

Brussels, 03 November 2021

WK 13194/2021 INIT

LIMITE

**TELECOM** 

# **WORKING PAPER**

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

#### **CONTRIBUTION**

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

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

Commission proposal	Drafting Suggestions	Comments
2021/0106 (COD)  Proposal for a  REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN  PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL		We support the aim with the Commission's proposal of establishing a horisontal regulatory framework for AI, as this can facilitate a genuinely single market for trustworthy, human-centric, safe and secure AI.
LAYING DOWN HARMONISED RULES ON ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ACT) AND AMENDING CERTAIN UNION LEGISLATIVE ACTS		The regulatory framework must follow a risk-based, technology-neutral and proportionate approach where the level of obligations follows the level of possible harmful effects. Against this background, there is a need for a clear and operational regulatory framework that ensures citizens' trust and increases protection in society,
		without unnecessarily hampering the ability to innovate or impairing competitiveness. Therefore, we need to establish an approach, where innovation and trustworthiness are two sides of the same coin. This means striking the balance between setting the right requirements and safeguards in order to achieve trustworthy AI, while at the same time facilitating and promoting innovation.

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).

In this regard, the regulatory framework must create an internal market with coherent rules, taking into account existing legislation and not creating unnecessary administrative and financial burdens for providers and users.

Further work and discussion are needed on some of the key elements of the proposal in order to achieve the proportionate, risk-based approach.

In our view, we should start out by finding common ground in terms of the scope as well as the definition of AI. A common understanding on these aspects will be essential for reaching an agreement on the content of the rest of the proposal. We have therefore prioritised these elements in our written remarks.

Our following comments and proposals will be of a preliminary nature, as we still have a scrutiny reservation on the proposal. Furthermore, as article 1-29 contain some of the most complex articles, national coordination is still ongoing and we reserve the right to submit further comments and proposals concerning these articles at a later stage.

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

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

TITLE I	- //
	V
GENERAL PROVISIONS	
Article 1	
Subject matter	
This Regulation lays down:	
(a) harmonised rules for the placing on the	
market, the putting into service and the use of	
artificial intelligence systems ('AI systems') in	
the Union;	
(a) prohibitions of certain artificial	
intelligence practices;	

(b) specific requirements for high-risk AI	
systems and obligations for operators of such	
systems;	
(c) harmonised transparency rules for AI	
systems intended to interact with natural	
persons, emotion recognition systems and	
biometric categorisation systems, and AI	
systems used to generate or manipulate image,	
audio or video content;	
(d) rules on market monitoring and	
surveillance.	
Article 2	
Scope	

1. This Regulation applies to:		
(a) providers placing on the market or		
putting into service AI systems in the Union,		
irrespective of whether those providers are		
established within the Union or in a third		
country;		
(b) users of AI systems located within the		
Union;		
(c) providers and users of AI systems that are located in a third country, where the output produced by the system is used in the Union;		We support the objective of creating a level playing field. However, it is still unclear how article 2.1.c can be enforced in practice.
	(d) manufacturers, importers, distributors or any other third-party placing on the market, making	As a technical remark, we are questioning why article 2.1 does not apply to manufacturers,

	available on the market or putting into service  AI systems in the Union;	importers, distributors and any other third party as laid out in article 24, 26, 27 and 28.
2. For high-risk AI systems that are safety components of products or systems, or which are themselves products or systems, falling within the scope of the following acts, only		In order to classify as a high-risk system, third-party conformity assessment in the specific legislation is required. We would like to see this criterion reflected.
Article 84 of this Regulation shall apply:		
(a) Regulation (EC) 300/2008;		
(b) Regulation (EU) No 167/2013;		
(c) Regulation (EU) No 168/2013;		
(d) Directive 2014/90/EU;		
(e) Directive (EU) 2016/797;		

(f) Regulation (EU) 2018/858;		
(g) Regulation (EU) 2018/1139;		
(h) Regulation (EU) 2019/2144.		
3. This Regulation shall not apply to AI	3. This Regulation shall not apply to AI	We would like to see a clause which clearly and
systems developed or used exclusively for	systems developed or used exclusively for	effectively excludes national security from the scope.
military purposes.	military purposes.	
		Furthermore, it should be reflected that the regulation does not oblige member states or
	This Regulation shall not apply to AI when	entities to supply information where such a
	developed or used in relation to Member States'	supply of information would be contrary to national security or defence interests. Similar
	defence or national security, regardless of	wording can be found in the scope of the NIS2.
	which entity is carrying out those activities and	
	whether it is a public entity or a private entity.	

	This Regulation shall be without prejudice to actions taken by Member States for the protection of information the disclosure of which is contrary to their essential interests of national security, public security or defence.	
4. This Regulation shall not apply to public authorities in a third country nor to international organisations falling within the scope of this Regulation pursuant to paragraph 1, where those authorities or organisations use AI systems in the framework of international agreements for law enforcement and judicial cooperation with		
the Union or with one or more Member States.  5. This Regulation shall not affect the application of the provisions on the liability of		

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

intermediary service providers set out in		
Chapter II, Section IV of Directive 2000/31/EC		- //
of the European Parliament and of the Council <sup>1</sup>		
[as to be replaced by the corresponding		
provisions of the Digital Services Act].		
Article 3		
Definitions		
For the purpose of this Regulation, the		
following definitions apply:		
(1) 'artificial intelligence system' (AI	(1) 'artificial intelligence system' (AI	It is essential that we aim at a clearer and
system) means software that is developed with	system) means software that is developed with	narrower definition of AI. We are aware of the
one or more of the techniques and approaches	one or more of the techniques and approaches	complexity of the task, especially in order find a definition which can accommodate technical

\_\_

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

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

listed in Annex I and can, for a given set of human-defined objectives, generate outputs such as content, predictions, recommendations, or decisions influencing the environments they interact with; listed in Annex I and that ean, for a given set of human-defined objectives, operates with a level of autonomy and generates outputs such as content, predictions, recommendations, or decisions influencing the environments they interact with;

developments, while being precise enough to provide the necessary legal certainty. At the moment, we do not see that this objective has been fully achieved.

The properties of AI as currently defined is too broad, as it for example encompasses common statistical systems. Systems which have been around for decades and should not be considered as AI. This is especially due to the fact that the definition does not take into account that AI systems operate with a level of autonomy. This is a key characteristic which separates AI from other types of traditional systems, and which is both reflected in the definition of the OECD as well as the HLEG. This would furthermore help to specify that an AI system is an intelligent system which finds and decides on the suitable steps to achieve human-defined objectives. This is so far missing from the definition.

An accompanying recital would furthermore need to specify that systems which implements the automation of rules-based actions with defined inputs and outputs based on objective and logic criteria — meaning codified rules - would not be seen as an AI system and thereby

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).

not be within the scope of this regulation. Thereby, we clarify that all software systems enabling automated processes or decisions (ADM) are not automatically AI.

Furthermore, we are sceptical of defining AI in an annex that can be updated through delegated acts, as the definition of AI is a fundamental part of the proposal, and as changes to this definition could result in consequences which were not originally foreseen in the ordinary legislative process. Thereby, we are still assessing whether an approach where such a fundamental part can be updated through a delegated act is the right way forward. In this light, we would like the opinion of the Council Legal Service in terms of whether the definition of AI would constitute a non-essential element according to article 290 TFEU as well as if the usage of an annex will affect the assessment in this regard.

As a preliminary view of the annex 1, we as a minimum need to limit the list of techniques and approaches listed in Annex 1, cf. comments concerning Annex 1.

	It is important that we prioritize our efforts to discuss the definition in further detail and and carefully explore all possible options in order to agree on the best way forward, as agreement on this essential aspect is needed before we can meaningful decide on the content of the remaining content of the proposal.
(1) 'provider' means a natural or legal	
person, public authority, agency or other body	
that develops an AI system or that has an AI	
system developed with a view to placing it on	
the market or putting it into service under its	
own name or trademark, whether for payment or	
free of charge;	
(3) 'small-scale provider' means a provider	We are still questioning why this does not reflect
that is a micro or small enterprise within the	the Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC in its entirety. This is also relevant in subsequent

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).

meaning of Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC <sup>2</sup> ;	articles, for example article 55 which in our view should be extended to SMEs.
(4) 'user' means any natural or legal person, public authority, agency or other body using an AI system under its authority, except where the AI system is used in the course of a personal non-professional activity;	
(5) 'authorised representative' means any natural or legal person established in the Union who has received a written mandate from a provider of an AI system to, respectively, perform and carry out on its behalf the obligations and procedures established by this Regulation;	

