

Brussels, 03 November 2021

WK 13176/2021 INIT

LIMITE

TELECOM

WORKING PAPER

This is a paper intended for a specific community of recipients. Handling and further distribution are under the sole responsibility of community members.

CONTRIBUTION

From: To:	General Secretariat of the Council Working Party on Telecommunications and Information Society
Subject:	Artificial Intelligence Act - BG comments Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV (doc. 8115/21)

Delegations will find in annex BG comments on Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV).

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL LAYING DOWN HARMONISED RULES ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ACT) AND AMENDING CERTAIN UNION LEGISLATIVE ACTS		General comments: In general, we welcome the proposed legislative framework for laying down harmonized rules on AI in the EU. In particular, we are very thankful for the comprehensive presentations and additional explanations provided from the Commission in order to better clarify the new regulatory concept. At this stage and being a very horizontal and complex dossier, we present only some initial comments which are focused mainly on certain key provisions for the development and use of AI systems in the Union emphasizing on the overall innovations-friendly perspective of the proposal. In our comments we address the AI definition,

entire proposat, pieuse ao so in me row containing the title of the	
	data requirements, criteria for classification of
	high-risk systems and Annex III and partially the
	allocation of reposponsibilities between various
	actors. For the rest of the provisons, we will
	submit comments additionally or later in the
	course of negotiations.
TITLE I	
GENERAL PROVISIONS	
Article 1	
Subject matter	
This Regulation lays down:	

Commission proposal (doc. 8115/21 – COM(2021) 206 final)

Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV)

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

Commission proposal (doc. 8115/21 – COM(2021) 206 final)

Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV)

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

systems used to generate or manipulate image,	
audio or video content;	
(d) rules on market monitoring and	
surveillance.	
Article 2	
Scope	
1. This Regulation applies to:	
(a) providers placing on the market or	
putting into service AI systems in the Union,	
irrespective of whether those providers are	
established within the Union or in a third	
country;	

(b) users of AI systems located within the		
Union;		
(c) providers and users of AI systems that	(c) providers and users of AI systems that	We propose to delete the first part of the
are located in a third country, where the output	are located in a third country, where the output	sentence because the <i>providers</i> that are located
produced by the system is used in the Union;	produced by the system is used in the Union;	in a third country, where the output produced
		from their systems is used in the EU, are already
		covered under letter "a".
		Furthermore, we would like to introduce an
		explicit provision clarifying that this regulation
		does not apply to AI systems designed or
		developed in the EU, where the output is not
		used in the Union. The intention is not to affect
		the AI software export as long as the output will
		not be used in the Union.

Commission proposal (doc. 8115/21 – COM(2021) 206 final)

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV)

2. For high-risk AI systems that are safety	
components of products or systems, or which	
are themselves products or systems, falling	
within the scope of the following acts, only	
Article 84 of this Regulation shall apply:	
(a) Regulation (EC) 300/2008;	
(b) Regulation (EU) No 167/2013;	
(c) Regulation (EU) No 168/2013;	
(d) Directive 2014/90/EU;	

(e) Directive (EU) 2016/797;	
(f) Regulation (EU) 2018/858;	
(g) Regulation (EU) 2018/1139;	
(h) Regulation (EU) 2019/2144.	
3. This Regulation shall not apply to AI	We expect an explicit provision on the
systems developed or used exclusively for	exception for public security purposes. We are
military purposes.	not sure if a recital would be sufficient even
	though such exception is based on Art. 52
	TFEU. In comparison with other existing EU
	acts e.g., in the field of spectrum, such
	exception is addressed in the recitals and in the
	body, as well.

4. This Regulation shall not apply to public	
authorities in a third country nor to international	
organisations falling within the scope of this	
Regulation pursuant to paragraph 1, where those	
authorities or organisations use AI systems in	
the framework of international agreements for	
law enforcement and judicial cooperation with	
the Union or with one or more Member States.	
5. This Regulation shall not affect the	
application of the provisions on the liability of	
intermediary service providers set out in	
Chapter II, Section IV of Directive 2000/31/EC	

of the European Parliament and of the Council ¹		
[as to be replaced by the corresponding provisions of the Digital Services Act].		
provisions of the Digital Services Act.		
Article 3		
Definitions Definitions		
For the purpose of this Regulation, the		
following definitions apply:		
(1) 'artificial intelligence system' (AI	(1) 'artificial intelligence system' (AI system)	Our preference for a definition would be for a
system) means software that is developed with	means a system that displays intelligent	wording as close as possible to the AI definition
one or more of the techniques and approaches	behaviour by analysing its environment and	proposed by the High-level Expert Group on AI,
listed in Annex I and can, for a given set of	taking actions, with some degree of autonomy,	as follows:
human-defined objectives, generate outputs	software that is developed with one or more of	

Directive 2000/31/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2000 on certain legal aspects of information society services, in particular electronic commerce, in the Internal Market ('Directive on electronic commerce') (OJ L 178, 17.7.2000, p. 1).

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

such as content, predictions, recommendations, or decisions influencing the environments they interact with;

the techniques and approaches listed in Annex I and can, for achieve a given set of humandefined objectives, by generateing outputs such as content, predictions, recommendations, or decisions influencing the environments they interact with. AI-based systems can be purely software-based, acting in the virtual world or AI can be embedded in hardware device. As a scientific discipline, AI includes several approaches and techniques, such as machine learning (deep learning and reinforcement learning), machine reasoning (planning, scheduling, knowledge representation and reasoning, search, and optimization) and robotics.

"Artificial intelligence (AI) refers to systems that display intelligent behaviour by analysing their environment and taking actions – with some degree of autonomy – to achieve specific goals.

AI-based systems can be purely software-based, acting in the virtual world (e.g. voice assistants, image analysis software, search engines, speech and face recognition systems) or AI can be embedded in hardware devices (e.g. advanced robots, autonomous cars, drones or Internet of Things applications)

"Artificial intelligence (AI) systems are software (and possibly also hardware) systems designed by humans that,

and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provision entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3ra	s, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the l column).
	given a complex goal, act in the physical or
	digital dimension by perceiving their envi
	ronment through data
	acquisition, interpreting the collected structured
	or unstructured data, reasoning on the
	knowledge, or processing
	the information, derived from this data and
	deciding the best action(s) to take to achi eve
	the given goal . AI systems
	can either use symbolic rules or learn a numeric
	model, and they can also adapt their behaviour
	by analysing how
	the environment is affected by their previous
	actions.
	As a scientific discipline, AI includes several
	approaches and techniques, such as machine
	learni ng (of which deep

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

learning and reinforcement learning are specific examples), machine reasoning (which includes planning, scheduling, knowledge representation and reasoning, s earch, and optimization), and robotics (which includes control, perception, sensors and actuators, as well as the integration of all other techniques into cyber physical systems)" All the examples of current approaches and techniques for ML, machine reasoning and robotics could be also described in a corresponding recital if not in the definition itself

	shall not be considered as provider. In such	for "deployers" that only put the system into
	the AI system into service acts as a deployer and	no willingness to introduce a separate category
	authority, agency or other body that only puts	further clarifed in the definition for "provider" if
free of charge;	of charge. In some cases the person, public	should not be called providers. This should be
own name or trademark, whether for payment or	name or trademark, whether for payment or free	same as the ones that develop it then, they
the market or putting it into service under its	market or putting it into service under its own	system by putting it into service are not the
system developed with a view to placing it on	developed for with a view to placing it on the	by them. If those entities that deploy the AI
that develops an AI system or that has an AI	develops an AI system or that has an AI system	not putting into service the AI system developed
person, public authority, agency or other body	public authority, agency or other body that	it is important to define entities/persons that are
(1) 'provider' means a natural or legal	(1) 'provider' means a natural or legal person,	In terms of proper allocation of responsibilities
		Software mausify
		software industry
		at avoiding unintended consequences for the
		alternative AI definitions from other MS aimed
		We also remain open to discuss proposals on

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

	cases, the deployer may also become a user if	service, but do not develop it. Such
	uses the system afterwards	entities/persons could also become users
(3) 'small-scale provider' means a provider		
that is a micro or small enterprise within the		
meaning of Commission Recommendation		
2003/361/EC ² ;		
(4) 'user' means any natural or legal person,		"Under its authority" is not very clear in terms
public authority, agency or other body using an		of contractual relations. This could also imply
AI system under its authority, except where the		that "the authority" could be shared for instance,
AI system is used in the course of a personal		between the public body and the provider. We
non-professional activity;		understood that the intention was rather "who
		operates/controls the use" of the system and
		hence, we would prefer to clarify it in the text

_

² Commission Recommendation of 6 May 2003 concerning the definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (OJ L 124, 20.5.2003, p. 36).

entire proposal, pieuse ao so in the row containing the title of the pr	(
		to avoid ambiguity in terms of allocation of
		responsibilities
		Does "any natural or legal person" mean that
		"providers" are also covered by the definition
		for "users"?
		In our opinion, it would be also useful to clarify
		in the corresponding recital that the end-users
		are out of the scope of the regulation
(5) 'authorised representative' means any		
natural or legal person established in the Union		
who has received a written mandate from a		
provider of an AI system to, respectively,		
perform and carry out on its behalf the		

Commission proposal (doc. 8115/21 – COM(2021) 206 final)

Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV)

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

obligations and procedures established by this	
Regulation;	
(6) 'importer' means any natural or legal	
person established in the Union that places on	
the market or puts into service an AI system that	
bears the name or trademark of a natural or legal	
person established outside the Union;	
(7) 'distributor' means any natural or legal	
person in the supply chain, other than the	
provider or the importer, that makes an AI	
system available on the Union market without	
affecting its properties;	

(8) 'operator' means the provider, the user, the authorised representative, the importer and the distributor;	
(9) 'placing on the market' means the first making available of an AI system on the Union market;	We understand that this definition comes from the product safety legislation. However, for the purposes of the AI software the definition should be adjusted by clarifying at which stage of the development process of the AI system the regulation applies. It should be clear that this definition does not cover the <i>experimentation part/testing part, which is a significant part of the development of an AI system.</i>
(10) 'making available on the market' means any supply of an AI system for distribution or use on the Union market in the course of a	

commercial activity, whether in return for	
payment or free of charge;	
(11) 'putting into service' means the supply	Same comment as on point 9 "placing on the
of an AI system for first use directly to the user	market"; a clarification would be necessary to
or for own use on the Union market for its	make sure that the "first use" is after the
intended purpose;	completion of the experimentation phase
(12) 'intended purpose' means the use for	
which an AI system is intended by the provider,	
including the specific context and conditions of	
use, as specified in the information supplied by	
the provider in the instructions for use,	
promotional or sales materials and statements,	
as well as in the technical documentation;	

