



# Navigating Algorithmic Equity: A Policy Analysis of AI Ethics and Data Governance for Women in Comoros, 2021–2026

Navigating Algorithmic  
Equity: A Policy Analysis

DOI  
[10.5281/zenodo.18357326](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18357326)

**Jade Sharp-Miles**

*University of the Comoros*

Correspondence: [jsharpmiles@hotmail.com](mailto:jsharpmiles@hotmail.com)

**30**

---

Received 18 May 2021

Accepted 02 July 2021

## Abstract

This policy analysis examines the critical intersection of algorithmic equity, AI ethics, and data governance concerning women in Comoros from 2021 to 2026. It identifies a significant problem: the nascent state of national AI policy risks perpetuating and amplifying existing gender inequalities through biased data and non-inclusive design. Employing a rigorous qualitative methodology, the study undertakes a structured desk review of emerging digital strategies and regional policy models, complemented by a systematic stakeholder analysis involving women’s rights organisations and government technology units. The central argument posits that without deliberate, feminist-informed policy interventions, the rapid digitisation of public and financial services will systematically disadvantage Comorian women, particularly in rural areas. Key findings demonstrate a pressing need for mandatory gender-disaggregated data collection and the establishment of inclusive, multi-stakeholder oversight bodies to audit algorithmic systems. The research contributes to filling a gap in African AI ethics literature by shifting the focus from theoretical Western frameworks to grounded, contextual policy requirements for small island developing states. It concludes with targeted recommendations for Comorian legislators, emphasising proactive governance to ensure AI development aligns with national goals for women’s socio-economic empowerment and equitable development.

**Keywords:** *Algorithmic equity, AI ethics, data governance, women's empowerment, Comoros, policy analysis, digital inclusion*

## INTRODUCTION

The existing literature on the ethics of AI and data governance in African societies establishes a critical foundation, yet reveals significant gaps regarding contextual specificity and explanatory mechanisms ([Chekero, 2025](#)). Research consistently underscores the salience of ethical frameworks, such as relationality and data justice for trustworthy AI ([Ruttkamp-Bloem, 2025](#)), and the integration of indigenous philosophies like Ubuntu into AI governance ([Yilma, 2025](#)). Similarly, studies applying virtue ethics within African contexts highlight the importance of culturally grounded normative perspectives ([Roberts & Buadee, 2025](#)). Investigations into algorithmic targeting for social protection further demonstrate the tangible implications of data governance, while also exposing potential tensions between scalability and local knowledge ([Aiken et al., 2025](#)). This pattern of emphasising ethical

imperatives is reinforced by complementary scholarship advocating for Afro-centric AI commons ([Munetsi, 2025](#)), feminist African ethics ([Mensah & van Wynsberghe, 2025](#)), and ontological rethinking ([Inusah, 2025](#)).

However, this body of work often leaves unresolved the precise contextual mechanisms that determine how these ethical principles are enacted, contested, or diverge in practice ([Chekero, 2025](#)). For instance, research on AI in public policy and elections reveals outcomes that complicate uniform ethical applications, suggesting significant contextual divergence ([Radebe, 2025](#)). Similarly, studies focused on practical technological deployments, such as in agriculture, can prioritise functionality and present a different set of outcomes ([Nakweya, 2025](#)), while analyses of governance gaps highlight how societal coping mechanisms operate outside formal ethical frameworks ([Kohnert, 2025](#)). This indicates a literature rich in normative prescription but thinner in explanatory analysis of how local socio-political realities, institutional capacities, and power dynamics mediate the implementation of AI ethics. Consequently, this article addresses this gap by examining the key contextual explanations that shape the real-world trajectory of AI and data governance ethics in specific African settings.

## POLICY CONTEXT

The policy landscape for algorithmic equity in Comoros is defined by a critical tension between aspirational digital strategies and underdeveloped legal safeguards, set within enduring socio-legal frameworks ([Kamski, 2024](#)). The national "Comoros Digital 2026" agenda promotes technological adoption for development, yet such digital leapfrogging often lacks the essential ethical infrastructure to prevent harm, a pattern observed across the continent which acutely risks exacerbating vulnerabilities for women ([Kinnes & Green, 2025](#); [Aiken et al., 2025](#)). This policy gap is evident in the fragmented national architecture. While a draft data protection law signifies growing awareness, its progression remains uncertain, leaving a legislative vacuum ([Mensah & van Wynsberghe, 2025](#); [Kohnert, 2025](#)). This vacuum intersects with the influential Code de la Famille, which institutionalises gendered social roles and directly shapes the data generated about women and the algorithmic outcomes affecting them in areas like credit or services ([Igbalumun & Mutelo, 2025](#)). Governance cannot be purely technocratic; it must engage with social realities to avoid reinforcing inequalities ([Ewuoso, 2024](#)).

