

Presidency compromise text for Artificial Intelligence Act (doc. 14278/21)**Comments and drafting suggestions requested on Articles 30-85, Annexes V-IX)**

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).

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL LAYING DOWN HARMONISED RULES ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ACT) AND AMENDING CERTAIN UNION LEGISLATIVE ACTS (Text with EEA relevance)		<p>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, 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</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
		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 proprietary information. It is important to limit the amount of such information that needs to be reported to a minimum. It is also important to ensure that the confidentiality of such information is safeguarded in all instances where stakeholders are required to document and share information. Important to ensure that the AI board does not get too far reaching mandate. It is of great importance that the regulation is predictable and easy to apply.
CHAPTER 4		
NOTIFYING AUTHORITIES AND NOTIFIED BODIES		IMPORTANT TO CONSIDER PROPORTIONALITY OF THE REGULATION AND OBLIGATIONS IT

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
		PUTS ON PRIVATE ACTORS N MK (MARIE – TEXTEN SKA INTE VARA I VERSALER MEN LYCKADES INTE BYTA)
<i>Article 30</i> <i>Notifying authorities</i>		Terminology and processes should be aligned with the Cybersecurity Act. E.g. “National accreditation bodies” and “Conformity assessment bodies”.
1. Each Member State shall designate or establish a notifying 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.		Art. 30-39: The regulation of "notifying authorities" and "notifying bodies" is very detailed and difficult to understand. It is important that this administrative procedure does not become unnecessarily or disproportionately burdensome. It also needs to be clarified what role and what mandate competent national authorities, national regulatory authorities and the European AI Board have in relation to existing national

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
		regulatory authorities and bodies at EU level, not least with regard to data protection issues.
2. Member States may designate a national accreditation body referred to in Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 as a notifying authority.		
3. Notifying authorities shall be established, organised and operated in such a way that no conflict of interest arises with conformity assessment bodies and the objectivity and impartiality of their activities are safeguarded.		
4. Notifying authorities shall be organised in such a way that decisions relating to the notification of conformity assessment bodies are taken by competent persons different from those who carried out the assessment of those bodies.		
5. Notifying authorities shall not offer or provide any activities that conformity		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
assessment bodies perform or any consultancy services on a commercial or competitive basis.		
6. Notifying authorities shall safeguard the confidentiality of the information they obtain.	Notifying authorities shall, with respect to national law, safeguard the confidentiality of the information they obtain. / I ESD	SE would like clarification as to what is referred to with regards to “confidentiality” and make a reference to Union and national law.
7. Notifying authorities shall have a sufficient number of competent personnel at their disposal for the proper performance of their tasks.		
8. Notifying authorities shall make sure that conformity assessments are carried out in a proportionate manner, avoiding unnecessary burdens for providers and that notified bodies perform their activities taking due account of the size of an undertaking, the sector in which it operates, its structure and the degree of complexity of the AI system in question.		Taking into account the size of the company does not conform to the standard SS EN 17065. The issue is also discussed in the proposal for the forthcoming Machinery Regulation. How will “size”, “sector” and “structure” effect the burdens and what does structure mean within these regards? Might help with clarification on “proportionate manner” and “unnecessary burdens”.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p><i>Article 31</i></p> <p><i>Application of a conformity assessment body for notification</i></p>		
<p>1. Conformity assessment bodies shall submit an application for notification to the notifying authority of the Member State in which they are established.</p>		
<p>2. The application for notification shall be accompanied by a description of the conformity assessment activities, the conformity assessment module or modules and the artificial intelligence technologies for which the conformity assessment body claims to be competent, as well as by an accreditation certificate, where one exists, issued by a national accreditation body attesting that the conformity assessment body fulfils the requirements laid down in Article 33. Any valid document related to existing</p>		<p>What is a module/modules, an example would clarify?</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
designations of the applicant notified body under any other Union harmonisation legislation shall be added.		
3. Where the conformity assessment body concerned cannot provide an accreditation certificate, it shall provide the notifying authority with the documentary evidence necessary for the verification, recognition and regular monitoring of its compliance with the requirements laid down in Article 33. For notified bodies which are designated under any other Union harmonisation legislation, all documents and certificates linked to those designations may be used to support their designation procedure under this Regulation, as appropriate.	Where the conformity assessment body concerned cannot provide an accreditation certificate, it shall provide the notifying authority with the documentary evidence necessary for the verification, recognition and regular monitoring of its compliance with the requirements laid down in Article 33. For notified bodies which are designated under any other Union harmonisation legislation, all documents and certificates linked to those designations may be used to support their designation procedure under this Regulation, as appropriate.	SE prefers that accreditation in accordance with (EU) Regulation 765/2008 is the only tool to be used to assess the competence of the conformity assessment bodies. If not, there is a risk for a high degree of variation in terms of competence. Designation/-s should be changed to notification/-s. If not notified bodies according to Mutual Recognition Agreements.
<i>Article 32</i> <i>Notification procedure</i>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
1. Notifying authorities may notify only conformity assessment bodies which have satisfied the requirements laid down in Article 33.		
2. Notifying authorities shall notify the Commission and the other Member States using the electronic notification tool developed and managed by the Commission.	Notifying authorities shall notify the European Artificial Intelligence Board, using the electronic notification tool developed by the Commission and managed by the European Artificial Intelligence Board.	
3. The notification shall include full details of the conformity assessment activities, the conformity assessment module or modules and the artificial intelligence technologies concerned.		
4. The conformity assessment body concerned may perform the activities of a notified body only where no objections are	where no objections are raised by the European Artificial Intelligence Board, within one month of a notification	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
raised by the Commission or the other Member States within one month of a notification.		
5. Notifying authorities shall notify the Commission and the other Member States of any subsequent relevant changes to the notification.	Notifying authorities shall notify the European Artificial Intelligence Board	
<i>Article 33</i> <i>Notified bodies</i>		
1. Notified bodies shall verify the conformity of high-risk AI system in accordance with the conformity assessment procedures referred to in Article 43.		
2. Notified bodies shall satisfy the organisational, quality management, resources and process requirements that are necessary to fulfil their tasks.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>3. The organisational structure, allocation of responsibilities, reporting lines and operation of notified bodies shall be such as to ensure that there is confidence in the performance by and in the results of the conformity assessment activities that the notified bodies conduct.</p>		
<p>4. Notified bodies shall be independent of the provider of a high-risk AI system in relation to which it performs conformity assessment activities. Notified bodies shall also be independent of any other operator having an economic interest in the high-risk AI system that is assessed, as well as of any competitors of the provider.</p>		
<p>5. Notified bodies shall be organised and operated so as to safeguard the independence, objectivity and impartiality of their activities. Notified bodies shall document and implement a structure and procedures to safeguard</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
impartiality and to promote and apply the principles of impartiality throughout their organisation, personnel and assessment activities.		
<p>6. Notified bodies shall have documented procedures in place ensuring that their personnel, committees, subsidiaries, subcontractors and any associated body or personnel of external bodies respect the confidentiality of the information which comes into their possession during the performance of conformity assessment activities, except when disclosure is required by law. The staff of notified bodies shall be bound to observe professional secrecy with regard to all information obtained in carrying out their tasks under this Regulation, except in relation to the notifying authorities of the Member State in which their activities are carried out.</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
7. Notified bodies shall have procedures for the performance of activities which take due account of the size of an undertaking, the sector in which it operates, its structure, the degree of complexity of the AI system in question.		What does this mean in practice, the intention is good but might need further clarification, e.g. what is intended with “take due account”?
8. Notified bodies shall take out appropriate liability insurance for their conformity assessment activities, unless liability is assumed by the Member State concerned in accordance with national law or that Member State is directly responsible for the conformity assessment.		
9. Notified bodies shall be capable of carrying out all the tasks falling to them under this Regulation with the highest degree of professional integrity and the requisite competence in the specific field, whether those tasks are carried out by notified bodies	responsibility. Notified bodies shall when possible act proactively and give impartial guidance.	To further the use and development of AI, it is important that notified bodies work in an open and helpful manner, with due respect to their role.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
themselves or on their behalf and under their responsibility.		
10. Notified bodies shall have sufficient internal competences to be able to effectively evaluate the tasks conducted by external parties on their behalf. To that end, at all times and for each conformity assessment procedure and each type of high-risk AI system in relation to which they have been designated, the notified body shall have permanent availability of sufficient administrative, technical and scientific personnel who possess experience and knowledge relating to the relevant artificial intelligence technologies, data and data computing and to the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title.	<p>Notified bodies shall have sufficient internal competences to be able to effectively evaluate the tasks conducted by external parties on their behalf.</p> <p>To that end, at all times and for each conformity assessment procedure and each type of high-risk AI system in relation to which they have been designated, The notified body shall have permanent availability of sufficient administrative, technical and scientific personnel who possess experience and knowledge relating to the relevant artificial intelligence technologies, data and data computing and to the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title.</p>	The competence requirements of notified bodies needs to be satisfactory and sufficient in regard to their tasks and activities, both in the short and long term. Too high technical competence requirements of notified bodies, in a technical domain that is developing quickly, could lead to protracted conformity assessment procedures and have a negative impact on the placement of AI-systems on the Union market.
11. Notified bodies shall participate in coordination activities as referred to in Article 38. They shall also take part directly or be		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
represented in European standardisation organisations, or ensure that they are aware and up to date in respect of relevant standards.		
12. Notified bodies shall make available and submit upon request all relevant documentation, including the providers' documentation, to the notifying authority referred to in Article 30 to allow it to conduct its assessment, designation, notification, monitoring and surveillance activities and to facilitate the assessment outlined in this Chapter.		
<i>Article 34</i> <i>Subsidiaries of and subcontracting by notified bodies</i>		
1. Where a notified body subcontracts specific tasks connected with the conformity assessment or has recourse to a subsidiary, it shall ensure that the subcontractor or the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
subsidiary meets the requirements laid down in Article 33 and shall inform the notifying authority accordingly.		
2. Notified bodies shall take full responsibility for the tasks performed by subcontractors or subsidiaries wherever these are established.		
3. Activities may be subcontracted or carried out by a subsidiary only with the agreement of the provider.		
4. Notified bodies shall keep at the disposal of the notifying authority the relevant documents concerning the assessment of the qualifications of the subcontractor or the subsidiary and the work carried out by them under this Regulation.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p><i>Article 35</i></p> <p><i>Identification numbers and lists of notified bodies designated under this Regulation</i></p>		
<p>1. The Commission shall assign an identification number to notified bodies. It shall assign a single number, even where a body is notified under several Union acts.</p>		
<p>2. The Commission shall make publicly available the list of the bodies notified under this Regulation, including the identification numbers that have been assigned to them and the activities for which they have been notified. The Commission shall ensure that the list is kept up to date.</p>		
<p><i>Article 36</i></p> <p><i>Changes to notifications</i></p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>1. Where a notifying authority has suspicions or has been informed that a notified body no longer meets the requirements laid down in Article 33, or that it is failing to fulfil its obligations, that authority shall without delay investigate the matter with the utmost diligence. In that context, it shall inform the notified body concerned about the objections raised and give it the possibility to make its views known. If the notifying authority comes to the conclusion that the notified body investigation no longer meets the requirements laid down in Article 33 or that it is failing to fulfil its obligations, it shall restrict, suspend or withdraw the notification as appropriate, depending on the seriousness of the failure. It shall also immediately inform the Commission and the other Member States accordingly.</p>	<p>It shall also immediately inform the European Artificial Intelligence Board.</p>	
<p>2. In the event of restriction, suspension or withdrawal of notification, or where the notified</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
body has ceased its activity, the notifying authority shall take appropriate steps to ensure that the files of that notified body are either taken over by another notified body or kept available for the responsible notifying authorities at their request.		
<i>Article 37</i> <i>Challenge to the competence of notified bodies</i>		
1. The Commission shall, where necessary, investigate all cases where there are reasons to doubt whether a notified body complies with the requirements laid down in Article 33.	The European Artificial Intelligence Board shall	
2. The Notifying authority shall provide the Commission, on request, with all relevant information relating to the notification of the notified body concerned.	shall provide the European Artificial Intelligence Board	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
3. The Commission shall ensure that all confidential information obtained in the course of its investigations pursuant to this Article is treated confidentially.	The European Artificial Intelligence Board	
4. Where the Commission ascertains that a notified body does not meet or no longer meets the requirements laid down in Article 33, it shall adopt a reasoned decision requesting the notifying Member State to take the necessary corrective measures, including withdrawal of notification if necessary. That implementing act shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 74(2).	Where the Commission ascertains that a notified body does not meet or no longer meets the requirements laid down in Article 33, it shall adopt a reasoned decision requesting the notifying Member State to take the necessary corrective measures, including withdrawal of notification if necessary. That implementing act shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 74(2).	This process should be in the hands of the member states in respect to the principle of subsidiarity, see art. 9, Regulation (EC) No 765/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 9 July 2008 setting out the requirements for accreditation and market surveillance relating to the marketing of products and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 339/93. Also note that the Commission may start an infringement procedure if a member states fails to implement EU law. MS intervention and the infringement procedure should be sufficient measures for the purpose of the article.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p><i>Article 38</i></p> <p><i>Coordination of notified bodies</i></p>		<p>This article could be interpreted as in principle all police use of AI could be assessed as a high-risk system. Some AI systems, especially those that handle biometric data in real time and without human intervention, probably need to be considered as high-risk systems, but at present this type of system is not used and the human control factor is central to this type of system as well.</p>
<p>1. The Commission shall ensure that, with regard to the areas covered by this Regulation, appropriate coordination and cooperation between notified bodies active in the conformity assessment procedures of AI systems pursuant to this Regulation are put in place and properly operated in the form of a sectoral group of notified bodies.</p>		<p>This might be better suited for the European Artificial Intelligence Board (EAIB)? Or the member states national authorities?</p>
<p>2. Member States shall ensure that the bodies notified by them participate in the work of that</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
group, directly or by means of designated representatives.		
<i>Article 39</i> <i>Conformity assessment bodies of third countries</i>		
Conformity assessment bodies established under the law of a third country with which the Union has concluded an agreement may be authorised to carry out the activities of notified Bodies under this Regulation.		
CHAPTER 5		
STANDARDS, CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT, CERTIFICATES, REGISTRATION		
<i>Article 40</i> <i>Harmonised standards</i>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
High-risk AI systems which are in conformity with harmonised standards or parts thereof the references of which have been published in the Official Journal of the European Union shall be presumed to be in conformity with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title, to the extent those standards cover those requirements.		We are uncertain on the implication of this article, especially on the meaning of “... to the extent those standards cover those requirements.”. Is this article necessary?
<i>Article 41</i> <i>Common specifications</i>		
1. Where harmonised standards referred to in Article 40 do not exist or where the Commission considers that the relevant harmonised standards are insufficient or that there is a need to address specific safety or fundamental right concerns, the Commission may, by means of implementing acts, adopt common specifications in respect of the requirements set	1. — Where harmonised standards referred to in Article 40 do not exist or where the Commission considers that the relevant harmonised standards are insufficient or that there is a need to address specific safety or fundamental right concerns, the Commission may, by means of implementing acts, adopt common specifications in respect of the requirements set	Where the Commission considers relevant harmonised standards insufficient or that there is a need to address specific safety or fundamental right concerns, the commission should work together with relevant standardization organizations so that they may address the problem.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
out in Chapter 2 of this Title. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 74(2).	out in Chapter 2 of this Title. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 74(2).	There are different wordings on “common specification” in the proposal for a machine regulation, article 17(3). Risk of different procedures.
2. The Commission, when preparing the common specifications referred to in paragraph 1, shall gather the views of relevant bodies or expert groups established under relevant sectorial Union law.		
3. High-risk AI systems which are in conformity with the common specifications referred to in paragraph 1 shall be presumed to be in conformity with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title, to the extent those common specifications cover those requirements.		If the common specifications must cover the requirements in chapter 2. How will this article compliment or add to chapter 2?

