LUMO INSIGHTS

Tuesday, 21 July 2026

Global regulators tighten AI rules as corporate risks mount

Executive Summary

A wave of regulatory and legal developments in the last two days signals that AI governance has entered a new, urgent phase. From Europe's updated AI Act and U.S. legislative moves to high-profile lawsuits and investor demands, businesses face mounting pressure to implement responsible AI oversight. Staying ahead of these changes is now critical for C-suites and boards to avoid legal penalties and protect long-term competitiveness.

Europe: New AI rules and enforcement countdown

The European Union's landmark AI Act is entering its enforcement stage, making AI governance a concrete legal obligation for companies operating in Europe. Until now, many firms saw the AI Act as a distant concern, but as of 1 August 2024 the law has been in force, and its most stringent requirements are about to bite. Originally, the Act's rules for "high-risk" AI applications - those in critical areas like hiring, credit, biometric ID, and more - were set to take effect on 2 August 2026. In a late-breaking development, EU legislators approved a "Digital Omnibus" update that pushes some high-risk compliance deadlines back by 12 - 24 months (www.consilium.europa.eu [1]). This adjustment, formally signed on 8 July 2026, extends the application dates to December 2027 for stand-alone high-risk AI systems and August 2028 for high-risk AI embedded in products. At the same time, the EU added a new prohibition: AI systems that generate non-consensual deepfake sexual images or child abuse material are now outlawed, with the ban taking effect by the end of this year (www.consilium.europa.eu [2]). The intent is clear - technological innovation must align with fundamental values and safety.

Despite the timeline reprieve for certain use cases, most of the AI Act's obligations remain on schedule. From early August, any company deploying a high-risk AI system in the EU must have a documented risk management system, rigorous data governance processes, detailed technical documentation, and human oversight measures in place. High-risk AI (from recruitment algorithms to medical AI devices) will also need to be registered in an EU database before being put into service. To guide compliance, the European Commission published a finalised Code of Practice for general-purpose AI models on 26 June, clarifying how foundation model providers and users should meet transparency and safety expectations. Companies fine-tuning or integrating open AI models - say, adapting a model like Llama for a hiring tool - are warned that they inherit the "deployer" obligations of the AI Act. In addition, a template for mandatory Fundamental Rights Impact Assessments (FRIA) has been released to help organisations assess and document risks in sensitive AI use cases.

European regulators are gearing up for active enforcement. EU Member State authorities and Data Protection Authorities have formed dedicated AI oversight teams and signalled that initial enforcement actions may commence before year-end. Penalties under the AI Act can be dramatic - up to

€35 /million or 7% of global annual revenue (whichever is higher) for the gravest violations such as banned practices. Even non-compliance with high-risk requirements can draw fines up to €15 /million or 3% of revenue. Yet worryingly, a recent industry report found 78% of enterprises are not yet prepared to meet the August 2026 EU AI Act obligations. With only days left, European business leaders should treat finalising AI compliance as mission-critical. The EU's message is that it will not hesitate to make examples of companies that fall short, and the rest of the world is watching closely.

References:

[1] www.consilium.europa.eu — https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2026/06/29/artificial-intelligence-council-gives-final-green-light-to-simplify-and-streamline-rules/#:~:text=systems%20were%20due%20to%20enter,Other%20key%20elements%20of%20the

[2] www.consilium.europa.eu — https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2026/06/29/artificial-intelligence-council-gives-final-green-light-to-simplify-and-streamline-rules/#:~:text=time%2C%20by%20banning%20AI,proposals%20for%20two%20regulations%20aiming

