

AI Royalties

An IP Framework to Compensate Artists & IP Holders for AI-Generated Content

Pablo Ducru {p_ducru@mit.edu}^{1,2,3} Jonathan Raiman⁴ Ronaldo Lemos^{2,7} Clay Garner^{3,9}
George He⁵ Hanna Balcha⁶ Gabriel Souto^{3,8} Sérgio Branco⁷ Celina Bottino⁷

¹Massachusetts Institute of Technology, US ²École Polytechnique, France ³Schwarzman Scholars, Tsinghua University, China
⁴Université Paris-Saclay, France ⁵Harvard Law School, US ⁶NYU School of Law, US ⁷Instituto de Tecnologia e Sociedade (ITS), Brazil ⁸Laboratório de Políticas Públicas e Internet (LAPIN), Brazil ⁹Stanford University, US

Abstract

This article investigates how AI-generated content can disrupt central revenue streams of the creative industries, in particular the collection of dividends from intellectual property (IP) rights. It reviews the IP and copyright questions related to the input and output of generative AI systems. A systematic method is proposed to assess whether AI-generated outputs, especially images, infringe previous copyrights, using a CLIP metric between images against historical copyright rulings. An examination (economic and technical feasibility) of previously proposed compensation frameworks reveals their financial implications for creatives and IP holders. Lastly, we propose a novel IP framework for compensation of artists and IP holders based on their published “licensed AIs” as a new medium and asset from which to collect AI royalties.

1 Introduction & Background

This decade has seen spectacular advances in generative artificial intelligence (AI) models – notably generative adversarial networks (GANs)(2020), VQVAE (2021) and probabilistic diffusion models (DMs)(2015, 2022) – ushering in a new area of high quality multimedia AI content generation, starting with image [DALL-E 2 (Ramesh et al. 2022), Imagen (Saharia et al. 2022), Parti (Yu et al. 2022), Stable Diffusion (Rombach et al. 2022a), eDiff-I (Balaji et al. 2022), (Ho, Jain, and Abbeel 2020; Karras et al. 2018; Rombach et al. 2022b; Dhariwal and Nichol 2021; Saharia et al. 2021)], and now pushing the frontier in AI video and sound generation [Imagen Video (Ho et al. 2022), Phenaki (Villegas et al. 2022), Make-a-video (Singer et al. 2022b), (Dhariwal et al. 2020; Singer et al. 2022a)].

Increasing public access to these technologies has led to a boom in AI-generated content (Rombach, Blattmann, and Ommer 2022), provoking a global debate around the legality of AI-generated content, the future of intellectual property rights (IPR), and potential disruption of the creative industries (Burk 2020; Levin and Downes 2023; Compton and Mateas 2015; Gordon et al. 2022; Shan et al. 2023; Lemley and Casey 2020; Levendowski 2018; Grimmelmann 2015; Sobel 2017; Franceschelli and Musolesi 2022; Eshraghian 2020; Guadamuz 2017; Baio 2022; Fjeld and Kortz 2017; Margoni and Kretschmer 2022; Fjeld and Kortz 2020a,b;

Submitted for review to the Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org).

Somepalli et al. 2022; Heikkilä 2022; Hetrick 2022; Hertzmann 2018; Henderson et al. 2023; Huang and Siddharth 2023; Elish 2019; Epstein et al. 2020; Watson 2019; Reeves and Nass 1996; Ramalho 2017).

At the heart of concerns about IPR, legality, and AI-generated content lies the question of compensating creatives and IP-holders for their work.

Any such successful compensation framework will be based on contractual agreements, underpinned by some enforceable IP rights. Importantly, IPRs grant the power to exclude others from infringing on the IPR. This exclusivity (often limited in time) is at the heart of IP law and enables artists, creatives, and IP-holders to enforce and collect dividends from the revenues generated by their IPRs. These revenues are then contractually split amongst different stakeholders by a series of licensing frameworks.

As of now, limited frameworks have been proposed to compensate IP-holders in a future where content is AI-generated – most are based on paying to access the data necessary to train AI systems, and none have found widespread adoption from the creative industries (Grimes 2023; Gapper 2023; O’Keefe et al. 2020).

In this article, we focus on the key question of how to compensate creatives and IP-holders in a world of AI-generated content.

We first review the IP legal questions around input (training) and output (inference) of generative AI systems – focusing on whether creatives and IP-holders can claim compensation for copyright infringement under US law. This prompts us to propose, focusing on the case of image generation, a systemic method to evaluate whether or not an AI-generated output violates previous copyright – and assess the performance of this metric (CLIP) on a series of copyright rulings.

Subsequently, we document previously proposed compensation frameworks, and estimate their monetary outcomes for artists and IP holders.

Finally, we propose a new IP framework based on officially “licensed AIs”, viewed as a new format (and medium) for artistic creative expression, and a new asset from which creatives and IP-holders can collect AI royalties. We discuss the grounds (contractual and rights) for enforcing this new IP framework (extending copyright, trademark, and rights of publicity, to AI models).

2 IP Problems of Generative AI: Training and Outputs

U.S. law recognizes several classes of IPR that protect creative expression. These include:

- *Copyright*: Protects original works of authorship, including literary, dramatic, musical, and artistic works (U.S. Copyright Office 2022b).
- *Trademark*: Protects brand names, logos, and other identifiers of source (U. S. Patent and Trademark Office 2013).
- *Rights of Publicity*: Protects an individual’s right to exercise control over the commercial exploitation of their name, image, likeness, or other distinctive personal characteristics (persona) (Nimmer 1954). These rights prevent unauthorized use of an individual’s identity for commercial purposes without obtaining their explicit consent. Unlike the Copyright and Trademark, there is no federal law that explicitly safeguards an individual’s right of publicity. Instead, the protection of this right is granted and regulated primarily by state laws through common law, statute, or both (California Civil Code § 3344(a) 1971; Civil Rights (CVR) Chapter 6, Article 5 - § 50-f. Right of publicity 2020).

