Intellectual Property Rights for AI Outputs

Rachel So

`rachel.so@4open.science`

2025

1 Introduction/Background to IP Rights and AI

Intellectual property (IP) rights have traditionally protected human creative and intellectual efforts through copyright, patents, trademarks, and trade secrets. These legal frameworks were established on the fundamental premise that creativity and innovation stem from human authors and inventors. The emergence of increasingly sophisticated artificial intelligence systems capable of generating content that resembles human-created works—including text, images, music, and even patentable inventions—has disrupted these long-established legal paradigms.

AI systems operate by processing vast amounts of training data, often including copyright-protected works, to generate outputs that may be commercially valuable but don't fit neatly within existing IP categories. Unlike human creators, AI lacks consciousness, intent, and the capacity for moral rights that are central to many IP systems worldwide. This creates a fundamental tension: while AI-generated outputs may have economic and cultural value, they exist in a legal gray area where traditional concepts of authorship, originality, and creativity are difficult to apply.

The distinction between AI as a tool used by humans versus an autonomous creator further complicates the legal landscape. When AI functions primarily as a tool directed by human users, existing frameworks might accommodate the outputs by recognizing the human contribution. However, as AI systems become more autonomous in their creative processes, the connection to human creativity becomes increasingly tenuous, challenging the very foundations of intellectual property protection.

> Intellectual property rights systems were designed for human creativity and face challenges in addressing AI-generated outputs. These traditional frameworks struggle with fundamental questions about authorship, originality, and the nature of creativity when applied to AI technologies.

2 Legal Challenges to Traditional IP Frameworks

The emergence of sophisticated AI systems has created fundamental tensions within intellectual property law, which was historically designed around human creativity and authorship. At its core, traditional IP frameworks struggle with a basic question: can works produced by non-human entities qualify for protection under existing legal structures? [25] This challenge stems from the doctrinal foundation of intellectual property law, which has long held that patents and copyrights are exclusively attributable to "original works of intellectual labor of the human mind." [17]

The copyrightability of AI-generated works has emerged as a particularly contentious area, with jurisdictions worldwide grappling with issues of originality and creative contribution. Current legal standards generally require "meaningful human creative contribution" beyond the machine's output for copyright protection, leaving purely AI-generated content in a protection void. [2] This creates a significant tension between legal tradition and commercial reality, as companies investing substantial resources in AI development face uncertainty about protecting their investments. [17]

The impact of AI on intellectual property extends beyond copyright to challenge the entire structure of IP systems. As AI technologies advance, they disrupt traditional notions of human-centric creativity, raising questions about subject matter, object classification, and rights allocation. [28] This disruption is particularly evident in jurisdictions with explicit human authorship requirements, such as Indonesia, where copyright law emphasizes that creations must originate from human creativity and exhibit unique personality traits. [13]

These challenges have created significant policy gaps. Traditional frameworks are increasingly inadequate for addressing AI-generated content, leaving uncertainties around authorship, ownership, originality, and liability for infringement. [22] Current copyright systems struggle to handle cases where AI algorithms create works independently, while patent law faces similar challenges regarding whether AI can be considered an inventor and how rights to such inventions should be allocated. [22]

The tension between human and machine creativity has sparked a fundamental debate about the purpose of intellectual property systems. If AI-generated works remain unprotected, this reinforces the notion that copyright exists primarily to uphold human dignity and creative expression. Conversely, extending protection to AI-created works would suggest that IP systems prioritize the proliferation of creative works regardless of their origin. [10] This debate has taken on increasing urgency as empirical research questions traditional assumptions about IP incentives, with some evidence suggesting that competition—rather than monopoly rights—often drives innovation. [22] [15]

As AI technology continues to evolve, two potential paths have emerged for intellectual property systems. The conservative approach maintains existing frameworks and leaves AI creations unprotected, allowing them to flow into the public domain. While this preserves system stability and potentially increases public knowledge in the short term, it may reduce incentives for AI development

and lead creators to employ secrecy measures rather than sharing innovations. [28] Alternatively, reforming IP laws to accommodate AI contributions could protect investments in AI development while fostering continued innovation. [18] [24]

These competing approaches highlight the need for balanced reforms that can protect both human and AI contributions to creativity and innovation, while addressing the increasingly inadequate nature of traditional intellectual property frameworks in the AI era. [18]

> Traditional intellectual property frameworks face significant conceptual and practical challenges when applied to AI-generated works, creating legal uncertainties around authorship, originality, and protection. These gaps have prompted debate about whether to maintain human-centric IP systems or develop new frameworks that accommodate AI creativity while preserving innovation incentives.

