

Brussels, 03 November 2021

WK 13173/2021 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 - SK comments Articles 1-29

Delegations will find in annex SK comments on Artificial Intelligence Act (Articles 1-29).

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		SK: Slovakia hereby enters a general scrutiny reservation. Also, the combination of short deadline and high number of articles and annexes under review did not enable Slovakia to prepare and include relevant drafting suggestions (i.e. only comments are submitted).  In order to prevent possible successful court challenges to the validity of the regulation (as was previously the case in the field of data flows and data retention), Slovakia proposes to request CLS to provide an opinion – in light of case-law of CJEU - on  - sufficiency of legal bases for the proposal, as it appears to regulate also areas falling under exclusive or shared competence of MSs, e.g.

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).

exercise of public powers by national authorites in fields such as justice, education or social benefits; public security (in fields such as law enforcement) and national security (e.g. dual-use of AI systems for military purposes; supply of AI systems to national security bodies by private actors),

- limitations of article 290 TFEU for delegated powers of the Commission, especially those proposed under article 4 and 7,
- possible implications of article 16 TFEU for institutional independe of national and EU authorities, including areas beyond law enforcement.

Slovakia also proposes to invite the EU Fundamental Rights Agency to have a deeper

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).

look into the current challenges and limitations of law enforcement in cyberspace and of software assessment and monitoring, and also to identify possible toolbox for addressing these challenges. Lessons learned from application of GDPR and EU Medical Device Regulation should be taken into account in the study.

Last but not least, the proposal should take equal care of *all* its declared goals, i.e. overriding reasons of public interest as enumerated in recital no. 1: the protection of (1) health, (2) safety and (3) fundamental rights. The regulatory tools for both *ex ante* and *ex post* protection fundamental rights and health need to be as explicit, sophisticated and effective as those related to safety. The current proposal is primarily focused on safety aspects, given that it is built on product

and relies to a significant extent on technical standards created by private entities. The protection of health and fundamental rights should not be reduced to technical standards in situations where this is not feasible or adequate. This is all the more important because the proposal is a full harmonisation measure which implies that all AI deployment and uses not	entire proposat, pieuse do so in the row containing the title of the p	
standards created by private entities. The protection of health and fundamental rights should not be reduced to technical standards in situations where this is not feasible or adequate. This is all the more important because the proposal is a full harmonisation measure which implies that all AI deployment and uses not forbidden or restricted by the proposed regulation will be automatically deemed legitimate, lawful and proportionate.		safety legislation and conformity assessments,
protection of health and fundamental rights should not be reduced to technical standards in situations where this is not feasible or adequate. This is all the more important because the proposal is a full harmonisation measure which implies that all AI deployment and uses not forbidden or restricted by the proposed regulation will be automatically deemed legitimate, lawful and proportionate.		and relies to a significant extent on technical
should not be reduced to technical standards in situations where this is not feasible or adequate.  This is all the more important because the proposal is a full harmonisation measure which implies that all AI deployment and uses not forbidden or restricted by the proposed regulation will be automatically deemed legitimate, lawful and proportionate.  TITLE I		standards created by private entities. The
situations where this is not feasible or adequate.  This is all the more important because the proposal is a full harmonisation measure which implies that all AI deployment and uses not forbidden or restricted by the proposed regulation will be automatically deemed legitimate, lawful and proportionate.  TITLE I		protection of health and fundamental rights
This is all the more important because the proposal is a full harmonisation measure which implies that all AI deployment and uses not forbidden or restricted by the proposed regulation will be automatically deemed legitimate, lawful and proportionate.  TITLE I		should not be reduced to technical standards in
proposal is a full harmonisation measure which implies that all AI deployment and uses not forbidden or restricted by the proposed regulation will be automatically deemed legitimate, lawful and proportionate.  TITLE I		situations where this is not feasible or adequate.
implies that all AI deployment and uses not forbidden or restricted by the proposed regulation will be automatically deemed legitimate, lawful and proportionate.  TITLE I		This is all the more important because the
forbidden or restricted by the proposed regulation will be automatically deemed legitimate, lawful and proportionate.  TITLE I		proposal is a full harmonisation measure which
regulation will be automatically deemed legitimate, lawful and proportionate.  TITLE I		implies that all AI deployment and uses not
legitimate, lawful and proportionate.  TITLE I		forbidden or restricted by the proposed
TITLE I		regulation will be automatically deemed
		legitimate, lawful and proportionate.
GENERAL PROVISIONS	TITLE I	
GENERAL PROVISIONS		
	GENERAL PROVISIONS	

