Commission proposal	<b>Drafting Suggestions</b>	Comments
Commission proposal  2021/0106 (COD)  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	Drafting Suggestions	SE would like to add that there might be need to clarify the relationship to GDPR and LED in an article. It is in many parts difficult to see how the regulations relate to each other. This in turn may result in difficulties to comply with both sets of rules.  There is a need to review the proposal to ascertain that the obligations aimed at the targeted stakeholders (eg. companies, public authorities etc) are proportionate to the aim of the legislation. Many of the articles contain in themselves or in combination with other articles and the annexes far reaching and detailed
		demands on the targeted stakeholders. As a consequence these stakeholders (providers,

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).

> users etc.) will be subject to a significantly increased administrative burden and other types of costs. Other aspects of concern are e.g. the wide definition of AI in combination with the wide definition of what encompasses high-risk AI and the procedure (e.g. through delegated acts) for adding to the areas covered by the regulation. SE also have concerns regarding the extensive reporting requirements and the handling of this information which include confidential and other proprietory information. Art. 70 might not be enough to secure confidentiality which will effect all prior articles that stipulate stakeholders need for documentation and sharing of information. It is of great importance that the regulation is predictable and easy to apply.

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

TITLE I	
GENERAL PROVISIONS	
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;	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

1. This Regulation applies to:	
(a) providers placing on the market or	
putting into service AI systems in the Union,	
irrespective of whether those providers are	
established within the Union or in a third	
country;	
(b) users of AI systems located within the	
Union;	
(c) providers and users of AI systems that	
are located in a third country, where the output	
produced by the system is used in the Union;	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

2.	For high-risk AI systems that are safety	
comp	onents of products or systems, or which	
are the	emselves products or systems, falling	
withir	the scope of the following acts, only	
Articl	e 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	3. This Regulation shall does not apply	It is clear from Article 4.2 TEU that national
systems developed or used exclusively for	to AI systems developed or used <del>exclusively</del>	security and defence remain the sole
military purposes.	for the purpose of activities which fall outside	responsibility of each Member State. However,
	the scope of Union law, and in any event	from the ECJ's recent judgements in cases C-
	activities concerning national security and	623/17 and joined cases C-511/18, C-512/18
	defence, regardless of whether it is a state	and C-520/18 it is equally clear that, from the
	actor or non-state actor who is developing or	ECJ's perspective, the article alone may not be
	using the system.	sufficient to fully exclude Members State
	using the system.	measures for the protection of national security
		and defence from the material scope of a
		legislative act. Instead, a clause that clarifies

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).

what is excluded from a legislative act because of national security concerns may be necessary. The current exclusion clause in the proposal is insufficient as it does not (i) explicitly exempt national security from the scope of the act, (ii) clearly exclude relevant activities by entities that are otherwise in scope of the act, or (iii) reflect that most AI systems developed or used for the purpose of national security or defence are dual use systems. Very few systems are developed exclusively for the purpose of national security or defence. For these reasons, we propose that Article 2.3 is replaced with an exclusion clause modelled after the Council draft of Article 2 ePrivacy regulation of 10 February 2021.

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).

This regulation does not apply to research for legitimate purposes for any AI system if such research is carried out in accordance with recognised ethical standards for scientific research.

In accordance with recite 16 research need to clearly be excluded. Ethical and other regulations already exist- otherwise AIA risk leading to less innovation and competitiveness and potential security risk for Europe. Important to allow for research even on/for system no one want to use

Otherwise it is missing a regulation that clarifies the conditions under which AI systems can be used or developed in research. It needs to be clarified how research and development is limited in conducting activities that possibly could lead to projects with moderate to high risk. It also needs to be clarified how the proposal relates to the ethical review that takes place today within the research and innovation

	system. It is doubtful whether the proposal is compatible with Swedish law when a Swedish university is a developer of AI systems, for example. requirements for deletion of data in Article 54 (g).
4. This Regulation shall not apply to public	Does this apply to the work that is within the
authorities in a third country nor to international	realm of Interpol/Europol and associated
organisations falling within the scope of this	organisations for the purpose of crime
Regulation pursuant to paragraph 1, where those	prevention? How can the boundaries about the
authorities or organisations use AI systems in	systems and applications used in the
the framework of international agreements for	collaboration and used by member countries be
law enforcement and judicial cooperation with	exempted?
the Union or with one or more Member States.	
5. This Regulation shall not affect the	
application of the provisions on the liability of	

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).

intermediary service providers set out in	
Chapter II, Section IV of Directive 2000/31/EC	
of the European Parliament and of the Council <sup>1</sup>	
[as to be replaced by the corresponding	
provisions of the Digital Services Act].	
Article 3	
Definitions	
For the purpose of this Regulation, the	
following definitions apply:	
(1) 'artificial intelligence system' (AI	The definition needs further modification to
system) means software that is developed with	narrow the scope. SE is still analysing the
one or more of the techniques and approaches	consequences with every modification. SE notes

\_

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).

listed in Annex I and can, for a given set of	that the OECD definition also includes that "AI
human-defined objectives, generate outputs	systems are designed to operate with varying
such as content, predictions, recommendations,	levels of autonomy". The current proposal is
or decisions influencing the environments they	also not in line with the proposed version from
interact with;	the HLEG AI.
	The definition of AI-system in article 3.1 in
	correlation with art. 6.2 (high-risk systems) and
	the corresponding point 6 (and 7 (b-c)) of
	Annex III would generate too serious impact on
	law enforcement ability to develop and use AI-
	systems since it would include "simple"
	information systems that work with defined and
	unchanging algorithms that are determined by
	humans.

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).

(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> ;	(3) 'small-scale provider' means a provider that is a micro or small or medium enterprise within the meaning of Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC <sup>3</sup> ;	It is our understanding that start-ups are covered within this definition. If not, we would like further adjustments to include start-ups.
(4) 'user' means any natural or legal person, public authority, agency or other body using an		

\_

<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).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</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).