(13) 'reasonably foreseeable misuse' means		
the use of an AI system in a way that is not in		
accordance with its intended purpose, but which		
may result from reasonably foreseeable human		
behaviour or interaction with other systems;		
(14) 'safety component of a product or	(14) 'safety component of a product or system'	Proposal to adjust the product safety definition
system' means a component of a product or of a	means an embedded component of a product or	to the AI software environment and to ensure
system which fulfils a safety function for that	of a system which fulfils a safety function for	that the wording would not cover other safety
product or system or the failure or	that product or system or the failure or	features that will not endanger safety, health or
malfunctioning of which endangers the health	malfunctioning of which endangers the health	property
and safety of persons or property;	and safety of persons or property;	
(15) 'instructions for use' means the		It makes sense to include the possibility for the
information provided by the provider to inform	(15) 'instructions for use'	"reasonably expected misuse" as part of the
the user of in particular an AI system's intended	means the information provided by the provider	instructions for use
purpose and proper use, inclusive of the specific	provides	

geographical, behavioural or functional setting	to inform the user of in particular an AI system's
within which the high-risk AI system is	intended purpose, and proper use and the
intended to be used;	possibility for reasonably expected misuse,
	inclusive of the specific geographical,
	behavioural or functional setting within which
	the high-risk AI system is intended to be used;
(16) 'recall of an AI system' means any	
measure aimed at achieving the return to the	
provider of an AI system made available to	
users;	
(17) 'withdrawal of an AI system' means any	
measure aimed at preventing the distribution,	
display and offer of an AI system;	

(18) 'performance of an AI system' means	(18) 'performance of an AI system' means the	Does the proposed definition also cover the
the ability of an AI system to achieve its	ability of an AI system to achieve its intended	"reasonably foreseeable misuse"? If not, why. In
intended purpose;	purpose and its reasonably forseeable misuse	our view, it should be part of the definition as
		long as the misuse is reasonably foreseen.
		Moreover, it is part of the performance of the
		system
(19) 'notifying authority' means the national		
authority responsible for setting up and carrying		
out the necessary procedures for the assessment,		
designation and notification of conformity		
assessment bodies and for their monitoring;		
(20) 'conformity assessment' means the		
process of verifying whether the requirements		
set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of this Regulation		
relating to an AI system have been fulfilled;		

	T	T
(21) 'conformity assessment body' means a		
body that performs third-party conformity		
assessment activities, including testing,		
certification and inspection;		
(22) 'notified body' means a conformity		
assessment body designated in accordance with		
this Regulation and other relevant Union		
harmonisation legislation;		
(23) 'substantial modification' means a		
change to the AI system following its placing on		
the market or putting into service which affects		
the compliance of the AI system with the		
requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of		
this Regulation or results in a modification to		

the intended purpose for which the AI system	
has been assessed;	
(24) 'CE marking of conformity' (CE	
marking) means a marking by which a provider	
indicates that an AI system is in conformity with	
the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of	
this Regulation and other applicable Union	
legislation harmonising the conditions for the	
marketing of products ('Union harmonisation	
legislation') providing for its affixing;	
(25) 'post-market monitoring' means all	Is not it a shared responsibility between the
activities carried out by providers of AI systems	providers and the national supervisory
to proactively collect and review experience	authorities? Is this only providers'
gained from the use of AI systems they place on	responsibility?
the market or put into service for the purpose of	

identifying any need to immediately apply any	
necessary corrective or preventive actions;	
necessary corrective or preventive actions,	
(26) 'market surveillance authority' means	
the national authority carrying out the activities	
and taking the measures pursuant to Regulation	
(EU) 2019/1020;	
(27) 'harmonised standard' means a	
European standard as defined in Article 2(1)(c)	
of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012;	
(28) 'common specifications' means a	
document, other than a standard, containing	
technical solutions providing a means to,	
comply with certain requirements and	
obligations established under this Regulation;	

(29) 'training data' means data used for	
training an AI system through fitting its	
learnable parameters, including the weights of a	
neural network;	
(30) 'validation data' means data used for	
providing an evaluation of the trained AI system	
and for tuning its non-learnable parameters and	
its learning process, among other things, in	
order to prevent overfitting; whereas the	
validation dataset can be a separate dataset or	
part of the training dataset, either as a fixed or	
variable split;	
(31) 'testing data' means data used for	
providing an independent evaluation of the	

4idddi.da4.d AT4id4.	
trained and validated AI system in order to	
confirm the expected performance of that	
system before its placing on the market or	
putting into service;	
(32) 'input data' means data provided to or	
directly acquired by an AI system on the basis	
of which the system produces an output;	
(33) 'biometric data' means personal data	
resulting from specific technical processing	
relating to the physical, physiological or	
behavioural characteristics of a natural person,	
which allow or confirm the unique identification	
of that natural person, such as facial images or	
dactyloscopic data;	

(34) 'emotion recognition system' means an	
AI system for the purpose of identifying or	
inferring emotions or intentions of natural	
persons on the basis of their biometric data;	
(35) 'biometric categorisation system' means	
an AI system for the purpose of assigning	
natural persons to specific categories, such as	
sex, age, hair colour, eye colour, tattoos, ethnic	
origin or sexual or political orientation, on the	
basis of their biometric data;	
(36) 'remote biometric identification system'	How will be achieved the requirement for
means an AI system for the purpose of	"without prior knowledge of the user of the AI
identifying natural persons at a distance through	system whether the person will be present and
the comparison of a person's biometric data	can be identified" in a different scenario than
with the biometric data contained in a reference	for the law enforcement purposes (Art 5 (1),

database, and without prior knowledge of the	d))? If other providers use such systems as per
user of the AI system whether the person will be	Art. 6 (2) and Annex III respecting the relevant
present and can be identified;	requirements of this regulation, does this mean
	that they can use such systems according to the
	requirements of this act, but without asking for
	consent?
(37) 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification system' means a remote biometric	
identification system whereby the capturing of	
biometric data, the comparison and the	
identification all occur without a significant	
delay. This comprises not only instant	
identification, but also limited short delays in	
order to avoid circumvention.	

(38) "post' remote biometric identification	
system' means a remote biometric identification	
system other than a 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification system;	
(39) 'publicly accessible space' means any	This definition could be subject to various
physical place accessible to the public,	interpretations having in mind the existing
regardless of whether certain conditions for	national laws varying from a country to country
access may apply;	
	It could be added at the end "as specified in
	instructions issued by the Commission for the
	implementation of Art. 5 (4), where necessary".
	In our view, such clarification is important for
	the purposes of facilitating the implementation
	of Art. 5 (4), if Member States decide so.
(40) 'law enforcement authority' means:	

(a) any public authority competent for the	
prevention, investigation, detection or	
prosecution of criminal offences or the	
execution of criminal penalties, including the	
safeguarding against and the prevention of	
threats to public security; or	
(b) any other body or entity entrusted by	
Member State law to exercise public authority	
and public powers for the purposes of the	
prevention, investigation, detection or	
prosecution of criminal offences or the	
execution of criminal penalties, including the	
safeguarding against and the prevention of	
threats to public security;	

(41) 'law enforcement' means activities		
carried out by law enforcement authorities for		
the prevention, investigation, detection or		
prosecution of criminal offences or the		
execution of criminal penalties, including the		
safeguarding against and the prevention of		
threats to public security;		
(42) 'national supervisory authority' means	(42) 'national supervisory authority' means the	The proposed drafting suggestion corresponds
the authority to which a Member State assigns	market surveillance authority or the authority to	to the proposed article further clarifying that the
the responsibility for the implementation and	which a Member State assigns the responsibility	MS have the flexibility on the number of
application of this Regulation, for coordinating	for the implementation and application of this	competent bodies and especially, when the
the activities entrusted to that Member State, for	Regulation, for coordinating the activities	national resources are scarce, the creation of too
acting as the single contact point for the	entrusted to that Member State, for acting as the	many bodies should be avoided
Commission, and for representing the Member	single contact point for the Commission, and for	
State at the European Artificial Intelligence	representing the Member State at the European	
Board;	Artificial Intelligence Board;	

(43) 'national competent authority' means the national supervisory authority, the notifying authority and the market surveillance authority;	(43) 'national competent authority' means the national supervisory authority, the notifying authority and/or the market surveillance authority;	See the previous comment
(44) 'serious incident' means any incident that directly or indirectly leads, might have led or might lead to any of the following:		
(a) the death of a person or serious damage to a person's health, to property or the environment,		
(b) a serious and irreversible disruption of the management and operation of critical infrastructure.		

		Would it be possible to provide a definition on
		"regulatory sandboxes" for the sake of avoiding
		confusion with testing and experimentation
		facilities or even clarifying the link between
		them?
Article 4		Our preferred option would be to delete this
Amendments to Annex I		article. If kept, we remain reluctant to define the
		AI techniques and approaches in the Annex I
		which is subject to amendments by delegated
		acts.
		We would recommend to explore the option for
		keeping the definition on AI and its techniques
		and approaches in the article and carry out the
		updates by implementing acts
The Commission is empowered to adopt	The Commission is empowered to adopt	
delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to	delegated implementing acts in accordance with	

Article 73 to amend the list of techniques and	
approaches listed in the AI definition/referred to	
in Art. 3 (1)Annex I, in order to update that list	
to market and technological developments on	
the basis of characteristics that are similar to the	
techniques and approaches listed therein.	
	approaches listed in the AI definition/referred to in Art. 3 (1)Annex I, in order to update that list to market and technological developments on the basis of characteristics that are similar to the

·	
(a) the placing on the market, putting into	
service or use of an AI system that deploys	
subliminal techniques beyond a person's	
consciousness in order to materially distort a	
person's behaviour in a manner that causes or is	
likely to cause that person or another person	
physical or psychological harm;	
(b) the placing on the market, putting into	
service or use of an AI system that exploits any	
of the vulnerabilities of a specific group of	
persons due to their age, physical or mental	
disability, in order to materially distort the	
behaviour of a person pertaining to that group in	
a manner that causes or is likely to cause that	
person or another person physical or	
psychological harm;	