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

Article 1	
Subject matter	
This Regulation lays down:	
(a) harmonised rules for the placing on the	
market, the putting into service and the use of	
artificial intelligence systems ('AI systems') in	
the Union;	
(a) prohibitions of certain artificial	
intelligence practices;	
(b) specific requirements for high-risk AI	
systems and obligations for operators of such	
systems;	

(c) harmonised transparency rules for AI		
systems intended to interact with natural		
persons, emotion recognition systems and		
biometric categorisation systems, and AI		
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:		<b>SK:</b> As the proposal leaves extremely limited
		room for MSs to regulate other aspects of AI
		(because of full harmonisation approach), it is
		suitable to either expand the scope of the
	ı	

regulation to non-professional provision and us
of AI systems or to explicitly state that the
regulation does not pre-empt MSs' competence
to regulate such provision and (especially) use
of AI systems beyond the scope of the
regulation. The non-professional provision and
especially use of AI systems, including by
unknown actors, can be at least as highly risky
as in professional cases. It is also hard to prove
whether the use is professional or not.
To the extent that the proposal does not intend
to regulate R&D, this should be stated clearly i
this article. However, as regards R&D, the
iterative (constantly developing) nature of man
AI systems needs to be taken into account.

/	1	
(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		
are located in a third country, where the output		
produced by the system is used in the Union;		
2. For high-risk AI systems that are safety		
components of products or systems, or which		
are themselves products or systems, falling		

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

withi	n the scope of the following acts, only	
Artic	le 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 systems developed or used exclusively for military purposes.	SK: The issue of division of competences between the EU and its MSs as well as sufficiency of legal bases needs to be examined. See above general comments to the entire proposal.
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	SK: This exemption opens up possibilities for deviation from the general rules contained in the proposal, such as article 2 (1) (c). Impacts on protection of fundamental rights of EU citizens (including on article 16 TFEU) need to be analysed in depth. Such analysis was not
law enforcement and judicial cooperation with the Union or with one or more Member States.	contained in the impact assessment.

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).

5. This Regulation shall not affect the	SK: This provision should also state that the
application of the provisions on the liability of	regulation does not affect relevant selected
intermediary service providers set out in	provisions of Regulation (EU) 600/2014
Chapter II, Section IV of Directive 2000/31/EC	(MiFIR) and Directive 2014/65/EU (MiFID). At
of the European Parliament and of the Council <sup>1</sup>	the same time, closer inter-linkage between
[as to be replaced by the corresponding	these acts and the proposal should be considered
provisions of the Digital Services Act].	as it may be beneficial in areas such as
	definition of AI systems or other legal
	definitions, etc. Legal certainty may encourage
	further innovation and investments in financial
	markets.
Article 3	SK: For the sake of legal certainty, Slovakia
Definitions	believes that this article should also define
	- "AI systems that continue to learn",

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).

