



Qualis A3 ISSN: 2178-2008

ARTIGO

Listas de conteúdos disponíveis em [DOAJ](#)

Revista Processus de Estudos de Gestão, Jurídicos e Financeiros



The 11th WIPO conversation on intellectual property & frontier technologies

Sobre a 11ª conversa da OMPI sobre propriedade intelectual e tecnologias de fronteira

Alessandro Aveni¹

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6266-6818>

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/0679425851663633>

Universidade de Brasília, UnB, DF, Brasil

E-mail: alessandro@unb.br



Publication Information

ISSN: 2178-2008

Received: 25-01-2026

Accepted: 18-03-2026

Published: 23-03-2026

Keywords:

Wipo.

Intellectual property (IP).

Artificial Intelligence (AI).

Palavras-chave:

Ompi.

Propriedade Intelectual (PI).

Inteligência Artificial (IA).

Abstract

The goal of this paper is to summarize key points from the 11th WIPO discussion about artificial intelligence (AI), held in April 2025. The conversation theme was "Infrastructure for Rights Holders and Innovation," which is of particular interest to intellectual property. Key areas discussed included the evolution of copyright infrastructure, handling of training data, respecting rights holders' preferences, tracking and labeling AI outputs, and issues of compensation and rights application. The discussion also covered regulatory developments, related Codes of Practice, and their implications for copyright, transparency, and rights management. The paper provides a summary of the conversation's results and outlines remaining issues. This is part of the author's research on AI and property rights systems.

Resumo

O objetivo do artigo é resumir os pontos-chave da 11ª discussão da OMPI sobre AI em Abril de 2025. O tema da conversa foi "Infraestrutura para Titulares de Direitos e Inovação" e o tema tem especial interesse em Propriedade Intelectual. As principais áreas incluíram: como a infraestrutura de direitos autorais deve evoluir, como os dados de treinamento são tratados, como respeitar as preferências dos titulares de direitos, como os resultados da AI devem ser rastreados e rotulados, e como a compensação ou os direitos podem ser aplicados. A discussão abrange desenvolvimentos regulatórios e Códigos de Prática relacionados, e suas implicações para direitos autorais, transparência e gestão de direitos. O artigo também apresenta um resumo de todos os resultados das conversas e das questões ainda em discussão. O artigo faz parte da pesquisa do autor sobre as relações entre AI e o sistema de direitos de propriedade.

¹ Bacharel em Administração e Mestre em Geografia pela Universidade de Brasília-UnB, Doutor em Ciências Políticas pela Universidade Statale de Milano e em Administração pela Universidade Commerciale Luigi Bocconi di Milano ambas na Itália. Possui também Especialização em Estratégia Empresarial pela Fundação Getúlio Vargas-FGV.

Introduction

Held the 23–24 April 2025 under the theme “Infrastructure for Rights Holders and Innovation” the WIPO eleventh session focused on how to build and adapt the infrastructure needed to support rights-holders (creators, artists, publishers, etc.) while fostering innovation with artificial intelligence (AI) systems. In that same years, at the end of October 2025, there will be the Twelfth Session of the WIPO Conversation: Intellectual Property and Synthetic Media (WIPO 2025).

The Key areas included in the eleventh session were: how copyright infrastructure (management systems, licensing, detection, registers etc.) must evolve, how training data is handled (access, licensing, attribution, opt-out mechanisms), how to respect preferences of rights holders. how outputs of artificial intelligence (AI) (i.e. content generated by AI) should be tracked, labeled, how compensation or rights might apply, and Regulatory developments such as the EU AI Act and related Codes of Practice, and their implications for copyright, transparency, and rights management.

The paper reports the discussion on Infrastructure for Rights Holders and Innovation session and makes observations and conclusions about the WIPO strategy and results of the sessions till today. In that sense, it is a communication of an ongoing research that starts the first WIPO session on. The goal of WIPO is to be informed on the subject but also participate and listen to the speakers that are researching worldwide in order to make suggestions for regulators. In that sense the research is also a comparative assessment of the consciousness of the artificial intelligence (AI) technology today.