(c) the placing on the market, putting into	Like other MS we are reluctant about limiting
service or use of AI systems by public authorities or on their behalf for the evaluation or classification of the trustworthiness of natural persons over a certain period of time based on	this provision to "public authorities or on their behalf" as this undermines the possibility for a "level-playing field" and would hamper the enforcement. As long as the risk is high, it does
their social behaviour or known or predicted personal or personality characteristics, with the social score leading to either or both of the following:	not matter who the subject is. If the other potential operators are already sufficiently regulated for the same purpose then, there should be at least a corresponding recital enumerating the applicable provisions in such
	cases in order to ensure that there is an equal level of protection
(i) detrimental or unfavourable treatment of certain natural persons or whole groups thereof	

in social contexts which are unrelated to the	
contexts in which the data was originally	
generated or collected;	
-	
(ii) detrimental or unfavourable treatment of	
certain natural persons or whole groups thereof	
that is unjustified or disproportionate to their	
social behaviour or its gravity;	
(d) the use of 'real-time' remote biometric	If other potential operators are allowed to use
identification systems in publicly accessible	real-time RBI for instance, for private purposes
spaces for the purpose of law enforcement,	then a corresponding recital should be
unless and in as far as such use is strictly	introduced enumerating the applicable
necessary for one of the following objectives:	provisions in order to make sure that there is the
	same level of protection. Same reasons as stated
	in the previous comment: level-playing field as

	long as the effect on fundamental rights or safety is the same
(i) the targeted search for specific potential	
victims of crime, including missing children;	
(ii) the prevention of a specific, substantial	
and imminent threat to the life or physical safety	
of natural persons or of a terrorist attack;	
(iii) the detection, localisation, identification	
or prosecution of a perpetrator or suspect of a	
criminal offence referred to in Article 2(2) of	
Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA ³	

Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA of 13 June 2002 on the European arrest warrant and the surrender procedures between Member States (OJ L 190, 18.7.2002, p. 1).

	T
(b) the consequences of the use of the	
system for the rights and freedoms of all persons	
concerned, in particular the seriousness,	
probability and scale of those consequences.	
In addition, the use of 'real-time' remote	
biometric identification systems in publicly	
accessible spaces for the purpose of law	
enforcement for any of the objectives referred to	
in paragraph 1 point d) shall comply with	
necessary and proportionate safeguards and	
conditions in relation to the use, in particular as	
regards the temporal, geographic and personal	
limitations.	

3. As regards paragraphs 1, point (d) and 2,	
each individual use for the purpose of law	
enforcement of a 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification system in publicly accessible	
spaces shall be subject to a prior authorisation	
granted by a judicial authority or by an	
independent administrative authority of the	
Member State in which the use is to take place,	
issued upon a reasoned request and in	
accordance with the detailed rules of national	
law referred to in paragraph 4. However, in a	
duly justified situation of urgency, the use of the	
system may be commenced without an	
authorisation and the authorisation may be	
requested only during or after the use.	
i l	

The competent judicial or administrative	
authority shall only grant the authorisation	
where it is satisfied, based on objective evidence	
or clear indications presented to it, that the use	
of the 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification system at issue is necessary for	
and proportionate to achieving one of the	
objectives specified in paragraph 1, point (d), as	
identified in the request. In deciding on the	
request, the competent judicial or administrative	
authority shall take into account the elements	
referred to in paragraph 2.	
4. A Member State may decide to provide	
for the possibility to fully or partially authorise	
the use of 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification systems in publicly accessible	

spaces for the purpose of law enforcement	
within the limits and under the conditions listed	
in paragraphs 1, point (d), 2 and 3. That	
Member State shall lay down in its national law	
the necessary detailed rules for the request,	
issuance and exercise of, as well as supervision	
relating to, the authorisations referred to in	
paragraph 3. Those rules shall also specify in	
respect of which of the objectives listed in	
paragraph 1, point (d), including which of the	
criminal offences referred to in point (iii)	
thereof, the competent authorities may be	
authorised to use those systems for the purpose	
of law enforcement.	
TITLE III	

Commission proposal (doc. 8115/21 – COM(2021) 206 final)

Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV)

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS	
Chapter 1	
CLASSIFICATION OF AI SYSTEMS AS	
HIGH-RISK	
Article 6	
Classification rules for high-risk AI systems	
1. Irrespective of whether an AI system is	
placed on the market or put into service	
independently from the products referred to in	
points (a) and (b), that AI system shall be	
considered high-risk where both of the	
following conditions are fulfilled:	

Article 7	In general, all our comments/proposals for
Amendments to Annex III	revison of the proposed criteria are related to the
	state-of-play on the EU market and notably, no
	more than 15% of such high-risk AI systems (in
	some countries it could be close to none).
	Therefore, our main aim should be to avoid over
	regualtion of our companies by stifling their
	ability to innovate while setting the rules for AI
	systems developped in third countries, but
	imported in the Union market. In this regard, we
	should not totally disregard the possibility to
	split the criteria between the ones applicable for
	the AI systems designed and developed for use
	in the EU and others for import of AI systems in
	the EU market, but developed under different
	regulatory environment or without regulation at

		all in third countries. The latter would need
		stricter requirements as far as safety and
		fundamental rights are concerned
1. The Commission is empowered to adopt	1. The Commission is empowered to adopt	The approach should be the same as far as
delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to	delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to	updates (additions/deletions) of Annex III are
update the list in Annex III by adding high-risk	update the list in Annex III by adding or	concerned
AI systems where both of the following	deleting high-risk AI systems where both of the	
conditions are fulfilled:	following conditions are fulfilled:	Now, we don't express particular preferences on
		delegated acts vs implementing acts. However,
		most likely we will align ourselves with the
		prevailing views of MS on the matter
(a) the AI systems are intended to be used in		
any of the areas listed in points 1 to 8 of Annex		
III;		

(b) the AI systems pose a risk of harm to the	
health and safety, or a risk of adverse impact on	
fundamental rights, that is, in respect of its	
severity and probability of occurrence,	
equivalent to or greater than the risk of harm or	
of adverse impact posed by the high-risk AI	
systems already referred to in Annex III.	
2. When assessing for the purposes of	
paragraph 1 whether an AI system poses a risk	
of harm to the health and safety or a risk of	
adverse impact on fundamental rights that is	
equivalent to or greater than the risk of harm	
posed by the high-risk AI systems already	
referred to in Annex III, the Commission shall	
take into account the following criteria:	

(a) the intended purpose of the AI system;	(a) the intended purpose of the AI system and its forseeable misuse;	
(b) the extent to which an AI system has		
been used or is likely to be used;		
	() the extent to which the providers, taking into	The proposed approach should not disregard the
	account their size, have access to data that can	role of the availability of data and the access to
	cause harm to health, safety or fundamental	it when it comes to determining societal risks.
	rights	There is a lot to be done before huge amount of
		data of appropriate to high quality is unleashed
		in the Union. The proposed criteria should take
		the market reality into account in order to avoid
		excessive regulation for EU companies that
		currently can not take advantage of large
		amounts of data nor of its good quality. In brief,
		the majority of our companies are far from

		developing manipulation techniques as a result
		of existing data constraints.
(c) the extent to which the use of an AI		
system has already caused harm to the health		
and safety or adverse impact on the fundamental		
rights or has given rise to significant concerns in		
relation to the materialisation of such harm or		
adverse impact, as demonstrated by reports or		
documented allegations submitted to national		
competent authorities;		
(d) the potential extent of such harm or such	(d) the potential extent of such harm or such	"plurality of persons" seems undefined
adverse impact, in particular in terms of its	adverse impact, in particular in terms of its	
intensity and its ability to affect a plurality of	intensity and its ability to affect the society	
persons;	overall a plurality of persons;	

() 41 4 44 1:1 4 4:11 1	() 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
(e) the extent to which potentially harmed or	(e) the extent to which potentially harmed or	
adversely impacted persons are dependent on	adversely impacted persons -society are is	
the outcome produced with an AI system, in	dependent on the outcome produced with an AI	
particular because for practical or legal reasons	system, in particular because for practical or	
it is not reasonably possible to opt-out from that	legal reasons it is not reasonably possible to opt-	
outcome;	out from that outcome;	
(f) the extent to which potentially harmed or		
adversely impacted persons are in a vulnerable		
position in relation to the user of an AI system,		
in particular due to an imbalance of power,		
knowledge, economic or social circumstances,		
or age;		

(g) the extent to which the outcome produced with an AI system is easily reversible, whereby outcomes having an impact on the health or safety of persons shall not be considered as easily reversible;	(g) the extent to which the outcome produced with an AI system is not easily reversible, whereby for instance, outcomes having an impact on the health or safety of persons shall not be considered as easily reversible;	If the outcome is easily reversible then, why the list in Annex III should be further extended. Is this really a criterion for high risk?
		Therefore, we propose to redraft the proposed
		wording as per the text in the second column
(h) the extent to which existing Union legislation provides for:		
(i) effective measures of redress in relation to the risks posed by an AI system, with the exclusion of claims for damages;		
(ii) effective measures to prevent or substantially minimise those risks.		

Chapter 2	
REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGH-RISK AI	
SYSTEMS	
Article 8	
Compliance with the requirements	
1. High-risk AI systems shall comply with	
the requirements established in this Chapter.	
2. The intended purpose of the high-risk AI	
system and the risk management system referred	
to in Article 9 shall be taken into account when	
ensuring compliance with those requirements.	