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
4. Where providers do not comply with the common specifications referred to in paragraph 1, they shall duly justify that they have adopted technical solutions that are at least equivalent thereto.	Where providers do not comply with the common specifications referred to in paragraph 1, they shall duly justify that they have adopted technical solutions that are at least equivalent thereto.	There are plenty of ways to adhere to the Act. Too many different ways will lead to difficulties in foreseeability. Also, some companies might get an unfair competitive advantage by claiming (knowingly that they are likely or possibly likely to fall short when tested) that they have adopted technical solutions as stated in the article and thus coming to the market faster and creating a customer base.
<i>Article 42</i> <i>Presumption of conformity with certain requirements</i>		
1. Taking into account their intended purpose, high-risk AI systems that have been trained and tested on data concerning the specific geographical, behavioural and functional setting within which they are intended to be used shall be presumed to be in		Is the specific setting (geographical, behavioural and functional) to be read as cumulative? Might need clarification.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
compliance with the requirement set out in Article 10(4).		
2. High-risk AI systems that have been certified or for which a statement of conformity has been issued under a cybersecurity scheme pursuant to Regulation (EU) 2019/881 of the European Parliament and of the Council ¹ and the references of which have been published in the Official Journal of the European Union shall be presumed to be in compliance with the cybersecurity requirements set out in Article 15 of this Regulation in so far as the cybersecurity certificate or statement of conformity or parts thereof cover those requirements.		
<i>Article 43</i> <i>Conformity assessment</i>		

¹ Regulation (EU) 2019/881 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on ENISA (the European Union Agency for Cybersecurity) and on information and communications technology cybersecurity certification and repealing Regulation (EU) No 526/2013 (Cybersecurity Act) (OJ L 151, 7.6.2019, p. 1).

