

Miles Apart

Comparing key AI Act proposals

21 November 2023

The table below provides an analysis of several transatlantic policy proposals on how to regulate the most advanced AI systems. The analysis shows that the recent <u>non-paper circulated</u> by Italy, France, and Germany (as reported by Euractiv) includes the fewest provisions with regards to foundation models or general purpose AI systems, even falling below the minimal standard that was set in a recent <u>U.S. White House Executive</u> Order. While the non-paper proposes a voluntary code of conduct, it does not include any of the safety obligations required by previous proposals, including by the Council's own adopted position. Moreover, the non-paper envisions a much lower level of oversight and enforcement than the <u>Spanish Presidency's</u> compromise proposal and both the <u>Parliament and Council's</u> adopted positions.

policy@futureoflife.org

	IT/FR/DE Non-Paper	White House Executive Order	Spanish Presidency Compromise Proposal	Parliament's Adopted Position	Council's Adopted Position
Required safety obligations					
Identifying and documenting potential risks					
Conducting internal /external red-teaming					
Conducting independent audits/testing/evaluations					
Demonstrating the reduction and mitigation of reasonably foreseeable risks to health, safety, fundamental rights, the environment and democracy and the rule of law					
Establishing data governance measures					
Designing and developing models in a way that achieves appropriate levels of performance, predictability, interpretability, corrigibility, safety and cybersecurity					
Compute-related monitoring					
Governmental monitoring of large training runs/large-scale compute clusters					
Required documentation of computing power/large-scale compute clusters					
Governance body oversight					
Calls for a governance body to develop guidelines for safe development of the models					
Governance body oversees compliance with transparency obligations					
Governance body is capable of sanctioning providers not complying with transparency obligations					
Governance body oversees compliance with non-transparency safety obligations					
Governance body is capable of sanctioning providers who fail to comply with non-transparency safety obligations					
Governance body can enforce rules by requesting documentation, carrying out compliance controls, and carrying out investigations					
Mandatory registration of certain models to a central database					
Mandatory establishment of a quality management system to ensure/document compliance with obligations					
Code of conduct					
Establishment of voluntary codes of conduct					
Information sharing					
Required sharing of information along the value chain (such as through model cards)					
Required documentation/reporting of information on intended use/instructions for use of the model					
Required documentation/reporting of potential limitations/non-mitigable risks					
Required documentation/reporting of any red-teaming results					
Required documentation/reporting of any safety mitigations undertaken					
Required reporting of ownership/possession of model weights					
Report to be made to a government authority					
Some reporting requirements are based on computing power/capacity					