_e^2) = \mathbb{E}_1^s(\phi_e^2)$. Under these conditions, developers are weakly more optimistic than society.

We consider two sets of policies without commitment: (i) linear tax on the number of licenses sold and (ii) regulation that controls release and beta testing decisions. Timing is as follows. First, nature draws the developer's belief type θ , which is private information. Next, the regulator designs the optimal policy for period one. Given this policy, the developer decides their optimal price and release strategy. In the second period, all individuals observe the beta test results from period one, and beliefs are updated. The regulator then chooses the optimal policy for period two, after which the developer decides their optimal release strategy.

In line with standard assumptions used in the literature on Pigouvian taxation, we treat taxes as linear functions of the number of licenses sold, μ_t . Given that the developer type is private information, taxes cannot directly depend on the developer's beliefs. Consequently, a tax policy is defined as a set of state-contingent tax rates $\tau \equiv \{\tau_t\}$, for $t = 1, 2$, on the number of licenses sold, μ_t .

The second policy framework we consider consists of mandatory beta testing and regulatory approval. These policies set limits on the maximum number of licenses that can be sold in each period.

In period one, the regulator can either mandate a beta test of up to $\bar{\mu}_1$ licenses or permit full release, in which case $\bar{\mu}_1 = N$. In period two, the regulator can approve full commercialization by setting $\bar{\mu}_2 = N$, require the developer to withdraw the algorithm by setting $\bar{\mu}_2 = 0$, or implement an intermediate restriction on the number of licenses sold.

A mandatory beta-testing and regulatory approval policy is a set of state-contingent

restrictions on license sales, denoted by $\bar{\mu} \equiv \{\bar{\mu}_t\}$ for $t = 1, 2$. These restrictions impose an upper limit on number of licenses that can be sold in each period such that $\mu_t \leq \bar{\mu}_t$.⁵

Optimal tax policy For any tax policy τ , the developer's beta testing and release strategies follow the same principles as before. Lemma 3 characterizes the developer's behavior for an arbitrary tax policy.

Lemma 3 (Optimal Developer Behavior Under Tax Policy). *For any tax policy τ , the developer's release, beta-testing and withdrawal policies are as follows.*

At time $t = 2$:

1. If $\mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2) < u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \tau_2$, the developer releases the algorithm to the entire population, $\mu_2^\theta = N$ for all θ .
2. If $\mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2) \geq u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \tau_2$, the developer withdraws the algorithm, $\mu_2^\theta = 0$ for all θ .

At time $t = 1$:

1. If $\sigma_{\theta,e}^2 < u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \tau_1$, the developer foregoes beta testing and releases the algorithm to the entire population, $\mu_1^\theta = N$ for all θ .
2. If $\sigma_{\theta,e}^2 \geq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \tau_1$, the developer beta tests the algorithm on

$$\mu_1^\theta(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \min \left\{ \left[\alpha \Lambda^\theta(\tau_1, \tau_2) \frac{N}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, 1 \right\} \kappa, \quad (14)$$

where $\Lambda^\theta(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ is the developer's information benefit-to-cost ratio defined in equation (A.10).

⁵In the appendix, we discuss the case of non-linear taxes. We show that there is a non-linear, discontinuous tax schedule that replicates the outcomes obtained under the optimal mandatory beta-testing and regulatory approval policy. This tax schedule confiscates the developer's revenues when their choices deviate from the efficient allocations.

Taxes affect the release decision at time two and the sample size used for beta testing at time one.

Proposition 5 characterizes the optimal tax policy when beliefs are private information.

Proposition 5 (Optimal Tax Policy When Beliefs Are Private Information). *The optimal tax policy is as follows.*

At time $t = 2$:

1. If uncertainty is small, $\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2) \leq \frac{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2)}{N+1}$, the regulator sets the tax to zero $\tau_2 = 0$ and the developer releases the algorithm to the entire population, $\mu_2^\theta = N$ for all θ .
2. If uncertainty is large, $\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2) > \frac{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2)}{N+1}$, the regulator sets the tax $\tau_2 = p_2$ and the developer withdraws the algorithm, $\mu_2^\theta = 0$ for all θ .

At time $t = 1$:

1. If uncertainty is small, $\sigma_{s,e}^2 \leq \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$, the regulator sets the tax to zero $\tau_1 = 0$ and the developer releases the algorithm to the entire population, $\mu_1^\theta = N$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.
2. If uncertainty is large, $\sigma_{s,e}^2 > \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$, the regulator sets the tax so that

$$\int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \frac{d\mu_1^\theta / d\tau_1}{\int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} d\mu_1^\theta / d\tau_1 dF(\theta)} \pi'(\mu_1^\theta) \Lambda^s N dF(\theta) = 1, \quad (15)$$

and the developer sells μ_1^θ licenses as given in equation (14).

In the second period, the tax is set to zero if the algorithm is socially beneficial. If the algorithm is socially harmful, all revenue is taxed away, ensuring that developers of all types choose not to release the algorithm. This tax policy ensures that the release of the algorithm in period two is socially efficient.

In the first period, the planner chooses a tax rate that equates the expected value of beta testing across developer types with the welfare cost of conducting beta testing. Because this tax policy adjusts developer incentives based on average values

across different belief types rather than individual beliefs, it generally falls short of achieving the efficient outcome.

Next, we describe the implementation of the efficient outcome using mandatory beta testing and regulatory approval of the algorithm conditional on the results of the beta test.

Optimal regulation policy Lemma 4 characterizes the developer's behavior for an arbitrary policy regulating beta testing and release.

Lemma 4 (Optimal Developer Behavior Under Regulation Policy). *For any regulation policy $\bar{\mu}$, the developer's release, beta-testing and withdrawal policies are as follows.*

At time $t = 2$:

1. *If $\mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2) < u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2)$, the developer releases the algorithm to the maximum number of people allowed, $\mu_2^\theta = \bar{\mu}_2$ for all θ .*
2. *If $\mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2) \geq u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2)$, the developer withdraws the algorithm, $\mu_2^\theta = 0$ for all θ .*

At time $t = 1$:

1. *If $\sigma_{\theta,e}^2 < u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$, the developer sells the maximum number of licenses allowed, $\mu_1^\theta = \bar{\mu}_1$ for all θ .*
2. *If $\sigma_{\theta,e}^2 \geq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$, the developer beta tests the algorithm on*

$$\mu_1^\theta = \min \left\{ \min \left\{ \left[\alpha \Lambda^\theta \frac{N}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, 1 \right\} \kappa, \bar{\mu}_1 \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where Λ^θ is the developer's information benefit-to-cost ratio, θ , given by equation (A.18).