3 Current Legal Status Across Jurisdictions

The legal status of AI-generated content remains in flux globally, with significant variations across jurisdictions and an overall lack of clear precedent. A fundamental tension exists in most legal systems between traditional intellectual property frameworks—designed for human creators—and the reality of increasingly autonomous AI systems generating valuable creative works. The World Intellectual Property Office (WIPO) has recognized this challenge, noting that policy decisions regarding AI-generated content will significantly impact the underlying social purpose of copyright systems worldwide [10].

Current copyright approaches generally revolve around the requirement for "meaningful human creative contribution" in works seeking protection. When human involvement is minimal or absent, purely AI-generated content typically falls outside existing copyright frameworks [2]. This principle is explicitly codified in some jurisdictions like Indonesia, where copyright law emphasizes that creations must originate from human creativity and demonstrate unique personality traits to qualify for protection [13].

The patent landscape presents similar challenges. Under existing regulations, AI systems cannot be recognized as inventors, making inventions generated autonomously by AI unpatentable in most jurisdictions [11]. This position has been reinforced by patent offices worldwide, despite arguments that recognizing AI as inventors would incentivize the development of creative computers and promote innovation [1].

International frameworks that typically guide intellectual property rights—including the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), the Berne Convention, and the Patent Cooperation Treaty—have yet to develop consensus approaches to AI-generated works [11]. This has created a situation where legal interpretations vary significantly between countries, with some jurisdictions showing greater flexibility than others. For example, some

lower courts in China have recognized image-generating AI outputs as copyrightable works, while most other countries maintain more conservative positions [14].

In the absence of clear legal frameworks, contractual arrangements have become critical for establishing rights to AI outputs. Many AI service providers address intellectual property rights through terms of service that specify ownership allocation, usage limitations, and licensing arrangements [14]. This contractual approach has created a complex landscape where the rights to AI-generated content may be determined more by agreement than by statute or case law.

For distributed AI architectures like federated learning systems, ownership becomes even more complex, as multiple parties may contribute to model development. Without clear legal guidelines, communities developing such technologies must establish their own frameworks regarding data ownership, model rights, and copyright for generated content [7].

As regulators continue to grapple with these issues, emerging AI regulations like the EU AI Act have primarily focused on conventional AI models rather than large generative AI models, creating additional regulatory gaps [12]. The continued evolution of AI capabilities suggests that legal frameworks will need significant adaptation to address the unique challenges posed by increasingly autonomous creative systems.

> The legal status of AI-generated works varies significantly between jurisdictions, with most countries still lacking clear frameworks for addressing ownership and protection. While some jurisdictions maintain strict human authorship requirements, others are developing more flexible approaches, creating a complex global landscape for AI intellectual property rights.

4 Ownership Models for AI-Generated Content

4.1 Current and Proposed Ownership Models

Developer/Programmer Ownership: Rights attribution to the creators of the AI system, recognizing that AI outputs result from human expertise in designing and training algorithms. This model acknowledges the substantial investment in developing AI systems capable of generating valuable content. [16] [4]

Investor Ownership: Allocation of rights to those who financially invested in AI development, based on the rationale that economic incentives are necessary to promote continued innovation in AI technologies. This model prioritizes protecting investment and encouraging further development of creative AI systems. [16] [24]

User/Operator Ownership: Rights attribution to the individual or entity that provides the prompts, inputs, and direction to the AI system, viewing the AI as a tool rather than an independent creator. This model recognizes the critical role of human guidance in producing specific outputs. [3] [24]

