

Operationalising Governance for AI-Generated Content: A Socio-Technical Approach Based on the MATH-COPE Framework

Anja M. Neubauer

0009-0001-9545-9097

University of Gloucestershire / Independent Researcher
AiNJA Consulting: anja.neubauer@neubauer.consulting

Abstract—Generative AI systems pose a challenge to traditional copyright governance due to their complex, non-linear data pipelines and automated content creation processes. Current frameworks, which are still based on human authorship and linear production models, have difficulty addressing key issues such as authorship attribution, accountability of training data, protection of moral rights, and recognition of human originality. Building on prior qualitative research, this paper applies the MATH-COPE framework — a legal-socio-technical model that systematically links the four problem domains of copyright (Moral Rights, Authorship, Training Data and Human Originality) with the four dimensions of governance (Commercialisation, Organisational Practice, Policy and Governance, and Ethical Technology). The paper then extends this foundation by proposing an operational governance-by-design approach that identifies concrete intervention points across the AI system lifecycle, from data ingestion to output generation. By translating legal and ethical requirements into technical architectures and organisational processes, the framework promotes transparency, accountability, interoperability and regulatory compliance. This work offers a structured pathway for the responsible governance of AI-generated content within businesses and wider society.

Index Terms—AI governance, generative AI, AI-generated content, copyright, authorship, training data, socio-technical systems, governance-by-design, data provenance, accountability.

I. INTRODUCTION

GENERATIVE artificial intelligence systems have evolved into complex pipelines that span the processes of data ingestion, model training, inference and large-scale deployment across digital platforms. Their ability to reproduce human expression at syntactic and semantic levels is challenging existing approaches to copyright governance.

Current governance frameworks are still largely based on the assumption of human authorship and linear production processes, as well as territorially-bounded enforcement, as reflected in international copyright instruments such as the Berne Convention [1].

Consequently, fundamental issues such as authorship attribution, accountability for training data, moral rights and human originality cannot be consistently addressed across contemporary AI systems. Building upon prior research, this paper presents the MATH-COPE framework, a legal-socio-technical model that links the four copyright problem do-

main of Moral Rights, Authorship, Training Data, and Human Originality (MATH) with the four governance dimensions of Commercialisation, Organisational Practice, Policy and Governance, and Ethical Technology (COPE).

While the original framework provides a conceptual structure for analysing governance challenges, this paper focuses on operationalising them. It identifies governance intervention points across AI system lifecycles and demonstrates how governance requirements can be translated into technical architectures and organisational processes. Rather than proposing new copyright doctrine, the paper puts forward a governance-by-design approach that promotes transparency, traceability, accountability, interoperability and regulatory compliance throughout the development and deployment of AI systems.

II. RELATED WORK

In response to growing concerns regarding transparency, accountability, copyright, and regulatory compliance, research on the governance of generative artificial intelligence has expanded rapidly. International initiatives, including the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) [2], have emphasised the importance of adapting intellectual property frameworks to AI-enabled innovation. Meanwhile, the European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act (EU AI Act) [3] introduces a risk-based regulatory framework that increasingly links legal obligations with technical system design. However, both WIPO initiatives and the EU regulatory approach have so far struggled to provide coherent, practical solutions to the copyright challenges posed by generative AI. This has left a significant gap between legal principles and their effective implementation in technical systems.

From a socio-technical perspective, governance has long been examined through approaches such as Socio-Technical Systems (STS) [4], which advocate joint optimisation of technical systems and organisational structures, and the Social Shaping of Technology (SST) [5] perspective, which argues that technological development is shaped by social, organisational and institutional factors, rather than technical capabilities alone. More recent governance-by-design concepts [6] build on these ideas by proposing that governance requirements should be embedded directly into technical architectures and organisational processes from the earliest

stages of system development. While these approaches provide valuable insights into the interaction between technology, organisations, and society, they primarily focus on socio-technical dynamics and organisational governance. Consequently, they do not systematically address the legal challenges specific to copyright arising from generative AI, including authorship attribution, moral rights, training data provenance, and the protection of human originality. These legal dimensions are essential for effective AI governance, yet they remain largely outside the scope of existing socio-technical governance models. None of these approaches systematically integrates copyright-specific challenges with actionable design principles across technical, organisational, and policy layers.