In the U.S., several tort claims arise from violations of copyright, trademark, and rights of publicity. These include: *Infringement*: This pertains to unauthorized IP usage, governed by copyright, trademark, or rights of publicity laws (Rozansky, Antoine, and Beutler 2021; United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) 2023; Copyright Infringement and Remedies - 17 U.S.C. § 501 2012); *Dilution* (diminishing trademark (Moorhead 1995)); *False Advertising* (misleading promotion (15 U.S.C. § 1125 2021)); *Misappropriation* (unauthorized use of valuable asset such as a trade secret (Uniform Trade Secrets Act with 1985 Amendments 1985)); *Unfair Competition* (dishonest industry practice (Case Western Reserve School of Law 2023; ABA Section of Antitrust Law 2006)).

Specifically, copyright infringement is assessed based on four fair use factors. These are outlined in § 107 of Title 17, termed “Limitations on exclusive rights: Fair use” (U.S. Copyright Office 2022a):

17 U.S.C. §107: Four Factors for Copyright Fair Use

1. The purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes
2. The nature of the copyrighted work
3. The amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole
4. The effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work

Artists and the wider creative industries earn revenue through the monetization of IPR – including royalties from

copyright (creative works) and licensing related to rights of publicity and trademarks (World Intellectual Property Organization 2014; Rothman 2018). Generative AI has prompted a backlash of copyright infringement lawsuits from the creative industries, for producing art-like output and training on copyrighted material scrapped from the Internet, with neither consent nor compensation (Henderson et al. 2023; Getty Images v. Stability AI 2023; Coscarelli 2023; Andersen et al v. Stability AI 2023). Other creative industry figures have sought to proactively integrate AI into their IP strategies, creating digital replicas of celebrity likenesses and corresponding licensing schemes (Coffee 2023; Grimes 2023). Academic and industry discussion is centered on two areas: foundation model training – the “input” – and whether it constitutes fair use or copyright infringement, (Henderson et al. 2023; Epstein et al. 2023; Lemley and Casey 2021; Bonadio and McDonagh 2020; Hsu and Myers 2023; Metz 2022; Lemley and Casey 2020; Sobel 2017; Levendowski 2018; Williams 2023; Samuelson 2023), and to what extent (and under which circumstances) the outputs of AI systems can be copyrighted (Samuelson 2023). Varying regulatory perspectives have emerged on whether AI training falls under fair use (Kii 2023; Band 2023) and whether AI output is afforded intellectual property rights, including works of mixed human and AI authorship (U.S. Copyright Office 2023; Stephen Thaler v. Comptroller General of Patents Trade Marks and Designs 2021; South Africa Companies and Intellectual Property Commission).

Concerning our key question of compensation for AI-generated content, if training an AI system on data constitutes a violation of IP rights, then the IP-holders can claim compensation – this is the approach taken by the recent wave of lawsuits against the use of the LAION dataset and open image-generating AI systems (such as Microsoft & OpenAI (Metz 2022), Meta (Plaintiffs Richard Kadrey, Sarah Silverman, and Christopher Golden v. Meta Platforms, Inc. 2023), Stability.ai (Getty Images v. Stability AI 2023), Midjourney (Plaintiffs Sarah Andersen, Kelly McKernan, and Karla Ortiz v. Stability AI Ltd., Stability AI Inc., Midjourney Inc., and DeviantArt Inc. 2023)). Some proposed compensation schemes studied in section 3 rely on compensation for training, somewhat resting on the assumption that training is not fair use. New registration guidance released in March 2023 reflects the U.S. Copyright Office’s increasingly nuanced stance towards AI authorship – suggesting that there will be more paths toward extending some IPR to AI output (U.S. Copyright Office 2023).

Two key unanswered questions emerge from this discussion:

1. Does an AI-generated output infringe someone’s IPRs (in particular copyright)?
2. If the output does not infringe IPRs, what framework could compensate IP-holders for inspiring AI-generated content, and on what grounds could it be enforced? (we propose AI publishers and AI royalties in section ??).

We propose a systematic AI method to evaluate whether an AI-generated output infringes previous IP rights, and assess its performance on a series of rulings.

For standardization, we focus on image copyright infringement, using an approach that is readily extendable (with corresponding metrics) to other forms of IPRs (trademark, image, name, likeness, etc.) and creative expression protected by copyright (sound, video, 3D graphics and games, text, etc.). Of the four factors considered when ruling for copyright infringement 2, we focus on a metric for sufficient transformation the image itself (factor 3). For a broader analysis encompassing all four factors, this metric could be combined in a multi-modal AI system incorporating predictive treatments of court rulings, such as previous specifically developed LLMs (Li and Zhang 2021).


Copyright infringement metric

Metrics to measure whether or not a new image constitutes sufficient transformation for fair use or violates previous copyrights must:

- Identify identical images beyond formats, aspect ratios, or indistinguishable pixel alterations
- Identify transformations of the same image
- Identify different images referencing identical objects or subjects
- Integrate the subjective elements of precedent jury’s decisions and court rulings

Since these combine technical and subjective social aspects, such metric should extend beyond mere visual image analysis. We propose to use a recent AI metric that combines pixel processing of images with contextual language, called CLIP. CLIP models (Radford et al. 2021) were made freely available by research organizations such as OpenAI, Hugging Face, Stability.AI, etc. The family of CLIP image understanding models is trained to recognize the similarity between an image and a caption. They thus combine elements of visual and language intelligence of images that could be repurposed to assess the level of transformation an original image has undergone, and interpret it in light of precedent copyright rulings.

Dataset of U.S. Copyright Images Rulings: We constituted a dataset of 10 copyright fair use rulings (accessible here ^{a)}), totaling 20 pairs of contested works, opposing 14 original works to derivative ones, where the ruling was primarily decided along the criteria of sufficient transformation for fair use or not (factor #3 – “the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole.”). There is no straightforward way to do this: there are relatively few cases limited to factor #3 and visual image; and some of the cases (such as Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts, Inc. v. Goldsmith) were also ruled with other factors contributing significantly. It is likely many cases were settled out of court or not contested, and these cases are not represented in the dataset.



