

Meeting Summary

Joint Task Force on Artificial Intelligence

Meeting #8

[Link](#) to Task Force on OLIS



LPRO
LEGISLATIVE POLICY
AND RESEARCH OFFICE

Date/Time	November 15, 10 a.m. - 12 p.m. (link to recording)
Attendees	Chair Newberry Representative Reschke Reza Alavi Alan Fern Jimmy Godard Jason Kistler Sean McSpaden Kelsey Wilson Rose Feliciano; substituting for David Edmonson
Informational Meeting Final Survey Results	<p>During the previous meeting, task force members requested additional information about questionnaire replies.</p> <p>LPRO provided data showing that of 187 respondents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 31 respondents “straight-lined,” or gave the same answer to all 30 of the definitions in the questionnaire. <p>Of these 31 respondents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ 11 gave exclusively “acceptable” responses,○ 10 gave “not acceptable” responses,○ 5 gave “neutral” responses, and○ 5 do not know responses” for all definitions. <p>Of these respondents, those from the government sector were more likely to choose all “acceptable” answers, while those who declined to specify their sector were more likely to choose all “not acceptable” answers. Overall, straight-line answers were distributed among numerous sectors.</p> <p>Respondents were also able to submit information on their own sources of definitions. Seven specifically mentioned the glossary from NIST. Single respondents recommended publications from the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, the Food and Drug Administration, and other entities.</p> <p>Open responses noted AI is an emerging and evolving field. Some respondents wanted definitions tailored to Oregon contexts, while others wanted more national level standards. Health care and insurance sectors had concerns about different legislation in different states and state-level enforcement. Some noted they would want context on policy before supporting specific definitions.</p>
Public Hearing	<p>The task force’s draft recommendations were posted to OLIS, and a public hearing was scheduled. The public was able to register to testify before the task force members or to submit written comment.</p> <p>No one signed up to testify before the task force, and one person submitted written testimony as of the meeting time. Chair Newberry noted the portal to</p>

submit written comment would be open until Sunday, November 17, at 10:00 am.

Informational Meeting

Draft Recommendations Discussion

LPRO reviewed the task force charge of examining AI-related terms and definitions, beginning with those used by federal agencies, and making recommendations to the Legislative Assembly. The draft recommendations were compiled based on previous task force discussions and guidelines that members have suggested for legislators to consider when crafting AI-related legislation.

LPRO reminded the task force that the final recommendations and vote on those are scheduled for the December 3 meeting. Chair Newberry then opened up discussion on draft recommendations.

Recommendation: Terms and Definitions Sources

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](#).*

Task force members expressed satisfaction with the recommendation covering terms and definitions. They suggested adding secondary resources, such as the AI principles from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), and the European Union (EU) Artificial Intelligence Act.

Members also noted there are industry-specific sets of definitions that may be useful for legislation in their respective topic areas, with health care and industry suggested as potential examples to note in the report. They noted the main message is terms and definitions will change, and that a definition may not be suitable for all situations.

Recommendations: Guidelines, Part 1

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.*

Task force members wanted to ensure that when there is existing law, that AI definitions are not reinventing it, though it was noted that such law was often written prior to the advent of AI. Multiple members stressed that the main recommendation here is that legislation should focus on the use of AI rather than the underlying technology of AI. Present members agreed on adding “of its current and likely applications” to the end of the first bullet point.

Recommendations: Guidelines, Part 2

- *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.*

Regarding these draft guidelines, members reiterated that the context of how AI is used is more important than the underlying technology of AI. They suggested breaking the first bullet point into two separate points and reverse the order, so the second sentence was given priority. Members again noted AI technology is rapidly evolving and changing. Members also suggested removing “regulate” from the recommendations and preferred language closer to “related to.”

Additional Discussion

LPRO reviewed the group suggestions to the draft recommendations:

- Add the OECD and EU as secondary definition sources.
- Note industry-specific definitions exist.
- Add “current and likely applications” to the specified recommendation.
- Split the specific recommendation into separate bullet points.
- Remove “regulating” from the specific recommendation.
- Prioritize the recommendation for addressing the uses of AI rather than its underlying technology.

Chair Newberry reminded the group the next meeting is the work session to formally adopt the recommendations and report, and that it is scheduled from 3 to 5 pm on December 3. Members will have the opportunity to discuss these further and make final refinements before the vote occurs. Members will also be able to review the report before adoption, though member suggestions should focus on the recommendations.



Public Comment

- [Link](#) to written comments

Meeting Materials

- [Link](#) to LPRO presentation
- [Link](#) to draft task force recommendations
- [Link](#) to witness registration list