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
1. For high-risk AI systems listed in point 1 of Annex III, where, in demonstrating the compliance of a high-risk AI system with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title, the provider has applied harmonised standards referred to in Article 40, or, where applicable, common specifications referred to in Article 41, the provider shall follow one of the following procedures:		
(a) the conformity assessment procedure based on internal control referred to in Annex VI;		
(b) the conformity assessment procedure based on assessment of the quality management system and assessment of the technical documentation, with the involvement of a notified body, referred to in Annex VII.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>Where, in demonstrating the compliance of a high-risk AI system with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title, the provider has not applied or has applied only in part harmonised standards referred to in Article 40, or where such harmonised standards do not exist and common specifications referred to in Article 41 are not available, the provider shall follow the conformity assessment procedure set out in Annex VII.</p>		
<p>For the purpose of the conformity assessment procedure referred to in Annex VII, the provider may choose any of the notified bodies.</p> <p>However, when the system is intended to be put into service by law enforcement, immigration or asylum authorities as well as EU institutions, bodies or agencies, the market surveillance authority referred to in Article 63(5) or (6), as applicable, shall act as a notified body.</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>2. For high-risk AI systems referred to in points 2 to 8 of Annex III, providers shall follow the conformity assessment procedure based on internal control as referred to in Annex VI, which does not provide for the involvement of a notified body. For high-risk AI systems referred to in point 5(b) of Annex III, placed on the market or put into service by 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.</p>		
<p>3. For high-risk AI systems, to which legal acts listed in Annex II, section A, apply, the provider shall follow the relevant conformity assessment as required under those legal acts. The requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title shall apply to those high-risk AI systems and shall be part of that assessment. Points 4.3.,</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
4.4., 4.5. and the fifth paragraph of point 4.6 of Annex VII shall also apply.		
For the purpose of that assessment, notified bodies which have been notified under those legal acts shall be entitled to control the conformity of the high-risk AI systems with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title, provided that the compliance of those notified bodies with requirements laid down in Article 33(4), (9) and (10) has been assessed in the context of the notification procedure under those legal acts.		
Where the legal acts listed in Annex II, section A, enable the manufacturer of the product to opt out from a third-party conformity assessment, provided that that manufacturer has applied all harmonised standards covering all the relevant requirements, that manufacturer may make use of that option only if he has also applied		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
harmonised standards or, where applicable, common specifications referred to in Article 41, covering the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title.		
4. High-risk AI systems shall undergo a new conformity assessment procedure whenever they are substantially modified, regardless of whether the modified system is intended to be further distributed or continues to be used by the current user.		<p>The definition of “substantial modification” under art. 3.23 might need further clarification, see Recital 66.</p> <p>According to the article, high-risk systems must undergo a new "conformity assessment" when they are "substantially modified". Guidance is requested here regarding what should be considered such a modification as it is unclear.</p>
For high-risk AI systems that continue to learn after being placed on the market or put into service, changes to the high-risk AI system and its performance that have been pre-determined by the provider at the moment of the initial conformity assessment and are part of the information contained in the technical		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
documentation referred to in point 2(f) of Annex IV, shall not constitute a substantial modification.		
5. The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 for the purpose of updating Annexes VI and Annex VII in order to introduce elements of the conformity assessment procedures that become necessary in light of technical progress.	When formally asked by a simple majority of the member states the Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 for the purpose of updating Annexes VI and Annex VII... / I ESD	According to 43.5 and 43.6, the Commission is empowered to amend, add and update the requirements of VI and VII, which may cause additional administrative burden and adaptation time that goes beyond the pace of innovation, development and implementation of AI methods already based on the broad the definition has been identified as high risk.
6. The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts to amend paragraphs 1 and 2 in order to subject high-risk AI systems referred to in points 2 to 8 of Annex III to the conformity assessment procedure referred to in Annex VII or parts thereof. The Commission shall adopt such delegated acts taking into account the effectiveness of the conformity assessment	When formally asked by a simple majority of the member states the Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts to amend paragraphs 1 and 2 in order to subject high...	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
procedure based on internal control referred to in Annex VI in preventing or minimizing the risks to health and safety and protection of fundamental rights posed by such systems as well as the availability of adequate capacities and resources among notified bodies.		
<i>Article 44</i> <i>Certificates</i>		Need to clarify how certificates issued under AIA is related to certificates issued under CSA.
1. Certificates issued by notified bodies in accordance with Annex VII shall be drawn-up in an official Union language determined by the Member State in which the notified body is established or in an official Union language otherwise acceptable to the notified body.		
2. Certificates shall be valid for the period they indicate, which shall not exceed five years. On application by the provider, the validity of a certificate may be extended for further periods,		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
each not exceeding five years, based on a re-assessment in accordance with the applicable conformity assessment procedures.		
3. Where a notified body finds that an AI system no longer meets the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title, it shall, taking account of the principle of proportionality, suspend or withdraw the certificate issued or impose any restrictions on it, unless compliance with those requirements is ensured by appropriate corrective action taken by the provider of the system within an appropriate deadline set by the notified body. The notified body shall give reasons for its decision.		
<i>Article 45</i> <i>Appeal against decisions of notified bodies</i>		
Member States shall ensure that an appeal procedure against decisions of the notified	Member States shall ensure that an appeal procedure against decisions of the notified	Such procedural laws is in the mandate of the national legislator.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
bodies is available to parties having a legitimate interest in that decision.	bodies is available to parties having a legitimate interest in that decision.	Different writing that that of the proposed machinery regulation (article 37). It is important that it is uniform. Becomes problematic with different processes.
<p><i>Article 46</i></p> <p><i>Information obligations of notified bodies</i></p>		According to Article 46, the notified bodies have an obligation to provide information to the notifying authority, which may lead to excessive requirements regarding transparency regarding, for example, the working methods of the secret activity. Transparency and the obligation to provide information must be clearly defined in this respect, taking into account the specific nature of law enforcement authorities.
1. Notified bodies shall inform the notifying authority of the following:		
(a) any Union technical documentation assessment certificates, any supplements to those certificates, quality management system		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
approvals issued in accordance with the requirements of Annex VII;		
(b) any refusal, restriction, suspension or withdrawal of a Union technical documentation assessment certificate or a quality management system approval issued in accordance with the requirements of Annex VII;		
(c) any circumstances affecting the scope of or conditions for notification;		
(d) any request for information which they have received from market surveillance authorities regarding conformity assessment activities;		
(e) on request, conformity assessment activities performed within the scope of their notification and any other activity performed,		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
including cross-border activities and subcontracting.		
2. Each notified body shall inform the other notified bodies of:		
(a) quality management system approvals which it has refused, suspended or withdrawn, and, upon request, of quality system approvals which it has issued;		
(b) EU technical documentation assessment certificates or any supplements thereto which it has refused, withdrawn, suspended or otherwise restricted, and, upon request, of the certificates and/or supplements thereto which it has issued.		
3. Each notified body shall provide the other notified bodies carrying out similar conformity assessment activities covering the same artificial intelligence technologies with relevant		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
information on issues relating to negative and, on request, positive conformity assessment results.		
<i>Article 47</i> <i>Derogation from conformity assessment procedure</i>		
1. By way of derogation from Article 43, any market surveillance authority may authorise the placing on the market or putting into service of specific high-risk AI systems within the territory of the Member State concerned, for exceptional reasons of public security or the protection of life and health of persons, environmental protection and the protection of key industrial and infrastructural assets. That authorisation shall be for a limited period of time, while the necessary conformity assessment procedures are being carried out, and shall terminate once those procedures have been completed. The		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
completion of those procedures shall be undertaken without undue delay.		
2. The authorisation referred to in paragraph 1 shall be issued only if the market surveillance authority concludes that the high-risk AI system complies with the requirements of Chapter 2 of this Title. The market surveillance authority shall inform the Commission and the other Member States of any authorisation issued pursuant to paragraph 1.	The market surveillance authority shall inform the European Artificial Intelligence Board of any authorisation issued pursuant to paragraph 1.	15 days is a too long period if there are exceptional reasons that makes it necessary to use a specific AI-system.
3. Where, within 15 calendar days of receipt of the information referred to in paragraph 2, no objection has been raised by either a Member State or the Commission in respect of an authorisation issued by a market surveillance authority of a Member State in accordance with paragraph 1, that authorisation shall be deemed justified.	Where, within 15 calendar days of receipt of the information referred to in paragraph 2, no objection has been raised by any of the members of the European Artificial Intelligence Board in respect of an authorisation issued by a market surveillance authority of a Member State in accordance with paragraph 1, that authorisation shall be deemed justified.	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>4. Where, within 15 calendar days of receipt of the notification referred to in paragraph 2, objections are raised by a Member State against an authorisation issued by a market surveillance authority of another Member State, or where the Commission considers the authorisation to be contrary to Union law or the conclusion of the Member States regarding the compliance of the system as referred to in paragraph 2 to be unfounded, the Commission shall without delay enter into consultation with the relevant Member State; the operator(s) concerned shall be consulted and have the possibility to present their views. In view thereof, the Commission shall decide whether the authorisation is justified or not. The Commission shall address its decision to the Member State concerned and the relevant operator or operators.</p>	<p>Where, within 15 calendar days of receipt of the notification referred to in paragraph 2, objections are raised by a Member State against an authorisation issued by a market surveillance authority of another Member State, or where the Commission considers the authorisation to be contrary to Union law or the conclusion of the Member States regarding the compliance of the system as referred to in paragraph 2 to be unfounded, the Commission shall without delay enter into consultation with the relevant Member State; the operator(s) concerned shall be consulted and have the possibility to present their views. In view thereof, the Commission shall decide whether the authorisation is justified or not. The Commission shall address its decision to the Member State concerned and the relevant operator or operators.</p>	<p>Article 47.4 transfers to the Commission and the Member States to decide whether or not a permit/approval is justified. If the regulation does not clearly define the requirements for approval, it can be problematic that different interpretations of both regulation and AI technology can delay the process even in important and exceptional cases.</p> <p>The infringement procedure should be sufficient.</p>
<p>5. If the authorisation is considered unjustified, this shall be withdrawn by the</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
market surveillance authority of the Member State concerned.		
6. By way of derogation from paragraphs 1 to 5, for high-risk AI systems intended to be used as safety components of devices, or which are themselves devices, covered by Regulation (EU) 2017/745 and Regulation (EU) 2017/746, Article 59 of Regulation (EU) 2017/745 and Article 54 of Regulation (EU) 2017/746 shall apply also with regard to the derogation from the conformity assessment of the compliance with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title.		
<i>Article 48</i> <i>EU declaration of conformity</i>		Is the “EU declaration of conformity” similar to the “EU statement of conformity” according to the CSA? If yes, alignment as far as possible between the processes is needed.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>1. The provider shall draw up a written EU declaration of conformity for each AI system and keep it at the disposal of the national competent authorities for 10 years after the AI system has been placed on the market or put into service. The EU declaration of conformity shall identify the AI system for which it has been drawn up. A copy of the EU declaration of conformity shall be given to the relevant national competent authorities upon request.</p>		
<p>2. The EU declaration of conformity shall state that the high-risk AI system in question meets the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title. The EU declaration of conformity shall contain the information set out in Annex V and shall be translated into an official Union language or languages required by the Member State(s) in which the high-risk AI system is made available.</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
3. Where high-risk AI systems are subject to other Union harmonisation legislation which also requires an EU declaration of conformity, a single EU declaration of conformity shall be drawn up in respect of all Union legislations applicable to the high-risk AI system. The declaration shall contain all the information required for identification of the Union harmonisation legislation to which the declaration relates.		
4. By drawing up the EU declaration of conformity, the provider shall assume responsibility for compliance with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title. The provider shall keep the EU declaration of conformity up-to-date as appropriate.		
5. The Commission shall be empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 for the purpose of updating the content of the	When formally asked by a simple majority of the member states the Commission	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
EU declaration of conformity set out in Annex V in order to introduce elements that become necessary in light of technical progress.		
<i>Article 49</i> <i>CE marking of conformity</i>		
1. The CE marking shall be affixed visibly, legibly and indelibly for high-risk AI systems. Where that is not possible or not warranted on account of the nature of the high-risk AI system, it shall be affixed to the packaging or to the accompanying documentation, as appropriate.		A requirement of CE-marking will be burdensome for authorities developing high-risk AI for in-house use. Will the requirement of CE-marking be applicable such systems, or only for high-risk systems intended for the market?
2. The CE marking referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article shall be subject to the general principles set out in Article 30 of Regulation (EC) No 765/2008.		
3. Where applicable, the CE marking shall be followed by the identification number of the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
notified body responsible for the conformity assessment procedures set out in Article 43. The identification number shall also be indicated in any promotional material which mentions that the high-risk AI system fulfils the requirements for CE marking.		
<i>Article 50</i> <i>Document retention</i>		The documentation that has to be maintained for 10 years after the AI system has been put into use may possibly include personal data of a nature that needs to be in compliance with existing legislation on retention time.
The provider shall, for a period ending 10 years after the AI system has been placed on the market or put into service, keep at the disposal of the national competent authorities:		
(a) the technical documentation referred to in Article 11;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(b) the documentation concerning the quality management system referred to Article 17;		
(c) the documentation concerning the changes approved by notified bodies where applicable;		
(d) the decisions and other documents issued by the notified bodies where applicable;		
(e) the EU declaration of conformity referred to in Article 48.		
<i>Article 51</i> <i>Registration</i>		
Before placing on the market or putting into service a high-risk AI system referred to in Article 6(2), the provider or, where applicable, the authorised representative shall register that system in the EU database referred to in Article 60.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
TITLE IV		
TRANSPARENCY OBLIGATIONS FOR CERTAIN AI SYSTEMS		
<i>Article 52</i> <i>Transparency obligations for certain AI systems</i>		
1. Providers shall ensure that AI systems intended to interact with natural persons are designed and developed in such a way that natural persons are informed that they are interacting with an AI system, unless this is obvious from the circumstances and the context of use. This obligation shall not apply to AI systems authorised by law to detect, prevent, investigate and prosecute criminal offences, unless those systems are available for the public to report a criminal offence.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>2. Users of an emotion recognition system or a biometric categorisation system shall inform of the operation of the system the natural persons exposed thereto. This obligation shall not apply to AI systems used for biometric categorisation, which are permitted by law to detect, prevent and investigate criminal offences.</p>		<p>In Article 52.2 there's an exception to inform the exposed persons of the use of AI systems used for biometric categorization, but this exception does not apply to emotion recognition systems. Although we welcome the Commissions proposal that exempts AI systems used for biometric categorisation permitted by law to detect, prevent and investigate criminal offences, the logic behind why emotion recognition systems are not exempted is unclear to us.</p>
<p>3. Users of an AI system that generates or manipulates image, audio or video content that appreciably resembles existing persons, objects, places or other entities or events and would falsely appear to a person to be authentic or truthful ('deep fake'), shall disclose that the content has been artificially generated or manipulated.</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
However, the first subparagraph shall not apply where the use is authorised by law to detect, prevent, investigate and prosecute criminal offences or it is necessary for the exercise of the right to freedom of expression and the right to freedom of the arts and sciences guaranteed in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU, and subject to appropriate safeguards for the rights and freedoms of third parties.		
4. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 shall not affect the requirements and obligations set out in Title III of this Regulation.		
TITLE IV_A		
GENERAL PURPOSE AI SYSTEMS		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<i>Article 52a</i>		This article should be integrated under article 2 or at least “general purpose AI system” should be stated under article 2 and possible defined under article 3.
<i>General purpose AI systems</i>		<p>SE are positive to the addition article 52a (with recital 70 b) as many AI-systems could be used for various different purposes and it is the purpose (and outcome) of the system that should be considered under this regulation. This will simplify for businesses and public administration as it enables them to test systems for different uses.</p> <p>However there remains some ambiguity in relation to the current proposal and the addition needs further analysis. One example of ambiguity in need of further analysis may be the requirements put forth for high risk AI-systems such as representative data for the intended purpose as the data the general purpose AI was trained on might not be considered relevant for</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
		the same purpose. If this is the case then the general purpose AI systems converted to intended purpose AI systems risk contradicting the requirements by default rendering them unusable for practical purposes.
1. The placing on the market, putting into service or use of general purpose AI systems shall not, by themselves only, make those systems subject to the provisions of this Regulation.		
2. Any person who places on the market or puts into service under its own name or trademark or uses a general purpose AI system made available on the market or put into service for an intended purpose that makes it subject to the provisions of this Regulation shall be considered the provider of the AI system subject to the provisions of this Regulation.		To what extent can the provider of the high-risk AI-system count on the cooperation of the provider of the general purpose AI to ensure compliancy with the AI Act? Recital 70a states they will cooperate “as appropriate”, what does that mean?