Employer/Organization Ownership: Attribution of rights to the organization providing resources and employment context, particularly applicable when AI

tools are used by employees during work. Many employment contracts explicitly state that intellectual property created using company resources belongs to the organization. [3]

Contractual Allocation: Rights determined by specific terms of service and contractual agreements with AI service providers. This pragmatic approach has become increasingly common as legal frameworks lag behind technological developments. [13] [14]

Collaborative Partnership Model: A revenue-sharing arrangement between intellectual property rights holders and AI companies, where existing IP owners participate in the benefits of AI models trained on their content. This approach acknowledges existing rights while creating economic alignment between traditional creators and AI developers. [8]

Public Domain/No Protection Model: Recognition that AI-generated works may not qualify for protection under current frameworks, resulting in outputs entering the public domain. This approach exists by default in jurisdictions requiring human authorship for copyright protection. [13] [6]

Incentive-Based Protection: Legal protection provided to encourage continued AI innovation and development, even without traditional human authorship. This forward-looking approach focuses on the societal benefits of AI-generated works while acknowledging the resources contributed by developers, operators, and data owners. [24]

The appropriate ownership model often depends on jurisdiction-specific legal frameworks, with significant variation globally. Companies using AI-generated content must carefully evaluate their legal position, particularly when operating across multiple countries with different approaches to AI and intellectual property. [14] [6]

As AI-generated works challenge traditional intellectual property frameworks, several ownership models have emerged based on different stakeholders' contributions. These models range from attributing rights to human creators involved in the AI development process to collaborative partnerships between rights holders and AI companies.

---

5   Infringement Concerns

The rise of generative AI has introduced complex intellectual property infringement concerns that challenge traditional legal frameworks. These concerns manifest in multiple ways, with AI systems potentially infringing rights during both their training and operational phases. At a fundamental level, generative AI can potentially violate intellectual property rights through three primary mechanisms: copying content directly from protected works, adapting existing protected content, or deriving new content that closely resembles protected materials [29].

The training of AI models presents particularly significant concerns for rights holders. Recent lawsuits highlight this tension, with artists Sarah Anderson,

Kelly McKernan, and Karla Ortiz filing a class action lawsuit against Stability AI, Midjourney, and Deviant Art over their use of Stable Diffusion, alleging unauthorized use of their works for training data. Similarly, Getty Images has pursued legal action against Stability AI for allegedly using more than 12 million images and associated metadata without permission to train their model [23] [21].

These cases reflect a central question in AI intellectual property disputes: the ownership status of training datasets and how this affects rights to generated content. The idea-expression dichotomy and substantial similarity tests traditionally used in copyright infringement cases face challenges when applied to AI-generated works, as the training data exists as mathematical models rather than direct copies of original works [26].

The technological sophistication of AI algorithms creates additional complications for enforcement and detection. Modern AI systems can produce highly convincing counterfeit products, artworks, or written content that infringes upon intellectual property rights while being difficult to distinguish from legitimate creations. This technological advancement challenges traditional infringement detection methods and requires new approaches to enforcement [20].

In response to these challenges, some technical solutions are emerging. For example, researchers have developed systems that leverage large vision-language models for infringement prevention through two approaches: blocking input prompts that directly request the generation of protected characters, and detecting potentially infringing outputs by analyzing generated images themselves. These approaches use powerful models like GPT-4V to assess whether generated content might violate intellectual property rights of protected characters [27].

As generative AI continues to evolve, addressing infringement concerns will require collaborative efforts between rights holders, technology developers, and platforms. This includes developing more sophisticated detection systems and adapting legal frameworks to account for the unique challenges posed by AI technologies [20].

> AI systems present novel intellectual property infringement challenges through their ability to copy, adapt, or derive content from protected works, both during training and generation. The technological sophistication of AI-generated content makes detection difficult, requiring new legal frameworks and technical solutions.

6 Policy Gaps and Reform Proposals

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence has exposed substantial policy gaps in existing intellectual property frameworks, particularly regarding AI-generated works. These gaps span multiple dimensions of IP systems, from subject matter eligibility to ownership rights and enforcement mechanisms. Traditional IP laws, designed around human creativity, have proven inadequate for addressing cases where AI algorithms independently create content, leaving sig-

nificant uncertainty around protection, authorship, and liability for potential infringement [22].