Methodology

The methodological process is a study case or an expanded summary of the WIPO 11th sessions and also sketch a summary of the whole discussion. The first section examine the discussion reports the main theme, conclusions and a synthesis of the sessions, seeking for results of the 11th session. In the second section the paper add a summary of the state of art of WIPO about artificial intelligence (AI) till today. The paper present a concluding remarks section and the bibliographic references. All data are retrieved from WIPO web site. Other bibliography is retrieved from the Internet. Part of the research on internet was made using ChatGPT tool.

DISCUSSION

The interest on WIPO artificial intelligence (AI) conversations is great because it is a showcase of many speakers about AI and their concerns on relations between AI in a IP framework in the international agreement and rules. For all academics working with IP in every place in the world, to know WIPO conversations is mandatory, as a resource and basic knowledge of the on going researches and discussions about AI. Today, everybody is using sort of generative AI software even not knowing the basic of AI. We know of labour market heavy impacts, products and services that could be developed by individuals solutions against great corporations solutions, starting new companies and develop marginal or disruptive innovations (OECD/Eurostat, 2018).

The mark to define innovation is The Oslo Manual, jointly developed by the OECD and Eurostat, which provides the international guidelines for collecting and interpreting innovation data. In its 4th edition (2018), it distinguishes types and degrees of innovation without explicitly using the term disruptive innovation, but it sets a conceptual framework that helps differentiate between incremental (marginal) and radical (disruptive) changes. There are marginal (Incremental) Innovation: These are small,

continuous improvements to existing products, processes, or organizational methods. According to the Oslo Manual, they often build on existing knowledge and capabilities, resulting in “modifications and improvements that do not significantly change the overall functionality or performance” (OECD/Eurostat, 2018, p. 56). Such innovations are essential for competitiveness but usually reinforce existing markets and technological trajectories.

The manual explain also disruptive (Radical) Innovation. While the Oslo Manual does not formally adopt Christensen’s terminology of “disruptive innovation,” it describes radical innovation as those that “introduce entirely new functionalities or result in significant departures from previous practices” (OECD/Eurostat, 2018, p. 58). These innovations can create new markets, restructure industries, or render existing technologies and business models obsolete.

The Marginal vs. Disruptive Innovation in the Oslo Manual Key Difference are: Marginal innovations = incremental, cumulative, efficiency-oriented, and sustaining of current markets. Disruptive innovations = radical, market-creating or market-transforming, and often challenge incumbents by shifting technological or economic paradigms.

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a marginal innovation when considered to support everyday software or services, but the overall TI and AI systems are a new wave of programs developing a disruptive or radical change into the market changing the relation between human and machine joint activities. AI cannot be classified only as one software alone but as part of innovations supporting a dramatic change in the market. So it is important to be cautious to use Oslo Manual definitions but also to claim AI is the main part of new industrial revolution like Industry 4.0 or even Industry 5.0 (AVENI 2024).

It is essential to study the basic innovations and the regulations definitions, and different fields and uses of artificial intelligence (AI) before discuss the relations between Intellectual Property and AI systems because of the complexity but also because, as it can easily seen in the WIPO sessions, there are many points of view in the world. The study of WIPO sessions could help a lot to explore the fragmented framework of relations system today.

The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations, established in 1967 with the entry into force of the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization. Its mandate is to “promote the protection of intellectual property (IP) throughout the world through cooperation among States” and to ensure the administration of various international treaties in the IP field (WIPO, 1967).

WIPO thus, functions as both a norm-setting body—developing frameworks and treaties that harmonize IP protection globally—and as a service provider, offering registration systems such as the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), the Madrid System for trademarks, and the Hague System for industrial designs (Ruse-Khan, 2016).

WIPO’s mission extends beyond the technical administration of IP rights. It aims to foster innovation, creativity, and knowledge diffusion by balancing the interests of creators, industries, and the public (Gervais, 2020). In recent decades, WIPO has also emphasized the role of IP in economic development, capacity-building, and digital transformation, particularly for developing countries (De Beer, 2018).

Its activities therefore bridge the global North–South divide by facilitating access to IP systems, promoting technology transfer, and encouraging inclusive participation in the knowledge economy. WIPO is not only the custodian of international IP treaties but also a forum or a think tank where legal, economic, and political dimensions of

intellectual property intersect. Its mission reflects a dual commitment: to strengthen IP protection globally and to ensure that IP serves as a catalyst for cultural exchange.

