

Birce Barlas Yılmaz
Turkish Patent and Trademark Office, Industrial Property Examiner

I make my submission as my personal opinion.

Issue 1: Issue 1: Inventorship and Ownership

7/ (i) Should the law permit or require that the AI application be named as the inventor or should it be required that a human being be named as the inventor? In the event that a human inventor is required to be named, should the law give indications of the way in which the human inventor should be determined, or should this decision be left to private arrangements, such as corporate policy, with the possibility of judicial review by appeal in accordance with existing laws concerning disputes over inventorship?

Patent laws of most of the countries do not currently offer a clear solution of AI inventorship problem. However, according to the information to be obtained by interpreting the existing laws, it is understood that there is no existing regulation for patenting of AI inventions which is produced by AI or human support. While it can be interpreted that these inventions could be patented, it will be more difficult to make inferences about who the inventor will be. For instance, in Turkish Industrial Property Law, there is no clear clause as to who the inventor is, but it is understood from the letter that the inventor should be a “person”. There are alternative approaches to solve AI inventorship problem as giving the inventorship right to the Software and Hardware Developers, to Public or to Owner. In this case, the model of giving electronic personality to AI argued in the European Union, can be taken as an example among the alternative approaches. However, for such a system to be established, the terms of the contract must be created in such a way as to protect the persons involved in the formation of AI, the investor and the rights of other shareholders who have contractual rights as well as *personality* of AI. This may be followed by arrangements for the incorporation of AI machines into patent records as inventors.

- ++ AI should initially have patent rights. After that, the rights will be entitled to whoever is authorized by the contract
- ++ An agreement to protect the persons involved in the formation of AI, the investor and the rights of other shareholders who have contractual rights
- ++ AI machines into patent records as inventor
- ++ In case of infringement, to meet financial obligations– We could create a deposit account to satisfy claims. The source of these fund will be the people who has contractual rights in relation to AI.¹

I think this solution will be meet the concept of «person» as legally and support the aim of intellectual property protection by promoting incentive mechanism for inventors.

Birce Barlas Yılmaz
Industrial Property Examiner
12/02/2020

¹ SOLUM, Lawrence B., “Legal Personhood for Artificial Intelligences”, North Carolina Law Review, V.70, Y.1992, p.1245.