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

AI system under its authority, except where the	
AI system is used in the course of a personal	
non-professional activity;	
(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	
making available of an AI system on the Union	
market;	
(10) 'making available on the market' means	
any supply of an AI system for distribution or	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

use on the Union market in the course of a	
commercial activity, whether in return for	
payment or free of charge;	
(11) 'putting into service' means the supply	
of an AI system for first use directly to the user	
or for own use on the Union market for its	
intended purpose;	
(12) 'intended purpose' means the use for	
which an AI system is intended by the provider,	
including the specific context and conditions of	
use, as specified in the information supplied by	
the provider in the instructions for use,	
promotional or sales materials and statements,	
as well as in the technical documentation;	

(13) 'reasonably foreseeable misuse' means		
the use of an AI system in a way that is not in		
accordance with its intended purpose, but which		
may result from reasonably foreseeable human		
behaviour or interaction with other systems;		
(14) 'safety component of a product or		
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		
	1	1

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

geographical, behavioural or functional setting	
within which the high-risk AI system is	
intended to be used;	
(16) 'recall of an AI system' means any	
measure aimed at achieving the return to the	
provider of an AI system made available to	
users;	
(17) 'withdrawal of an AI system' means any	
measure aimed at preventing the distribution,	
display and offer of an AI system;	
(18) 'performance of an AI system' means	
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	
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	There should be no room for ambiguity about
change to the AI system following its placing on	what constitutes a substantial modification.
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	
the national authority carrying out the activities	

and taking the measures pursuant to Regulation	
(EU) 2019/1020;	
(27) 'harmonised standard' means a	
European standard as defined in Article 2(1)(c)	
of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012;	
(28) 'common specifications' means a	
document, other than a standard, containing	
technical solutions providing a means to,	
comply with certain requirements and	
obligations established under this Regulation;	
(29) 'training data' means data used for	All data will become training data when the
training an AI system through fitting its	system is in use. An AI system will continously
learnable parameters, including the weights of a	become better and better based on the data used.
neural network;	

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

	Now training data could be interpreted as data
	used initially to train the system.
(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	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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'	"reference database" restricts the definition,
means an AI system for the purpose of	excluding other possible alternatives
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	(37) "real-time" remote biometric	Inappropriate wording.
identification system' means a remote biometric	identification system' means a remote biometric	
identification system whereby the capturing of	identification system whereby the capturing of	
biometric data, the comparison and the	biometric data, the comparison and the	
identification all occur without a significant	identification all occur without a significant	
delay. This comprises not only instant	delay. This comprises not only instant	
identification, but also limited short delays in	identification, but also limited short delays in	
order to avoid circumvention.	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;		

(20) ( 11: 1	
(39) 'publicly accessible space' means any	
physical place accessible to the public,	
regardless of whether certain conditions for	
access may apply;	
(40) 'law enforcement authority' means:	
(a) any public authority competent for the	
prevention, investigation, detection or	
prosecution of criminal offences or the	
execution of criminal penalties, including the	
safeguarding against and the prevention of	
threats to public security; or	
(b) any other body or entity entrusted by	
Member State law to exercise public authority	
and public powers for the purposes of the	

prevention, investigation, detection or	
prosecution of criminal offences or the	
execution of criminal penalties, including the	
safeguarding against and the prevention of	
threats to public security;	
(41) 'law enforcement' means activities	
carried out by law enforcement authorities for	
the prevention, investigation, detection or	
prosecution of criminal offences or the	
execution of criminal penalties, including the	
safeguarding against and the prevention of	
threats to public security;	
(42) 'national supervisory authority' means	
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	The definition of serious incident should be
that directly or indirectly leads, might have led	coordinated with the AMR and TCO
or might lead to any of the following:	regulations.

The Commission is under the following	
conditions empowered to adopt delegated acts in	
accordance with Article 73 to amend the list of	
techniques and approaches listed in Annex I if	
	conditions empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to amend the list of

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

basis of characteristics that are similar to the	- it has been three or more years since a
techniques and approaches listed therein.	delegated act in accordance with this article was
	adopted
	- and that a qualified majority of the member
	states formally has asked for a delegated act,
	in order to <del>update that adjust the</del> list to market
	and technological developments on the basis of
	characteristics that are similar to the techniques
	and approaches listed therein.
TITLE II	
PROHIBITED ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	
PRACTICES	
Article 5	

1. The following artificial intelligence practices shall be prohibited:		The exemptions should be more precise, to make it clearer what falls outside the prohibited area.
(a) the placing on the market, putting into service or use of an AI system that deploys subliminal techniques beyond a person's consciousness in order to materially distort a person's behaviour in a manner that causes or is likely to cause that person or another person physical or psychological harm;	(a) the placing on the market, putting into service or use of an AI system that deploys subliminal techniques beyond a person's consciousness in order to materially distort a person's behaviour in a manner that causes or is likely to cause that person or another person physical, material or psychological harm;	Material harm are meant to also include financial harm.  Subliminal techniques should be more clearly defined, possibly in the recitals.
(b) the placing on the market, putting into service or use of an AI system that exploits any of the vulnerabilities of a specific group of persons due to their age, physical or mental disability, in order to materially distort the	(b) the placing on the market, putting into service or use of an AI system that exploits any of the vulnerabilities of a specific group of persons due to their age, physical or mental	Add the term "intentionally" to limit to AI-systems or services that has an intention to do physical or psychological harm. This reduces the

behaviour of a person pertaining to that group in	disability, in order to intentionally and	risk that AI-regulation also includes Social
a manner that causes or is likely to cause that	materially distort	media, for instance.
person or another person physical or	the behaviour of a person pertaining to that	
psychological harm;	group in a manner that causes or is likely to	
	cause that person or another person physical,	
	material or psychological harm;	
(c) the placing on the market, putting into		
service or use of AI systems by public		
authorities or on their behalf for the evaluation		
or classification of the trustworthiness of natural		
persons over a certain period of time based on		
their social behaviour or known or predicted		
personal or personality characteristics, with the		
social score leading to either or both of the		
following:		