	- "subliminal techniques"  - "significant changes" (in design or intended purpose)  - "public security" (to the extent this is intended to be regulated under the proposal)
	- "public assistance".
For the purpose of this Regulation, the following definitions apply:	
(1) 'artificial intelligence system' (AI system) means software that is developed with one or more of the techniques and approaches listed in Annex I and can, for a given set of	SK: This definition appears too wide even if the cumulative nature (combined reading) of the provision and Annex I is taken into account. It covers also automating software other than AI
human-defined objectives, generate outputs	systems, such as software – which uses one or

such as content, predictions, recommendations,	more techniques in Annex I – that can also
or decisions influencing the environments they	generate outputs influencing the environments
interact with;	they interact with, for a given set of human-
	defined objectives.
	At the same time, the definition should also
	cover software which is not only developed
	with, but also comprising (at the time of their
	placing on the market, putting into service or
	use) of one or more of the techniques and
	approaches listed in Annex I. In such a way we
	make sure that such techniques were not used
	solely as supplementary techniques in the
	development phase and that the AI systems are
	capable of functioning in environments other
	than those pre-defined or derived in the
	development phase.

	Focus on "software function" rather than
	"software" as such can be considered in the
	definition of AI system.
	Slovakia would welcome an existing practical
	example of true AI system using solely
	techniques mentioned in Annex I c) as it is
	uncertain that such true AI systems exist, as
	suggested by the proposed definition.
(1) 'provider' means a natural or legal	
person, public authority, agency or other body	
that develops an AI system or that has an AI	
system developed with a view to placing it on	
the market or putting it into service under its	
own name or trademark, whether for payment or	
free of charge;	

(3) 'small-scale provider' means a provider	
that is a micro or small enterprise within the	
meaning of Commission Recommendation	
2003/361/EC <sup>2</sup> ;	
(4) 'user' means any natural or legal person,	<b>SK</b> : See above comments to article 2.
public authority, agency or other body using an	Notwithstanding the issue of non-professional
AI system under its authority, except where the	users, Slovakia also believes that a new and
AI system is used in the course of a personal	distinct category (definition) needs to be created
non-professional activity;	for a wider category of all persons directly or
	indirectly affected by deployment and use of AI
	systems as the proposed definition of user does
	not cover these. The notion of "consumer" or
	"end-user", as currently used in EU law, may be

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Commission Recommendation of 6 May 2003 concerning the definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (OJ L 124, 20.5.2003, p. 36).

	too narrow for protection of these affected
	persons. See also comments to article 9 below.
(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	
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	<b>SK:</b> It needs to be considered whether the
making available of an AI system on the Union	notion properly reflects practical varieties of
market;	production and dissemination of software.

(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;	SK: It needs to be considered whether the notion properly reflects practical varieties of production and dissemination of software.
(11) 'putting into service' means the supply of an AI system for first use directly to the user or for own use on the Union market for its intended purpose;	SK: It needs to be considered whether the notion properly reflects practical varieties of production and dissemination of software.
(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,	SK: The notion of "intended purpose" does not necessarily suit all the complex, dynamic and evolving value chains in AI. In other words, it is not clear whether the provider of AI system is always able to specify the intended purpose with the required clarity, as there may be instances

promotional or sales materials and statements,	where this can be done only "downstream", i.e.
as well as in the technical documentation;	by the user. Even if we use the concept of
	intended use for the purpose of setting clearly
	the obligations and liabilities, such construction
	may not reflect the complexities of value chains.
	Innovative approaches to (collective and
	individual) liabilities and responsibilities seem
	to be necessary, going beyond one single person
	being liable. Last but not least, the possibilities
	under article 29 (2) for MSs to impose
	additional obligations on users do not represent
	an adequate solution to this problem, as this
	increases the risk of internal market
	fragmentation and divergent approaches in MSs
	in this important matter.
	Finally, if open-source tech companies/libraries
	and "general purpose" software were intended

	to be excluded from the scope of the regulation
	(and from the notion of provider) due to the fact
	that the intended purpose cannot be defined in
	such situations, this should be clearly stated in
	the text of the regulation.
(13) 'reasonably foreseeable misuse' means	<b>SK:</b> See comments above regarding the notion
the use of an AI system in a way that is not in	of "intended purpose".
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	
system' means a component of a product or of a	
system which fulfils a safety function for that	
product or system or the failure or	

malfunctioning of which endangers the health	
and safety of persons or property;	
(15) 'instructions for use' means the	
information provided by the provider to inform	
the user of in particular an AI system's intended	
purpose and proper use, 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;	