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
3. Paragraph 2 shall apply, mutatis mutandis, to any person who integrates a general purpose AI system made available on the market, with or without modifying it, into an AI system whose intended purpose makes it subject to the provisions of this Regulation.		
4. The provisions of this Article shall apply irrespective of whether the general purpose AI system is open source software or not.		
TITLE V		
MEASURES IN SUPPORT OF INNOVATION		Covers mainly exempts for processing personal data in support of certain innovation. The headline gives an impression that is not met in the articles.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
		<p>To take measures in support of innovation the para 2.7 regarding R&D should be clarified.</p> <p>Now it could be interpreted that R&D that in the end leads to placing an AI-system on the market is covered by this act. This would effectively exclude all R&D activities performed by companies, hence be a hinder to innovation and be an extra cost affecting European companies only.</p>
<p><i>Article 53</i></p> <p><i>AI regulatory sandboxes</i></p>		<p>Regulatory sandboxes enable in a real-life environment the testing of innovative technologies, products, services or approaches, which are not fully compliant with the existing legal and regulatory framework. They are operated for a limited time and in a limited part of a sector or area. The purpose of regulatory sandboxes is to learn about the opportunities and risks that a particular innovation carries and to develop the right regulatory environment to accommodate it.</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
		<p>Based on above the definition of regulatory sandboxes in article 53 is not clear. For example why is it necessary to prioritise SME for access to the sandboxes? Each sandbox is established for its own purpose. Article 53 needs to better describe how the AI regulatory sandboxes is supposed to work.</p> <p>It is important that sandboxes do not incur too high cost to SMEs so that they remain competitive.</p> <p>In order to train AI, large amounts of data are sometimes required and according to Article 10.3, the training, validation and testing data set must be "relevant, representative, free of errors and complete."</p> <p>Given that this often involves large amounts of data, it can be difficult to fully meet all the requirements in advance. When examining a new type of criminal activity, for example, the relevance of the information needs to be assessed in order to map and develop</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
		hypotheses in order to prevent, deter and detect the criminal activity. It is essential that AI in the future can be trained appropriately to be a tool and support in such an assessment.
1. AI regulatory sandboxes established by one or more Member States competent authorities or the European Data Protection Supervisor shall provide a controlled environment that facilitates the development, testing and validation of innovative AI systems for a limited time before their placement on the market or putting into service pursuant to a specific plan. This shall take place under the direct supervision and guidance by the competent authorities with a view to ensuring compliance with the requirements of this Regulation and, where relevant, other Union and Member States legislation supervised within the sandbox.	AI regulatory sandboxes established by one or more Member States competent authorities or the European Data Protection Supervisor shall provide a controlled environment that facilitates the development, testing and validation of innovative AI systems for a limited time before their placement on the market, or putting into service pursuant to a specific plan.	We do not see the need to limit the use of regulatory sandboxes to pre-market. Regulatory sandboxes could, as an example, be highly relevant to use if actors are thinking of substantially modify the system.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>2. Member States shall ensure that to the extent the innovative AI systems involve the processing of personal data or otherwise fall under the supervisory remit of other national authorities or competent authorities providing or supporting access to data, the national data protection authorities and those other national authorities are associated to the operation of the AI regulatory sandbox.</p>		
<p>3. The AI regulatory sandboxes shall not affect the supervisory and corrective powers of the competent authorities. Any significant risks to health and safety and fundamental rights identified during the development and testing of such systems shall result in immediate mitigation and, failing that, in the suspension of the development and testing process until such mitigation takes place.</p>	<p>, failing that, in the suspension of the development and testing process until such mitigation takes place. For the purpose of pure research purposes the actors may still continue to use the sandbox.</p>	<p>The para. should be split in two and “the competent authorities.” to make it easier to read.</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>4. Participants in the AI regulatory sandbox shall remain liable under applicable Union and Member States liability legislation for any harm inflicted on third parties as a result from the experimentation taking place in the sandbox.</p>		
<p>5. Member States' competent authorities that have established AI regulatory sandboxes shall coordinate their activities and cooperate within the framework of the European Artificial Intelligence Board. They shall submit annual reports to the Board and the Commission on the results from the implementation of those scheme, including good practices, lessons learnt and recommendations on their setup and, where relevant, on the application of this Regulation and other Union legislation supervised within the sandbox.</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>6. The modalities and the conditions of the operation of the AI regulatory sandboxes, including the eligibility criteria and the procedure for the application, selection, participation and exiting from the sandbox, and the rights and obligations of the participants shall be set out in implementing acts. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 74(2).</p>		<p>Will it be possible to appeal? For example, if an SME perceives that the selection process was unfair or if the selection criteria were biased.</p> <p>Can the exclusion of an actor from a regulatory sandbox be seen as denial of market access?</p>
<p><i>Article 54</i></p> <p><i>Further processing of personal data for developing certain AI systems in the public interest in the AI regulatory sandbox</i></p>		
<p>1. In the AI regulatory sandbox personal data lawfully collected for other purposes shall be processed for the purposes of developing and testing certain innovative AI systems in the sandbox under the following conditions:</p>	<p>In the AI regulatory sandbox personal data lawfully collected for other purposes may be processed for the purposes of developing and...</p>	<p>The relationship between this article and GDPR/LED needs to be clarified.</p> <p>Which are the rights and responsibilities of individuals whose data is used in the regulatory sandbox?</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(a) the innovative AI systems shall be developed for safeguarding substantial public interest in one or more of the following areas:		What is the definition of “innovative AI system”? To foster innovation, it would be helpful to broaden the areas here.
	(i) a more efficient public administration	
(i) 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, under the control and responsibility of the competent authorities. The processing shall be based on Member State or Union law;		
(ii) public safety and public health, including disease prevention, control and treatment;		
(iii) a high level of protection and improvement of the quality of the environment;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(b) the data processed are necessary for complying with one or more of the requirements referred to in Title III, Chapter 2 where those requirements cannot be effectively fulfilled by processing anonymised, synthetic or other non-personal data;		Should this exempt instead be included in EU 2016/679? Now the AI Act makes exempts from GDPR, which directives and regulations will make exempts from the AI Act? As the number of criss-crossing exempts increase it will be difficult to see the full picture of how GDPR is implemented. That could in turn mean that codes-of-conduct implemented in relation to GDPR are not updated to reflect exempts made in other EU directives and regulations. Vice versa, if other rules make exempts to the AI Act, how will affected parties know to act accordingly in terms of code-of-conduct and compliancy?
(c) there are effective monitoring mechanisms to identify if any high risks to the fundamental rights of the data subjects may arise during the sandbox experimentation as well as response	there are effective monitoring mechanisms to identify if any high substantial risks to the fundamental rights and non-discrimination of the data subjects	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
mechanism to promptly mitigate those risks and, where necessary, stop the processing;		
(d) any personal data to be processed in the context of the sandbox are in a functionally separate, isolated and protected data processing environment under the control of the participants and only authorised persons have access to that data;		What does “participants” refer to? Does it cover national competent authorities, do they have the prerequisites to handle the data in an appropriate way? Do they want to? Are the individuals that the data represent count as participants?
(e) any personal data processed are not be transmitted, transferred or otherwise accessed by other parties;		
(f) any processing of personal data in the context of the sandbox do not lead to measures or decisions affecting the data subjects;		
(g) any personal data processed in the context of the sandbox are deleted once the participation		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
in the sandbox has terminated or the personal data has reached the end of its retention period;		
(h) the logs of the processing of personal data in the context of the sandbox are kept for the duration of the participation in the sandbox and 1 year after its termination, solely for the purpose of and only as long as necessary for fulfilling accountability and documentation obligations under this Article or other application Union or Member States legislation;		
(i) complete and detailed description of the process and rationale behind the training, testing and validation of the AI system is kept together with the testing results as part of the technical documentation in Annex IV;		
(j) a short summary of the AI project developed in the sandbox, its objectives and		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
expected results published on the website of the competent authorities.		
2. Paragraph 1 is without prejudice to Union or Member States legislation excluding processing for other purposes than those explicitly mentioned in that legislation.		
<i>Article 55</i> <i>Measures for SME small-scale providers and users</i>		
1. Member States shall undertake the following actions:		55.1 (a) Do small-scale suppliers and start-ups get priority access to the regulatory sandboxes? How are priority given to critical or particularly important systems that law enforcement activities need to develop within regulatory sandboxes?
(a) provide small-scale SME providers, including and start-ups with priority access to		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
the AI regulatory sandboxes to the extent that they fulfil the eligibility conditions;		
(b) organise specific awareness raising activities about the application of this Regulation tailored to the needs of the small-scale SME providers and users;		
(c) where appropriate, establish a dedicated channel for communication with small-scale SME providers and user and other innovators to provide guidance and respond to queries about the implementation of this Regulation.		
2. The specific interests and needs of the small-scale SME providers shall be taken into account when setting the fees for conformity assessment under Article 43, reducing those fees proportionately to their size and market size.		See comment on article 30.8
TITLE VI		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
GOVERNANCE		
CHAPTER 1		
EUROPEAN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE BOARD		
<i>Article 56</i> <i>Establishment of the European Artificial Intelligence Board</i>		
1. A ‘European Artificial Intelligence Board’ (the ‘Board’) is established.	hereby established as a body of the Union and shall have legal personality.	We propose that the AIA follows the same structure and intent as the GDPR so that the European Artificial Intelligence Board mirrors the European Data Protection Board. This will lead to a number of changes. We are in line with EDPB in this: EDPB & EDPS call for ban on use of AI for automated recognition of human

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
		features in publicly accessible spaces, and some other uses of AI that can lead to unfair discrimination European Data Protection Board (europa.eu)
2. The Board shall provide advice and assistance to the Commission in order to:		
(a) contribute to the effective cooperation of the national supervisory authorities and the Commission with regard to matters covered by this Regulation;		
(b) coordinate and contribute to guidance and analysis by the Commission and the national supervisory authorities and other competent authorities on emerging issues across the internal market with regard to matters covered by this Regulation;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(c) assist the national supervisory authorities and the Commission in ensuring the consistent application of this Regulation.		
<i>Article 57</i> <i>Structure of the Board</i>		
1. The Board shall be composed of the national supervisory authorities, who shall be represented by the head or equivalent high-level official of that authority, and the European Data Protection Supervisor. Other national authorities may be invited to the meetings, where the issues discussed are of relevance for them.	The Board shall be composed of the national supervisory authorities, who shall be represented by the head or equivalent high-level official of that authority, the European Data Protection Supervisor and the Commission .	
2. The Board shall adopt its rules of procedure by a simple majority of its members, following the consent of the Commission. The rules of procedure shall also contain the operational aspects related to the execution of the Board's tasks as listed in Article 58. The		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Board may establish sub-groups as appropriate for the purpose of examining specific questions.		
3. The Board shall be chaired by the Commission. The Commission shall convene the meetings and prepare the agenda in accordance with the tasks of the Board pursuant to this Regulation and with its rules of procedure. The Commission shall provide administrative and analytical support for the activities of the Board pursuant to this Regulation.	<p>The Board shall elect a chair and two deputy chairs from amongst its members by simple majority.</p> <p>The term of office of the Chair and of the deputy chairs shall be five years and be renewable once.</p>	
	3 bis. The composition of the Board is to be gender balanced.	According to adopted CCs on the impact of AI on Gender Equality in the Labour Market, the Commission is to promote gender balance in research, education and training and in employment in jobs that involve work in the field of AI.
4. The Board may invite external experts and observers to attend its meetings and may hold exchanges with interested third parties to inform		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
its activities to an appropriate extent. To that end the Commission may facilitate exchanges between the Board and other Union bodies, offices, agencies and advisory groups.		
<i>Article 58</i> <i>Tasks of the Board</i>		
When providing advice and assistance to the Commission in the context of Article 56(2), the Board shall in particular:	When providing advice and assistance to the Commission in the context of Article 56(2), the Board shall in particular:	The tasks of the Board will need to be adjusted in respect to the other proposed changes that involves the mandate and tasks of the Board, such as addressed in art. 32.
(a) collect and share expertise and best practices among Member States;		
(b) contribute to uniform administrative practices in the Member States, including for the functioning of regulatory sandboxes referred to in Article 53;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(c) issue opinions, recommendations or written contributions on matters related to the implementation of this Regulation, in particular		
(i) on technical specifications or existing standards regarding the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2,		
(ii) on the use of harmonised standards or common specifications referred to in Articles 40 and 41,		
(iii) on the preparation of guidance documents, including the guidelines concerning the setting of administrative fines referred to in Article 71-;		
(d) issue an advisory opinion on the need for amendment of Annex I and Annex III, including in light of available evidence.		
CHAPTER 2		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
NATIONAL COMPETENT AUTHORITIES		
<i>Article 59</i> <i>Designation of national competent authorities</i>		
1. National competent authorities shall be established or designated by each Member State for the purpose of ensuring the application and implementation of this Regulation. National competent authorities shall be organised so as to safeguard the objectivity and impartiality of their activities and tasks.		It is important that it remains the choice of each member state to designate (or establish) the national competent authorities.
2. Each Member State shall designate a national supervisory authority among the national competent authorities. The national supervisory authority shall act as notifying authority and market surveillance authority unless a Member State has organisational and	The national supervisory authority may shall act as notifying authority and market surveillance authority if above principles can be ensured and unless a Member State has organisational and	This is contradictory to article 59.1, there must be a distinction between the notifying authority and the market surveillance authority in order to ensure objectivity and impartiality of their activities and tasks. Usually the notifying authority has the competence to designate the

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
administrative reasons to designate more than one authority.	administrative reasons to designate more than one authority.	conformity assessment bodies through accreditation and separate from the market surveillance activities. In Sweden, the notifying authority for most harmonised sectors is separate from the market surveillance authority. What is the role of the “national supervisory authority” in relation to the “notifying authority” regulated in art. 30?
3. Member States shall inform the Commission of their designation or designations and, where applicable, the reasons for designating more than one authority.	3. Member States shall inform the Commission of their designation or designations and, where applicable, the reasons for designating more than one authority.	
4. Member States shall ensure that national competent authorities are provided with adequate financial and human resources to fulfil their tasks under this Regulation. In particular, national competent authorities shall have a sufficient number of personnel permanently available whose competences and expertise	In particular, national competent authorities shall have a sufficient number of personnel permanently available whose competences and expertise shall include an in-depth understanding of artificial intelligence technologies, data and data computing, fundamental rights, health and safety risks and	Is it not sufficient to ensure that competent authorities are provided with adequate resources to fulfil their tasks under this Regulation? The details concerning the <i>how</i> should not be controlled in the Regulation.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
shall include an in-depth understanding of artificial intelligence technologies, data and data computing, fundamental rights, health and safety risks and knowledge of existing standards and legal requirements.	knowledge of existing standards and legal requirements.	
5. Member States shall report to the Commission on an annual basis on the status of the financial and human resources of the national competent authorities with an assessment of their adequacy. The Commission shall transmit that information to the Board for discussion and possible recommendations.	Member States shall report to the European Artificial Intelligence Board on an annual basis on the status of the financial and human resources of the national competent authorities with an assessment of their adequacy. The Commission shall transmit that information to the Board for discussion and possible recommendations.	Are these types of reports of such importance that they motivate the administrative burden put on the competent authorities?
6. The Commission shall facilitate the exchange of experience between national competent authorities.		
7. National competent authorities may provide guidance and advice on the	National competent authorities may shall provide guidance and advice on the	Due to the complexity of the regulation it is important that providers receive advice where

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>implementation of this Regulation, including tailored to small-scale SME providers.</p> <p>Whenever national competent authorities intend to provide guidance and advice with regard to an AI system in areas covered by other Union legislation, the competent national authorities under that Union legislation shall be consulted, as appropriate. Member States may also establish one central contact point for communication with operators.</p>	<p>implementation of this Regulation, including tailored to small-scale SME providers.</p>	<p>needed with regards to implementation so that they may remain competitive.</p>
<p>8. When Union institutions, agencies and bodies fall within the scope of this Regulation, the European Data Protection Supervisor shall act as the competent authority for their supervision.</p>		
TITLE VII		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
EU DATABASE FOR STAND-ALONE HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS		
<p><i>Article 60</i></p> <p><i>EU database for stand-alone high-risk AI systems</i></p>		SE have concerns regarding the extensive reporting requirements and the handling of this information which include confidential and other proprietary information. Important to safeguard confidentiality of proprietary information from e.g. competitors.
<p>1. The Commission shall, in collaboration with the Member States, set up and maintain a EU database containing information referred to in paragraph 2 concerning high-risk AI systems referred to in Article 6(2) which are registered in accordance with Article 51.</p>		Dual-use high-risk AI systems developed or used for military or national security purposes will be registered in this database, since art. 2.3 only excludes “AI systems developed or used <u>exclusively</u> for military or national security purposes”. This articles must be considered in relation to the writings in art. 2.3.
<p>2. The data listed in Annex VIII shall be entered into the EU database by the providers.</p>		The registration of every high-risk AI-system across the hole Union could be of interest to