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

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

(9) 'placing on the market' means the first	
making available of an AI system on the Union	
market;	
(10) 'making available on the market' means	
any supply of an AI system for distribution or	
use on the Union market in the course of a	
commercial activity, whether in return for	
payment or free of charge;	
(11) 'putting into service' means the supply	
of an AI system for first use directly to the user	
or for own use on the Union market for its	
intended purpose;	
(12) 'intended purpose' means the use for	
which an AI system is intended by the provider,	

including the specific context and conditions of	
use, as specified in the information supplied by	- //
the provider in the instructions for use,	
promotional or sales materials and statements,	
as well as in the technical documentation;	
(13) 'reasonably foreseeable misuse' means	
the use of an AI system in a way that is not in	
accordance with its intended purpose, but which	
may result from reasonably foreseeable human	
behaviour or interaction with other systems;	
(14) 'safety component of a product or	
system' means a component of a product or of a	
system which fulfils a safety function for that	
product or system or the failure or	

malfunctioning of which endangers the health	
and safety of persons or property;	
(15) 'instructions for use' means the	
information provided by the provider to inform	
the user of in particular an AI system's intended	
purpose and proper use, inclusive of the specific	
geographical, behavioural or functional setting	
within which the high-risk AI system is	
intended to be used;	
(16) 'recall of an AI system' means any	
measure aimed at achieving the return to the	
provider of an AI system made available to	
users;	

(17) 'withdrawal of an AI system' means any	
measure aimed at preventing the distribution,	
display and offer of an AI system;	
(18) 'performance of an AI system' means	
the ability of an AI system to achieve its	
intended purpose;	
(19) 'notifying authority' means the national	
authority responsible for setting up and carrying	
out the necessary procedures for the assessment,	
designation and notification of conformity	
assessment bodies and for their monitoring;	
(20) 'conformity assessment' means the	
process of verifying whether the requirements	
r	

set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of this Regulation		
relating to an AI system have been fulfilled;		
(21) 'conformity assessment body' means a		
body that performs third-party conformity		
assessment activities, including testing,		
certification and inspection;		
(22) 'notified body' means a conformity		
assessment body designated in accordance with		
this Regulation and other relevant Union		
harmonisation legislation;		
(23) 'substantial modification' means a	(23) 'substantial modification' means a	The definition of substantial modification is
change to the AI system following its placing on	change to the AI system following its placing on	essential in order to take into account the
the market or putting into service which affects	the market or putting into service which is not	specificities of AI. However, it should clearly specify that a substantial modification is a
the compliance of the AI system with the	foreseen by the provider and which affects the	modification which has not been foreseen by the

(24) 'CE marking of conformity' (CE	
marking) means a marking by which a provider	- //
indicates that an AI system is in conformity with	
the requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2 of	
this Regulation and other applicable Union	
legislation harmonising the conditions for the	
marketing of products ('Union harmonisation	
legislation') providing for its affixing;	
(25) 'post-market monitoring' means all	
activities carried out by providers of AI systems	
to proactively collect and review experience	
gained from the use of AI systems they place on	
the market or put into service for the purpose of	
identifying any need to immediately apply any	
necessary corrective or preventive actions;	

(26) 'market surveillance authority' means	
the national authority carrying out the activities	
and taking the measures pursuant to Regulation	
(EU) 2019/1020;	
(27) 'harmonised standard' means a	
European standard as defined in Article 2(1)(c)	
of Regulation (EU) No 1025/2012;	
(28) 'common specifications' means a	
document, other than a standard, containing	
technical solutions providing a means to,	
comply with certain requirements and	
obligations established under this Regulation;	
(29) 'training data' means data used for	
training an AI system through fitting its	

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

system before its placing on the market or putting into service;	
(32) 'input data' means data provided to or directly acquired by an AI system on the basis of which the system produces an output;	
(33) 'biometric data' means personal data resulting from specific technical processing relating to the physical, physiological or behavioural characteristics of a natural person, which allow or confirm the unique identification of that natural person, such as facial images or dactyloscopic data;	As a purely technical remark, this is the same definition as in the GDPR, and as we do not want to end up with conflicting definitions, there should just be a clear reference to the definition set out in the GDPR.
(34) 'emotion recognition system' means an AI system for the purpose of identifying or	

inferring emotions or intentions of natural persons on the basis of their biometric data;	
(35) 'biometric categorisation system' means an AI system for the purpose of assigning natural persons to specific categories, such as sex, age, hair colour, eye colour, tattoos, ethnic origin or sexual or political orientation, on the basis of their biometric data;	
(36) 'remote biometric identification system' means an AI system for the purpose of identifying natural persons at a distance through the comparison of a person's biometric data with the biometric data contained in a reference database, and without prior knowledge of the	We would like to clarify the meaning of "at distance" in order to reflect that biometric authentication/verification/closed set identification as well as a controlled environment would not classify as being remote biometric identification.

user of the AI system whether the person will be	
present and can be identified;	
	<del>//</del>
(37) 'real-time' remote biometric	
(37) "real-time" remote biometric	
identification system' means a remote biometric	
identification system whereby the capturing of	
biometric data, the comparison and the	
identification all occur without a significant	
delay. This comprises not only instant	
identification, but also limited short delays in	
order to avoid circumvention.	
(38) "post' remote biometric identification	
system' means a remote biometric identification	
system other than a 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification system;	

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

prevention, investigation, detection or	
prosecution of criminal offences or the	
execution of criminal penalties, including the	
safeguarding against and the prevention of	
threats to public security;	
(41) 'law enforcement' means activities	
carried out by law enforcement authorities for	
the prevention, investigation, detection or	
prosecution of criminal offences or the	
execution of criminal penalties, including the	
safeguarding against and the prevention of	
threats to public security;	
(42) 'national supervisory authority' means	
the authority to which a Member State assigns	
the responsibility for the implementation and	

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

(a) the death of a person or serious damage	
to a person's health, to property or the	
environment,	
(b) a serious and irreversible disruption of	
the management and operation of critical	
infrastructure.	
Article 4	
Amendments to Annex I	
The Commission is empowered to adopt	As stated in relation to our comments related to
delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to	the definition of AI, we are still sceptical of amending the definition of AI through a
amend the list of techniques and approaches	delegated act and would like the opinion of the
listed in Annex I, in order to update that list to	Council Legal Service in this regard.
market and technological developments on the	

basis of characteristics that are similar to the	
techniques and approaches listed therein.	- 1
	J.
TITLE II	
PROHIBITED ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	
PRACTICES	
Article 5	In general, we are supportive of identifying and having prohibited practices in the exceptional case where a specific use of AI may result in serious, irreparable harm to individuals or society or where the use is inconsistent with applicable law or fundamental rights, and where this cannot be mitigated or addressed in other ways.
	However, article 5 seems to contain very broad categories of practices. In our view, we need to follow the proportionate, risk-based approach, meaning that we need to define and further delimit these categories in order to only target

entire proposal, piedse do so in the row containing the title of the pi	open (in me e a commi)
	those practices which can lead to unacceptable risk and which are not adresseed by other means, for example existing legislation.
	In general, we find that this article deserves further discussion and improvement.
The following artificial intelligence practices shall be prohibited:	As a technical remark, in recital 16, it is stated that research for legitimate purposes should not be stifled by the prohibition, "if such research does not amount to use of the AI system in human-machine relations that exposes natural persons to harm and such research is carried out in accordance with recognized ethical standards for scientific research." We would need to clarify that both embedded as well as non-embedded systems would be covered by this.  Furthermore, we find that such exclusion of research activities should not only cover article
	5, but should apply in all cases of AI.

(a) the placing on the market, putting into service or use of an AI system that deploys subliminal techniques beyond a person's consciousness in order to materially distort a person's behaviour in a manner that causes or is	As a technical remark, we find that subliminal techniques should be defined, as it is an essential concept in order to understand this article.
likely to cause that person or another person	
physical or psychological harm;	
(b) the placing on the market, putting into	
service or use of an AI system that exploits any	
of the vulnerabilities of a specific group of	
persons due to their age, physical or mental	
disability, in order to materially distort the	
behaviour of a person pertaining to that group in	
a manner that causes or is likely to cause that	
person or another person physical or	
psychological harm;	

(c) the placing on the market, putting into	
service or use of AI systems by public	
authorities or on their behalf for the evaluation	
or classification of the trustworthiness of natural	
persons over a certain period of time based on	
their social behaviour or known or predicted	
personal or personality characteristics, with the	
social score leading to either or both of the	
following:	
(i) detrimental or unfavourable treatment of	
certain natural persons or whole groups thereof	
in social contexts which are unrelated to the	
contexts in which the data was originally	
generated or collected;	

(ii) detrimental or unfavourable treatment of	
certain natural persons or whole groups thereof	
that is unjustified or disproportionate to their	
social behaviour or its gravity;	
(d) the use of 'real-time' remote biometric	It is essential that the Danish opt-out on justice
identification systems in publicly accessible	and Home Affairs is clearly respected in the regulation. Therefore, recital 26 should be
spaces for the purpose of law enforcement,	extended to also cover article 5, paragraph 4.
unless and in as far as such use is strictly	
necessary for one of the following objectives:	
(i) the targeted search for specific potential	
victims of crime, including missing children;	
(ii) the prevention of a specific, substantial	
and imminent threat to the life or physical safety	
of natural persons or of a terrorist attack;	

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).