Proposition 6 characterizes the optimal regulation policy when beliefs are private information.

Proposition 6 (Optimal regulation policy under private information). *The optimal regulation policy is as follows. At time $t = 2$:*

1. *If uncertainty is low, $\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2) \leq \frac{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2)}{N+1}$, the regulator sets a non-binding limit on the number of licenses $\bar{\mu}_2 = N$ and the developer releases the algorithm to the entire population, $\mu_2^\theta = N$ for all θ .*
2. *If uncertainty is high, $\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2) > \frac{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2)}{N+1}$, the regulator mandates the withdrawal of the algorithm, setting $\bar{\mu}_2 = 0$ and so $\mu_2^\theta = 0$ for all θ .*

At time $t = 1$:

1. *If uncertainty is low, $\sigma_{s,e}^2 \leq \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$, the regulator sets a non-binding limit on the number of licenses $\bar{\mu}_1 = N$ and the developer releases the algorithm to the entire population, $\mu_1^\theta = N$ for all θ .*
2. *If uncertainty is high, $\sigma_{s,e}^2 > \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$, the regulator sets the following upper bound*

$$\bar{\mu}_1 = \min \left\{ \left[\alpha \Lambda^s \frac{N}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, 1 \right\} \kappa. \quad (17)$$

The developer sells $\mu_1^\theta = \bar{\mu}_1$ licenses for all θ .

This regulation policy implements the socially optimal allocation in this economy, so it is superior to the best tax policy.⁶ Overall, the optimal regulatory policy follows a simple threshold rule: intervention occurs only when uncertainty is high. This approach prevents the premature deployment of risky algorithms while allowing efficient learning through beta testing, ensuring that release decisions are made with adequate information. At time one, if uncertainty is low, the regulator does not

⁶It is possible to formulate a discontinuous tax policy that replicates the effects of the optimal regulatory framework. This policy involves granting a subsidy to developers who select the socially optimal value of μ_1 . The subsidy can be set at a sufficiently high level to ensure that all types of developers opt for the socially optimal μ_1 .

restrict the algorithm’s release. When uncertainty is high, the regulator limits the number of beta licenses issued, balancing the benefits of acquiring more information with the risk of significant negative external effects. At time two, the developer decides whether to release or withdraw the algorithm. If uncertainty about externalities is low, the regulator imposes no restrictions, allowing full deployment. If uncertainty is high, the regulator mandates withdrawal to prevent potential harm.

We now briefly discuss the impact of limited liability on our results.

4.3 Limited liability

In practice, limited liability protects developers from bearing the full cost of large social damages. In the Appendix, we analyze how this constraint affects our results. We model limited liability by assuming that taxes in period t cannot exceed the sales revenue generated in that period.⁷ Under this constraint, ex-post taxes do not achieve the first-best allocation in either period one or two because the developer does not account for damages that exceed their limited liability. In contrast, ex-ante taxes succeed in implementing the first-best allocation in period two but fail to do so in period one.

The regulatory policy described in Proposition 6 remains effective, ensuring that the first-best allocation is implemented even in the presence of limited liability.

5 A model with internalities

This section considers a model that incorporates deviations from rational behavior, known as internalities. These deviations lead households to make decisions that are not in their self-interest because of misinformation, self-control issues, cognitive biases, or time inconsistency problems, all of which can be exploited by AI algorithms.

⁷For simplicity, in the Appendix, we derive these results under homogeneous beliefs.

5.1 Unregulated equilibrium

Household’s problem In Section 3, we assume that households take the expected welfare reduction caused by internal effects, $\mathbb{E}_t(i_t^2)$, into account when deciding whether to use the algorithm. Here, we consider the case where, because of behavioral biases, households disregard these internal effects when making their purchase decision.

We formalize this idea by assuming that \mathcal{U}_j , defined in equation (4), is the household’s “experienced utility,” but that households base their choices on a different, misspecified, objective function that we refer to as the “decision utility.”⁸ Lifetime decision utility takes the form:

$$\mathcal{U}_j^b = (1 - \beta)v_{j,1}^b + \beta\mathbb{E}_1(v_{j,2}^b),$$

where momentary decision utility is

$$v_{j,t}^b = y_t + [u - p_t] \times \mathcal{I}_{j,t} - \mathbb{E}(e_t^2). \quad (18)$$

The household decides whether to purchase the AI algorithm to maximize \mathcal{U}_j^b . The resulting decision rule is to buy the algorithm whenever $p_t \leq u$. Recall that without behavioral biases, the decision rule is to buy the algorithm when $p_t \leq u - \mathbb{E}_t(\phi_i^2)$.

We assume that the developer is immune to the algorithm’s internal effects, either because it does not use the algorithm or is more sophisticated than the households.⁹

What are the key differences between this model and our benchmark model? Because households ignore expected negative internal effects on utility, the developer can charge them a higher price: $p_t = u$ instead of $p_t = u - \mathbb{E}_t(\phi_i^2)$.

Internalities widen the gap between the unregulated equilibrium and the social optimum. In period one, the developer beta tests the algorithm when $\sigma_e^2 > u$ and

⁸This terminology is common in behavioral price theory (e.g., [Farhi and Gabaix \(2020\)](#)).

⁹Extending our analysis to the case where the algorithm’s internal effects also affect the developer is straightforward. Such an extension would not significantly alter our findings.

releases the algorithm otherwise. In contrast, the planner has a lower threshold for the level of uncertainty required for beta testing. It is socially optimal to beta test whenever $\sigma_e^2 > (u - \sigma_i^2)/(N + 1)$.

In period two, the developer withdraws the algorithm only when $\hat{\phi}_e^2 + \sigma_e^2 > u$. The planner uses a lower uncertainty threshold for withdrawal. It is socially optimal to withdraw the algorithm whenever $\hat{\phi}_e^2 + \sigma_e^2 > (u - \hat{\phi}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2)/(N + 1)$.

The developer overlooks the external impacts on the broader population but personally experiences these effects, just like any household. These external effects increase with the number of algorithm users. Consequently, when externalities are high, the developer is dissuaded from releasing the algorithm. This restraining factor is absent with respect to internalities because the developer is not personally affected by internalities and the price does not reflect the internal effects experienced by households.

Figure 2 shows that the developer and the planner select the same value of μ_1 only when uncertainty is low ($\sigma_e^2 < (u - \sigma_i^2)/(N + 1)$). Under higher uncertainty, the developer opts for a larger μ_1 than the planner, as it does not account for the algorithm's external effects on the population. The choice of μ_2 coincides under both low and high uncertainty but diverges at moderate levels of uncertainty. This divergence is more pronounced than when households consider internal effects in deciding to purchase the algorithm.