(a) Kienitz v. Scoonie Nation: fair use, CLIP metric = 0.479



(b) Cariou v. Prince: probably not fair use, CLIP metric = 0.776



(c) Dr. Seuss v. ComicMix: not fair use (copyright infringement), CLIP metric = 0.723



(d) Warhol foundation v. Goldsmith: not fair use (copyright infringement), CLIP metric = 0.852

Figure 1: Copyright cases and CLIP-based metric




Figure 2: CLIP Metric and Copyright Infringement

Table 1: CLIP distance between contested cases

CLIP Distance	Mean	Standard Deviation
· Fair Use	0.604	± 0.093
· Not Fair Use	0.764	± 0.123

Analysis: We measured the CLIP distance for every pair, documenting the results in figure 2 and table 1. In figure 2, the CLIP distance between images ruled as fair use is documented in green, that between those ruled not fair use (copyright infringements) in red, those in blue were deemed probably not fair use, while the CLIP distance between all other pairs is documented in grey.

Though we are in a heavily undersampled regime with low statistical power (only 20 pairs of copyright infringement image cases) we can observe a distinction between uncontested images, and contested ones, with the average CLIP distance between uncontested image pairs around 0.5, while that for those contested around 0.69. Moreover, for contested images, CLIP seems to be able to discern between those ruled fair use (mean of 0.6), and those infringing copyright (mean of 0.76), with a resolution beyond the first standard deviation. Examples of contested image pairs are documented in figure 1, along with their respective CLIP distance. Though more cases would be necessary to improve the statistical power and resolution, this approach shows promise towards building an AI system to detect copyright infringement. Note that starting from a CLIP based metric with the thresholds proposed in table 2, additional training on an embedding specialized on copyright cases is likely to produce a metric with a more statistical resolution power.

^a<https://github.com/Pablo-Ducru/ai-royalties>

Table 2: CLIP-Based Thresholds for Copyright & Fair Use

If Contested	CLIP Distance
Copyright safe	$CLIP \leq 0.6$
Likely fair use	$0.6 < CLIP \leq 0.7$
Likely copyright infringement	$0.7 < CLIP$

3 Previously Proposed Compensation Frameworks

As of now, three main frameworks have been proposed to compensate IP-holders for AI-generated content:

1. Universal income from Windfall AI profits (section 3.1).
2. Pay to train, proportionally to contribution to training dataset (section 3.2).
3. Pay to train & inspire, proportionally to “what input training data inspired this output?” (section 3.3).

The latter two implicitly rest on assuming training is not fair use, and the last one seeks to make a direct connection between inputs and outputs of an AI system (at inference). We assess compensation for these frameworks across examples from three categories of artists, looking at relative output volume and fame: the median Shutterstock stock photo contributor (2,000 low-fame images) (Kneschke 2023), the emerging artist Sam Yang (500 medium-fame images), and the renowned artist Claude Monet (2,000 high-fame images).

3.1 No Direct Compensation – Windfall Clause

No shared ownership is a scenario where both training is fair use (does not infringe IPRs), and the outputs of generative AI systems cannot be legally owned through copyright or another IPR mechanism. In this case, creatives and IP-holders cannot be compensated for contributing to the training of an AI system, nor can they own the AI outputs. If AI-generated content ends up being very valuable, the artists are simply displaced. If artists and IP holders are not compensated for inspiring, contributing to directly, or prompting AI art, this raises serious ethical, moral, and financial concerns about the viability of creative work (Epstein et al. 2023).

Anticipating a world where AI-caused displacement negatively impacts labor participation, a proposal has emerged for a “windfall clause” as an “*ex ante* commitment by AI firms to donate a significant amount of any eventual extremely large profit” (O’Keefe et al. 2020). The authors propose that this commitment scales “based on signatory’s profits as [a] portion of gross world product” – for example, with a marginal clause obligation (portion of marginal profits) of 1% to be donated for profits 0.1%-1% of gross world product (O’Keefe et al. 2020). We here estimate the compensation this Windfall Clause would yield for displaced artists.

Windfall Clause, Adapted for US:

The proposed windfall clause could offer an “unemployability insurance” to someone who loses their job due to AI. (O’Keefe et al. 2020).

In 2030, assume the U.S. workforce is 165.4 million (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) 2021), 30% of US labor automated (Ellingrud et al. 2023) and AI developers’ profits equal 0.5% of US GDP (\$35 trillion).

Compensation: With AI profits at \$175 billion, a 1% Windfall Clause would generate \$1.75 billion for the estimated 50 million displaced workers (30% automation), amounting to \$35 per year per displaced worker. Profits of 5% of GDP would lead to a 20% clause, yielding \$700 per year per displaced worker.

3.2 Compensate to train - Pay IP holders for contribution to training datasets

Pay-to-train is a proposed compensation scheme consisting of paying IP holders for the use of their IP in training datasets of generative AI models (Gordon-Levitt 2023; Miller 2023; Murphy 2023). Compensation for and – by extension – consent to train are at the core of the lawsuits brought against AI developers, including Microsoft & OpenAI (Metz 2022), Meta (Plaintiffs Richard Kadrey, Sarah Silverman, and Christopher Golden v. Meta Platforms, Inc. 2023), Stability.ai (Getty Images v. Stability AI 2023), Midjourney (Plaintiffs Sarah Andersen, Kelly McKernan, and Karla Ortiz v. Stability AI Ltd., Stability AI Inc., Midjourney Inc., and DeviantArt Inc. 2023), etc. Regardless of whether or not training is considered fair use (Henderson et al. 2023), current pay-to-train compensations are based on contributions as a percentage of the total dataset – often hundreds of millions of unique works.

Compensate to Train (Shutterstock’s AI Data Contributor Fund): Shutterstock constituted a large training dataset (734 million images by Q3 2023), licensing it to earn revenues, and contributors earn a share of this revenue on a pro-rata basis of their content volume in the dataset (Licensing and the Contributor Fund 2023).

Contributors to Shutterstock’s AI models will get a share of the contract value based on the amount of their content in the licensed datasets (Licensing and the Contributor Fund 2023).

