**Adding comments to the Generative AI copyright Analysis**

As an individual consumer of information as well a creator of images, content and information, I am very interested in the process of AI copyrighting and am inspired by this forum which has opened the procedure to a diverse audience for comments and facts.

As your organization (The Office) has stated, content ownership in AI has "moved out of the realm of speculation." With advanced applications and broadly-ranged usage affecting millions, the path towards regulation seems brand new.  It is an exciting time to share with others my points of view.

One of  the prime reasons for sending remarks to this session is the hope that along with the main objective of determining 'copyrightability', we may also expand the outreach to persons and businesses not considered the technological elite. Perhaps there should be more than one layer to the regulations of copyright standards being established: the legal documents which conform to statutes under the law; while other layers could include a repository of information that would explain the legalities in layman terms for a diverse number of people to understand. Within this community an inclusive audience would be afforded access to legal rights made comprehensive along with the means to comment, offer opinion, and to report on misuses and abuse. And incidentally to offer positive reinforcement.

Regarding point 1 under general questions:

"*As described above, generative AI systems have the ability to produce material that would be copyrightable if it were created by a human author. What are your views on the potential benefits and risks of this technology? How is the use of this technology currently affecting or likely to affect creators, copyright owners, technology developers, researchers, and the public?*"

I am aware that the risks of AI may be plentiful, as an example, generative AI's ability to fine tune design and images that may then be used to misguide users, and the ever-prevalent hacking into systems is an additional concern. These issues of malfeasance, created by bad actors, I would defer to security software personnel who are experts in across board risk concerns.

For me, the benefits far exceed the risks by multiples and I am excited for full-fledged AI products and their incorporation into our existing systems and futures. We as artists, designers, performers and consumers need the kind of aid which can be supplied by generative AI. Its precision, speed and omni-focus will support our brick-and-mortar libraries with digital libraries for storage, especially of those crumbling treasures that can be made available to all for work, study, research and perusal. AI can be used to assist teachers assuring that each student can receive as much attention as needed. When AI is utilized as tutors, students benefit from assistance with homework assignments and papers, and help with dissertations. Still other support is given to dancers in the form of notation, mapping the physicality in dance movement, the patterns of muscularity and spinal placement.

Regarding the case of visual arts, in contemporary digital art and photography, software tool boxes often contain applications such as 'actions' and 'filters' which are algorithmic aids that add atmosphere, texture, backgrounds to a composition. When these aids are implemented into works, the artists still can claim full credit. I think generative AI can also be used in this manner.

If teachers of art students studying styles want to include specific compositions into their classroom agendas and the art creations they want do not fall under the heading Creative Commons, perhaps there is a student-teacher discount available.

For the numerous benefits AI has to offer and I have only named a few, it is crucial that we copyright and establish ownership, so that legality will not overshadow the multiple advantages.

It seems that throughout this copyright study presented by The Office, the prevailing questioned is: How do we implement ownership after a work has been finished and finalized?

I suggest instead of attacking the problem from the backend, approach it from the frontend in what I refer to as Body of Copyright. This approach to licensing would offer a smoother base of operation and lend clarity to both the source of the selected data and the recipient of said data.

Since generative AI has no thoughts of its own, necessarily most of its material is derived from and sourced from humans, with the AI largely assembling and presenting accessed information.

The AI pulls together and presents images and content with logic imbued it by its owner. But the LLM should not be allowed to disseminate information before giving proper credit for the use of sourced material. This is very important.

**How Body of Copyright might be initiated**

A.  The proposed method would require an extended concept for copyrighting by The Office, wherein licensing is done on demand.
B.  People and businesses interested in collecting copyright fees directly from their site would first have a continuously working site for at least six months.
C.  Owners would make an application of website registry thru a well-known search engine like Google, Bing or other and receive a certification letting users know the site is not fake or full of misinformation. The website should also receive a rating from the search engines that attests to quality of content and reputation.
D.  Under Terms of Service, the site would carry a listing of the content they have on offer categorized in the same manner as that of The Copyright Office: to Copy the work; to Prepare derivative of works based upon the work (e.g., make a movie from a book); to Distribute copies of the work to the public; to Perform the work publicly (e.g., movies, theater, dance); to Display the work publicly (e.g., for pictorial, graphic, or sculptural works); etc. The Copyright on Demand follows in alignment with that of The Office so that the same principles and statutes may be applied.
E.  An owner would place an oracle onsite guiding consumers to exchange information with the site's blockchain.
F.  The owner would connect to a blockchain system for identity. This will verify the website's legitimacy. Equipped with the basic wallet, contracts, ledger, outbound and inbound oracles, the chain may have any other applications needed. Stipulations for transactions:
    a.  The contract would carry specifications for types of usage, scale, residuals, if any, length of time allowed to retain content, the number of times the content may be used, etc.
    b.  The contracted material would fall under the legal headings of Fair Use, Creative Commons, For-profit, Not-for-Profit, Library lending Agreement, or General Copyright.
    c.  The contract would be enabled with software that could search outside the perimeters for international laws akin to those listed for the U.S.A., along with translation into local area languages and monetary systems.

d. When the agreement between owner and consumer is completed, the site owner will send out an invoice with a special tag like a bar code.
e. If the consumer is only interested in the specifications of a transaction, they will be given that.
f. <u>What if a contract is made and paid for by the consumer, who then says they did not use the material</u>?
   If a person has gone through appropriate channels and copied data from a site owner, then that represents usage of material. Copying material is different than just perusing the material. The act of copying the site triggers a copywriting fee by any human, organization or entity, if it is not a Creative Commons site.
g. For site owners who think their audience of users might copy work without permission, a 'captcha' might be effective.

**In Summary:**

I believe a system of this kind could be very beneficial to all parties involved. For those who are hoping to have an online business or wanting to upscale one, it allows them websites to be up and running quickly by adding a budget to their list of requirements. At the same time, site owners who have content to sell, will have the satisfaction of knowing they are getting credit and renumeration for their work.

Some might say the web scraping necessary to feed data to LLMs should be housed under Fair Use but the ebbing away of a creator's monetary funds and reputation is impractical and not even fair.