Milestone M4

Report on success criteria of different AI stakeholders

Ann-Katrien Oimann

FORSEE
Forging Successful AI Applications for European Economy and Society

FORSEE

Forging Successful AI Applications for European Economy and Society

Milestone M4: Report on success criteria of different AI stakeholders

Project Information
Project Number: 101177579
Project Title: Forging Successful AI Applications for European Economy and Society - FORSEE
Funding Scheme: HORIZON-CL2-2024-TRANSFORMATIONS-01-06
Project Start Date: 1 February 2025

Deliverable Information	
Title	Milestone M4: Report on success criteria of different AI stakeholders
Work Package	WP 2 - Mapping of social expectations: institutional/formal approaches to success
Lead Beneficiary	Tilburg University
Due Date	30/04/2026
Revision Number:	V2.0
Authors	Ann-Katrien Oimann

Internal reviewers	Elizabeth Farries, Alexandros Minotakis

Funded by
the European Union

Executive Summary

This Milestone 4 report presents an integrated synthesis of research carried out across Work Package 2 (institutional perspectives), Work Package 3 (lifeworld stakeholder perspectives), and Work Package 4 (public, media, and legal perspectives). It summarises how different groups articulate what "successful AI" means in practice and maps the landscape of expectations surrounding AI deployment in Europe based on regulatory texts, standards, professional guidelines, interviews, workshops, surveys, social media debates, news coverage, and judicial decisions.

The report's central synthesis is presented through a structured mapping of structural convergences, partial convergences, and fundamental divergences in stakeholder definitions of AI success. Convergences refer to success criteria that are widely shared across actors, partial convergences capture shared concerns accompanied by differing interpretations, and fundamental divergences highlight deeper, position-dependent differences that cannot be reduced to differences in emphasis alone. Together, these patterns provide an integrated view of how AI success is stabilised in some areas while remaining contested in others.

Across stakeholders, FORSEE identifies strong alignment on the need for reliable AI outputs, need to mitigate negative employment effects while promoting AI development, concerns about dependence on non-EU infrastructure, alongside an emerging but weakly articulated awareness of AI's environmental footprint. The analysis also reveals partial convergences, where stakeholders agree on the relevance of EU-level regulation and the shift from ethics-based to risk-based governance frameworks, but diverge in interpretation and implementation. At the same time, significant fundamental divergences persist. These include differing priorities attached to digital sovereignty, contrasting assessments of the balance between innovation and regulation, divergent understandings of gender bias as a technical versus systemic issue, and structurally different experiences of governance clarity and enforcement. Taken together, these findings confirm that AI success in Europe is defined through multidimensional and contested criteria rather than a single shared benchmark.

This milestone confirms that the project has successfully mapped the layered and contested landscape of AI success criteria across stakeholder groups. The synthesis provides a robust foundation for subsequent work on governance approaches that reflect both European socio-political priorities and the realities of stakeholder contestation.


Funded by
the European Union

Acronyms

ACM	Association for Computing Machinery
AI	Artificial Intelligence
AI Act	European Union Artificial Intelligence Act
CCBE	Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe
CEPEJ	European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice
EDPS	European Data Protection Supervisor
ELI	European Law Institute
EU	European Union
EU HLEG	High-level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence
EUROJUST	European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation
FBE	Fédération des Barreaux d'Europe
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IEC	International Electrotechnical Commission
IEEE	Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
ISO	International Organization for Standardisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UIA	International Association of Lawyers
WP	Work Package

Funded by
the European Union

Table of Contents

Funded by
the European Union

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence is reshaping economic sectors, public institutions, and everyday life. Despite this progress, there is still no common understanding of what counts as successful AI for different actors in society. Existing definitions tend to emphasise technical performance or economic value, but AI systems are always embedded within, and shaped by, broader social, political, and institutional contexts. As a result, success is not a purely technical matter, but it is a multi-dimensional, negotiated, and often contested concept.