United States: patchwork of State laws vs. a coming federal Framework

In the United States, the regulatory landscape for AI remains fragmented but is evolving rapidly. Earlier this month, Illinois became the first state to enact a comprehensive AI safety law, the Artificial Intelligence Safety Measures Act (www.enterprisetimes.co.uk [1]). Signed by Governor J.B. Pritzker on 6 July 2026, the Illinois law imposes rigorous obligations on "frontier" AI developers with over $500 /million in annual revenue (www.yahoo.com [2]). Affected AI companies (a group that includes industry leaders like OpenAI and Anthropic) must undergo independent third-party audits of their AI systems' safety each year and implement whistleblower protections for staff who flag AI risks (www.yahoo.com [3]) (www.yahoo.com [4]). Crucially, the law also compels these firms to disclose how they detect and respond to critical AI incidents and to report any such high-severity AI incidents to state authorities within 24 hours (72 hours for other significant incidents) (www.yahoo.com [5]). Non-compliance can carry fines up to $1 /million for a first violation (and $3 /million for repeat offenses) (www.yahoo.com [6]). This state-level initiative reflects mounting concern over AI risks and a desire to fill the regulatory vacuum at the federal level. Notably, both OpenAI and Anthropic endorsed the Illinois law as a model that could bring more consistency to AI governance across jurisdictions (www.enterprisetimes.co.uk [7]).

However, the future of state-driven AI rules is uncertain. In Washington, D.C., lawmakers are pushing for a national framework that could override this emerging patchwork of state laws. In a significant development, the U.S. Senate has passed the proposed "Great American AI Act of 2026" (GAAIA) which contains a broad federal preemption clause to unify AI regulations across the country. If the House of Representatives concurs and the bill becomes law, states would be barred from enforcing their own AI-specific statutes, centralising AI oversight at the federal level. The draft federal legislation would establish mandatory transparency for advanced AI models, require external audits, and institute safety standards - similar in spirit to the Illinois approach, but on a national scale. The prospect of preemption is sparking debate: many businesses favour a single clear set of rules nationwide, while some state policymakers fear a one-size-fits-all law could weaken protections. Until Congress acts, companies must navigate the varying state requirements - for example, new laws in states like Colorado, California, New York, and Texas have recently taken effect, targeting issues from AI hiring bias to AI-generated deepfakes in political ads. Keeping track of these local obligations - and preparing for a potential federal regime - is a growing compliance challenge for U.S. enterprises.

Meanwhile, the Biden Administration has moved forward with executive action on AI. On 7 July 2026, the White House issued a sweeping Executive Order (EO 14128) to drive "Safe and Secure Procurement of Frontier AI" at the federal level. This order requires any company selling advanced AI systems to U.S. government agencies to comply with stringent new standards. Vendors must conduct

independent “red team” security and bias testing of AI models before deployment, provide extensive transparency documentation (model cards detailing training data sources, capabilities, and limitations), and promptly report any significant AI incidents within 72 hours to a federal AI safety board. The order also mandates that suppliers disclose foreign ownership or influence in their AI supply chain. Though aimed at government contractors, these requirements are anticipated to cascade into the broader market. Much as the NIST Cybersecurity Framework became a de facto standard for private industry, the EO directs NIST to develop new AI security and risk management standards that will likely be adopted beyond the public sector. U.S. companies - especially those in defence, infrastructure, or other regulated sectors - should treat these federal guidelines as the new baseline for trustworthy AI development.

References:

[1] www.enterprisetimes.co.uk — https://www.enterprisetimes.co.uk/2026/07/13/security-and-ai-news-from-the-week-beginning-6-july-2026/#:~:text=Schneider%E2%80%99s%20share%20price,24%20hours%20for%20imminent%20risks

[2] www.yahoo.com — https://www.yahoo.com/news/politics/articles/gov-jb-pritzker-signs-first-194200303.html#:~:text=signed%20will%20require%20large%20AI,auditors%20would%20need%20to%20demonstrate

[3] www.yahoo.com — https://www.yahoo.com/news/politics/articles/gov-jb-pritzker-signs-first-194200303.html#:~:text=take%20effect%20Jan,company%20posed%20a%20public%20safety

[4] www.yahoo.com — https://www.yahoo.com/news/politics/articles/gov-jb-pritzker-signs-first-194200303.html#:~:text=legislation%20also%20includes%20whistleblower%20protections%2C,run%20up%20to%20%241%20million

[5] www.yahoo.com — https://www.yahoo.com/news/politics/articles/gov-jb-pritzker-signs-first-194200303.html#:~:text=take%20effect%20Jan,company%20posed%20a%20public%20safety

[6] www.yahoo.com — https://www.yahoo.com/news/politics/articles/gov-jb-pritzker-signs-first-194200303.html#:~:text=state%20or%20federal%20authorities%20if,Advertisement

[7] www.enterprisetimes.co.uk — https://www.enterprisetimes.co.uk/2026/07/13/security-and-ai-news-from-the-week-beginning-6-july-2026/#:~:text=Both%20OpenAI%20and%20Anthropic%20were,The