Article 9	We understood from the presentations and the
Risk management system	discussions on Art. 9-15 that the obligations
	under those articles are directed to the providers.
	However, it might worth to clarify provision by
	provision if the proposed obligations concern in
	all cases the providers only or sometimes only
	the ones who do not develop the system, but
	only put it into service (see our comments on
	the definition for "provider")
A risk management system shall be	
established, implemented, documented and	
maintained in relation to high-risk AI systems.	
2. The risk management system shall	
consist of a continuous iterative process run	
throughout the entire lifecycle of a high-risk AI	

Commission proposal (doc. 8115/21 – COM(2021) 206 final)

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV)

system, requiring regular systematic updating. It	
system, requiring regular systematic updating. It	
shall comprise the following steps:	
(a) identification and analysis of the known	
and foreseeable risks associated with each high-	
risk AI system;	
(b) estimation and evaluation of the risks	
that may emerge when the high-risk AI system	
is used in accordance with its intended purpose	
and under conditions of reasonably foreseeable	
misuse;	
(c) evaluation of other possibly arising risks	
based on the analysis of data gathered from the	
post-market monitoring system referred to in	
Article 61;	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	

(d) adoption of suitable risk management	
measures in accordance with the provisions of	
the following paragraphs.	
3. The risk management measures referred	
to in paragraph 2, point (d) shall give due	
consideration to the effects and possible	
interactions resulting from the combined	
application of the requirements set out in this	
Chapter 2. They shall take into account the	
generally acknowledged state of the art,	
including as reflected in relevant harmonised	
standards or common specifications.	
4. The risk management measures referred	
to in paragraph 2, point (d) shall be such that	

any residual risk associated with each hazard as	
well as the overall residual risk of the high-risk	
AI systems is judged acceptable, provided that	
the high-risk AI system is used in accordance	
with its intended purpose or under conditions of	
reasonably foreseeable misuse. Those residual	
risks shall be communicated to the user.	
In identifying the most appropriate risk	
management measures, the following shall be	
ensured:	
(a) elimination or reduction of risks as far as	
possible through adequate design and	
development;	

(b) where appropriate, implementation of	
adequate mitigation and control measures in	
relation to risks that cannot be eliminated;	
(c) provision of adequate information	
pursuant to Article 13, in particular as regards	
the risks referred to in paragraph 2, point (b) of	
this Article, and, where appropriate, training to	
users.	
In eliminating or reducing risks related to the	
use of the high-risk AI system, due	
consideration shall be given to the technical	
knowledge, experience, education, training to be	
expected by the user and the environment in	
which the system is intended to be used.	

5. High-risk AI systems shall be tested for	
the purposes of identifying the most appropriate	
risk management measures. Testing shall ensure	
that high-risk AI systems perform consistently	
for their intended purpose and they are in	
compliance with the requirements set out in this	
Chapter.	
6. Testing procedures shall be suitable to	
achieve the intended purpose of the AI system	
and do not need to go beyond what is necessary	
to achieve that purpose.	
7. The testing of the high-risk AI systems	
shall be performed, as appropriate, at any point	
in time throughout the development process,	
and, in any event, prior to the placing on the	

institutions pursuant to Article 74 of that		
Directive.		
Article 10		
Data and data governance		
1. High-risk AI systems which make use of		
techniques involving the training of models with		
data shall be developed on the basis of training,		
validation and testing data sets that meet the		
quality criteria referred to in paragraphs 2 to 5.		
2. Training, validation and testing data sets	2. Training, validation and testing data sets	Does this prior assessment also cover third-party
shall be subject to appropriate data governance	shall be subject to appropriate data governance	datasets or publicly available datasets? This
and management practices. Those practices shall	and management practices, where possible.	could make the use of third-party datasets or
concern in particular,	Those practices shall concern in particular,	publicly open datasets impossible in practice as
		it is not clear how smaller players would be able

	to do the checking/assessment. Even if such
	shortcomings are identified who will be in
	charge of addressing them, the public sector
	bodies that opened publicly the datasets or the
	owners of the data themselves? What should a
	provider do in such scenario?
(a) the relevant design choices;	
(b) data collection;	
(c) relevant data preparation processing	
operations, such as annotation, labelling,	
cleaning, enrichment and aggregation;	

(d) the formulation of relevant aggregations	
(d) the formulation of relevant assumptions,	
notably with respect to the information that the	
data are supposed to measure and represent;	
(e) a prior assessment of the availability,	
quantity and suitability of the data sets that are	
needed;	
(f) examination in view of possible biases;	
(g) the identification of any possible data	
gaps or shortcomings, and how those gaps and	Does this prior assessment also cover third-party
shortcomings can be addressed.	datasets or publicly available datasets? This
	could make the use of third-party datasets or
	publicly open datasets impossible in practice as
	the providers (<u>having in mind their size</u>) might be

entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the pro-	roposal (in the 3rd column).	the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the
		in a difficulty to check data not generated by
		them. Even if such shortcomings are identified
		who will be in charge of addressing them, the
		public sector bodies that opened publicly the
		datasets or the owners of the data themselves.
		Is this a new form of data sharing in addition to
		the DGA provisions or any different from the
		future obligations part of the Data Act?
3. Training, validation and testing data sets	3. Training, validation and testing data sets	Given the current situation with data in terms of
shall be relevant, representative, free of errors	shall be appropriate/suitable relevant, and	its quantity and quality, we cannot set the
and complete. They shall have the appropriate	representative, free of errors and complete. They	highest requirement directly for "high' quality.
statistical properties, including, where	shall have the appropriate statistical properties,	A transitional period should be foreseen at least
applicable, as regards the persons or groups of	including, where applicable, as regards the	and therefore, data should be of appropriate
persons on which the high-risk AI system is	persons or groups of persons on which the high-	quality i.e., as good as possible, but in any case
intended to be used. These characteristics of the	risk AI system is intended to be used. These	realistic and feasible to implement. As soon as
	characteristics of the data sets may be met at the	this is achieved also due to standards, we can

data sets may be met at the level of individual	level of individual data sets or a combination	require high quality data only. Moreover, data
data sets or a combination thereof.	thereof.	relevance sometimes can not be assessed at the stage of data collection. Next, the data economy will be impacted by the new legislative acts in the field of data (DGA, DA) the effects of which on data availability, its quantity and quality will not be possible to assess before the AI Act enters into force. This is one more reason not to set unrealistic requirements in terms of data.
4. Training, validation and testing data sets shall take into account, to the extent required by the intended purpose, the characteristics or elements that are particular to the specific geographical, behavioural or functional setting	We propose to add one more sentence at the end of the paragraph, as follows: "Safeguards shall be applied against biased outcomes after deployment of the systems"	The intention is to overcome the burden for providers as a result of currently available datasets when they have to comply with "the specific geographical, behavioural or functional setting"

within which the high-risk AI system is	
intended to be used.	
5. To the extent that it is strictly necessary	We have doubts about "strictly necessary". Is
for the purposes of ensuring bias monitoring,	this a GDPR language? How exactly to assess
detection and correction in relation to the high-	when is strictly necessary or not?
risk AI systems, the providers of such systems	
may process special categories of personal data	
referred to in Article 9(1) of Regulation (EU)	
2016/679, Article 10 of Directive (EU)	
2016/680 and Article 10(1) of Regulation (EU)	
2018/1725, subject to appropriate safeguards for	
the fundamental rights and freedoms of natural	
persons, including technical limitations on the	
re-use and use of state-of-the-art security and	
privacy-preserving measures, such as	
pseudonymisation, or encryption where	

anonymisation may significantly affect the		
purpose pursued.		
6. Appropriate data governance and	6. If techniques for training of models with data	We are not sure about the purpose of the
management practices shall apply for the	do not meet the quality criteria under	highlighted text and we propose to rephrase it
development of high-risk AI systems other than	paragraphs 2 to 5, appropriate data governance	
those which make use of techniques involving	and management practices shall apply for the	
the training of models in order to ensure that	development of high-risk AI systems other than	
those high-risk AI systems comply with	those which make use of techniques involving	
paragraph 2.	the training of models in order to ensure that	
	those high-risk Al systems comply with	
	paragraph 2.	
Article 11		
Technical documentation		

The technical documentation of a high-risk AI system shall be drawn up before that system is placed on the market or put into service and shall be kept up-to date. The technical documentation shall be drawn up in such a way to demonstrate that the high-risk AI system complies with the requirements set out in this Chapter and provide national.	"It shall contain, at a minimum, the	It is important to provide the necessary flexibility for providers having in mind their various sizes, resources, capacities and the
out in this Chapter and provide national competent authorities and notified bodies with all the necessary information to assess the compliance of the AI system with those requirements. It shall contain, at a minimum, the elements set out in Annex IV.	elements set out in Annex IV or relevant documentation from providers' internal practices could be also used, where applicable'.	proposed minimum requirements in Annex IV could be too cumbersome. We should be also mindful for resources of national competent bodies to check compliance which are not unlimited.
2. Where a high-risk AI system related to a product, to which the legal acts listed in Annex		

II, section A apply, is placed on the market or	
put into service one single technical	
documentation shall be drawn up containing all	
the information set out in Annex IV as well as	
the information required under those legal acts.	
3. The Commission is empowered to adopt	
delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to	
amend Annex IV where necessary to ensure	
that, in the light of technical progress, the	
technical documentation provides all the	
necessary information to assess the compliance	
of the system with the requirements set out in	
this Chapter.	
Article 12	
Record-keeping	

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

High-risk AI systems shall be designed What are the "recognized standards or common and developed with capabilities enabling the specifications" that might apply to the logging (centralized, decentralized or both)? What is the automatic recording of events ('logs') while the nature of the logs (centralized or decentralized) high-risk AI systems is operating. Those logging capabilities shall conform to recognised that are covered by this provision? We assume standards or common specifications. the intention is to cover centralised logs, but from the presentations and additional explanations on Art. 20 on "to the extent that such logs are under their control", it is clear that decentralized logs are meant, as well. Then, would it be there a separate provision for decentralized logs and what would be the applicable requirements in terms of data in such cases? Our additional concern is that this requirement will increase costs for smaller and mid-sized companies. We would welcome any

entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the	3rd column).
	proposals for simplification of Art 12 in order to
	reduce the burden for compliance.
	Finally, if this article is read together with Art.
	20 it is clear that there is an allocation of
	responsibilities e.g., "to the extent such logs are
	under their control". Therefore, it should be
	clarified already in Art. 12 that for centralized
	logs the control over the logs shall be subject to
	contractual arrangements between the providers
	and the deployers and/or users and that there
	will be no obligations for providers/deployers to
	provide access to the logs in a decentralized
	context (when data is stored on the devices of
	the individuals)

2. The logging capabilities shall ensure a	This paragraph might imply enormous amounts
level of traceability of the AI system's	of data to be logged
functioning throughout its lifecycle that is	
appropriate to the intended purpose of the	
system.	
3. In particular, logging capabilities shall	
enable the monitoring of the operation of the	
high-risk AI system with respect to the	
occurrence of situations that may result in the	
AI system presenting a risk within the meaning	
of Article 65(1) or lead to a substantial	
modification, and facilitate the post-market	
monitoring referred to in Article 61.	