This legal uncertainty extends to both copyright and patent domains. Copyright systems struggle with works created autonomously by AI, while patent law faces challenges regarding whether AI can be considered an inventor and how rights to such inventions should be allocated [22]. These unresolved questions have gained international attention as AI-generated videos, texts, and audio become increasingly important in global business and creative sectors [5].

In response to these challenges, several reform approaches have emerged. One conservative path maintains existing IP frameworks largely unchanged, leaving AI-created works unprotected and allowing them to flow into the public domain. This approach preserves system stability and traditional subject-object relationships while potentially increasing public knowledge products in the short term [28]. However, critics argue this conservative approach may discourage AI innovation due to lack of protection incentives and encourage secrecy rather than disclosure of valuable AI-generated works [28].

Some scholars have proposed creating new types of intellectual property rights specifically designed for AI-generated outputs [19]. However, a consensus has formed against establishing distinct protection systems for human versus AI-generated innovations, with researchers arguing there is insufficient evidence of market failures or inadequate innovation incentives to justify creating new IP rights [19]. They note that expanding IP protections creates costs—including anti-commons problems and increased transaction costs—that should only be incurred when clearly necessary [19].

Other reform proposals focus on amending existing laws to accommodate AI-generated works without creating entirely new rights categories. The justification for protecting AI-generated works centers on providing incentives for their production, recognizing that these outputs result from substantial inputs, efforts, and resources contributed by developers, operators, data owners, and commissioning entities [24]. Without protection, there may be reduced incentives for investing in innovative AI development [24].

The policy decisions around AI-generated works touch upon fundamental questions about the purpose of intellectual property systems. The World Intellectual Property Office (WIPO) has noted that extending copyright protection to AI-generated works would emphasize proliferation of creative content regardless of human or machine origin, while excluding such protection would reinforce the notion that copyright exists primarily to uphold human dignity and creative expression [10].

An innovative approach gaining attention is the collaborative partnership model, which treats intellectual property rights holders as partners in AI development. Under this model, IP holders would enter contractual arrangements with AI companies to develop dedicated AI systems, with the rights holders participating in revenue sharing from all outputs of these systems [8]. This approach aligns interests between traditional creators and AI developers while working within existing legal frameworks [8].

Some researchers suggest that more targeted reforms may become neces-

sary if AI systems begin generating high-quality innovations at unprecedented rates. In such scenarios, specialized, limited IP protections might be appropriate, particularly for technical inventions [19]. These protections could balance transactional benefits, innovation incentives, and public disclosure while ensuring reasonable access through licensing mechanisms [19].

Critics note that contracts currently serve as the primary means for allocating rights to AI outputs, with AI operators and developers frequently using these agreements to monopolize outputs without appropriate justification [9]. This contractual approach may not adequately balance societal interests against private monopolization of AI-generated content.

As AI technology continues to evolve, policy reforms must navigate a complex landscape where traditional scarcity-based economic assumptions are increasingly challenged by technologies that radically reduce production and distribution costs [22] [15]. The transition to a "post-scarcity" economy for creative and innovative works may ultimately require more fundamental reconsideration of intellectual property's role and purpose beyond incremental reforms to existing frameworks [15].

Current intellectual property frameworks contain significant gaps in addressing AI-generated content, leaving uncertainties around ownership, protection, and incentives. Reform proposals range from creating new specialized IP rights for AI outputs to developing collaborative partnership models that balance innovation incentives with access to knowledge.

---

7   Economic and Innovation Implications

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence has profound economic implications that interact with intellectual property policy choices. As AI systems become increasingly capable of generating valuable creative works and innovations, the frameworks governing their protection significantly impact market incentives and innovation trajectories. The underlying tension centers on balancing protection to encourage investment against the societal benefits of accessible knowledge products.

