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In May, the BCS held their annual summit in Brussels, under the title “singularity-copyright: where are we?”. The BCS has a long-standing history of promoting and defending the interests of computer professionals and has been a valuable forum for discussing the implications of advances in technology for copyright law. This year’s summit was no exception, with a focus on the challenges posed to copyright law by artificial intelligence (AI).

The discussion was divided into two panels. The first panel debated the impact of AI on copyright issues, focusing on possible regimes and criteria for protection. The second panel included presentations on other issues, such as new rights, digital rights management (DRM), and personal data law.

The initial panel was chaired by Professor MarieChristine Janssens, while the second panel was divided into two sub-discussions: one on the impact of AI on copyright issues, and another on the challenges posed to copyright law by artificial intelligence. The session ended beautifully, with Professor Bently observing that “one comparison is not enough; a fresh approach is needed and some new legal protection for AI architecture as a new way to look at the AI systems,” while still finding a need for further research and regulation.

Three questions were taken up by Professor MarieChristine Janssens and Tatiana Synodinou, who focused their presentations on the topic of criteria for protection.

Professor Bently was of the view that the UK regime is not a useful model for the protection of AI generated works. The BCS is concerned that there is a need to establish a framework that will ensure that AI generated works are protected, and that such protection should be effective and proportionate to the level of creativity involved. The UK regime is seen as too lenient, as it allows for the exploitation of AI generated works without any form of protection or remuneration.

Professor Janssens argued that the European Commission’s 2018 proposal for the protection of AI generated works was a step in the right direction, but that there is still a need for more research and regulation. She pointed out that the current legal framework for copyright protection is too broad, and that AI generated works should be treated as a separate category.

Professor Hilty discussed the issue of moral rights in the context of AI generated works. She argued that the current legal framework for copyright protection does not adequately address the issue of moral rights, as the AI system is not capable of exercising such rights. The proposition of a new legal regime was seen as necessary, but that it should be based on the principles of respect for the human author and the protection of the original work.

Professor T. was of the view that the regime allowing for the protection of AI generated works should be based on the principles of respect for the human author and the protection of the original work. She argued that the current legal framework for copyright protection does not adequately address the issue of moral rights, as the AI system is not capable of exercising such rights. The proposition of a new legal regime was seen as necessary, but that it should be based on the principles of respect for the human author and the protection of the original work.

In conclusion, it was argued that the current legal framework for copyright protection does not adequately address the issue of moral rights, as the AI system is not capable of exercising such rights. The proposition of a new legal regime was seen as necessary, but that it should be based on the principles of respect for the human author and the protection of the original work.

The second panel of the afternoon discussed other issues related to AI generated works, namely DRM and software. The second panel was chaired by Professor Rognstad, who highlighted the importance of DRM in the context of AI generated works. He pointed out that DRM is essential for controlling the use and exploitation of AI generated works, and that it should be treated as a separate category.

In summary, the BCS summit was a valuable forum for discussing the implications of advances in technology for copyright law. The panel discussions were well-structured, and the presentations were informative. The summit ended beautifully, with Professor Bently observing that “one comparison is not enough; a fresh approach is needed and some new legal protection for AI architecture as a new way to look at the AI systems,” while still finding a need for further research and regulation.