



Tuesday August 13, 2024

Consumer Protection and Privacy Subcommittee Meeting
Artificial Intelligence Task Force

Attendees:

Crystal Leatherman, WA Retail Association, Subcommittee co-chair
Tee Sannon, ACLU, Subcommittee co-chair
Sumayo Hassan, AGO
Cliff Magness, WA Health Benefits Exchange
Susanna Parker, Verus
Angela Kleis, WaTech
Rose Feliciano, TechNet
Matt King, WATech
Katherine Hoffman, Department of Labor and Industries
Adam Cappio, Transparency Coalition
Richard Varn, Coalition for Sensible Public Records Access
Sam Brown, State Legislature
Anna Sherles
Ralph Johnson, WaTech
Jarrell Cook, WorkDay
Kris Page, Representative Strickland's office
Brynn Brady, contract lobbyist for AWS
Jai Jaisimha, Transparency Coalition
Eileen Sullivan, representing Meta and Comcast
Eli Veenendaal, Amazon
Will Saunders, Department of Licensing
Rory Paine-Donovan, AGO
Michelle Rusk- House of Representatives staff, Consumer Protection and Business Committee
Latoya Belgrave
Charles Knutson, Amazon
Jay Newbern
Kris Tefft

- Introductions of AGO staff & task force members, followed by members of the public attending the meeting.
- Meeting host begins discussion on informing meeting members general topic discussion on AI matters.
- Discussion continues with questions and responses regarding subcommittee operation and administration.
- Discussion shifts to ask about privacy protection for training AI models that interact with consumer data, raising concepts of responsibility and opting into data collection.
- Conversation circles back to general suggestions of how subcommittee functions and how meeting members can engage actively with the subcommittee meeting. Further comments onto how expertise can inform AI policy.



- Facilitator brings the conversations to mention the draft Task Force bylaws for meeting members to gain a better understanding [see July 26th meeting]. Emphasizes how subcommittees are a forum for learning from expertise and experience.
- Meeting member makes recommendations of including a CISA [Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency] representative and recommends resource document to guide goal-making for task force.
- Meeting facilitator emphasizes the early stage of the task force and states that recommendations of individuals and organizations for subcommittee inclusion is welcome.
- Meeting members share their initial questions and concerns regarding with consumer protection and privacy, as well as broader task force work.
- Suggestion from task force member that further investigation/question of AI policy and legislation from across the nation is needed.
- Meeting member discusses the lack of substantial AI legislation and policy. Mentions the niche AI proposals in specific contexts in state legislatures.
- A separate suggestion from meeting member of focusing attention on developing standards for AI and investigating those standards currently in place.
- Meeting member recommends level setting regarding AI privacy protection laws, and suggests divorcing AI and privacy in the same legislative/policy package at the risk of making a great mistake.
- An individual lists other privacy acts that provide protection for consumers, including the EU AI Act as a model to create a universal standard for privacy, following from more stringent legislation, which in turn can inform standards of secure software by design.
- Additional member emphasizes not neglecting the positive changes of AI to narrow legislation on risk. Suggests taking a balanced perspective.
- Member recommends looking into Colorado legislation on AI and privacy that takes into effect in 2026 to understand what does and does not work.
- Task force member suggests standardizing definitions to inform the conversations in order to prevent misuse and misunderstanding. Additional meeting member suggests NIST's and EU glossary of terms surrounding language of AI.
- Further comment by meeting member to have designated subject matter expertise i.e. who to point to for specific inquiry and information.
- Task force member asks for comments/questions surrounding consumer protections.
- Additional meeting member asks for the consideration of "smart city," Washington state being a place for institutions and businesses ready for the digital wave, which in turn would reduce harm by using AI as a tool.
- Meeting member emphasizes the necessity of having a narrow scope on the subcommittee topic to specify relevant outcomes.
- A suggestion from meeting member about turning focus to what is novel about the intersection of AI & privacy as means to guide deliverables.
- A comment in meeting chat regarding judicial cases to inform what works and what doesn't work to borrow from to inform policy making process.



- Task force member asks for last topics/ comments. Additional task force member guides conversation to consumer protection and discriminatory AI.
- Meeting member states the challenge of attempting to design AI to remove biases, and the risk of creating new biases through the process. Emphasizes the importance of not removing people from decision making processes and not defaulting to AI outcomes.
- Meeting member speaks to state bills that are targeting bias in AI to set a foundation of understanding.
- Meeting member emphasizes the importance of taking a nuanced view of the emergence of this technology.
- Another comment on understanding the gaps in current laws as it relates to AI that can cause harm (i.e. deepfakes, child risks, voice/identity impersonation).