



Han Kun Newsletter

Issue 195 (7th edition of 2023)

Legal Updates

1. **Interim Measures of Generative AI Services Released**
2. **Key Takeaways of the New HGR Guidelines**

1. Interim Measures of Generative AI Services Released

Authors: Kevin DUAN | Kemeng CAI | Jin JIN

On July 13, 2023, the Cyberspace Administration of China (“CAC”), together with the National Development and Reform Commission, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Science and Technology, the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology, the Ministry of Public Security, and the National Radio and Television Administration issued the *Interim Measures for Generative Artificial Intelligence Services* (the “**Interim Measures**”), which will come into effect on August 15, 2023. The Interim Measures have been substantially revised based on public feedback received in response to the *Measures for Administration of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services* (the “**Draft**”), which the CAC issued for public comments on April 11. Compared to the Draft, the Interim Measures provide greater tolerance for immature generative AI services and place more emphasis on encouraging technological development and innovation, while better balancing development and security at the principle and institutional levels. In this article, we briefly analyze the Interim Measures in terms of the scope of application, regulatory approach, interplay with the existing system, data training, service application, and foreign investment restrictions, with a focus on the optimizations and innovations in the Interim Measures based on the Draft, as well as their potential impacts.

The applicable scope emphasizes the provision of services to the domestic public, excludes research and internal applications

Article 2 of the Interim Measures stipulates that “*these Measures shall apply to the utilization of generative artificial intelligence technologies to provide services for generating text, images, audio, video, and other content to the public within the territory of the People’s Republic of China (hereinafter referred to as GAI services)*”, emphasizing that the target of the Interim Measures is the provision of GAI services to the public in the People’s Republic of China. The Interim Measures emphasize that the target of regulation is the provision of GAI services “to the public within the territory of the People’s Republic of China”. Compared to the Draft, the Interim Measures incorporate public comments and exclude from their scope of application the research, development and application of GAI technologies that do not provide services to the domestic public. This greatly reduces the compliance burden at the model development stage, while the latter alleviates the compliance concerns of many enterprises when accessing GAI services for internal application purposes such as improving work efficiency, reflecting the Interim Measures’ prudent and inclusive regulatory approach and the policy goal of encouraging innovation.

Inclusive and prudent, categorized and classified regulatory approach, emphasizing the coordination of multisectoral regulations

The Interim Measures call for an “inclusive and prudent, categorized and classified” regulation of GAI services. The Interim Measures add the *Law of the People’s Republic of China on Scientific and Technological Progress* as their legislative basis, which highlights the policy orientation of encouraging scientific and technological innovation. In addition, the Interim Measures add the National Development

and Reform Commission, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Science and Technology, the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology, the Ministry of Public Security, and the National Radio and Television Administration as the relevant regulatory authorities, stipulating that each department will strengthen the management of GAI services in accordance with its own authority.

The classified approach to regulation may be inspired by the European Union's (draft) Artificial Intelligence Act, which categorizes AI systems into unacceptable risk, high risk, limited risk and minimal risk. Due to the generic nature of GAI, the "inclusive and prudent, categorized and graded" regulatory approach will help the Interim Measures retain a certain degree of flexibility as the "basic law" in the field of GAI, on the basis of which regulatory authorities, industry authorities and standardization organizations can also formulate more detailed regulations for GAI. Regulators, industry authorities, and standardization organizations can also formulate more detailed rules for the classification of GAI on this basis and set more stringent specifications for certain industries, application scenarios, and certain high-risk GAI services. In addition, the Interim Measures address some of the major application scenarios of GAI services, stipulating that the use of GAI services to engage in activities such as news publishing, film and television production, and artistic and literary creation is subject to regulations in the relevant fields, which conform to the existing regulatory framework (Article 2).

