BUSINESS, CORPORATE & SECURITIES

Services

Business, Corporate & Securities

Legal Alerts for the Arizona Business Community

August 2023

Why You Probably Need an Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy by Colson B. Franse and Ken Witt

probably needs an AI policy to be proactive instead of reactive in the ever-evolving AI world.

Do you know if your employees or vendors are using generative AI in their work? Chances are that some of them are (and yes, that can be a big deal). This article takes a quick look at why your company

ChatGPT is the fastest growing app of all time since its launch in November 2022 and generative Al continues to take the world by storm. Unfortunately, many businesses (including law firms) have not paused to consider how they should approach generative Al. Before we get ahead of ourselves, let's make sure we are on the same page as to what we mean by generative Al. Generative Al is any type of artificial intelligence system that can generate text, images or other media in response to a prompt based on the patterns and structure of their input training data. On the surface that doesn't sound so bad but let's narrow in on what we mean by "input training data," specifically in the context of ChatGPT.

Like your browsing history, ChatGPT by default keeps a chat history of the "conversations" that you have with ChatGPT and uses this data to train and improve ChatGPT, meaning that both data you input and outputs you receive from ChatGPT are out of your control and subject to the whims of the complex AI algorithm. Fortunately, the ChatGPT feature introduced on April 25 now allows users to turn off their chat history. Conversations that take place after chat history is turned off will not be used to train and improve ChatGPT and will be deleted after 30 days. While this is a step in the right direction, keep in mind that ChatGPT is not the only generative AI platform and by default ChatGPT will be keeping a chat history.

What does this mean for your business? Here are a few quick examples:

First, unbeknownst to you, your employee may have used ChatGPT or a similar platform to generate that blog post requested by your client and there are a number of issues, including copyright, that could be the subject of another article.

Second, imagine you have an outdated filing system and your company signs a contract with a new online document management platform that will help you become more organized. One of the key selling points is that this document management company scans the documents and then uses OCR (optical character recognition) combined with Al to process those piles of documents around the office into orderly online folders. What you failed to consider was that the document management platform utilizes a third-party Al provider whose policy provides that your documents will be used as "input training data" for the Al provider. Hopefully those documents did not have confidential client information, personal health information covered by HIPAA or data from customers in Europe subject to the General Data Protection Regulation because they are now forever part of the Al platform.

KUTAKROCK

KUTAKROCK

Page 2

Third, imagine you hire an attorney to do some research for you surrounding some of your company's trade secrets. This attorney prepares a draft memo but decides to use ChatGPT to rewrite part of the memo to make it more understandable (not knowing to turn off chat history). The attorney uploads the memo, and out comes a much more polished product for you. The first problem is that the lawyer has probably violated the important duty of confidentiality (Model Rules of Professional Conduct 1.6) and may have waived attorney-client privilege by disclosing confidential client information to ChatGPT. The second problem is that you may have lost trade secret protection because the trade secrets were discussed in the memo, and the memo is now part of the ChatGPT training data and used to generate content for other users.

Perhaps you now see some of the risks surrounding generative AI. We recommend that every company consider adopting AI policies and procedures both for employees and external vendors. An AI policy should at a minimum (i) provide for general training on the topic to all employees; (ii) address permitted uses, prohibited uses and uses requiring internal approval; (iii) define what company information may or may not be uploaded; (iv) specify what generative AI platforms are permitted and prohibited (possibly having your IT department block prohibited platforms); (v) adopt transparency protocols which help internal and external stakeholders identify content created by generative AI and (vi) provide for continuous monitoring of new platforms and technology.

If you have questions or want assistance creating an AI policy, please contact a member of Kutak Rock's Scottsdale Corporate and Securities Group. You may also visit us at <u>www.kutakrock.com</u>.

Scottsdale Corporate and Securities Group

Mark Lasee 480.429.4828 mark.lasee@kutakrock.com

Marc Lieberman 480.429.7103 marc.lieberman@kutakrock.com

Richard Lieberman 480.429.4830 richard.lieberman@kutakrock.com

Emily Smith 480.429.4886 emily.smith@kutakrock.com

Michael Tobak 480.429.5000 michael.tobak@kutakrock.com

Isaiah Wilson II 480.429.7122 isaiah.wilson@kutakrock.com

Ken Witt 480.429.4864 ken.witt@kutakrock.com

Matthew Ditman 480.429.5000 matthew.ditman@kutakrock.com

Colson Franse 480.429.4851 colson.franse@kutakrock.com

Christina Ribble 480.429.4844 christina.ribble@kutakrock.com

Scottsdale Government Relations Group

Marcus Osborn 480.429.4862 marcus.osborn@kutakrock.com

Daniel Romm 480.429.4852 daniel.romm@kutakrock.com



Prickly Pear is a publication of Kutak Rock LLP's Scottdale Corporate and Securities Group. This publication is intended to notify our clients and friends of current events and provide general information about business, corporate and securities issues in Arizona. *Prickly Pear* is not intended, nor should it be used, as specific legal advice, and it does not create an attorney-client relationship. This communication could be considered advertising in some jurisdictions. The choice of a lawyer is an important decision and should not be based solely upon advertisements.