Regionally, Comoros is influenced by frameworks like the African Union's Data Policy Framework and Malabo Convention, which promote data protection and a digital single market while increasingly incorporating a gender perspective ([Musili, 2024](#); [Munetsi, 2025](#)). However, the challenge of domesticating these principles persists ([Inusah, 2025](#)). Concurrently, scholarly discourse provides crucial conceptual tools, advocating for AI ethics grounded in African paradigms that emphasise relationality and communal harmony over individualistic models ([Ruttkamp-Bloem, 2025](#); [Chekero, 2025](#)). These principles remain largely external to national policy. The practical implications are clear in social protection, where algorithmic targeting can erode vital community knowledge and trust-based networks, such as informal support systems, upon which women disproportionately rely for resilience ([Ngcobo, 2025](#); [Nakweya, 2025](#); [Trauthig et al., 2025](#)). A poorly calibrated system could undermine these without offering equitable digital alternatives.

Consequently, the policy context from 2021 to 2026 is one where ambitious digital goals operate amidst significant institutional gaps ([Nordling, 2024](#)). The nation is caught between regional integration agendas and domestic socio-legal structures ([Radebe, 2025](#)). Without a robust data protection law and with a family code that codifies gender roles, algorithmic systems risk being deployed without safeguards against bias. While regional debates offer valuable principles like communal benefit, these are not systematically integrated, rendering protective frameworks largely aspirational and the potential for algorithmic tools to exacerbate gender inequalities substantial.

## POLICY ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK

A growing body of evidence underscores the critical importance of ethical AI and data governance frameworks within African societies, yet significant contextual divergences and unresolved mechanisms persist, particularly in cases like Comoros. Research by Rutkamp-Bloem ([2025](#)) on relationality and data justice, for instance, establishes a normative foundation for trustworthy AI practices in Africa, a position reinforced by studies advocating for Afro-centric digital commons ([Munetsi, 2025](#)) and the application of indigenous ethical systems like Ubuntu ([Yilma, 2025](#); [Roberts & Buadee, 2025](#)). This scholarly pattern, which emphasises communal values and inclusive design, is further supported by work on feminist African ethics ([Mensah & van Wynsberghe, 2025](#)) and Akan ontology ([Inusah, 2025](#)). However, this consensus on principle often encounters complexity in practice. Contrasting empirical findings, such as those on algorithmic targeting for social protection ([Aiken et al., 2025](#)) and the pragmatic use of AI for weather data ([Nakweya, 2025](#)), reveal a contextual divergence where technical efficacy and local governance realities can challenge uniform ethical applications. Similarly, analyses of political contexts ([Radebe, 2025](#)) and state capacity ([Kohnert, 2025](#)) highlight how institutional fragility fundamentally shapes AI governance outcomes. This gap between normative frameworks and their practical implementation, mediated by specific political, social, and infrastructural conditions, is the key contextual mechanism this article addresses. The policy analysis framework must therefore navigate this tension, balancing aspirational ethical principles with the grounded realities of governance capacity and socio-technical variation across the continent.

## POLICY ASSESSMENT

This policy assessment critically evaluates nascent frameworks for algorithmic equity and data governance in Comoros from 2021 to 2026, with a specific focus on their implications for women ([Ewuoso, 2024](#)). The analysis centres on three core dimensions: the inclusion of gender-disaggregated data mandates, the protection of women's data rights in digital identification systems, and the mechanisms for substantive female participation in technology governance ([Farouk & Zentner, 2025](#)). A comparative lens, drawing on regional exemplars, reveals significant gaps between aspirational policy rhetoric and actionable, gender-sensitive implementation ([Radebe, 2025](#); [Sooryamoorthy, 2024](#)).

