Response from the City of Nice to the European Commission's consultation on artificial intelligence

About the public consultation on artificial intelligence, the **city of Nice** wished to position itself for two reasons:

- **As a local authority**, having undertaken several procedures at the local or European level, aimed at promoting the use of new technologies and thereby the development of experiments for security purposes.
- **As coordinator of the "Security in Public Spaces" partnership** within the framework of the EU Urban Agenda and after consulting all the partners by responding directly to the online consultation

The security context is changing every day, the protean threats that surround us are based on innovative means, and it is up to us to be able to respond to them by using tools of the same dimension, if not more effective still, to remain anticipatory and not in the reaction.

While we must face major challenges, at a time when everything is always going faster, it seems essential to allow us to go further. The emergence of new technologies and, in recently, artificial intelligence, is part of a dynamic in which Man has begun a new phase of evolution, an evolution that has always defined Humanity.

The administrative organization of France and the acceleration of decentralization measures tend to force territories to assume more and more responsibilities, including in the area of security. Other European countries have chosen even more decentralized management methods. Local and regional authorities have thus become key players in the security continuum.

The health crisis we are going through now illustrates once again **the importance of territories in the management of everyday events**, whether they are of an emergency nature or not. It made use of them in terms of health, of course, but also in terms of security: in the fight against COVID 19, the major objective of the territories lies in securing public space, resulting in active fight against the spread of the virus.

Administrative measures or measures to set up physical devices in a public space, is not the only solution to fight against problems, whether they are identified or not. Human protection and surveillance action come in addition to physical devices. The threats have a new face every day requiring an important adaptability of the agents in charge of the fight against the spread or the emergence of a problem and a great adaptability of the public authorities.

New technologies have the capacity to provide the assistance necessary to achieve objectives aimed at effectively protecting populations: where humans can have many flaws, artificial intelligence can considerably reduce them.

Given the intrusiveness of certain technologies, particularly those based on the biometric data of individuals, more particularly still those used for criminal purposes, it seems essential before approving and deploying a technology to ensure its good technical operation but also the relevance of its use. To do this, only experiments carried out under real conditions (in the context of technology development and / or relevance assessment) in territories subject to GDPR rules seem to constitute a solid basis for reflection on the use of new technologies by public authorities. In addition to the aspect of the location of the experiment, there is the problem of the transfer of competence to territories wishing to implement legitimate experiments, responding to a public issue. More specifically, the emergence of new technologies must be able to support the protection of populations in the same way that it increasingly accompanies the daily life of everyone, whether one is animated by good or bad intentions.

Among these new technologies, facial recognition, silhouette detection, the exploitation of public data from social networks or the implementation of mobile security applications are either criticized or welcomed, very often without anyone has not really taken the measure of their scope.

The city of Nice, a pioneer in terms of innovation, achieved the feat of implementing the first facial recognition experiment in real time and on public roads during the 135th edition of its carnival. If it emerged from the lines of reflection of this experiment, the fact remained that out of a panel of 821 spectators surveyed, 97% of them declared themselves in favor of the use of new technologies for security when more than 5000 participants wished to participate in the experiment.

Technologies are neither good nor bad, they should be used wisely, supervised and to the extent necessary: experiments and, as such, all the provisions inherent in them (temporary transfer or sustainability of certain skills in the regions, co-development of tools with European SMEs, supported tests of software developed or offered, evaluation by a dedicated committee, etc.) have their place in everyday safety and in the interests of fairness between Member States and particularly between territories, it seems relevant that the EU has room for maneuver to allow them to become areas of innovation and trust. It is important to deploy innovation in a homogeneous manner in Europe in the field of AI, in particular for security purposes, to encourage national data protection authorities not to restrain innovation while supervising it, to support European technologies and companies in this area to ensure our industrial sovereignty and boost employment in Europe, and finally to provide more education to citizens and the media on AI in Europe.

Addendum: you will find in following pages the results of responses given by some members of the UA

Partnership on security in public spaces i.e: cities of Helsinki, Mechelen, Madrid, Nice and the Unione Romagna
Faentina.