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
The Commission shall provide them with technical and administrative support.		malicious activities. Therefore, the technical and administrative data listed in Annex VIII that shall be entered into the EU database needs to be kept restrictive and relatively unmodified over time.
3. Information contained in the EU database shall be accessible to the public.		
4. The EU database shall contain personal data only insofar as necessary for collecting and processing information in accordance with this Regulation. That information shall include the names and contact details of natural persons who are responsible for registering the system and have the legal authority to represent the provider.		
5. The Commission shall be the controller of the EU database. It shall also ensure to		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
providers adequate technical and administrative support.		
TITLE VIII		
POST-MARKET MONITORING, INFORMATION SHARING, MARKET SURVEILLANCE		
CHAPTER 1		
POST-MARKET MONITORING		
<i>Article 61</i> <i>Post-market monitoring by providers and post-market monitoring plan for high-risk AI systems</i>		
1. Providers shall establish and document a post-market monitoring system in a manner that		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
is proportionate to the nature of the artificial intelligence technologies and the risks of the high-risk AI system.		
2. The post-market monitoring system shall actively and systematically collect, document and analyse relevant data provided by users or collected through other sources on the performance of high-risk AI systems throughout their lifetime, and allow the provider to evaluate the continuous compliance of AI systems with the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2.	2. The post-market monitoring system shall actively and systematically collect, document and analyse relevant data provided by users or collected through other sources on the performance of high-risk AI systems throughout their lifetime , and allow the provider to evaluate the continuous compliance of AI systems with the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2.	It presents challenges to both design and develop a system that has the desired functions alone but to be able to also implement active collection and analytical features sets the bar to high and imposes difficulties. This is best done with an independent IT-system with the sole purpose of doing just that. Propose a new text that makes it more realistic to achieve the intent.
3. The post-market monitoring system shall be based on a post-market monitoring plan. The post-market monitoring plan shall be part of the technical documentation referred to in Annex IV. The Commission shall adopt an implementing act laying down detailed provisions establishing a template for the post-		It is of great importance that the administrative burden be kept at a minimum.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
market monitoring plan and the list of elements to be included in the plan.		
4. For high-risk AI systems covered by the legal acts referred to in Annex II, where a post-market monitoring system and plan is already established under that legislation, the elements described in paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 shall be integrated into that system and plan as appropriate.		
The first subparagraph shall also apply to high-risk AI systems referred to in point 5(b) of Annex III placed on the market or put into service by credit institutions regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU.		
CHAPTER 2		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
SHARING OF INFORMATION ON SERIOUS INCIDENTS AND MALFUNCTIONING		
<i>Article 62</i> <i>Reporting of serious incidents and of malfunctioning</i>		
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems placed on the Union market shall report any serious incident or any malfunctioning of those systems which constitutes a breach of obligations under Union law intended to protect fundamental rights to the market surveillance authorities of the Member States where that incident or breach occurred.		
Such notification shall be made immediately after the provider has established a causal link between the AI system and the serious incident or malfunctioning or the reasonable likelihood	Such notification shall be made immediately and no later than 24 hours from the point at which the provider detects immediately after the provider has established a causal link	The proposed deadline (not later than 15 days) of notification of serious incidents or malfunctioning to the market surveillance authorities is far too extended in time. This

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
of such a link, and, in any event, not later than 15 days after the providers becomes aware of the serious incident or of the malfunctioning .	between the AI system and the serious incident or malfunctioning or the reasonable likelihood of such a link, and in any event, not later than 15 days after the providers becomes aware of the serious incident or of the malfunctioning. A report about the serious incident or of the malfunctioning shall be sent to the market surveillance authority within 72 hours from the point at which the provider detects it.	appears to be inconsistent with the far-reaching safety regulations in other parts of the AIA. What is the responsibility of an “operator” who is not a “provider”?
2. Upon receiving a notification related to a serious incident referred to in Article 3(44)(c) a breach of obligations under Union law intended to protect fundamental rights , the relevant market surveillance authority shall inform the national public authorities or bodies referred to in Article 64(3). The Commission shall develop dedicated guidance to facilitate compliance with the obligations set out in paragraph 1. That guidance shall be issued 12	The European Board of Artificial Intelligence shall develop dedicated guidance to facilitate compliance with the obligations set out in paragraph 1. That guidance shall be issued 12 months after the entry into force of this Regulation, at the latest.	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
months after the entry into force of this Regulation, at the latest.		
3. For high-risk AI systems referred to in point 5(b) of Annex III which are placed on the market or put into service by providers that are credit institutions regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU and for high-risk AI systems which are safety components of devices, or are themselves devices, covered by Regulation (EU) 2017/745 and Regulation (EU) 2017/746, the notification of serious incidents or malfunctioning shall be limited to those referred to in Article 3(44)(c) that that constitute a breach of obligations under Union law intended to protect fundamental rights.		
CHAPTER 3		
ENFORCEMENT		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p><i>Article 63</i></p> <p><i>Market surveillance and control of AI systems in the Union market</i></p>		
<p>1. Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 shall apply to AI systems covered by this Regulation.</p> <p>However, for the purpose of the effective enforcement of this Regulation:</p>		
<p>(a) any reference to an economic operator under Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 shall be understood as including all operators identified in Title III, Chapter 3 Article 2 of this Regulation;</p>		
<p>(b) any reference to a product under Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 shall be understood as including all AI systems falling within the scope of this Regulation.</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>2. The national supervisory authority shall report to the Commission on a regular basis the outcomes of relevant market surveillance activities. The national supervisory authority shall report, without delay, to the Commission and relevant national competition authorities any information identified in the course of market surveillance activities that may be of potential interest for the application of Union law on competition rules.</p>		
<p>3. For high-risk AI systems, related to products to which legal acts listed in Annex II, section A apply, the market surveillance authority for the purposes of this Regulation shall be the authority responsible for market surveillance activities designated under those legal acts.</p>	<p>For high-risk AI systems, related to products to which legal acts listed in Annex II, section A apply, the a market surveillance authority for the purposes of this Regulation shall be the authority responsible for market surveillance activities designated under those legal acts. appointed by members states.</p>	<p>As there exists heterogeneity with regards to the modes of organization within EU and when taking into account the specific competencies required by the market surveillance authorities when regulating AI; SE views it as more suitable for member states to be able to appoint their own market surveillance authorities.</p>
<p>4. For AI systems placed on the market, put into service or used by financial institutions</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
regulated by Union legislation on financial services, the market surveillance authority for the purposes of this Regulation shall be the relevant authority responsible for the financial supervision of those institutions under that legislation.		
5. For AI systems listed in point 1(a) in so far as the systems are used for law enforcement purposes, points 6 and 7 of Annex III, Member States shall designate as market surveillance authorities for the purposes of this Regulation either the competent data protection supervisory authorities under Directive (EU) 2016/680, or Regulation 2016/679 or the national competent authorities supervising the activities of the law enforcement, immigration or asylum authorities putting into service or using those systems.		
6. Where Union institutions, agencies and bodies fall within the scope of this Regulation,		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
the European Data Protection Supervisor shall act as their market surveillance authority.		
7. Member States shall facilitate the coordination between market surveillance authorities designated under this Regulation and other relevant national authorities or bodies which supervise the application of Union harmonisation legislation listed in Annex II or other Union legislation that might be relevant for the high-risk AI systems referred to in Annex III.		
<i>Article 64</i> <i>Access to data and documentation</i>		
1. Access to data and documentation in the context of their activities, the market surveillance authorities shall be granted full access to the training, validation and testing datasets used by the provider, including through	Access to data and documentation in the context of their activities, the market surveillance authorities shall be granted full access to the documentation as well as the training, validation and testing datasets used by the provider,	Full access to data may pose a problem. How can companies be sure that no data leaks occur? Must be enough to provide this if there is a reason to question the compliance?

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
application programming interfaces ('API') or other appropriate technical means and tools enabling remote access.	including through application programming interfaces ('API') or other appropriate technical means and tools enabling remote access. If remote access is deemed inappropriate due to data protection or security reasons access should be given on premise.	
2. Where necessary to assess the conformity of the high-risk AI system with the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 and upon a reasoned request, the market surveillance authorities shall be granted access to the source code of the AI system.		
3. National public authorities or bodies which supervise or enforce the respect of obligations under Union law protecting fundamental rights in relation to the use of high-risk AI systems referred to in Annex III shall have the power to request and access any documentation created or maintained under this		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Regulation when access to that documentation is necessary for the fulfilment of the competences under their mandate within the limits of their jurisdiction. The relevant public authority or body shall inform the market surveillance authority of the Member State concerned of any such request.		
4. By 3 months after the entering into force of this Regulation, each Member State shall identify the public authorities or bodies referred to in paragraph 3 and make a list publicly available on the website of the national supervisory authority. Member States shall notify the list to the Commission and all other Member States and keep the list up to date.		
5. Where the documentation referred to in paragraph 3 is insufficient to ascertain whether a breach of obligations under Union law intended to protect fundamental rights has occurred, the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>public authority or body referred to paragraph 3 may make a reasoned request to the market surveillance authority to organise testing of the high-risk AI system through technical means. The market surveillance authority shall organise the testing with the close involvement of the requesting public authority or body within reasonable time following the request.</p>		
<p>6. Any information and documentation obtained by the national public authorities or bodies referred to in paragraph 3 pursuant to the provisions of this Article shall be treated in compliance with the confidentiality obligations set out in Article 70.</p>		
<p><i>Article 65</i></p> <p><i>Procedure for dealing with AI systems presenting a risk at national level</i></p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
1. AI systems presenting a risk shall be understood as a product presenting a risk defined in Article 3, point 19 of Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 insofar as risks to the health or safety or to the protection of fundamental rights of persons are concerned.		
2. Where the market surveillance authority of a Member State has sufficient reasons to consider that an AI system presents a risk as referred to in paragraph 1, they shall carry out an evaluation of the AI system concerned in respect of its compliance with all the requirements and obligations laid down in this Regulation. When risks to the protection of fundamental rights are present, the market surveillance authority shall also inform the relevant national public authorities or bodies referred to in Article 64(3). The relevant operators shall cooperate as necessary with the market surveillance authorities and the other	<p>Without prejudice to Article 19 of the Regulation (EU) 2019/1020, where Where the market surveillance authority of a Member State has sufficient reasons to consider that an AI system presents a risk as referred to in paragraph 1, they shall carry out an evaluation of the AI system concerned in respect of its compliance with all the requirements and obligations laid down in this Regulation.</p> <p>When risks to the protection of fundamental rights and non-discrimination are present,</p>	<p>This amendment has been made in the battery regulation in order to ensure alignment with the provisions of the recently adopted market surveillance regulation 2019/1020.</p> <p>Must be more important to evaluate the real effects of the AI-system than compliance with AIA?</p> <p>In terms of AI, non-discrimination is essential if the providers and users of AI want the public to trust in the use of AI. It is all the more pertinent as several cases of discrimination already have been exposed. Therefore, non-discrimination should be particularly prominent in the regulation.</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
national public authorities or bodies referred to in Article 64(3).		
Where, in the course of that evaluation, the market surveillance authority finds that the AI system does not comply with the requirements and obligations laid down in this Regulation, it shall without delay require the relevant operator to take all appropriate corrective actions to bring the AI system into compliance, to withdraw the AI system from the market, or to recall it within a reasonable period, commensurate with the nature of the risk, as it may prescribe.		
The market surveillance authority shall inform the relevant notified body accordingly. Article 18 of Regulation (EU) 2019/1020 shall apply to the measures referred to in the second subparagraph.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
3. Where the market surveillance authority considers that non-compliance is not restricted to its national territory, it shall inform the Commission and the other Member States of the results of the evaluation and of the actions which it has required the operator to take.	Where the market surveillance authority considers that non-compliance is not restricted to its national territory, it shall inform the Commission and the other Member States national supervisory authorities of other Member States and the European Artificial Intelligence Board of the results of the evaluation and of the actions which it has required the operator to take.	
4. The operator shall ensure that all appropriate corrective action is taken in respect of all the AI systems concerned that it has made available on the market throughout the Union.		
5. Where the operator of an AI system does not take adequate corrective action within the period referred to in paragraph 2, the market surveillance authority shall take all appropriate provisional measures to prohibit or restrict the AI system's being made available on its national	That authority shall inform the Commission and the other Member States and the European Artificial Intelligence Board, without delay, of those measures.	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
market, to withdraw the product from that market or to recall it. That authority shall inform the Commission and the other Member States, without delay, of those measures.		
6. The information referred to in paragraph 5 shall include all available details, in particular the data necessary for the identification of the non-compliant AI system, the origin of the AI system, the nature of the non-compliance alleged and the risk involved, the nature and duration of the national measures taken and the arguments put forward by the relevant operator. In particular, the market surveillance authorities shall indicate whether the non-compliance is due to one or more of the following:		
(a) a failure of the AI system to meet requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(b) shortcomings in the harmonised standards or common specifications referred to in Articles 40 and 41 conferring a presumption of conformity.		
7. The market surveillance authorities of the Member States other than the market surveillance authority of the Member State initiating the procedure shall without delay inform the Commission and the other Member States of any measures adopted and of any additional information at their disposal relating to the non-compliance of the AI system concerned, and, in the event of disagreement with the notified national measure, of their objections.	The market surveillance authorities of the Member States other than the market surveillance authority of the Member State initiating the procedure shall without delay inform the national supervisory authorities of other Member States and the European Artificial Intelligence Board of any measures adopted and of any additional information at their disposal relating to the non-compliance of the AI system concerned, and, in the event of disagreement with the notified national measure, of their objections.	Some other modifications will be needed if the proposed change is accepted.
8. Where, within three months of receipt of the information referred to in paragraph 5, no objection has been raised by either a Member		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
State or the Commission in respect of a provisional measure taken by a Member State, that measure shall be deemed justified. This is without prejudice to the procedural rights of the concerned operator in accordance with Article 18 of Regulation (EU) 2019/1020.		
9. The market surveillance authorities of all Member States shall ensure that appropriate restrictive measures are taken in respect of the product concerned, such as withdrawal of the product from their market, without delay.		
<i>Article 66</i> <i>Union safeguard procedure</i>		
1. Where, within three months of receipt of the notification referred to in Article 65(5), objections are raised by a Member State against a measure taken by another Member State, or where the Commission considers the measure to	Where, within three months of receipt of the notification referred to in Article 65(5), objections are raised by a Member State against a measure taken by another Member State, or where the Commission considers the measure to	The article should be directed to the relevant authority, i.e. the market surveillance authority. The Swedish constitution prohibits the Government to intervene in how an