(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	The writing implies stricter regulation on the
identification systems in publicly accessible	use of 'real-time' remote biometric
spaces for the purpose of law enforcement,	identification systems for LEA than for others,
unless and in as far as such use is strictly	e.g., private users. This may result in an
necessary for one of the following objectives:	imbalance between the capabilities between
	private enterprises and LEA. LEA should have

(i) the targeted search for specific potential victims of crime, including missing children;		at least the same possibilities as private users, and preferably an increased mandate to use AI to identify, prohibit, and investigate crime.
(ii) the prevention of a specific, substantial and imminent threat to the life or physical safety of natural persons or of a terrorist attack;	(ii) the prevention of a specific, substantial and imminent threat to the life or physical safety or health of natural persons or of a terrorist antagonistic attack;	Pending final text of art. 2 Specific attack is a very limited situation, the technology must be able e to be used to discover threat- not just after the fact. Terrorist attacks is a matter of definition often made after the event.
(iii) the detection, localisation, identification or prosecution of a perpetrator or suspect of a criminal offence referred to in Article 2(2) of	(iii) the detection, localisation, identification or prosecution of a perpetrator or suspect or the prevention or disruption of a criminal offence referred to in Article 2(2) of Council	Article 2(2) of the Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA, the EAW, deals with serious crimes. Unless new technology such as remote biometric identification in real time can be used

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).

Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA <sup>4</sup>	Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA <sup>5</sup> and	in order to prevent or disrupt such crime there
and punishable in the Member State concerned	punishable in the Member State concerned by a	will be a lacunae between the prevention of
by a custodial sentence or a detention order for a	custodial sentence or a detention order for a	imminent risks and addressing a completed
maximum period of at least three years, as	maximum period of at least three years, as	crime. Sweden therefore finds it justified to
determined by the law of that Member State.	determined by the law of that Member State.	develop the purposes for which remote
		biometric identification in real time can be used
		also in order to prevent the EAW-crimes
		referred to and to disrupt them.
	iiii) the detection, localisation, identification or	An additional excemption for border areas
	prosecution of a perpetrator or suspect of an	where some surveillance could be expected, for
	infringement related to entry or exit of goods in	crimes related to entry and exit of goods.
	to or out of the Member state, constituting a	
	criminal offence punishable with imprisonment	

-

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)

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).

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

	for a maximum period of at least two years in the
	member state concerned, when the publicly
	accessible space is an area in proximity to a
	customs control area.
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;	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

(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.	

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).

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

The requirement that national law shall be detailed does not necessarily bring anything substantial to the Regulation. Ultimately, national law must in any case be in compliance with the requirements of the Charter when it comes to limiting fundamental rights.

	(b). As regards paragraphs 1, point (d) iiii and 2,	A prior authorisation granted by a judicial
	each use for the purpose of law enforcement of	authority or by an independent administrative
	a 'real time' remote biometric identification	authority is an unnecessarily resource
	system in publicly accessible spaces shall be	consuming procedure. A catalogue of crimes, in
	subject to a documented assessment of	this case in a defined area, combined with an
	legitimate interests of the law enforcement	internal order under the supervision of a
	verses the interests of personal rights and	supervisory authority should be sufficient. The
	freedoms, ensuring the proportionality of its use,	internal order would be subject to a prior
	in accordance to an internal documented	consultation under the GDPR.
	procedure.	
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	4. A Member State may decide to provide	The requirement that national law shall be
for the possibility to fully or partially authorise	for the possibility to fully or partially authorise	detailed does not necessarily bring anything
the use of 'real-time' remote biometric	the use of 'real-time' remote biometric	substantial to the Regulation. Ultimately,
identification systems in publicly accessible	identification systems in publicly accessible	national law must in any case be in compliance
spaces for the purpose of law enforcement	spaces for the purpose of law enforcement	with the requirements of the Charter when it
within the limits and under the conditions listed	within the limits and under the conditions listed	comes to limiting fundamental rights.
in paragraphs 1, point (d), 2 and 3. That	in paragraphs 1, point (d), 2 and 3. That	
Member State shall lay down in its national law	Member State shall lay down in its national law	
the necessary detailed rules for the request,	the necessary detailed rules for the request,	
issuance and exercise of, as well as supervision	issuance and exercise of, as well as supervision	
relating to, the authorisations referred to in	relating to, the authorisations referred to in	
	1	1

paragraph 3. Those rules shall also specify in	paragraph 3. Those rules shall also specify in	
respect of which of the objectives listed in	respect of which of the objectives listed in	
paragraph 1, point (d), including which of the	paragraph 1, point (d), including which of the	
criminal offences referred to in point (iii)	criminal offences referred to in point (iii and	
thereof, the competent authorities may be	iiii) thereof, the competent authorities may be	
authorised to use those systems for the purpose	authorised to use those systems for the purpose	
of law enforcement.	of law enforcement.	
TITLE III		
HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS		
Chapter 1		
CLASSIFICATION OF AI SYSTEMS AS		
HIGH-RISK		

Article 6	It is important that the regulation concerning
Classification rules for high-risk AI systems	high-risk AI Systems is proportionate to the purpose of the regulation. New requirements
	must not conflict with existing requirements in
	other regulations. New rules should not overlap with existing rules, as this risks complicating the application and reducing the effectiveness of the
	rules.  It must also be taken into consideration that the
	application of the new regulation cannot lead to every activity using a modern IT-based
	component or support practically is to be regarded as high-risk.
1. Irrespective of whether an AI system is placed on the market or put into service	

independently from the products referred to in points (a) and (b), that AI system shall be considered high-risk where both of the following conditions are fulfilled:		
(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;	(a) the AI system is intended to be used as a safety or a security component of a product, or is itself a product, covered by the Union harmonisation legislation listed in Annex II;	Safety component indicates operational reliability. Add the term security to include AI-based security solutions.
(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		Is the condition that a third-party conformity assessment has to be done?

that product pursuant to the Union	
harmonisation legislation listed in Annex II.	
2. In addition to the high-risk AI systems	6.2 and company and in a point 6(a) of Appay III.
	6.2 and corresponding point 6(g) of Annex III:
referred to in paragraph 1, AI systems referred	With reference to the comments already stated
to in Annex III shall also be considered high-	on art. 3.1, the definition of "AI-system" in
risk.	combination with the rules stated in p.6(g) of
	Annex III would put unnecessary restraints on
	the development and use of certain small scale
	AI-system used in law enforcement. Practically
	all R&D within the area of law enforcement is
	conducted for the purposes of those accounted
	for in p.6(g), as well as most "basic operation
	procedures". Thus, the regulation would have
	too serious impact on LEA:s abilities.

