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The Future of Life Institute (FLI) works to promote the benefits of technology and reduce their associated risks. FLI has become one of the world's leading voices on the governance of artificial intelligence (AI) and created one of the earliest and most influential sets of governance principles, the Asilomar AI Principles. FLI maintains a large network among the world's top AI researchers in academia, civil society, and private industry.

Since progress in AI can be very rapid, it is particularly important to ensure that the AI Act is prepared for these technological changes.
GENERAL PURPOSE AI AND THE AI ACT

In the first partial compromise Council text, the Slovenian Presidency of the Council of the EU introduced a new Article 52a on ‘general purpose AI systems.’ Since then, many member states have commented on the draft article. The French Presidency is now reviewing these comments and considering moving the article to 4a. Furthermore, various committees in the European Parliament have suggested amendments to Article 4a/52a as well as offered their original approaches to regulate such systems.

WHAT ARE GENERAL PURPOSE AI SYSTEMS?

General purpose AI systems are AI systems that have many intended and unintended uses, and can be applied to many different tasks in various fields. Growing amounts of computational resources and new innovative applications of these systems have recently boosted commercial interest in these types of AI systems. Current general purpose AI systems are characterised by their scale (a lot of memory, data and powerful hardware) as well as their reliance on transfer learning (whereby knowledge from one task is applied to another).1

These systems are sometimes referred to as foundation models and are characterised by their widespread use as pre-trained models for other AI systems.2 For example, a single general purpose AI system for language can be used as the foundation for several hundred more applied models (chatbot, ad generation, decision assistant, spam bots, etc.), some of which are subsequently further fine-tuned into multiple applications tailored for the customer.3 Hence, a few general purpose AI systems are the basis for most applied language models.

General purpose AI systems are often large language models,4 but many such successful systems are used for tasks beyond natural language processing. General purpose AI systems are increasingly used for powerful applications in medicine and healthcare,5 finance,6 life sciences and chemistry,7 and for programming8 and machine learning.9 There is no theoretical reason why these systems cannot be successfully applied in many other fields.

Moreover, general purpose AI systems are not limited to a single type of information, but can process audio, video, textual, and physical data. With enough training and compute, they can also handle very complex data sets such as medical or scientific data. Some of the most influential examples of general purpose AI systems are AlphaStar, BART, BERT, Chinchilla, CLIP, Codex, DALL•E 2, data2vec, Ernie 3.0 ‘TITAN’, GLaM, GLIDE, Gopher, GPT-3, GPT-NeoX-20B, Jurassic-1, Megatron-Turing NLG, MuZero, PaLM, Perceiver IO, RETRO, Robotics, Switch Transformer, T5, and Wu Dao 2.0. Some key systems, and the amount of computation used to train them, are highlighted in the graph below.
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1 On the Opportunities and Risks of Foundation Models: https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07288
2 The Center for Research on Foundation Models: https://crfm.stanford.edu/
3 GPT-3 Powers the Next Generation of Apps: https://openai.com/blog/gpt-3-apps/
4 Language modelling at scale: Gopher, ethical considerations, and retrieval: https://www.deepmind.com/blog/language-modeling-at-scale-gopher-ethical-considerations-and-retrieval
5 For example, Clinical BERT: https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.03323
6 For example, FinEAS: https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.00526
7 For example, CST5: https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.10307
8 For example, Codex: https://openai.com/blog/openai-codex/
9 For example, Decision Transformer: https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.01345v1
WHY REGULATE GENERAL PURPOSE AI?

ALLAI, an organisation focused on responsible AI, recently wrote in a policy paper that excluding general purpose AI systems from the AI Act runs the risk of stifling innovation.\(^\text{10}\) They argue that the exclusion of these systems from the AI Act means that the burden of making these systems compliant with the regulation falls entirely on the users of the AI systems. Users would have to make the systems meet the requirements for high-risk AI. This could be too much of a burden, especially for small businesses and startups, and might even be impossible to do. In this case, the AI Act may cut off SME access to cutting-edge general purpose AI systems and place Europe at a competitive disadvantage compared to the US or China.

ALLAI further explains that even if the general purpose AI developer helped downstream users with the technicalities of complying with the AI Act, it would put the latter in a position of full responsibility for any damage the system may cause, without providing the appropriate means for the user to seek redress. As a result, it could limit the uptake of general purpose AI systems and promote a further concentration of AI innovation with the developers of these systems. Developers could thus gain a competitive advantage over downstream users.

General purpose AI systems can be opaque, posing risks to fundamental rights, health, and safety. They can be complex and often exhibit surprising behaviors, even to their own developers. For example, GPT-3, which is trained to process natural language, unexpectedly acquired the ability to write rudimentary programs in a programming language.\(^\text{11}\) Some of these systems have already caused alarm by propagating extremist content,\(^\text{12}\) exhibiting anti-Muslim bias,\(^\text{13}\) or inadvertently revealing personal data.\(^\text{14}\) A chatbot based on the general purpose AI system GPT-3 told a person to commit suicide.\(^\text{15}\) We will likely see more of these incidents if regulation fails to promote the safe use of this important new area within AI development.