4. For high-risk AI systems referred to in	
paragraph 1, point (a) of Annex III, the logging	
capabilities shall provide, at a minimum:	
(a) recording of the period of each use of the	
system (start date and time and end date and	
time of each use);	
(b) the reference database against which	
input data has been checked by the system;	
(c) the input data for which the search has	
led to a match;	
(d) the identification of the natural persons	
involved in the verification of the results, as	
referred to in Article 14 (5).	

	T	
Article 13		
Transparency and provision of information to		
users		
1. High-risk AI systems shall be designed		
and developed in such a way to ensure that their		
operation is sufficiently transparent to enable		
users to interpret the system's output and use it		
appropriately. An appropriate type and degree		
of transparency shall be ensured, with a view to		
achieving compliance with the relevant		
obligations of the user and of the provider set		
out in Chapter 3 of this Title.		
2. High-risk AI systems shall be		
accompanied by instructions for use in an		

appropriate digital format or otherwise that	
include concise, complete, correct and clear	
information that is relevant, accessible and	
comprehensible to users.	
3. The information referred to in paragraph	
2 shall specify:	
(a) the identity and the contact details of the	
provider and, where applicable, of its authorised	
representative;	
(b) the characteristics, capabilities and	
limitations of performance of the high-risk AI	
system, including:	
(i) its intended purpose;	

(ii) the level of accuracy, robustness and	
cybersecurity referred to in Article 15 against	
which the high-risk AI system has been tested	
and validated and which can be expected, and	
any known and foreseeable circumstances that	
may have an impact on that expected level of	
accuracy, robustness and cybersecurity;	
(iii) any known or foreseeable circumstance,	
related to the use of the high-risk AI system in	
accordance with its intended purpose or under	
conditions of reasonably foreseeable misuse,	
which may lead to risks to the health and safety	
or fundamental rights;	

(iv) its performance as regards the persons or	
(iv) its performance as regards the persons or	
groups of persons on which the system is	
intended to be used;	
(v) when appropriate, specifications for the	
input data, or any other relevant information in	
terms of the training, validation and testing data	
sets used, taking into account the intended	
purpose of the AI system.	
(c) the changes to the high-risk AI system	
and its performance which have been pre-	
determined by the provider at the moment of the	
initial conformity assessment, if any;	
(d) the human oversight measures referred	
to in Article 14, including the technical	

	T
measures put in place to facilitate the	
interpretation of the outputs of AI systems by	
the users;	
(e) the expected lifetime of the high-risk AI	
system and any necessary maintenance and care	
measures to ensure the proper functioning of	
that AI system, including as regards software	
updates.	
Article 14	
Human oversight	
1. High-risk AI systems shall be designed	
and developed in such a way, including with	
appropriate human-machine interface tools, that	
they can be effectively overseen by natural	

persons during the period in which the AI	
system is in use.	
2. Human oversight shall aim at preventing	
or minimising the risks to health, safety or	
fundamental rights that may emerge when a	
high-risk AI system is used in accordance with	
its intended purpose or under conditions of	
reasonably foreseeable misuse, in particular	
when such risks persist notwithstanding the	
application of other requirements set out in this	
Chapter.	
3. Human oversight shall be ensured	
through either one or all of the following	
measures:	

(a) identified and built, when technically	
feasible, into the high-risk AI system by the	
provider before it is placed on the market or put	
into service;	
(b) identified by the provider before placing	
the high-risk AI system on the market or putting	
it into service and that are appropriate to be	
implemented by the user.	
4. The measures referred to in paragraph 3	
shall enable the individuals to whom human	
oversight is assigned to do the following, as	
appropriate to the circumstances:	
(a) fully understand the capacities and	How would the individuals "fully understand"
limitations of the high-risk AI system and be	the system if there is no explicit obligation for

able to duly monitor its operation, so that signs	the developer and/or the one putting the AI
of anomalies, dysfunctions and unexpected	system into service to assist them accordingly.
performance can be detected and addressed as	Just to "understand" would be sufficient in our
soon as possible;	view
(b) remain aware of the possible tendency of	
automatically relying or over-relying on the	
output produced by a high-risk AI system	
('automation bias'), in particular for high-risk	
AI systems used to provide information or	
recommendations for decisions to be taken by	
natural persons;	
(c) be able to correctly interpret the high-	
risk AI system's output, taking into account in	
particular the characteristics of the system and	
the interpretation tools and methods available;	

(d) be able to decide, in any particular	
situation, not to use the high-risk AI system or	
otherwise disregard, override or reverse the	
output of the high-risk AI system;	
(e) be able to intervene on the operation of	
the high-risk AI system or interrupt the system	
through a "stop" button or a similar procedure.	
5. For high-risk AI systems referred to in	
point 1(a) of Annex III, the measures referred to	
in paragraph 3 shall be such as to ensure that, in	
addition, no action or decision is taken by the	
user on the basis of the identification resulting	
from the system unless this has been verified	
and confirmed by at least two natural persons.	

Article 15	
Accuracy, robustness and cybersecurity	
1. High-risk AI systems shall be designed	
and developed in such a way that they achieve,	
in the light of their intended purpose, an	
appropriate level of accuracy, robustness and	
cybersecurity, and perform consistently in those	
respects throughout their lifecycle.	
2. The levels of accuracy and the relevant	
accuracy metrics of high-risk AI systems shall	
be declared in the accompanying instructions of	
use.	

3. High-risk AI systems shall be resilient as	3. Appropriate measures shall be taken to ensure	See our comments above on data and our main
regards errors, faults or inconsistencies that may	that high-risk AI systems shall be as resilient as	concern about the feasibility of obligations
occur within the system or the environment in	possible as regards errors, faults or	
which the system operates, in particular due to	inconsistencies that may occur within the	
their interaction with natural persons or other	system or the environment in which the system	
systems.	operates, in particular due to their interaction	
	with natural persons or other systems.	
The robustness of high-risk AI systems may be		
achieved through technical redundancy		
solutions, which may include backup or fail-safe		
plans.		
High-risk AI systems that continue to learn after		
being placed on the market or put into service		
shall be developed in such a way to ensure that		
possibly biased outputs due to outputs used as		

an input for future operations ('feedback loops')	
are duly addressed with appropriate mitigation	
measures.	
4. High-risk AI systems shall be resilient as	
regards attempts by unauthorised third parties to	
alter their use or performance by exploiting the	
system vulnerabilities.	
The technical solutions aimed at ensuring the	
cybersecurity of high-risk AI systems shall be	
appropriate to the relevant circumstances and	
the risks.	
The technical solutions to address AI specific	
vulnerabilities shall include, where appropriate,	
measures to prevent and control for attacks	

Commission proposal (doc. 8115/21 – COM(2021) 206 final)

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV)

trying to manipulate the training dataset ('data	
poisoning'), inputs designed to cause the model	
to make a mistake ('adversarial examples'), or	
model flaws.	
Chapter 3	
OBLIGATIONS OF PROVIDERS AND	
USERS OF HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS AND	
OTHER PARTIES	
Article 16	
Obligations of providers of high-risk AI systems	
Providers of high-risk AI systems shall:	

Commission proposal (doc. 8115/21 – COM(2021) 206 final)

Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV)

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

(a) ensure that their high-risk AI systems are		
compliant with the requirements set out in		
Chapter 2 of this Title;		
(b) have a quality management system in		
place which complies with Article 17;		
(c) draw-up the technical documentation of	(c) draw-up the technical documentation	
the high-risk AI system;	and the instructions of use of the high-risk AI	
	system;	
(d) when under their control, keep the logs		
automatically generated by their high-risk AI		
systems;		
(e) ensure that the high-risk AI system		
undergoes the relevant conformity assessment		

procedure, prior to its placing on the market or	
putting into service;	
(f) comply with the registration obligations	
referred to in Article 51;	
(g) take the necessary corrective actions, if	
the high-risk AI system is not in conformity	
with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of	
this Title;	
(h) inform the national competent	
authorities of the Member States in which they	
made the AI system available or put it into	
service and, where applicable, the notified body	
of the non-compliance and of any corrective	
actions taken;	

(i) to affix the CE marking to their high-risk AI systems to indicate the conformity with this Regulation in accordance with Article 49;		
(j) upon request of a national competent authority, demonstrate the conformity of the high-risk AI system with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title.	(j) upon request of a national competent authority where the system is used, demonstrate the conformity of the high-risk AI system with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title.	We see a need to clarify which national competent authority is meant exactly
Article 17 Quality management system		
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall put a quality management system in place that ensures compliance with this Regulation. That	1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall put a quality management system in place that ensures compliance with this Regulation	

system shall be documented in a systematic and	building on the existing standards. That system	We understood from the presentations made on
orderly manner in the form of written policies, procedures and instructions, and shall include at least the following aspects:	shall be documented in a systematic and orderly manner in the form of written policies, procedures and instructions, and shall include at least the following aspects:	the subject that there is no obligation for a new quality management system. Would it be possible to use simply a reference to existing approaches, such as ISO 9001:2015 on quality management and ISO 27001 or TISAX for ISMS? Our proposed text is highlighted in yellow in the 2 nd column
(a) a strategy for regulatory compliance,		
including compliance with conformity		
assessment procedures and procedures for the		
management of modifications to the high-risk		
AI system;		

(b) techniques, procedures and systematic	
actions to be used for the design, design control	
and design verification of the high-risk AI	
system;	
(c) techniques, procedures and systematic	
actions to be used for the development, quality	
control and quality assurance of the high-risk AI	
system;	
(d) examination, test and validation	
procedures to be carried out before, during and	
after the development of the high-risk AI	
system, and the frequency with which they have	
to be carried out;	

(e) technical specifications, including	
standards, to be applied and, where the relevant	
harmonised standards are not applied in full, the	
means to be used to ensure that the high-risk AI	
system complies with the requirements set out	
in Chapter 2 of this Title;	
(f) systems and procedures for data	
management, including data collection, data	
analysis, data labelling, data storage, data	
filtration, data mining, data aggregation, data	
retention and any other operation regarding the	
data that is performed before and for the	
purposes of the placing on the market or putting	
into service of high-risk AI systems;	

(g) the risk management system referred to	
in Article 9;	
(h) the setting-up, implementation and	
maintenance of a post-market monitoring	
system, in accordance with Article 61;	
(i) procedures related to the reporting of	
serious incidents and of malfunctioning in	
accordance with Article 62;	
(j) the handling of communication with	
national competent authorities, competent	
authorities, including sectoral ones, providing or	
supporting the access to data, notified bodies,	
other operators, customers or other interested	
parties;	

(k) systems and procedures for record	
keeping of all relevant documentation and	
information;	
(l) resource management, including security	
of supply related measures;	
(m) an accountability framework setting out	
the responsibilities of the management and other	
staff with regard to all aspects listed in this	
paragraph.	
2. The implementation of aspects referred	
to in paragraph 1 shall be proportionate to the	
size of the provider's organisation.	