Existing copyright scholarship has primarily examined individual legal issues, including authorship, training data, originality, and moral rights. The MATH-COPE framework, which was developed in the author's previous qualitative research and further elaborated upon in subsequent interdisciplinary work, addressed this fragmentation by integrating these issues into a unified legal-socio-technical framework.

Building upon this foundation, the present paper makes a distinct contribution by identifying governance intervention points across AI system lifecycles and operationalising the framework. Rather than proposing new copyright doctrine, the paper translates existing governance requirements into technical and organisational design considerations that promote transparency, accountability, interoperability and regulatory compliance within AI-enabled environments.

III. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE PROBLEM

Generative AI systems operate across global data flows, architectures, and distribution platforms that are largely indifferent to national legal boundaries. As reflected in international copyright instruments such as the Berne Convention [1], copyright law remains territorially anchored and continues to rely on the assumptions of human authorship, linear production processes and *ex post facto* enforcement.

This structural mismatch has created an expanding governance gap in relation to AI-generated content, particularly in high-impact creative and commercial contexts.

At the doctrinal level, four recurrent problem domains can be identified across jurisdictions.

First, authorship attribution remains unresolved where outputs are generated through complex human-AI interaction or fully automated systems. Existing legal frameworks either require a human author or rely on functional attribution models that bypass traditional originality thresholds, creating uncertainty for creators, developers, and downstream users.

Second, significant risks arise in relation to the legality of training data [2]. Large-scale model training depends on datasets assembled through heterogeneous licensing regimes, exceptions, or unverified sources. At the same time, existing doctrines struggle to distinguish between

large-scale syntactic processing and forms of semantic reproduction.

Third, moral rights and identity-related interests—such as attribution and integrity—are unevenly protected and rarely adapted to AI-driven forms of stylistic imitation, voice replication, or identity-based simulation.

Fourth, the concept of human originality itself is increasingly contested, as high-fidelity generative systems replicate meaning, style, and creative expression through statistical processes rather than human authorship.

While these issues are often analysed separately in legal scholarship, they are tightly interlinked in practice through the design and deployment of AI systems. Architectural decisions—such as model opacity, dataset aggregation, or output labelling—directly affect the feasibility of compliance and enforcement. Likewise, organisational practices within firms and platforms determine whether attribution, transparency, and licensing obligations can be operationalised at scale. Market structures and economic incentives further influence how creative value is distributed between human creators and AI-driven systems.

Existing international instruments provide limited guidance in this context. While minimum standards of copyright protection offer a common baseline, they do not adequately address hybrid human-AI creation, system-level responsibility, or the cross-border enforcement of transparency and provenance requirements. As a result, regulatory fragmentation persists, encouraging forum shopping, compliance asymmetries, and uncertainty for actors operating in global AI markets.

Crucially, the governance challenges associated with AI-generated content cannot be addressed through doctrinal refinement alone. Legal norms increasingly depend on their ability to be embedded within technical architectures, organisational workflows, and market mechanisms. Without such embedding, transparency obligations risk remaining symbolic, licensing regimes become difficult to enforce, and moral rights protections fail to scale beyond individual cases.

This paper therefore approaches the problem from a convergence perspective. Rather than treating copyright law and AI system design as separate domains, it conceptualises them as interdependent layers within a shared governance space.

The novelty of this work does not lie in the MATH-COPE framework itself, but in its implementation as a governance matrix that maps copyright governance requirements onto specific organisational and technical intervention points throughout the lifecycle of AI systems.

The following sections build on this perspective by structuring the identified challenges within a systemic framework and by developing a governance approach that supports both legal coherence and operational implementation across AI value chains.

IV. METHODOLOGY

This paper draws on prior research [7], in which the MATH-COPE framework was developed through qualitative analysis combining comparative legal analysis and structured stakeholder insights. The framework emerged from the identification of recurring structural tensions across legal systems (in particular the United Kingdom, the United States, and Germany) and practical governance contexts, particularly in relation to authorship, training data, moral rights, and human originality.