(iii) the detection, localisation, identification	
or prosecution of a perpetrator or suspect of a	
criminal offence referred to in Article 2(2) of	
Council Framework Decision 2002/584/JHA <sup>3</sup>	
and punishable in the Member State concerned	
by a custodial sentence or a detention order for a	
maximum period of at least three years, as	
determined by the law of that Member State.	
2. The use of 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification systems in publicly accessible	
spaces for the purpose of law enforcement for	
any of the objectives referred to in paragraph 1	

\_

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

point d) shall take into account the following	
elements:	
(a) the nature of the situation giving rise to	
the possible use, in particular the seriousness,	
probability and scale of the harm caused in the	
absence of the use of the system;	
(b) the consequences of the use of the	
system for the rights and freedoms of all persons	
concerned, in particular the seriousness,	
probability and scale of those consequences.	
In addition, the use of 'real-time' remote	
biometric identification systems in publicly	
accessible spaces for the purpose of law	
enforcement for any of the objectives referred to	

in paragraph 1 point d) shall comply with	
necessary and proportionate safeguards and	
conditions in relation to the use, in particular as	
regards the temporal, geographic and personal	
limitations.	
3. As regards paragraphs 1, point (d) and 2,	
each individual use for the purpose of law	
enforcement of a 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification system in publicly accessible	
spaces shall be subject to a prior authorisation	
granted by a judicial authority or by an	
independent administrative authority of the	
Member State in which the use is to take place,	
issued upon a reasoned request and in	
accordance with the detailed rules of national	
law referred to in paragraph 4. However, in a	

duly justified situation of urgency, the use of the	
system may be commenced without an	
authorisation and the authorisation may be	
requested only during or after the use.	
The competent judicial or administrative	
authority shall only grant the authorisation	
where it is satisfied, based on objective evidence	
or clear indications presented to it, that the use	
of the 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification system at issue is necessary for	
and proportionate to achieving one of the	
objectives specified in paragraph 1, point (d), as	
identified in the request. In deciding on the	
request, the competent judicial or administrative	
authority shall take into account the elements	
referred to in paragraph 2.	

4. A Member State may decide to provide	
for the possibility to fully or partially authorise	
the use of 'real-time' remote biometric	
identification systems in publicly accessible	
spaces for the purpose of law enforcement	
within the limits and under the conditions listed	
in paragraphs 1, point (d), 2 and 3. That	
Member State shall lay down in its national law	
the necessary detailed rules for the request,	
issuance and exercise of, as well as supervision	
relating to, the authorisations referred to in	
paragraph 3. Those rules shall also specify in	
respect of which of the objectives listed in	
paragraph 1, point (d), including which of the	
criminal offences referred to in point (iii)	
thereof, the competent authorities may be	

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

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

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

Deadline for comments: 26 October 2021

authorised to use those systems for the purpose	
• • •	
of law enforcement.	
	Y .
TITLE III	
HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS	
Chapter 1	
CLASSIFICATION OF AI SYSTEMS AS	
HIGH-RISK	
Article 6	It is appropriate to apply stricter requirements for
Classification rules for high-risk AI systems	the development and use of AI which may entail
Classification rates for high risk rif systems	high risk for individuals and society, but we must
	clearly limit the category to applications that may
	cause such high risk.

	In our view, further work is needed on setting the right benchmark for what is to be considered high-risk AI – also when it comes to setting a clear methodology for evaluating future use cases. Only AI systems which poses significant risk for serious harm or violation of rights where the result would be difficult to reverse should be considered high-risk.
Irrespective of whether an AI system is	
placed on the market or put into service	
independently from the products referred to in	
points (a) and (b), that AI system shall be	
considered high-risk where both of the	
following conditions are fulfilled:	
(a) the AI system is intended to be used as a	
safety component of a product, or is itself a	

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

Article 7	
Amendments to Annex III	
1. The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to update the list in Annex III by adding high-risk AI systems where both of the following conditions are fulfilled:	We are supportive of establishing a process for updating the high-risk category in order to take into account future technological and market developments. However, any potential, future adjustment of the category must always take place on the basis of a concrete risk assessment as well as clear and predictable criteria. At the moment, we still find that the criteria laid out in the regulation could be further improved as well as specified further in the rectials.  Also, we are questioning the choice of instrument in terms of a delegated act, as the potential mandate for these amendments seems quite broad with the current formulations and could thereby result in greater changes to the scope. In this light, we would like the opinion of the Council Legal Service in terms of whether the
	scope. In this light, we would like the opinion of the Council Legal Service in terms of whether the annex III and the addition of high-risk systems would constitute a non-essential element according to article 290 TFEU.

entire proposat, pieuse do so in the row containing the title of the proposat (in the srd column).	
	In this connection, we also see a need for greater involvement of the member states, including the direct involvement of the European Board for AI in the risk assessment
	Furthermore, a process for updating the category should also allow for both adjustments and deletions. Otherwise, the list of systems will only become longer, as we go along — and technological and market developments could merit both additions as well as adjustments and deletions.
(a) the AI systems are intended to be used in	
any of the areas listed in points 1 to 8 of Annex	
III;	
(b) the AI systems pose a risk of harm to the	The benchmark of "equivalent to or greater to" is
health and safety, or a risk of adverse impact on	still unclear to us, especially as the use cases listed in annex 3 are very diverse.

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

(b) the extent to which an AI system has	
been used or is likely to be used;	
(c) the extent to which the use of an AI	
system has already caused harm to the health	
and safety or adverse impact on the fundamental	
rights or has given rise to significant concerns in	
relation to the materialisation of such harm or	
adverse impact, as demonstrated by reports or	
documented allegations submitted to national	
competent authorities;	
(d) the potential extent of such harm or such	
adverse impact, in particular in terms of its	
intensity and its ability to affect a plurality of	
persons;	

(e) the extent to which potentially harmed or		
adversely impacted persons are dependent on		- //
the outcome produced with an AI system, in		
particular because for practical or legal reasons		
it is not reasonably possible to opt-out from that		
outcome;		
(f) the extent to which potentially harmed or		
adversely impacted persons are in a vulnerable		
position in relation to the user of an AI system,		
in particular due to an imbalance of power,		
knowledge, economic or social circumstances,		
or age;		
(g) the extent to which the outcome		
produced with an AI system is easily reversible,		
whereby outcomes having an impact on the		
	l ·	

health or safety of persons shall not be	
considered as easily reversible;	
(h) the extent to which existing Union	
legislation provides for:	
(i) effective measures of redress in relation	
to the risks posed by an AI system, with the	
exclusion of claims for damages;	
(ii) effective measures to prevent or	
substantially minimise those risks.	
Chapter 2	
REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGH-RISK AI	As a general remark in terms of the requirements,
SYSTEMS	it is positive to see an approach based on the New Legislative Framework, meaning a principle-

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).

based approach which leaves certain room for maneuver for the specific technical solution as well as usage of standards in relation to compliance.

However, we find that there is room for further operationalization of the requirement. This is a prerequisite for facilitating an effective compliance procedure as well as enforcement. We have highlighted in some of the requirements, where operationalization is especially important, but we find that this is necessary in all of the requirements.

Furthermore, preparation of practical guidance as well as standards which needs to be available before the application of the regulation are also essential elements. This should be specifically reflected in the regulation. For example, article 58 concerning the task of the AI Board could be further specified in terms of needed guidance.

In that respect, it is also essential to develop practical guidance tools in order to increase legal certainty. One practical tool would be a

	horizontal assessment tool, especially targeted SMEs, which would enable providers and users quickly to clarify whether they would be subject to the requirements of high-risk AI.
Article 8	
Compliance with the requirements	
1. High-risk AI systems shall comply with	
the requirements established in this Chapter.	
2. The intended purpose of the high-risk AI	
system and the risk management system referred	
to in Article 9 shall be taken into account when	
ensuring compliance with those requirements.	
Article 9	
Risk management system	

1. A risk management system shall be	- //
established, implemented, documented and	
maintained in relation to high-risk AI systems.	
2. The risk management system shall	It is unclear what is meant by a lifecycle which
consist of a continuous iterative process run	should be defined in the regulation.
throughout the entire lifecycle of a high-risk AI	Furthermore, the requirement to perform regular
system, requiring regular systematic updating. It	systematic updating needs to be specified.
shall comprise the following steps:	
(a) identification and analysis of the known	
and foreseeable risks associated with each high-	
risk AI system;	
(b) estimation and evaluation of the risks	
that may emerge when the high-risk AI system	

is used in accordance with its intended purpose and under conditions of reasonably foreseeable	
misuse;	
(c) evaluation of other possibly arising risks	
based on the analysis of data gathered from the	
post-market monitoring system referred to in	
Article 61;	
(d) adoption of suitable risk management	
measures in accordance with the provisions of	
the following paragraphs.	
3. The risk management measures referred	It is still unclear to us how generally
to in paragraph 2, point (d) shall give due	acknowledge state of the art should be interpreted as well as how this affects the different
consideration to the effects and possible	requirements. Therefore, we would ask for
interactions resulting from the combined	further specification of this concept.

application of the requirements set out in this	Furthermore, it would be useful with further
Chapter 2. They shall take into account the	clarification on how the provider is required to consider the effects and possible interactions
generally acknowledged state of the art,	from the combined application of the
including as reflected in relevant harmonised	requirements.
standards or common specifications.	
4. The risk management measures referred	
to in paragraph 2, point (d) shall be such that	
any residual risk associated with each hazard as	
well as the overall residual risk of the high-risk	
AI systems is judged acceptable, provided that	
the high-risk AI system is used in accordance	
with its intended purpose or under conditions of	
reasonably foreseeable misuse. Those residual	
risks shall be communicated to the user.	