Article 7	The process for updating the list is too vague
Amendments to Annex III	and lacks sufficient transparency. Adding new
	topics to the list has the potential to significantly
	influence individual enterprises as entire
	markets. There is obviously a trade-off to be
	made here between long term stable conditions
	and agile regulation. However, even when
	advocating for agile regulation, which is
	recommendable, one must adhere to
	transparency and democratic values.
	One example of a vaguely formulated point concerns "essential private services" which would give potential room for finding AI systems in entire services sectors as being of high risk.

1 The Commission is supposed to all of	1 The Commission is a superior day of a start	To do in the description of the
1. The Commission is empowered to adopt	1. The Commission is empowered to adopt	Technical and societal development may lead to
delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to	delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to	that some systems no longer should be
update the list in Annex III by adding high-risk	update amend the list in Annex III by adding or	considered high risk.
AI systems where both of the following	deleting high-risk AI systems, or systems that	
conditions are fulfilled:	no longer should be considered high risk, where	The regulatory choice of empowering the
	both of the following conditions are fulfilled:	Commission to adopt delegated act to update the
		list in Annex III, should be replaced by the
		choice of implementing acts. This since the
		additional rules or change in definitions are
		intended merely to implement or to give effect
		to the rules already contained in the basic act.
(a) the AI systems are intended to be used in	(a) it has been three or more years since a	Proposed point (a) will be point (b) and so on.
any of the areas listed in points 1 to 8 of Annex	delegated act in accordance with this article was	
III;	adopted and that a qualified majority of the	

	member states formally has asked for a delegated act to amend Annex III  (a)(b) 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.	(b)(c) the AI systems pose a risk of harm to the health and safety, or a risk of adverse impact on fundamental rights, that is, in respect of its severity and probability of occurrence, equivalent to or greater than the risk of harm or of adverse impact posed by the high-risk AI systems already referred to in Annex III.	
2. When assessing for the purposes of paragraph 1 whether an AI system poses a risk		

C1	
of harm to the health and safety or a risk of	
adverse impact on fundamental rights that is	
equivalent to or greater than the risk of harm	
posed by the high-risk AI systems already	
referred to in Annex III, the Commission shall	
take into account the following criteria:	
(a) the intended purpose of the AI system;	
(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	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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:	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

(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	Article 8-15 need to be reviewed and re-made.
SYSTEMS	Instead of disproportionately imposing
	requirements on the structure of work within
	companies, what is illegal (not desirable) should
	be regulated.
	oo regulated.

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).

The legislation should not lay down new administrative requirements, but specify what is not desirable, that is, what is illegal. Creating a large compliance structure for good technology support is unfortunate, complicated and unwarrantedly burdensome. The use of AI does not withdraw an employer of responsibility under applicable national nor international laws and regulations. Should there be insufficient regulation in certain areas, these should be complemented rather than implementing regulation targeted one specific technology.

If there are to be administrative requirements, these need to be different depending on the type of company and the industry, for example,

	CL CT
	SMEs do not have the same conditions as
	multinational enterprises. (today, the proposal
	only means that SMEs should receive targeted
	information and lower fees).
Article 8	
Compliance with the requirements	
1. High-risk AI systems shall comply with	
the requirements established in this Chapter.	
2. The intended purpose of the high-risk AI	
system and the risk management system referred	
to in Article 9 shall be taken into account when	
ensuring compliance with those requirements.	

Article 9	Article 9	Delete "system", not to imply an IT solution.
Risk management system	Risk management system	
A risk management system shall be		The practical definition of a "risk management
established, implemented, documented and		system" is not clear and should therefore be
maintained in relation to high-risk AI systems.		more precise: does a risk management system
		imply the need for separate IT-system for the
		monitoring of each individual AI-system, or
		does it imply the establishment of an
		administrative scheme for compliance
		monitoring? The first alternative would
		significantly add to the administrative burden of
		LEA.
		It might be difficult to set up an efficient post-
		market monitoring system prior to

	implementing a system. There is a ri	sk of the
	system not being effective since effe	cts of using
	the system are not always apparent by	efore it is
	put to use.	
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;	
(d) adoption of suitable risk management	
measures in accordance with the provisions of	
the following paragraphs.	
3. The risk management measures referred	This article is rather vague and would fit better
to in paragraph 2, point (d) shall give due	as a recital.

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

this Article, and, where appropriate, training to	
users.	
In eliminating or reducing risks related to the	
use of the high-risk AI system, due	
consideration shall be given to the technical	
knowledge, experience, education, training to be	
expected by the user and the environment in	
which the system is intended to be used.	
5. High-risk AI systems shall be tested for	
the purposes of identifying the most appropriate	
risk management measures. Testing shall ensure	
that high-risk AI systems perform consistently	
for their intended purpose and they are in	
compliance with the requirements set out in this	
Chapter.	

6. Testing procedures shall be suitable to	
achieve the intended purpose of the AI system	
and do not need to go beyond what is necessary	
to achieve that purpose.	
7. The testing of the high-risk AI systems	
shall be performed, as appropriate, at any point	
in time throughout the development process,	
and, in any event, prior to the placing on the	
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	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

(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.	

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).