(45)	
(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	
the ability of an AI system to achieve its	
intended purpose;	
(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	
the ability of an AI system to achieve its intended purpose;  (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	

set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of this Regulation	
relating to an AI system have been fulfilled;	
(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	
activities carried out by providers of AI systems	
to proactively collect and review experience	

gained from the use of AI systems they place on	
the market or put into service for the purpose of	
identifying any need to immediately apply any	
necessary corrective or preventive actions;	
(26) 'market surveillance authority' means	<b>SK:</b> The definition should be adapted/expanded
the national authority carrying out the activities	in such a way so that the MSs can choose other
and taking the measures pursuant to Regulation	national authorities than those listed in
(EU) 2019/1020;	Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 for supervision of
	stand-alone systems mentioned in Annex III.
	The market surveillance authorities under
	regulation (EU) 2019/1020 are not necessarily
	suitable for that purpose, as confirmed also by
	art. 63 (3) and (5).

(2-) (1 1 1 1 1)	
(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	
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'	
means an AI system for the purpose of	
identifying natural persons at a distance through	
the comparison of a person's biometric data	
with the biometric data contained in a reference	
database, and without prior knowledge of the	
user of the AI system whether the person will be	
present and can be identified;	
(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	<b>SK:</b> Given the importance of virtual digital
physical place accessible to the public,	platforms for peoples' (public) collective
regardless of whether certain conditions for	interactions, it is suitable to expand the
access may apply;	definition of "publicly accessible space" also to
	"virtual" places, or create a separate definition
	of "virtual space" for that purpose.

(40) 'law enforcement authority' means:	<b>SK:</b> The "execution of criminal penalties"
	should not be covered in the definition of law
	enforcement authorities and a separate, possibly
	more nuanced regime for a provision and use of
	AI systems should be provided in the regulation
	for penitentiary facilities.
(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	<b>SK:</b> See comments to subsection 40 above.
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	
the authority to which a Member State assigns	
the responsibility for the implementation and	

application of this Regulation, for coordinating	
the activities entrusted to that Member State, for	
acting as the single contact point for the	
Commission, and for representing the Member	
State at the European Artificial Intelligence	
Board;	
(43) 'national competent authority' means the	
national supervisory authority, the notifying	
authority and the market surveillance authority;	
(44) 'serious incident' means any incident	
that directly or indirectly leads, might have led	
or might lead to any of the following:	

<b>SK:</b> See above general comments to the entire
proposal.

basis of characteristics that are similar to the	
techniques and approaches listed therein.	
TITLE II	
PROHIBITED ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	
PRACTICES	
Article 5	<b>SK:</b> The proposal should explicitly secure
	issuance of more detailed guidance for
	interpretation of the prohibitions which may
	also take into account evolving experiences and
	practices.
1. The following artificial intelligence	
practices shall be prohibited:	