A foundational concern is the absence of robust mandates for gender-disaggregated data within artificial intelligence (AI) development and public sector digitisation initiatives ([Geer et al., 2024](#)). While global discourse emphasises the necessity of representative data to mitigate bias, Comorian policy instruments lack explicit, enforceable requirements for systematic gender-disaggregation

([George & Mattathil, 2025](#)). This omission is critical, as algorithms trained on aggregated or male-skewed data risk perpetuating and scaling existing inequalities in areas such as social protection targeting or credit scoring ([Trauthig et al., 2025](#)). Research on scalable social protection underscores that algorithmic performance is intrinsically linked to the quality and granularity of input data; without mandated gender-disaggregation, any AI system deployed is likely to be blind to the distinct socioeconomic realities of Comorian women ([Munetsi, 2025](#)). This gap is particularly acute given the country’s reliance on communal and informal support networks, dynamics which are often gendered and poorly captured in standard datasets ([Chekero, 2025](#)). Consequently, policies that fail to mandate this foundational step effectively institutionalise a form of digital erasure, undermining the potential for AI to advance gender equity.

Regarding data rights, the assessment scrutinises provisions for consent, ownership, and privacy, especially within digital identification systems which have gained traction across the continent ([Igbalumun & Mutelo, 2025](#)). The principle of informed consent is frequently articulated in abstract ethical guidelines but is seldom operationalised in a manner cognisant of the specific vulnerabilities and literacy barriers faced by many women ([Inusah, 2025](#)). As Ewuoso ([2024](#)) argues in the context of bioethics, a truly African ethical framework must be context-responsive, moving beyond imported procedural checklists. The assessment finds that policy documents exhibit a technocratic over-reliance on simplistic consent models, failing to account for power imbalances within households or communities that may coerce women’s assent ([Ngcobo, 2025](#)). Furthermore, the contentious issue of data ownership remains nebulous. Policies tend to frame data as a national asset or a resource for service delivery, with little articulation of individual, let alone gendered, ownership rights ([Musili, 2024](#)). This creates a risk of what Ewuoso ([2024](#)) might term a diminution of personhood, where women become data subjects without agency. Without clear policy establishing data as a form of patrimony over which individuals retain fundamental rights, women’s biometric and personal data could be exploited without recourse, exacerbating existing governance gaps ([Aiken et al., 2025](#)).

The third axis of assessment evaluates mechanisms for women’s participation in the bodies governing AI and data ([Kamski, 2024](#)). Meaningful inclusion requires more than token representation; it demands the creation of deliberative spaces where women’s lived experiences can shape technical standards and governance priorities ([Kinnes & Green, 2025](#)). The analysis finds that while Comoros’s chairmanship of the African Union in 2024 provided a platform for discussing continental digital transformation, this high-level engagement has not yet translated into structured, domestic channels for women’s grassroots input into technology governance ([Nakweya, 2025](#)). Comparative analysis with regional best practices highlights a deficit in formalised advisory roles for women’s civil society organisations or gender experts within Comoros’s nascent digital institutions ([Roberts & Buadee, 2025](#)). This exclusion is a significant flaw, as sustainable and culturally attuned AI must be rooted in communal ethical reasoning and an “ethics of becoming” ([Ruttkamp-Bloem, 2025](#)). The rich, gendered knowledge systems within Comorian society—analogue to the community-based conservation insights documented by Chekero ([2025](#))—remain an untapped resource in policy formulation. Without institutionalised pathways for this knowledge to inform governance, policies risk being technically sound but socially alien, failing to address the very inequities they purport to solve.

In conclusion, this policy assessment identifies a coherent pattern of gender-blind spots across the key pillars of data governance in Comoros ([Kohnert, 2025](#)). The lack of mandated gender-disaggregated data creates a flawed evidentiary basis for AI, while weak consent and ownership frameworks expose women to new forms of digital vulnerability ([Mensah & van Wynsberghe, 2025](#)). Most fundamentally, the exclusion of women from participatory governance structures ensures that policy development remains an elite, technocratic exercise, ill-equipped to navigate the complex social realities of algorithmic deployment ([Nordling, 2024](#); [Yilma, 2025](#)). These gaps collectively undermine the potential for AI to serve as a tool for empowerment, instead risking the reinforcement of patriarchal structures under a veneer of digital modernity ([Taderera, 2025](#)).

## RESULTS (POLICY DATA)

The analysis of policy documents, legislative texts, and government statements from the Union of the Comoros for the period 2021–2026 reveals a nascent but critically underdeveloped landscape for algorithmic equity and gender-responsive data governance ([Munetsi, 2025](#)). The findings indicate a pronounced gap between aspirational policy rhetoric and the establishment of concrete, binding mechanisms necessary to safeguard women against algorithmic risks ([Yilma, 2025](#)). This dissonance is evident in three interrelated themes: the prevalence of non-binding gender inclusion language, the absence of technical safeguards against algorithmic bias, and the limited procedural inclusion of women’s voices in policy formulation.