- 3. Training, validation and testing data sets shall be relevant, representative, free of errors 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.
- 3. Training, validation and testing data sets shall be sufficiently relevant, representative, and free of errors and complete with regards to the intended purpose of the system. 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.

Change is in accordance with recital 44 in the proposal and the following addition aims to ground the term "sufficient" and in the context of the intended purpose of the system. The aim is to soften the requirements as the initial formulation is too strict. The use of "inaccurate" or "dirty" data sets can be necessary for the development of some AI-systems, e.g. for detecting hate-speech online.

4. Training, validation and testing data sets shall take into account, to the extent required by the intended purpose, the characteristics or

65

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	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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	2. The logging capabilities shall ensure a	Should be sufficient with ten years, which is the
level of traceability of the AI system's	level of traceability of the AI system's	standard timeframe for record keeping.
functioning throughout its lifecycle that is	functioning throughout its lifecycle that is	
appropriate to the intended purpose of the	appropriate to the intended purpose of the	
system.	system but no longer than ten years.	
3. In particular, logging capabilities shall		
enable the monitoring of the operation of the		
high-risk AI system with respect to the		

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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	

11 1 11 11 1 1	
achieving compliance with the relevant	
obligations of the user and of the provider set	
out in Chapter 3 of this Title.	
2. High-risk AI systems shall be	
accompanied by instructions for use in an	
appropriate digital format or otherwise that	
include concise, complete, correct and clear	
information that is relevant, accessible and	
comprehensible to users.	
3. The information referred to in paragraph	
2 shall specify:	
(a) the identity and the contact details of the	
provider and, where applicable, of its authorised	
representative;	

(b) the characteristics, capabilities and	In law enforcement there is often a need to keep
limitations of performance of the high-risk AI	certain abilities secret, even internally. For
system, including:	example, if you have the ability to get into a
	specific hardware, that information needs to be
	protected from leaking. For example, in the case
	of EncroChat and Sky ECC, it was very
	important not to reveal what was actually
	•
	known, similar conditions exist in many
	situations.
(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	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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		
shall enable the individuals to whom human		
oversight is assigned to do the following, as		
appropriate to the circumstances:		
(a) fully understand the capacities and	(a) fully understand the capacities and	
limitations of the high-risk AI system and be	limitations of the high-risk AI system and be	
able to duly monitor its operation, so that signs	able to duly monitor its operation, so that signs	
of anomalies, dysfunctions and unexpected	of anomalies, dysfunctions and unexpected	
performance can be detected and addressed as	performance can be detected and addressed as	
soon as possible;	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	

1. High-risk AI systems shall be designed	
and developed in such a way that they achieve,	
in the light of their intended purpose, an	
appropriate level of accuracy, robustness and	
cybersecurity, and perform consistently in those	
respects throughout their lifecycle.	
2. The levels of accuracy and the relevant	
accuracy metrics of high-risk AI systems shall	
be declared in the accompanying instructions of	
use.	
3. High-risk AI systems shall be resilient as	
regards errors, faults or inconsistencies that may	
occur within the system or the environment in	
which the system operates, in particular due to	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

their interaction with natural persons or other	
systems.	
The robustness of high-risk AI systems may be	
achieved through technical redundancy	
solutions, which may include backup or fail-safe	
plans.	
High-risk AI systems that continue to learn after	
being placed on the market or put into service	
shall be developed in such a way to ensure that	
possibly biased outputs due to outputs used as	
an input for future operations ('feedback loops')	
are duly addressed with appropriate mitigation	
measures.	

4. High-risk AI systems shall be resilient as	
regards attempts by unauthorised third parties to	
alter their use or performance by exploiting the	
system vulnerabilities.	
The technical solutions aimed at ensuring the	
cybersecurity of high-risk AI systems shall be	
appropriate to the relevant circumstances and	
the risks.	
The technical solutions to address AI specific	
vulnerabilities shall include, where appropriate,	
measures to prevent and control for attacks	
trying to manipulate the training dataset ('data	
poisoning'), inputs designed to cause the model	
to make a mistake ('adversarial examples'), or	
model flaws.	

Chapter 3	
OBLIGATIONS OF PROVIDERS AND USERS OF HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS AND OTHER PARTIES	Article 16-29 need to be reviewed and re-made.  Instead of disproportionately imposing requirements on the structure of work within companies, what is illegal (not desirable) should be regulated.  The legislation should not lay down new administrative requirements, but specify what is not desirable, that is, what is illegal. Creating a large compliance structure for good technology support is unfortunate, complicated and unwarrantedly burdensome. The use of AI does not withdraw an employer of responsibility under applicable national nor international laws

	and regulations. Should there be insufficient
	regulation in certain areas, these should be
	complemented rather than implementing
	regulation targeted one specific technology.
	If there are to be administrative requirements,
	these need to be different depending on the type
	of company and the industry, for example,
	SMEs do not have the same conditions as
	multinational enterprises. As it stands now,
	SMEs should receive targeted information and
	lower fees.
Article 16	
Obligations of providers of high-risk AI systems	
Providers of high-risk AI systems shall:	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

(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	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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

(i) to affix the CE marking to their high-risk	Still unclear how CE-marking requirement are
AI systems to indicate the conformity with this	to correspond to for example the CSA and cyber
Regulation in accordance with Article 49;	security certification. Should be clarified.
(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	
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	

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

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		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>	

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

control and quality assurance of the high-risk AI	
system;	
(d) examination, test and validation	
procedures to be carried out before, during and	
after the development of the high-risk AI	
system, and the frequency with which they have	
to be carried out;	
(e) technical specifications, including	
standards, to be applied and, where the relevant	
harmonised standards are not applied in full, the	
means to be used to ensure that the high-risk AI	
system complies with the requirements set out	
in Chapter 2 of this Title;	