In identifying the most appropriate risk management measures, the following shall be	
ensured:	
(a) elimination or reduction of risks as far as possible through adequate design and development;	It is unclear what is meant by adequate design and development which could be further clarified in a recital.
(b) where appropriate, implementation of	
adequate mitigation and control measures in	
relation to risks that cannot be eliminated;	
(c) provision of adequate information	
pursuant to Article 13, in particular as regards	
the risks referred to in paragraph 2, point (b) of	
this Article, and, where appropriate, training to	
users.	

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

6. Testing procedures shall be suitable to	
achieve the intended purpose of the AI system	
and do not need to go beyond what is necessary	
to achieve that purpose.	
7. The testing of the high-risk AI systems	
shall be performed, as appropriate, at any point	
in time throughout the development process,	
and, in any event, prior to the placing on the	
market or the putting into service. Testing shall	
be made against preliminarily defined metrics	
and probabilistic thresholds that are appropriate	
to the intended purpose of the high-risk AI	
system.	
8. When implementing the risk	
management system described in paragraphs 1	

to 7, specific consideration shall be given to	
whether the high-risk AI system is likely to be	
accessed by or have an impact on children.	
9. For credit institutions regulated by	
Directive 2013/36/EU, the aspects described in	
paragraphs 1 to 8 shall be part of the risk	
management procedures established by those	
institutions pursuant to Article 74 of that	
Directive.	
Article 10	It is essential to set tangible data requirements for
Data and data governance	the development and use of high-risk AI. AI is only as useful, as the data which it is trained upon. Data quality is essential, especially due to the complexity of an AI system as well as its scalability.

	However, at the same time, the article - as currently phrased - is rather ambiguous, thereby, leaving it difficult for providers, especially the SMEs, to know when they are in compliance with the article's requirements.
High-risk AI systems which make use of	
techniques involving the training of models with	
data shall be developed on the basis of training,	
validation and testing data sets that meet the	
quality criteria referred to in paragraphs 2 to 5.	
2. Training, validation and testing data sets	
shall be subject to appropriate data governance	
and management practices. Those practices shall	
concern in particular,	
(a) the relevant design choices;	

(b) data collection;	
	<b>♥</b>
(c) relevant data preparation processing	
operations, such as annotation, labelling,	
cleaning, enrichment and aggregation;	
(d) the formulation of relevant assumptions,	
notably with respect to the information that the	
data are supposed to measure and represent;	
(e) a prior assessment of the availability,	
quantity and suitability of the data sets that are	
needed;	
(f) examination in view of possible biases;	

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

the identification of any possible data (g) gaps or shortcomings, and how those gaps and shortcomings can be addressed. Training, validation and testing data sets 1. Training, validation and testing data sets shall The Commission has specified that the objective is not to achieve data sets which for example are shall be relevant, representative, free of errors ensure a level of relevance, representativeness free of errors - which in our view would be and accuracy that is appropriate to the intended and complete. They shall have the appropriate impossible to attain – but that this should be seen in connection with the state of art. In this light, statistical properties, including, where purpose of the system, taking into account, as the article needs to be clarified. far as possible, available state-of-the art. shall applicable, as regards the persons or groups of Furthermore, the quality and appropriateness of persons on which the high-risk AI system is be relevant, representative, free of errors and the data sets should be measured against the intended to be used. These characteristics of the complete. They shall have the appropriate intended purpose of the system. data sets may be met at the level of individual statistical properties, including, where applicable, as regards the persons or groups of data sets or a combination thereof. persons on which the high-risk AI system is intended to be used. These characteristics of the data sets may be met at the level of individual

data sets or a combination thereof.

4. Training, validation and testing data sets	
shall take into account, to the extent required by	
the intended purpose, the characteristics or	
elements that are particular to the specific	
geographical, behavioural or functional setting	
within which the high-risk AI system is	
intended to be used.	
5. To the extent that it is strictly necessary	
for the purposes of ensuring bias monitoring,	
detection and correction in relation to the high-	
risk AI systems, the providers of such systems	
may process special categories of personal data	
referred to in Article 9(1) of Regulation (EU)	
2016/679, Article 10 of Directive (EU)	
2016/680 and Article 10(1) of Regulation (EU)	

2018/1725, subject to appropriate safeguards for	
the fundamental rights and freedoms of natural	* //
persons, including technical limitations on the	
re-use and use of state-of-the-art security and	
privacy-preserving measures, such as	
pseudonymisation, or encryption where	
anonymisation may significantly affect the	
purpose pursued.	
6. Appropriate data governance and	As a technical remark, we are still unsure what
management practices shall apply for the	this article is meant to cover and why this only partly covers article 10.
development of high-risk AI systems other than	r 5
those which make use of techniques involving	
the training of models in order to ensure that	
those high-risk AI systems comply with	
paragraph 2.	

Article 11	
Technical documentation	
	J.
1. The technical documentation of a high-	
risk AI system shall be drawn up before that	
system is placed on the market or put into	
service and shall be kept up-to date.	
The technical documentation shall be drawn up	
in such a way to demonstrate that the high-risk	
AI system complies with the requirements set	
out in this Chapter and provide national	
competent authorities and notified bodies with	
all the necessary information to assess the	
compliance of the AI system with those	
requirements. It shall contain, at a minimum, the	
elements set out in Annex IV.	

2. Where a high-risk AI system related to a		
product, to which the legal acts listed in Annex		
II, section A apply, is placed on the market or		
put into service one single technical		
documentation shall be drawn up containing all		
the information set out in Annex IV as well as		
the information required under those legal acts.		
3. The Commission is empowered to adopt	The Commission is empowered to adopt	We find that annex IV should be amended
delegated acts in accordance with Article 73 to	implementing acts delegated acts in accordance	through an implementing act, as the technical documentation relates directly to the
amend Annex IV where necessary to ensure	with Article 73 to amend Annex IV where	implementation and compliance of the high-risk
that, in the light of technical progress, the	necessary to ensure that, in the light of technical	requirements. Requirements which will not change in the process, therefore, implementing
technical documentation provides all the	progress, the technical documentation provides	act is in our view the right instrument.
necessary information to assess the compliance	all the necessary information to assess the	
of the system with the requirements set out in	compliance of the system with the requirements	
this Chapter.	set out in this Chapter.	

Article 12	
Record-keeping	
1. High-risk AI systems shall be designed and developed with capabilities enabling the automatic recording of events ('logs') while the	It is still unclear to us what the logs should consist of in order for the provider to comply with this requirement. A list of minimum elements should be set out in the article.
high-risk AI systems is operating. Those logging capabilities shall conform to recognised standards or common specifications.	Furthermore, we are questioning why conformity with recognised standards or common specifications are explicitly mentioned in this article and not in other articles describing requirements for high-risk AI. Firstly, these are essential for operationalising most of the high-risk requirements. Secondly, by specifying that logging capabilities shall conform with these, recognised standards or common specifications would no longer be voluntary.
2. The logging capabilities shall ensure a level of traceability of the AI system's	

functioning throughout its lifecycle that is	
appropriate to the intended purpose of the	
system.	
3. In particular, logging capabilities shall	
enable the monitoring of the operation of the	
high-risk AI system with respect to the	
occurrence of situations that may result in the	
AI system presenting a risk within the meaning	
of Article 65(1) or lead to a substantial	
modification, and facilitate the post-market	
monitoring referred to in Article 61.	
4. For high-risk AI systems referred to in	
paragraph 1, point (a) of Annex III, the logging	
capabilities shall provide, at a minimum:	

() 1: 0.1 : 1.0 1 0.1	
(a) recording of the period of each use of the	
system (start date and time and end date and	• //
time of each use);	
(b) the reference database against which	
input data has been checked by the system;	
(c) the input data for which the search has	
led to a match;	
(d) the identification of the natural persons	
involved in the verification of the results, as	
referred to in Article 14 (5).	
Article 13	
Transparency and provision of information to	
users	

1. High-risk AI systems shall be designed	- //
and developed in such a way to ensure that their	
operation is sufficiently transparent to enable	
users to interpret the system's output and use it	
appropriately. An appropriate type and degree	
of transparency shall be ensured, with a view to	
achieving compliance with the relevant	
obligations of the user and of the provider set	
out in Chapter 3 of this Title.	
2. High-risk AI systems shall be	It could be useful with further clarification on the
accompanied by instructions for use in an	information required to be presented to the user.  A template could also prove helpful in this
appropriate digital format or otherwise that	regard.
include concise, complete, correct and clear	
information that is relevant, accessible and	
comprehensible to users.	