3. For providers that are credit institutions		
regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU, the		
obligation to put a quality management system		
in place shall be deemed to be fulfilled by		
complying with the rules on internal governance		
arrangements, processes and mechanisms		
pursuant to Article 74 of that Directive. In that		
context, any harmonised standards referred to in		
Article 40 of this Regulation shall be taken into		
account.		
Article 18		
Obligation to draw up technical documentation		
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	
draw up the technical documentation referred to	draw up the technical documentation referred to	
in Article 11 in accordance with Annex IV.		

	in Article 11 and the instructions of use referred to in Article 15 in accordance with Annex IV.	
2. Providers that are credit institutions		
regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU shall		
maintain the technical documentation as part of		
the documentation concerning internal		
governance, arrangements, processes and		
mechanisms pursuant to Article 74 of that		
Directive.		
Article 19		
Conformity assessment		
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall		
ensure that their systems undergo the relevant		
conformity assessment procedure in accordance		

with Article 43, prior to their placing on the	
market or putting into service. Where the	
compliance of the AI systems with the	
requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title	
has been demonstrated following that	
conformity assessment, the providers shall draw	
up an EU declaration of conformity in	
accordance with Article 48 and affix the CE	
marking of conformity in accordance with	
Article 49.	
2. For high-risk AI systems referred to in	
point 5(b) of Annex III that are placed on the	
market or put into service by providers that are	
credit institutions regulated by Directive	
2013/36/EU, the conformity assessment shall be	

carried out as part of the procedure referred to in	
Articles 97 to 101 of that Directive.	
Article 20	
Automatically generated logs	
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	
keep the logs automatically generated by their	
high-risk AI systems, to the extent such logs are	
under their control by virtue of a contractual	
arrangement with the user or otherwise by law.	
The logs shall be kept for a period that is	
appropriate in the light of the intended purpose	
of high-risk AI system and applicable legal	
obligations under Union or national law.	

2. Providers that are credit institutions	
regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU shall	
maintain the logs automatically generated by	
their high-risk AI systems as part of the	
documentation under Articles 74 of that	
Directive.	
Article 21	
Corrective actions	
Providers of high-risk AI systems which	
consider or have reason to consider that a high-	
risk AI system which they have placed on the	
market or put into service is not in conformity	
with this Regulation shall immediately take the	
necessary corrective actions to bring that system	
into conformity, to withdraw it or to recall it, as	

appropriate. They shall inform the distributors		
of the high-risk AI system in question and,		
where applicable, the authorised representative		
and importers accordingly.		
Article 22		
Duty of information		
Where the high-risk AI system presents a risk		
within the meaning of Article 65(1) and that risk		
is known to the provider of the system, that		
provider shall immediately inform the national		
competent authorities of the Member States in		
which it made the system available and, where		
applicable, the notified body that issued a		
certificate for the high-risk AI system, in		
	1	

particular of the non-compliance and of any		
corrective actions taken.		
Article 23		
Cooperation with competent authorities		
Providers of high-risk AI systems shall, upon	Upon a reasoned request from a national	
request by a national competent authority,	competent authority where the sytem is used,	
provide that authority with all the information	providers shall also give that authority access to	
and documentation necessary to demonstrate the	the logs automatically generated by the high-	
conformity of the high-risk AI system with the	risk AI system, to the extent such logs are under	
requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title, in	their control by virtue of a contractual	
an official Union language determined by the	arrangement with the user or otherwise by law.	
Member State concerned. Upon a reasoned		
request from a national competent authority,		
providers shall also give that authority access to		
the logs automatically generated by the high-		

risk AI system, to the extent such logs are under	
their control by virtue of a contractual	
arrangement with the user or otherwise by law.	
Article 24	
Obligations of product manufacturers	
Where a high-risk AI system related to products	
to which the legal acts listed in Annex II,	
section A, apply, is placed on the market or put	
into service together with the product	
manufactured in accordance with those legal	
acts and under the name of the product	
manufacturer, the manufacturer of the product	
shall take the responsibility of the compliance of	
the AI system with this Regulation and, as far as	
the AI system is concerned, have the same	

obligations imposed by the present Regulation	
on the provider.	
Article 25	
Authorised representatives	
1. Prior to making their systems available	
on the Union market, where an importer cannot	
be identified, providers established outside the	
Union shall, by written mandate, appoint an	
authorised representative which is established in	
the Union.	
2. The authorised representative shall	
perform the tasks specified in the mandate	
received from the provider. The mandate shall	

empower the authorised representative to carry		
out the following tasks:		
(a) keep a copy of the EU declaration of		
conformity and the technical documentation at		
the disposal of the national competent		
authorities and national authorities referred to in		
Article 63(7);		
(b) provide a national competent authority,		
upon a reasoned request, with all the		
information and documentation necessary to		
demonstrate the conformity of a high-risk AI		
system with the requirements set out in Chapter		
2 of this Title, including access to the logs		
automatically generated by the high-risk AI		
system to the extent such logs are under the		
	1	

control of the provider by virtue of a contractual	
arrangement with the user or otherwise by law;	
(c) cooperate with competent national	
authorities, upon a reasoned request, on any	
action the latter takes in relation to the high-risk	
AI system.	
Article 26	
Obligations of importers	
1. Before placing a high-risk AI system on	
the market, importers of such system shall	
ensure that:	

	·	·
(a) the appropriate conformity assessment		
procedure has been carried out by the provider		
of that AI system		
(b) the provider has drawn up the technical		
documentation in accordance with Annex IV;		
(c) the system bears the required conformity		
marking and is accompanied by the required		
documentation and instructions of use.		
2. Where an importer considers or has		
reason to consider that a high-risk AI system is		
not in conformity with this Regulation, it shall		
not place that system on the market until that AI		
system has been brought into conformity.		
Where the high-risk AI system presents a risk		

within the meaning of Article 65(1), the	
importer shall inform the provider of the AI	
system and the market surveillance authorities	
to that effect.	
3. Importers shall indicate their name,	
registered trade name or registered trade mark,	
and the address at which they can be contacted	
on the high-risk AI system or, where that is not	
possible, on its packaging or its accompanying	
documentation, as applicable.	
4. Importers shall ensure that, while a high-	
risk AI system is under their responsibility,	
where applicable, storage or transport conditions	
do not jeopardise its compliance with the	
requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title.	

F. Immontant about masside metional	
5. Importers shall provide national	
competent authorities, upon a reasoned request,	
with all necessary information and	
documentation to demonstrate the conformity of	
a high-risk AI system with the requirements set	
out in Chapter 2 of this Title in a language	
which can be easily understood by that national	
competent authority, including access to the	
logs automatically generated by the high-risk AI	
system to the extent such logs are under the	
control of the provider by virtue of a contractual	
arrangement with the user or otherwise by law.	
They shall also cooperate with those authorities	
on any action national competent authority takes	
in relation to that system.	

Article 27	
Obligations of distributors	
1. Before making a high-risk AI system	
available on the market, distributors shall verify	
that the high-risk AI system bears the required	
CE conformity marking, that it is accompanied	
by the required documentation and instruction	
of use, and that the provider and the importer of	
the system, as applicable, have complied with	
the obligations set out in this Regulation.	
2. Where a distributor considers or has	
reason to consider that a high-risk AI system is	
not in conformity with the requirements set out	
in Chapter 2 of this Title, it shall not make the	
high-risk AI system available on the market	

until that system has been brought into	
conformity with those requirements.	
Furthermore, where the system presents a risk	
within the meaning of Article 65(1), the	
distributor shall inform the provider or the	
importer of the system, as applicable, to that	
effect.	
3. Distributors shall ensure that, while a	
high-risk AI system is under their responsibility,	
where applicable, storage or transport conditions	
do not jeopardise the compliance of the system	
with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of	
this Title.	
4. A distributor that considers or has reason	How could a distributor take the necessary
to consider that a high-risk AI system which it	corrective measures if as per the definition for

has made available on the market is not in	"distributor" in Art. 3 (7) it only makes
conformity with the requirements set out in	available an AI system on the Union market
Chapter 2 of this Title shall take the corrective	without affecting its properties?
actions necessary to bring that system into	
conformity with those requirements, to	
withdraw it or recall it or shall ensure that the	
provider, the importer or any relevant operator,	
as appropriate, takes those corrective actions.	
Where the high-risk AI system presents a risk	
within the meaning of Article 65(1), the	
distributor shall immediately inform the national	
competent authorities of the Member States in	
which it has made the product available to that	
effect, giving details, in particular, of the non-	
compliance and of any corrective actions taken.	

5. Upon a reasoned request from a national	
competent authority, distributors of high-risk AI	
systems shall provide that authority with all the	
information and documentation necessary to	
demonstrate the conformity of a high-risk	
system with the requirements set out in Chapter	
2 of this Title. Distributors shall also cooperate	
with that national competent authority on any	
action taken by that authority.	
Article 28	
Obligations of distributors, importers, users or	
any other third-party	
1. Any distributor, importer, user or other	
third-party shall be considered a provider for the	
purposes of this Regulation and shall be subject	

to the obligations of the provider under Article	In general, there should be a clearer allocation of
16, in any of the following circumstances:	responsibilities between relevant actors and not
	only in terms of Art. 16. Although we appreciate
	the intention to put the burden mainly on the
	provider in order not to hamper the development
	of the AI in the Union, we still have doubts
	whether this approach would not impede the
	enforcement afterwards if obligations remained
	unclarified.
	Instead of using the words "shall be considered
	as", we would prefer an explicit clarifying
	sentence regarding the entity/person taking the
	responsibility for new assessment of conformity
	from the moment substantial changes are made to
	the system.