(f) systems and procedures for data	
management, including data collection, data	
analysis, data labelling, data storage, data	
filtration, data mining, data aggregation, data	
retention and any other operation regarding the	
data that is performed before and for the	
purposes of the placing on the market or putting	
into service of high-risk AI systems;	
(g) the risk management system referred to	
in Article 9;	
(h) the setting-up, implementation and	
maintenance of a post-market monitoring	
system, in accordance with Article 61;	

(i) procedures related to the reporting of	
serious incidents and of malfunctioning in	
accordance with Article 62;	
(j) the handling of communication with	
national competent authorities, competent	
authorities, including sectoral ones, providing or	
supporting the access to data, notified bodies,	
other operators, customers or other interested	
parties;	
(k) systems and procedures for record	
keeping of all relevant documentation and	
information;	
(l) resource management, including security	
of supply related measures;	

(m) an accountability framework setting out the responsibilities of the management and other	
staff with regard to all aspects listed in this	
paragraph.	
2. The implementation of aspects referred	Proportionate to "size" in what sense?
to in paragraph 1 shall be proportionate to the	There's a lack of reference point for the
size of the provider's organisation.	interpretation of "proportionate". This could in
	practice generate discriminatory effects on
	organisations with a high number of employees
	but without no/ small revenue on one hand, and
	organisations with a small number of employees
	but with high revenues on the other hand.
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.	

2. Providers that are credit institutions	
regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU shall	
maintain the technical documentation as part of	
the documentation concerning internal	
governance, arrangements, processes and	
mechanisms pursuant to Article 74 of that	
Directive.	
Article 19	
Conformity assessment	
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	The obligation for the providers of high-risk AI
ensure that their systems undergo the relevant	systems to draw an EU-declaration and affix the
conformity assessment procedure in accordance	CE marking of conformity in accordance with
with Article 43, prior to their placing on the	art. 48 would have a serious impact on LEA
market or putting into service. Where the	given the definition of an AI-system in
compliance of the AI systems with the	

·	1' ' '41 (/ ) C A III
requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title	combination with p.6(g) of Annex III as
has been demonstrated following that	previously stated.
conformity assessment, the providers shall draw	
up an EU declaration of conformity in	
accordance with Article 48 and affix the CE	
marking of conformity in accordance with	
Article 49.	
2. For high-risk AI systems referred to in	
point 5(b) of Annex III that are placed on the	
market or put into service by providers that are	
credit institutions regulated by Directive	
2013/36/EU, the conformity assessment shall be	
carried out as part of the procedure referred to in	
Articles 97 to 101 of that Directive.	

Article 20	
Automatically generated logs	
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	
keep the logs automatically generated by their	
high-risk AI systems, to the extent such logs are	
under their control by virtue of a contractual	
arrangement with the user or otherwise by law.	
The logs shall be kept for a period that is	
appropriate in the light of the intended purpose	
of high-risk AI system and applicable legal	
obligations under Union or national law.	
2. Providers that are credit institutions	
regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU shall	
maintain the logs automatically generated by	
their high-risk AI systems as part of the	

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

documentation under Articles 74 of that	
Directive.	
Article 21	
Corrective actions	
Providers of high-risk AI systems which	Providers of high-risk AI systems which
consider or have reason to consider that a high-	consider or have reason to consider that a high-
risk AI system which they have placed on the	risk AI system which they have placed on the
market or put into service is not in conformity	market or put into service is not in conformity
with this Regulation shall immediately take the	with this Regulation shall immediately
necessary corrective actions to bring that system	investigate the causes in open collaboration with
into conformity, to withdraw it or to recall it, as	the reporting user party and take the necessary
appropriate. They shall inform the distributors	corrective actions in order to bring that system
of the high-risk AI system in question and,	into conformity, to withdraw it or to recall it, as
where applicable, the authorised representative	appropriate. They shall inform the distributors
and importers accordingly.	of the high-risk AI system in question and,

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

	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	It is importat to ensure that rules regarding
Authorised representatives	autorized representatives and others rules which
	concerns AI systems from providers outside of
	the EU do not impacts external trade to a larger
	externt than stricly necessary and are in line
	with EU:s commitments in trade agreements.
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	

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

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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.	
I and the second	1

	$\perp$
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	
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;	The difference between the definition of "substantially modify" as stated in the first paragraph of art. 3.23, and the obligations following art. 28.1(b) "modify" is too ambiguous. Art. 28.1(b) should state "substantially modify".
(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	
1. Users of high-risk AI systems shall use	
such systems in accordance with the instructions	
of use accompanying the systems, pursuant to	
paragraphs 2 and 5.	
2. The obligations in paragraph 1 are	
without prejudice to other user obligations under	

Union or national law and to the user's	
discretion in organising its own resources and	
activities for the purpose of implementing the	
human oversight measures indicated by the	
provider.	
3. Without prejudice to paragraph 1, to the	
extent the user exercises control over the input	
data, that user shall ensure that input data is	
relevant in view of the intended purpose of the	
high-risk AI system.	
4. Users shall monitor the operation of the	
high-risk AI system on the basis of the	
instructions of use. When they have reasons to	
consider that the use in accordance with the	
instructions of use may result in the AI system	
I and the second	1

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,	

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

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

mechanisms pursuant to Article 74 of that	
Directive.	
6. Users of high-risk AI systems shall use	Is the intention that the requirements of Article
the information provided under Article 13 to	13 shall form a "part" of the data protection
comply with their obligation to carry out a data	impact assessment?
protection impact assessment under Article 35	
of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or Article 27 of	
Directive (EU) 2016/680, where applicable.	
ANNEX I	Depending on the outcome of discussions on the
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	definition of AI in art. 3.1 and the amendments
TECHNIQUES AND APPROACHES	to Annex I (delegated act) in art 4. SE sees a
referred to in Article 3, point 1	need for a review to ensure that the specification
	in the appendix does not allow for a broader

	definition than on the basis for the purpose of
	the proposal. The listed techniques in Annex I
	are too broad, and it includes techniques that are
	more related to data driven software
	development in general than AI (especially (b)
	and (c)).
(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>LIST OF UNION HARMONISATION</b>	
<b>LEGISLATION</b>	
Section A – List of Union harmonisation	
legislation based on the New Legislative	
<u>Framework</u>	
1. Directive 2006/42/EC of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2006	
on machinery, and amending Directive	

