

Generative AI systems are not human. Generative AI is absolutely not advanced enough to be considered for personhood. Therefore generative AI cannot make content that should be copyrightable. Allowing generative AI to have copyright would contradict current precedent and would cause harm to creators and copyright owners.

As someone in the creative industries, it would negatively affect my sector. Many artists online are already reporting issues with unauthorized use of their work as training data by bad actors who want to avoid paying the artist.

Due to the very international nature of the internet, international consistency of AI regulation would be better.

New legislation is absolutely warranted to address copyright and other issues created by generative AI.

Training data needs to be properly licensed. For the same reason an artist who traces another copyright owner's work to pass off as their own should be punished, training data taken without permission should not be allowed.

Training data should be opt-in. Generative AI should not have data that their makers have not contacted relevant copyright holders to use. Indiscriminate "scraping" for data has led to issues such as private medical photos ending up in data sets and situations like this should absolutely be avoided. Private personal data has no reason to be included in these data sets.

Article regarding the above:

<https://arstechnica.com/information-technology/2022/09/artist-finds-private-medical-record-photos-in-popular-ai-training-data-set/>

Developers of AI models should absolutely be required to collect, retain, and disclose records regarding the materials used to train their models. Creators of training data sets should have similar obligations.

Allowing a complete lack of transparency on the chain of custody of images would be disastrous for maintaining proper copyrights.

Copyright owners absolutely need to be notified if their works have been used to train an AI model. Makers of generative AI absolutely need to be public about their data sets. Hiding the data sources allows them to hide the facts regarding whether or not they had access to infringing material.

A human using generative AI should not be considered the "author" of material produced by the system. The human does not make the majority of the decisions on how the image looks. Many users of generative AI can't even explain how the generative AI comes to the conclusions it

does. This is like claiming a movie director who tells a crew “make me a scary movie” with no further details has done more work than the entire crew.

If someone hires me to make an image, even if they buy the rights to it, it does not suddenly make them the “author” of my labor.

The law should absolutely require AI-generated material to be labelled and publicly identified. The sheer amount of content that can be generated has potential to spread further misinformation and increase issues already present on social media websites.

AI-generated material should not feature the name or likeness of a particular person. This is particularly dangerous for spreading misinformation. Using voice generators to create false evidence about a person could have disastrous results.

AI-generated models should not be used with the intent to circumvent hiring a human creator.