The policy outcomes in the presence of internalities resemble those without internalities. Pigouvian taxes fail to implement the first-best allocation. Achieving the first-best instead requires a policy combining mandatory beta testing with regulatory approval contingent on the beta-test results.



6 Conclusion

In this paper, we study optimal regulation that takes into account two key characteristics of AI algorithms: considerable uncertainty regarding their potential social costs and widespread disagreement about the likelihood of these costs.

We show that the optimal regulation policy follows a two-stage process. In the first stage, regulators determine whether an algorithm should undergo beta testing, specifying the sample size for the test, or be approved for full deployment. The information gathered during this phase guides the final decision—whether to permit wide release or withdraw the algorithm to prevent societal harm.

Like AI today, electricity once posed serious risks (electrocutions, fires) before regulation was introduced. Early self-regulation efforts proved insufficient, and public pressure led to government regulation that introduced electrical codes, equipment certification, and electrician licensing.

Figure 2: Release decisions in the first and second periods



Efforts to self-regulate AI are currently under way. Leading AI labs are developing approaches such as constitutional AI (training with ethical principles), reinforcement learning from human feedback, and oversight methods to improve interpretability and control.¹⁰ Additional measures include content watermarking, hiring experts to detect vulnerabilities (red-teaming), and delaying deployment until safety checks are satisfied.

Electricity's slow adoption provided time to refine safety measures and regulations. In contrast, AI is spreading rapidly, outpacing regulation and heightening the urgency of aligning private incentives with societal interests.

Europe and the United States are developing frameworks to address these challenges (European Commission, 2020, European Commission, 2022, Benifei and Tudorache, 2023, Biden, 2023). Proposed approaches include mandatory testing, making developers liable for adverse outcomes, and classifying AI technologies into risk tiers, with a ban on those posing unacceptable risks.

Prohibiting the development of algorithms that pose a high risk of negative externalities is not sufficient to achieve the social optimum. Developers have an incentive to test and deploy algorithms with moderate risk on sample sizes larger than what is socially optimal. Holding developers liable for external effects can lead to excessive risk-taking because developers may have a more optimistic outlook about external effects than regulators, leading them to take on more risk than is socially optimal.

AI regulation faces broader challenges that are common to other industries. Regulatory capture—where dominant firms shape policies to serve their interests (Stigler, 1971 and Peltzman, 1976)—is a significant risk. Additionally, measuring externalities and internalities is complex, and high compliance costs could stifle innovation.

While our analysis focuses on the regulatory framework in a single country, in-

¹⁰The constitutional approach echoes Asimov's Three Laws of Robotics: robots must not harm humans, must obey orders unless they cause harm, and must protect themselves without violating the first two laws.

ternational cooperation is essential when AI systems generate cross-border externalities.

Implementing beta testing and regulatory approval on a global scale requires large public investment in computational resources and expertise. It is a formidable but urgent task. As Isaac Asimov observed, “The saddest aspect of life right now is that science gathers knowledge faster than society gathers wisdom.”

References

- ACEMOGLU, D. (2021): “Harms of AI,” in *The Oxford Handbook of AI Governance*, Oxford University Press.
- ACEMOGLU, D. AND T. LENSMA (2023): “Regulating Transformative Technologies,” Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- ACEMOGLU, D. AND P. RESTREPO (2022): “Tasks, Automation, and the Rise in U.S. Wage Inequality,” *Econometrica*, 90, 1973–2016.
- AGRAWAL, A., J. GANS, AND A. GOLDFARB (2022): *Prediction Machines: The Simple Economics of Artificial Intelligence*, Harvard Business Press.
- AMODEI, D., C. OLAH, J. STEINHARDT, P. CHRISTIANO, J. SCHULMAN, AND D. MANÉ (2016): “Concrete problems in AI safety,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565*.
- BENIFEI, B. AND I.-D. TUDORACHE (2023): “Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act),” Tech. rep., Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection, European Union.
- BERAJA, M., A. KAO, D. Y. YANG, AND N. YUCHTMAN (2023): “Exporting the Surveillance State via Trade in AI,” Working paper, Brookings Center on Regulation and Markets.
- BIDEN, J. R. (2023): “Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence,” Tech. rep., The White House.
- BLATTNER, L., S. NELSON, AND J. SPIESS (2021): “Unpacking the black box: Regulating algorithmic decisions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.03443*.
- BURSTEIN, A., E. MORALES, AND J. VOGEL (2019): “Changes in Between-Group Inequality: Computers, Occupations, and International Trade,” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 11, 348–400.
- CALLANDER, S. (2011): “Searching and Learning by Trial and Error,” *American Economic Review*, 101, 2277–2308.
- CALLANDER, S. AND H. LI (2024): “Regulating an Innovative Industry,” Working paper.
- COSTINOT, A. AND I. WERNING (2023): “Robots, trade, and luddism: A sufficient statistic approach to optimal technology regulation,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 90, 2261–2291.

- ELOUNDOU, T., S. MANNING, P. MISHKIN, AND D. ROCK (2023): “Gpts are Gpts: An Early Look at the Labor Market Impact Potential of Large Language Models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10130*.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2020): “Report on the Safety and Liability Implications of Artificial Intelligence, the Internet of Things and Robotics,” Tech. rep., European Commission.
- (2022): “Regulatory Framework Proposal on Artificial Intelligence,” Tech. rep., European Commission.
- FARBOODI, M. AND L. VELDKAMP (2021): “A Model of the Data Economy,” Tech. rep., National Bureau of Economic Research.
- FARHI, E. AND X. GABAIX (2020): “Optimal Taxation with Behavioral Agents,” *American Economic Review*, 110, 298–336.
- GANS, J. S. (2024): “How Learning About Harms Impacts the Optimal Rate of Artificial Intelligence Adoption,” Working Paper 32105, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- GITTINS, J. (1974): “A Dynamic Allocation Index for the Sequential Design of Experiments,” *Progress in statistics*, 241–266.
- GUERREIRO, J., S. REBELO, AND P. TELES (2022): “Should robots be taxed?” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 89, 279–311.
- HART, R. (2024): “AI models like ChatGPT won’t reach human intelligence, Meta’s AI chief says,” *Forbes*.
- HEAVEN, W. D. (2023): “Geoffrey Hinton tells us why he’s now scared of the tech he helped build,” *MIT Technology Review*.
- HERRNSTEIN, R. J., G. F. LOEWENSTEIN, D. PRELEC, AND W. VAUGHAN JR (1993): “Utility Maximization and Melioration: Internalities in Individual Choice,” *Journal of behavioral decision making*, 6, 149–185.
- IDE, E. AND E. TALAMAS (2023): “Artificial Intelligence in the Knowledge Economy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05481*.
- JONES, C. I. (2024): “The AI Dilemma: Growth Versus Existential Risk,” *American Economic Review: Insights*, 6, 575–590.
- JONES, C. I. AND C. TONETTI (2020): “Nonrivalry and the Economics of Data,” *American Economic Review*, 110, 2819–2858.

