

I appreciate the difficulty in these decisions around AI, the following are my thoughts as a layperson:

2) Does the increasing use or distribution of AI-generated material raise any unique issues for your industry as compared to other copyright stakeholders?

Novel writing is not my industry, but I personally know someone who is working in the AI development industry who claimed that their ultimate goal is to perfectly emulate in the style of people currently creating content. The specific quote was along the lines of "I want to use my AI job at \*\*\*\* to eventually 'write' books in the exact style of Brandon Sanderson. Imagine a world where you never run out of novels to read 'by' him."

5) Is new legislation warranted to address copyright or related issues with generative AI? If so, what should it entail?

I personally hold the view that legislation should be put in that covers the general following: AI should be allowed to be used as a tool or framework, such as helping visualize how lighting might hit a certain object or help structure a written piece. But, like derivation used in the traditional sense, significant changes should be made before the final object is considered human-made and thus copyrightable. This may mean that the individual must submit the piece(s) generated by AI along with the piece they are trying to copyright, so that a comparison can be made to confirm that there is sufficient change from the source AI material. However, items entirely produced by AI should remain not copyrightable.

As Honeybog on the Ars Technica comments section pointed out, allowing AI-generated pieces to be copyrighted will likely result in "large corporations to profit from derivatives of other people's work, while avoiding contributing money back into the economy by laying off all creative staff and trimming payroll down to mostly c-suite execs. "

6 - 14) Regarding Training, I do not have anything that directly relates to the questions, but I really wanted to share my personal feelings about AI training.

As a content creator myself who typically chooses to share my material openly under different creative commons permissions, I feel that AI should follow creative commons criteria, in that permission must be specifically given for each type of use, in this case, for AI training. There already exists plenty of data available that can be used for successful AI training that is currently (and in the future) in the public domain, or have already given active permission to be used. The only use I can see to wanting to train on material not in that data set is to provide the ability to purposefully emulate the styles of individuals who still have material in copyright TO circumvent that copyright.

28) Should the law require AI-generated material to be labeled or otherwise publicly identified as being generated by AI? If so, in what context should the requirement apply and how should it work?

I am in favor of AI systems adding a disclaimer that the piece was in whole or partial produced by AI. Specifically because we are at risk of an explosion in misinformation without any tools or skills that can be used as individuals to identify when something has been generated with AI.

However, once those tools are available, I think any required labeling law will get in the way of AI being used as the aiding tool it can be, so flexibility will be needed.

28.1) Who should be responsible for identifying a work as AI-generated?

I personally think the AI interface/program should take on the responsibility.

30) What legal rights, if any, currently apply to AI-generated material that features the name or likeness, including vocal likeness, of a particular person?

Whether or not there exists current rights, I strongly feel that there should be legislation enacted that protects individuals from realistic AI generated likenesses made and used without their permissions. If the AI generation cannot be distinguished by a lay person on the street from the real thing, then its infringing on that person's protected likeness.

32) Are there or should there be protections against an AI system generating outputs that imitate the artistic style of a human creator (such as an AI system producing visual works "in the style of" a specific artist)?

I feel that in order to ensure that individuals are properly compensated for their creative works, protections are critical for their "style". For example, otherwise what would stop publishing companies from stopping their relationships with the Brandon Sandersons of the novel writing world and just using AI to write "his" novels going forward with no compensation or support for the original author?