3. The information referred to in paragraph	
2 shall specify:	
(a) the identity and the contact details of the	
provider and, where applicable, of its authorised	
representative;	
(b) the characteristics, capabilities and	
limitations of performance of the high-risk AI	
system, including:	
(i) its intended purpose;	
(ii) the level of accuracy, robustness and	
cybersecurity referred to in Article 15 against	
which the high-risk AI system has been tested	

and validated and which can be expected, and	
any known and foreseeable circumstances that	- //
may have an impact on that expected level of	
accuracy, robustness and cybersecurity;	
(iii) any known or foreseeable circumstance,	
related to the use of the high-risk AI system in	
accordance with its intended purpose or under	
conditions of reasonably foreseeable misuse,	
which may lead to risks to the health and safety	
or fundamental rights;	
(iv) its performance as regards the persons or	
groups of persons on which the system is	
intended to be used;	

(v) when appropriate, specifications for the	
input data, or any other relevant information in	• //
terms of the training, validation and testing data	
sets used, taking into account the intended	
purpose of the AI system.	
(c) the changes to the high-risk AI system	
and its performance which have been pre-	
determined by the provider at the moment of the	
initial conformity assessment, if any;	
(d) the human oversight measures referred	
to in Article 14, including the technical	
measures put in place to facilitate the	
interpretation of the outputs of AI systems by	
the users;	

(e) the expected lifetime of the high-risk AI	
system and any necessary maintenance and care	* //
measures to ensure the proper functioning of	
that AI system, including as regards software	
updates.	
Article 14	When categorized as high-risk AI, we are
Human oversight	generally positive towards having a requirement of appropriate and proportionate involvement of human oversight in the specific AI application, meaning that ability to intervene, reverse the output etc.
	However, as currently outlined, it is unclear how this requirement should work in practice or how providers and users can comply with this requirement.
	For example, it will be difficult for providers to design measures which enables the individual to whom human oversight is assigned to fully understand the capacities and limitations. Such

	aspect would also be interlinked with the competences of that specific individual.
	A. C.
High-risk AI systems shall be designed	
and developed in such a way, including with	
appropriate human-machine interface tools, that	
they can be effectively overseen by natural	
persons during the period in which the AI	
system is in use.	
2. Human oversight shall aim at preventing	
or minimising the risks to health, safety or	
fundamental rights that may emerge when a	
high-risk AI system is used in accordance with	
its intended purpose or under conditions of	
reasonably foreseeable misuse, in particular	
when such risks persist notwithstanding the	

application of other requirements set out in this	
Chapter.	
3. Human oversight shall be ensured	
through either one or all of the following	
measures:	
(a) identified and built, when technically	
feasible, into the high-risk AI system by the	
provider before it is placed on the market or put	
into service;	
(b) identified by the provider before placing	
the high-risk AI system on the market or putting	
it into service and that are appropriate to be	
implemented by the user.	

4. The measures referred to in paragraph 3	
shall enable the individuals to whom human	
oversight is assigned to do the following, as	
appropriate to the circumstances:	
(a) fully understand the capacities and	
limitations of the high-risk AI system and be	
able to duly monitor its operation, so that signs	
of anomalies, dysfunctions and unexpected	
performance can be detected and addressed as	
soon as possible;	
(b) remain aware of the possible tendency of	
automatically relying or over-relying on the	
output produced by a high-risk AI system	
('automation bias'), in particular for high-risk	
AI systems used to provide information or	

recommendations for decisions to be taken by	
natural persons;	
(c) be able to correctly interpret the high-	
risk AI system's output, taking into account in	
particular the characteristics of the system and	
the interpretation tools and methods available;	
(d) be able to decide, in any particular	
situation, not to use the high-risk AI system or	
otherwise disregard, override or reverse the	
output of the high-risk AI system;	
(e) be able to intervene on the operation of	
the high-risk AI system or interrupt the system	
through a "stop" button or a similar procedure.	

5. For high-risk AI systems referred to in	
point 1(a) of Annex III, the measures referred to	* //
in paragraph 3 shall be such as to ensure that, in	
addition, no action or decision is taken by the	
user on the basis of the identification resulting	
from the system unless this has been verified	
and confirmed by at least two natural persons.	
Article 15	
Accuracy, robustness and cybersecurity	
1. High-risk AI systems shall be designed	
and developed in such a way that they achieve,	
in the light of their intended purpose, an	
appropriate level of accuracy, robustness and	
cybersecurity, and perform consistently in those	
respects throughout their lifecycle.	

2. The levels of accuracy and the relevant	
accuracy metrics of high-risk AI systems shall	
be declared in the accompanying instructions of	
use.	
3. High-risk AI systems shall be resilient as	
regards errors, faults or inconsistencies that may	
occur within the system or the environment in	
which the system operates, in particular due to	
their interaction with natural persons or other	
systems.	
The robustness of high-risk AI systems may be	
achieved through technical redundancy	
solutions, which may include backup or fail-safe	
plans.	

High-risk AI systems that continue to learn after being placed on the market or put into service shall be developed in such a way to ensure that possibly biased outputs due to outputs used as an input for future operations ('feedback loops')	This seems to establish a separate category of AI, instead we find that this could be a characterisctic in terms of defining AI. The HLEG also states in their updated definition that "AI systems can also be designed to learn to adapt their behaviour by analysing how the environment is affected by their previous actions."
are duly addressed with appropriate mitigation measures.	Further, this characteristic could also be relevant for other requirements besides article 15.
4. High-risk AI systems shall be resilient as	
regards attempts by unauthorised third parties to	
alter their use or performance by exploiting the system vulnerabilities.	
The technical solutions aimed at ensuring the	
cybersecurity of high-risk AI systems shall be	

appropriate to the relevant circumstances and the risks.	
1110 111011	
The technical solutions to address AI specific	
vulnerabilities shall include, where appropriate,	
measures to prevent and control for attacks	
trying to manipulate the training dataset ('data	
poisoning'), inputs designed to cause the model	
to make a mistake ('adversarial examples'), or	
model flaws.	
Chapter 3	
OBLIGATIONS OF PROVIDERS AND	We are supportive of differentiating obligations
USERS OF HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS AND	depending on the specific placement in the value chain. However, when it comes to the obligations
OTHER PARTIES	of the provider and the user, the interface
	between the two is not always clear.

	Furthermore, we are still assessing whether we need a more nuanced distribution of roles – and thereby a more nuanced distribution of obligations - in order to reflect the AI ecosystem, where there are different routes of developing an AI system, for example by building on top of existing systems, using open-source code development etc.
Article 16	
Obligations of providers of high-risk AI systems	
Providers of high-risk AI systems shall:	
(a) ensure that their high-risk AI systems are compliant with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title;	Some of these requirements such as human oversight are addressed towards the user. This should be reflected in order not to make the provider responsible for all requirements.