The FORSEE project addresses this challenge by analysing expectations of AI success from multiple vantage points. Its approach draws on sociological insights that emphasise how technologies co-evolve with social norms, institutional structures, and political agendas and how differing stakeholder positions shape what is understood as desirable, acceptable, or successful AI. Rather than assuming a single definition of success, the project examines how success criteria emerge, align, or conflict across contexts.

The M4 report consolidates the findings from:

- WP2, which analyses institutional and regulatory sources, including documents from supranational bodies, standards organisations and professional associations.
- WP3, which examines lifeworld perspectives through empirical work with SMEs and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), including interviews, workshops, surveys, and award-criteria analysis.
- WP4, which investigates societal discourses through news media analysis, social media debates, and emerging patterns in AI-related court cases.

Rather than adding new empirical material, this M4 integrates the findings from earlier deliverables (D2.1-4, D3.1-4, D4.1-3) into a coherent cross-WP synthesis of how different stakeholder categories define, support, question, or challenge AI success criteria in Europe. This synthesis systematically maps where stakeholder definitions of AI success converge, where they align only conditionally, and where deeper fundamental divergences persist. In doing so, the report provides an integrated analytical foundation for understanding how AI success is imagined and negotiated across Europe and anchors the project's subsequent work on governance design and policy alignment.

Funded by
the European Union

2. Methodological Approach and Dataset Development

2.1 Methodological Approach

Given the heterogeneity of stakeholders involved in AI development, governance, and public discourse, the project adopted a blended methodological approach. The combination of qualitative, computational, and documentary analysis across WP2, WP3, and WP4 was designed to enable systematic comparison of how different actors define and evaluate AI success, while remaining sensitive to differences in institutional roles, resource availability, and positionality.

WP2 – Institutional and standards-based perspectives

- *Methods*: Qualitative thematic analysis and unsupervised topic modelling (BERTopic) to analyse institutional and standards-based documents. Manual thematic coding was conducted using NVivo, complemented by topic modelling to identify recurring patterns and contextual relationships within large, technical, and highly formalised document corpora.
- *Sources*: AI standards (international ISO/IEC, German standards body DIN), AI policy documents issued by the EU (notably the AI Act) and other supranational organisations (OECD, G20, UNESCO, UN, Council of Europe), ethics materials from academic and ICT professional bodies (policy documents, codes of conduct and standards by ACM/IEEE), European non-ICT professional associations (representing legal, healthcare, engineering professionals)
- *Rationale*: Institutional texts are high-volume, technical, and highly formalised. Their analysis therefore required a combination of computational topic modelling and expert qualitative interpretation. Topic modelling was applied across full corpora to surface dominant themes, while manual thematic analysis focused on normatively significant documents and supported interpretation of algorithmic outputs. Across Tasks 2.1–2.4, identified themes were systematically organised into four shared meta-themes (AI Technical Issues, AI Uses, AI Risks and Harms, and AI Governance) and examined across micro (organisational), meso (sectoral or national), and macro (societal) levels where applicable. This common analytical

Funded by
the European Union

frame enabled comparison of how different institutional actors articulate baseline criteria for AI success and informed the cross-WP synthesis presented in MS4.