The underlying research integrated two complementary methodological components. First, a comparative legal analysis across the selected jurisdictions was conducted using international copyright principles as a harmonising reference point. Second, semi-structured interviews with stakeholders from legal, technical, industry, and creative domains were used to identify operational bottlenecks and governance gaps in real-world AI practices. These elements informed the development of MATH-COPE as a structured analytical model linking doctrinal problem areas with systemic governance dimensions.

In the present study, the framework is not further developed but used as a structuring basis for applying the research findings to the design of a system-level governance approach for AI-generated content. The methodological focus lies on operationalisation, examining how the identified problem-governance relationships can be translated into concrete intervention points within AI system workflows and organisational processes.

Accordingly, the approach is conceptual and application-oriented, aiming to translate abstract normative requirements into implementable governance considerations. This includes the identification of system-level integration points across typical AI pipelines, such as data ingestion, model training, and output generation, and their alignment with governance requirements.

Rather than proposing prescriptive legal solutions, the study focuses on enabling structured alignment between legal and socio-cultural requirements and technical system architectures, organisational practices, and data-driven environments. In doing so, it draws on the regulatory approach developed in the underlying research as a conceptual basis for exploring governance implementation, with the aim of balancing stakeholder interests, addressing regulatory gaps, and supporting more equitable outcomes in AI-enabled environments.

V. THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF MATH-COPE

Governance challenges related to AI-generated content arise at the intersection of legal doctrine, system architecture, and socio-economic deployment contexts. Addressing these challenges requires a structured approach that links normative requirements with the operational layers of AI systems and their surrounding ecosystems.

This paper builds on the MATH-COPE framework as a legal-socio-technical convergence model for analysing and

structuring governance challenges in AI-enabled environments. Developed in prior research [7] and further elaborated in subsequent interdisciplinary analysis [8], the framework provides the analytical foundation for the present study.

	Moral Rights	Authorship	Training Data	Human Originality
Commercialisation	...	...	...	...
Organisational Practice	...	...	...	...
Policy & Governance	...	...	...	...
Ethical Technology	...	...	...	...

Figure 1. The MATH-COPE Framework: Mapping Copyright Problem Domains to Governance Dimensions

(The MATH-COPE matrix integrates four core copyright challenges (Moral Rights, Authorship, Training Data, Human Originality) with four systemic governance dimensions. It serves as a legal-socio-technical convergence tool for identifying gaps and intervention points in AI-generated content governance.)

In this context, the framework is not used as a prescriptive doctrinal model or empirical method, but as a structured mapping instrument. It connects copyright-related problem domains with the governance layers in which these challenges emerge and can be operationally addressed, enabling the systematic translation of normative requirements into system-level design considerations.

A. The MATH Axis: Core Copyright Problem Domains

The MATH axis identifies four doctrinal domains consistently affected by generative AI systems across jurisdictions:

- **Moral Rights (M):** Captures attribution, integrity, and identity-related interests of human creators. These are increasingly challenged by automated content generation, stylistic imitation, and the absence of clear attribution mechanisms.
- **Authorship (A):** Concerns the allocation of creative responsibility and legal ownership. Generative AI disrupts traditional authorship by enabling outputs detached from identifiable human decision-making, creating uncertainty regarding control thresholds and attribution.
- **Training Data (T):** Addresses the legality and provenance of data used in model training, including licensing, exceptions, and traceability. The scale and opacity of training processes complicate enforcement of existing doctrines.
- **Human Originality (H):** Represents the semantic and expressive core of protected works. High-fidelity generative models challenge this concept by replicating meaning and style through statistical processes rather than human authorship.

Taken together, the MATH axis outlines the key areas in which generative AI places structural pressure on copyright law.

B. The COPE Axis: Systemic Dimensions of Governance

While the MATH axis defines what is at stake, the COPE axis identifies where and how governance challenges materialise in practice:

- Commercialisation (C): Relates to market structures, remuneration models, and value distribution. AI-generated content reshapes creative markets and raises questions of fair compensation and sustainability.
- Organisational Practice (O): Refers to internal workflows within organisations, platforms, and development environments, determining how attribution, transparency, and compliance are implemented operationally.
- Policy and Governance (P): Encompasses regulatory frameworks, institutional oversight, and international coordination. Fragmentation contributes to enforcement gaps and regulatory inconsistency.
- Ethical Technology (E): Focuses on governance embedded in system design, including transparency, auditability, and safeguards against harmful or deceptive uses of AI.