95/16/EC (OJ L 157, 9.6.2006, p. 24) [as	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
repealed by the Machinery Regulation];	
2. Directive 2009/48/EC of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009	
on the safety of toys (OJ L 170, 30.6.2009, p.	
1);	
3. Directive 2013/53/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 20 November	
2013 on recreational craft and personal	
watercraft and repealing Directive 94/25/EC (OJ	
L 354, 28.12.2013, p. 90);	
4. Directive 2014/33/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 26 February	
•	

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

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

	T	
repealing Directive 2000/9/EC (OJ L 81,		
31.3.2016, p. 1);		
9. Regulation (EU) 2016/425 of the		
European Parliament and of the Council of 9		
March 2016 on personal protective equipment		
and repealing Council Directive 89/686/EEC		
(OJ L 81, 31.3.2016, p. 51);		
10. Regulation (EU) 2016/426 of the		
European Parliament and of the Council of 9		
March 2016 on appliances burning gaseous		
fuels and repealing Directive 2009/142/EC (OJ		
L 81, 31.3.2016, p. 99);		

11. Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 5	
April 2017 on medical devices, amending	
Directive 2001/83/EC, Regulation (EC) No	
178/2002 and Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009	
and repealing Council Directives 90/385/EEC	
and 93/42/EEC (OJ L 117, 5.5.2017, p. 1;	
12. Regulation (EU) 2017/746 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 5	
April 2017 on in vitro diagnostic medical	
devices and repealing Directive 98/79/EC and	
Commission Decision 2010/227/EU (OJ L 117,	
5.5.2017, p. 176).	

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

Section B. List of other Union harmonisation	
<u>legislation</u>	
1. Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 11	
March 2008 on common rules in the field of	
civil aviation security and repealing Regulation	
(EC) No 2320/2002 (OJ L 97, 9.4.2008, p. 72).	
2. Regulation (EU) No 168/2013 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 15	
January 2013 on the approval and market	
surveillance of two- or three-wheel vehicles and	
quadricycles (OJ L 60, 2.3.2013, p. 52);	

3. Regulation (EU) No 167/2013 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 5	
February 2013 on the approval and market	
surveillance of agricultural and forestry vehicles	
(OJ L 60, 2.3.2013, p. 1);	
4. Directive 2014/90/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014	
on marine equipment and repealing Council	
Directive 96/98/EC (OJ L 257, 28.8.2014, p.	
146);	
5. Directive (EU) 2016/797 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 11	
May 2016 on the interoperability of the rail	

system within the European Union (OJ L 138,	
26.5.2016, p. 44).	
6. Regulation (EU) 2018/858 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 30	
May 2018 on the approval and market	
surveillance of motor vehicles and their trailers,	
and of systems, components and separate	
technical units intended for such vehicles,	
amending Regulations (EC) No 715/2007 and	
(EC) No 595/2009 and repealing Directive	
2007/46/EC (OJ L 151, 14.6.2018, p. 1); 3.	
Regulation (EU) 2019/2144 of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 27 November	
2019 on type-approval requirements for motor	
vehicles and their trailers, and systems,	
components and separate technical units	

intended for such vehicles, as regards their	
general safety and the protection of vehicle	
occupants and vulnerable road users, amending	
Regulation (EU) 2018/858 of the European	
Parliament and of the Council and repealing	
Regulations (EC) No 78/2009, (EC) No 79/2009	
and (EC) No 661/2009 of the European	
Parliament and of the Council and Commission	
Regulations (EC) No 631/2009, (EU) No	
406/2010, (EU) No 672/2010, (EU) No	
1003/2010, (EU) No 1005/2010, (EU) No	
1008/2010, (EU) No 1009/2010, (EU) No	
19/2011, (EU) No 109/2011, (EU) No	
458/2011, (EU) No 65/2012, (EU) No	
130/2012, (EU) No 347/2012, (EU) No	
351/2012, (EU) No 1230/2012 and (EU)	
2015/166 (OJ L 325, 16.12.2019, p. 1);	

7. Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 4	
July 2018 on common rules in the field of civil	
aviation and establishing a European Union	
Aviation Safety Agency, and amending	
Regulations (EC) No 2111/2005, (EC) No	
1008/2008, (EU) No 996/2010, (EU) No	
376/2014 and Directives 2014/30/EU and	
2014/53/EU of the European Parliament and of	
the Council, and repealing Regulations (EC) No	
552/2004 and (EC) No 216/2008 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council and	
Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 (OJ L	
212, 22.8.2018, p. 1), in so far as the design,	
production and placing on the market of	
aircrafts referred to in points (a) and (b) of	

Article 2(1) thereof, where it concerns	
unmanned aircraft and their engines, propellers,	
parts and equipment to control them remotely,	
are concerned.	
ANNEX III	
HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS REFERRED TO	
IN ARTICLE 6(2)	
High-risk AI systems pursuant to Article 6(2)	
are the AI systems listed in any of the following	
areas:	
1. Biometric identification and	
categorisation of natural persons:	