WP3 – SMEs and CSOs

- *Methods*: Semi-structured interviews (39 SMEs, 40-60min each), workshops (Budapest, Berlin, Dublin) including one hybrid workshop in Brussels and one additional online SME session, surveys (91 CSOs), analysis of SME award criteria, gender-perspectives analysis. Qualitative data were analysed using deductive content analysis supported by NVivo, enabling systematic comparison of success criteria, concerns, and evaluative logics across stakeholder groups.
- *Sources*: lifeworld perspectives drawn from three main stakeholder categories: SMEs with direct experience in developing or deploying AI systems; CSOs including workers and activists engaged with AI-related social, gender, and rights-based issues; and award and prize frameworks recognising AI-enabled innovation among SMEs. Empirical material included SME interviews and workshops, CSO surveys and workshops, and documentary sources from award-giving bodies.
- *Rationale*: This mixed-methods qualitative approach enabled insight into how success criteria are shaped by organisational resources, stakeholder mandates, and proximity to AI design or deployment. WP3 is grounded in the premise that definitions of AI success are context-sensitive and shaped by social position, organisational resources, and lived experience. Its rationale is to capture how success is understood and evaluated by actors directly involved in AI development, deployment, and social impact, particularly SMEs and Civil Society Organisations. By triangulating practitioner narratives, institutionalised recognition frameworks (such as awards), and gender-sensitive civil-society perspectives, WP3 enables a comparative analysis of where success criteria converge or diverge across social and economic lifeworlds. This approach provides empirically grounded insight into how success criteria extend beyond technical performance to include feasibility, fairness, inclusion, and societal impact.

WP4 – Media, Social Media & Legal System

- *Methods*: Computational text analysis, network analysis, qualitative discourse analysis, and socio-legal analysis. Large-scale digital data were analysed using lexicometric discourse analysis (IRaMuTeQ) and network analysis (Gephi), supplemented by qualitative

interpretation. Legal materials were examined through descriptive socio-legal analysis to identify recurring and emerging domains of contestation in AI deployment.

- *Sources:* Three complementary types of sources capturing societal-level expectations and contestation around AI were used: (1) 1.2 million social media posts, videos, and comments (Facebook, TikTok, Youtube) collected via platform-specific research interfaces and APIs, (2) Analysis of news-media coverage, including 31,294 newspaper articles published between 2022 and 2025 from national media in France, Germany, Ireland, and Spain (retrieved via Factiva and Europresse databases), (3) review of legal cases and regulatory disputes, consisting of 20 prominent AI-related court cases and Data Protection Authority inquiries across five countries (France, Germany, Italy, Ireland, Spain) and the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU).
- *Rationale*: Media/public discourse expresses societal expectations and AI imaginaries, while court cases provide insight into how success and failure are contested in legally binding contexts. Social media discourse, news-media coverage, and litigation offer insight into how success and failure are framed, challenged, and adjudicated in practice. Given the high volume of social media data, computational methods were necessary to identify key themes, patterns, and actors. By analysing public debate, journalistic narratives, and legal cases, WP4 captures societal expectations, moments of unease, and points of contestation that reveal tensions not always visible in policy or organisational settings. This perspective is essential for understanding how AI success criteria are negotiated in real-world contexts where public legitimacy, rights claims, and enforcement come into play.

2.2 Dataset overview

The dataset was constructed to enable comparison across institutional, economic, civic, public, and legal perspectives on AI. It combines normative texts, empirical stakeholder data, public discourse, and judicial reasoning, allowing triangulation of success criteria and identification of convergences and divergences across levels of governance and practice.

Documents and cases were included where they (a) explicitly addressed AI success, expectations, or governance, (b) were produced by actors with sectoral authority or recognised involvement in AI development or oversight, and (c) were relevant to European AI ecosystems. On this basis, purely technical documentation and sources unrelated to governance or societal impact were excluded in order to ensure analytical comparability.

The overall dataset comprises:

Funded by
the European Union

- 36 international and national AI standards documents (ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC 42, DIN)
- 13 supranational AI policies and guidelines (EU HLEG, AI Act, OECD, G20, UNESCO, UN, Council of Europe)
- 22 professional body documents (CCBE, CEPEJ, EUROJUST, ELI, EDPS, FBE, UIA, EFPIA, MHE, EMA, CPME, CBDIO, ANE, AIM-NET, EFCE)
- 39 SME interviews
- 91 CSO survey responses
- 3 CSO workshops
- 3 SME workshops
- 91 award innovation award documents across EU, UK, US and Asia (issued between 2023-2025)
- 1.2 million social media posts
- 31 294 newspaper articles (FR/DE/ES/IE)
- 20 legal cases (Italy, Spain, Germany, France, Ireland, CJEU)