Here is a short summary of WIPO's Conversation on IP & artificial intelligence (AI) (now "IP & Frontier Technologies") sessions so far — the date, number, and title/topic of each of the eleven sessions. There are some gaps in details for certain sessions because WIPO doesn't always publish full names or distinct "titles" for all; where a formal title isn't given, I've used descriptive topic as published by WIPO.

Table 1 - Summary of all WIPO IP & artificial intelligence (AI) / Frontier Technologies Conversation Sessions

Session No.	Title / Topic
1st Session	<i>WIPO Conversation on IP and AI — "Artificial Intelligence and IP Policy":</i> addressing broad conceptual questions; formulating questions policymakers need to ask.
2nd Session	<i>IP & AI: AI works/inventions, and data</i> — conceptually discussing IP protection for AI works & inventions, and data.
3rd Session	<i>IP & AI: AI in relation to trademarks, capacity building, etc.</i> — connecting AI with trademarks, capacity building, etc.
4th Session	<i>Data and IP</i> — focusing on data beyond AI, business & legal relevance of data in an increasingly connected world.
5th Session	<i>New Technologies for Intellectual Property Administration</i> — assessing the uses (and disruptions) of new technologies in IP administration/registration.
6th Session	<i>Frontier Technologies – AI Inventions</i> — deep dive into AI inventions: how autonomous AI is, its role in the inventive process, how IP Offices are handling patenting of AI inventions.
7th Session	<i>Intellectual Property and the Metaverse</i> — discussing frontier technologies enabling the metaverse (AI, blockchain, AR/VR, NFTs, IoT, data processing) and the challenges these pose to existing IP systems.
8th Session	<i>GenAI and IP</i> — discussing how generative AI (GenAI) affects content creation (music, images, text), questions around protection of creative works, AI model protection, data input-output relationships.
9th Session	<i>"Training the Machines – Bytes, Rights and the Copyright Conundrum"</i> — focusing on training data, its copyright implications, the legal issues around using copyrighted works for AI training.
10th Session	<i>"Generative AI: IP and Output – To Protect, or Not to Protect – that is the IP question"</i> — exploring whether outputs of generative AI should or can be protected by IP.

11th Session

“AI and IP: Infrastructure for Rights Holders and Innovation” — examining role of copyright infrastructure in implementing fairness (transparency, attribution, compensation, etc.), infrastructure solutions, regulatory frameworks to protect creators while supporting innovation.

Source https://www.wipo.int/en/web/frontier-technologies/frontier_conversation

A Summary of The Eleventh Session April 2025

The eleventh session could be summarized by these main topics:

-Text & Data Mining (TDM) vs Opt-out systems
There's significant discussion about whether exceptions (or mandatory permissions) for TDM are sufficient, or whether systems should allow rights holders to opt out. Infrastructure challenges include how to manage such opt-out at scale, and how to implement it technically (for example via robots.txt etc.).

-Use of technical standards / simple mechanisms
For example, Google's proposal/initiative around "robots.txt" (or "robots.txt-extended") to let publishers express preferences about whether their content should be used in artificial intelligence (AI) model training. This is seen as a low-barrier tool for transparency and control.

-Legal/regulatory harmonisation & global regulatory trends
Many speakers emphasized that differences across national laws risk fragmenting the infrastructure, complicating licensing, enforcement, and interoperability. There was attention to how the EU artificial intelligence (AI) Act, forthcoming Code of Practice, and other jurisdictions are shaping expectations.

-Infrastructure for outputs
How to detect artificial intelligence (AI)-generated content, how to label it (so users and consumers know what's human vs generated), mechanisms for "unlearning" (removing outputs or training data upon request), and ensuring compensation or rights protection for original creators?.

-Importance for individual creators
Not only big institutions or tech companies are affected. Individual creators raised that existing infrastructure often fails smaller rights holders: lack of visibility, resources, or capacity to track or enforce rights, understand licenses, or push back where needed.

-Interoperability and risk of fragmentation
Because different jurisdictions, publishers, platforms, artificial intelligence (AI) modelers may adopt different standards, there's a risk of balkanization. For example, what counts as "opt-out", how licenses are structured, the metadata standards for rights information — all need to be compatible.