Policy measures addressing practical issues and favoring innovation in the development of generative AI in the industry

Against the backdrop of the U.S. "decoupling" and "cracking down" on China's technology and the many obstacles to Chinese enterprises' access to advanced chips and computing capacity, the Interim Measures put forward a series of policy incentives for GAI research and development and application, including:

- Encouraging the innovative application of GAI technology in various industries and fields, generating positive and healthy, upwardly mobile quality content, exploring optimized application scenarios and building an application ecosystem.
- Supporting collaboration among industry organizations, enterprises, educational and scientific research institutions, public cultural institutions and relevant professional institutions in GAI technology innovation, data resource construction, transformation and application, and risk prevention.
- Encouraging independent innovation of basic technologies such as GAI algorithms, frameworks, chips and supporting software platforms, carrying out international exchanges and cooperation on an equal and mutually beneficial basis, and participating in the formulation of international rules related to GAI.
- Promoting the construction of GAI infrastructure and public training data resource platforms. Promoting the categorized, graded and orderly opening of public data, and expanding high-quality public training data resources. Promoting collaborative sharing of computing resources and enhancing the effectiveness of arithmetic resource utilization (Articles 5 and 6).

At present, some regions are already at the forefront of the construction and coordination of computing power, data and other infrastructure. For example, the *Implementation Plan for Beijing Municipality to Accelerate the Construction of a Source of Artificial Intelligence Innovation with Global Influence (2023-*

2025) released in May 2023 puts forward specific favorable policies in areas such as “enhancing the ability to coordinate the supply of computing resources”, “strengthening the open sharing of public data”, and “building an efficient and collaborative big model technology industry ecosystem”.

Moderately loosening specific regulations on data training, model application, and optimization

The Interim Measures have drawn on feedback from the industry and more fully considered the current technical barriers and limitations in the quality of training data, reliability and accuracy of generated content, and moderately relax the specific compliance requirements for GAI data training, model application and optimization, which are mainly reflected in the following aspects.

- The Interim Measures appropriately relax the requirements on the quality of training data. Article 7 replaces “ensure” the “authenticity, accuracy, objectivity, and diversity” of data in the Draft with “take effective measures to improve authenticity, accuracy, objectivity, and diversity”, which reduces the responsibility of service providers in terms of the quality of training data.
- Article 4 of the Draft is deleted, which would have required that “the content generated by GAI shall be true and accurate, and measures shall be taken to prevent the generation of false information” and shall not contain “content that may disturb the economic order and social order”. This is replaced with a requirement that the provider “based on the characteristics of the service type, take effective measures to enhance the transparency of GAI services and improve the accuracy and reliability of generated content”, which to a certain extent reduces the responsibility of the service provider in generating content.
- The requirement for real identity verification in Article 9 of the Draft is removed. This may be due to the fact that current GAI services are mainly chat rather than publication, and many GAI services provided through programmable interfaces (APIs) may not be able to implement real identity verification obligations. However, on the other hand, if GAI is used to provide internet information services, it may still be necessary to fulfill real-name identity authentication obligations in accordance with relevant regulatory requirements.
- Article 11 of the Interim Measures removes the requirement not to create user profiles and replaces the prohibition of providing user input information to others with a prohibition on collecting non-essential information and “unlawfully” providing user input information to others, i.e., excluding cases in which the user has given consent or in which there are other provisions in laws and regulations. This amendment is more in line with the principles of informed consent and necessity of the Personal Information Protection Act and leaves more room for service providers to use user input information to optimize models and improve service quality.
- The Interim Measures reduce the obligation to monitor and dispose of illegal content by deleting the requirement in Article 13 of the Draft that providers should take measures to stop the generation of illegal content when they find or know of such content, by relaxing the requirement to establish a mechanism for the reporting of complaints and to deal with illegal information in a timely manner, and to rectify by taking measures such as optimizing model training and other measures. The Interim

Measures also did not adopt the controversial time limit of three months set in Article 13 of the Draft for preventing the generation of illegal content again through model optimization and training, leaving a certain amount of flexibility.

- The Interim Measures reduce the obligations of service providers in terms of algorithmic transparency by deleting the detailed requirement in Article 17 of the Draft for providers to “provide necessary information that may affect the trust and choice of users”, and only requiring providers to “take effective measures to improve algorithmic transparency” in Article 4(5), allowing service providers to explore more flexible ways to improve algorithmic transparency. Service providers can explore more flexible ways to improve the transparency of algorithms.