3. Convergence and Divergence in stakeholder definitions of AI success

This section synthesises findings across WP2, WP3, and WP4 by identifying patterns in how different stakeholder groups define and evaluate successful AI. Rather than listing stakeholder views in isolation[1], the section provides an integrated, cross-stakeholder mapping of success criteria through patterns of structural convergence, partial convergence, and fundamental divergence. To facilitate comparison, issues are organised into three analytical categories:

- **Structural convergences**, referring to success criteria that are widely shared across stakeholder groups, even when articulated from different positions or rationales.
- **Partial convergences**, where stakeholders align on the importance of an issue but diverge in interpretation, scope, or expectations of implementation.
- **Fundamental divergences**, capturing deeper differences rooted in stakeholders' social position, institutional mandates, and exposure to risks and dependencies, which cannot be

[1] For readers interested in exploring the underlying work package reports and datasets in more detail, project outputs are available via the Zenodo FORSEE community: https://zenodo.org/communities/forsee/records?q=&l=list&p=1&s=10&sort=newest

Funded by
the European Union

reduced to differences in emphasis alone.

This categorisation reflects an interpretive synthesis across work packages and highlights both common ground and persistent tensions relevant for the governance of AI in Europe.

3.1 Structural convergence

The issues discussed below are treated as structural convergences because they recur consistently across institutional documents, SMEs and CSOs perspectives, media and social media discourse, and, where relevant, legal reasoning.

3.1.1 Reliability of AI outputs

Concerns about reliability appear consistently across WP2, WP3, and WP4, regardless of stakeholder position or methodological approach. Across all stakeholder groups, AI output reliability is identified as a foundational condition for success. Unreliable outputs undermine trust, adoption, and legitimacy, cutting across technical performance, societal acceptance, and political accountability. Institutional actors emphasise robustness and safety, SMEs focus on reputational and operational risks, CSOs and media highlight democratic and societal harms, and public discourse and news-media coverage frequently references hallucinations and deepfakes.

3.1.2 Protection of employment and working conditions

Stakeholders converge on the need to mitigate negative employment effects while promoting AI development. SMEs emphasise augmentation rather than replacement of human labour and explicitly resist fully autonomous systems, CSOs warn against intensified surveillance and deteriorating working conditions, public discourse frequently raises concerns about job losses, and courts show sensitivity to the risk that AI deployment may reinforce existing workplace power imbalances. This is important because labour impacts play a key role in shaping societal acceptance and the political sustainability of AI deployment.

3.1.3 Dependence on large non-EU technology providers

Funded by
the European Union

Although expressed less explicitly in institutional texts, SMEs, CSOs, and national press consistently express concern about reliance on non-European AI infrastructures, platforms, and foundation models. These concerns relate to competitiveness, control, and alignment with European values. Dependence on external providers constrains both economic agency and the effectiveness of regulation.

3.1.4 Sustainability and environmental impacts

Environmental sustainability emerges across stakeholder groups as a relevant issue in relation to AI, yet it is consistently treated as a secondary concern rather than a core success criterion. Institutional actors acknowledge the environmental impacts inconsistently across documents, with references tending to weaken when moving from high-level principles to binding or actionable regulatory requirements. Media and social media discourse show limited engagement, with notable national exceptions such as Irish press coverage linked to the concentration of data centres. SMEs developing AI demonstrate moderate to low awareness of sustainability concerns and often frame environmental impacts as beyond their control, given reliance on large-scale infrastructure. CSOs recognise environmental risks associated with AI, but frequently lack the organisational capacity and resources to respond to these challenges in practice.