(a) the placing on the market, putting into	<b>SK:</b> The qualifying cumulative condition of
service or use of an AI system that deploys	"causing or likely causing physical or
subliminal techniques beyond a person's	psychological harm" should be deleted as this
consciousness in order to materially distort a	does not appear necessary and at the same time
person's behaviour in a manner that causes or is	is hard to prove.
likely to cause that person or another person	
physical or psychological harm;	
(b) the placing on the market, putting into	<b>SK:</b> The qualifying cumulative condition of
service or use of an AI system that exploits any	"causing or likely causing physical or
of the vulnerabilities of a specific group of	psychological harm" should be deleted as this
persons due to their age, physical or mental	does not appear necessary and at the same time
disability, in order to materially distort the	is hard to prove.
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	SK: Slovakia does not see a legitimate and
service or use of AI systems by public	justified purpose why the proposed prohibition
authorities or on their behalf for the evaluation	should not apply also to private operators.
or classification of the trustworthiness of natural	Moreover and in any case, the proposal does not
persons over a certain period of time based on	seem to be consistent as it enables public
their social behaviour or known or predicted	authorities to obtain outputs of AI systems –
personal or personality characteristics, with the	which they themselves would not be able to
social score leading to either or both of the	achieve – from private operators. Adequate
following:	safeguards should be included in this respect.
(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	SK: Biometric categorisation systems and
identification systems in publicly accessible	emotion recognition systems should be included
spaces for the purpose of law enforcement,	in the provision because state-of the-art of these
unless and in as far as such use is strictly	technologies does not appear to guarantee
necessary for one of the following objectives:	adequate reliability for now and, at the same
	time, are very sensitive and intrusive.
	Additionally, given the nature of technology and
	doubts about current tools of effective
	enforcement of legal rules in cyberspace, it is
	important to consider possible moratorium, a
	temporary complete ban on the use of "real
	time" biometric identification systems in

entire proposai, piease ao so in the row containing the title of the pi	oposat (in the 3rd column).
	publicly accessible spaces for the purpose of
	law enforcement.
	Slovakia does not see a legitimate and justified
	reason why the prohibition/restricted use should
	not apply also to private operators.
	Moreover and in any case, the proposal does not
	seem to be consistent as it enables public
	authorities to obtain outputs of AI systems –
	which they themselves would not be able to
	achieve – from private operators. Adequate
	safeguards should be included in this respect.
(i) the targeted search for specific potential	
victims of crime, including missing children;	

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).

(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 <sup>3</sup>	
and punishable in the Member State concerned	
by a custodial sentence or a detention order for a	
maximum period of at least three years, as	
determined by the law of that Member State.	

\_

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).

2. 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 take into account the following	
elements:	
(a) the nature of the situation giving rise to	
the possible use, in particular the seriousness,	
probability and scale of the harm caused in the	
absence of the use of the system;	
(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,	SK: "Duly justified situation" should be defined
each individual use for the purpose of law	for the sake of legal certainty and prevention of
enforcement of a 'real-time' remote biometric	internal market fragmentation by giving
identification system in publicly accessible	concrete examples of such situations.
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.	
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	

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

Article 6	
Classification rules for high-risk AI systems	
Irrespective of whether an AI system is	SK: It is unclear what is meant by the
placed on the market or put into service	formulation "Irrespective of whether an AI
independently from the products referred to in	system is placed on the market or put into
points (a) and (b), that AI system shall be	service independently from the products
considered high-risk where both of the	referred to in points (a) and (b)". The provision
following conditions are fulfilled:	should be reformulated as it seems that the
	original intention was not to create a new
	unknown category of AI systems but rather a
	closed list of hisk-risk systems listed Annex II
	and III. Note no. 229 on page 50 of the Impact
	Assessment (SWD(2021) 84 final, Part 1/2)
	seems to imply that the current wording was
	meant to cover safety components placed on the
	market independently from the products under

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).

a) and b), but the wording in article 6 is different as it refers to AI systems in general. In addition, article 6 applies a somewhat mechanistic and possibly even oversimplifying classification of (high) risks. Firstly, as Annex II can be updated only via standard legislative procedure, the list of products referred to in article 6 (1) may not catch on time the spread of IoT run on AI systems. For instance, wearables, implantables, embeddables, ingestibles or voice and other personal assistants may already today present a high risk to fundamental rights and health, yet are not covered by the current product harmonisation legislation under NLF and Old Approach. Secondly, it is not clear why the risks are being reduced to safety components of products under article 6 (1), as the risks and

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).