The Draft would have required that a security assessment of internet information services with public opinion attributes or social mobilization capabilities be conducted prior to providing services to the public using GAI products. Article 17 of the Interim Measures clarifies that the subject of the security assessment obligation is the provider of GAI services that have “public opinion attributes or social mobilization capabilities”, appropriately restricting the scope of the security assessment and maintaining consistency with the existing norms.

Foreign investment access and overseas services

Article 20 of the Interim Measures stipulates that if services provided by sources outside the PRC to the domestic territory do not comply with laws, administrative regulations, or the provisions of these measures, the national cyberspace department will notify relevant agencies to take technical measures and other necessary measures for disposal. Combined with the provisions of Article 2 of the Interim Measures on the scope of application, we tend to believe that this article mainly aims to restrict foreign GAI services that do not comply with the Interim Measures from **providing services to the domestic public**. In this case, the competent authorities may take technical measures such as blocking to cut off access to relevant overseas service websites and applications. In addition, if domestic service providers embed foreign GAI services into their products to provide services to the domestic public, they need to comply with the relevant provisions of the Interim Measures; otherwise, the competent authorities may punish such domestic service providers in accordance with Article 21 of the Interim Measures.

Article 23 of the Interim Measures adds a provision that *“if laws and administrative regulations stipulate that relevant administrative licenses must be obtained for providing GAI services, providers shall obtain licenses according to the law. Foreign investment in GAI services shall comply with relevant laws and administrative regulations on foreign investment.”* At present, laws and regulations have not set administrative licenses or foreign investment access restrictions on the provision of GAI services themselves, but GAI services will need to comply with relevant licenses or market access regulations if they are used in areas where licenses or foreign investment access exist, such as providing value-added telecommunications services, network audio-visual program services, and internet cultural operations.

Impact and outlook

Overall, the Interim Measures reflect many comments from the industry and the public on the Draft by

taking into account the current technical limitations of generative artificial intelligence to a greater extent. The Interim Measures take a prudent and inclusive approach and moderately relax the compliance requirements for generative artificial intelligence from research and development, model training to application, fine tuning, and other stages. The Interim Measures show an encouraging new technology development and application policy orientation. However, looking at the specific rules, the Interim Measures requirements for training data compliance, generation content security and accuracy, transparency, etc., require enterprises to propose creative solutions to combine technology and legal compliance to alleviate the security concerns of regulatory agencies and win more institutional space for industrial development.

2. Key Takeaways of the New HGR Guidelines

Authors: Aaron GU | Pengfei YOU | Duzhiyun ZHENG | Fengqi YU

On July 14, 2023, the Ministry of Science and Technology of the PRC (“MOST”) issued the *Notice on Updating the Guidelines on Administrative Approval Items and the Scope and Procedures for Filing and Prior Reporting of Human Genetic Resources*, which unveiled six documents, including the administrative guidelines on collection approval, biobanking approval, exportation approval and international collaboration approval of human genetic resources (“HGRs”), as well as the scope and procedures for international collaboration filing and data sharing reporting of HGRs (collectively “**New Administrative Guidelines**”). The *New Administrative Guidelines* have been officially implemented on July 1, 2023 and serve as the supporting documents for the *Regulations on the Administration of Human Genetic Resources* (“**HGR Regulations**”) and the *Implementation Rules for the Regulation of Human Genetic Resources Administration* (“**Implementation Rules**”), which have attracted due attention from the industry since its release by the MOST on June 1, 2023 (for reference, please refer to [Highlights on HGR Regulation Implementation Rules](#) and its Chinese version [汉坤·观点 | 重磅首发:《人类遗传资源管理条例实施细则》要点解读](#)). The *New Administrative Guidelines* have further clarified and refined the regulatory requirements of *HGR Regulations* and *Implementation Rules* and have provided convenience and guidance for related parties to fulfill compliance obligations and go through the administrative approval, filing and reporting procedures.