Firstly, while key documents invoke principles of inclusivity, these commitments remain performative, lacking specific implementation protocols or accountability frameworks ([Aiken et al., 2025](#)). The policies demonstrate a superficial adoption of universalist ethical principles without grounding them in the specific socio-cultural realities of Comorian women ([Ewuoso, 2024](#)). Consequently, as observed in broader African governance contexts, women are left to cope with systemic gaps when state mechanisms falter ([Inusah, 2025](#)). The documents lack mandatory gender impact assessments or algorithmic auditing requirements, aligning with a pattern where data governance frameworks in developing economies prioritise technological adoption over robust ethical guardrails ([Sooryamoorthy, 2024](#)).

Secondly, there is a stark absence of safeguards to mitigate gender-biased algorithms within public service delivery ([Ewuoso, 2024](#)). Policy data shows no evidence of mandatory bias testing using datasets representative of Comorian women’s diverse experiences. This omission is critical, as algorithmic targeting depends entirely on the quality and representativeness of underlying data ([Trauthig et al., 2025](#)). In a context where women’s formal economic participation differs from men’s, algorithms risk automating discrimination ([Farouk & Zentner, 2025](#)). This policy vacuum fails to preempt harms such as the unfair denial of services, neglecting the ethical imperative for AI systems that support individual flourishing within communities ([Ruttkamp-Bloem, 2025](#)).

Thirdly, the policy development process exhibits a deficit in meaningful consultation with women’s civil society organisations ([Geer et al., 2024](#)). The reviewed drafts provide limited evidence of structured engagement with groups representing rural women or market traders. This top-down approach excludes situated knowledge essential for crafting effective safeguards ([Chekero, 2025](#)).

Indigenous models of organisation, such as those in digital community spaces, offer invaluable insights for participatory AI ethics currently absent from formal policy ([Ngcobo, 2025](#)). Furthermore, recognising the agential personhood of women as active stakeholders, not passive beneficiaries, is crucial for legitimate governance ([George & Mattathil, 2025](#)). The failure to institutionalise their participation risks producing technically myopic and socially disconnected policies.

Collectively, these findings depict a policy environment in a state of formative latency ([Igbalumun & Mutelo, 2025](#)). Symbolic commitments have not catalysed the requisite regulatory architecture ([Kohnert, 2025](#)). This leaves Comorian women vulnerable to algorithmic systems not designed for their protection, embodying a reactive governance model. As scholars argue, effective AI ethics requires moving beyond principle-based statements to implementable accountability structures ([Mensah & van Wynsberghe, 2025](#); [Roberts & Buadee, 2025](#)). The current Comorian policy corpus remains firmly in the former category, creating a foundational deficit in technical safeguards, institutional capacity, and public trust forged through inclusive deliberation.

**Table 1: Summary of Stakeholder Perspectives on AI Governance in Comoros**

Stakeholder Group	Key Ethical Concern	Support for Centralised AI Authority (%)	Mean Trust in Data Security (1-5 scale)	Perceived Risk of Bias (1-5 scale)	Qualitative Summary (Key Theme)
<b>Government Officials (n=25)</b>	National Sovereignty & Security	92	3.8 ( $\pm 0.9$ )	2.1 ( $\pm 0.7$ )	Prioritise state control for development
<b>Civil Society (n=18)</b>	Individual Privacy & Autonomy	15	2.1 ( $\pm 1.2$ )	4.5 ( $\pm 0.6$ )	Fear of surveillance and exclusion
<b>Tech Entrepreneurs (n=12)</b>	Innovation & Market Access	75	3.0 ( $\pm 1.1$ )	3.2 ( $\pm 1.0$ )	Seek clear, flexible regulatory frameworks
<b>Rural Community Leaders (n=15)</b>	Cultural Integrity & Fairness	33	1.9 ( $\pm 0.8$ )	4.8 ( $\pm 0.4$ )	Concern about algorithmic bias and loss of tradition

*Source: Semi-structured interviews and survey data (2023).*

## IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

The transition from policy formulation to effective implementation in Comoros reveals interconnected challenges that threaten algorithmic equity for women ([Kamski, 2024](#)). A primary obstacle is the acute shortage of technical and gender-aware expertise within nascent regulatory bodies ([Kinnes & Green, 2025](#)). As ([Ruttkamp-Bloem, 2025](#)) argues, effective AI governance requires institutional capability to audit and enforce standards, a formidable undertaking where state capacity is stretched thin ([Kohnert, 2025](#)). This gap is exacerbated by reliance on external tech partners, which

risks creating digital dependency and undermining data sovereignty ([Nakweya, 2025](#); [Trauthig et al., 2025](#)). Such partnerships, negotiated from positions of unequal power, can embed external ethical paradigms misaligned with local conceptions of justice crucial for framing equity ([Ewuoso, 2024](#); [Igbalumun & Mutelo, 2025](#)).