Legal battles highlight AI liability risks

Recent legal cases underscore that AI-related risks are no longer theoretical - they are leading to real lawsuits, settlements, and precedent-setting court decisions. In a striking development, Apple has filed suit against OpenAI, alleging that the AI firm engaged in an organised effort to steal Apple’s trade secrets (www.cnbc.com [1]). The complaint, lodged in federal court on 10 July 2026, claims OpenAI recruited Apple employees and directed them to divulge confidential information about Apple’s proprietary hardware projects for use in OpenAI’s own device development (techcrunch.com [2]). Apple’s filing even names OpenAI’s Chief Hardware Officer - himself a 24-year Apple veteran - as orchestrating a “pattern of theft” at the behest of OpenAI’s top leadership (techcrunch.com [3]). This battle between two of the world’s most valuable companies has far-reaching implications: it signals that the race for AI leadership may be leading to aggressive (and allegedly unlawful) talent raids and intellectual property disputes. For enterprises, it’s a cautionary tale about protecting IP when integrating AI partners or hiring AI talent. The case could also impose costly injunctions or damages on OpenAI, potentially hindering its rumored hardware ambitions and even its anticipated IPO. The lesson: AI innovation must be matched by rigorous legal and ethical guardrails, or companies risk multi-front litigation.

Beyond this high-profile dispute, the broader AI liability landscape is heating up. According to an industry legal monitor, 42 new AI-related lawsuits were filed in Q2 2026 alone - a 35% jump from the previous quarter (cyber-ivy.com [4]). These cases span issues from product liability (e.g., questioning who is at fault when an AI system causes harm) to intellectual property and privacy violations (cyber-ivy.com [5]). Courts are now grappling with fundamental questions: Is a generative AI’s output a product (implicating product liability) or protected speech? Who bears responsibility when AI systems defame individuals or infringe copyrights? Already, dozens of major copyright lawsuits have been launched by authors, artists, and media companies accusing AI developers of misusing protected data for training. Meanwhile, enforcement agencies are beginning to act. In one precedent, Google’s

parent company agreed to a $68 /million settlement after allegations that its AI voice assistant unlawfully recorded private conversations without user consent (share.ca [6]). Alphabet and startup Character.AI have likewise quietly settled claims that their AI chatbots caused harm to minors via inappropriate content (share.ca [7]). These early outcomes suggest courts will hold companies accountable for clear-cut abuses like privacy violations or failure to prevent foreseeable harms caused by AI.

Increasingly, corporate customers and the public are also scrutinising safety incidents involving AI. A new report from DigiCert revealed that 78% of organisations have already experienced at least one AI-related security incident or discovered an AI vulnerability in their systems (ppc.land [8]). This startling statistic shows that the rush to deploy AI comes with tangible risks - from data leaks caused by AI errors to AI-driven cyberattacks and compliance failures. For instance, a U.S. regulatory action in June temporarily forced leading AI company Anthropic to pull one of its advanced AI models offline over concerns about a jailbreak that could enable misuse (techmaniacs.com [9]). That sudden suspension disrupted some business operations and highlighted an uncomfortable reality: if your enterprise relies on third-party AI models, government orders or safety flaws could abruptly cut off access. In another incident from earlier this year, a powerful AI model's confidential weights were leaked online, causing panic about potential misuse and wiping out $14.5 /billion in cybersecurity industry market value in a single day (foresiet.com [10]). Taken together, these incidents and legal trends reinforce the need for proactive AI risk management. Companies must stress-test their AI systems for vulnerabilities, monitor for misuse or bias, and be prepared with incident response plans. The era of "move fast and break things" with AI is over - breakages now come with serious liability.