The COPE axis highlights that governance is not solely a legal issue but a systemic one shaped by economic, organisational, regulatory, and technical factors.

C. The Integrative MATH–COPE Matrix

The analytical strength of the framework lies in the integration of the MATH and COPE axes. Each problem domain interacts with each governance dimension, forming a matrix of interdependent risk and intervention spaces.

For example, training data governance (T) requires corresponding measures in ethical technology (E), such as transparency and auditability, as well as in commercialisation (C), such as licensing structures. Similarly, protecting human originality (H) requires coordinated interventions across organisational practices, policy frameworks, and system design.

The MATH–COPE matrix thus functions as a convergence architecture for identifying governance gaps and aligning legal norms with AI system design. Rather than prescribing jurisdiction-specific solutions, it provides a structured basis for developing interoperable governance approaches across AI value chains.

The following section builds on this framework by translating these structured insights into a system-level governance approach for AI-generated content.

VI. GOVERNANCE REQUIREMENTS DERIVED FROM THE MATH–COPE FRAMEWORK

The qualitative findings underlying the MATH–COPE framework revealed a set of recurring governance requirements that emerged consistently across the examined legal systems and stakeholder groups. While these requirements originate in copyright law, their scope is not limited to legal analysis. Rather, they establish normative constraints that

any AI governance framework must address, regardless of whether implementation occurs through legislation, organisational policy or technical system design. Consequently, they provide the normative basis for the operational governance approach set out in this paper.

The resulting governance requirements encompass eleven interrelated areas. These include:

- a clear definition of protected works based on meaningful human creative contribution
- principles for human authorship attribution in AI-assisted environments
- lawful sourcing, licensing and provenance of training data
- mechanisms for remuneration where protected works contribute to AI-generated value
- protection of moral rights in AI-mediated contexts
- proportionate transparency obligations for AI-assisted and AI-generated content
- safeguards for posthumous personality and identity-related rights
- narrowly defined research and educational exceptions
- technical enforcement mechanisms supporting traceability and accountability
- international interoperability through harmonised governance approaches
- effective implementation and enforcement supported by monitoring, auditability and organisational oversight

Taken together, these governance requirements represent the normative output of the underlying research. Rather than constituting prescriptive legal provisions, they define the legal and governance objectives that must subsequently be translated into organisational processes and technical system architectures. The following section demonstrates how these requirements can be operationalised across AI system lifecycles through an operational governance matrix.

VII. OPERATIONALISING GOVERNANCE: FROM GOVERNANCE REQUIREMENTS TO AI SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION

While the proposed design components provide a structured governance framework, their relevance depends on how they can be applied within real-world AI systems and organisational contexts. This section outlines how the research findings structured within the MATH–COPE framework can be translated into practical governance interventions across AI value chains.

Rather than prescribing specific implementations, the approach identifies operational entry points where governance requirements can be embedded into system design, data processing practices, and organisational workflows. These entry points align with typical AI pipelines, including data ingestion, model training (e.g., fine-tuning and retrieval-augmented generation), and output generation, where decisions directly affect attribution, transparency, and compliance.

	Moral Rights	Authorship	Training Data	Human Originality
Commercialisation	Rights Management	Attribution Models	Licensing	Incentive Mechanisms
Organisational Practice	Attribution Workflows	Human Oversight	Dataset Governance	Human-in-the-loop
Policy & Governance	Moral-Rights Policies	Authorship Criteria	Provenance Standards	International Interoperability
Ethical Technology	Watermarking	Audit Trails	Metadata & Provenance	Explainability

Figure 2. Operational Governance Matrix: Translating MATH-COPE Requirements into AI System Intervention Points

(This matrix maps the MATH-COPE framework onto concrete technical and organisational measures across the AI lifecycle (data, model, and output layers). It illustrates how governance requirements can be embedded into system design, processes, and practices to achieve transparency, accountability, and compliance.)

The operational governance matrix shows how the governance requirements derived from the MATH-COPE framework can be translated into specific organisational and technical actions. Rather than prescribing a single implementation model, the matrix identifies representative governance mechanisms across the three complementary implementation layers of AI systems.