The *Biosecurity Law*, the *HGR Regulations* and the newly implemented *Implementation Rules* have jointly formed the current regulatory framework for HGRs in China. Among them, the *Implementation Rules* have optimized and refined the regulatory provisions including some key definitions and scopes and obligations to be fulfilled by related parties when carrying out activities such as collection, biobanking, exportation, external provision and access opening of HGRs, as well as administrative supervision and penalties. To adapt to the changes in the regulations, the previous administrative approval/filing guidelines have also been updated accordingly by the MOST. Meanwhile, the MOST has also provided responses in the *New Administrative Guidelines* to some of the concerns and doubts on the rules and approval/filing procedures from the industry. It is also worth noting that at the end of June, the MOST launched a new version of declaration system (Human Genetic Resource Management System: <https://apply.hgrg.net/>), which will facilitate companies in conducting relevant regulatory procedures for HGR-related activities.

This article will analyze and summarize the key provisions of the *New Administrative Guidelines* in terms of the scope of HGRs, the definition of foreign parties, data sharing reporting and national security review and regulatory requirements in exportation approval and international collaboration approval and filing procedures.

The scope of HGR materials and HGR information

The *New Administrative Guidelines* have clarified the scope of HGR materials and HGR information.

I. The scope of HGR materials

Regarding the HGR materials, the *HGR Regulations* have defined them as “the organs, tissues, cells and other genetic materials containing human genome, genes and other genetic substances”. The *Implementation Rules* do not further limit or explain the scope of HGR materials, while the *New Administrative Guidelines* specifically list the types of HGR materials, which include “all types of cells, whole blood, tissues/tissue sections, semen, cerebrospinal fluid, thoracic/abdominal effusion, blood/bone marrow smears, hair (with follicles), etc.”. Moreover, the *New Administrative Guidelines* have also provided certain limitations, indicating that “human secretions, body fluids, swabs, etc. without cells” are excluded from the scope of HGR materials.

We understand that practically, some human secretions, without certain treatments, may still include human cells, thus containing “human genome, genes and other genetic substances”. Therefore, even if the *New Administrative Guidelines* have provided the aforementioned limitation, based on past practices, it is still possible for certain untreated human secretions to be deemed as HGR materials. Further observation is needed for future practices on this issue. Nevertheless, if the human secretions are confirmed that they do not contain any human cells, they will no longer be subject to HGR-related regulation.

II. The scope of HGR information

Regarding the *HGR information*, the *Implementation Rules* have narrowed the scope of it by only explicitly including human genes and genome data generated by using HGR materials while excluding clinical data, imaging data, protein data, and metabolic data. The *New Administrative Guidelines* further list some examples of HGR information, providing that HGR information includes “data information such as genes, genomes, transcriptomes, epigenomes and nucleic acid biomarkers such as ctDNA, as well as the related information such as the relevant diseases and ethnic origins”. The regulatory requirements will not apply to data where human genes and genome data are not involved.

The *New Administrative Guidelines* have responded to the widely concerned question of whether certain types of data (such as biomarkers) will constitute HGR information. From the clarification that data including transcriptome data are HGR information, we understand that HGR information will not only include typical data containing DNA base sequences. The results of research on DNA methylation and the messenger RNA (mRNA) information obtained from Chinese human cells may also constitute HGR information. Moreover, regarding biomarkers, we understand that nucleic acid biomarkers such as ctDNA are clearly within the scope of HGR information, while other biomarkers that do not contain human genes and genome data are no longer subject to regulation.

The definition of foreign parties

The *Implementation Rules* have narrowed the scope of “foreign parties” by only including entities where foreign investors have more than 50% of shares, voting rights or other similar interests, and entities where foreign investors can dominate or have significant impacts on corporate decision-making and internal management. After the release of the *Implementation Rules*, the industry is very concerned about how the MOST would determine whether the foreign investors are sufficient to “dominate or have significant

impacts”. However, in the *New Administrative Guidelines*, the MOST does not provide further specific explanations for this issue.