Compensation: A recent survey of revenue to contributors from AI generated content (Kneschke 2023) found the average contributor has 6,343 images, with a median of 2,112 images, and esti-

mated a total payout to contributors of \$4.4 million in the first 6 months. Assuming Shutterstock’s first 6 months revenue is \$430M, this means about 1% of total revenues went to the contributor fund. This yielded average revenues per image of \$0.008, and (median of \$0.007), and corresponding 6-month payout averages of \$46 (\$92/yr), with a median of \$18.5 (\$37 /yr) per contributor – for a total dataset with 615 million images (Kneschke 2023). In comparison, traditional compensation for contributors to stock imaging have averaged \$0.24 per image over a year (though royalty-free sales can generate as much as \$100 (Broz 2023)). This means a median contributor with 2,112 images can expect \$507/yr (and the average one with 6,343 some \$1,522/yr).

Let d_c be the percentage of total revenues for AI-generated outputs that are distributed to the contributors of the AI dataset. Without knowing the fraction of total revenues that was generated by AI contracts, we cannot provide a clear estimate of d_c for today’s Shutterstock Contributor Fund. However, we could consider $d_c = 55%$, since YouTube and Instagram share 55% of ad revenue with creators, which has been described as “industry standard” (Dayal 2022). If we assume that, by the end of 2024, 90% of Shutterstock images will be AI-generated, and that the total revenue is \$1 billion/yr, with the dataset size growing to 1 billion images. A median contributor with 2,112 images in this scenario would generate \$1,045/yr (and the average revenues from 6,343 contributions would yield \$3,140/yr).

One should consider the different dynamics at play between stock media (often priced in volume) and famous artwork (often priced on celebrity). For instance, considering Monet and Van Gogh, who each produced around 2,000 works in their lifetimes, a contributor fund model based on pro-rata contributions to the above dataset (by volume) would yield \$990/yr for each artist. Moreover, a different industry standard for AI revenue splitting may emerge than that of the ads model – especially if IPR are not infringed or if enforcement is intractable. If, for example, our simulation were $d_c = 10%$ distributed instead of $d_c = 55%$, Monet would make \$180/yr.

3.3 Compensate to train & inspire – Trace back to the data that inspired the output

Pay to train & inspire is a compensation scheme proposed as a potential solution to the volume (stock media) versus value/recognition (say Van Gogh or Monet) problem of a flat pro-rata pay-to-train scheme (note that both rest on training not being fair use). Some creatives and IP-holders have expressed the wish to be compensated proportionately to how much the content they contributed to the training dataset is “being consumed” by the AI model and its users, that is according to “how much was this output influenced by my data”. Conceptually this would mean calculating an “influ-

ence function” for each training datapoint, given an output and prompt. Philosophically it is akin to asking someone to trace back, from everything they have learned, how much each thing influenced what they just wrote.

Let $X = \{x_i\}$ be a training dataset on which generative AI model g_X is trained. The model is prompted with inputs and conditions c , yielding output $y = g_X(c)$. Consider one could build an “influence function”, $f(x; y, c) \in [0, 1]$ which estimates the percentage to which each datapoint x_i contributed to generating output y , such that:

$$\sum_{x_i \in X} f(x_i; y, c) = 1 \quad (1)$$

Tracing back what training data influenced the AI-generated output

A first way to compute influence functions from training data was introduced in (Koh and Liang 2017). In theory, one could compute these and normalize them to calculate $f(x; y, c)$ that satisfy (1). However, this is intractable in practice because the influence functions need to be computed for every training point (with respect to an output), including a Hessian of the size of the parameter space. Though various methods have made this computation more efficient (Koh and Liang 2017), their computational complexity is still prohibitive for large AI systems with tens of billions of parameters, trained on billions of datapoints.

Since, discussions about traceability, explainability, and fair-use of training, have proposed various methods to trace back the data that influenced a given output (Henderson et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2023; Somepalli et al. 2022; Koh and Liang 2017). In particular, a recent one based on model and instance attribution (Wang et al. 2023) is promising for the creative industries. It proposes to create various fine-tuned models (from a foundation base), which can be attributed to a given dataset (say specific to an artist or IP-holder) – each for a specific concept (object, likeness, style). For a given output, the method performs model attribution – which models generated this output? – and within the model, extracts soft influence scores to determine which images influenced the output (Wang et al. 2023).

Though promising, these methods remain costly and more work is needed before industry adoption. For instance, they only consider the training data. Yet the prompt and constraints c (specially if an image) are also instrumental to the output — how to account for these? Parsing out the influence of training, fine-tuning, and prompting (in particular augmented retrieval), is an open problem which is likely to only have somewhat subjective answers (highly dependent on modelization and implementation).

Compensate to train & inspire

In pay-to-train-&-influence on dataset X , a contributor A of data $X_A \in X$ would be compensated for output y according to $\sum_{x_i \in X_A} f(x_i; y, c)$. In a revenue-share scheme where output y generates revenues $r(y)$, the compensation C_A to IP-holder A for all outputs Y generated over a given time period would be proportional to:

$$C_A \propto \sum_{y \in Y} r(y) \sum_{x_i \in X_A} f(x_i; y, c) \quad (2)$$

In practice, estimating such influence functions $f(x_i; y, c)$ is both technically challenging (as reviewed), and may not really solve the compensation problem:

- First, it does not necessarily solve the compensation problem, because it is possible to train an AI model without using any data of a given artist, and still produce outputs so close to the artists work as to infringe their IP.

No need to train on your data to reproduce you

A generative AI model does not need to train on an artist’s works to produce an output that closely mimics their style, or infringe on their IP. For instance, one could train an AI model that produces highly similar works to Andy Warhol (to the point of possible infringement) – without that model ever “seeing” any Andy Warhol works in the training dataset. Under the “pay-to-train-&-inspire” logic, the inspiring artist would not get compensated. Such reproduction or inspiration without using the subject in the training data has long existed, for instance with likeness and eigenfaces (Turk and Pentland 1991), and is the subject of recent developments such as “Celeb Basis”. (Yuan et al. 2023).