References:

[1] www.cnbc.com — https://www.cnbc.com/2026/07/10/apple-openai-lawsuit-trade-secrets.html#:~:text=trade%20secret%20theft%2C%20says%20scheme,property%20in%20order%20to%20develop
[2] techcrunch.com — https://techcrunch.com/2026/07/10/apple-sues-openai-over-alleged-trade-secret-theft/#:~:text=pattern%20of%20theft%20from%20OpenAI,Before%20joining%20OpenAI%2C%20Tan%20had
[3] techcrunch.com — https://techcrunch.com/2026/07/10/apple-sues-openai-over-alleged-trade-secret-theft/#:~:text=pattern%20of%20theft%20from%20OpenAI,Before%20joining%20OpenAI%2C%20Tan%20had
[4] cyber-ivy.com — https://cyber-ivy.com/en/articles/ai-litigation-q2-disputes-monitor-2026-07-15#:~:text=The%20Q2%202026%20AI%20Disputes,are%20now%20moving%20into%20view
[5] cyber-ivy.com — https://cyber-ivy.com/en/articles/ai-litigation-q2-disputes-monitor-2026-07-15#:~:text=ivy,are%20now%20converging%20in%20court
[6] share.ca — https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/#:~:text=to%20AI%E2%80%91powered%20products%2C%20including%20a,Alphabet%E2%80%99s%20board%20removed%20civil%20and
[7] share.ca — https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/#:~:text=to%20AI%E2%80%91powered%20products%2C%20including%20a,Alphabet%E2%80%99s%20board%20removed%20civil%20and
[8] ppc.land — https://ppc.land/digicert-78-of-firms-face-ai-incidents-half-lack-governance/#:~:text=to%20govern%2C%20too%20blank%20to,gap%20between%20how%20fast%20companies
[9] techmaniacs.com — https://techmaniacs.com/2026/07/01/ai-security-daily-briefing-july-01-2026/#:~:text=putting%20Claude%20Fable%205%20back,when%20cloud%20AI%20providers%20face
[10] foresiet.com — https://foresiet.com/blog/ai-enabled-cyberattacks-2026-incidents/#:~:text=trust%20in%20AI%20judgment,state

Boardrooms and investors demand accountability

As AI permeates core business strategy and operations, corporate governance is rapidly evolving to keep pace. Boards of directors are increasingly expected to oversee AI risks just as they do financial, cyber, and compliance risks (chambers.com [1]). In fact, a coalition of major investors has made AI oversight a boardroom issue at Alphabet (Google's parent company). In May 2026, shareholder groups including Parnassus Investments and Canada's SHARE filed a proposal urging Alphabet's board to formalise responsibility for AI governance at the committee level (share.ca [2]). They argue that clear board accountability for AI is essential to managing long-term risk and protecting stakeholder trust (share.ca [3]). The investors pointed to Alphabet's recent troubles - such as the multi-million dollar settlements over privacy and child safety failures in its AI products (share.ca [4]) - as evidence that oversight gaps can lead to real financial and reputational damage (share.ca [5]).

Notably, Alphabet had removed explicit human rights and AI risk oversight from its board committee in 2025 (share.ca [6]), bucking an emerging best practice. By contrast, peers like Microsoft, Meta, Accenture, and even traditional companies like eBay and Comcast have already established board-level committees or roles dedicated to AI ethics and risk management (share.ca [7]). Investors now expect tech giants and AI vendors alike to follow suit, ensuring that someone at the highest level is responsible for guiding AI strategy and monitoring its downsides.

Regulators may soon add to this pressure on boards. Just as Delaware courts have started treating cyber-risk oversight as a “mission critical” fiduciary duty for corporate directors - spawning shareholder derivative suits when breaches occur (chambers.com [8]) - it is plausible that a major AI failure could trigger similar litigation against an inattentive board. Federal regulators in the U.S. are also watching AI governance closely: the SEC has indicated that misrepresentations about AI (so-called “AI-washing”) could expose companies to securities fraud claims if investors are misled about AI’s role or risks (chambers.com [9]). In light of these trends, boards should proactively integrate AI governance into their charters and risk committees. This includes setting AI ethics principles, requiring management to conduct regular AI risk assessments and bias audits, and receiving frequent briefings on AI projects and incidents. Forward-looking companies are already appointing Chief AI Ethics or Risk Officers and tying executive compensation to safe AI development. With investors, employees, and regulators all zeroed in on AI’s potential downsides, treating AI governance as a board-level priority is now part of responsible leadership. The bottom line: effective AI oversight isn’t just a moral issue - it’s fast becoming a legal and business imperative.