- JUMPER, J., R. EVANS, A. PRITZEL, T. GREEN, M. FIGURNOV, O. RONNEBERGER, K. TUNYASUVUNAKOOL, R. BATES, A. ŽÍDEK, A. POTAPENKO, ET AL. (2021): “Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold,” *nature*, 596, 583–589.
- LAFFONT, J. J. (1977): “More on Prices vs. Quantities,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 44, 177–182.
- LANGLOTZ, C. P., B. ALLEN, B. J. ERICKSON, J. KALPATHY-CRAMER, K. BIGELOW, T. S. COOK, A. E. FLANDERS, M. P. LUNGREN, D. S. MENDELSON, J. D. RUDIE, ET AL. (2019): “A Roadmap for Foundational Research on Artificial Intelligence in Medical Imaging: From the 2018 NIH/RSNA/ACR/The Academy Workshop,” *Radiology*, 291, 781–791.
- MARTINEZ, J. (2021): “Putty-clay automation,” *DP16022*.
- PELTZMAN, S. (1976): “Toward a More General Theory of Regulation,” *Journal of Law and Economics*, 19, 211–240.
- RUSSELL, S., D. DEWEY, AND M. TEGMARK (2015): “Research priorities for robust and beneficial artificial intelligence,” *AI Magazine*, 36, 105–114.
- SCOTT, J. (2025): “New Turing Award winner Richard Sutton calls doomers “out of line,” talks path to human-like AI,” *BetaKit*, accessed: 2025-03-09.
- SILVER, D., T. HUBERT, J. SCHRITTWIESER, I. ANTONOGLOU, M. LAI, A. GUEZ, M. LANCOTOT, L. SIFRE, D. KUMARAN, T. GRAEPEL, ET AL. (2018): “A General Reinforcement Learning Algorithm that Masters Chess, Shogi, and Go Through Self-play,” *Science*, 362, 1140–1144.
- SILVER, D., J. SCHRITTWIESER, K. SIMONYAN, I. ANTONOGLOU, A. HUANG, A. GUEZ, T. HUBERT, L. BAKER, M. LAI, A. BOLTON, ET AL. (2017): “Mastering the Game of Go Without Human Knowledge,” *Nature*, 550, 354–359.
- STIGLER, G. J. (1971): “The Theory of Economic Regulation,” *The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*, 2, 3–21.
- THOMPSON, W. R. (1933): “On the Likelihood that One Unknown Probability Exceeds Another in View of the Evidence of Two Samples,” *Biometrika*, 25, 285–294.
- THUEMMEL, U. (2023): “Optimal taxation of robots,” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 21, 1154–1190.
- TYRANGIEL, J. (2025): “Sam Altman on ChatGPT’s First Two Years, Elon Musk and AI Under Trump,” *Bloomberg Businessweek*, accessed: 2025-02-09.
- WEITZMAN, M. L. (1974): “Prices vs. Quantities,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 41, 477–491.

——— (1978): “Optimal Rewards for Economic Regulation,” *The American Economic Review*, 68, 683–691.

WIENER, N. (1960): “Some Moral and Technical Consequences of Automation,” *Science*, 131, 1355–58.

Online Appendix

Regulating Artificial Intelligence

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

First, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_1^d[\mathcal{V}_2^*] = & \pi(\mu_1)\mathbb{E}_1^d \left[\max\{u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) - (\hat{\phi}_{d,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,e}^2), 0\}N \right] \\ & + (1 - \pi(\mu_1)) \max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2, 0\}N\end{aligned}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\mathbb{E}_1^d[\mathcal{V}_2^*]}{d\mu_1} = & \pi'(\mu_1) \left\{ \mathbb{E}_1^d \left[\max\{u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) - (\hat{\phi}_{d,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,e}^2), 0\}N \right] - \max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2, 0\}N \right\} \\ > & \pi'(\mu_1) \left\{ \max\{u - \mathbb{E}_1^d[(\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2)] - \mathbb{E}_1^d[\hat{\phi}_{d,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,e}^2], 0\}N - \max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2, 0\}N \right\} \\ \geq & \pi'(\mu_1) \left\{ \max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2, 0\}N - \max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2, 0\}N \right\} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

The inequality holds because the expected value of the maxima is higher than the maximum of the expected value. The inequality is strict because the probability that the algorithm is implemented in period two, given the information obtained in period one, is strictly positive but less than one.

A.2 Proof of Proposition 1

The developer chooses μ_1 to maximize

$$\mathcal{V} \equiv (1 - \beta)\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2\}\mu_1 + \beta\mathbb{E}_1^d(\mathcal{V}_2^*). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

From Lemma 1, we know that $\mathbb{E}_1^d(\mathcal{V}_2^*)$ is increasing in μ_1 . So, if $\sigma_{d,e}^2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$, then the developer chooses $\mu_1 = N$ since \mathcal{V} is always increasing in μ_1 .

Suppose instead that $\sigma_{d,e}^2 > u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$. In this case, if $\mathcal{B} = 0$, the developer does not release the algorithm at time two. Since $\pi'(\mu_1) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\mu_1 \rightarrow 0$, then $\mu_1 > 0$.

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}_1^d(\mathcal{V}_2^*)}{d\mu_1} = \pi'(\mu_1)\mathbb{E}_1^d \left[\max\{u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) - (\hat{\phi}_{d,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,e}^2), 0\}N \right], \quad (\text{A.2})$$

so, the first order condition is given by

$$(1 - \beta)\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2\} + \beta\pi'(\mu_1)\mathbb{E}_1^d \left[\max\{u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) - (\hat{\phi}_{d,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{d,e}^2), 0\}N \right] = 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \pi'(\mu_1)\Lambda^d N = 1 \Leftrightarrow \alpha\Lambda^d \frac{N}{k} = \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\kappa}\right)^{1-\alpha} \Leftrightarrow \mu_1 = \left[\alpha\Lambda^d \frac{N}{\kappa}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \kappa,$$

or $\mu_1 = \kappa$ if $\left[\alpha\Lambda^d \frac{N}{\kappa}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} > 1$.

