From:	Ľudmila Hladká <ludmila.hladka@indprop.gov.sk>
Sent:	Friday, 14 February 2020 7:10 AM
To:	ai2ip
Subject:	WIPO Contact Form: Impact of AI on IP Policy: Call for Comments (14.02.2020 07:09:38)

Topic: Artificial intelligence
Sub-topic: Impact of AI on IP Policy: Call for Comments
Question: Dear Ms. Till,

I would like to thank the International Bureau for preparing of interesting document. The patentability inventions generated of AI belongs to the most important topic at present.

It is a new phenomenon in the field of IP and protection such inventions will requires a new approach for their registration. We are on beginning of the new technological revolution so according to my opinion we will need to find a new way how to protect such inventions.

In the future closer cooperation of more and more experts from different scientific field will be required for creating ground of a new AI which will be able to create invention called „autonomously generated invention".

I suppose that we will need create of a new treaty for such inventions because inventions generated by AI require a new definition of inventor, owner and completely different way of examination novelty than exist in the present time.

Issue 1: Inventorship and Ownership
Under my opinion, the AI should not name as inventor. I agree with opinion mentioned in paragraph 7 sub-paragraph (i). "The law should be require that a human inventor is required to be named and the law should give indications of the way in which human inventor is determinate" and as is indicate in (ii) "we need specific legal provisions to be introduced govern the ownership of autonomously generated AI inventions"

Issue 2: Patentable Subject Matter and Patentability Guidelines
In the case of AI-generated or assisted inventions, the law should exclude form patent eligibility inventions that are generated by an AI applications („autonomously generated invention") and for such inventions should be introduced specific provisions.
Maybe we would need a new definition of "patent" for such types of patents, to define different conditions on patentability as well as inventor who in fact train AI how to select the correct data, how to use it and how to check if the autonomously generated invention of AI works correct.

Issue 3: Inventive step or non-obviousness
A person skilled in the art should be replacing by an algorithm trained with data from designated field of art and AI should generate content of qualify as prior art as it is mentioned in sub-paragraph (ii) and (i).
In my opinion, in this cases, a person skilled in the art should not consider prior art without help of another AI.

Issue 4: Disclosure
The system of deposit for algorithms, as is presented in sub-paragraph (iii), could be useful for such inventions. Maybe there will be need to create some new type of database for such algorithms.
My questions are:
"Could such algorithms be a priority for other inventions created by AI? What about priority period? Should not be priority period shorter than 12 month for such applications in respect of fast changes in science and technology?"

Issue 5: General Policy Considerations for the Patent System
I think that we need a completely new approach for the inventions autonomously generated invention by AI in the field of the patent system.

First name: Ľudmila
Last name: Hladká
Company/Organization: IPO SR
Phone number: ++421 48 4300343
E-mail address: ludmila.hladka@indprop.gov.sk

ID: 215475
Time Stamp: 14.02.2020 07:09:38
Recipient: ai2ip@wipo.int