GENERAL RESULTS (1)

| | | 1 - Not | 2 - Not | 2 Nautual | 4- | 5 - Very | 6- No |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|---------------------------|
| | | important at all | important | 3 - Neutral | Important | important | opinion |
| | Working with Mombor states | | | | V V | VVV | |
| | Working with Member states | | | | X X | XXX | |
| | Focussing the efforts of the research and innovation community | | | | v | xxxx | |
| 1-1 In your opinion, how | Skills | | Y | | XX | XX | Y |
| important are the six actions | Focus on SMEs | | | v | | x | , , |
| proposed in section 4 of the | FOCUS OII SIVIES | | | Х | XX | X | X |
| White Paper on AI? | Partnership with the private sector | | | х | XX | xx | |
| | Promoting the adoption of AI by the public sector | | x | x | x | xx | |
| | | Nice : Authorize | and regulate | public sector | experiments | with new ted | hnologies |
| | Are there other actions that should be considered? | for security purp | _ | | | | _ |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | allow territories | to experimer | nt with techno | ologies in con | npliance with | the GDPR |
| | | and assess the in | npacts of the | implementat | ion of techno | logies as wel | l as the |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not | 2 - Not | 2 Noutral | 4 - | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | | important at all | important | 3 - Neutral | Important | important | opinion |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Strengthen excellence in research | | | | xx | xxx | |
| 1-2 Revising the Coordinated | Establish world-reference testing facilities for Al | | | | | | |
| Plan on AI (Action 1) | Establish world-reference testing facilities for Al | | | | xx | xx | х |
| In your opinion, how | Promote the untake of Al by business and the sublic sector | | | | | | |
| important is it in each of | Promote the uptake of AI by business and the public sector | | х | | x | xx | x |
| these areas to align policies and strengthen coordination | | | | | | | |
| as described in section 4.A of | Increase the financing for start-ups innovating in AI | | | | | | |
| the White Paper | | | | | XXXX | х | |
| | Develop skills for AI and adapt existing training programmes | | | | | | |
| | beverop skins for Ar and daupt existing training programmes | | | | х | xxxx | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Build up the European data space | | | | | | |
| | | | | v | | xx | xx |
| | | | | ^ | | NA. | IAA . |
| | Are there other areas that that should be considered? 500 character(s) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not | 2 - Not | 3 - Neutral | 4 - | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| 1-3 A united and | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| 1-3 A united and strengthened research and | | | | 3 - Neutral | | | |
| | Support the establishment of a lighthouse research centre that is | | | 3 - Neutral | Important | important | |
| strengthened research and | Support the establishment of a lighthouse research centre that is world class and able to attract the best minds | | | 3 - Neutral | | | |
| strengthened research and innovation community | world class and able to attract the best minds | | | 3 - Neutral | Important | important | |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three | 1 '' | | | 3 - Neutral | Important | important | |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections | world class and able to attract the best minds | | | 3 - Neutral | Important | important | |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres | | important | x | xx xx xxx | important xxx xxx xxx | opinion x |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres | important at all Nice :Allow the t partnership with | important erritories to companies o | x use the produ utside of con | xx xx xx xx ct tested and ventional pul | xxx xxx xxd developed in | opinion x |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research | important at all | important erritories to companies o | x use the produ utside of con | xx xx xx xx ct tested and ventional pul | xxx xxx xxd developed in | opinion x |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation | important at all Nice :Allow the t partnership with | important erritories to companies o | x use the produ utside of con | xx xx xx xx ct tested and ventional pul | xxx xxx xxd developed in | opinion x |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to companies o | x use the produ utside of con | xx xx xx xx xx ct tested and ventional pubories. | xxx xxx xxd developed in | opinion x |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con | xx xx xx xxx ct tested and ventional pubories. | xxx xxx xxdeveloped in lic markets, i | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to companies o | x use the produ utside of con by the territo | xx xx xx xx xx ct tested and ventional pubories. | xxx xxx xxd developed in | opinion x |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con by the territo | xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx 4- | xxx xxx xxdeveloped in lic markets, i | x x G- No |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con by the territo | xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx 4- | xxx xxx xxdeveloped in lic markets, i | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | xx | xxx xx developed in olic markets, | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx 4- | xxx xx developed in olic markets, in order to the control of the | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | xx | important xxx xxx developed in olic markets, in olic m | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | xx | xxx xx developed in olic markets, | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | xx | important xxx xxx developed in olic markets, in olic m | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital Innovation Hubs | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | xx | important xxx xxx developed in olic markets, in olic m | x x G- No |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | xx | important xxx xxx developed in olic markets, in olic m | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of the White Paper in relation to | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | xx | important xxx xxx xx developed in olic markets, in ol | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | Important xx xx xx xxx xxx ct tested and ventional pubories. 4- Important xx xxx | important xxx xxx xx developed in olic markets, in ol | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of the White Paper in relation to | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to a companies o prized for use | x use the produ utside of con- by the territo 3 - Neutral | xx | important xxx xxx xx developed in olic markets, in ol | opinion x n if |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of the White Paper in relation to | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects Provide information about equity financing for AI startups | Nice :Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to companies orized for use | x use the produ utside of con by the territo 3 - Neutral xxx | Important xx xx xx xxx ct tested and ventional pubories. 4 - Important xx xxx xxx | important xxx xx developed in lic markets, in mortant xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx | opinion x 1 |
| strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the White Paper on Al 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of the White Paper in relation to | world class and able to attract the best minds Network of existing AI research excellence centres Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI Provide access to testing and reference facilities Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | Nice : Allow the t partnership with technology author | erritories to companies orized for use 2 - Not important | x use the produ utside of con by the territo 3 - Neutral xxx xx | Important xx xx xx xxx ct tested and ventional pubories. 4 - Important xx xxx xxx | important xxx xx developed in lic markets, in mortant xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx xx | opinion x 6- No opinion |