dangers to fundamental rights may go beyond those risks of products identified in article 3 (14), such as risks to privacy and dignity. Thirdly, the Impact Assessment lacks a detailed analysis proving an absence of possible duplications and overlaps with existing sectorial legislation (such as medical devices). Fourthly, for the whole article 6, we need to ensure that *all* high-risk systems – both the stand-alone systems under article 6 (2) and the products under article 6 (1) - are matched with an equal level of requirements, obligations and comparable costs for operators, including obligations related to the type of assessment (internal vs. third party; this has naturally also impacts on equal protection of fundamental rights of affected persons). Fifthly, the

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).

classification of risks is focused only on risks related to individual products and stand-alone systems, while systemic risks not addressed by other EU legislation are not considered at all (e.g. mutual interactions between AI systems; AI systems deployed on digital platforms but not specifically addressed by the Digital Services Act – see below comments to Annex III; AI systems deployed on financial markets and not addressed by sectorial legislation; impacts on public services and real economy on macro-scale).

It follows that new types of flexible lists of products and risks need to be created, possibly via delegating powers to an independent EU authority, while respecting the *Meroni* and *Romano* line of case-law of CJEU.

;	
(a) the AI system is intended to be used as a	
safety component of a product, or is itself a	
product, covered by the Union harmonisation	
legislation listed in Annex II;	
(b) the product whose safety component is	
the AI system, or the AI system itself as a	
product, is required to undergo a third-party	
conformity assessment with a view to the	
placing on the market or putting into service of	
that product pursuant to the Union	
harmonisation legislation listed in Annex II.	
2. In addition to the high-risk AI systems	
referred to in paragraph 1, AI systems referred	

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

	T	
to in Annex III shall also be considered high-		
risk.		
Article 7		
Amendments to Annex III		
1. The Commission is empowered to adopt		
delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to		
update the list in Annex III by adding high-risk		
AI systems where both of the following		
conditions are fulfilled:		
(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	<b>SK:</b> It should be clearly stated that the criteria
paragraph 1 whether an AI system poses a risk	are not cumulative (as Slovakia understands was
of harm to the health and safety or a risk of	the original intention).
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;	
(b) the extent to which an AI system has	
been used or is likely to be used;	
(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	
adverse impact, in particular in terms of its	

intensity and its ability to affect a plurality of	
persons;	
(e) the extent to which potentially harmed or	
adversely impacted persons are dependent on	
the outcome produced with an AI system, in	
particular because for practical or legal reasons	
it is not reasonably possible to opt-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;	
(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	
High-risk AI systems shall comply with	
the requirements established in this Chapter.	
2. The intended purpose of the high-risk AI	SK: An explicit reference to technological
system and the risk management system referred	"state-of-the-art" should be included among the
to in Article 9 shall be taken into account when	elements to be taken into account for all
ensuring compliance with those requirements.	requirements under Chapter II Title III. Recital
	49 is not sufficient and too narrow. For
	comments on the notion of "intended purpose"
	see above.

Article 9	<b>SK:</b> The risk management system should
Risk management system	incorporate systemic risks (see comments above
	related to article 6) and also risks for all affected
	persons beyond those specified in article 9 (8) or
	article 5 (1) (b) (see comments above related to
	definition of "user" – article 3 4)).
1. 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	
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;	

	T	
(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		
	1	

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 mo	st appropriate		
risk management measures. Testin	g 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 th	e AI system		
and do not need to go beyond wha	t 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 developmen	nt process,		
and, in any event, prior to the place	ng on the		
1		l	

market or the putting into service. Testing shall	
be made against preliminarily defined metrics	
and probabilistic thresholds that are appropriate	
to the intended purpose of the high-risk AI	
system.	
8. When implementing the risk	
management system described in paragraphs 1	
to 7, specific consideration shall be given to	
whether the high-risk AI system is likely to be	
accessed by or have an impact on children.	
9. For credit institutions regulated by	
Directive 2013/36/EU, the aspects described in	
paragraphs 1 to 8 shall be part of the risk	
management procedures established by those	

