

Washington State Artificial Intelligence Task Force

Ethical/Responsible AI Governance and Consumer Protection & Privacy Joint Subcommittee Meeting

Friday, October 11, 2024

Attendees: Yuki Ishizuka, Crystal Leatherman, Sumayo Hassan, Katy Ruckle, Farah Alqattan, Rory Paine-Donovan, Jai Jaisimha, Dr. John Scott, Leah Koshiyama, Ryan Harkins, Michael Stidham, Latoya Belgrave Francis, Dinah Le Duc, Montana Miranda, Caroline El Jazmi, Dua Abudiab, Suellen Siqueira-Fisher, William Cotter, Jarrell Cook, Alexi Madon, Derek Woods, Tee Sannon, Paula Sardinas, Richard Varn, Aylin Caliskin, David Salisbury, Betty Moe, Elise Sivilay

- The meeting began with introductions of the meeting members and the subcommittee co-chairs.
- The meeting facilitator gave an overview of the previous subcommittee meeting's takeaways, and transitions to discuss the White House AI Bill of Rights.
- A meeting member comments on parallel concerns with AI and what is missing in the discussion, and points out that a lot of the harms are primarily from generative AI. Mentions that guidelines that target automated decision making do not necessarily address harms of generative AI which can be an oversight.
- A meeting co-chair mentions how the White House Blueprint might fall short of the goals of the subcommittee to create guidelines for all use and deployment of AI.
- A Subcommittee co-chair provides a presentation on the guiding principles for the use of generative AI.
- The main principles are about making generative AI: explainable and interpretable, defining public purpose and social benefit, transparency and auditability, accountability and responsibility, safe secure and resilient, and valid and reliable. These principles were derived from National Institute of Science and Technology (NIST) Risk Management Framework (RMF) but amended for public sector/state government use.
- A comment is made about how the Task Force should consider the scope of regulations as various comments have been made considering the users, deployers, etc.
- A meeting member makes a comment stating harms are disproportionate to the users rather than deployers and that users who might input their personal information are susceptible to the most harm. Meeting member makes a recommendation of other federal agency guidelines to adopt to mitigate harm.
- A meeting member makes a comment about an organization that mandated nutrition labels, suggesting a similar rating structure for AI.
- A co-chair recenters the conversation to consider principles for AI.
- A meeting member makes a comment about risk assessments for deployed automated decision-making systems and generative AI.
- The meeting facilitator transitions the topic to the discussion of child sexual abuse material (CSAM) legislation from Representative Tina Orwall. AGO Deputy Legislative Director discusses the content of the bill for meeting members, and

notes the Representative is interested in the Task Force perspective, although a bill draft is not currently available to review.

- A meeting member comments that the software that is designed to generate these images is a challenge, education is an essential aspect to this issue, and consent is essential. Meeting member states that this software is designed for the intake of these images and how that point should not escape the attention of the TF.
- The meeting facilitator discusses how current bill language hinders law enforcement from prosecuting individuals with CSAM because of the specific language requiring the image to be of an “identifiable” person. The present harm cannot be precisely addressed because proving “identifiable” is challenging.
- A meeting member asks about other states that have passed similar bill language targeting CSAM.
- A comment is made about proposed legislation in California that requires embedded information in metadata to identify AI created images. This could potentially be a tool in addressing the generation of CSAM.
- A meeting co-chair returns the discussion to principles and makes a comment about deciding on which principles are being adopted by this subcommittee and the TF more broadly.
- A meeting member asks about anticipated outcomes for the principles, such as credible certification or a compliance structure.
- A subcommittee co-chair responds that the principles, from their understanding, are foundational to work of the Task Force as common ground to align prior to considering recommendations. A further comment is made about adding examples to explain the importance of the principle and practical application.
- A meeting member comments how to think critically about the problems presented, and to consider what is missing in terms of enforcement and penalties.