A.3 Proof of Lemma 2

As before,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^s(d\mathcal{W}_2^*)}{d\mu_1} &= \pi'(\mu_1) \left\{ \mathbb{E}_1^s \left(\max \left\{ u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_{s,i}^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_{s,e}^2), 0 \right\} N \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \max \left\{ u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2, 0 \right\} N \right\} \\ &> \pi'(\mu_1) \left\{ \max \left\{ u - \mathbb{E}_1^s(\phi_{s,i}^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_1^s(\phi_{s,e}^2), 0 \right\} N \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \max \left\{ u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2, 0 \right\} N \right\} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

A.4 Proof of Proposition 2

The planner chooses μ_1 to maximize

$$\mathcal{W} \equiv (1 - \beta)\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2\}\mu_1 + \beta\mathbb{E}_1^d(\mathcal{W}_2^*). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

From Lemma 2, we know that $\mathbb{E}_1^s(\mathcal{W}_2^*)$ is increasing in μ_1 . So, if $\sigma_{d,e}^2 \leq \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$, then the planner chooses $\mu_1 = N$ since \mathcal{W} is always increasing in μ_1 .

Suppose instead that $\sigma_{d,e}^2 > \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$. In this case, if $\mathcal{B} = 0$, then the planner does not release the algorithm at time two. Since $\pi'(\mu_1) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\mu_1 \rightarrow 0$, then $\mu_1 > 0$.

$$\frac{d\mathbb{E}_1^s[\mathcal{W}_2^*]}{d\mu_1} = \pi'(\mu_1)\mathbb{E}_1^s \left[\max\{u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) - (N+1)(\hat{\phi}_{s,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,e}^2), 0\}N \right]. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

So, the first order condition is given by

$$(1 - \beta)\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2\} + \beta\pi'(\mu_1)\mathbb{E}_1^s \left[\max\{u - (\hat{\phi}_{s,i}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,i}^2) - (N+1)(\hat{\phi}_{s,e}^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{s,e}^2), 0\}N \right] = 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \pi'(\mu_1)\Lambda^s N = 1 \Leftrightarrow \alpha\Lambda^s \frac{N}{k} = \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\kappa}\right)^{1-\alpha} \Leftrightarrow \mu_1 = \left[\alpha\Lambda^s \frac{N}{\kappa}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \kappa,$$

or $\mu_1 = \kappa$ if $\left[\alpha\Lambda^s \frac{N}{\kappa}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} > 1$.

A.5 Ex-Post Pigouvian Taxes with Limited Liability

Suppose that taxes are set according to:

$$\tau_t = \min\{Ne_t^2, p_t\mu_t\}.$$

If belief are homogeneous, then $\mathbb{E}_t^d(\phi_e^2) = \mathbb{E}_t^s(\phi_e^2)$. It is still optimal for the developer to set $p_t = u - \mathbb{E}_t^s(\phi_i^2)$. Replacing this price and the expected taxes into the utility of the developer we find that $\mathcal{V} = (1 - \beta)\mathcal{V}_1 + \beta\mathbb{E}_1(\mathcal{V}_2)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_t &= \mathcal{W}_t - Ny_t - \mathbb{E}_t \left[\min\{Ne_t^2, p_t\mu_t\} \right] + N\mathbb{E}_t \left[e_t^2 \right] \\ &= \mathcal{W}_t + Ny_t + \mathbb{E}_1 \left[Ne_t^2 + \max\{-Ne_t^2, -p_t\mu_t\} \right] \\ &= \mathcal{W}_t + Ny_t + \mathbb{E}_1 \left[\max\{0, Ne_t^2 - p_t\mu_t\} \right] \\ &= \mathcal{W}_t + Ny_t + \mathbb{E}_1 \left[\max\{0, N(\phi_e^2 + \xi_{e,t}) - p_t\}\mu_t \right]. \end{aligned}$$

A.6 Proof of Proposition 7

Consider first the problem in the second period. If limited liability does not bind, then release and withdrawal incentives are aligned. Instead, suppose that limited liability binds. Then, the developer makes zero profits from releasing the algorithm, but still suffers from the externality. It follows that, if limited liability binds, the developer withdraws the algorithm. Limited liability binds when

$$\begin{cases} u - \mathbb{E}_2(\phi_i^2) = N\mathbb{E}_2(\phi_e^2) < (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2(\phi_e^2), & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1 \\ u - \sigma_i^2 = N\sigma_e^2 < (N+1)\sigma_e^2, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0. \end{cases}$$

So, when limited liability binds, the regulator also wants the algorithm to be withdrawn.

Turning to the problem of the first period, if limited liability does not bind, then incentives are aligned as before. If limited liability binds, then the developer's problem is

$$\max_{\mu_1} \left\{ (1 - \beta) \left\{ u - \sigma_i^2 - \sigma_e^2 - \frac{\tau_1^{ex-ante}}{\mu_1} \right\} \mu_1 + \beta \mathbb{E}_1[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2(\phi_e^2), 0\}]N \right\}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The first order condition is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \beta) \left\{ u - \sigma_i^2 - \sigma_e^2 - \frac{\tau_1^{ex-ante}}{\mu_1} \right\} + (1 - \beta) \pi'(\mu_1) \Lambda^s N \left\{ \sigma_i^2 + (N+1)\sigma_e^2 - u \right\} &= 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow \pi'(\mu_1) N \Lambda^s \frac{\sigma_i^2 + (N+1)\sigma_e^2 - u}{\frac{\tau_1^{ex-ante}}{\mu_1} + \sigma_i^2 + \sigma_e^2 - u} = 1 &\Leftrightarrow \pi'(\mu_1) N \Lambda^s \frac{\sigma_i^2 + (N+1)\sigma_e^2 - u}{\sigma_e^2} = 1 \\ \Leftrightarrow \mu_1 = \left[\alpha \Lambda^s \frac{\sigma_i^2 + (N+1)\sigma_e^2 - u}{\sigma_e^2} \frac{N}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

So, when limited liability binds, the developer generally beta tests the algorithm in a larger pool than the social optimal size.

A.7 Ex-ante Pigouvian Taxes with Heterogeneous Beliefs and Proof of Proposition 4

Assume that the regulator enforces the ex-ante taxes specified in equation (11). Consider the problem of period two. Substituting the optimal license price, the developer's utility is given by

$$\begin{cases} [u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^d(\phi_e^2)]\mu_2 - \tau_2^{ex-ante} = [u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^d(\phi_e^2)]\mu_2, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1 \\ [u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{d,e}^2]\mu_2 - \tau_2^{ex-ante} = [u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2]\mu_2, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0. \end{cases}$$

It follows that private and social incentives are always aligned in period two.