- Second, as AI-generated data (influenced by training data) is used to train new models (and therefore influence new AI-generated outputs), it opens a somewhat intractable problem of recursive fractionalization.
- Third, it does not solve the ownership problem – specially if training is fair use. Even if clear attribution were drawn to original IP, it would not yield ownership rights to the outputs. For instance, style is not protected – a work can be “heavily inspired by Andy Warhol” and, with sufficient transformation, not infringe. As such, a contractual pay-to-train-&-influence compensation would be a departure from current creative industry practices.

4 AI Royalties – Artists partner with AI companies and share revenues

We hereby propose a partnership framework to compensate creatives and IP-holders for AI-generated content based on the market usage and value of their AIs, rather than the volume they contributed (c.f. sections 3.2 & 3.3).

Table 3: Compensation schemes comparison

	No contributor person	Stock media (median) contributor	Artist (median) Greg Rutkowski	Artist (famous) Claude Monet
Volume of works	0	2000	200	2000
Windfall	\$35/yr	\$35/yr	\$35/yr	\$35/yr
Compensate-to-train	0	\$1,000/yr	\$100/yr	\$1,000/yr
AI royalties (fame) (Monet 1000x Rutkowski)	0	\$500/yr	\$550/yr	\$50,500/yr
AI royalties (fame) (Rutkowski 1000x Monet)	0	\$500/yr	\$50,500/yr	\$550/yr

4.1 Contractual compensation: AI royalties

We propose a collaborative arrangement that would treat holders of IPR as partners in the success of an AI model that would be built by an AI company in collaboration with the IP partner, and specifically dedicated to the named rightsholder’s IP. There is no need to revolutionize the existing legal framework for this to work. The IP partner and the AI company would enter into a contractual arrangement that accepts a priori the existing IPR of the rightsholder under the current legal framework with respect to outputs of the AI system. This proposal would recognize the exclusive rights of an IPR holder to the commercial exploitation of outputs that are substantially similar under copyright, derivative works under copyright, confusingly similar trademark uses or are readily identifiable uses of the holder’s rights of publicity. As a partner, the named rightsholder would then participate in all of the revenues generated by the dedicated AI model. The rightsholder would grant the AI company the right under their IPR to use the AI system to create outputs. In exchange, as a commercial partner, the rightsholder would receive a share of all of the revenue generated by the dedicated AI system. Because the rightsholder will participate in all of the revenue generated by the dedicated AI system without regard to whether the revenue is derived from outputs that would otherwise infringe the rightsholder’s IPR, there is no need to make fine legal distinctions with the named rightsholder partner on an output-by-output basis. As a partner, the rightsholder could participate also in establishing acceptable use and editorial guidelines with respect to the output, thereby allowing the rightsholder to oversee and protect enduring brand and name value. The foregoing collaborative partnership reduces many points of potential friction by aligning the interests of the parties.

To illustrate this framework, we compare the results from the compensate-to-train model discussed above, to this IP rightsholder partnership with an AI company to build and commercialize their AI. We consider that overall, 50% of revenues will go to stock media having trained the base models, and 50% will go to AI models dedicated to specific rightsholders’ IP, taking the example of two artists, Claude Monet, who produced about 2,000 painting throughout his life, and Greg Rutkowski, who has produced about 200 to date. Claude Monet being one of the most famous impressionist painters, and given the power-law distributions of fame (Simkin and Roychowdhury 2013; Ramirez

and Hagen 2018; Prinz 2022; Gustar 2019, 2020; Etro and Stepanova 2018; Visser 2013) we can a priori estimate that 1000 times more people know of Monet than Rutkowski. We compare in table 3 the compensation the different schemes could amount to, in orders of magnitude. The case of Greg Rutkowski is particularly interesting here because this artist became very popular in prompting for AI-generated imaged (Heikkilä; Lanz 2023). This means that with the type of scheme that we propose, where a specific Rutkowski AI model could be attributable and licensed, Rutkowski could have collected significant revenues from the heavy usage people did of this AI style (as we suggest with the last row of table 3).

4.2 Enforcement and defensibility

This framework could be enforced on two grounds:

Legal & contractual: Legally, copyright, trademark, and rights of publicity would underpin the partnership. Contractually, licensing rights and terms of service could restrict usage (e.g. personal or commercial use). Misappropriation or other torts could also be claimed for undermining the livelihood of an artist because a “non-licensed AI” is provoking a loss of revenue in a newly established AI market. This could make paying AI royalties to artists and IP-holders a *de facto* industry *modus operandis*.

Technology: AI-generated content IDs with tracking systems, as well as automatic contracts could help enforcement – e.g. takedowns from automatic identification of copyright infringement (YouTube), or content moderation on social platforms. Also, it may be impossible to technologically suppress online piracy, but convenient technology can funnel the vast majority of users to a legal paid service – c.f. streaming content platforms (Spotify, Netflix, Disney+, etc.).

4.3 Forward Looking Agenda

In examining the future of AI-generated content, we should recall the primary objective of intellectual property (IP) protection: to support and incentivize human creativity by offering financial benefits to creators. As AI starts to create content of its own, it will be necessary to determine clear authorship rights and adapt IP frameworks that emphasize human contribution. Additionally, we should consider the potential for value dilution from AI-generated content and find solutions that address this issue without hindering creative reinterpretation.