While not all conclusions of the session were definitive some of the signals and possible directions are first a push toward standardized mechanisms for rights-holders to express preferences about their works (opt-out / licensing / attribution metadata). Tools like robots.txt (or enhanced versions) were discussed as promising starting points.

The discussion had greater emphasis on transparency in both inputs (what goes into training datasets) and outputs (how generated content is identified) and need for legal/regulatory updates in many jurisdictions to keep pace: e.g. codifying TDM exceptions or opt-outs, ensuring enforcement, updating licensing frameworks. Was also discussed. It was raised the voice / role of smaller creators, developing countries, less

resourced stakeholders, in shaping infrastructure so it serves not only major tech / publishing players.

There is a list of the summaries of all the work presents Key proposals / positions that came out of the session:

- Standardised, machine-readable rights signals are essential. Strong push for low-friction, machine-readable ways for rights holders to express training-use preferences (e.g., robots.txt-style signals, ORDF-like metadata). Proposed as a practical first step to let publishers/creators opt out or specify licence terms.
- Transparency for both inputs (training data) and outputs (generated content). Repeated calls for mechanisms to disclose training sources and to label artificial intelligence (AI) outputs so users and downstream platforms can make informed decisions (and so rights-holders can track downstream uses).
- Practical interoperability and standards (metadata, registries, detection). Multiple speakers advocated interoperable registries and metadata standards (for rights, licences, authorship attribution) to avoid fragmentation and lower transaction costs for collective management organizations (CMOs) and small creators. Bill Rosenblatt and others emphasised technical interoperability.
- Support for smaller creators and capacity building. Recurrent point: infrastructure solutions must serve small/independent creators and resource-constrained jurisdictions, not only major publishers or big tech. Suggested actions: funding for creator uptake of tools, simplified licensing templates, and inclusive governance of standards.
- Legal/regulatory alignment is needed but will vary by jurisdiction. Speakers noted the EU artificial intelligence (AI) Act and various national copyright reforms are raising expectations around transparency and data rights — but global harmonisation is lacking; hence the need for flexible technical standards that can operate across legal regimes. Céline Castets-Renard spoke to the EU Act's implications.
- Certification, auditing and “fair training” initiatives. Civil society / creator-led proposals (e.g., Fairly Trained / Statement on artificial intelligence (AI) Training) were highlighted as complementary — industry certification and independent auditing/labels were discussed as ways to validate training practices. Ed Newton-Rex's work was referenced.
- Operational ideas: ‘unlearning’, takedown, and payment flows. Technical feasibility of unlearning (removing particular works from models), practical licensing/payment flows (how to remunerate authors whose works were used), and automated detection for enforcement were discussed as urgent R&D/standardisation priorities.

It is also interesting split and resume a Regional / stakeholder breakdown of strategic summary as the follow:

- EU / Europe (e.g., Anna Vuopala and EU-taskforce speakers) Focus: building copyright infrastructure aligned with EU policy (ORDF/open rights frameworks), interoperability across EU CMOs, and leveraging EU policy momentum (CDSM, EU artificial intelligence (AI) Act) to push metadata standards.
- North America / tech industry representatives (e.g., Google, Microsoft, legal counsels) Focus: practical technical solutions (robots.txt-style signals, detection tools), concerns about over-fragmenting internet access, and emphasis on workable standards that scale for large datasets. Legal counsel highlighted ongoing litigation trends and compliance considerations.
- China / East Asia (e.g., Wang Qian, Wu Guanyong) Focus: national regulatory development, large-scale technical approaches to monitoring and detection (artificial intelligence (AI) fingerprinting), and the role of domestic industry in building detection / rights-management tools.

-Global South / creators' organizations (e.g., Dora Makwinja, Santiago Schuster Vergara) Emphasis on capacity building, making standards accessible to smaller CMOs, ensuring remuneration reaches creators in developing countries, and warning that purely technical opt-outs can disadvantage creators who lack resources to use them.

The Civil society & creators (e.g., Ed Newton-Rex, Fairly Trained) Pushed for ethical/"fair" training standards, public registries/certification, and stronger remedies for creators. Advocated for both industry accountability and independent certification. WIPO and the Director General referenced the idea of creating a practical forum for sharing artificial intelligence (AI) infrastructure practices (reported afterwards as the AI Infrastructure Interchange (AII) — intended as a collaborative forum to share information around AI infrastructure).