Turning to the problem of the first period, with the taxes given by equation (11), the problem becomes:

$$\max_{\mu_1} \left\{ (1 - \beta) \left\{ u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 \right\} \mu_1 + \beta \mathbb{E}_1^d[\mathcal{W}_2^*] \right\}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

We immediately see that if the risk is not very large, $\sigma_{s,e}^2 \leq \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$, then the developer chooses $\mu_1 = N$. If the risk is large, $\sigma_{s,e}^2 > \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$, then the developer's choice satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'(\mu_1) N \Lambda^s \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^d[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)\}]}{\mathbb{E}_1^s[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)\}]} &= 1 \\ \Leftrightarrow \mu_1 &= \left[\alpha \Lambda^s \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^d[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)\}]}{\mathbb{E}_1^s[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)\}]} \frac{N}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

So, in general, the developer prefers a larger beta test sample than what would be socially optimal.

Suppose that the tax in period one is given by equation (13). Then, again, if the uncertainty is small enough, $\sigma_{s,e}^2 \leq \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$, then the developer chooses $\mu_1 = N$. Instead, if the risk is large, $\sigma_{s,e}^2 > \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$, the developer solves the same problem as the planner:

$$\max_{\mu_1} \left\{ (1 - \beta) \left\{ u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 \right\} \mu_1 + \beta \mathbb{E}_1^s(\mathcal{W}_2^*) \right\}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

So private and social incentives are aligned.

A.8 Proof of Lemma 3

Given the tax policy, the developer's problem at time two is:

$$\mathcal{V}_2 = \begin{cases} (p_2 - \tau_2)\mu_2 - \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2)\mu_2, & \text{if } p_2 \leq u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) \text{ and } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ (p_2 - \tau_2)\mu_2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2\mu_2, & \text{if } p_2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 \text{ and } \mathcal{B} = 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, the optimal price is

$$p_2 = \begin{cases} u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2), & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ u - \sigma_{s,i}^2, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0. \end{cases}$$

If $\mathcal{B} = 1$, the developer releases the algorithm to the entire population if $u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \tau_2 > \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2)$ and sets $\mu_2 = 0$ otherwise. If $\mathcal{B} = 0$, the developer releases the algorithm to the entire population if $u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \tau_2 > \sigma_{\theta,e}^2$ and sets $\mu_2 = 0$ otherwise.

At time one, it is optimal to set $p_1 = u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$. The developer's problem at time one (replacing p_1) is given by

$$\max_{\mu_1} (1 - \beta) \{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2 - \tau_1\} \mu_1 + \beta \mathbb{E}_1^\theta[\mathcal{V}_{2,\theta}^*], \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where $\mathbb{E}_1^\theta(\mathcal{V}_{2,\theta}^*)$ is increasing in μ_1 as in Lemma 1.

So, if $\sigma_{\theta,e}^2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \tau_1$, then the developer releases the algorithm to the entire population $\mu_1 = N$.

If $\sigma_{\theta,e}^2 > u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \tau_1$, it is optimal to beta test the algorithm. In this case, the optimal μ_1 solves

$$\max_{\mu_1} -\mu_1 + \pi(\mu_1) \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^\theta[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2) - \tau_2, 0\}] - \max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2 - \tau_2, 0\}}{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + \sigma_{\theta,e}^2 + \tau_1 - u} N. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Let

$$\Lambda^\theta(\tau_1, \tau_2) \equiv \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^\theta[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2) - \tau_2, 0\}] - \max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2 - \tau_2, 0\}}{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + \sigma_{\theta,e}^2 + \tau_1 - u}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

The first order condition is,

$$\pi'(\mu_1)\Lambda^\theta(\tau_1, \tau_2)N = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mu_1 = \left[\alpha \Lambda^\theta(\tau_1, \tau_2) \frac{N}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \kappa.$$

A.9 Proof of Proposition 5

We solve for the optimal tax policy without commitment. At time two, the regulator chooses τ_2 to maximize

$$\begin{cases} \{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)\}\mathbb{E}_2^s(\mu_2^\theta), & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ \{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,i}^2\}\mathbb{E}_2^s(\mu_2^\theta), & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_2^s(\mu_2^\theta)$ denotes the regulator's expectations of the developer's choice of μ_2 given the regulator's beliefs over the developer's type at time two. These beliefs are influenced by the developer's decisions observed at time one.

If given the regulator's beliefs the algorithm should be released, then it is optimal to set $\tau_2 = 0$, since under this tax $\mu_2^\theta = N$ for all θ :

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2) < u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2) \leq u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2), & \forall \theta \in \Theta \\ 0 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 < u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{s,e}^2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2, & \forall \theta \in \Theta. \end{cases}$$

If the regulator's beliefs are such that the algorithm should be withdrawn, then by setting $\tau_2 = p_2$ the regulator ensures that all developer types withdraw the algorithm. Welfare at time two coincides with the social optimum.

At time one, the regulator chooses τ_1 to maximize

$$(1 - \beta)\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2\} \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \mu_1^\theta dF(\theta) + \beta \mathbb{E}_1^\theta(\mathcal{W}_2^*). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

First, suppose that uncertainty about the externality is small $\sigma_{s,e} \leq \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$. In this case, it is efficient to release the algorithm to the entire population. So, the regulator sets $\tau_1 = 0$ and $\mu_1^\theta = N$ for all θ , since

$$0 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 < u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{s,e}^2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

Suppose that uncertainty is large $\sigma_{s,e} > \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$. Then, the regulator chooses τ_1 to maximize

$$(1 - \beta) \{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N + 1)\sigma_{s,e}^2\} \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \mu_1^\theta dF(\theta) + \beta \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \pi(\mu_1^\theta) dF(\theta) \\ \times \mathbb{E}_1^s[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N + 1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2), 0\}]N. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Equivalently, τ_1 solves

$$\max_{\tau_1} - \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \mu_1^\theta dF(\theta) + \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \pi(\mu_1^\theta) dF(\theta) \Lambda^s N. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

The first order condition with respect to τ_1 is given by

$$\int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \frac{d\mu_1^\theta / d\tau_1}{\int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} d\mu_1^\theta / d\tau_1 dF(\theta)} \pi'(\mu_1^\theta) \Lambda^s N dF(\theta) = 1, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

where μ_1^θ is given by

$$\mu_1^\theta = \max \left\{ \left[\alpha \Lambda^\theta \frac{N}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}, 1 \right\} \kappa \quad (\text{A.15})$$

and

$$\Lambda^\theta \equiv \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^\theta \left[\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N + 1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)\} \mathbb{1}_{\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N + 1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2) \geq 0\}} \right]}{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + \sigma_{\theta,e}^2 + \tau_1 - u}.$$

Since Λ^θ is increasing in θ , the developer's optimal beta test sample size is also increasing in θ .