References:

[1] chambers.com — https://chambers.com/articles/ai-governance-cyber-risk-board-imperatives#:~:text=Delaware%2C%20stockholder%20derivative%20complaints%20now,securities%20class%20actions%20are%20testing

[2] share.ca — https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/#:~:text=Board,million%20settlement%20over%20claims%20that

[3] share.ca — https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/#:~:text=Engagement%20at%20SHARE,AI%20chatbots%20caused%20harm%20to

[4] share.ca — https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/#:~:text=to%20AI%E2%80%91powered%20products%2C%20including%20a,Alphabet%E2%80%99s%20board%20removed%20civil%20and

[5] share.ca — https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/#:~:text=risks%20arise,Shareholders%20say%20the%20move

[6] share.ca — https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/#:~:text=Character,its%20peers%20on%20AI%20governance

[7] share.ca — https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/#:~:text=AI,AI%20risks%20and%20related%20human

[8] chambers.com — https://chambers.com/articles/ai-governance-cyber-risk-board-imperatives#:~:text=Delaware%2C%20stockholder%20derivative%20complaints%20now,securities%20class%20actions%20are%20testing

[9] chambers.com — https://chambers.com/articles/ai-governance-cyber-risk-board-imperatives#:~:text=In%20federal%20courts%20across%20the,continues%20to%20treat%20cybersecurity%20and

Global outlook: China and others step up

AI governance is not just a Western preoccupation - governments worldwide are enacting their own rules, often with strict provisions that multinational businesses must heed. In China, a new regulatory framework for “anthropomorphic” AI services (essentially AI that interacts in a human-like manner) came into force on 15 July 2026 (iapp.org [1]). The Cyberspace Administration of China’s measures impose specific duties on providers of AI chatbots, virtual companions, and similar services designed for personal interaction (aigovernance.com [2]). Companies must clearly inform users that they are engaging with an AI system (to prevent confusion or deception) and must implement content controls and safeguards to prevent these AI “companions” from causing psychological harm (aigovernance.com [3]). Notably, China’s rules heavily restrict offering such virtual companion services to minors: any AI persona that simulates a friend or family member for under-18 users is effectively prohibited unless stringent protections are proven, reflecting cultural sensitivities and recent incidents (aigovernance.com [4]) (aigovernance.com [5]). Providers face liability for

noncompliance under multiple overlapping Chinese regulations, meaning firms need to ensure their AI products in China meet not only these new rules but also China's existing generative AI and algorithmic recommendation laws (aigovernance.com [6]) (aigovernance.com [7]). The Chinese approach underscores a principle of caution - aiming to curb AI-driven social risks (like addiction or manipulation) before they spread.

Other major jurisdictions are also moving on AI oversight. The United Kingdom, which opted not to create an EU-style single AI Act, has been advancing sector-specific guidance through existing regulators. In June 2026, the UK's Financial Conduct Authority issued final guidelines on AI use in financial services, requiring firms to demonstrate "appropriate governance" over AI-driven decisions and to assess bias and consumer protection impacts. Simultaneously, the UK's Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency rolled out its AI-as-a-Medical-Device regulatory framework to ensure AI tools in healthcare meet safety and effectiveness standards. A broader UK "AI Regulation and Safety" bill is also making its way through Parliament, indicating Britain may yet formalise certain cross-sector AI requirements in law.

Emerging economies are joining the regulatory push as well. India, for example, published a draft Digital India Act on 1 July 2026 that, for the first time, includes provisions assigning liability for harms caused by AI systems deployed in the country. Brazil is deliberating a comprehensive AI Bill that recently cleared a key committee and is expected to face a full legislative vote by September. These actions, alongside initiatives in Canada, Japan, and elsewhere, mean that companies can no longer assume any region is a law-free zone for AI. The global trend is towards more oversight, not less. Enterprises operating internationally must track and adapt to each jurisdiction's rules - from data disclosure requirements to mandatory risk assessments - all while striving for a harmonised internal governance approach. Regulatory fragmentation remains a concern, but efforts by groups like the G7 to establish common AI governance principles may eventually help. Until then, staying competitive means meeting the highest standard among the markets you serve. Companies should treat these new laws and guidelines as an opportunity to build robust, trust-worthy AI processes that can scale across borders.