However the main players orientations on AI follow they own schedule. Europe (EU) says that : "Copyright infrastructure must be interoperable across borders. If each country builds its own opt-out or licensing tools, creators will be lost in fragmentation. We need metadata standards that work for everyone."

The US has another view: "The priority is practicality. Rights signals must be simple enough for billions of web pages — robots.txt is a workable starting point. If the solution is too complex, it won't scale."

For China artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming copyright faster than any legal reform. Our challenge is to design detection and registration tools that can identify works in vast datasets — only then can enforcement be real.

Global South (Africa/Latin America) are discussing that infrastructure should not serve only big publishers and platforms. Small creators and CMOs in developing countries need affordable, accessible tools; otherwise, they will be excluded from the artificial intelligence (AI) economy.

Creators / Civil Society out from institutions affirm that fair training is not just a slogan. Creators deserve to know if their works trained artificial intelligence (AI), and they deserve a choice: permission, payment, or opt-out. Certification and transparency are non-negotiable."

As a result a Policy Briefs was also developed in the session. Government Agency must ensure national copyright law & infrastructure stay aligned with global artificial intelligence (AI) developments, support international interoperability efforts (metadata standards, opt-out mechanisms), implement domestic guidelines for transparency of artificial intelligence (AI) training & outputs, invest in national registries/detection tools to help smaller rights holders, monitor EU artificial intelligence (AI) Act (EU 2024) , US copyright reforms (US 2025) , China's detection tech (China 2025) adapt accordingly.

The Collective Management Organization (CMO) must protect members' rights and revenue in the artificial intelligence (AI) era, advocate for interoperable metadata standards to manage rights across borders, develop opt-out / licensing services for members (simple, low-cost), build partnerships with artificial intelligence (AI) firms for direct licensing and monitoring, educate members about artificial intelligence (AI) risks, opportunities, and available technical tools.

While Independent Creator Coalition must empower small creators to defend rights in artificial intelligence (AI) systems, demand clear labelling of artificial intelligence (AI) outputs and transparent disclosure of training datasets, lobby for "fair training" certification and collective bargaining with artificial intelligence (AI) platforms, promote free/open tools for opt-out and detection (robots.txt extensions, watermarking), build solidarity networks across borders to ensure small creators' voices are heard in WIPO and national policy debates.

We must underline also that not all WIPO session are directed or generate by public administrations and institutions or to discuss general rules or agreements. The speakers of that entities are participating sessions with the consent of their bosses so they are telling the bosses stories. Moreover the participation of experts does not imply accordance of the entity with the conclusions and the suggestions of the WIPO sessions.

RESULTS. WIPO STATE OF ART AFTER 11th SESSION

This section clarify what is the “state of the art” for WIPO’s work on artificial intelligence (AI) & IP after the 11th Conversation session (April 2025). This partially explain what’s been done, what are the key tensions, and where things seem headed? What WIPO has accomplished / current status can be resumed by:

- Global multi-stakeholder dialogue, growing reach. The WIPO Conversation on IP and Frontier Technologies has become a regular forum: every year (twice per year roughly), bringing together creators, tech firms, regulators, academics, IP offices from many countries. Participation is broad (member states, creative industries, collective management organizations, etc.), which helps surface diverse perspectives.
- Greater clarity on specific challenges posed by artificial intelligence (AI). Issues like training data (how to license or allow/deny use, how to attribute, opt-out mechanisms) are now well recognized. The output side (how AI-generated works should be tracked, labelled, how compensation flows, whether new rules / enforcement needed) are being more systemically discussed. The regulatory landscape (e.g. EU AI Act, Codes of Practice) is being taken into account in how infrastructure might need to adapt.
- Identification of infrastructure as a central concept. WIPO has emphasized that “infrastructure” isn’t just legal text: it includes technical systems (metadata, registries, detection tools), management & licensing systems, attribution mechanisms, transparency tools. The idea is that unless infrastructure evolves, legal reforms won’t be enough — because the enforcement, attribution, tracking, licensing etc. will lag behind what generative artificial intelligence (AI) makes possible.
- New initiatives / tools. WIPO is launching or supporting tools / forums. For example, the artificial intelligence (AI) Infrastructure Interchange (AIII) is mentioned as a new platform for sharing best practices among rights-holders, developers, policymakers. WIPO also produces toolkits, policy-resources for public use, to help stakeholders (especially in developing countries) understand AI-IP trade-offs.
- Increased focus on fairness, equity, inclusion. Recognizing the risk that smaller creators, CMOs in less resourced settings, or less developed jurisdictions will be disadvantaged by complex legal/technical mechanisms. Emphasis on making infrastructure scalable, affordable, and understandable for all, not just large tech players.

