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Ethical Concerns and Consumer Risks for BCI Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Socioeconomic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implantation</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Personhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normalization</td>
<td>Biodata Privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biodata Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regulaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Adapted summary from Coin et. al.

Figure 2: Screenshot from The Verge of 2020 Neuralink presentation

An "Independent Working Group"

Wexler & Reiner (2019) propose "an independent working group"

Group Function
"Survey the main domains of [direct-to-consumer (DTC)] neurotechnology"
"Appraise "potential harms and probably efficacy of DTC neurotechnology"
"Provide generalizable [non-specific to one DTC] appraisals"

Required Expertise
Scientists and Health Professionals
Consumer Groups and other Stakeholders
Ethicists and Legal Regulators

Expanding via The "Think Tank"

Mission
Provide specific, as well as generalizable, appraisals for DTC neurotechnology

Advocacy
Non-profit listed as 501(c)4, not 501(c)3, in order to:
Publicly promote or endorse social welfare
Engage in political lobbying
Eliminate eligibility for corporate income tax deduction

Funding
Corporate neurotech donors seeking regulations and appraisals.

References: