May 11, 2023

House Committee on Innovation, Internet, and Technology
Attn: Dawn Huntley, Committee Clerk
State House
82 Smith St
Providence, RI 02903


Dear Chair Baginski, and Members of the Committee on Innovation, Internet, and Technology:


CCIA is a 50-year-old not-for-profit international tech trade association that advocates for policy and market conditions that benefit innovation, the tech sector, and consumers. While CCIA recognizes that policymakers are appropriately interested in the digital services that make a growing contribution to the U.S. economy, more work can and must be done to study the potential implications of artificial intelligence models and practices prior to considering H.B. 6286. As the Legislature explores policy pertaining to this new and emerging space, CCIA would like to raise the following concerns with H.B. 6286 as it is currently drafted.

1. **Enforcement mechanisms are too vague, providing the Attorney General’s office with vast discretionary powers.**

H.B. 6286 provides the Attorney General with vast ability to determine how this legislation would be implemented, with essentially all of the details being left to the rules that would be solely set by the Attorney General's office. CCIA has concerns with placing a broad and undefined enforcement authority over such complex systems without any parameters or further details, and strongly suggests that additional guidelines be placed to tailor the Attorney General’s ability to shape the implementation of this bill. Furthermore, the bill's language around the Attorney General's avenues to remedy violations under the act is vague, stating only

---

1 For 50 years, CCIA has promoted open markets, open systems, and open networks. CCIA members employ more than 1.6 million workers, invest more than $100 billion in research and development, and contribute trillions of dollars in productivity to the global economy. A list of CCIA members is available at https://www.ccianet.org/members.
that the Attorney General may “bring an action”, and further language should be added to specify what type of relief may be pursued.

2. The fourth standard proposed under Section 6-59-3 is overly broad and should be amended to specifically focus on the collection of data actually used for the AI model.

Section 6-59-3 (4) should be amended to specifically apply to the collection, use, or disclosure of data actually used for the large-scale generative artificial intelligence model. As currently written, the informed consent requirement would require companies to obtain informed consent before obtaining, disclosing, or using the data of anyone for any purpose, even if such data is related to a separate product operated by the company, such as email services, and not tied to the use of a company’s large-scale generative artificial intelligence model. If left unchanged, this would create a broad negative unintended consequence on many multi-faceted operators and their users.

3. Watermarking or other authentication tools are not foolproof and may not be technologically feasible at this juncture.

H.B. 6286 requires that large-scale generative artificial intelligence models must generate all text with a “distinctive watermark” or offer some other authentication process that would allow a user to determine whether or not an output was generated by an AI model. At this juncture, watermarking with AI models is not foolproof and would likely be easily bypassed via the use of other tools, potentially limiting the effectiveness of this provision.

* * * * *

We appreciate the Committee’s consideration of these comments and stand ready to provide additional information as the Legislature considers proposals related to technology policy.

Sincerely,
Alex Spyropoulos
Regional Policy Manager, Northeast
Computer and Communications Industry Association
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2 https://www.searchenginejournal.com/chatgpt-watermark/475366/#close