However there are tensions / ongoing challenges. First the legal harmonization vs. local diversity. Different jurisdictions have different copyright laws, different expectations of rights and enforcement. Ensuring cross-border interoperability without constraining sovereignty is hard. Second the opt-out vs. mandatory usage vs licensing. How to balance rights-holder control (opt-out, licensing) with the needs of artificial intelligence (AI) developers (access to data). Infrastructure must be built so that both are possible, but there’s disagreement on how much control is feasible or reasonable.

A third point to manage is the technical feasibility of detection, attribution, unlearning. Identifying which works were used in training (especially when data is large and opaque), unlearning specific works, labelling generated content– all pose technical, cost, and operational challenges. A fourth point is Transparency vs confidentiality / trade secrets. artificial intelligence (AI) model makers sometimes resist full transparency over

training data or model internals citing proprietary concerns. Balancing transparency and protecting innovation/investment is delicate.

As fifth point there is the remuneration / compensation mechanisms. How do rights-holders get paid when their works are used? Is it via royalties, licensing schemes, statutory levies, or something else? These discussions are progressing, but practical implementation lags. Sixth point to manage is the implementation for smaller/less resourced stakeholders. Many tools or proposed standards are technically or financially heavy; resource constraints in many countries (or among individual creators) mean many may not benefit unless special support or scaled down tools are provided.

As a final result we guess to summarize the operations where things seem to be heading following all WIPO suggestions. There is more standardization of rights signals and metadata. Efforts to define common machine-readable signals (opt-out metadata, licensing metadata), registries of rights, detection tools. These will likely be a cornerstone in upcoming regulations and market practices.

Laws like the EU artificial intelligence (AI) Act, Codes of Practice are emerging, and as countries observe each other, more regulatory frameworks will define obligations for transparency and rights management. Also infrastructure exchanges and capacity building are growing. Platforms like AIII will help share best practices. There will be more toolkits, model contracts, templates to help countries & creators build needed infrastructure, especially in developing regions

There are more enforcement / oversight mechanisms. Stronger mechanisms for detecting unauthorized use in training, labelling outputs, possibly obligations for model makers/developers to audit or certify their processes. It seems that user / rights-holder it is empowered. Greater demands for tools that allow creators to opt-out, to monitor, to be compensated; possibly new legal doctrines or rights around synthetic media /artificial intelligence (AI) outputs (depending on jurisdiction).

In summary the “State of the Art after 2025” shows that WIPO has not made real progress: the conversation has moved from very abstract framing (what is artificial intelligence (AI), what are IP rights generally) toward practical issues (training data licensing, outputs, how infrastructure works) but AI is not completely discussed. Once a year session did not had deep results. In many places, action is still nascent: many proposals, standards, and initiatives are being discussed but not yet fully implemented globally.

The balance between rights-holder protection and innovation remains unresolved by the progression of the innovation worldwide. The artificial intelligence (AI) generative innovations are running faster than the discussions, and many of the solutions proposal are provisional, experimental, or localized. For many stakeholders (smaller creators, developing countries), much still depends on WIPO and national governments to provide support (technical, legal, financial) to build or access infrastructure.

However WIPO’s stance is collaborative and non-prescriptive: focus on standards, tooling and inclusion rather than imposing a single legal rule. By contrast, national/regional approaches are diverging. For instance the evidence-backed comparison of WIPO’s position (post-11th Conversation, Apr 2025) versus the state of national / regional laws and practice could be drawn.

Europe is pushing hard on legal obligations and transparency through the EU artificial intelligence (AI) Act (already in force with staged application), which creates binding duties for certain AI systems and raises expectations for transparency and governance. This puts legal pressure on model developers to disclose and manage training/use practices.