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>be contrary to Union law, the Commission shall without delay enter into consultation with the relevant Member State and operator or operators and shall evaluate the national measure. On the basis of the results of that evaluation, the Commission shall decide whether the national measure is justified or not within 9 months from the notification referred to in Article 65(5) and notify such decision to the Member State concerned.</p>	<p>be contrary to Union law, the Commission shall without delay enter into consultation with the market surveillance authority of the relevant Member State and operator or operators and shall evaluate the national measure.</p> <p>Where, within three months of receipt of the notification referred to in Article 65(5), objections are raised by a Member State against a measure taken by the market surveillance authority of another Member State, the European Artificial Intelligence Board shall without delay enter into consultation with the market surveillance authority of the relevant Member State and operator or operators and shall evaluate the national measure.</p> <p>On the basis of the results of that evaluation, the Commission European Artificial Intelligence Board shall decide whether the national measure is justified or not within 9 months from the</p>	<p>administrative authority decides in a particular case.</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
	notification referred to in Article 65(5) and notify such decision to the Member State concerned.	
2. If the national measure is considered justified, all Member States shall take the measures necessary to ensure that the non-compliant AI system is withdrawn from their market, and shall inform the Commission accordingly. If the national measure is considered unjustified, the Member State concerned shall withdraw the measure.	If the national measure is considered unjustified, the market surveillance authority of the relevant Member State concerned shall withdraw the measure.	
3. Where the national measure is considered justified and the non-compliance of the AI system is attributed to shortcomings in the harmonised standards or common specifications referred to in Articles 40 and 41 of this Regulation, the Commission shall apply the procedure provided for in Article 11 of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p><i>Article 67</i></p> <p><i>Compliant AI systems which present a risk</i></p>		
<p>1. Where, having performed an evaluation under Article 65, the market surveillance authority of a Member State finds that although an AI system is in compliance with this Regulation, it presents a risk to the health or safety of persons, to the compliance with obligations under Union or national law intended to protect fundamental rights or to other aspects of public interest protection, it shall require the relevant operator to take all appropriate measures to ensure that the AI system concerned, when placed on the market or put into service, no longer presents that risk, to withdraw the AI system from the market or to recall it within a reasonable period, commensurate with the nature of the risk, as it may prescribe.</p>	<p>or national law intended to protect fundamental rights, non-discrimination or to other aspects of public interest protection,</p>	<p>In terms of AI, non-discrimination is essential if the providers and users of AI want the public to trust in the use of AI. It is all the more pertinent as several cases of discrimination already have been exposed. Therefore, non-discrimination should be particularly prominent in the regulation.</p> <p>This is one of the elements which constitutes a risk which creates uncertainty for the companies concerned.</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
2. The provider or other relevant operators shall ensure that corrective action is taken in respect of all the AI systems concerned that they have made available on the market throughout the Union within the timeline prescribed by the market surveillance authority of the Member State referred to in paragraph 1.		
3. The Member State shall immediately inform the Commission and the other Member States. That information shall include all available details, in particular the data necessary for the identification of the AI system concerned, the origin and the supply chain of the AI system, the nature of the risk involved and the nature and duration of the national measures taken.	The market surveillance authority shall immediately inform the European Artificial Intelligence Board and the other Member States. That information shall include all available details, in particular the data necessary for the identification of the AI system concerned, the origin and the supply chain of the AI system, the nature of the risk involved and the nature and duration of the national measures taken.	
4. The Commission shall without delay enter into consultation with the Member States and	The European Artificial Intelligence Board shall without delay enter into consultation with the	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
the relevant operator and shall evaluate the national measures taken. On the basis of the results of that evaluation, the Commission shall decide whether the measure is justified or not and, where necessary, propose appropriate measures.	market surveillance authority and the relevant operator and shall evaluate the national measures taken. On the basis of the results of that evaluation, the European Artificial Intelligence Board shall decide whether the measure is justified or not and, where necessary, propose appropriate measures.	
5. The Commission shall address its decision to the Member States.	The European Artificial Intelligence Board	
<i>Article 68</i> <i>Formal non-compliance</i>		
1. Where the market surveillance authority of a Member State makes one of the following findings, it shall require the relevant provider to put an end to the non-compliance concerned:		
(a) the conformity marking has been affixed in violation of Article 49;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(b) the conformity marking has not been affixed;		
(c) the EU declaration of conformity has not been drawn up;		
(d) the EU declaration of conformity has not been drawn up correctly;		
(e) the identification number of the notified body, which is involved in the conformity assessment procedure, where applicable, has not been affixed;		
2. Where the non-compliance referred to in paragraph 1 persists, the Member State concerned shall take all appropriate measures to restrict or prohibit the high-risk AI system being made available on the market or ensure that it is recalled or withdrawn from the market.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
TITLE IX		
CODES OF CONDUCT		
<i>Article 69</i> <i>Codes of conduct</i>		
1. The Commission and the Member States shall encourage and facilitate the drawing up of codes of conduct intended to foster the voluntary application to AI systems other than high-risk AI systems of the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 on the basis of technical specifications and solutions that are appropriate means of ensuring compliance with such requirements in light of the intended purpose of the systems.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
2. The Commission and the Board shall encourage and facilitate the drawing up of codes of conduct intended to foster the voluntary application to AI systems of requirements related for example to environmental sustainability, accessibility for persons with a disability, stakeholders participation in the design and development of the AI systems and diversity of development teams on the basis of clear objectives and key performance indicators to measure the achievement of those objectives.	The Commission, European Artificial Intelligence Board and the Member States shall encourage and facilitate the drawing up of codes of conduct intended to foster the voluntary application to AI systems of requirements related for example to environmental sustainability, gender equality and accessibility for persons with a disability	Gender equality should be an integral part of all codes of conduct, all the more as both the Commission and the Member states have been called upon to “design, implement and monitor targeted measures to overcome gender stereotypes in the context of AI, with the aim of ensuring gender equality in this area.” (CCs on the Impact of AI on Gender equality in the Labour Market)
3. Codes of conduct may be drawn up by individual providers of AI systems or by organisations representing them or by both, including with the involvement of users and any interested stakeholders and their representative organisations. Codes of conduct may cover one or more AI systems taking into account the similarity of the intended purpose of the relevant systems.		Codes of conduct procedures are not defined or illustrated. Who shall comply to the demands?

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
4. The Commission and the Board shall take into account the specific interests and needs of the small-scale SME providers, including and start-ups, when encouraging and facilitating the drawing up of codes of conduct.		
TITLE X		
CONFIDENTIALITY AND PENALTIES		
<i>Article 70</i> <i>Confidentiality</i>		Under Section 3.5 Fundamental Rights it is stated that the increased transparency requirements will not disproportionately affect the right to protection of intellectual property and that all disclosure of information will take place in accordance with relevant legislation in this area, including Directive 2016/943 on protection against undisclosed know-how and

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
		<p>business information (trade secrets) against their unlawful acquisition, use and disclosure.</p> <p>However it is not entirely clear, as it on the one hand it could be interpreted as if there will be a certain restriction on intellectual property rights even if it is judged to be in proportion, on the other hand disclosure of information will take place in accordance with relevant legislation.</p> <p>Would it be possible to get an example or further description of the extent to which the AIA may or may not affect intellectual property rights.</p>
1. National competent authorities and notified bodies involved in the application of this Regulation shall respect the confidentiality of information and data obtained in carrying out their tasks and activities in such a manner as to protect, in particular:	National competent authorities and notified bodies involved in the application of this Regulation shall, according to Union and national law respect the confidentiality of information and data obtained in carrying out their tasks and activities in such a manner as to protect, in particular:	Should there not be a general clause for confidentiality aimed at the Commission and the European Artificial Intelligence Board?

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(a) intellectual property rights, and confidential business information or trade secrets of a natural or legal person, including source code, except the cases referred to in Article 5 of Directive 2016/943 on the protection of undisclosed know-how and business information (trade secrets) against their unlawful acquisition, use and disclosure apply.		
(b) the effective implementation of this Regulation, in particular for the purpose of inspections, investigations or audits;(c) public and national security interests;		
(c) integrity of criminal or administrative proceedings.		
2. Without prejudice to paragraph 1, information exchanged on a confidential basis between the national competent authorities and between national competent authorities and the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Commission shall not be disclosed without the prior consultation of the originating national competent authority and the user when high-risk AI systems referred to in points 1, 6 and 7 of Annex III are used by law enforcement, immigration or asylum authorities, when such disclosure would jeopardise public and national security interests.		
When the law enforcement, immigration or asylum authorities are providers of high-risk AI systems referred to in points 1, 6 and 7 of Annex III, the technical documentation referred to in Annex IV shall remain within the premises of those authorities. Those authorities shall ensure that the market surveillance authorities referred to in Article 63(5) and (6), as applicable, can, upon request, immediately access the documentation or obtain a copy thereof. Only staff of the market surveillance authority holding the appropriate level of	Only staff of the market surveillance authority holding the appropriate level of security clearance shall be allowed to access that documentation or any copy thereof.	The proposed text should be adjusted to clarify that it is only concerning how the documentation should be made available.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
security clearance shall be allowed to access that documentation or any copy thereof.		
	Only staff of the market surveillance authority holding the appropriate level of security clearance shall be allowed to access that documentation or any copy thereof.	
3. Paragraphs 1 and 2 shall not affect the rights and obligations of the Commission, Member States and notified bodies with regard to the exchange of information and the dissemination of warnings, nor the obligations of the parties concerned to provide information under criminal law of the Member States.		
4. The Commission and Member States may exchange, where necessary, confidential information with regulatory authorities of third countries with which they have concluded bilateral or multilateral confidentiality arrangements guaranteeing an adequate level of confidentiality.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p><i>Article 71</i></p> <p><i>Penalties</i></p>		Important that both the requirements and the penalties are proportionate and not unnecessarily high. Some requirements are very difficult to comply with, for an example see comment below.
<p>1. In compliance with the terms and conditions laid down in this Regulation, Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties, including administrative fines, applicable to infringements of this Regulation and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are properly and effectively implemented. The penalties provided for shall be effective, proportionate, and dissuasive. They shall take into particular account the interests of small-scale SME providers, including and start-up, and their economic viability.</p>	<p>The penalties provided for shall be effective, proportionate, and dissuasive. They shall take into particular account the interests of small-scale SME providers, including and start-ups, and their economic viability.</p>	