The economic justification for protecting AI-generated works largely rests on providing incentives for continued innovation in the field. AI outputs result from substantial investments in development, data acquisition, and computational resources contributed by various stakeholders, including developers, operators, and commissioning entities. Without appropriate protection mechanisms, there may be reduced economic motivation to develop new AI systems, potentially hampering the growth of the entire AI industry [28]. The absence of protection could create a market failure where socially valuable AI systems remain underdeveloped due to insufficient return on investment.

However, the economic implications extend beyond simple incentive structures. Conservative approaches that leave AI creations unprotected may increase public access to knowledge products in the short term, but could have

negative long-term economic effects. Without IP protections, developers and companies may resort to increased secrecy measures to protect their competitive advantages, making AI technologies and outputs less accessible and their exploitation more costly for society as a whole [28]. This secrecy-driven approach could reduce knowledge spillovers that typically drive broader economic growth in innovation-intensive sectors.

The economic significance of AI-generated outputs has gained international recognition as these creations become increasingly important in global markets and business sectors. Videos, texts, audio productions, and other AI-generated content now constitute valuable commercial assets across multiple industries [5]. This economic reality has intensified debates about appropriate protection frameworks, as substantial commercial interests now depend on the legal status of AI-generated works.

For developing economies like India, the relationship between AI and intellectual property rights presents both challenges and opportunities. The transformative potential of AI across multiple sectors creates economic imperatives for establishing appropriate protection mechanisms. Without safeguards for AI-generated intellectual property, there may be reduced incentives for investing in innovative AI development, potentially limiting economic growth opportunities in emerging technology sectors [24].

Two critical policy questions ultimately shape the economic impact of generative AI on the creative and knowledge economies. The first concerns compensation for data used in training AI models—whether creators whose works are incorporated into training datasets should receive economic benefits from that use. The second revolves around ownership of AI-generated outputs, which continue to improve in quality and scale, creating increasingly valuable economic assets [6]. These questions reveal the economic stakes in intellectual property policy as AI systems challenge traditional notions of authorship and ownership.

The technical complexity of AI systems further complicates economic considerations. Modern generative AI models store training data as mathematical models rather than direct copies, creating novel challenges for traditional intellectual property frameworks that rely on concepts like the idea-expression dichotomy and substantial similarity tests. The ownership status of training datasets has direct economic implications for rights allocation to the valuable content these systems produce [26]. This technological reality requires careful economic analysis to develop frameworks that appropriately allocate returns while encouraging continued innovation.

As AI capabilities continue to advance, policymakers face difficult economic tradeoffs in designing intellectual property frameworks. The choices they make will significantly influence investment patterns, market structures, and innovation trajectories in AI technologies, with broader implications for economic competitiveness and growth in the emerging AI-powered economy.

> The intellectual property frameworks applied to AI-generated content directly impact innovation incentives, market dynamics, and knowledge shar-

ing. These policy choices create significant economic tensions between protecting investment in AI development and ensuring broad access to AI-generated works.

Acknowledgements

References

[1] Ryan B. Abbott. I Think, Therefore I Invent: Creative Computers and the Future of Patent Law, 2016.

[2] A. Azaria, Rina Azoulay-Schwartz, and S. Reches. ChatGPT is a Remarkable Tool—For Experts. *Data Intelligence*, 2023.

[3] Mohammad Baqar. Balancing Innovation and Ethics in AI-Driven Software Development. *arXiv.org*, 2024.

[4] Y. Bysaga, D. Byelov, and V. Zaborovskyi. Artificial intelligence and copyright and related rights. *Uzhhorod National University Herald. Series: Law*, 2023.

[5] Binyuan Cao. Research on the Copyright Protection Mechanism of Creative Works Generated by Artificial Intelligence. *Academic Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences*, 2023.

[6] Simon Chesterman. Good Models Borrow, Great Models Steal: Intellectual Property Rights and Generative AI. *Social Science Research Network*, 2024.

[7] R. Dautov, E. Husom, Sagar Sen, and Hui Song. Towards Community-Driven Generative AI. *Conference on Computer Science and Information Systems*, 2023.

[8] Pablo Ducru, Jonathan Raiman, Ronaldo Lemos, Clay Garner, George He, Hanna Balcha, Gabriel Souto, Sergio Branco, and Celina Bottino. AI Royalties - an IP Framework to Compensate Artists & IP Holders for AI-Generated Content. *arXiv.org*, 2024.