According to our understanding of regulatory practices, the MOST holds the view that the companies are in the best position to make their own assessment regarding whether their foreign investors can “dominate or have significant impacts” on corporate decision-making and internal management, and the companies themselves shall be responsible for such determination. We understand that when making such determination, important factors to be considered usually include the companies’ voting mechanisms at shareholders’ meetings or board meetings, the methods for appointing board members, and the composition of board seats, etc. At the same time, when a company declares itself as a Chinese party, it shall provide corresponding materials as supporting documents (such as the analysis from its internal or external legal counsels) and submit a commitment letter to the MOST promising that it does not constitute a foreign party. The companies shall be responsible for the authenticity of the submitted materials. The MOST will conduct a formal review of such materials and register such companies as Chinese/foreign parties accordingly.

The *Implementation Rules* have also stipulated that companies located in Hong Kong or Macao that are controlled by domestic investments can be deemed as Chinese parties. In the *New Administrative Guidelines*, the MOST does not provide further explanations on the definition of “be controlled by domestic investments”. As a result, questions such as whether companies indirectly controlled by domestic investments (such as the Hong Kong companies under the “Red Chip(红筹)” structures) can be deemed as Chinese parties, and whether the subsidiaries of such Hong Kong and Macao companies can also be regarded as Chinese parties, will still need further observation in future practice.

Data sharing reporting and national security review

According to the *HGR Regulations*, before the external provision or access opening of HGR information to foreign parties, the data sharing reporting and backup procedure must be completed. The *New Administrative Guidelines*, aligning with the *Implementation Rules*, further provide that, in an ongoing international collaboration that has already been approved or filed, the data exchange between the “collaborating parties” will be exempted from the data sharing reporting and backup procedures as long as such data exchange arrangements are stipulated in the international collaboration agreements.

Nevertheless, according to current regulatory practices, we understand that the sponsors, the leading sites, the contract research organizations (“**CROs**”) and the third-party laboratories that are listed and approved/filed as the “collaborating partners” are all interpreted as the “collaborating parties” and thus the data exchange between them can also be exempted from additional data sharing reporting. After the effectiveness of the *Implementation Rules* and the *New Administrative Guidelines*, it is necessary to further observe whether parties other than the sponsors and the leading sites can also be exempted from the data sharing reporting and backup procedures.

Regarding the national security review, the *New Administrative Guidelines* clearly state that if the MOST, during its formal review process of data sharing reporting, believes that the application for external provision or access opening of HGR information meets the requirements for national security review, the

national security review procedure will be carried out. Accordingly, we understand that the initiation of the national security review will be determined by the MOST during the formal review stage of data sharing reporting, and the applicants are not required to voluntarily submit a separate application for national security review.

Approval of exporting HGR materials

The *New Administrative Guidelines* have further refined the application material requirements for the approval of exporting HGR materials. In comparison to the previous guidelines, the *New Administrative Guidelines* additionally stipulate that the applicant should submit research protocol, agreements on the disposal of remaining HGR materials (if involved), and proof of the legitimate source of HGR materials (if applicable), etc. The *New Administrative Guidelines* also emphasize that the submitted research protocol should encompass the entire process of sample utilization, reflecting the enhanced regulatory requirements outlined in the *HGR Regulations*, such as the need for reasonable use in exports and ensuring no harm to China's public health, national security, and social public interests.

Approval procedure for international collaboration scientific research

Regarding major/non-major changes in the approval of international collaboration scientific research (“ICSR”), the *Implementation Rules* provide specific criteria for determining non-major changes and clearly outlines some non-major change situations, including situations where the changes in total cumulative quantity do not exceed 10% of the approved HGR quantity. The *New Administrative Guidelines* further explain this provision, emphasizing that the term “changes” only pertain to quantity increases while reductions in quantity are exempted from regulations. Regarding the involvement of different types of HGR, the *New Administrative Guidelines* state that the inclusion of a new type of HGR should be declared as a major change, regardless of its quantity. Furthermore, if any one type of HGR undergoes a cumulative change in the total amount exceeding 10%, it should also be declared as a major change. Finally, the *New Administrative Guidelines* emphasize that if multiple non-major changes result in a cumulative change in a quantity exceeding 10% of the initially approved quantity, all non-major change amounts should be accumulated and declared as a major change when declaring the current change that exceeds the 10% threshold of the initial approval amount.