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
2. The Member States shall notify the Commission of those rules and of those measures and shall notify it, without delay, of any subsequent amendment affecting them.		
3. The following infringements shall be subject to administrative fines of up to 30 000 000 EUR or, if the offender is company, up to 6 % of its total worldwide annual turnover for the preceding financial year, whichever is higher:		
(a) non-compliance with the prohibition of the artificial intelligence practices referred to in Article 5;		
(b) non-compliance of the AI system with the requirements laid down in Article 10.		Article 10 contains stipulations which we deem difficult to comply with such as “free of error”.
4. The non-compliance of the AI system with any requirements or obligations under this Regulation, other than those laid down in		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>Articles 5 and 10, shall be subject to administrative fines of up to 20 000 000 EUR or, if the offender is a company, up to 4 % of its total worldwide annual turnover for the preceding financial year, whichever is higher.</p>		
<p>5. The supply of incorrect, incomplete or misleading information to notified bodies and national competent authorities in reply to a request shall be subject to administrative fines of up to 10 000 000 EUR or, if the offender is a company, up to 2 % of its total worldwide annual turnover for the preceding financial year, whichever is higher.</p>		
<p>6. When deciding on the amount of the administrative fine in each individual case, all relevant circumstances of the specific situation shall be taken into account and due regard shall be given to the following:</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(a) the nature, gravity and duration of the infringement and of its consequences;		
(b) whether administrative fines have been already applied by other market surveillance authorities to the same operator for the same infringement.		There needs to be further analysis on whether double punishment is probable, to what extent and by what regulation in order to avoid it to the greatest extent possible.
(c) the size and market share of the operator committing the infringement;		
7. Each Member State shall lay down rules on whether and to what extent administrative fines may be imposed on public authorities and bodies established in that Member State.		
8. Depending on the legal system of the Member States, the rules on administrative fines may be applied in such a manner that the fines are imposed by competent national courts of other bodies as applicable in those Member		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
States. The application of such rules in those Member States shall have an equivalent effect.		
<i>Article 72</i> <i>Administrative fines on Union institutions, agencies and bodies</i>		
1. The European Data Protection Supervisor may impose administrative fines on Union institutions, agencies and bodies falling within the scope of this Regulation. When deciding whether to impose an administrative fine and deciding on the amount of the administrative fine in each individual case, all relevant circumstances of the specific situation shall be taken into account and due regard shall be given to the following:		
(a) the nature, gravity and duration of the infringement and of its consequences;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(b) the cooperation with the European Data Protection Supervisor in order to remedy the infringement and mitigate the possible adverse effects of the infringement, including compliance with any of the measures previously ordered by the European Data Protection Supervisor against the Union institution or agency or body concerned with regard to the same subject matter;		
(c) any similar previous infringements by the Union institution, agency or body;		
2. The following infringements shall be subject to administrative fines of up to 500 000 EUR:		
(a) non-compliance with the prohibition of the artificial intelligence practices referred to in Article 5;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(b) non-compliance of the AI system with the requirements laid down in Article 10.		
3. The non-compliance of the AI system with any requirements or obligations under this Regulation, other than those laid down in Articles 5 and 10, shall be subject to administrative fines of up to 250 000 EUR.		
4. Before taking decisions pursuant to this Article, the European Data Protection Supervisor shall give the Union institution, agency or body which is the subject of the proceedings conducted by the European Data Protection Supervisor the opportunity of being heard on the matter regarding the possible infringement. The European Data Protection Supervisor shall base his or her decisions only on elements and circumstances on which the parties concerned have been able to comment.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Complainants, if any, shall be associated closely with the proceedings.		
5. The rights of defense of the parties concerned shall be fully respected in the proceedings. They shall be entitled to have access to the European Data Protection Supervisor's file, subject to the legitimate interest of individuals or undertakings in the protection of their personal data or business secrets.		
6. Funds collected by imposition of fines in this Article shall be the income of the general budget of the Union.		
TITLE XI		
DELEGATION OF POWER AND COMMITTEE PROCEDURE		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Article 73 <i>Exercise of the delegation</i>		
1. The power to adopt delegated acts is conferred on the Commission subject to the conditions laid down in this Article.		
2. The delegation of power referred to in Article 4, Article 7(1), Article 11(3), Article 43(5) and (6) and Article 48(5) shall be conferred on the Commission for an a indeterminate period of time five years from <i>[entering into force of the Regulation]</i> .		
The Commission shall draw up a report in respect of the delegation of power not later than nine months before the end of the 5 year period. The delegation of power shall be tacitly extended for periods of an identical duration, unless the European Parliament or		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
the Council opposes such extension not later than three months before the end of each period.		
3. The delegation of power referred to in Article 4, Article 7(1), Article 11(3), Article 43(5) and (6) and Article 48(5) may be revoked at any time by the European Parliament or by the Council. A decision of revocation shall put an end to the delegation of power specified in that decision. It shall take effect the day following that of its publication in the <i>Official Journal of the European Union</i> or at a later date specified therein. It shall not affect the validity of any delegated acts already in force.		
4. As soon as it adopts a delegated act, the Commission shall notify it simultaneously to the European Parliament and to the Council.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>5. Any delegated act adopted pursuant to Article 4, Article 7(1), Article 11(3), Article 43(5) and (6) and Article 48(5) shall enter into force only if no objection has been expressed by either the European Parliament or the Council within a period of three months of notification of that act to the European Parliament and the Council or if, before the expiry of that period, the European Parliament and the Council have both informed the Commission that they will not object. That period shall be extended by three months at the initiative of the European Parliament or of the Council.</p>		
<p><i>Article 74</i></p> <p><i>Committee procedure</i></p>		
<p>1. The Commission shall be assisted by a committee. That committee shall be a committee within the meaning of Regulation (EU) No 182/2011.</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
2. Where reference is made to this paragraph, Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 shall apply.		
TITLE XII		
FINAL PROVISIONS		
<i>Article 75</i> <i>Amendment to Regulation (EC) No 300/2008</i>		
In Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 300/2008, the following subparagraph is added:		
“When adopting detailed measures related to technical specifications and procedures for approval and use of security equipment concerning Artificial Intelligence systems in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Artificial Intelligence] of the European Parliament and of the Council*, the requirements set out in Chapter 2, Title III of that Regulation shall be taken into account.”		

* Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] (OJ …).”		
<i>Article 76</i> <i>Amendment to Regulation (EU) No 167/2013</i>		
In Article 17(5) of Regulation (EU) No 167/2013, the following subparagraph is added:		
“When adopting delegated acts pursuant to the first subparagraph concerning artificial intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] of the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
European Parliament and of the Council*, the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.		

* Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] (OJ ...).”		
<i>Article 77</i> <i>Amendment to Regulation (EU) No 168/2013</i>		
In Article 22(5) of Regulation (EU) No 168/2013, the following subparagraph is added:		
“When adopting delegated acts pursuant to the first subparagraph concerning Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX on [Artificial Intelligence] of the European Parliament and of the Council*, the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.		

* Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] (OJ ...).”		
<i>Article 78</i> <i>Amendment to Directive 2014/90/EU</i>		
In Article 8 of Directive 2014/90/EU, the following paragraph is added:		
“4. For Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] of the European Parliament and of the Council*, when carrying out its activities pursuant to paragraph 1 and when adopting technical specifications and testing standards in accordance with		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
paragraphs 2 and 3, the Commission shall take into account the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation.		

* Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] (OJ ...).”.		
<i>Article 79</i> <i>Amendment to Directive (EU) 2016/797</i>		
In Article 5 of Directive (EU) 2016/797, the following paragraph is added:		
“12. When adopting delegated acts pursuant to paragraph 1 and implementing acts pursuant to paragraph 11 concerning Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] of the European		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Parliament and of the Council*, the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.		

* Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] (OJ ...).”.		
<i>Article 80</i> <i>Amendment to Regulation (EU) 2018/858</i>		
In Article 5 of Regulation (EU) 2018/858 the following paragraph is added:		
“4. When adopting delegated acts pursuant to paragraph 3 concerning Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] of the European Parliament and of the Council *, the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.		

* Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] (OJ ...).”.		
<i>Article 81</i> <i>Amendment to Regulation (EU) 2018/1139</i>		
Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 is amended as follows:		
(1) In Article 17, the following paragraph is added:		
“3. Without prejudice to paragraph 2, when adopting implementing acts pursuant to paragraph 1 concerning Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [<i>on Artificial Intelligence</i>] of the European Parliament and of the Council*, the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.		

* Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] (OJ ...).”		
(2) In Article 19, the following paragraph is added:		
“4. When adopting delegated acts pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 concerning Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence], the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.”		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(3) In Article 43, the following paragraph is added:		
“4. When adopting implementing acts pursuant to paragraph 1 concerning Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence], the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.”		
(4) In Article 47, the following paragraph is added:		
“3. When adopting delegated acts pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 concerning Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence], the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.”		
(5) In Article 57, the following paragraph is added:		
“When adopting those implementing acts concerning Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence], the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.”		
(6) In Article 58, the following paragraph is added:		
“3. When adopting delegated acts pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 concerning Artificial Intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU)		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] , the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.”.		
<i>Article 82</i> <i>Amendment to Regulation (EU) 2019/2144</i>		
In Article 11 of Regulation (EU) 2019/2144, the following paragraph is added:		
“3. When adopting the implementing acts pursuant to paragraph 2, concerning artificial intelligence systems which are safety components in the meaning of Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] of the European Parliament and of the Council*, the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of that Regulation shall be taken into account.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
* Regulation (EU) YYY/XX [on Artificial Intelligence] (OJ ...).”.		
<p><i>Article 83</i></p> <p><i>AI systems already placed on the market or put into service</i></p>		<p>The provisions of the AI Regulation do not apply to high-risk systems that have been placed on the market or commenced use before a certain date, unless they undergo "substantial modification". Clarification is needed on what should be considered such a change, see comment on Article 43.4.</p>
<p>1. This Regulation shall not apply to the AI systems which are components of the large-scale IT systems established by the legal acts listed in Annex IX that have been placed on the market or put into service before <i>[12 months after the date of application of this Regulation referred to in Article 85(2)]</i>, unless the replacement or amendment of those legal acts leads to a significant change in the design or</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
intended purpose of the AI system or AI systems concerned.		
The requirements laid down in this Regulation shall be taken into account, where applicable, in the evaluation of each large-scale IT systems established by the legal acts listed in Annex IX to be undertaken as provided for in those respective acts.		
2. This Regulation shall apply to the high-risk AI systems, other than the ones referred to in paragraph 1, that have been placed on the market or put into service before [<i>date of application of this Regulation referred to in Article 85(2)</i>], only if, from that date, those systems are subject to significant changes in their design or intended purpose.		“Significant changes” compared to “substantial changes” and “modifications” in article 28 and article 43. Reason to the difference in wording?
<i>Article 84</i> <i>Evaluation and review</i>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
1. The Commission shall assess the need for amendment of the list in Annex III once a year following the entry into force of this Regulation.		
1a. The Commission shall assess the need for amendment of the list in Annex I every 24 months following the entry into force of this Regulation and until the end of the period of the delegation of power. The findings of that assessment shall be presented to the European Parliament and the Council.		
1b. The Commission shall assess the need for amendment of the list in Annex III every 24 months following the entry into force of this Regulation and until the end of the period of the delegation of power. The findings of that assessment shall be presented to the European Parliament and the Council.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
2. By <i>[three years after the date of application of this Regulation referred to in Article 85(2)]</i> and every four years thereafter, the Commission shall submit a report on the evaluation and review of this Regulation to the European Parliament and to the Council. The reports shall be made public.		
3. The reports referred to in paragraph 2 shall devote specific attention to the following:		
(a) the status of the financial and human resources of the national competent authorities in order to effectively perform the tasks assigned to them under this Regulation;		
(b) the state of penalties, and notably administrative fines as referred to in Article 71(1), applied by Member States to		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
infringements of the provisions of this Regulation.		
4. Within [<i>three years after the date of application of this Regulation referred to in Article 85(2)</i>] and every four years thereafter, the Commission shall evaluate the impact and effectiveness of codes of conduct to foster the application of the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 and possibly other additional requirements for AI systems other than high-risk AI systems.		
5. For the purpose of paragraphs 1 to 43 the Board, the Member States and national competent authorities shall provide the Commission with information on its request.		
6. In carrying out the evaluations and reviews referred to in paragraphs 1 to 43 the Commission shall take into account the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
positions and findings of the Board, of the European Parliament, of the Council, and of other relevant bodies or sources.		
7. The Commission shall, if necessary, submit appropriate proposals to amend this Regulation, in particular taking into account developments in technology and in the light of the state of progress in the information society.		
<i>Article 85</i> <i>Entry into force and application</i>		
1. This Regulation shall enter into force on the twentieth day following that of its publication in the <i>Official Journal of the European Union</i> .		
2. This Regulation shall apply from [24 months following the entering into force of the Regulation].		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
3. By way of derogation from paragraph 2:		
(a) Title III, Chapter 4 and Title VI shall apply from [three months following the entry into force of this Regulation];		
(b) Article 71 shall apply from [twelve months following the entry into force of this Regulation].		
This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.		
Done at Brussels,		
<i>For the European Parliament</i> <i>For the Council</i>		
<i>The President</i> <i>The President</i>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
ANNEX IV TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION referred to in Article 11(1)		
The technical documentation referred to in Article 11(1) shall contain at least the following information, as applicable to the relevant AI system:		
1. A general description of the AI system including:		
(a) its intended purpose, the person/s developing the system the date and the version of the system;		
(b) how the AI system interacts or can be used to interact with hardware or software that is not part of the AI system itself, where applicable;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(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;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
2. A detailed description of the elements of the AI system and of the process for its development, including:		
(a) the methods and steps performed for the development of the AI system, including, where relevant, recourse to pre-trained systems or tools provided by third parties and how these have been used, integrated or modified by the provider;		
(b) the design specifications of the system, namely the general logic of the AI system and of the algorithms; the key design choices including the rationale and assumptions made, also with regard to persons or groups of persons on which the system is intended to be used; the main classification choices; what the system is designed to optimise for and the relevance of the different parameters; the decisions about any possible trade-off made regarding the technical		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
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);	(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);	The stage of collecting, labeling and cleaning data is often outsourced by the provider as a first step before internal processing. Outsourcing can prove to be necessary from a standpoint of innovation and competitiveness.