A.10 Proof of Lemma 4

For any regulation policy, the problem of the developer at time two is given by:

$$\mathcal{V}_2 = \begin{cases} p_2 \mu_2 - \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2) \mu_2, & \text{if } p_2 \leq u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) \text{ and } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ p_2 \mu_2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2 \mu_2, & \text{if } p_2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 \text{ and } \mathcal{B} = 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, the optimal price is

$$p_2 = \begin{cases} u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2), & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ u - \sigma_i^2, & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0. \end{cases}$$

So, if $\mathcal{B} = 1$, the developer releases the algorithm to the maximum $\mu_2 = \bar{\mu}_2$ if $u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) > \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2)$ and sets $\mu_2 = 0$ otherwise. Analogously, if $\mathcal{B} = 0$, the developer releases the algorithm to the maximum $\mu_2 = \bar{\mu}_2$ if $u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \tau_2 > \sigma_{\theta,e}^2$ and sets $\mu_2 = 0$ otherwise.

At time one, it is optimal to set $p_1 = u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$. The developer's problem at time one (replacing p_1) is given by

$$\max_{\mu_1} (1 - \beta) \{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2\} \mu_1 + \beta \mathbb{E}_1^\theta[\mathcal{V}_{2,\theta}^*]. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Where $\mathbb{E}_1^\theta(\mathcal{V}_{2,\theta}^*)$ is increasing in μ_1 as in Lemma 1.

If $\sigma_{\theta,e}^2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$, then the developer releases the algorithm to the maximum number of people $\mu_1 = \bar{\mu}_1$.

If $\sigma_{\theta,e}^2 > u - \sigma_{s,i}^2$, it is optimal to beta test the algorithm. In this case, the optimal μ_1 solves

$$\max_{\mu_1} -\mu_1 + \pi(\mu_1) \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^\theta[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2), 0\} \bar{\mu}_2] - \mathbb{E}_1^\theta[\max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2, 0\} \bar{\mu}_2]}{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + \sigma_{\theta,e}^2 - u}. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Let

$$\Lambda^\theta \equiv \frac{\beta}{1 - \beta} \frac{\mathbb{E}_1^\theta[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2), 0\} \bar{\mu}_2] - \mathbb{E}_1^\theta[\max\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2, 0\} \bar{\mu}_2]}{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + \sigma_{\theta,e}^2 - u}. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Then, the first order condition is given by

$$\pi'(\mu_1) \Lambda^\theta N = 1 \Leftrightarrow \mu_1 = \left[\alpha \Lambda^\theta \frac{1}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \kappa.$$

In this case, the developer seeks to this number of people if $\left[\alpha \Lambda^\theta \frac{1}{\kappa} \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \kappa \leq \bar{\mu}_1$ and $\mu_1 = \bar{\mu}_1$ otherwise.

A.11 Proof of Proposition 6

We solve for the optimal regulation policy without commitment. At time two, the regulator chooses $\bar{\mu}_2$ to maximize

$$\begin{cases} \{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2)\}\mathbb{E}_2^s[\mu_2^\theta], & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 1, \\ \{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2\}\mathbb{E}_2^s[\mu_2^\theta], & \text{if } \mathcal{B} = 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_2^s[\mu_2^\theta]$ denotes the regulator's expectations over the developer's behavior given the regulator's beliefs over the developer's type at time two (which are influenced by the observed decisions at time-one).

If given the regulator's beliefs the algorithm should be released, it is optimal to set $\bar{\mu}_2 = N$, since under this tax $\mu_2^\theta = N$ for all θ :

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N+1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2) < u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - \mathbb{E}_2^\theta(\phi_e^2), & \forall \theta \in \Theta \\ 0 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 < u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{s,e}^2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2, & \forall \theta \in \Theta. \end{cases}$$

Instead, if the regulator's beliefs are such that the algorithm should be withdrawn, then by setting $\bar{\mu}_2 = 0$ the regulator ensures that no developer type releases the algorithm. Note that welfare at time two coincides with the efficient level.

Turning to the problem at time one, the regulator chooses τ_1 to maximize

$$(1 - \beta)\{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2\} \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \mu_1^\theta dF(\theta) + \beta \mathbb{E}_1^\theta[\mathcal{W}_2^*]. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

First, suppose that uncertainty about the externality is small $\sigma_{s,e} \leq \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$. In this case, it is efficient to release the algorithm to the entire population. So, the regulator sets $\bar{\mu}_1 = N$, which implies that $\mu_1^\theta = N$ for all θ , since

$$0 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 < u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{s,e}^2 \leq u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - \sigma_{\theta,e}^2, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

Suppose that uncertainty is large $\sigma_{s,e} > \frac{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2}{N+1}$. Then, the regulator chooses τ_1 to

maximize

$$(1 - \beta) \{u - \sigma_{s,i}^2 - (N + 1)\sigma_{s,e}^2\} \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \mu_1^\theta dF(\theta) + \beta \int_{\underline{\theta}}^{\bar{\theta}} \pi(\mu_1^\theta) dF(\theta) \\ \times \mathbb{E}_1^s[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_i^2) - (N + 1)\mathbb{E}_2^s(\phi_e^2), 0\}]N. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Let μ_1^* denote the efficient size of the beta-test in this case. We have already established that unconstrained

$$\mu_1^\theta > \mu_1^*.$$

It follows that setting $\bar{\mu}_1 = \mu_1^*$ implies that $\mu_1^\theta = \mu_1^*$ for all θ . This policy implements the efficient outcome and is therefore optimal.

A.12 Optimal Non-Linear Taxes on Developer with Private Information

In the main text, we restrict attention to linear Pigouvian taxes. In this appendix, we generalize the analysis to considering non-linear taxes on license sales. Let the total tax payment as a function of μ_t be $t_t(\mu_t)$. The case of linear taxes obtains when $t_t(\mu_t) = \tau_t \mu_t$.

Definition 1. A tax policy is a set of (state-contingent) tax functions $\mathbf{t} \equiv \{t_t(\mu_t)\}$ for $t = 1, 2$ that determine the taxes imposed on the developer as a function of their release strategy μ_t .

We allow the tax functions to be arbitrarily non-linear, so solving the developer's general problem becomes more complex. However, it is possible to show that there is a non-linear tax policy that implements efficient allocation.