References

- 15 U.S.C. § 1125. 2021. 15 USC 1125: False designations of origin, false descriptions, and dilution forbidden. U.S. Code. Subchapter III - General Provisions.
- ABA Section of Antitrust Law. 2006. *Business Torts and Unfair Competition Handbook*. American Bar Association. Federal Law of Unfair Competition.
- Andersen et al v. Stability AI. 2023. Andersen et al v. Stability AI Ltd. et al, Docket No. 3:23-cv-00201. N.D. Cal.
- Baio, A. 2022. Invasive Diffusion: How one unwilling illustrator found herself turned into an AI model. *Waxy.org*.
- Balaji, Y.; Nah, S.; Huang, X.; Vahdat, A.; Song, J.; Kreis, K.; Aittala, M.; Aila, T.; Laine, S.; Catanzaro, B.; et al. 2022. eDiffi: Text-to-Image Diffusion Models with an Ensemble of Expert Denoisers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01324*.
- Band, J. 2023. Israel Ministry of Justice Issues Opinion Supporting the Use of Copyrighted Works for Machine Learning. <https://www.project-disco.org/intellectual-property/011823-israel-ministry-of-justice-issues-opinion-supporting-the-use-of-copyrighted-works-for-machine-learning/>.
- Bonadio, E.; and McDonagh, L. 2020. Artificial intelligence as producer and consumer of copyright works: Evaluating the consequences of algorithmic creativity. *Intellectual Property Quarterly*, 2: 112–137.
- Broz, M. 2023. How Much Can You Make Selling Stock Photos? (2023 Data). Accessed on 2023-08-15.
- Burk, D. L. 2020. Thirty-Six Views of Copyright Authorship, By Jackson Pollock. *Houston Law Review*, 58. UC Irvine School of Law Research Paper No. 2020-40.
- California Civil Code § 3344(a). 1971. California Civil Code § 3344(a) - Use of another's name, voice, signature, photograph, or likeness in advertising or soliciting without prior consent.
- Case Western Reserve School of Law. 2023. Intellectual Property Law. This guide covers basic resources for researching intellectual property (IP) law: copyright, patents, trademarks, and more.
- Civil Rights (CVR) Chapter 6, Article 5 - § 50-f. Right of publicity. 2020. Civil Rights (CVR) Chapter 6, Article 5 - § 50-f. Right of publicity. (New York State Legislature).
- Coffee, P. 2023. Celebrities Use AI to Take Control of Their Own Images. *The Wall Street Journal*. Using AI-generated duplicates, brands also benefit, using stars in ways they never could before.
- Compton, K.; and Mateas, M. 2015. Casual Creators. In *International Conference on Computational Creativity*, 228–235.
- Copyright Infringement and Remedies - 17 U.S.C. § 501. 2012. Chapter 5: Copyright Infringement and Remedies.
- Coscarelli, J. 2023. An A.I. Hit of Fake 'Drake' and 'The Weeknd' Rattles the Music World. *The New York Times*, sec. Arts.
- Dayal, M. 2022. YouTube Increases Pressure on Instagram, TikTok to Share Ad Revenue. 4:14 PM PDT. Photo: Chart by Shane Burke.
- Dhariwal, P.; Jun, H.; Payne, C.; Kim, J. W.; Radford, A.; and Sutskever, I. 2020. Jukebox: A Generative Model for Music. ArXiv:2005.00341 [cs, eess, stat].
- Dhariwal, P.; and Nichol, A. 2021. Diffusion Models Beat GANs on Image Synthesis. arXiv:2105.05233.
- Elish, M. C. 2019. Moral crumple zones: Cautionary tales in human-robot interaction (pre-print). *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society (pre-print)*.
- Ellingrud, K.; Sanghvi, S.; Dandona, G. S.; Madgavkar, A.; Chui, M.; White, O.; and Hasebe, P. 2023. Generative AI and the future of work in America. Report, McKinsey Global Institute.
- Epstein, Z.; Hertzmann, A.; Herman, L.; Mahari, R.; Frank, M. R.; Groh, M.; Schroeder, H.; et al. 2023. Art and the Science of Generative AI: A Deeper Dive. arXiv:2306.04141.
- Epstein, Z.; Levine, S.; Rand, D. G.; and Rahwan, I. 2020. Who gets credit for ai-generated art? *Iscience*, 23(9): 101515.
- Eshraghian, J. K. 2020. Human ownership of artificial creativity. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2(3): 157–160.
- Etro, F.; and Stepanova, E. 2018. Power-laws in art. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 506: 217–220.
- Fjeld, J.; and Kortz, M. 2017. A legal anatomy of AI-generated art: Part I. *Harvard Journal of Law and Technology*.
- Fjeld, J.; and Kortz, M. 2020a. Re: USPTO Request for Comments on Intellectual Property Protection for Artificial Intelligence Innovation.
- Fjeld, J.; and Kortz, M. 2020b. Re: WIPO Conversation on Intellectual Property (IP) and Artificial Intelligence (AI) .
- Franceschelli, G.; and Musolesi, M. 2022. Copyright in generative deep learning. *Data & Policy*, 4.
- Gapper, J. 2023. Generative AI Should Pay Human Artists for Training. *Financial Times*. Accessed: 2023-01-27.
- Getty Images v. Stability AI. 2023. In the United States District Court for the District of Delaware. Case No. 1:23-cv-00135-UNA, Document 1, Filed 02/03/23.
- Gordon, S.; Mahari, R.; Mishra, M.; and Epstein, Z. 2022. Co-creation and ownership for AI radio. In *International Conference on Computational Creativity*.
- Gordon-Levitt, J. 2023. If artificial intelligence uses your work, it should pay you. *The Washington Post*.
- Grimes. 2023. Grimes tweet on AI 50/50 royalty sharing.
- Grimmelmann, J. 2015. Copyright for literate robots. *Iowa Law Review*, 101: 657.
- Guadamuz, A. 2017. Do androids dream of electric copyright? Comparative analysis of originality in artificial intelligence generated works. *Intellectual Property Quarterly*.
- Gustar, A. 2019. Fame, Obscurity and Power Laws in Music History. *Empirical Musicology Review*, 14(3-4): 186–215. Number: 3-4.
- Gustar, A. 2020. The laws of musical fame and obscurity. *Significance*, 17(5): 14–17. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/1740-9713.01443>.