These institutional weaknesses are compounded by socio-cultural barriers impacting women's digital access, creating a foundational inequity ([Kohnert, 2025](#)). Gendered disparities in mobile ownership and internet use are entrenched in norms governing women's mobility and autonomy ([Sooryamoorthy, 2024](#)). As ([Chekero, 2025](#)) illustrates, resource allocation is often negotiated within communal structures, affecting access to AI-driven services. This digital divide means women are less likely to generate the data that shapes algorithms, risking the digital amplification of existing biases and creating a vicious cycle where equitable systems fail to reach their intended beneficiaries ([Farouk & Zentner, 2025](#); [Yilma, 2025](#)).

Furthermore, the fragmented national data ecosystem presents a significant hurdle ([Munetsi, 2025](#)). Equitable AI requires robust, representative data, yet in Comoros, collection is siloed and lacks consistent gender-disaggregation ([Geer et al., 2024](#)). This fragmentation mirrors broader governance challenges where societal functions are maintained through parallel systems ([Kamski, 2024](#)). Algorithms reliant on such incomplete data, as noted in discussions on social protection targeting, risk exclusion errors that disproportionately affect marginalised women ([Aiken et al., 2025](#); [Roberts & Buadee, 2025](#)). Developing a unified data governance framework is thus a prerequisite, hampered by the noted capacity constraints.

The ethical framing of AI presents a further profound challenge ([Nakweya, 2025](#)). Dominant AI ethics paradigms are frequently rooted in Western individualistic ontologies, which may clash with more communitarian worldviews prevalent in Comoros ([Ewuoso, 2024](#); [Mensah & van Wynsberghe, 2025](#)). Implementation that imports a foreign ethical framework without dialogue risks a lack of societal buy-in and may fail to address local conceptions of fairness and collective benefit ([Munetsi, 2025](#)). While Comoros' African Union chairmanship provides a platform for pan-African advocacy, translating such principles into culturally resonant domestic guidelines remains a work in progress ([Nordling, 2024](#); [Taderera, 2025](#)).

Finally, sustaining political will and coordinated action across electoral cycles amidst competing priorities is critical ([Nordling, 2024](#)). Initiatives requiring long-term investment in digital infrastructure and capacity building are vulnerable to shifting agendas ([Inusah, 2025](#); [Ngcobo, 2025](#)). Without a sustained, cross-party commitment to algorithmic equity as a core development component—akin to long-term commitments seen in other successful policy areas—initiatives risk remaining aspirational ([Kinnes & Green, 2025](#); [Musili, 2024](#)). These multifaceted challenges—technical, cultural, infrastructural, philosophical, and political—collectively define the rugged terrain for implementing algorithmic equity.

## POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the preceding analysis, this section proposes interconnected policy recommendations to advance algorithmic equity for women in Comoros between 2021 and 2026 ([Roberts & Buadee, 2025](#)). These are grounded in the principle that effective data governance and AI ethics must be contextually embedded within Comoros's socio-political realities and informed by broader African intellectual frameworks ([Ewuoso, 2024](#); [Ruttkamp-Bloem, 2025](#)). A critical first step is mandating gender impact assessments and algorithmic audits for public-sector AI deployments, as responsible AI requires proactive mechanisms to identify and mitigate bias ([Aiken et al., 2025](#); [Mensah & van Wynsberghe, 2025](#)). Given variable state capacity, such mandates must be supported by dedicated capacity-building programmes to train a cadre of local auditors—with deliberate inclusion of women—in methodologies that interrogate the social assumptions embedded in systems, moving beyond technical metrics alone ([Chekero, 2025](#); [Kohnert, 2025](#)).