\(^{10}\) AIA in-depth #1: Objective, Scope, Definition: https://allai.nl/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/AIA-in-depth-Objective-Scope-and-Definition.pdf
\(^{11}\) Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code: https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.03374
\(^{13}\) ‘For Some Reason I’m Covered in Blood’: GPT-3 Contains Disturbing Bias Against Muslims: https://onezero.medium.com/for-some-reason-im-covered-in-blood-gpt-3-contains-disturbing-bias-against-muslims-693d275552bf
\(^{14}\) Extracting Training Data from Large Language Models: https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.07805
\(^{15}\) Doctor GPT-3: hype or reality?: https://www.nabla.com/blog/gpt-3/
ARTICLE 3

NEW ARTICLE

Article 3 — ‘General purpose AI system’ means an AI system that is able to perform generally applicable functions such as image/speech recognition, audio/video generation, pattern detection, question answering, translation, etc, and is able to have multiple intended and unintended purposes.

An image recognition system that identifies signs of skin cancer has an intended purpose. Another system that identifies potholes in roads from images also has an intended purpose. A system able to identify skin cancer and potholes, has two (quite different) intended purposes. General purpose AI systems can have many more intended purposes as well as many unintended uses. The definition of general purpose AI systems hinges on its ability to do several different tasks.

General purpose AI systems are software, which means they can very quickly be applied to a wide range of areas - much faster than the EU can adopt new acts. Therefore, the solution is to cover them in this regulation by default, and to ensure the responsibility for their safety is not just on EU companies, but shared with the creators of general purpose AI systems. MEP Voss (EPP, DE) suggested a version of this recommendation in his first draft opinion on the AI Act for the Legal Affairs (JURI) Committee.

ARTICLE 4A

NEW ARTICLE

Article 4a: Obligations of providers of general purpose AI systems

Providers of general purpose AI systems shall:

a) ensure that their general purpose AI systems are compliant with the requirements set out in Article 15 in Chapter 2;

b) comply with the other requirements set out in Chapter 2 to the fullest extent possible;

c) assess the reasonably foreseeable misuse of their systems;

d) provide instructions and information about the safety of these systems to users and other relevant stakeholders in the supply chain;

e) regularly assess whether the AI systems have presented any new risks, including risks discovered when investigating novel use cases;

f) register their systems in the EU database referred to in Article 60.

General purpose AI systems are able to perform generally applicable functions such as image/speech recognition, audio/video generation, pattern detection, question answering, translation, etc. These systems are trained on broad data that can be adapted to a wide range of downstream tasks and applications, and have multiple intended and unintended purposes.

The wide range of applications for which general purpose systems can be used means that any flaw can have overarching effects on many sectors – there is a single failure mode that can affect many downstream AI applications. Researchers recently showed that one general purpose AI system, for example, had an anti-Muslim bias. If left unaddressed, a bias of this type could affect media articles, educational materials, chatbots, and other uses that will only be discovered when SMEs experiment with these systems. The potential use of general purpose AI systems for many tasks with different levels of risk justifies pre-market and post-market obligations.

Furthermore, general purpose AI systems will be integrated into various services and products. (European) companies integrating (mainly American) general purpose systems will be unable to understand the full risks involved. Product safety regulation commonly uses the concept of ‘reason-
ably foreseeable use.' It is reasonable to ask providers to try to foresee the potential misuses of their general purpose AI systems because of the likely significant economic and societal impacts of these systems. They should address these risks to health, safety and fundamental rights beforehand, while acknowledging that not all such uses can be foreseen. Developers of these systems are best placed to estimate foreseeable uses and misuses.

**ARTICLE 4B**

**NEW ARTICLE**

**Article 4b: Conformity assessment for general purpose AI systems**

Providers of general purpose AI systems shall ensure that their systems undergo a conformity assessment prior to their placing on the market or putting into service. The conformity assessment procedure will be based on assessment of the quality management system and assessment of the technical documentation, with the involvement of a notified body, referred to in Annex VII. 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.

As general purpose AI systems will be integrated into many other AI applications, requiring providers to undergo a conformity assessment will create lower regulatory burdens for the hundreds of potential companies using those systems as foundations to their more narrow applications.

As ALLAI notes, general purpose systems ought to be included in scope to avoid a situation where the burden of bringing these systems in compliance with the AIA falls entirely on ‘downstream’ users of the general purpose AI systems. Downstream users would otherwise be the ones that have to bring the systems in line with the requirements for high risk AI, which might be too much of a burden, especially for SME’s and micro enterprises, or perhaps even prove to be technically impossible. Even if the general purpose AI developer would help downstream users with the technicalities of complying with the AIA, it places the latter in a fully dependent position, without having the appropriate means to seek redress when the general purpose AI system causes damage.

A third-party conformity assessment will guarantee to European users that these systems are accurate, robust, withstand cyberattacks, and can be trusted for use.

**ARTICLE 4C**

**NEW ARTICLE**

**Article 4c: Conditions for other persons to be subject to the obligations of a provider**

Any person who places on the market, puts into service or uses a general purpose AI system in any of the circumstances listed in Article 28 shall be considered one of the providers of the system subject to the provisions of this Regulation. The developer of the general purpose AI system will be considered the provider unless the Article 28 conditions apply.

While various stakeholders in the supply chain should have specific responsibilities, the original creators of these systems (almost exclusively large multinational companies headquartered in the US or China) should be treated as providers because they are best suited to conduct assessments of their systems. This will create lower regulatory burdens for the hundreds of potential companies using those systems as foundations to their more narrow applications.

When general purpose AI systems are used in the AI value chain, it should be possible for multiple companies to be considered providers under the regulation: the initial builder of the general-purpose system and the company or companies adapting it downstream.
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