Stakeholders therefore converge primarily on *recognition* of sustainability as an issue, not on its prioritisation, operationalisation, or whose responsibility it is. While environmental sustainability represents a growing long-term constraint on AI deployment, particularly in the context of Europe's green and digital transition, it currently plays a limited role in how AI success is defined and evaluated across stakeholders.

Table 3.1.: Cross-stakeholder convergences on AI success criteria

Converged issue	Stakeholders involved	Nature of convergence	Why it matters
Output reliability	Institutions, SMEs, CSOs, press/social media discourse	Shared concern over hallucinations, deepfakes, and unpredictability	Reliability underpins trust, adoption, legitimacy, and accountable use of AI

Funded by
the European Union

Protection of employment and working conditions	SMEs, CSOs, press/social media discourse, courts	Preference for AI systems that complement rather than replace human labour	Shapes societal acceptance and political sustainability of AI deployment
Dependence on large non-EU technology providers	SMEs, CSOs, press/social media discourse, courts	Shared concern over infrastructure reliance	Affects competitiveness, control, enforcement capacity, and alignment with EU values
Sustainability and environmental impacts	Institutions, SMEs, CSOs, press (selectively)	Broad recognition of environmental impacts, but low prioritisation and limited operationalisation	Emerging long-term viability constraint

3.2 Partial convergence

The issues below are treated as partial convergences because stakeholders align on their relevance but diverge in interpretation, scope, or expectations of implementation.

3.2.1 EU-Level Regulation

Across stakeholder groups, there is broad support in principle for EU-level AI regulation. Institutional actors, SMEs, CSOs, courts, and public discourse recognise regulation as necessary for addressing risks, protecting fundamental rights, and shaping the conditions for AI to be more trustworthy. At the same time, stakeholders diverge markedly in how regulation is experienced and evaluated in practice. Convergence thus exists at the level of *necessity*, not at the level of operational success criteria.

Institutional documents emphasise rights protection and stakeholder engagement but rely largely

Funded by
the European Union

on broad references to data protection, non-discrimination, and intellectual property, with limited procedural specificity. Legal analysis reveals uncertainty through a *stage-based judicial logic*, prioritising innovation in early development phases and rights protection at deployment. SMEs welcome EU regulation as a means to counteract AI-related risks, to limit Big Tech dominance and to foster a European AI ecosystem, seeking assistance with compliance costs, regulatory complexity, and the over-generalised classification of AI systems as high-risk. CSOs support strong regulatory frameworks but question whether current arrangements, including the AI Act, can deliver effective safeguards for accountability, democracy, and protection against surveillance. They also report limited inclusion in governance processes, resource constraints in a time of global aid reductions, and inability to communicate with publics due to AI mediated platform monopolies. Last, for the most part, daily newspapers across the analysed countries constructed a narrative warning that "over-regulation" could stifle innovation, demonstrating the agenda-setting power of specific elite actors, namely political and tech leaders. By overwhelmingly amplifying these pro-business sources, mainstream and established news media prioritised framing AI's potential positive impact on competitiveness and macroeconomic indicators.

3.2.2 Shift from ethics-based to risk-based governance

Across the materials analysed in WP2–WP4, a shift was observed in discourse around AI governance away from the ethics-based principles toward compliance-oriented, risk-based regulatory frameworks. This shift is most visible in institutional and regulatory documents and reflects the influence of the EU AI Act and its risk-based approach. At the same time, ethics-oriented framings remain prominent in ICT professional guidance (notably documents produced by ACM and IEEE). Moreover, while many stakeholders operate within a risk-based regulatory framework, they do not consider it as sufficient for addressing broader societal and democratic concerns associated with AI.

The move toward risk-based governance establishes a shared regulatory language and set of practices for AI oversight, but it also reshapes how responsibility, accountability and compliance are operationalised in practice.