In this sense, the approach builds on the concept of regulation by design [6], linking normative requirements to concrete system-level design choices such as metadata structures, model interfaces, and logging mechanisms.

It is important to emphasise that the proposed components do not constitute binding legal provisions. Instead, they function as a structured governance translation layer, supporting the practical implementation of existing and emerging regulatory principles. As such, they complement technical system design by integrating governance considerations into AI development and deployment processes.

The following sections provide examples of implementation mechanisms that can be integrated into the lifecycle of AI systems. While the examples are drawn from research and enterprise environments, the proposed governance architecture is intended to be domain-independent. The focus is not on abstract principles, but on how a researcher or system designer would need to structure data, processes, and outputs in order to meet governance requirements in practice.

A. Governance at the Data Layer

Governance begins at the data ingestion stage. Licensing, provenance and transparency requirements must be operationalised before any model training takes place.

1) Training Data Licence

Developers and organisations must verify the origin, licensing status and permitted use of every dataset. This can be achieved using dataset registries combined with structured documentation, such as data cards or datasheets for datasets. Advanced setups integrate automated licence compliance checks (e.g. via metadata scanners or controlled repositories) directly into the pre-processing pipeline. Datasets with unclear or incompatible licences should be

flagged or excluded automatically to prevent infringement risks further down the line. In generative AI systems, this ensures that training corpora for text-to-image or large language models comply with copyright and licensing regimes at scale.

2) Transparency Obligations

AI involvement must be made explicitly visible at the point of output consumption. This can be achieved operationally by embedding standardised labels or metadata (e.g. C2PA provenance markers) directly into generated content, and by providing concise system disclosures (e.g. model version, training data summary and confidence scores). Where feasible, outputs should link back to relevant data sources. For generative AI platforms, this enables users and downstream platforms to understand whether an image, text or video was AI-generated, and on which data it was trained.

3) International Harmonisation

AI pipelines must support cross-jurisdictional interoperability by using standardised metadata formats and provenance protocols. This involves adopting internationally recognised schemas (e.g. C2PA and Data Cards) and designing workflows that allow compliance information to accompany data and models. In practice, generative AI services operating globally can use blockchain-backed or cryptographically signed provenance logs to enable consistent traceability and regulatory compliance across borders.

B. Governance at the Model Layer

At the model layer, governance requirements focus on human oversight and attribution, as well as the technical embedding of legal safeguards during training, fine-tuning and inference.

1) Definition of work

Organisations must distinguish between human and AI contributions throughout the development process. This begins with clear documentation of human decision points (e.g. prompt engineering, evaluation criteria or creative direction) and continues with structured logging of prompts, parameters and model interactions. Human-in-the-loop controls at critical stages, such as the review of fine-tuning datasets or output validation, ensure traceability. This prevents outputs from generative AI systems from being treated as purely machine-generated when substantial human creative input was involved.

2) Authorship attribution

Attribution must be captured automatically at the point of output generation. Outputs should be annotated with structured metadata indicating the underlying datasets, model version, fine-tuning steps and degree of human versus automated contribution. This can be implemented through output-level schemas, automated tagging pipelines, and provenance tools that link results back to earlier workflow stages. For text-to-image or large language models, this enables platforms and users to clearly identify the respective roles of human creators and the AI system.

3) *Educational and research exception*

AI systems used for research or educational purposes must be technically restricted to non-commercial use. This includes access controls that limit datasets and models to authorised environments, prevent model export or reuse outside the defined context and comprehensively log usage. In practice, generative AI platforms can implement sandboxed research instances with the automatic expiration of trained adapters or fine-tuned models to ensure compliance with research exceptions and prevent unintended commercial exploitation.

4) *Technological measures of enforcement*

Governance must be embedded directly into the infrastructure of the model through provenance metadata, watermarking and audit logging. Systems should generate cryptographically signed records that link outputs to training data, fine-tuning steps and generation parameters. Techniques such as invisible watermarking (e.g. SynthID or C2PA-compliant markers) and persistent audit trails enable the verification and reconstruction of decision paths. For generative AI, this creates enforceable transparency across the entire pipeline, from pre-training to user-facing deployment.