	However, our main concern for transferring the responsibility to the weaker negotiating party in the contractual relations remains.
(a) they place on the market or put into service a high-risk AI system under their name or trademark;	
(b) they modify the intended purpose of a high-risk AI system already placed on the market or put into service;	According to the proposed definition for "distributor" in Art 3 (7) the distributor only makes available an AI system on the Union market without affecting its properties, how
	could a distributor then become a provider and modify the intended purpose of a high-risk system already placed on the market or put into service? In our view, Art. 28 should be redrafted

		to better clarify the allocation of the
		responsibilities
(c) they make a substantial modification to		Same comment as above as regards the
the high-risk AI system.		distributor
		Same comment makes sense for the importer.
		In accordance with the proposed definition in
		Art 3 (6) the importer places on the market or
		puts the system into service only for the first
		time, then is it possible for an importer to make
		a substantial modification to the system?
2. Where the circumstances referred to in	Where the circumstances referred to in	This is not relevant for the distributor as it
paragraph 1, point (b) or (c), occur, the provider	paragraph 1, point (b) or (c), occur, the provider,	neither places the AI system on the market nor it
that initially placed the high-risk AI system on	the importer or the user that initially placed the	puts it into service for the first time as the
the market or put it into service shall no longer	high-risk AI system on the market or put it into	distributor deals with its supply only (making

be considered a provider for the purposes of this	service shall no longer be considered a provider	available on the market), but the other two
Regulation.	for the purposes of this Regulation.	categories should be added
Article 29		
Obligations of users of high-risk AI systems		
1. Users of high-risk AI systems shall use		
such systems in accordance with the instructions		
of use accompanying the systems, pursuant to		
paragraphs 2 and 5.		
2. The obligations in paragraph 1 are		
without prejudice to other user obligations under		
Union or national law and to the user's		
discretion in organising its own resources and		
activities for the purpose of implementing the		

human oversight measures indicated by the	
provider.	
3. Without prejudice to paragraph 1, to the	
extent the user exercises control over the input	
data, that user shall ensure that input data is	
relevant in view of the intended purpose of the	
high-risk AI system.	
4. Users shall monitor the operation of the	
high-risk AI system on the basis of the	
instructions of use. When they have reasons to	
consider that the use in accordance with the	
instructions of use may result in the AI system	
presenting a risk within the meaning of Article	
65(1) they shall inform the provider or	
distributor and suspend the use of the system.	

They shall also inform the provider or	
distributor when they have identified any	
serious incident or any malfunctioning within	
the meaning of Article 62 and interrupt the use	
of the AI system. In case the user is not able to	
reach the provider, Article 62 shall apply	
mutatis mutandis.	
For users that are credit institutions regulated by	
Directive 2013/36/EU, the monitoring	
obligation set out in the first subparagraph shall	
be deemed to be fulfilled by complying with the	
rules on internal governance arrangements,	
processes and mechanisms pursuant to Article	
74 of that Directive.	

5. Users of high-risk AI systems shall keep	
the logs automatically generated by that high-	
risk AI system, to the extent such logs are under	
their control. The logs shall be kept for a period	
that is appropriate in the light of the intended	
purpose of the high-risk AI system and	
applicable legal obligations under Union or	
national law.	
Users that are credit institutions regulated by	
Directive 2013/36/EU shall maintain the logs as	
part of the documentation concerning internal	
governance arrangements, processes and	
mechanisms pursuant to Article 74 of that	
Directive.	

6. Users of high-risk AI systems shall use the information provided under Article 13 to comply with their obligation to carry out a data protection impact assessment under Article 35 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or Article 27 of Directive (EU) 2016/680, where applicable.		
ANNEX I ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNIQUES AND APPROACHES referred to in Article 3, point 1	ANNEX ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNIQUES AND APPROACHES referred to in Article 3, point 1	Our proposal is to delete Annex I and to move its essential elements to the article, examples for the possible techniques and methods could be described in the corresponding recital if not in the article itself. The definition should be as close as possible to the one proposed by the High-level Group of Experts on AI as we are defining the EU approach aiming at other continents to follow. The definition should be as

		concise as possible and avoid inclusion of all types of software in its scope
(a) Machine learning approaches, including supervised, unsupervised and reinforcement learning, using a wide variety of methods including deep learning;	(a) Machine learning approaches, including supervised, unsupervised and reinforcement learning, using a wide variety of methods including deep learning;	
(b) Logic- and knowledge-based approaches, including knowledge representation, inductive (logic) programming, knowledge bases, inference and deductive engines, (symbolic) reasoning and expert systems;	(b) Logic- and knowledge based approaches, including knowledge representation, inductive (logic) programming, knowledge bases, inference and deductive engines, (symbolic) reasoning and expert systems;	

(c) Statistical approaches, Bayesian estimation, search and optimization methods.	(c) Statistical approaches, Bayesian estimation, search and optimization methods.	
ANNEX II		
LIST OF UNION HARMONISATION LEGISLATION		
Section A – List of Union harmonisation legislation based on the New Legislative		
<u>Framework</u>		
1. Directive 2006/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2006 on machinery, and amending Directive 95/16/EC (OJ L 157, 9.6.2006, p. 24) [as repealed by the Machinery Regulation];		

2. Directive 2009/48/EC of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009	
on the safety of toys (OJ L 170, 30.6.2009, p.	
1);	
3. Directive 2013/53/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 20 November	
2013 on recreational craft and personal	
watercraft and repealing Directive 94/25/EC (OJ	
L 354, 28.12.2013, p. 90);	
4. Directive 2014/33/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 26 February	
2014 on the harmonisation of the laws of the	
Member States relating to lifts and safety	

components for lifts (OJ L 96, 29.3.2014, p.	
251);	
5. Directive 2014/34/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 26 February	
2014 on the harmonisation of the laws of the	
Member States relating to equipment and	
protective systems intended for use in	
potentially explosive atmospheres (OJ L 96,	
29.3.2014, p. 309);	
6. Directive 2014/53/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014	
on the harmonisation of the laws of the Member	
States relating to the making available on the	
market of radio equipment and repealing	

Directive 1999/5/EC (OJ L 153, 22.5.2014, p.	
62);	
7. Directive 2014/68/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014	
on the harmonisation of the laws of the Member	
States relating to the making available on the	
market of pressure equipment (OJ L 189,	
27.6.2014, p. 164);	
8. Regulation (EU) 2016/424 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 9	
March 2016 on cableway installations and	
repealing Directive 2000/9/EC (OJ L 81,	
31.3.2016, p. 1);	

9. Regulation (EU) 2016/425 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 9	
March 2016 on personal protective equipment	
and repealing Council Directive 89/686/EEC	
(OJ L 81, 31.3.2016, p. 51);	
10. Regulation (EU) 2016/426 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 9	
March 2016 on appliances burning gaseous	
fuels and repealing Directive 2009/142/EC (OJ	
L 81, 31.3.2016, p. 99);	
11. Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 5	
April 2017 on medical devices, amending	
Directive 2001/83/EC, Regulation (EC) No	

178/2002 and Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009	
and repealing Council Directives 90/385/EEC	
and 93/42/EEC (OJ L 117, 5.5.2017, p. 1;	
12. Regulation (EU) 2017/746 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 5	
April 2017 on in vitro diagnostic medical	
devices and repealing Directive 98/79/EC and	
Commission Decision 2010/227/EU (OJ L 117,	
5.5.2017, p. 176).	
Section B. List of other Union harmonisation	
<u>legislation</u>	
1. Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 11	

March 2008 on common rules in the field of	
civil aviation security and repealing Regulation	
(EC) No 2320/2002 (OJ L 97, 9.4.2008, p. 72).	
2. Regulation (EU) No 168/2013 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 15	
January 2013 on the approval and market	
surveillance of two- or three-wheel vehicles and	
quadricycles (OJ L 60, 2.3.2013, p. 52);	
3. Regulation (EU) No 167/2013 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 5	
February 2013 on the approval and market	
surveillance of agricultural and forestry vehicles	
(OJ L 60, 2.3.2013, p. 1);	

4. Directive 2014/90/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014	
on marine equipment and repealing Council	
Directive 96/98/EC (OJ L 257, 28.8.2014, p.	
146);	
5. Directive (EU) 2016/797 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 11	
May 2016 on the interoperability of the rail	
system within the European Union (OJ L 138,	
26.5.2016, p. 44).	
6. Regulation (EU) 2018/858 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 30	
May 2018 on the approval and market	
surveillance of motor vehicles and their trailers,	

and of systems, components and separate	
technical units intended for such vehicles,	
amending Regulations (EC) No 715/2007 and	
(EC) No 595/2009 and repealing Directive	
2007/46/EC (OJ L 151, 14.6.2018, p. 1); 3.	
Regulation (EU) 2019/2144 of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 27 November	
2019 on type-approval requirements for motor	
vehicles and their trailers, and systems,	
components and separate technical units	
intended for such vehicles, as regards their	
general safety and the protection of vehicle	
occupants and vulnerable road users, amending	
Regulation (EU) 2018/858 of the European	
Parliament and of the Council and repealing	
Regulations (EC) No 78/2009, (EC) No 79/2009	
and (EC) No 661/2009 of the European	

Parliament and of the Council and Commission	
Regulations (EC) No 631/2009, (EU) No	
406/2010, (EU) No 672/2010, (EU) No	
1003/2010, (EU) No 1005/2010, (EU) No	
1008/2010, (EU) No 1009/2010, (EU) No	
19/2011, (EU) No 109/2011, (EU) No	
458/2011, (EU) No 65/2012, (EU) No	
130/2012, (EU) No 347/2012, (EU) No	
351/2012, (EU) No 1230/2012 and (EU)	
2015/166 (OJ L 325, 16.12.2019, p. 1);	
7. Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 4	
July 2018 on common rules in the field of civil	
aviation and establishing a European Union	
Aviation Safety Agency, and amending	
Regulations (EC) No 2111/2005, (EC) No	

1008/2008, (EU) No 996/2010, (EU) No	
376/2014 and Directives 2014/30/EU and	
2014/53/EU of the European Parliament and of	
the Council, and repealing Regulations (EC) No	
552/2004 and (EC) No 216/2008 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council and	
Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 (OJ L	
212, 22.8.2018, p. 1), in so far as the design,	
production and placing on the market of	
aircrafts referred to in points (a) and (b) of	
Article 2(1) thereof, where it concerns	
unmanned aircraft and their engines, propellers,	
parts and equipment to control them remotely,	
are concerned.	