Funded by
the European Union

Converged issue	Stakeholders involved	Nature of alignment	Why it matters
EU-level regulation	Institutions, SMEs, CSOs, news media, courts	Agreement on necessity of EU AI regulation, divergence on clarity, adequacy and implementation	Reliability underpins trust, adoption, legitimacy, and accountable use of AI
Shift from ethics-based to risk-based governance	Institutions, SMEs, CSOs, professional bodies	Alignment on direction toward risk-based, divergence on normative sufficiency of risk models and continued role of ethics	Shapes societal acceptance and political sustainability of AI deployment

3.3. Fundamental divergences

Fundamental divergences reflect differences rooted in stakeholders' institutional roles, resources, and exposure to risk.

3.3.1 Digital sovereignty

Digital sovereignty, commonly understood as the pursuit of greater autonomy and self-determination in the development and use of digital infrastructures, technologies, and applications, is a major concern for SMEs, CSOs, and press discourse. These stakeholders commonly point to the significant gap between the European AI industry and its counterparts in the United States and China, expressing uncertainty about Europe's long-term competitive prospects. Within press discourse in particular, this concern is often articulated through a top-down, macroeconomic framing, heavily influenced by well-known political actors like Emmanuel Macron and Mario Draghi, who present digital sovereignty as a strategic imperative for achieving European autonomy. On the contrary, discourse on social media showed that users rarely engaged with the abstract ideal of European digital sovereignty, instead exhibiting a more

Funded by
the European Union

pragmatic perspective that treats AI as a novel technology they must master to remain competitive in the labour market.

The divergence reflects differences in stakeholders' structural positions and exposure to dependency risks rather than disagreement over principles. Actors closest to development and deployment experience infrastructural dependence as a core constraint, whereas supranational governance documents foreground regulatory solutions with limited engagement with infrastructural feasibility.

SMEs emphasise the limited availability of European AI infrastructures, particularly most cloud computing services, which increases their reliance on non-EU providers. These dependencies are not only perceived as economic vulnerabilities but are also regarded as constraints on the EU's ability to pursue the objectives of the green and digital transition[2], safeguard data privacy, and ensure the protection of fundamental rights. By contrast, digital sovereignty and related infrastructure dependencies are considerably less prominent in the documents of supranational organisations.

3.3.2 Innovation-regulation trade-offs

Stakeholders diverge on whether regulation enables or constrains innovation. SMEs do not assert that regulation constrains innovation per se; rather they side with business-oriented press on the need to reduce compliance burdens and regulatory uncertainty, CSOs argue existing safeguards remain insufficient, and institutional actors pursue a balancing approach. While stakeholders broadly agree that Europe faces competitive pressures relative to the US and China, they disagree on whether and how regulatory approaches alleviate or exacerbate these challenges and how innovation should be balanced against rights protection and enforcement capacity. The divergence is rooted in stakeholders' institutional roles, resource positions, and exposure to competitive pressures, rather than in disagreements over specific regulatory provisions. These positions reflect structurally different economic roles, resource capacities, and exposure to competitive pressures rather than disagreement over specific regulatory provisions.

[2] https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC129319

Funded by
the European Union

3.3.3 Gender bias

Bias, particularly gender bias, directly affects fairness, non-discrimination, trust and may undermine confidence in AI-enabled decision-making. However, while bias is acknowledged across stakeholder groups, bias is understood and addressed in fundamentally different ways. Rather than functioning as a shared success criterion, bias highlights contrasting assumptions about what constitutes AI-related harm, where bias originates, and who holds responsibility for addressing it.

Institutional actors make limited reference to gender bias in regulatory and policy documents, and the issue is notably absent from award schemes recognising excellence in AI applications. Where bias is referenced, it is typically addressed in general terms and without dedicated mechanisms or indicators, suggesting a relatively low degree of institutional prioritisation. SMEs tend to conceptualise bias as a technical dataset issue, focusing on mitigation through data correction while engaging less with organisational diversity. CSOs, by contrast, frame bias as a systemic social problem linked to inequality, discrimination, and exclusion. They express strong concern about the societal impacts of biased AI systems and demonstrate a commitment to collaborative approaches involving gendered, racialised, and LGBTQ+ communities. Though their capacity to act is often constrained by limited resources and communication constraints which affects their ability to engage with AI governance processes in a sustained manner.

