



**Science, Innovation
and Technology
Committee**

Wednesday, 12 March 2025

Katie O'Donovan
Director, Government Affairs and Public Policy, Google
By email only

Subject: AI and copyright consultation

Dear Katie,

On 4 February, the Science, Innovation and Technology Committee held a joint session with the Culture, Media and Sport Committee, to examine the proposals contained in the government's consultation on AI and copyright.

As you will have seen, following the session I wrote to the Secretary of State for Science, Innovation and Technology together with the Chair of the Culture, Media and Sport Committee, to set out our joint view on the consultation. We agreed that:

1. The government should introduce practical measures to provide transparency on AI training data, whatever its approach to copyright law.
2. The government's preferred option should not be taken forward without a technical solution that works, is implementable and accessible to all.
3. The government should publish a full impact assessment for each option set out in the consultation.
4. Robust mechanisms are needed to enforce compliance, enforcement and redress, particularly regarding transparency measures, while setting an appropriate balance with ease of compliance.

We invited Google and OpenAI to send representatives to our public session, an invite that you declined owing to the government consultation still being live.

Now that the consultation period has concluded, I would be grateful if you could confirm:



Science, Innovation and Technology Committee

1. Whether your response to the government's consultation contained proposals to utilise technology to help deliver an entirely transparent rights environment, the importance of which was highlighted during our session.
2. Whether your response contained proposals for "simple technical means for creators to exercise their rights, either individually or collectively" – as requested in the consultation.
3. Whether Google intends to publish its response to the government's consultation, in order to provide clarity as to your position on this issue.
4. If, in advance of your consultation response being published, or if you do not intend to do so, you would be willing to share a copy with this Committee.
5. Whether your organisation would be willing to send a representative to a future public session on this issue, should we decide to hold one – following the publication of the government's response to the consultation, for example.

I would be grateful for a response by Wednesday 2 April. I intend to place a copy of this correspondence into the public domain.

Thank you for your continued engagement on this important issue.

With best wishes,

Chi Onwurah MP
Chair, Science, Innovation and Technology Committee