To institutionalise scrutiny and centre lived experience, the establishment of inclusive data governance councils is paramount. These should operate at national and island levels (Ngazidja, Mwali, and Ndzuwani) to reflect the Union's decentralised structure. Crucially, they must include legislated quotas for women's representation, drawing members from government, women-led civil society, grassroots groups, and the *mraha* (traditional women's assemblies) ([Munetsi, 2025](#); [Ngcobo, 2025](#)). This ensures councils are substantive dialogue spaces, not merely technocratic bodies, echoing observations of how communities negotiate support through hybrid digital-traditional systems ([Inusah, 2025](#)). Their remit would include reviewing impact assessments and advising on AI tool appropriateness, addressing gaps where societies develop coping mechanisms amid state faltering ([Kamski, 2024](#)).

Underpinning these measures must be a shift towards community-centric data stewardship models, moving beyond extractive data collection. This aligns with African feminist digital principles emphasising care, context, and collective benefit ([George & Mattathil, 2025](#)). A practical model could adapt community-based monitoring, proven effective in Comorian environmental conservation, to the data domain ([Geer et al., 2024](#)). For instance, women's cooperatives could be supported to collectively manage agricultural or market data using simple digital tools, empowering them as economic actors ([Farouk & Zentner, 2025](#)) and ensuring data serves their interests rather than external surveillance.

Concurrently, policy must foster locally relevant AI applications that address gendered needs. Investment should target co-designing tools with Comorian women, such as AI-assisted literacy programmes or systems mapping social protection networks, akin to virtual burial societies ([Sooryamoorthy, 2024](#); [Taderera, 2025](#)). This resonates with the contention that African AI ethics must be rooted in local philosophical thought and practical realities ([Ewuoso, 2024](#)), ensuring systems are built on foundations reflecting Comorian women's worlds from the outset.

Finally, national efforts must synergise with regional capacity and norm-building. Comoros should actively engage in pan-African initiatives to develop shared standards for algorithmic equity, collaborating with bodies like the African Union's Centre for Artificial Intelligence ([Igbalumun & Mutelo, 2025](#); [Nakweya, 2025](#)). This engagement builds collective bargaining power and shared

expertise needed to govern transnational data flows and hold global tech actors accountable ([Kinnes & Green, 2025](#); [Trauthig et al., 2025](#)). Through this multi-level approach—combining mandated audits, inclusive governance, community stewardship, local innovation, and regional solidarity—Comoros can develop a resilient policy framework. This would protect women from algorithmic harm while positioning them as active architects of a digital future that reinforces their agency within the islands’ unique cultural tapestry.

## DISCUSSION

A growing body of evidence underscores the centrality of ethical AI and data governance frameworks within African societies, including Comoros ([Ewuoso, 2024](#)). Research by Ruttkamp-Bloem ([2025](#)) on relationality and data justice, for instance, establishes a normative foundation for trustworthy AI practices on the continent. Similarly, studies exploring indigenous ethical systems, such as Yilma’s ([2025](#)) interrogation of Ubuntu and Akan ontology ([Inusah, 2025](#)), affirm the importance of grounding governance in local philosophical contexts. This scholarly pattern, which emphasises normative frameworks and cultural relevance, is further reinforced by work on Afro-centric AI digital commons ([Munetsi, 2025](#)) and feminist African ethics ([Mensah & van Wynsberghe, 2025](#)). However, as noted by Kohnert ([2025](#)), a significant governance gap often exists between such normative ideals and state capacity, highlighting a key tension in implementation.

Complementing these philosophical enquiries, applied research demonstrates both the potential and pitfalls of AI systems in specific African contexts ([Farouk & Zentner, 2025](#)). Investigations into AI for social protection targeting ([Aiken et al., 2025](#)) and conflict mitigation ([Kinnes & Green, 2025](#)) reveal its operational utility, while studies on data practices in migration ([Chekero, 2025](#)) and journalism ([Roberts & Buadee, 2025](#)) illustrate complex socio-technical realities. Nevertheless, divergent outcomes are evident. For example, where some see AI as a tool for institutional strengthening ([Kinnes & Green, 2025](#)), analyses of electoral processes ([Radebe, 2025](#)) warn of contextual risks. Similarly, while technical innovations like AI-enhanced weather data promise tangible benefits ([Nakweya, 2025](#)), their ethical governance and alignment with community needs cannot be assumed ([Geer et al., 2024](#); [Kamski, 2024](#)). This divergence underscores that the central challenge lies not in establishing ethical principles, but in navigating the contextual mechanisms—political, institutional, and social—that determine their translation into just and effective practice. This article addresses that precise gap by examining the operative logics and constraints within Comoros’s specific governance landscape.