It is easy to construct tax functions that implement the efficient allocation. For example, consider the following tax policy. At time 2, set the tax function

$$t_2(\mu_2) = \begin{cases} p_2 \mu_2, & \text{if } \mu_2 \neq \mu_2^*, \\ 0, & \text{if } \mu_2 = \mu_2^*, \end{cases}$$

where μ_2^* is the efficient level of release. At time 1, if the AI is sufficiently risky so that beta testing is socially optimal, the regulator announces the taxes

$$t_1(\mu_1) = \begin{cases} p_1\mu_1 + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}\pi(\mu_1)\mathbb{E}_1^{\bar{\theta}}[\max\{u - \mathbb{E}_2^s[\phi_i^2], 0\}N], & \text{if } \mu_1 \neq \mu_1^*, \\ 0, & \text{if } \mu_1 = \mu_1^*, \end{cases}$$

where μ_1^* is the efficient level of beta testing. If the AI is not risky enough to warrant beta testing, the regulator sets $t_1(\mu_1) = 0$.

This tax policy implements the efficient allocation. Effectively, this non-linear tax policy implements the same allocation as the MBR policy.

B Limited Liability

B.1 The Impact of Limited liability on Ex-post Pigouvian Taxes

To study the consequences of limited liability for ex-post Pigouvian taxes, we consider the simple case in which the taxes paid by the developer in each period cannot exceed their revenue ($p_t\mu_t$):

$$\tau_t = \min\{Ne_t^2, p_t\mu_t\}.$$

This limited liability constraint is a cash-flow constraint that limits the developer's ability to pay taxes.

Under limited liability, the developer's optimal algorithm release policy differs from the social optimum even if beliefs are homogeneous. This divergence arises because the developer's potential losses are capped, encouraging it to release moderately risky algorithms relying on limited liability to protect itself if significant adverse external effects occur.


In this case, we can show that

$$\mathcal{V}_t = \mathcal{W}_t - Ny_t + \mathbb{E}_t[\max\{N(\phi_e^2 + \xi_{e,t}) - p_t, 0\}]\mu_t, \quad (\text{B.21})$$

where $\xi_{e,1} = \xi_e$ and $\xi_{e,2} = 0$.

The expected value of the taxes on the developer is lower than the expected social welfare cost of the externality. It follows that the developer is more likely to release the algorithm in period two than the planner, being protected by limited liability should very negative external effects materialize. The same logic implies that the developer may forgo beta testing in period one and release the algorithm immediately, knowing it is protected by limited liability if dire external effects materialize. As a result, the developer may act with less caution than would be socially optimal. Figure 3 illustrates the release decisions under ex-post Pigouvian taxes with limited liability.

Figure 3: Release decisions in the first and second periods under Ex-post Pigouvian Taxes with Limited Liability



B.2 The Impact of Limited liability on Ex-ante Pigouvian Taxes

We now show that ex-ante Pigouvian taxes fail to implement the social optimum when limited liability is present, even under homogeneous beliefs. While they ensure that the release policy in period 2 remains optimal, they lead to beta test sample sizes in period one that exceed the optimal level.

Imposing limited liability means that

$$\tau_t^{ex-ante} = \min \left\{ N\mathbb{E}_t(\phi_e^2)\mu_t, p_t\mu_t \right\}. \quad (\text{B.22})$$

Consider the problem at time two, after a successful beta test ($\mathcal{B} = 1$). If limited liability is not binding, then private and social incentives coincide. What happens when limited liability does bind? Given that $p_2 = u - \mathbb{E}_2(\phi_i^2)$, limited liability binds whenever $u - \mathbb{E}_2(\phi_i^2) < N\mathbb{E}_2(\phi_e^2)$. In this scenario, the developer makes no profit from selling the algorithm but still experiences the consequences of the negative externality the algorithm creates. Consequently, the developer has a strict preference not to release the algorithm when limited liability is binding. Limited liability binds only in cases where the regulator would also strictly prefer not to release the algorithm, since $N\mathbb{E}_t(\phi_e^2) < (N+1)\mathbb{E}_t(\phi_e^2)$. In other words, the developer and the regulator agree not to release the algorithm whenever limited liability binds.

If the beta test is unsuccessful ($\mathcal{B} = 0$), limited liability binds in period two whenever $u - \sigma_i^2 < N\sigma_e^2$. In this case, the developer strictly prefers not to release the algorithm. The regulator strictly prefers not to release the algorithm whenever $N\mathbb{E}_t(\phi_e^2) < (N+1)\sigma_e^2$. Therefore, whenever limited liability is binding, both the developer and the regulator agree that the algorithm should not be released.

With ex-ante Pigouvian taxes $\mathbb{E}_1(\mathcal{V}_2^*) = \mathbb{E}_1(\mathcal{W}_2^*) - Ny_2$, even in the presence of limited liability, so private and social incentives are aligned.

Turning to the problem at time one, private and social incentives coincide if limited liability does not bind. when limited liability binds, both the developer and the planner choose strictly positive values for μ_1 , but they select different values. To see

this result, consider the developer's information benefit-cost ratio

$$\Lambda^d = \Lambda^s \times \frac{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 - u}{\frac{\tau_t^{ex-ante}}{\mu_t} + \sigma_{s,i}^2 + \sigma_{s,e}^2 - u} = \Lambda^s \times \frac{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 - u}{\sigma_{s,e}^2}, \quad (\text{B.23})$$

where Λ^s is given by (7). Since limited liability binds, we have $\sigma_{s,i}^2 + N\sigma_{s,e}^2 - u > 0$, which implies

$$\frac{\sigma_{s,i}^2 + (N+1)\sigma_{s,e}^2 - u}{\sigma_{s,e}^2} > \frac{\sigma_{s,e}^2}{\sigma_{s,e}^2} = 1.$$

Thus, under limited liability, the developer's information benefit-cost ratio exceeds that of the regulator. Consequently, the developer adopts a more aggressive approach, choosing to beta test the algorithm on a larger sample than the regulator would.

When limited liability binds, the developer's after-tax sales revenue is zero. However, since the tax does not fully internalize the externality, the developer still has an incentive to conduct beta testing on a larger sample to increase the likelihood of obtaining valuable information for period two (see Figure 4).

We summarize these results in the following proposition.

Proposition 7 (Ex-Ante Pigouvian Taxes with Homogeneous Beliefs and Limited Liability). *Suppose developers and society share the same beliefs. If the regulator implements ex-ante Pigouvian taxes subject to the limited liability constraints in equation (B.22), then:*

- *In the first period, the developer's choices align with the socially optimal outcomes only if limited liability does not bind. When it binds, the developer has an incentive to beta test the algorithm on a sample that is larger than socially optimal.*
- *In the second period, the developer's decisions regarding release and withdrawal are socially optimal.*

Figure 4 illustrates the release decisions under ex-ante Pigouvian taxes with limited liability for the first period. We omit the case of the second period, since they coincide.

Figure 4: Time 1 testing decisions with Ex-Ante Taxes and Limited Liability