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	
shall be subject to appropriate data governance	
and management practices. Those practices shall	
concern in particular,	

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

(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 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	
shortcomings can be addressed.	
3. Training, validation and testing data sets	<b>SK</b> : The requirements are unrealistic and need
shall be relevant, representative, free of errors	to be adjusted.
and complete. They shall have the appropriate	
statistical properties, including, where	
applicable, as regards the persons or groups of	
persons on which the high-risk AI system is	
intended to be used. These characteristics of the	
data sets may be met at the level of individual	
data sets or a combination thereof.	
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	
within which the high-risk AI system is	
intended to be used.	
5. To the extent that it is strictly necessary	
for the purposes of ensuring bias monitoring,	
detection and correction in relation to the high-	
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	
management practices shall apply for the	
development of high-risk AI systems other than	
those which make use of techniques involving	
the training of models in order to ensure that	
those high-risk AI systems comply with	
paragraph 2.	
Article 11	
Technical documentation	

1. 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	
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.	
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	

1. High-risk AI systems shall be designed	
and developed with capabilities enabling the	
automatic recording of events ('logs') while the	
high-risk AI systems is operating. Those	
logging capabilities shall conform to recognised	
standards or common specifications.	
2. The logging capabilities shall ensure a	
level of traceability of the AI system's	
functioning throughout its lifecycle that is	
appropriate to the intended purpose of the	
system.	
3. In particular, logging capabilities shall	SK: Persons with lawful access to logs need to
enable the monitoring of the operation of the	be specified.
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).	
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	
achieving comphance 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	
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		
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	<b>SK:</b> Qualification of persons responsible for
shall enable the individuals to whom human	human oversight should be specified.

oversight is assigned to do the following, as	
ç ç	
appropriate to the circumstances:	
(a) fully understand the capacities and	
limitations of the high-risk AI system and be	
able to duly monitor its operation, so that signs	
of anomalies, dysfunctions and unexpected	
performance can be detected and addressed as	
soon as possible;	
(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	SK: A closer inter-linkage between EU cybersecurity certification may be considered, beyond what is already proposed (art. 42 (2), 47, 54, 61, 62, 65-67). Cybersecurity dimension of AI systems is crucial and may require a special analysis or opinion by ENISA or other similar authority.
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	
regards errors, faults or inconsistencies that may	
occur within the system or the environment in	
which the system 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.		
	l	l

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	
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	

SK: Obligations need to be distributed among operators in such a way so that they realistically reflect the complex value chains in AI and do not stifle innovation. For more details see above comments to article 3 (4).  Moreover, Slovakia notes that the proposal does not contain any enforceable material and procedural rights of affected persons which would possibly correspond to the obligations of operators. Specific rights and effective tools of protection need to be considered, also in light of the awaited "digital principles and rights" to be declared in common EU inter-instituional

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).

declaration. A timely and effective protection of fundamental rights in AI-driven cyberspace may be difficult for many reasons, a limited effectiveness of horizontal effect of fundamental rights towards private parties and slowness of off-line proceedings being two of those. It appears impractical, ineffective and costly to burden operators with an additional obligation of ex ante fundamental rights/health impact assessment. A special environment for policy prototyping (such as special testbeds, representative testing groups, TEFs etc.) could be created to inform necessary amendments resulting from a continous assessment of sensitive use cases encroaching upon fundamental rights and health. Such activity, including necessary amendments of lists of use

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

	111 11 (1) 1 1 (7)
	cases could be delegated to an independent EU
	authority, while respecting the Meroni line of
	case-law of CJEU.
Providers of high-risk AI systems shall:	
(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	
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;	

	·	<del>-</del>
(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.		

Article 17	
Quality management system	
Quanty management system	
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	
put a quality management system in place that	
ensures compliance with this Regulation. That	
system 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:	
(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;	

(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	
draw up the technical documentation referred to	
in Article 11 in accordance with Annex IV.	