United States remains litigation-driven and doctrine-oriented: the U.S. Copyright Office and courts are actively interrogating whether training on copyrighted works is fair use; the Copyright Office's reports and recent lawsuits show mixed, evolving results and heavy reliance on case law rather than a single regulatory framework.

China emphasizes operational control and technical solutions (detection, fingerprinting, content governance) alongside evolving regulatory instruments — a pragmatic approach that focuses on controlling outputs and building large-scale detection/registry systems.

Accordingly with China practice/regulatory summaries on artificial intelligence (AI), detection, and AIGC governance (China 2025), European Commission / EU AI Act overview and timeline (with the AI Act in force Aug 2024), U.S. Copyright Office Report series on AI & Training (US 2025). WIPO AI Infrastructure Interchange (AIII) - 11th WIPO Conversation (WIPO 2025) here a comparison table that shows the WIPO position vs national/regional state

Table 2 - Compact comparison WIPO - World

Topic / Function	WIPO position (post-11 session)	EU (law & practice)	United States (law & practice)	China (law & practice)
Overall stance	Infrastructure + multistakeholder standards; non-binding guidance; practical tooling (AIII).	Binding regulatory approach for AI (EU AI Act) with staged application; strong emphasis on governance & transparency.	Case law + agency reports drive change; Copyright Office reports scrutinise fair use in training; many lawsuits pending.	Rapid regulatory/technical development; emphasis on detection, content control and national governance; practical enforcement.
Training data (access & rights)	Favor machine-readable rights signals (opt-out/licensing metadata); registries; pragmatic interoperable signals.	Law will impose transparency and governance duties on some models; may raise obligations about dataset governance.	No uniform statutory rule; courts and Copyright Office assess fair use on a case-by-case basis; several major suits.	Focus on controlling datasets and building detection; state/industry tools expected to be used to police datasets.
Labeling / outputs (AIGC)	Urges standards for labeling outputs & detection methods; promote tools for attribution and "unlearning".	AI Act requires transparency obligations for certain systems; labeling/transparency likely to be enforced.	No uniform labeling rule; some sectoral guidance, voluntary industry practices; litigation may shape obligations.	Enforcement focus on downstream content; tech for detection and watermarking is being prioritised.

Enforcement & remedies	Recommends interoperable registries and monitoring tools; encourages capacity building for enforcement in developing countries.	Legal enforcement mechanisms available under AI Act and existing IP law; cross-border friction remains a challenge.	Enforcement via civil litigation and statutory damages under copyright; mixed judicial outcomes so far.	Strong state role, technical monitoring and administrative controls; enforcement can be rapid and operational.
Support for small creators / global South	Explicit priority: tooling, capacity building, low-cost registries, guidance to avoid exclusion. AIII aims to share best practices.	Policy instruments exist (funding, guidance) but complexity of legal obligations risks burdening small creators; WIPO sees need for help.	Mostly market/NGO support; policy guidance from agencies but no universal safety net—litigation can be costly for small creators.	Mixed: strong centralised programs could provide tools, but local implementation varies; state priorities dominate.

Source: the author

Thus, WIPO is a standards/infrastructure broker, not a law-maker. It works best where national laws are fragmented. Countries with strong domestic rules (EU) may implement stricter legal duties than WIPO's voluntary guidance anticipates; countries without clear laws (many jurisdictions) will likely lean on WIPO tools and AIII best practices. This imply that the suggestions are only consultive and not mandatory. With the actual fragmentation and polarized politics and conflicts it seems WIPO is weak and waste time and efforts.

Businesses and rights-holders must manage a mixed compliance landscape — e.g., a model maker serving EU users will face artificial intelligence (AI) Act obligations, while in the US they face active litigation risk; both require transparency and defensive/legal strategies. The business and the market are free to use the gray framework of rules and controls. The results is an oligopoly held not only by great corporations but also by Nations with great potential and licenses or property registrations.

