**Week 2 Summary (Feb 3-9, 2025)**

This week, I began my research and focused on AI ethics and legal cases surrounding the use of GenAI for creative purposes. I read and took notes on a paper titled “A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society” and also read a bit about the Concord Music Group Inc. v. Anthropic PBC case. A challenge I faced was understanding all of the legal vocabulary in the summary and keeping track of the case’s status updates. For next week, I want to finish taking notes on the case’s status updates, take notes on the Andersen v. Stability AI case, review troubling legal vocabulary, review the MIT Technology Review article “AI-generated art raises tricky questions about ethics, copyright, and security” and review concepts from CS ethics like deontology and utilitarianism.

**Week 3 Summary (Feb 10-17)**

This week, I continued to take notes on the Concord v. Anthropic PBC case and also took substantial notes on Andersen v. Stability AI. I also reviewed the MIT Technology Review Article “AI-generated art raises tricky questions about ethics, copyright, and security” and compiled a presentation of my research from the past two weeks. The biggest challenge this week was taking the notes on the legal cases because there were so many details and there was some troubling phrasing and vocabulary. However, I learned more about how AI infringes on copyright and was able to connect them to the ethical framework from the paper from last week. I also found a paper that I wrote that uses inductive reasoning to discuss ethical arguments and dilemmas of this issue and how deontology and utilitarianism come into play. However, to be on the safe side, I will need to ask my professor from that class for permission to use the paper in my research. For next week, I want to finish taking notes on these two cases, research and take notes on industry responses to GenAI, get permission to use my old paper and think about potential policies that could address the effect of GenAI on artists and the industries that they work in.

**Week 4 Summary (Feb 18-23)**

This week was a bit of a struggle in terms of research. I was able to finish taking notes on the summary of Andersen v. Stability AI, but not on the status updates of Concord Music Group v. Anthropic. In addition, I was able to compile some initial notes on industry responses to GenAI, but I need to do a lot more searching for more industry responses from industries like SAG-AFTRA and the visual arts industries, especially those that are very detailed in content. I also still need to ask my old ethics professor for permission to use my paper from that class in my research and set up another meeting with my supervisor to discuss AI generated content analysis, question drafting for the survey, project management and the first presentation with my research findings. Furthermore, I updated my GitHub Repo, added a tracker for the project in GitHub Projects and updated the slides discussing my project tools and diagrams.

**Week 5 Summary (Feb 24-March 2)**

This week I was able to get clarity on the direction that my project is headed after making progress on my initial research. I was able to find another legal case in this topic called Authors Guild v. OpenAI, which involves authors trying to protect their work from being used without permission by GenAI programs. In addition, I found many industry responses to GenAI including musicians, music professionals, visual artists and authors. After meeting with my supervisor, the next direction to head with the legal cases is to compare the three (Andersen v. Stability AI, Concord Music Group, Inc. v. Anthropic PBC and Authors Guild v. OpenAI) using a table, to review AI policies (specifically US industry regulations and policies and worldwide legal policies) and to draft the key arguments for policy recommendations. In addition, there will also be at least one survey done as a part of the data collection: one survey sent out to the general public that gathers information about people’s use of AI and their thoughts about ethics, legalities and regulations of it; there will also be an open-ended survey targeted to artists if there are enough people that can complete it. In addition, I will also be searching for and reviewing papers and literature on analyzing AI-generated content in order to gain insight on how to analyze AI-generated content for this type of research.

**Week 6 Summary (March 3-10)**

This week, my main focus was working on the questions for the general survey on generative AI. Time management was especially hard this week, so it took me 3 days out of the week, with a few hours each day, to finish creating the form. This is because I made sure to not only use my supervisor’s questions, but to add open-minded questions that would contextualize the multiple choice answers to the questions that my supervisor came up with. Once I was finished, I sent the form to my supervisor. I also tried searching for papers on AI data analysis on IEEE, but I did not find anything with the search “AI data analysis.” This upcoming week, I want to focus on comparing the 3 legal cases and finding policies and regulations on GenAI. Hopefully I will also be able to find some publishing or papers on AI-generated content analysis as well.

**Week 7 Summary (March 11-18)**

This week, I was able to jot down some notes on AI policies in countries around the world, including the US. I was also able to start making the table for case comparison and added info to the table about the claims made in Andersen v. Stability AI. Some challenges I faced this week were not knowing where to start with delving deeper into each policy. Also, with the US policies, the executive order documents are a bit lengthy, so I tried to start summarizing their main goals. In the upcoming week, I want to finish the table and update my supervisor on my progress with my research. I also want to start learning Overleaf and try to find resources or papers on analyzing AI-generated content and send out the general survey on GenAI.

**Week 8 Summary (Mar 19-25)**

This week, I finished a key piece of research: comparing the three legal cases that I found (Andersen v. Stability AI; Concord Music Group, Inc. v. Anthropic PBC; and Authors Guild v. OpenAI). The biggest challenge this week was distinguishing between the secondary copyright infringement claim made in Authors Guild v. OpenAI and the contributory and vicarious infringement claims made in Concord Music Group, Inc. v. Anthropic PBC because the former involved contributory and vicarious liability. As such, I need to clarify the vicarious and contributory claims in the Concord case to make sure that the claim is not the same type of claim in the Authors Guild case, especially since the reasonings are similar. I also added more detail to the information in the table about Andersen v. Stability AI and projected the outcomes/results of each case. Next week, I want to focus on getting started with worldwide legal AI policies, US-specific AI policies and policy recommendation arguments.

**Week 9 Summary (Mar 26-31)**

This week, I made great progress with researching AI policy around the world. Not only did I find policies, recommendations and laws for many world countries/continents surrounding AI, but I was also able to construct an argument for how to approach the policy recommendations after learning that OpenAI asked the Trump administration to consider the training of their models on copyrighted data as fair use from an AI discussion at the Tanger Hillel building, connecting it to the executive orders passed by the Trump administration in 2020 and how their goals contradict how human originators feel that GenAI affects them. As such, I honed in on the current state of the US’ AI policies and used the EU’s AI Act as a hypothetical framework that could be amended to address and resolve the harm that GenAI does to artists. I also updated my timelog and created my presentation slides for the upcoming deliverable. In the upcoming week, I need to meet with my supervisor to update her on my progress, start learning Overleaf to get started with writing and discuss how we’re going to analyze AI-generated content for this research. Given the literature that I’ve read so far, it is probably going to involve comparing AI-generated images with comparable human-drawn images and/or human-taken photographs and possibly the use of haveibeentrained.com to visually detect how the training of the AI models of the copyrighted data is reflected in the output and what art styles it seems to be trained on the most (depending on the platform). While I don’t feel comfortable generating images with AI myself, I’ve encountered images (fanart of video game characters to be specific) that I didn’t realize were AI until I took a closer look at the image’s details or used a GenAI checker after noticing something about the image that was off, so those could be good to start.