	1	
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		<b>SK:</b> See remarks on the entire proposal above.
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	<b>SK:</b> Logs retention period should be specified.
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	
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
request by a national competent authority,
provide that authority with all the information
and documentation necessary to demonstrate the
conformity of the high-risk AI system with the
requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title, in
an official Union language determined by the
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	
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.	
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		
to consider that a high-risk AI system which it		
has made available on the market is not in		
conformity with the requirements set out in		
Chapter 2 of this Title shall take the corrective		
1	1	1

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	
16, in any of the following circumstances:	

(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;	
(c) they make a substantial modification to	
the high-risk AI system.	
2. Where the circumstances referred to in	
paragraph 1, point (b) or (c), occur, the provider	
that initially placed the high-risk AI system on	
the market or put it into service shall no longer	
be considered a provider for the purposes of this	
Regulation.	

Article 29	
Obligations of users of high-risk AI systems	
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		
	i '	1

of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or Article 27 of	
Directive (EU) 2016/680, where applicable.	
ANNEX I	<b>SK:</b> See comments on article 3 (1) – definition
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	of AI system above.
TECHNIQUES AND APPROACHES	
referred to in Article 3, point 1	
(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;	
(c) Statistical approaches, Bayesian	
estimation, search and optimization methods.	
ANNEX II	<b>SK:</b> See comments to article 6 above.
ANNEX II LIST OF UNION HARMONISATION	<b>SK:</b> See comments to article 6 above.
	<b>SK:</b> See comments to article 6 above.
LIST OF UNION HARMONISATION	SK: See comments to article 6 above.
LIST OF UNION HARMONISATION LEGISLATION	SK: See comments to article 6 above.
LIST OF UNION HARMONISATION  LEGISLATION  Section A – List of Union harmonisation	<b>SK:</b> See comments to article 6 above.
LIST OF UNION HARMONISATION  LEGISLATION  Section A – List of Union harmonisation  legislation based on the New Legislative	SK: See comments to article 6 above.

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);	

r	T	
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);	
L 81, 31.3.2010, 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	
legislation	
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	

1	

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	<b>SK:</b> The use cases of AI systems operating
HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS REFERRED TO	certain forms of mobility and transportation,
IN ARTICLE 6(2)	insurance products and services, protection of
	environment, tools of attention economy,
	journalism and creation and selection of content
	(beyond practices forbidden in article 5),
	including deep audio and textual/language

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).

fakes, health and safety protection in sensitive environments, biotech solutions (e.g. AI interacting with biological/organic systems) are not contained in this annex. The critical infrastructure appears too narrowly defined (for instance, it does not cover food, digital networks security and other fields). Moreover, the Digital Services Act does not seem to specifically address deployment and use of AI systems, therefore adequate safeguards need to be introduced into this proposal by including relevant use cases in this annex. All the above use cases need to be carefully considered in light of the criteria contained in article 7. See also comments to article 5 and 6 and Title III Chapter 2 and 3.

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

igh-risk AI systems pursuant to Article 6(2)	
e the AI systems listed in any of the following	
eas:	
Biometric identification and	
tegorisation of natural persons:	
) AI systems intended to be used for the	
eal-time' and 'post' remote biometric	
entification of natural persons;	
Management and operation of critical	
frastructure:	
Biometric identification and attegorisation of natural persons:  AI systems intended to be used for the eal-time' and 'post' remote biometric entification of natural persons;  Management and operation of critical	

(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;	
(b) AI systems intended to be used for the	
purpose of assessing students in educational and	
vocational training institutions and for assessing	

<del>_</del>	
participants in tests commonly required for	
admission to educational institutions.	
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	
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.	
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;	
(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	

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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	
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		
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		
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	
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);	

	<u> </u>	
(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	
(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,	

. 1 1. 4 1 6 6	T	
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		
the users; specifications on input data, as		
appropriate;		

4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
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