3.3.4 Governance clarity and enforcement

Across WP2, WP3, and WP4, a fundamental difference emerges in how stakeholders experience the practical operation of AI governance, particularly with respect to the clarity of responsibility allocation and the enforceability of rules across the AI lifecycle. While governance is not articulated as an explicit success criterion in stakeholder materials, patterns across institutional documents, legal reasoning, SME accounts, and CSO perspectives indicate divergent experiences of how clearly responsibilities are defined and how consistently rules are applied in practice.

Institutional documents emphasise high-level principles of risk management, fundamental rights protection, and multi-stakeholder cooperation, but provide limited procedural guidance on responsibility allocation across the AI lifecycle. Courts reflect ongoing uncertainty through evolving and stage-based reasoning, particularly between early development phases and deployment

Funded by
the European Union

contexts. SMEs experience governance primarily through compliance obligations and report uncertainty regarding classification, proportionality, and liability. High compliance costs, limited internal legal capacity, and the perceived over-generalisation of risk categories contribute to a sense that governance expectations are insufficiently tailored to organisational size and role. CSOs question the effectiveness of enforcement mechanisms and report limited inclusion in governance processes.

Table 3.3.: Cross-stakeholder divergence on AI success criteria

Converged issue	Stakeholders involved	Core point of divergence	Why it matters
Digital sovereignty	SMEs, CSOs, press, institutions	Urgency and feasibility of infrastructural dependency	Shapes expectations of autonomy, enforceability, and rights protection
Innovation-regulation trade-off	SMEs, CSOs, press, institutions, courts	Relationship between regulation and competitiveness	Influences investment, scaling, and policy legitimacy
Gender bias	SMEs, CSOs, institutions, award bodies	Understanding of the nature of bias (technical dataset issue vs systemic social inequality)	Affects fairness, inclusion, and public trust in AI
Governance clarity and enforcement	Institutions, courts, SMEs, CSOs	Experience of how AI governance operates in practice	Determines trust in governance, compliance strategies, and perceived legitimacy of regulatory frameworks

Funded by
the European Union

Conclusion

This milestone has demonstrated that, while certain expectations of AI success are shared across stakeholder groups, no single, unified definition of successful AI exists in practice. Instead, success emerges as a multi-dimensional construct shaped by institutional roles, organisational capacities, and proximity to the development, deployment, or impact of AI systems. The synthesis presented in this report shows how success criteria strongly converge in some areas, align only conditionally in others, and remain structurally contested where stakeholder positions diverge fundamentally.

By integrating findings from WP2, WP3, and WP4, M4 provides a consolidated overview of where common ground exists (around AI output reliability, labour protection, and support in principle for regulatory intervention) and where tensions persist (in relation to digital sovereignty, innovation-regulation trade-offs, gender bias, and experiences of governance clarity and enforcement). These patterns highlight that governance challenges arise not only from competing interests, but also from differing conceptions of what successful AI should achieve. As a synthesis milestone, MS4 does not aim to resolve these tensions, but to structure them in a way that supports subsequent governance and design work within the project.

The value of this milestone lies not in proposing a singular benchmark for AI success, but in making visible the structure of agreement and contestation through which success is currently defined in Europe. This mapping provides a necessary foundation for the project's subsequent work by clarifying which expectations are widely shared, which remain unstable, and where governance interventions will need to engage with structurally divergent perspectives.

In fulfilment of its objectives, M4 confirms that FORSEE has reached a shared analytical understanding of stakeholder-defined AI success criteria, positioning the project to move from mapping expectations toward developing governance approaches that are responsive to both convergence and contestation within the European AI ecosystem.

Funded by
the European Union