1. I believe generative AI has many potential risks for the creators currently and in the future. The initial implementation of the technology has seen art and artist communities oversaturated with low-effort image content, some of which people are even beginning to charge for access to this content. However, many images contain errors such as extra or missing limbs/fingers, incorrect lighting and shadows, and flawed geometry for items in the backgrounds. The result of the current use of AI in these spaces produces something very much like art forgeries of the past, however they lack even the artistic skill and effort required of a human creator to produce such work. It feels as though quality takes a backseat to quantity, and the end result is that these spaces become difficult if not impossible for human authorship to compete - and for the people who've trained their skills in these fields to continue to find work, make a living, and meaningfully contribute to their nations and societies, both culturally and financially.

As an example, Sci-Fi magazine Clarkesworld had to shut down submissions to their writing contest after receiving a large number of entries believed to be AI generated. In the article linked below, the magazine's founder indicated that "the number of spam submissions resulting in bans has hit 38 percent this month." Authors, especially those celebrated as part of the national culture, do not arise overnight. They require years of work and nurturing in order for them to reach that level of expertise. Before such time, contests like this are a means of sharpening their skills, training themselves, and having an opportunity to begin making an income from the industry before they can work in it full-time. With generative AI effectively shutting down competition, how can the next generation of authors participate in the entry-level process of this field?

Source: https://futurism.com/the-byte/sci-fi-magazine-shuts-down-submissions-ai-spam

9. Yes, copyright owners should have to explicitly consent to their work being used for AI training. The use of opt-out is insufficient to protect creators.

9.1 Yes, explicit consent should be required for all AI models, even if they are not commercial. Otherwise, what protections are in place to prevent generative AI users from producing content from non-commercial tools and then attempting to profit from them?

9.3 It is irrelevant whether or not it is feasible to get consent in advance from copyright owners - I still believe it should be required. The internet website YouTube has hundreds of hours of content uploaded every minute, yet they are still required to moderate that content regardless of whether or not it is feasible. If they believe it is not feasible to operate their business while respecting the rights of copyright owners, then they should not be allowed to operate their business.

Source: https://www.statista.com/statistics/259477/hours-of-video-uploaded-to-youtube-every-minute

15. Yes, AI model developers should be required to collect, retain, and disclose records of ALL entries used in their datasets. I believe this should also be required of training datasets.

15.1 They should be required to disclose the following for every work used in training the dataset: a copy of the work, the name of the the creator, the location from where the content was obtained

16. I believe that AI model and training set developers should be required to notify copyright owners. I believe this should follow the same rules as someone using any copywritten work in creation. Example: you must license a song before using it in a film.

18. The only example in which I believe that a human could claim copyright on generative AI work would be if they were the author of all of the items in the training set. Example: an artist building their own AI model to create backgrounds using artwork they had previous created as the entirety of the image set. They would also need to possess the full copyright of all aspects of images in the training set (ex: they could not use fanart of non-original characters to train an AI model.)

20. Legal protection of AI-generated material is UNDESIRABLE as a policy.

25. Both the developers and the end users could be directly liable for infringement. Developers are liable at the time they include copywritten work or characters in their dataset. End users are liable if they use prompts which would explicitly attempt to copy protected works. Example: Entering Mickey Mouse into an image generative AI would be an infringement of those who own the copyright for that character. I believe that would be direct infringement by both the developer and the end user.

28. Yes, AI-generated material should be labeled publicly as generated by AI. It should be labeled both in the work itself, as well as in any accompanying documentation. Example: An AI-generated image should contain a clear watermark indicating it was AI generated. It should also be required to state the same in text to any platform to which such an image was uploaded.

28.1. It should be identified by the end users producing works if that work was AI generated. It should also be identified as part of the creation process (example: a watermark on an AI-generated image).

28.3. I believe the consequences for failing to label something as AI-generated should be the same as forgery and fraud laws, because implying a work is something it is not (whether explicitly or implicitly) is misleading in the same way as forgeries do and fraud does.

32. Yes, there should be protections imitating the creative style of human creators. All creators whose work is used to train AI should be eligible, and that protection should take the form of 1) disclosing which works are used for training and 2) disclosing what words are used as prompts to create the AI content. As an example of someone needing protection, artist Kim Jung Gi passed away in 2022, and AI artists created work imitating their style within a week of their passing. This is a violation of whomever

owns the rights to their work following their passing and the dispensation of their estate, as well any potential revenue that might be earned from that estate.

Source: https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/kim-jung-gi-death-stable-diffusion-artificial-intelligence-1234649787/