References:

[1] iapp.org — https://iapp.org/news/a/chinas-regulation-on-ai-companions-takes-force#:~:text=with%20China%20the%20latest%20to,state%20legislatures%20have

[2] aigovernance.com — https://aigovernance.com/news/chinas-anthropomorphic-ai-rules-take-effect-july-2026-setting-new-bar-for-companion-and-interaction-services#:~:text=Measures%20for%20Anthropomorphic%20AI%20Services,Separate%20and%20more

[3] aigovernance.com — https://aigovernance.com/news/chinas-anthropomorphic-ai-rules-take-effect-july-2026-setting-new-bar-for-companion-and-interaction-services#:~:text=Obligations%20include%20mandatory%20disclosure%20to,Separate%20and%20more

[4] aigovernance.com — https://aigovernance.com/news/chinas-anthropomorphic-ai-rules-take-effect-july-2026-setting-new-bar-for-companion-and-interaction-services#:~:text=interaction%20flows%2C%20and%20technical%20and,Regulations%2C%20and%20Algorithm%20Recommendation%20Regulations

[5] aigovernance.com — https://aigovernance.com/news/chinas-anthropomorphic-ai-rules-take-effect-july-2026-setting-new-bar-for-companion-and-interaction-services#:~:text=obligation%3A%20services%20that%20include%20virtual,%C2%B7%20The%20psychological%20influence%20and

[6] aigovernance.com — https://aigovernance.com/news/chinas-anthropomorphic-ai-rules-take-effect-july-2026-setting-new-bar-for-companion-and-interaction-services#:~:text=relative%20products%20in%20that%20demographic,protection

[7] aigovernance.com — https://aigovernance.com/news/chinas-anthropomorphic-ai-rules-take-effect-july-2026-setting-new-bar-for-companion-and-interaction-services#:~:text=restrictions%2C%20requiring%20age,003%20Bias%20and%20Fairness%20Monitoring

Key Statistics

- 42 new AI-related lawsuits were filed in Q2 2026 - up 35% from the previous quarter ([cyber-ivy.com](https://cyber-ivy.com/en/articles/ai-litigation-q2-disputes-monitor-2026-07-15#:~:text=The%20Q2%202026%20AI%20Disputes,are%20now%20moving%20into%20view)).
- 78% of organisations have already experienced an AI-related security incident or vulnerability ([ppc.land](https://ppc.land/digicert-78-of-firms-face-ai-incidents-half-lack-governance/#:~:text=to%20govern%2C%20too%20blank%20to,gap%20between%20how%20fast%20companies)).

- Google paid a $68 /million settlement after its AI assistant was accused of privacy violations ([share.ca](https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/#:~:text=to%20AI%E2%80%91powered%20products%2C%20including%20a,Alphabet%E2%80%99s%20board%20removed%20civil%20and)).

KEY TAKEAWAY

AI governance is now a pressing business mandate. In the past 48 hours alone, regulators in the EU, US, and China have set new rules with hefty penalties, while lawsuits and investors are forcing companies to strengthen AI oversight. Leaders must act now to ensure compliance and manage AI risks across their organisations.

Sources

Artificial Intelligence: Council gives final green light to simplify and streamline rules
https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2026/06/29/artificial-intelligence-council-gives-final-green-light-to-simplify-and-streamline-rules/

Security and AI news from the week beginning 6 July 2026
https://www.enterprisetimes.co.uk/2026/07/13/security-and-ai-news-from-the-week-beginning-6-july-2026/

Apple sues OpenAI over alleged trade secret theft
https://techcrunch.com/2026/07/10/apple-sues-openai-over-alleged-trade-secret-theft/

Gov. JB Pritzker signs first-in-nation Illinois law requiring third-party safety audits for AI giants
https://www.yahoo.com/news/politics/articles/gov-jb-pritzker-signs-first-194200303.html

Alphabet shareholders push board accountability as AI technology risks rise alongside opportunities
https://share.ca/blog/alphabet-shareholders-ai-technology-risks/

China's regulation on AI companions takes force
https://iapp.org/news/a/chinas-regulation-on-ai-companions-takes-force/

AI lawsuits jump to 42 new cases in the second quarter
https://cyber-ivy.com/en/articles/ai-litigation-q2-disputes-monitor-2026-07-15

DigiCert's New Report: 78% of Organizations Already Hit by AI Security Incidents
https://www.techbuzznews.com/digicert-ai-report-2026/