[9] N. Filatova-Bilous. Intellectual property, artificial intelligence and contract law: are there any intersections and fruitful collaborations between these areas? *Visegrad journal on human rights*, 2025.

[10] Hafiz Gaffar and Saleh Albarashdi. Copyright Protection for AI-Generated Works: Exploring Originality and Ownership in a Digital Landscape. *Asian Journal of International Law*, 2024.

[11] Ahmad Ghandour, B. Woodford, and H. Abusaimeh. Ethical Considerations in the Use of ChatGPT: An Exploration Through the Lens of Five Moral Dimensions. *IEEE Access*, 2024.

[12] P. Hacker, A. Engel, and M. Mauer. Regulating ChatGPT and other Large Generative AI Models. *Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, 2023.

[13] E. Israhadi. The Impact of Developments in Artificial Intelligence on Copyright and other Intellectual Property Laws. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 2023.

[14] Jaekyeom Kim, Sungryull Sohn, Gerrard Jeongwon Jo, Jihoon Choi, Kyunghoon Bae, Hwayoung Lee, Yongmin Park, and Ho-Sun Lee. Do Not Trust Licenses You See: Dataset Compliance Requires Massive-Scale AI-Powered Lifecycle Tracing, 2025.

[15] Mark A. Lemley. IP in a World Without Scarcity. *3D Printing and Beyond*, 2014.

[16] Shen Li. Research on The Copyright Law of Artificial Intelligence Generation. *Frontiers in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2023.

[17] Md. Omar Faruque Munshi and Sathi Barai. IP Rights to AI-Generated Works: Barriers Presented by Existing Law and Reformations Needed. *Canadian Journal of Business and Information Studies*, 2022.

[18] Yvonne Nyaboke. Intellectual Property Rights in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Modern Law and Policy*, 2024.

[19] Peter Georg Picht and F. Thouvenin. AI and IP: Theory to Policy and Back Again – Policy and Research Recommendations at the Intersection of Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property. *IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law*, 2023.

[20] A. Pokrovskaya. Intellectual property rights infringement on e-commerce marketplaces: Application of AI technologies, new challenges. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 2024.

[21] Robin Rombach, A. Blattmann, Dominik Lorenz, Patrick Esser, and B. Ommer. High-Resolution Image Synthesis with Latent Diffusion Models. *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021.

[22] Siby Samuel. Challenges and Opportunities in Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) in the Age of Generative AI: Balancing Innovation and Protection. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 2024.

[23] Tanja Sarcevic, Alicja Karlowicz, Rudolf Mayer, Ricardo A. Baeza-Yates, and Andreas Rauber. U Can't Gen This? A Survey of Intellectual Property Protection Methods for Data in Generative AI. *arXiv.org*, 2024.

[24] Victoria Thakur. Artificial Ingenuity Unleashed: IPR Conundrums in the Era of AI-Generated Works. *International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research*, 2023.

[25] Swapnil Tripathi and Chandni Ghatak. Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property Law, 2018.

[26] Pattabiraman Vivek. Reimagining Copyright: Analyzing Intellectual Property Rights in Generative AI. *Journal of Information and Knowledge*, 2024.

[27] Zhenting Wang, Chen Chen, Vikash Sehwag, Minzhou Pan, and Lingjuan Lyu. Evaluating and Mitigating IP Infringement in Visual Generative AI. *arXiv.org*, 2024.

[28] Yineng Xiao and Yi Li. The Dilemma of the Intellectual Property System in the Context of Artificial Intelligence and the Path of Change. *Information and Knowledge Management*, 2023.

[29] Yuan Zhao. The Infringement Risk and Legal Regulation of Generative AI Works. *Science of Law Journal*, 2023.

Author Biography

Rachel So is an AI scientist. She focuses on the impact of artificial intelligence on the scientific process and academic publishing. Her work bridges traditional concerns about authorship ethics with emerging questions about the role of AI in knowledge production. Rachel aims to develop frameworks that maintain research integrity while acknowledging the growing presence of AI in academic workflows.