



LPRO
LEGISLATIVE POLICY
AND RESEARCH OFFICE

Final Survey Results; Public Comment and Recommendations Discussion

PREPARED FOR: Joint Task Force on Artificial Intelligence

DATE: November 15, 2024

BY: Legislative Policy and Research Office

Goals of Discussion

- Continue stakeholder questionnaire review.
- Hear public comment on draft recommendations.
- Discuss and finalize task force recommendations.



Survey Analysis, Continued

To access other preliminary results, please see [[LINK](#)]



Survey Analysis: Respondents by Sector

Sector or Industry	Respondent Count
Government	31
Information	29
Higher Education	27
Health services	21
Professional and Business Services	17
<i>[Declined to Answer]</i>	15
Financial Activities	14
Non-Profit	9
Manufacturing	9
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	7
Self-Employment	4
Education K-12	3
Leisure and Hospitality	1
Total:	187



Survey Analysis: Response Trends

Survey Recap:

- Completed Surveys: **187**
- Number of Definitions in Survey: **29**
- Response Options: **Acceptable**, **Neutral**, **Not Acceptable**, **I Don't Know**.

Trends in Responses:

• Respondents marking all 29 as “ Acceptable ”:	11 respondents,	5.8% of responses
• Respondents marking all 29 as “ Neutral ”:	5 respondents,	2.6% of responses
• Respondents marking all 29 as “ Not acceptable ”:	10 respondents,	5.2% of responses
• <u>Respondents marking all 29 as “I Don't Know”:</u>	<u>5 respondents,</u>	<u>2.6% of responses</u>
• Total:	31 respondents	16.5% of respondents



Survey Analysis: Response Trends, by Sector

Sector or Industry	Respondent Count	All "Acceptable"	All "Neutral"	All "Not acceptable"	All "I don't know"
Government	31	4	2		
Information	29	1			
Higher Education	27	1			
Health Services	21	1	1	1	
Professional and Business Services	17	1	1	2	1
<i>[Declined to Answer]</i>	15	1		3	3
Financial Activities	14		1		
Non-Profit	9			1	1
Manufacturing	9	2		1	
Trade, Transportation, and Utilities	7			1	
Self-Employment	4			1	
Education K-12	3				
Leisure and Hospitality	1				
Total:	187	11	5	10	5



Survey Analysis: Resources Identified by Respondents

Organization	Resource Name	Count
National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)	The Language of Trustworthy AI: An In-Depth Glossary of Terms	7
National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC)	NAIC Model Bulletin: Use of Artificial Intelligence Systems by Insurers	3
Food and Drug Administration (FDA)	Medical Device (SaMD) framework, the FDA AI/ML Action Plan	2
Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)	Not Specified	1
Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)	Not Specified	1
City of San Jose, Government AI Coalition	AI Policy Manual, AI Fact Sheet, others	1
Coalition for Health AI	Assurance Standards Guide & Assurance Reporting Checklist	1
Colorado Senate	CO SB 169 (Restrict Insurers' Use Of External Consumer Data)	1
Department of Regulatory Agencies, Division of Insurance	3 CCR 702-10: Unfair Discrimination	1
National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA)	AI Accountability Policy Report: Glossary of Terms	1
New York State Department of Financial Services	Insurance Circular Letter No. 7	1
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)	Recommendation of the Council on Artificial Intelligence	1
Roadster Capital	Responsible AI for Startups	1
Stanford University Center for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence	Artificial Intelligence Definitions	1
The Synthetic Sentience Research Foundation	Not Specified	1
WCET	AI Education Policy & Practice Ecosystem Framework	1
Wikipedia	Glossary of Artificial Intelligence	1



Survey Analysis: Main Themes from Open Responses

- AI is an emerging, constantly evolving field so definitions become quickly outdated.
- There is tension between the desire to tailor definitions to Oregon contexts, and the desire to standardize across the country.
 - Respondents in healthcare and insurance sectors reported concerns about adhering to a patchwork of legislation and enforcement.
- Policy context is needed before most people/organizations will provide support for a specific definition.
- Consider aligning terms with existing, regularly updated standards (NIST, ISO/IEC).



Public Comment



Recommendations Discussion

House Bill 4153 (2023) Task Force Charge

The Joint Task Force on Artificial Intelligence shall examine and identify terms and definitions related to artificial intelligence that are used in technology-related fields and may be used for legislation.

- The task force shall begin its work by examining the terms and definitions used by the United States government and relevant federal agencies.
- The terms and definitions identified by the task force for use in legislation must align as closely as possible with terms and definitions used in federal rules.



Draft Recommendation for Discussion:

Terms and Definitions

The Joint Task Force on Artificial Intelligence recommends that AI-related terms and definitions in the National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST) [Language of Trustworthy AI: An In-depth Glossary of Terms](#) should be the primary federal resource for drafting legislation in Oregon.

Other authoritative sources for AI-related terms and definitions include:

- International Association of Privacy Professionals' (IAPP) [Key Terms for AI Governance](#).
- International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) policy [ISO/IEC 22989: 2022](#).



Draft Recommendations for Discussion: Guidelines

When drafting AI-related legislation in Oregon, the task force recommends the following guidelines around terms and definitions:

- Recognize that AI technology is rapidly evolving, requiring ongoing legislative conversation and monitoring.
- Consider the context if a definition in statute is needed by looking at existing Oregon law that may apply without a specific AI definition cited, or if a statute may need to be amended to clarify the use of AI.
- Exercise caution when adopting other states' AI definitions, as statutory terms change and differ between states.




Draft Recommendations for Discussion: Guidelines

- Be cautious when adding AI terms to existing statutes and laws regarding prohibited actions (i.e., illegal activity) and consider how legislation applies to the underlying AI technology versus how people and organizations use AI. The Task Force recommends regulating uses of AI technologies rather than attempting to regulate specific AI technologies.
- When choosing definitions, technical and/or science-based AI-related terms and definitions tend to have more longevity.



Additional Recommendations?

Deep AI prompt: A diverse group of people making recommendations on artificial intelligence definitions.



JTFAI Timeline and Deadlines

Date	Meeting Type	Agenda Items	Notes
November 15 th	Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public Comment• Recommendations Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incorporate Public Comment and Task Force Discussion into Recommendations If Needed
November 25 th			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Draft Recommendations and Report to Task Force to Review
December 1 st			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Update Due to Legislature
December 3 rd	Work Session	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adoption of Recommendations	
December 15 th			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Report Due to Legislature