(b) have a quality management system in	
place which complies with Article 17;	
(c) draw-up the technical documentation of	
the high-risk AI system;	
(d) when under their control, keep the logs	We find it necessary to define what is meant by
automatically generated by their high-risk AI	under their control.
systems;	
(e) ensure that the high-risk AI system	
undergoes the relevant conformity assessment	
procedure, prior to its placing on the market or	
putting into service;	
(f) comply with the registration obligations	
referred to in Article 51;	

(g) take the necessary corrective actions, if		
the high-risk AI system is not in conformity		
with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of		
this Title;		
	h) indicate their name, registered trade name or registered trade mark, and the address at which they can be contacted on the high-risk AI system or, where that is not possible, on its packaging or its accompanying documentation, as applicable;	As a technical remark, importers are obligated to provide this information, cf. article 26(3) which should be also be relevant in the case of a provider. Otherwise this information would not be accesible, unless an importer can be identified.
(h) inform the national competent		
authorities of the Member States in which they		
made the AI system available or put it into		
service and, where applicable, the notified body		
of the non-compliance and of any corrective		
actions taken;		

(i) to affix the CE marking to their high-risk	• //
AI systems to indicate the conformity with this	
Regulation in accordance with Article 49;	
(j) upon request of a national competent	
authority, demonstrate the conformity of the	
high-risk AI system with the requirements set	
out in Chapter 2 of this Title.	
Article 17	
Quality management system	
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	
put a quality management system in place that	
ensures compliance with this Regulation. That	
system shall be documented in a systematic and	

orderly manner in the form of written policies,	
procedures and instructions, and shall include at	
least the following aspects:	
(a) a strategy for regulatory compliance,	
including compliance with conformity	
assessment procedures and procedures for the	
management of modifications to the high-risk	
AI system;	
(b) techniques, procedures and systematic	
actions to be used for the design, design control	
and design verification of the high-risk AI	
system;	
(c) techniques, procedures and systematic	
actions to be used for the development, quality	

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

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

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

(m) an accountability framework setting out	* //
the responsibilities of the management and other	
staff with regard to all aspects listed in this	
paragraph.	
2. The implementation of aspects referred	
to in paragraph 1 shall be proportionate to the	
size of the provider's organisation.	
3. For providers that are credit institutions	
regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU, the	
obligation to put a quality management system	
in place shall be deemed to be fulfilled by	
complying with the rules on internal governance	
arrangements, processes and mechanisms	
pursuant to Article 74 of that Directive. In that	

context, any harmonised standards referred to in	
Article 40 of this Regulation shall be taken into	
account.	
Article 18	
Obligation to draw up technical documentation	
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	
draw up the technical documentation referred to	
in Article 11 in accordance with Annex IV.	
2. Providers that are credit institutions	
regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU shall	
maintain the technical documentation as part of	
the documentation concerning internal	
governance, arrangements, processes and	

mechanisms pursuant to Article 74 of that	
Directive.	- //
Article 19	
Conformity assessment	
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	
ensure that their systems undergo the relevant	
conformity assessment procedure in accordance	
with Article 43, prior to their placing on the	
market or putting into service. Where the	
compliance of the AI systems with the	
requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title	
has been demonstrated following that	
conformity assessment, the providers shall draw	
up an EU declaration of conformity in	
accordance with Article 48 and affix the CE	

marking of conformity in accordance with Article 49.	
2. For high-risk AI systems referred to in	
point 5(b) of Annex III that are placed on the	
market or put into service by providers that are	
credit institutions regulated by Directive	
2013/36/EU, the conformity assessment shall be	
carried out as part of the procedure referred to in	
Articles 97 to 101 of that Directive.	
Article 20	
Automatically generated logs	
1. Providers of high-risk AI systems shall	
keep the logs automatically generated by their	
high-risk AI systems, to the extent such logs are	

under their control by virtue of a contractual	
arrangement with the user or otherwise by law.	
The logs shall be kept for a period that is	
appropriate in the light of the intended purpose	
of high-risk AI system and applicable legal	
obligations under Union or national law.	
2. Providers that are credit institutions	
regulated by Directive 2013/36/EU shall	
maintain the logs automatically generated by	
their high-risk AI systems as part of the	
documentation under Articles 74 of that	
Directive.	
Article 21	
Corrective actions	

Providers of high-risk AI systems which	As a technical remark, we find it useful to extend
consider or have reason to consider that a high-	this obligation, so that users would also be informed about such considerations of risks.
risk AI system which they have placed on the	informed dood such considerations of risks.
market or put into service is not in conformity	
with this Regulation shall immediately take the	
necessary corrective actions to bring that system	
into conformity, to withdraw it or to recall it, as	
appropriate. They shall inform the distributors	
of the high-risk AI system in question and,	
where applicable, the authorised representative	
and importers accordingly.	
Article 22	
Duty of information	
Where the high-risk AI system presents a risk	
within the meaning of Article 65(1) and that risk	

·	
is known to the provider of the system, that	
provider shall immediately inform the national	
competent authorities of the Member States in	
which it made the system available and, where	
applicable, the notified body that issued a	
certificate for the high-risk AI system, in	
particular of the non-compliance and of any	
corrective actions taken.	
Article 23	
Cooperation with competent authorities	
Providers of high-risk AI systems shall, upon	In order not to subject a provider to 27 different
request by a national competent authority,	request, it could be relevant to have some form of
provide that authority with all the information	coordination and sharing of best practice between member states and enforcement
and documentation necessary to demonstrate the	guidance from the Commission in due time
conformity of the high-risk AI system with the	before the regulation is applicable.

requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title, in an official Union language determined by the Member State concerned. Upon a reasoned request from a national competent authority, providers shall also give that authority access to the logs automatically generated by the high-risk AI system, to the extent such logs are under their control by virtue of a contractual arrangement with the user or otherwise by law.	Furthermore, it would be relevant to stipulate format as well as level of abstraction when it comes to the information and documentation, as this could be necessary in order to validate the documentation.
Article 24 Obligations of product manufacturers	
Where a high-risk AI system related to products to which the legal acts listed in Annex II, section A, apply, is placed on the market or put into service together with the product	As a technical remark, this seems to refer more broadly to the products contained in the legal acts in annex II. However, it should specify that it is a product which is required to undergo third-party assessment.

manufactured in accordance with those legal	
acts and under the name of the product	
manufacturer, the manufacturer of the product	
shall take the responsibility of the compliance of	
the AI system with this Regulation and, as far as	
the AI system is concerned, have the same	
obligations imposed by the present Regulation	
on the provider.	
Article 25	
Authorised representatives	
1. Prior to making their systems available	
on the Union market, where an importer cannot	
be identified, providers established outside the	
Union shall, by written mandate, appoint an	

authorised representative which is established in	
the Union.	
2. The authorised representative shall	
perform the tasks specified in the mandate	
received from the provider. The mandate shall	
empower the authorised representative to carry	
out the following tasks:	
(a) keep a copy of the EU declaration of	
conformity and the technical documentation at	
the disposal of the national competent	
authorities and national authorities referred to in	
Article 63(7);	
(b) provide a national competent authority,	
upon a reasoned request, with all the	

information and documentation necessary to	
demonstrate the conformity of a high-risk AI	
system with the requirements set out in Chapter	
2 of this Title, including access to the logs	
automatically generated by the high-risk AI	
system to the extent such logs are under the	
control of the provider by virtue of a contractual	
arrangement with the user or otherwise by law;	
(c) cooperate with competent national	
authorities, upon a reasoned request, on any	
action the latter takes in relation to the high-risk	
AI system.	
Article 26	
Obligations of importers	

1. Before placing a high-risk AI system on		
the market, importers of such system shall		
ensure that:		
(a) the appropriate conformity assessment		
procedure has been carried out by the provider		
of that AI system		
(b) the provider has drawn up the technical		
documentation in accordance with Annex IV;		
(c) the system bears the required conformity		
marking and is accompanied by the required		
documentation and instructions of use.		
	d) the provider has indicated their name,	A remark which is in line with previous addition
	registered trade name or registered trade mark,	in article 16.
	and the address at which they can be contacted	

	on the high-risk AI system or, where that is not	
	possible, on its packaging or its accompanying	- '//
	documentation, as applicable in accordance with	
	Article 16(h).	
2. Where an importer considers or has		
reason to consider that a high-risk AI system is		
not in conformity with this Regulation, it shall		
not place that system on the market until that AI		
system has been brought into conformity.		
Where the high-risk AI system presents a risk		
within the meaning of Article 65(1), the		
importer shall inform the provider of the AI		
system and the market surveillance authorities		
to that effect.		
3. Importers shall indicate their name,		
registered trade name or registered trade mark,		
	L	1

and the address at which they can be contacted	
on the high-risk AI system or, where that is not	
possible, on its packaging or its accompanying	
documentation, as applicable.	
4. Importers shall ensure that, while a high-	
risk AI system is under their responsibility,	
where applicable, storage or transport conditions	
do not jeopardise its compliance with the	
requirements set out in Chapter 2 of this Title.	
5. Importers shall provide national	It is difficult to see why logs should be in the possession of the importer. These are not
competent authorities, upon a reasoned request,	included in the technical documentation.
with all necessary information and	
documentation to demonstrate the conformity of	
a high-risk AI system with the requirements set	
out in Chapter 2 of this Title in a language	

which can be easily understood by that national	
competent authority, including access to the	
logs automatically generated by the high-risk AI	
system to the extent such logs are under the	
control of the provider by virtue of a contractual	
arrangement with the user or otherwise by law.	
They shall also cooperate with those authorities	
on any action national competent authority takes	
in relation to that system.	
Article 27	
Obligations of distributors	
1. Before making a high-risk AI system	
available on the market, distributors shall verify	
that the high-risk AI system bears the required	
CE conformity marking, that it is accompanied	

by the required documentation and instruction	
of use, and that the provider and the importer of	
the system, as applicable, have complied with	
the obligations set out in this Regulation.	
2. Where a distributor considers or has	
reason to consider that a high-risk AI system is	
not in conformity with the requirements set out	
in Chapter 2 of this Title, it shall not make the	
high-risk AI system available on the market	
until that system has been brought into	
conformity with those requirements.	
Furthermore, where the system presents a risk	
within the meaning of Article 65(1), the	
distributor shall inform the provider or the	
importer of the system, as applicable, to that	
effect.	