- Heikkilä, M. ??? This artist is dominating AI-generated art. And he's not happy about it. *MIT Technology Review*.
- Heikkilä, M. 2022. Artists can now opt out of the next version of Stable Diffusion. *MIT Technology Review*.
- Henderson, P.; Li, X.; Jurafsky, D.; Hashimoto, T.; Lemley, M. A.; and Liang, P. 2023. Foundation Models and Fair Use. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.15715*.
- Hertzmann, A. 2018. Can computers create art? In *Arts*, volume 7, 18. MDPI.
- Hetrick, C. 2022. Art Created By Artificial Intelligence Can't Be Copyrighted, US Agency Rules. *dotLA*.
- Ho, J.; Chan, W.; Saharia, C.; Whang, J.; Gao, R.; Gritsenko, A.; Kingma, D. P.; Poole, B.; Norouzi, M.; Fleet, D. J.; et al. 2022. Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02303*.
- Ho, J.; Jain, A.; and Abbeel, P. 2020. Denoising Diffusion Probabilistic Models. In Larochelle, H.; Ranzato, M.; Hadsell, R.; Balcan, M. F.; and Lin, H., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, 6840–6851. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Hsu, T.; and Myers, S. L. 2023. Can We No Longer Believe Anything We See? *The New York Times*.
- Huang, S.; and Siddarth, D. 2023. Generative AI and the digital commons. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11074*.
- Karras, T.; Aila, T.; Laine, S.; and Lehtinen, J. 2018. Progressive Growing of GANs for Improved Quality, Stability, and Variation. *arXiv:1710.10196*.
- Kii, T. 2023. Reflecting on the questions at the subcommittee of the Board of Audit and Administrative Oversight Committee. In this article, Kii Takashi discusses his experiences and reflections on questioning during a subcommittee meeting of the Board of Audit and Administrative Oversight Committee. He focuses on issues such as the work style reform for educators and the use of generative AI in education.
- Kneschke, R. 2023. Analyse: Wie viel zahlt Shutterstock für KI-Trainingsdaten an Anbieter? Bildagenturen, Künstliche Intelligenz, Statistik.
- Koh, P. W.; and Liang, P. 2017. Understanding black-box predictions via influence functions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 1885–1894. PMLR.
- Lanz, J. A. 2023. Greg Rutkowski Was Removed From Stable Diffusion, But AI Artists Brought Him Back. *Decrypt*. Section: News.
- Lemley, M. A.; and Casey, B. 2020. Fair learning. *Texas Law Review*, 99: 743.
- Lemley, M. A.; and Casey, B. 2021. Fair Learning. <https://texaslawreview.org/fair-learning/>.
- Levendowski, A. 2018. How copyright law can fix artificial intelligence's implicit bias problem. *Washington Law Review*, 93: 579.
- Levin, B.; and Downes, L. 2023. Who Is Going to Regulate AI? *Harvard Business Review*.
- Li, Q.; and Zhang, Q. 2021. Court Opinion Generation from Case Fact Description with Legal Basis. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(17): 14840–14848. Number: 17.
- Licensing, S. D.; and the Contributor Fund. 2023. Shutterstock Data Licensing and the Contributor Fund. Accessed on: July 27, 2023.
- Margoni, T.; and Kretschmer, M. 2022. A deeper look into the EU text and data mining exceptions: harmonisation, data ownership, and the future of technology. *GRUR International*, 71(8): 685–701.
- Metz, C. 2022. Lawsuit Takes Aim at the Way A.I. Is Built.
- Miller, R. 2023. Adobe promises artists will be compensated fairly with new generative AI product, but is fuzzy on details. *TechCrunch*. 11:44 AM EDT.
- Moorhead, C. J. 1995. H.R.1295 - Federal Trademark Dilution Act of 1995. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/104th-congress/house-bill/1295#:~:text=Federal%20Trademark%20Dilution%20Act%20of%201995%20%2D%20Amends%20the%20Trademark%20Act,dilution%20of%20its%20distinctive%20quality>. Sponsor: Rep. Moorhead, Carlos J. [R-CA-27] (Introduced 03/22/1995). Committees: House - Judiciary. Committee Reports: H. Rept. 104-374. Latest Action: 01/16/1996 Became Public Law No: 104-98.
- Murphy, B. P. 2023. Is There a Way to Pay Content Creators Whose Work Is Used to Train AI? Yes, but It's Not Foolproof. *The Conversation*.
- Nimmer, M. B. 1954. The Right of Publicity. *Law & Contemporary Problems*, 19: 203–211.
- O'Keefe, C.; Cihon, P.; Garfinkel, B.; Flynn, C.; Leung, J.; and Dafeo, A. 2020. The Windfall Clause: Distributing the Benefits of AI for the Common Good. In *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, 327–331. New York NY USA: ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-7110-0.
- Plaintiffs Richard Kadrey, Sarah Silverman, and Christopher Golden v. Meta Platforms, Inc. 2023. *Class Action Complaint*. United States District Court for the Northern District of California.
- Plaintiffs Sarah Andersen, Kelly McKernan, and Karla Ortiz v. Stability AI Ltd., Stability AI Inc., Midjourney Inc., and DeviantArt Inc. 2023. *Class Action Complaint*. United States District Court for the Northern District of California.
- Prinz, A. L. 2022. The concentration of power in the market for contemporary art: an empirical analysis of ArtReview's "Power 100". *SN Business & Economics*, 2(1): 11.
- Radford, A.; Kim, J. W.; Hallacy, C.; Ramesh, A.; Goh, G.; Agarwal, S.; Sastry, G.; Askell, A.; Mishkin, P.; Clark, J.; et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Ramalho, A. 2017. Will Robots Rule the (Artistic) World? A Proposed Model for the Legal Status of Creations by Artificial Intelligence Systems. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2987757> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2987757>.
- Ramesh, A.; Dhariwal, P.; Nichol, A.; Chu, C.; and Chen, M. 2022. Hierarchical text-conditional image generation with clip latents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.06125*.