ANNEX III	
HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS REFERRED TO	
IN ARTICLE 6(2)	
High-risk AI systems pursuant to Article 6(2)	
are the AI systems listed in any of the following	
areas:	
1. Biometric identification and	
categorisation of natural persons:	
(a) AI systems intended to be used for the	
'real-time' and 'post' remote biometric	
identification of natural persons;	

2. Management and operation of critical		
infrastructure:		
(a) AI systems intended to be used as safety components in the management and operation of road traffic and the supply of water, gas, heating and electricity.		
3. Education and vocational training:		
(a) AI systems intended to be used for the purpose of determining access or assigning natural persons to educational and vocational training institutions;	(a) AI systems intended to be used for the purpose of determining access, ranking, admission or assigning natural persons to educational and vocational training institutions;	

(b) AI systems intended to be used for the	(b) AI systems intended to be used for the	We consider letter "b" as redundant. Moreover,
purpose of assessing students in educational and	purpose of assessing students in educational and	it is too broad as it might cover even low risk
vocational training institutions and for assessing	vocational training institutions and for assessing	systems used only for assessment or
participants in tests commonly required for	participants in tests commonly required for	optimization of educational processes. What we
admission to educational institutions.	admission to educational institutions.	understand from the presentations and
		explanations from COM on the subject is that
		this is not the intention, only systems that might
		result in discrimination of access, ranking or
		admission of persons to educational and
		vocational training institutions should be in the
		scope
4. Employment, workers management and		
access to self-employment:		

 (a) AI systems intended to be used for recruitment or selection of natural persons, notably for advertising vacancies, screening or filtering applications, evaluating candidates in the course of interviews or tests; (b) AI intended to be used for making 	(a) AI systems intended to be used for recruitment or selection of natural persons, notably for advertising vacancies, screening or filtering applications, evaluating candidates in the course of interviews or tests; (ab) AI intended to be used for	Point 4, letters "a" and "b" also seem too broad
decisions on promotion and termination of work-related contractual relationships, for task allocation and for monitoring and evaluating performance and behavior of persons in such relationships.	making decisions on recruitement, selection, promotion and termination of empoyment or work-related contractual relationships, for task allocation and for monitoring and evaluating performance and behavior of persons in such relationships.	as not all AI systems for making decisions for the needs of employment, workers management and access to self-employment are of high-risk. In order to avoid hampering innovations in this area and in particular, the use of such systems merely for evaluation or task allocation purposes, we propose to merge letters "a" and "b" by bringing more clarity on the scope. The last highlighted part of letter "b" is also

	redundant as the examples are already broadly covered by the wording "work-related contactual relationship". Therefore, we propose to delete it
5. Access to and enjoyment of essential private services and public services and benefits:	
(a) AI systems intended to be used by public authorities or on behalf of public authorities to evaluate the eligibility of natural persons for public assistance benefits and services, as well as to grant, reduce, revoke, or reclaim such benefits and services;	See our comment on Art 5 (1), (c) related to "by public authorities or on their behalf"

(b) AI systems intended to be used to	
evaluate the creditworthiness of natural persons	
or establish their credit score, with the exception	
of AI systems put into service by small scale	
providers for their own use;	
(c) AI systems intended to be used to	
dispatch, or to establish priority in the	
dispatching of emergency first response	
services, including by firefighters and medical	
aid.	
6. Law enforcement:	
(a) AI systems intended to be used by law	
enforcement authorities for making individual	

risk assessments of natural persons in order to	
assess the risk of a natural person for offending	
or reoffending or the risk for potential victims of	
criminal offences;	
(b) AI systems intended to be used by law	
enforcement authorities as polygraphs and	
similar tools or to detect the emotional state of a	
natural person;	
(c) AI systems intended to be used by law	
enforcement authorities to detect deep fakes as	
referred to in article 52(3);	
(d) AI systems intended to be used by law	
enforcement authorities for evaluation of the	

reliability of evidence in the course of	
investigation or prosecution of criminal	
offences;	
(e) AI systems intended to be used by law	
enforcement authorities for predicting the	
occurrence or reoccurrence of an actual or	
potential criminal offence based on profiling of	
natural persons as referred to in Article 3(4) of	
Directive (EU) 2016/680 or assessing	
personality traits and characteristics or past	
criminal behaviour of natural persons or groups;	
(f) AI systems intended to be used by law	
enforcement authorities for profiling of natural	
persons as referred to in Article 3(4) of	

Directive (EU) 2016/680 in the course of	
detection, investigation or prosecution of	
criminal offences;	
(g) AI systems intended to be used for crime	
analytics regarding natural persons, allowing	
law enforcement authorities to search complex	
related and unrelated large data sets available in	
different data sources or in different data	
formats in order to identify unknown patterns or	
discover hidden relationships in the data.	
7. Migration, asylum and border control	
management:	

(a) AI systems intended to be used by		
competent public authorities as polygraphs and		
similar tools or to detect the emotional state of a		
natural person;		
(b) AI systems intended to be used by		
competent public authorities to assess a risk,		
including a security risk, a risk of irregular		
immigration, or a health risk, posed by a natural		
person who intends to enter or has entered into		
the territory of a Member State;		
(c) AI systems intended to be used by		
competent public authorities for the verification		
of the authenticity of travel documents and		
supporting documentation of natural persons		
	1	

and detect non-authentic documents by	
checking their security features;	
(d) AI systems intended to assist competent	
public authorities for the examination of	
applications for asylum, visa and residence	
permits and associated complaints with regard	
to the eligibility of the natural persons applying	
for a status.	
8. Administration of justice and democratic	
processes:	
(a) AI systems intended to assist a judicial	
authority in researching and interpreting facts	

Commission proposal (doc. 8115/21 – COM(2021) 206 final)

Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29, Annexes I-IV)

Important: In order to guarantee that your comments appear accurately, please do not modify the table format by adding/removing/adjusting/merging/splitting cells and rows. This would hinder the consolidation of your comments. When adding new provisions, please use the free rows provided for this purpose between the provisions. You can add multiple provisions in one row, if necessary, but do not add or remove rows. For drafting suggestions (2nd column), please copy the relevant sentence or sentences from a given paragraph or point into the second column and add or remove text. Please do not use track changes, but highlight your additions in yellow or use strikethrough to indicate deletions. You do not need to copy entire paragraphs or points to indicate your changes, copying and modifying the relevant sentences is sufficient. For comments on specific provisions, please insert your remarks in the 3rd column in the relevant row. If you wish to make general comments on the entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the proposal (in the 3rd column).

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

and the law and in applying the law to a	
concrete set of facts.	
ANNEX IV	
TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION referred	
to in Article 11(1)	
The technical documentation referred to in	
Article 11(1) shall contain at least the following	
information, as applicable to the relevant AI	
system:	
1. A general description of the AI system	
including:	

(a) its intended purpose, the person/s	
(a) its intended purpose, the person/s	
developing the system the date and the version	
of the system;	
(b) how the AI system interacts or can be	
used to interact with hardware or software that	
is not part of the AI system itself, where	
applicable;	
(c) the versions of relevant software or	
firmware and any requirement related to version	
update;	
(d) the description of all forms in which the	
AI system is placed on the market or put into	
service;	

(e) the description of hardware on which the	
AI system is intended to run;	
(f) where the AI system is a component of	
products, photographs or illustrations showing	
external features, marking and internal layout of	
those products;	
(g) instructions of use for the user and,	
where applicable installation instructions;	
2. A detailed description of the elements of	
the AI system and of the process for its	
development, including:	

(a) the methods and steps performed for the	
development of the AI system, including, where	
relevant, recourse to pre-trained systems or tools	
provided by third parties and how these have	
been used, integrated or modified by the	
provider;	
(b) the design specifications of the system,	
namely the general logic of the AI system and	
of the algorithms; the key design choices	
including the rationale and assumptions made,	
also with regard to persons or groups of persons	
on which the system is intended to be used; the	
main classification choices; what the system is	
designed to optimise for and the relevance of the	

	T
different parameters; the decisions about any	
possible trade-off made regarding the technical	
solutions adopted to comply with the	
requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2;	
(c) the description of the system architecture	
explaining how software components build on	
or feed into each other and integrate into the	
overall processing; the computational resources	
used to develop, train, test and validate the AI	
system;	
(d) where relevant, the data requirements in	
terms of datasheets describing the training	
methodologies and techniques and the training	
data sets used, including information about the	

provenance of those data sets, their scope and	
main characteristics; how the data was obtained	
and selected; labelling procedures (e.g. for	
supervised learning), data cleaning	
methodologies (e.g. outliers detection);	
(e) assessment of the human oversight	
measures needed in accordance with Article 14,	
including an assessment of the technical	
measures needed to facilitate the interpretation	
of the outputs of AI systems by the users, in	
accordance with Articles 13(3)(d);	
(f) where applicable, a detailed description	
of pre-determined changes to the AI system and	
its performance, together with all the relevant	

information related to the technical solutions	
adopted to ensure continuous compliance of the	
AI system with the relevant requirements set out	
in Title III, Chapter 2;	
(g) the validation and testing procedures	
used, including information about the validation	
and testing data used and their main	
characteristics; metrics used to measure	
accuracy, robustness, cybersecurity and	
compliance with other relevant requirements set	
out in Title III, Chapter 2 as well as potentially	
discriminatory impacts; test logs and all test	
reports dated and signed by the responsible	
persons, including with regard to pre-	
determined changes as referred to under point	
(f).	

	
3. Detailed information about the	
monitoring, functioning and control of the AI	
system, in particular with regard to: its	
capabilities and limitations in performance,	
including the degrees of accuracy for specific	
persons or groups of persons on which the	
system is intended to be used and the overall	
expected level of accuracy in relation to its	
intended purpose; the foreseeable unintended	
outcomes and sources of risks to health and	
safety, fundamental rights and discrimination in	
view of the intended purpose of the AI system;	
the human oversight measures needed in	
accordance with Article 14, including the	
technical measures put in place to facilitate the	
interpretation of the outputs of AI systems by	
	1

the users; specifications on input data, as	
appropriate;	
4. A detailed description of the risk	
management system in accordance with Article	
9;	
5. A description of any change made to the	
system through its lifecycle;	
6. A list of the harmonised standards	
applied in full or in part the references of which	
have been published in the Official Journal of	
the European Union; where no such harmonised	
standards have been applied, a detailed	
description of the solutions adopted to meet the	

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2,		
including a list of other relevant standards and		
technical specifications applied;		
7. A copy of the EU declaration of		
conformity;		
8. A detailed description of the system in		
place to evaluate the AI system performance in		
the post-market phase in accordance with		
Article 61, including the post-market monitoring		
plan referred to in Article 61(3).		
	End	End