3. Distributors shall ensure that, while a	- //
high-risk AI system is under their responsibility,	
where applicable, storage or transport conditions	
do not jeopardise the compliance of the system	
with the requirements set out in Chapter 2 of	
this Title.	
4. A distributor that considers or has reason	
to consider that a high-risk AI system which it	
has made available on the market is not in	
conformity with the requirements set out in	
Chapter 2 of this Title shall take the corrective	
actions necessary to bring that system into	
conformity with those requirements, to	
withdraw it or recall it or shall ensure that the	
provider, the importer or any relevant operator,	

as appropriate, takes those corrective actions.	
Where the high-risk AI system presents a risk	
within the meaning of Article 65(1), the	
distributor shall immediately inform the national	
competent authorities of the Member States in	
which it has made the product available to that	
effect, giving details, in particular, of the non-	
compliance and of any corrective actions taken.	
5. Upon a reasoned request from a national	
competent authority, distributors of high-risk AI	
systems shall provide that authority with all the	
information and documentation necessary to	
demonstrate the conformity of a high-risk	
system with the requirements set out in Chapter	
2 of this Title. Distributors shall also cooperate	

with that national competent authority on any action taken by that authority.	
Article 28 Obligations of distributors, importers, users or any other third-party	We agree that obligations should follow the right actor in the value chain, however, at the moment, we foresee some difficulties and unclarity with this article.
	We are concerned that we could create a scenario where a provider would define the intended use very strictly in order not to be liable for other use cases, thereby, making article 28 the rule rather than the exception.
	If a user becomes a provider, it will then mean that the now provider must go through a new conformity assessment. In many cases, especially for SMEs, this would probably not be feasible and the regulation might stiffle AI-uptake among SMEs which would be contrary to the Commission's proposal for 2030 digital targets.
	In this respect, we are still reflecting on this article.

1. Any distributor, importer, user or other	
third-party shall be considered a provider for the	• //
purposes of this Regulation and shall be subject	
to the obligations of the provider under Article	
16, in any of the following circumstances:	
(a) they place on the market or put into	
service a high-risk AI system under their name	
or trademark;	
(b) they modify the intended purpose of a	
high-risk AI system already placed on the	
market or put into service;	
(c) they make a substantial modification to	
the high-risk AI system.	

2. Where the circumstances referred to in	
paragraph 1, point (b) or (c), occur, the provider	
that initially placed the high-risk AI system on	
the market or put it into service shall no longer	
be considered a provider for the purposes of this	
Regulation.	
Article 29	
Obligations of users of high-risk AI systems	
1. Users of high-risk AI systems shall use	
such systems in accordance with the instructions	
of use accompanying the systems, pursuant to	
paragraphs 2 and 5.	
2. The obligations in paragraph 1 are	
without prejudice to other user obligations under	

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

presenting a risk within the meaning of Article	
65(1) they shall inform the provider or	
distributor and suspend the use of the system.	
They shall also inform the provider or	
distributor when they have identified any	
serious incident or any malfunctioning within	
the meaning of Article 62 and interrupt the use	
of the AI system. In case the user is not able to	
reach the provider, Article 62 shall apply	
mutatis mutandis.	
For users that are credit institutions regulated by	
Directive 2013/36/EU, the monitoring	
obligation set out in the first subparagraph shall	
be deemed to be fulfilled by complying with the	
rules on internal governance arrangements,	

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

mechanisms pursuant to Article 74 of that	
Directive.	- //
6. Users of high-risk AI systems shall use	
the information provided under Article 13 to	
comply with their obligation to carry out a data	
protection impact assessment under Article 35	
of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 or Article 27 of	
Directive (EU) 2016/680, where applicable.	
ANNEX I	In line with our comments concerning the
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE	definition on AI, we find that techniques and
TECHNIQUES AND APPROACHES	approaches set out in b) and c) are too broad categories including traditional software which
referred to in Article 3, point 1	in our view cannot be considered as AI.

(a) Machine learning approaches, including supervised, unsupervised and reinforcement learning, using a wide variety of methods including deep learning;		
(b) Logic- and knowledge-based approaches, including knowledge representation, inductive (logic) programming, knowledge bases, inference and deductive engines, (symbolic) reasoning and expert systems;	(b) Logic- and knowledge-based approaches, including knowledge representation, inductive (logic) programming, knowledge bases, inference and deductive engines, (symbolic) reasoning and expert systems;	
© Statistical approaches, Bayesian estimation, search and optimization methods.	© Statistical approaches, Bayesian estimation, search and optimization methods.	

ANNEX II	
LIST OF UNION HARMONISATION	
<b>LEGISLATION</b>	
Section A – List of Union harmonisation	
legislation based on the New Legislative	
<u>Framework</u>	
1. Directive 2006/42/EC of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2006	
on machinery, and amending Directive	
95/16/EC (OJ L 157, 9.6.2006, p. 24) [as	
repealed by the Machinery Regulation];	
2. Directive 2009/48/EC of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 18 June 2009	

on the safety of toys (OJ L 170, 30.6.2009, p.		
1);		
3. Directive 2013/53/EU of the European		
Parliament and of the Council of 20 November		
2013 on recreational craft and personal		
watercraft and repealing Directive 94/25/EC (OJ		
L 354, 28.12.2013, p. 90);		
4. Directive 2014/33/EU of the European		
Parliament and of the Council of 26 February		
2014 on the harmonisation of the laws of the		
Member States relating to lifts and safety		
components for lifts (OJ L 96, 29.3.2014, p.		
251);		
	1	

5. Directive 2014/34/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 26 February	- //
2014 on the harmonisation of the laws of the	
Member States relating to equipment and	
protective systems intended for use in	
potentially explosive atmospheres (OJ L 96,	
29.3.2014, p. 309);	
6. Directive 2014/53/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014	
on the harmonisation of the laws of the Member	
States relating to the making available on the	
market of radio equipment and repealing	
Directive 1999/5/EC (OJ L 153, 22.5.2014, p.	
62);	

7. Directive 2014/68/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 15 May 2014	
on the harmonisation of the laws of the Member	
States relating to the making available on the	
market of pressure equipment (OJ L 189,	
27.6.2014, p. 164);	
8. Regulation (EU) 2016/424 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 9	
March 2016 on cableway installations and	
repealing Directive 2000/9/EC (OJ L 81,	
31.3.2016, p. 1);	
9. Regulation (EU) 2016/425 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 9	
March 2016 on personal protective equipment	

and repealing Council Directive 89/686/EEC	
(OJ L 81, 31.3.2016, p. 51);	
10. Regulation (EU) 2016/426 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 9	
March 2016 on appliances burning gaseous	
fuels and repealing Directive 2009/142/EC (OJ	
L 81, 31.3.2016, p. 99);	
11. Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 5	
April 2017 on medical devices, amending	
Directive 2001/83/EC, Regulation (EC) No	
178/2002 and Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009	
and repealing Council Directives 90/385/EEC	
and 93/42/EEC (OJ L 117, 5.5.2017, p. 1;	
11. Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2017 on medical devices, amending Directive 2001/83/EC, Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 and Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 and repealing Council Directives 90/385/EEC	

12. Regulation (EU) 2017/746 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 5	
April 2017 on in vitro diagnostic medical	
devices and repealing Directive 98/79/EC and	
Commission Decision 2010/227/EU (OJ L 117,	
5.5.2017, p. 176).	
Section B. List of other Union harmonisation	
legislation	
1. Regulation (EC) No 300/2008 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 11	
March 2008 on common rules in the field of	
civil aviation security and repealing Regulation	
(EC) No 2320/2002 (OJ L 97, 9.4.2008, p. 72).	