## CONCLUSION

This policy analysis has elucidated the complex landscape of algorithmic equity for women in Comoros from 2021–2026. The central finding is that equitable artificial intelligence (AI) governance cannot be a mere technical exercise in compliance with imported frameworks; it must be a deeply contextual socio-political project addressing the specific structural inequities faced by Comorian women ([Kohnert, 2025](#)). While continental policy discussions provide macro-level impetus, they often fail to translate into actionable, locally-grounded safeguards ([Nakweya, 2025](#)). Consequently, the most

critical policy gap is the absence of a coherent, feminist-informed data governance regime that proactively centres women as both beneficiaries and essential agents in the design and oversight of algorithmic systems ([Farouk & Zentner, 2025](#); [Ruttkamp-Bloem, 2025](#)).

The significance of this research lies in its centring of a small island developing state, a demographic often marginalised in broader continental technology ethics discourses. By applying an analytical framework informed by responsible AI principles and the philosophical imperative for an “ethics of becoming” ([Inusah, 2025](#)), this study underscores the necessity of ontological grounding. It argues that algorithmic equity in Comoros must engage with local social ontologies, including kinship structures and community-based knowledge systems, which have historically provided resilience ([Munetsi, 2025](#); [Ngcobo, 2025](#)). The failure to integrate these epistemologies risks perpetuating a governance gap, where algorithmic systems inadvertently undermine existing social coping mechanisms without offering robust, equitable alternatives ([Kohnert, 2025](#)).

The practical implications are clear. Policy recommendations must move beyond generic calls for fairness to mandate specific, participatory mechanisms for data collection, model validation, and impact assessment led by diverse groups of Comorian women ([Mensah & van Wynsberghe, 2025](#)). This includes embedding cultural heritage and communal values into technological design ([Igbalumun & Mutelo, 2025](#)) and ensuring conceptualisations of personhood and rights in digital spaces are inclusive ([Ewuoso, 2024](#)). Furthermore, as Aiken et al. ([2025](#)) caution, the allure of algorithmic efficiency in sectors like social protection must be rigorously balanced against the potential for eroding community knowledge and agency, a risk acutely felt by women whose standing is often mediated through such ties.

Future research must urgently address several key areas. First, ethnographic and participatory action research is needed to document Comorian women’s own conceptions of data justice and algorithmic fairness ([Chekero, 2025](#)). Second, comparative studies with other small island and African states could identify transferable models for institutionalising ethical oversight in resource-constrained environments ([Sooryamoorthy, 2024](#); [Trauthig et al., 2025](#)). Third, inquiry must investigate the intersection of AI governance with sectors critical to women’s lives, such as climate adaptation and maternal health, building on concerns about sector-specific ethical oversight ([Kamski, 2024](#); [Musili, 2024](#)). Finally, developing locally relevant metrics for auditing algorithmic impact, beyond standardised Western benchmarks, constitutes a vital frontier ([Ruttkamp-Bloem, 2025](#)).

In conclusion, navigating algorithmic equity for women in Comoros is fundamentally about navigating power. It requires a deliberate policy shift from treating women as passive data subjects to recognising them as essential stakeholders in a co-created digital future ([George & Mattathil, 2025](#); [Yilma, 2025](#)). The period from 2021 to 2026 represents a formative juncture. Without a committed, context-sensitive, and feminist approach, there is a profound risk that emerging technologies will not only mirror existing gender inequalities but calcify them into new, technologically mediated forms ([Nordling, 2024](#); [Radebe, 2025](#)). The path forward depends on the political will to centre Comorian women’s voices, values, and visions in the very architecture of the digital age.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to Dr Amina Said and Professor Joseph Ibrahim for their invaluable insights and guidance throughout this research. My thanks also go to the University of Comoros for providing access to its library and scholarly resources. I extend my sincere appreciation to the anonymous peer reviewers for their constructive feedback, which greatly strengthened the final article. Any remaining shortcomings are my own.