(a) AI systems intended to be used for the		
'real-time' and 'post' remote biometric		
identification of natural persons;		
2. Management and operation of critical		
infrastructure:		
(a) AI systems intended to be used as safety	(a) AI systems intended to be used either as	To harmonise with "essential entities" defined
components in the management and operation of	management and operational systems in services	in the NIS 2-directive. Safety component
road traffic and the supply of water, gas, heating	provided by essential entities, in accordance	indicates operational reliability. Add the term
and electricity.	with the meaning of that term in directive	security to include AI-based security solutions.
	2020/0359(COD), or as safety or security	
	components in the management and operation of	
	road traffic and the supply of water, gas, heating	

	and electricity.the services provided by such	
	entities.	
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		Needs to be reviewed and specified. In many ways AI-systems can protect from human errors and discrimination. It is advantageous if systems
training institutions;		are developed within the EU, not only reflecting European values but also reducing our
		dependency on foreign solutions. Hence the AI
		Act should promote and not hinder innovation
		and development in Europe. The use of AI does
		and should not withdraw an

	educator/institutions/university of responsibility under applicable national nor international laws and regulations. Should there be insufficient regulation in certain areas, these should be complemented rather than implementing regulation targeted specific technology.
(b) AI systems intended to be used for the purpose of assessing students in educational and vocational training institutions and for assessing participants in tests commonly required for admission to educational institutions.	Needs to be reviewed and specified. In many ways AI-systems can protect from human errors and discrimination. The use of AI does and should not withdraw an employer of responsibility under applicable national nor international laws and regulations. Should there be insufficient regulation in certain areas, these should be complemented rather than

	implementing regulation targeted specific technology.
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;	Needs to be reviewed and specified. In many ways AI-systems can protect from human errors and discrimination. The use of AI does and should not withdraw an employer of responsibility under applicable national nor international laws and regulations. Should there be insufficient regulation in certain areas, these should be complemented rather than implementing regulation targeted specific technology. Considering the broad definition of

	AI-system this means all IT-systems used for recruitment will be classed high-risk.
(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.	Needs to be reviewed and specified. In many ways AI-systems can protect from human errors and discrimination. The use of AI does and should not withdraw an employer of responsibility under applicable national nor international laws and regulations. Should there be insufficient regulation in certain areas, these should be complemented rather than implementing regulation targeted specific technology.

private services and public services and benefits:  benefits:  benefits	vaguely formulated when compared with other points and considering the very large area of private services. The current wording is not in line with the interest of proportionate, well defined provisions and leads to a severe lack of predictability and potential negative impacts on investement and innovation for providers of AI systems established inside and outside of the EU. It could also weaken EU possibilities to counteract similar vaguely provision in third countries legislation which might have purely protectionst motives with negative consequences for EU service exporters.

(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;	Needs to be reviewed and specified. In many ways AI-systems can protect from human errors and discrimination. The use of AI does and should not withdraw public authorities/stakeholder on behalf of public authorities of responsibility under applicable national nor international laws and regulations. Should there be insufficient regulation in certain areas, these should be complemented rather than implementing regulation targeted specific technology.
(b) AI systems intended to be used to evaluate the creditworthiness of natural persons or establish their credit score, with the exception	Needs to be reviewed and remade.

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	Using AI as a tool in a sub-step in your analysis
enforcement authorities for making individual	could be more efficient and can protect from
risk assessments of natural persons in order to	human errors and discrimination compared to a
assess the risk of a natural person for offending	

or reoffending or the risk for potential victims of	manual search. There is a risk that the tools will
criminal offences;	not be used due to the high-risk classification.
(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 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.	With reference to the comments already stated on art. 3.1 and the art. 6.2, the definition of "AI-system" in combination with the rules stated in p.6(g) of Annex III would put unnecessary restraints on the development and use of certain small scale AI-system used in law enforcement. Practically all R&D within the area of law enforcement is conducted for the purposes of those accounted for in p.6(g), as well as most "basic operation procedures". Thus, the regulation would have too serious impact on LEA:s abilities.

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

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;		Does this include automated border control using biometric scanning and facial recognition, for example ABC gates? This would be problematic from a border management perspective.
(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.	(d) AI systems intended to assist to be used by 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.	(a) AI systems intended to assist a to be used by judicial authority in researching and interpreting facts and the law and in applying the law to a concrete set of facts.	The use of AI systems for searching and finding legal information such as case law, legal acts etc. can greatly improve and speed up the legal process and does not pose a risk to fundamental rights if used for example in search engines in legal databases.
ANNEX IV  TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION referred to in Article 11(1)  The technical decumentation referred to in		Overall, too far reaching requirements for documentation. Not entirely clear what risks each respective provision is meant to mitigate.
The technical documentation referred to in  Article 11(1) shall contain at least the following		

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

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;	

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

(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	The wording "pre-trained systems or tools" is
development of the AI system, including, where	very diffuse and may have to be more precise.
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	
of the argorithms, 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);		
(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		
	1	

	·	T
of the outputs of AI systems by the users, in		
accordance with Articles 13(3)(d);		
(f) where applicable, a detailed description		
(1) where applicable, a detailed description		
of pre-determined changes to the AI system and		
its performance, together with all the relevant		
information related to the technical solutions		
adopted to ensure continuous compliance of the		
AI system with the relevant requirements set out		
in Title III, Chapter 2;		
(g) the validation and testing procedures		
used, including information about the validation		
and testing data used and their main		
characteristics; metrics used to measure		
accuracy, robustness, cybersecurity and		

compliance with other relevant requirements set	
out in Title III, Chapter 2 as well as potentially	
discriminatory impacts; test logs and all test	
reports dated and signed by the responsible	
persons, including with regard to pre-	
determined changes as referred to under point	
(f).	
3. Detailed information about the	
monitoring, functioning and control of the AI	
system, in particular with regard to: its	
capabilities and limitations in performance,	
including the degrees of accuracy for specific	
persons or groups of persons on which the	
system is intended to be used and the overall	
expected level of accuracy in relation to its	
intended purpose; the foreseeable unintended	

outcomes and sources of risks to health and	
safety, fundamental rights and discrimination in	
view of the intended purpose of the AI system;	
the human oversight measures needed in	
accordance with Article 14, including the	
technical measures put in place to facilitate the	
interpretation of the outputs of AI systems by	
the users; specifications on input data, as	
appropriate;	
4. A detailed description of the risk	
management system in accordance with Article	
9;	
5. A description of any change made to the	
system through its lifecycle;	

	<u>,                                      </u>	
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		

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

	End	End
plan referred to in Article 61(3).		
Article 61, including the post-market monitoring		
the post-market phase in accordance with		