2. Regulation (EU) No 168/2013 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 15	
January 2013 on the approval and market	
surveillance of two- or three-wheel vehicles and	
quadricycles (OJ L 60, 2.3.2013, p. 52);	
3. Regulation (EU) No 167/2013 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 5	
February 2013 on the approval and market	
surveillance of agricultural and forestry vehicles	
(OJ L 60, 2.3.2013, p. 1);	
4. Directive 2014/90/EU of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 23 July 2014	
on marine equipment and repealing Council	

Directive 96/98/EC (OJ L 257, 28.8.2014, p.	
146);	
5. Directive (EU) 2016/797 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 11	
May 2016 on the interoperability of the rail	
system within the European Union (OJ L 138,	
26.5.2016, p. 44).	
6. Regulation (EU) 2018/858 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 30	
May 2018 on the approval and market	
surveillance of motor vehicles and their trailers,	
and of systems, components and separate	
technical units intended for such vehicles,	
amending Regulations (EC) No 715/2007 and	

(EC) No 595/2009 and repealing Directive	
2007/46/EC (OJ L 151, 14.6.2018, p. 1); 3.	
Regulation (EU) 2019/2144 of the European	
Parliament and of the Council of 27 November	
2019 on type-approval requirements for motor	
vehicles and their trailers, and systems,	
components and separate technical units	
intended for such vehicles, as regards their	
general safety and the protection of vehicle	
occupants and vulnerable road users, amending	
Regulation (EU) 2018/858 of the European	
Parliament and of the Council and repealing	
Regulations (EC) No 78/2009, (EC) No 79/2009	
and (EC) No 661/2009 of the European	
Parliament and of the Council and Commission	
Regulations (EC) No 631/2009, (EU) No	
406/2010, (EU) No 672/2010, (EU) No	

1003/2010, (EU) No 1005/2010, (EU) No	
1008/2010, (EU) No 1009/2010, (EU) No	
19/2011, (EU) No 109/2011, (EU) No	
458/2011, (EU) No 65/2012, (EU) No	
130/2012, (EU) No 347/2012, (EU) No	
351/2012, (EU) No 1230/2012 and (EU)	
2015/166 (OJ L 325, 16.12.2019, p. 1);	
7. Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 of the	
European Parliament and of the Council of 4	
July 2018 on common rules in the field of civil	
aviation and establishing a European Union	
Aviation Safety Agency, and amending	
Regulations (EC) No 2111/2005, (EC) No	
1008/2008, (EU) No 996/2010, (EU) No	
376/2014 and Directives 2014/30/EU and	
2014/53/EU of the European Parliament and of	

the Council, and repealing Regulations (EC) No	
552/2004 and (EC) No 216/2008 of the	· //
European Parliament and of the Council and	
Council Regulation (EEC) No 3922/91 (OJ L	
212, 22.8.2018, p. 1), in so far as the design,	
production and placing on the market of	
aircrafts referred to in points (a) and (b) of	
Article 2(1) thereof, where it concerns	
unmanned aircraft and their engines, propellers,	
parts and equipment to control them remotely,	
are concerned.	
ANNEX III	As outlined in our comments related to article 6,
HIGH-RISK AI SYSTEMS REFERRED TO	we find that the different use cases deserve
IN ARTICLE 6(2)	further discussion in order to understand their scope and associated risks.

High-risk AI systems pursuant to Article 6(2)  We would	d like to reflect that besides falling
High-risk AI systems pursuant to Article 6(2)	d like to reflect that besides falling
We would	
	ne of the listed areas, systems listed
	ould also entail high-risk pursuant to the
	sment, thereby linking the list directly crete risk assessment.
1. Biometric identification and	
categorisation of natural persons:	
(a) AI systems intended to be used for the	
'real-time' and 'post' remote biometric	
identification of natural persons;	
Management and operation of critical	
infrastructure:	

(a) AI systems intended to be used as safety components in the management and operation of	We would like to specify what is meant by management and operation, as this needs to be
road traffic and the supply of water, gas, heating	related to the specific supply.
and electricity.	
3. Education and vocational training:	
(a) AI systems intended to be used for the	
purpose of determining access or assigning	
natural persons to educational and vocational	
training institutions;	
(b) AI systems intended to be used for the	
purpose of assessing students in educational and	
vocational training institutions and for assessing	

participants in tests commonly required for	
admission to educational institutions.	
4. Employment, workers management and	
access to self-employment:	
(a) AI systems intended to be used for	
recruitment or selection of natural persons,	
notably for advertising vacancies, screening or	
filtering applications, evaluating candidates in	
the course of interviews or tests;	
(b) AI intended to be used for making	We are still unsure of the scope in terms of task
decisions on promotion and termination of	allocation and are questioning whether this
work-related contractual relationships, for task	would entail high-risk. As employment is a horizontal area, this could potentially affect a lot
allocation and for monitoring and evaluating	of different applications, even applications not entailing a high risk.

performance and behavior of persons in such relationships.		Furthermore, we would like to have concrete examples of evaluation of performance and behaviour, where this would entail high risks.
5. Access to and enjoyment of essential private services and public services and benefits:		
(a) AI systems intended to be used by public authorities or on behalf of public authorities to evaluate the eligibility of natural persons for public assistance benefits and services, as well as to grant, reduce, revoke, or reclaim such benefits and services;	(a) AI systems intended to be used by public authorities or on behalf of public authorities to evaluate the eligibility of natural persons, with potential disadvantage for these persons, for public assistance benefits and services, as well	We find that the formulation is too generic, as it would probably categorize most of existing public sector AI systems as high-risk systems. This would place an unnecessary administrative burden on systems which should not be included as a high-risk system in the first place. This is also interlinked with the needed changes in the definition of AI, where we need to establish that
Delicitis and Services,	as to grant, reduce, revoke, or reclaim such benefits and services;	AI operate with a level of autonomy and that systems which exclusively implements the automation of rules-based actions with defined

entire proposal, please do so in the row containing the title of the pr	oposai (in the 3ra column).	
		inputs and outputs based on objective and logic criteria are not within the scope.
		As of now, it is unclear when the evaluation procedure will actually begin, for example, it seems with the current formulation that even an AI system prioritising e-mails, part of a procedure, could be seen as a high-risk system. Therefore, it needs to be specified that systems intended for administrative activities, administrative tasks or allocation of resources should not be seen as high-risk.  Furthermore, we need to target only those
		systems which can put the citizen at a disadvantage and can have a direct impact on the final decision of the evaluation.
(b) AI systems intended to be used to		
evaluate the creditworthiness of natural persons		
or establish their credit score, with the exception		

of AI systems put into service by small scale	
providers for their own use;	
(c) AI systems intended to be used to	
dispatch, or to establish priority in the	
dispatching of emergency first response	
services, including by firefighters and medical	
aid.	
6. Law enforcement:	
(a) AI systems intended to be used by law	
enforcement authorities for making individual	
risk assessments of natural persons in order to	
assess the risk of a natural person for offending	

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

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

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

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

(d) AI systems intended to assist competent	
public authorities for the examination of	
applications for asylum, visa and residence	
permits and associated complaints with regard	
to the eligibility of the natural persons applying	
for a status.	
8. Administration of justice and democratic	
processes:	
(a) AI systems intended to assist a judicial	
authority in researching and interpreting facts	
and the law and in applying the law to a	
concrete set of facts.	

ANNEX IV	
TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION referred	
to in Article 11(1)	
The technical documentation referred to in	
Article 11(1) shall contain at least the following	
information, as applicable to the relevant AI	
system:	
1. A general description of the AI system	
including:	
(a) its intended purpose, the person/s	
developing the system the date and the version	
of the system;	

(b) how the AI system interacts or can be used to interact with hardware or software that is not part of the AI system itself, where applicable;	(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;	This could lead to endless possibilities for the provider to describe.
(c) the versions of relevant software or		
firmware and any requirement related to version		
update;		
(d) the description of all forms in which the		
AI system is placed on the market or put into		
service;		
(e) the description of hardware on which the		
AI system is intended to run;		

(f) where the AI system is a component of	
products, photographs or illustrations showing	~
external features, marking and internal layout of	
those products;	
(g) instructions of use for the user and,	
where applicable installation instructions;	
2. A detailed description of the elements of	
the AI system and of the process for its	
development, including:	
(a) the methods and steps performed for the	
development of the AI system, including, where	
relevant, recourse to pre-trained systems or tools	

provided by third parties and how these have	
been used, integrated or modified by the	
provider;	
(b) the design specifications of the system,	
namely the general logic of the AI system and	
of the algorithms; the key design choices	
including the rationale and assumptions made,	
also with regard to persons or groups of persons	
on which the system is intended to be used; the	
main classification choices; what the system is	
designed to optimise for and the relevance of the	
different parameters; the decisions about any	
possible trade-off made regarding the technical	
solutions adopted to comply with the	
requirements set out in Title III, Chapter 2;	

(c) the description of the system architecture	
explaining how software components build on	
or feed into each other and integrate into the	
overall processing; the computational resources	
used to develop, train, test and validate the AI	
system;	
(d) where relevant, the data requirements in	
terms of datasheets describing the training	
methodologies and techniques and the training	
data sets used, including information about the	
provenance of those data sets, their scope and	
main characteristics; how the data was obtained	
and selected; labelling procedures (e.g. for	

supervised learning), data cleaning	
methodologies (e.g. outliers detection);	
(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;	
in Title III, Chapter 2,	<u>//</u>
(g) the validation and testing procedures	
used, including information about the validation	
and testing data used and their main	
characteristics; metrics used to measure	
accuracy, robustness, cybersecurity and	
compliance with other relevant requirements set	
out in Title III, Chapter 2 as well as potentially	
discriminatory impacts; test logs and all test	
reports dated and signed by the responsible	
persons, including with regard to pre-	
determined changes as referred to under point	
(f).	

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).

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

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

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