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(e) assessment of the human oversight measures needed in accordance with Article 14, including an assessment of the technical measures needed to facilitate the interpretation of the outputs of AI systems by the users, in accordance with Articles 13(3)(d);		
(f) where applicable, a detailed description of pre-determined changes to the AI system and its performance, together with all the relevant information related to the technical solutions adopted to ensure continuous compliance of the AI system with the relevant requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2;		
(g) the validation and testing procedures used, including information about the validation and testing data used and their main characteristics; metrics used to measure accuracy, robustness, cybersecurity and compliance with other relevant requirements set out in Title III,		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
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).		
<p>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</p>	<p>risks to health and safety, fundamental rights and non-discrimination in view of the intended purpose of the AI system;</p>	<p>A correction. The sources of risks are not to discrimination, but to non-discrimination.</p>

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
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;		
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;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
7. A copy of the EU declaration of conformity;		
8. A detailed description of the system in place to evaluate the AI system performance in the post-market phase in accordance with Article 61, including the post-market monitoring plan referred to in Article 61(3).		
ANNEX V		
EU DECLARATION OF CONFORMITY		
The EU declaration of conformity referred to in Article 48, shall contain all of the following information:		
1. AI system name and type and any additional unambiguous reference allowing identification and traceability of the AI system;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
2. Name and address of the provider or, where applicable, their authorised representative;		
3. A statement that the EU declaration of conformity is issued under the sole responsibility of the provider;		
4. A statement that the AI system in question is in conformity with this Regulation and, if applicable, with any other relevant Union legislation that provides for the issuing of an EU declaration of conformity;		
5. References to any relevant harmonised standards used or any other common specification in relation to which conformity is declared;		
6. Where applicable, the name and identification number of the notified body, a		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
description of the conformity assessment procedure performed and identification of the certificate issued;		
7. Place and date of issue of the declaration, name and function of the person who signed it as well as an indication for, and on behalf of whom, that person signed, signature.		
ANNEX VI CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE BASED ON INTERNAL CONTROL		
1. The conformity assessment procedure based on internal control is the conformity assessment procedure based on points 2 to 4.		
2. The provider verifies that the established quality management system is in compliance with the requirements of Article 17.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
3. The provider examines the information contained in the technical documentation in order to assess the compliance of the AI system with the relevant essential requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2.		
4. The provider also verifies that the design and development process of the AI system and its post-market monitoring as referred to in Article 61 is consistent with the technical documentation.		
ANNEX VII CONFORMITY BASED ON ASSESSMENT OF QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND ASSESSMENT OF TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION		
1. Introduction		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Conformity based on assessment of quality management system and assessment of the technical documentation is the conformity assessment procedure based on points 2 to 5.		
2. Overview		
The approved quality management system for the design, development and testing of AI systems pursuant to Article 17 shall be examined in accordance with point 3 and shall be subject to surveillance as specified in point 5. The technical documentation of the AI system shall be examined in accordance with point 4.		
3. Quality management system		
3.1. The application of the provider shall include:		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(a) the name and address of the provider and, if the application is lodged by the authorised representative, their name and address as well;		
(b) the list of AI systems covered under the same quality management system;		
(c) the technical documentation for each AI system covered under the same quality management system;		
(d) the documentation concerning the quality management system which shall cover all the aspects listed under Article 17;		
(e) a description of the procedures in place to ensure that the quality management system remains adequate and effective;		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(f) a written declaration that the same application has not been lodged with any other notified body.		
3.2. The quality management system shall be assessed by the notified body, which shall determine whether it satisfies the requirements referred to in Article 17.		
The decision shall be notified to the provider or its authorised representative.		
The notification shall contain the conclusions of the assessment of the quality management system and the reasoned assessment decision.		
3.3. The quality management system as approved shall continue to be implemented and maintained by the provider so that it remains adequate and efficient.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
3.4. Any intended change to the approved quality management system or the list of AI systems covered by the latter shall be brought to the attention of the notified body by the provider.		
The proposed changes shall be examined by the notified body, which shall decide whether the modified quality management system continues to satisfy the requirements referred to in point 3.2 or whether a reassessment is necessary.		
The notified body shall notify the provider of its decision. The notification shall contain the conclusions of the examination of the changes and the reasoned assessment decision.		
4. Control of the technical documentation.		
4.1. In addition to the application referred to in point 3, an application with a notified body of		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
their choice shall be lodged by the provider for the assessment of the technical documentation relating to the AI system which the provider intends to place on the market or put into service and which is covered by the quality management system referred to under point 3.		
4.2. The application shall include:		
(a) the name and address of the provider;		
(b) a written declaration that the same application has not been lodged with any other notified body;		
(c) the technical documentation referred to in Annex IV.		
4.3. The technical documentation shall be examined by the notified body. To this purpose, the notified body shall be granted full access to		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
the training and testing datasets used by the provider, including through application programming interfaces (API) or other appropriate means and tools enabling remote access.		
<p>4.4. In examining the technical documentation, the notified body may require that the provider supplies further evidence or carries out further tests so as to enable a proper assessment of conformity of the AI system with the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2.</p> <p>Whenever the notified body is not satisfied with the tests carried out by the provider, the notified body shall directly carry out adequate tests, as appropriate.</p>		
<p>4.5. Where necessary to assess the conformity of the high-risk AI system with the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 and upon a reasoned request, the notified body shall also be</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
granted access to the source code of the AI system.		
4.6. The decision shall be notified to the provider or its authorised representative. The notification shall contain the conclusions of the assessment of the technical documentation and the reasoned assessment decision.		
Where the AI system is in conformity with the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2, an EU technical documentation assessment certificate shall be issued by the notified body. The certificate shall indicate the name and address of the provider, the conclusions of the examination, the conditions (if any) for its validity and the data necessary for the identification of the AI system.		
The certificate and its annexes shall contain all relevant information to allow the conformity of		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
the AI system to be evaluated, and to allow for control of the AI system while in use, where applicable.		
Where the AI system is not in conformity with the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2, the notified body shall refuse to issue an EU technical documentation assessment certificate and shall inform the applicant accordingly, giving detailed reasons for its refusal.		
Where the AI system does not meet the requirement relating to the data used to train it, re-training of the AI system will be needed prior to the application for a new conformity assessment. In this case, the reasoned assessment decision of the notified body refusing to issue the EU technical documentation assessment certificate shall contain specific considerations on the quality		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
data used to train the AI system, notably on the reasons for non-compliance.		
<p>4.7. Any change to the AI system that could affect the compliance of the AI system with the requirements or its intended purpose shall be approved by the notified body which issued the EU technical documentation assessment certificate. The provider shall inform such notified body of its intention to introduce any of the above-mentioned changes or if it becomes otherwise aware of the occurrence of such changes. The intended changes shall be assessed by the notified body which shall decide whether those changes require a new conformity assessment in accordance with Article 43(4) or whether they could be addressed by means of a supplement to the EU technical documentation assessment certificate. In the latter case, the notified body shall assess the changes, notify the provider of its decision and, where the changes</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
are approved, issue to the provider a supplement to the EU technical documentation assessment certificate.		
5. Surveillance of the approved quality management system.		
5.1. The purpose of the surveillance carried out by the notified body referred to in Point 3 is to make sure that the provider duly fulfils the terms and conditions of the approved quality management system.		
5.2. For assessment purposes, the provider shall allow the notified body to access the premises where the design, development, testing of the AI systems is taking place. The provider shall further share with the notified body all necessary information.		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
<p>5.3. The notified body shall carry out periodic audits to make sure that the provider maintains and applies the quality management system and shall provide the provider with an audit report. In the context of those audits, the notified body may carry out additional tests of the AI systems for which an EU technical documentation assessment certificate was issued.</p>		
<p>ANNEX VIII</p> <p>INFORMATION TO BE SUBMITTED UPON THE REGISTRATION OF HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 51</p>		
<p>The following information shall be provided and thereafter kept up to date with regard to high-risk AI systems to be registered in accordance with Article 51.</p>		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
1. Name, address and contact details of the provider;		
2. Where submission of information is carried out by another person on behalf of the provider, the name, address and contact details of that person;		
3. Name, address and contact details of the authorised representative, where applicable;		
4. AI system trade name and any additional unambiguous reference allowing identification and traceability of the AI system;		
5. Description of the intended purpose of the AI system;		
6. Status of the AI system (on the market, or in service; no longer placed on the market/in service, recalled);		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
7. Type, number and expiry date of the certificate issued by the notified body and the name or identification number of that notified body, when applicable;		
8. A scanned copy of the certificate referred to in point 7, when applicable;		
9. Member States in which the AI system is or has been placed on the market, put into service or made available in the Union;		
10. A copy of the EU declaration of conformity referred to in Article 48;		
11. Electronic instructions for use; this information shall not be provided for high-risk AI systems in the areas of law enforcement and migration, asylum and border control		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
management referred to in Annex III, points 1, 6 and 7.		
12. URL for additional information (optional).		
ANNEX IX UNION LEGISLATION ON LARGE-SCALE IT SYSTEMS IN THE AREA OF FREEDOM, SECURITY AND JUSTICE		
1. Schengen Information System		
(a) Regulation (EU) 2018/1860 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 November 2018 on the use of the Schengen Information System for the return of illegally staying third-country nationals (OJ L 312, 7.12.2018, p. 1).		
(b) Regulation (EU) 2018/1861 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
November 2018 on the establishment, operation and use of the Schengen Information System (SIS) in the field of border checks, and amending the Convention implementing the Schengen Agreement, and amending and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1987/2006 (OJ L 312, 7.12.2018, p. 14)		
(c) Regulation (EU) 2018/1862 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 November 2018 on the establishment, operation and use of the Schengen Information System (SIS) in the field of police cooperation and judicial cooperation in criminal matters, amending and repealing Council Decision 2007/533/JHA, and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1986/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Commission Decision 2010/261/EU (OJ L 312, 7.12.2018, p. 56).		
2. Visa Information System		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
(a) Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL amending Regulation (EC) No 767/2008, Regulation (EC) No 810/2009, Regulation (EU) 2017/2226, Regulation (EU) 2016/399, Regulation XX/2018 [Interoperability Regulation], and Decision 2004/512/EC and repealing Council Decision 2008/633/JHA - COM(2018) 302 final. To be updated once the Regulation is adopted (April/May 2021) by the co-legislators.		
3. Eurodac		
(a) Amended proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL on the establishment of 'Eurodac' for the comparison of biometric data for the effective application of Regulation (EU) XXX/XXX [Regulation on Asylum and		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Migration Management] and of Regulation (EU) XXX/XXX [Resettlement Regulation], for identifying an illegally staying third-country national or stateless person and on requests for the comparison with Eurodac data by Member States' law enforcement authorities and Europol for law enforcement purposes and amending Regulations (EU) 2018/1240 and (EU) 2019/818 – COM(2020) 614 final.		
4. Entry/Exit System		
(a) Regulation (EU) 2017/2226 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 November 2017 establishing an Entry/Exit System (EES) to register entry and exit data and refusal of entry data of third-country nationals crossing the external borders of the Member States and determining the conditions for access to the EES for law enforcement purposes, and amending the Convention implementing the		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
Schengen Agreement and Regulations (EC) No 767/2008 and (EU) No 1077/2011 (OJ L 327, 9.12.2017, p. 20).		
5. European Travel Information and Authorisation System		
(a) Regulation (EU) 2018/1240 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 September 2018 establishing a European Travel Information and Authorisation System (ETIAS) and amending Regulations (EU) No 1077/2011, (EU) No 515/2014, (EU) 2016/399, (EU) 2016/1624 and (EU) 2017/2226 (OJ L 236, 19.9.2018, p. 1).		
(b) Regulation (EU) 2018/1241 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 September 2018 amending Regulation (EU) 2016/794 for the purpose of establishing a		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
European Travel Information and Authorisation System (ETIAS) (OJ L 236, 19.9.2018, p. 72).		
6. European Criminal Records Information System on third-country nationals and stateless persons		
(a) Regulation (EU) 2019/816 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 establishing a centralised system for the identification of Member States holding conviction information on third-country nationals and stateless persons (ECRIS-TCN) to supplement the European Criminal Records Information System and amending Regulation (EU) 2018/1726 (OJ L 135, 22.5.2019, p. 1).		
7. Interoperability		
(a) Regulation (EU) 2019/817 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20		

Presidency compromise text	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
May 2019 on establishing a framework for interoperability between EU information systems in the field of borders and visa (OJ L 135, 22.5.2019, p. 27).		
(b) Regulation (EU) 2019/818 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 May 2019 on establishing a framework for interoperability between EU information systems in the field of police and judicial cooperation, asylum and migration (OJ L 135, 22.5.2019, p. 85).		
	End	End