- Ramirez, E. D.; and Hagen, S. J. 2018. The quantitative measure and statistical distribution of fame. *PLOS ONE*, 13(7): e0200196. Publisher: Public Library of Science.
- Reeves, B.; and Nass, C. 1996. The media equation: How people treat computers, television, and new media like real people. *Cambridge, UK*, 10: 236605.
- Rombach, R.; Blattmann, A.; Lorenz, D.; Esser, P.; and Ommer, B. 2022a. High-Resolution Image Synthesis With Latent Diffusion Models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 10684–10695.
- Rombach, R.; Blattmann, A.; Lorenz, D.; Esser, P.; and Ommer, B. 2022b. High-Resolution Image Synthesis with Latent Diffusion Models. arXiv:2112.10752.
- Rombach, R.; Blattmann, A.; and Ommer, B. 2022. Text-Guided Synthesis of Artistic Images with Retrieval-Augmented Diffusion Models. arXiv:2207.13038.
- Rothman, J. E. 2018. *The Right of Publicity: Privacy Reimagined for the Public World*. Harvard University Press. Tracing the expansion of the right of publicity beyond name and likeness, pp. 88-96.
- Rozansky, D. A.; Antoine, H. A.; and Beutler, J. 2021. Protecting Image and Likeness Through Trademark Law.
- Saharia, C.; Chan, W.; Saxena, S.; Li, L.; Whang, J.; Denton, E.; Ghasemipour, S. K. S.; Ayan, B. K.; Mahdavi, S. S.; Lopes, R. G.; et al. 2022. Photorealistic Text-to-Image Diffusion Models with Deep Language Understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.11487*.
- Saharia, C.; Ho, J.; Chan, W.; Salimans, T.; Fleet, D. J.; and Norouzi, M. 2021. Image Super-Resolution via Iterative Refinement. arXiv:2104.07636.
- Samuelson, P. 2023. Generative AI meets copyright. *Science*, 381: 158–161.
- Shan, S.; Cryan, J.; Wenger, E.; Zheng, H.; Hanocka, R.; and Zhao, B. Y. 2023. Glaze: Protecting artists from style mimicry by text-to-image models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04222*.
- Simkin, M. V.; and Roychowdhury, V. P. 2013. A Mathematical Theory of Fame. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 151(1): 319–328.
- Singer, U.; Polyak, A.; Hayes, T.; Yin, X.; An, J.; Zhang, S.; Hu, Q.; Yang, H.; Ashual, O.; Gafni, O.; Parikh, D.; Gupta, S.; and Taigman, Y. 2022a. Make-A-Video: Text-to-Video Generation without Text-Video Data. arXiv:2209.14792.
- Singer, U.; Polyak, A.; Hayes, T.; Yin, X.; An, J.; Zhang, S.; Hu, Q.; Yang, H.; Ashual, O.; Gafni, O.; et al. 2022b. Make-a-video: Text-to-video generation without text-video data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14792*.
- Sobel, B. L. 2017. Artificial Intelligence’s Fair Use Crisis. *Columbia Journal of Law & Arts*, 41: 45.
- Somepalli, G.; Singla, V.; Goldblum, M.; Geiping, J.; and Goldstein, T. 2022. Diffusion Art or Digital Forgery? Investigating Data Replication in Diffusion Models. arXiv:2212.03860.
- South Africa Companies and Intellectual Property Commission. ????. Acceptance of Complete Specification: Stephen Thaler’s DABUS receives a patent for an AI-generated invention.
- Stephen Thaler v. Comptroller General of Patents Trade Marks and Designs. 2021. Stephen Thaler v. Comptroller General of Patents Trade Marks and Designs, Case No: A3/2020/1851. EWCA Civ 1374, Patents Court, Business and Property Courts of England and Wales.
- Turk, M.; and Pentland, A. 1991. Eigenfaces for Recognition. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 3(1): 71–86.
- U. S. Patent and Trademark Office. 2013. The Lanham Act (Title 15 of the United States Code). U. S. TRADEMARK LAW: FEDERAL STATUTES. Available from U. S. Patent and Trademark Office.
- Uniform Trade Secrets Act with 1985 Amendments. 1985. *Uniform Trade Secrets Act with 1985 Amendments*.
- United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). 2023. About Trademark Infringement. Sources: 15 U.S.C. §§1114, 1116-1118; Black’s Law Dictionary (9th ed. 2009); McCarthy on Trademarks & Unfair Competition (5th ed. 2017 updated quarterly).
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). 2021. Projections overview and highlights, 2020–30. *Monthly Labor Review*.
- U.S. Copyright Office. 2022a. 17 U.S. Code § 107 - Limitations on exclusive rights: Fair use. Circular 92. Page.
- U.S. Copyright Office. 2022b. Copyright Law of the United States and Related Laws Contained in Title 17 of the United States Code. Circular 92.
- U.S. Copyright Office, L. o. C. 2023. Copyright Registration Guidance: Works Containing Material Generated by Artificial Intelligence. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/03/16/2023-05321/copyright-registration-guidance-works-containing-material-generated-by-artificial-intelligence>. Accessed: 2023-08-03.
- Villegas, R.; Babaeizadeh, M.; Kindermans, P.-J.; Moraldo, H.; Zhang, H.; Saffar, M. T.; Castro, S.; Kunze, J.; and Erhan, D. 2022. Phenaki: Variable length video generation from open domain textual description. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02399*.
- Visser, M. 2013. Zipf’s law, power laws and maximum entropy. *New Journal of Physics*, 15(4): 043021. Publisher: IOP Publishing.
- Wang, S.-Y.; Efros, A. A.; Zhu, J.-Y.; and Zhang, R. 2023. Evaluating Data Attribution for Text-to-Image Models. In *ICCV*.
- Watson, D. 2019. The rhetoric and reality of anthropomorphism in artificial intelligence. *Minds and Machines*, 29(3): 417–440.
- Williams, K.-S. 2023. Will.i.am wants to protect his “facial math” from AI.
- World Intellectual Property Organization. 2014. *Monetization of Copyright Assets by Creative Enterprises*. Creative Industries. Geneva, Switzerland: World Intellectual Property

Organization (WIPO). ISBN 9789280524550. License: CC BY 3.0 IGO.

Yu, J.; Xu, Y.; Koh, J. Y.; Luong, T.; Baid, G.; Wang, Z.; Vasudevan, V.; Ku, A.; Yang, Y.; Ayan, B. K.; et al. 2022. Scaling autoregressive models for content-rich text-to-image generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10789*.

Yuan, G.; Cun, X.; Zhang, Y.; Li, M.; Qi, C.; Wang, X.; Shan, Y.; and Zheng, H. 2023. Inserting Anybody in Diffusion Models via Celeb Basis. *arXiv:2306.00926*.