5) *Protection of moral rights*

Models and workflows must actively safeguard attribution and integrity rights. This includes avoiding prompts that imitate specific living or recently deceased creators, implementing style-similarity checks and clearly separating AI-generated content from original human works. In generative systems, this can be supported by refusal mechanisms for high-risk imitation requests and mandatory attribution tags when outputs resemble protected styles or voices.

C. *Governance at the Output Layer*

At the output layer, governance ensures that generated content respects economic, personality and compliance requirements prior to distribution or commercial use.

1) *Revenue sharing and remuneration*

When AI-generated content creates commercial value, contributions from training data or human creators must be traceable. Platforms and developers should implement usage-tracking mechanisms that link outputs to source datasets and human inputs. This enables automated attribution or royalty distribution. This can be achieved in practice through the use of provenance metadata (e.g. C2PA), combined with smart contracts or licensing platforms that automatically trigger remuneration for rights holders when content is monetised.

2) *Posthumous protection*

AI systems must respect the personality and moral rights of deceased individuals. At the generation stage, workflows should detect and restrict outputs that simulate the voice, likeness or style of protected individuals. This can be achieved through identity tagging in training data, refusal mechanisms for high-risk prompts and post-generation filters. Generative platforms could maintain 'do not imitate' lists for public figures, for example, and apply watermarking

or disclaimers when outputs resemble historical or recently deceased creators.

3) *Implementation and enforcement*

Effective governance requires continuous monitoring beyond the initial design stage. Systems should maintain comprehensive audit trails of data processing, model usage and output generation. These should be supported by real-time compliance dashboards and anomaly detection. Organisations need defined escalation procedures and regular audits. In generative AI services, this can include automated content scanning to check watermark integrity, logging usage for regulatory reporting purposes, and integrating with platform-level governance tools to detect and mitigate violations on a large scale.

VIII. CLOSING

While this mapping demonstrates how governance requirements can be translated into system-level and organisational practices, not all aspects are currently fully implementable from a technical perspective. Certain requirements—particularly those relating to semantic attribution, fine-grained provenance tracking, or the protection of highly individualised creative expressions—remain only partially operationalisable with existing technologies.

However, these limitations should be understood as transitional rather than structural. As AI systems, data infrastructures, and auditing capabilities evolve, the feasibility of embedding such governance mechanisms is expected to increase. In this sense, the proposed approach is not only descriptive of current possibilities but also anticipatory, providing a forward-looking structure for aligning technological development with emerging governance expectations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author used machine translation and language polishing tools (DeepL and DeepL Write) for proofreading and linguistic improvements. All scientific content, arguments, structure, and original formulations were developed by the author.

REFERENCES

- [1] Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Sept. 9, 1886, as revised at Paris on July 24, 1971 and amended Sept. 28, 1979. Available: <https://www.wipo.int/wipolex/en/text/283698>
- [2] World Intellectual Property Organization, "Revised Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence," WIPO/IP/AI/2/GE/20/1 REV, May 29, 2020. Available: https://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/doc_details.jsp?doc_id=499504
- [3] European Union, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), Official Journal of the European Union, L 2024/1689, July 12, 2024. Available: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>
- [4] G. Baxter and I. Sommerville, "Socio-technical systems: From design methods to systems engineering," *Interacting with Computers*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 4–17, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.intcom.2010.07.003
- [5] R. Williams and D. Edge, "The social shaping of technology," *Research Policy*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 865–899, 1996, doi: 10.1016/0048-7333(96)00885-2

- [6] K. Prifti, J. Morley, C. Novelli, et al., “Regulation by Design: Features, Practices, Limitations, and Governance Implications,” *Minds and Machines*, vol. 34, article 13, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s11023-024-09675-z
- [7] A. M. Neubauer, “AI and Authorship Redefined: Towards a Global Copyright Framework for Commerce and Human Originality,” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Gloucestershire, 2025. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.2.29704.69126
- [8] A. M. Neubauer, M. Wynn, and R. Bown, “AI, Authorship, Copyright, and Human Originality,” *Encyclopedia*, vol. 6, no. 1, article 9, 2026, doi: 10.3390/encyclopedia6010009