

TDM:AI – Opt-out Registries

Open floor intervention: Sabine Richly and Sebastian Posth

Sabine Richly
sabine.richly@medialaw.digital

Sebastian Posth
s.posth@gmail.com

Sabine:

Thanks for inviting us to present to you a registry based opt-out method. My name is Sabine Richly, I am a German qualified lawyer, legal advisor to this project.

Sebastian:

Hello everyone, my name is Sebastian Posth, I am the founder of Liccium and developer of the TDM:AI protocol.

Sabine:

Sebastian, yesterday we heard an in-depth discussion about different perspectives on AI opt-out — from both rightsholders and model providers. Many creators are concerned that current systems aren't practical or effective. So, what makes the TDM:AI opt-out registries different?

Sebastian:

We've developed a solution that avoids the main drawbacks of domain-based and asset-based opt-outs that rely on domain or file metadata.

1. Domain-based opt-out

Sabine:

Let's go step by step. First, what's wrong with domain-based opt-outs?

Sebastian:

Domain-based opt-outs, like using `robots.txt`, only work as long as the content stays on the website you control. The moment someone reposts your content — say, on social media — that instruction is lost.

2. Asset-based opt-out

Sabine:

What if the opt-out is embedded in the file itself, like in the metadata?

Sebastian:

The so-called asset-based opt-out is more portable – the instruction travels inside the file. But there's a problem: many platforms, especially social media, remove the metadata. So the rights declaration will be lost.

3. Registry-based opt-out

Sabine:

How does TDMAI solve this problem?

Sebastian:

We bind the opt-out to the fingerprint of the media file – not its location, not its metadata.

Sabine:

I see, a fingerprint is unique and cannot be removed from the media file. But how can it be used to declare an opt-out?

Sebastian:

The approach uses the International Standard Content Code – a new ISO standard for digital content identification.

Creators can generate the ISCC fingerprint for any type of work, attach the opt-out, and publish both in a public registry.

AI model providers on the other hand can then compare the fingerprints in the registry with their training data and remove any content marked with an opt-out.

4. Beyond “no”: transparency and licensing

Sabine:

That sounds powerful. I can see even more possibilities for this technology in the context of AI.

Sebastian:

You are right, TDM:AI, as implemented by Liccium, goes beyond just saying “no.” Rightsholders can also express licensing preferences — so in addition to opting out, they can offer their content.

Sabine:

Another use case: Rightsholders demand transparency about the content that was used to train AI – and the copyright template under the EU AI Act will specify an obligation to disclose information on training data.

Sebastian:

With TDMAI, model providers can publish ISCC fingerprints of their training datasets — being transparent without revealing trade secrets. It's an efficient way to comply with copyright law.

Sabine:

Exactly. And the same technology can be used to flag AI-generated content. Synthetic content has its own ISCC fingerprint, which can also be published in a registry.

Sebastian:

That way, all relevant information – rights, opt-outs, licenses, and whether content is synthetic or created by humans – can be connected to the content itself.

Sabine:

So to sum it up:

We suggest binding the opt-out declaration to the fingerprint of the work. And make it accessible in public opt-out registries.

Sebastian:

TDMAI registries are a new and reliable way to opt-out. They enable the licensing of training data and the labelling of AI-generated content.

Sabine:

Overall, TDM:AI public registries help create a transparent ecosystem for creators and other rightsholders, platforms and AI developers.

Sebastian:

And it all starts with a standard fingerprint for digital content — the ISCC and its associated rights and metadata.

If you have any further questions, feel free to reach out.