Regarding application materials for ICSR approval, it is worth noting that the *New Administrative Guidelines* require sponsors, leading sites, CROs, and third-party laboratories to submit the executed versions of international collaboration agreements. This is because of the increased pass rate of actual ICSR approval. Previously, the pass rate for ICSR approval was lower, and requiring the submission of executed versions of collaboration agreements may have resulted in a significant number of applicants who failed to pass ICSR approval to breach their agreements. While this is no more the case, the MOST clearly states in the *New Administrative Guidelines* that sponsors, leading sites, CROs, and third-party laboratories shall submit signed and stamped versions of international collaboration agreements. Nevertheless, there are currently no such requirements for other participating parties besides these four collaborating parties.

Filing procedure for international collaboration clinical trials

The *Implementation Rules* have stipulated that HGR can be tested, analyzed and disposed of in domestic institutions designated by clinical trial protocols in international collaboration filing projects. Although the *New Administrative Guidelines* do not provide further explanation regarding the “domestic institution” designated by the clinical trial protocol, we understand that the term “domestic institution” here may also include foreign-invested institutions in China, rather than merely referring to Chinese Parties under the HGR supervision regime.

Regarding change procedures for international collaboration filing, the *New Administrative Guidelines* align with the *Implementation Rules* in determining major and non-major filing changes and outline specific major change situations, including changes in types, quantities, uses, partners, research protocols, research content, or research purposes. It is worth noting that non-major changes for ICSR approval do not apply to international collaboration filing. Therefore, if there is a change in the total cumulative quantity of HGR that does not exceed 10% of the HGR quantity stipulated in the international collaboration filing, it may still fall under the category of a major change and shall undergo the necessary filing change procedures.

Regarding the application materials for international collaboration filing, the same requirements as the previous guidelines remain in place. Applicants are required to provide signed and stamped versions of international collaboration agreements.

Conclusion

The *New Administrative Guidelines* have further refined some key definitions and scope such as HGR materials and HGR information and provide more detailed operational requirements for approval, filing and reporting procedures regarding HGR-related activities. While responding to some major concerns from the industry, the *New Administrative Guidelines* also leave the regulatory authorities with room for discretion on specific cases. Therefore, we understand that when carrying out HGR-related activities, such as collection, biobanking, exportation, data sharing, etc., relevant parties should strictly fulfill relevant compliance requirements and obligations based on the regulations and guidelines.

As mentioned in previous articles, the existing regulations on HGRs in China have heightened the regulatory supervision of HGR-related activities. Therefore, we understand HGR compliance is increasingly important for relevant business activities, and suggest relevant parties continue to pay attention to the evolving regulatory requirements and trends. We will keep a close eye on the regulations in HGRs.

Important Announcement

This Newsletter has been prepared for clients and professional associates of Han Kun Law Offices. Whilst every effort has been made to ensure accuracy, no responsibility can be accepted for errors and omissions, however caused. The information contained in this publication should not be relied on as legal advice and should not be regarded as a substitute for detailed advice in individual cases.

If you have any questions regarding this publication, please contact:

Beijing	Wenyu JIN	Attorney-at-law
	Tel:	+86 10 8525 5557
	Email:	wenyu.jin@hankunlaw.com
<hr/>		
Shanghai	Yinshi CAO	Attorney-at-law
	Tel:	+86 21 6080 0980
	Email:	yinshi.cao@hankunlaw.com
<hr/>		
Shenzhen	Jason WANG	Attorney-at-law
	Tel:	+86 755 3680 6518
	Email:	jason.wang@hankunlaw.com
<hr/>		
Hong Kong	Dafei CHEN	Attorney-at-law
	Tel:	+852 2820 5616
	Email:	dafei.chen@hankunlaw.com
<hr/>		
Haikou	Jun ZHU	Attorney-at-law
	Tel:	+86 898 3665 5000
	Email:	jun.zhu@hankunlaw.com
<hr/>		
Wuhan	Jiao MA	Attorney-at-law
	Tel:	+86 27 5937 6200
	Email:	jiao.ma@hankunlaw.com
<hr/>		
Singapore	Lan YU	Attorney-at-law
	Tel:	+65 6013 2966
	Email:	lan.yu@hankunlaw.com