Technical standards (opt-out metadata, fingerprinting, registries) are high-value currency — WIPO's push for machine-readable signals could lower transaction costs and help reconcile different national regimes, but uptake depends on both industry and legal recognition. The increase of new technologies like blockchain to reduce costs and bureaucracy can be used if the regulations framework will change to be more flexible, productive and efficient. In case of fast regulation framework changes the market will rule with its law giving the result of dominant trusts like in the XIX century initial decades.

Enforcement risks are real and heterogeneous — U.S. litigation shows creators will sue; China shows state/sector controls; EU shows regulatory enforcement — meaning global operators must design multi-jurisdictional compliance + monitoring. The risk of artificial intelligence (AI) and new technology sensitive data breach it is an important issue but it can't be avoided only with Regulations. Consciousness, culture and education must be supported by ethics and morale. In our opinion if the market is a battleground

without limits the only possible defense is not to use sensitive data in the web, or to encrypt all data in a way that when they are used by anyone it is necessary to have the owner approval and the decrypt key.

Concluding remarks

The paper resumed the 11th WIPO session on artificial intelligence (AI). The session is summarized and explained. A summary of outcomes complete the discussion section. The paper also resumes the “state of the art” of WIPO sessions and try to underline the main suggestions and directions of the whole eleventh sessions. As the “state of art” shows many issues must be developed because of a weak positions of WIPO as a regulation agency.

The resulting remarks suggested a change of the actual WIPO and IP framework adding a new framework for the new economies and form of properties in the actual market (AVENI 2025). Following the orientation of the author, he claims the IP framework must be changed and the new technologies must be organized into other types of property legal mark (AVENI 2025) like collective property, if we want to use the definition still in use. Otherwise is better to start thinking a new system of rules and management to regulate artificial intelligence (AI) and new technologies.

WIPO as agency could be used again in future but to regulate the old market system and their property fundamentals. In a world that share, collaborative consumption, social and micro entrepreneurship, pay-per-use, crowdfund, peer-to-peer, are part of the market but also are not included in the Government Accountability and plans and have no trusted statics, the Intellectual and industrial property is a declining base to produce health and value for customers. A collective economy is more flexible and in line with the TI system as was discussed by Aveni in Free, open source and paid programs offer (AVENI 2025).

If WIPO and the actual framework are not more useful in today economy disruptive changes, could be used as a reference for not developed economies and their environment. WIPO is overpassed by the innovation and progress and must start a review of the whole system, before the market may shift completely in a new economic system without IP. Regulations and barriers to artificial intelligence (AI) are weak form of control innovation waves. The last suggestion is to review the human centered system and explore new form of property on behalf of all.

References

AVENI, A. Free, open source and paid programs offer. Increasing social surplus. *Revista Processus De Estudos De Gestão, Jurídicos E Financeiros*, 16(50), 2025. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14990843>

CHINA practice/regulatory summaries on artificial intelligence (AI), detection, and AIGC governance. GLL. 2025. Available at: https://www.globallegalinsights.com/practice-areas/ai-machine-learning-and-big-data-laws-and-regulations/china/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

EUROPEAN COMMISSION / EU artificial intelligence (AI) Act overview and timeline (AI Act in force Aug 2024, staged applicability). Available at: <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework->

ai#:~:text=The%20AI%20Act%20entered%20into,applicable%20on%202%20August%202025

GERVAIS, D. The TRIPS Agreement: Drafting History and Analysis (5th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell. 2020.

ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT OECD/Eurostat 2018. Oslo Manual 2018: Guidelines for Collecting, Reporting and Using Data on Innovation (4th Edition). The Measurement of Scientific, Technological and Innovation Activities. OECD Publishing, Paris/Eurostat, Luxembourg.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304604-en>

RUSE-KHAN, H.. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). In D. Carlsnaes, T. Risse, & B. Simmons (Eds.), Handbook of International Organizations (pp. 698–717). 2016. Oxford University Press.

U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE. Report series on artificial intelligence (AI) & Training (evidence of evolving administrative position) plus recent litigation coverage. May. 2025. Available at: https://www.copyright.gov/ai/Copyright-and-Artificial-Intelligence-Part-3-Generative-AI-Training-Report-Pre-Publication-Version.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION (WIPO). Artificial intelligence (AI) Infrastructure Interchange (AIII) / 11th WIPO Conversation pages. Geneva. 2025. Available at: https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/2025/ai-infrastructure-interchange.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com