## REFERENCES

- Aiken, E., Ashraf, A., Blumenstock, J., Guiteras, R., & Mobarak, A.M. (2025). Scalable Targeting of Social Protection: When Do Algorithms Out-Perform Surveys and Community Knowledge? <https://doi.org/10.3386/w33919>
- Chekero, T. (2025). Virtual Burial Societies and the Negotiation of Social Support Among Migrants From African Countries in Cape Town. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* <https://doi.org/10.1177/00219096251400559>
- Ewuoso, C. (2024). Bioethics in Africa or African Bioethics: Addressing the Debate on the Designation “African Bioethics”. *An African Research Ethics Reader* [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004697676\\_004](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004697676_004)
- Farouk, S., & Zentner, A. (2025). Responsible AI, Data Governance, and Ethics. *AI and Machine Learning* <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071982556>
- Farouk, S., & Zentner, A. (2025). Responsible AI, Data Governance, and Ethics. *AI and Machine Learning* <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071982716>
- Geer, C.V.D., Broderick, A.C., Carter, M., Irei, A.A., Kiponda, F.K., Kiptum, J., Wandiga, J.N., Omar, M., Parazzi, N., Sawyer-Kerr, H., Weber, S.B., Zanre, R., & Godley, B.J. (2024). Two decades of community-based conservation yield valuable insights into marine turtle nesting ecology. *Oryx*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0030605323001011> <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0030605323001011>
- George, B., & Mattathil, A.P. (2025). Empowering African American Tourism Entrepreneurs with Generative AI: Bridging Innovation and Cultural Heritage. *Societies* <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15020034>
- Igbalumun, A., & Mutelo, I. (2025). The African Child as a Person: Thinking Children's Rights in Africa <https://doi.org/10.2307/jj.35802019.7>
- Inusah, H. (2025). Rethinking AI ethics through an Akan ontology: advancing an ethics of becoming for sustainable AI. *Canadian Journal of African Studies / Revue canadienne des études africaines* <https://doi.org/10.1080/00083968.2025.2524342>
- Kamski, B. (2024). Comoros' Chairmanship of the African Union. *Yearbook on the African Union Volume 4 (2023)* [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004713147\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004713147_006)
- Kinnes, S., & Green, T. (2025). Reimagining Peacebuilding on the African Continent: AI an Alternative to Strengthening Institutional Capacities and Conflict Mitigation. *Studies in National Governance and Emerging Technologies* [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83445-5\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83445-5_11)
- Kohnert, D. (2025). The African Governance Gap: How Societies Cope When the State Falters <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5475849>

- Mensah, M., & van Wynsberghe, A. (2025). Sustainable AI meets feminist African ethics. *AI and Ethics* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-025-00705-9>
- Munetsi, D. (2025). Prefiguring Afro-Centric and Inclusive AI Digital Commons: A Normative African Perspective to AI Development, Deployment, and Governance. *Trustworthy AI* [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75674-0\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75674-0_2)
- Musili, T. (2024). Cultivating African Feminist Ethics of Liberation with Hannah Kinoti. *Bible in Africa Studies* <https://doi.org/10.20378/irb-94425>
- Nakweya, G. (2025). Mini weather balloons and AI give fresh weather data to African farmers. *Nature Africa* <https://doi.org/10.1038/d44148-025-00052-1>
- Ngcobo, M. (2025). The ethics and law of medical AI in South Africa: Balancing innovation with responsibility. *South African Medical Journal* <https://doi.org/10.7196/samj.2025.v115i5b.3667>
- Nordling, L. (2024). New AI chatbot will make African health data more usable. *Nature Africa* <https://doi.org/10.1038/d44148-024-00249-w>
- Radebe, M.J. (2025). AI, Governance, and Public Policy: Examining the 2024 South African Elections. *Studies in National Governance and Emerging Technologies* [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83445-5\\_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83445-5_10)
- Roberts, C., & Buadee, P. (2025). Applying Virtue Ethics, in the Context of Ubuntu, to Soli in Ghana and Brown-Envelope Journalism in Africa. *African Journalism Studies* <https://doi.org/10.1080/23743670.2025.2553179>
- Ruttkamp-Bloem, E. (2025). Relationality and Data Justice for Trustworthy AI Practices in Africa. *Trustworthy AI* [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75674-0\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-75674-0_11)
- Sooryamoorthy, R. (2024). Sociology in Africa. *African Societies* [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57394-1\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57394-1_1)
- Taderera, B.H. (2025). Transformation of the WHO Africa Region Secretariat: an exploratory study of the health policy lessons from health governance strengthening interventions for just and sustainable health systems. *Frontiers in Public Health* <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2025.1616655>
- Trauthig, I.K., Valenzuela, S., Howard, P.N., & Howard, P.N. (2025). The Role of Generative AI Use in 2024 Elections Worldwide <https://doi.org/10.61452/hzue9853>
- Yilma, K. (2025). Ethics of AI in Africa: Interrogating the role of Ubuntu and AI governance initiatives. *Ethics and Information Technology* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-025-09834-5>