GENERAL RESULTS (2)

| | Section 2 - An ecosystem of trust | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinio |
| | Al may endanger safety | | | x | xxx | x | |
| | Al may breach fundamental rights (such as human dignity, privacy, | | | | | | |
| | data protection, freedom of expression, workers' rights etc.) | | х | xx | х | xx | |
| | The use of AI may lead to discriminatory outcomes | | | x | xx | xx | |
| 2-1 In your opinion, how | Al may take actions for which the rationale cannot be explained | | | xx | xx | х | |
| important are the following concerns about AI | AI may make it more difficult for persons having suffered harm to | | | | | | |
| | obtain compensation | | х | х | xx | х | |
| | Al is not always accurate | Mechelen :Al its | | | | | |
| | | already existing choose to use it of | an. When im | plementing A | Al we should b | | |
| | Do you have any other concerns about AI that are not mentioned above? Please specify:500 character(s) maximum | own biases, beca | | | | | |
| | | Nice: Need to de use public data to | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | T | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | other | no opinion | | |
| | Do you think that the concerns expressed above can be addressed by applicable EU legislation? | xxxx | | Y | | | |
| | applicable EU registation? If not, do you think that there should be specific new rules for Al | 2000 | | j* | | | |
| | systems? | | | | | | |
| | Current legislation is fully sufficient | | xxx | | | | |
| | Current legislation may have some gaps | xxx | | x | | | |
| | There is a need for a new legislation Other | xx | х | | | | |
| | No opinion | | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | other | no opinion | | |
| | If you think that new rules are necessary for AI system, do you agree that the introduction of new compulsory requirements should be | | | | | | |
| | limited to high-risk applications (where the possible harm caused by the Al system is particularly high)? | xxxx | | | x | | |
| | If you wish, please indicate the AI application or use that is most | Nice: the thresh defined in a spec | | | | | |
| | concerning ("high-risk") from your perspective:500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not | 2 - Not | | 4- | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| 2-2 In your opinion, how important are the following | The quality of training data sets | important at all | important | 3 - Neutral | Important | important | |
| mandatory requirements of a | The quality of training data sets | | | v | VV | v | орино |
| | The keeping of records and data | | | x x | xx x | x xxx | х |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems | | | x x x | xx xx xx | x xxx xxx | х |
| | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems | | | x x x | xx xx xx xx xx | x xxx xxx | х |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules | | | x x x | xx x | x xxx xx xx | х |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules | yes | no | x x x x | xx x | x xxx xx xx | х |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules | yes | no | x x x x x other | x x xx | x xxx xx xx | х |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules | yes | | x x x x other | x x xx | x xxx xx xx | х |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly | yes | | x x x x | x x xx | x xxx xx xx | х |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the | | | x x x x x x x x | x x xx | x xxx xx xx | х |
| framework for Al (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you so the protective of the protective of the province of the protective of | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) | | | x x x x x x x x | x x xx | x xxx xx xx | х |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not | | | x x x x x other | x x xx | x xxx xx xx | x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. | | | x x x x other | x x xx | x xxx xx xx | x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces | XXX | | x x x x x x t other | x x xx | x xxx xx xx | x x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx xx xxxx | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion | XXX | x x xx | x x x x cother | x x xx | x xxx xx xx | x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx xx xxxx | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | x x |
| Framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx xx xxxx | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | x x |
| Framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx xx xxxx | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | x x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx x | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | x x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx x | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | x x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx x | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | opinio x |
| framework for Al (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx x | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | x x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure Ex-post market surveillance after the AI-enabled high-risk product or | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx x | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | x x |
| framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure Ex-post market surveillance after the AI-enabled high-risk product or service has been put on the market and, where needed, enforcement | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | x xx x | | xx | X XXX XXX XXX XX XXX XXX XXX XXX XXX X | x x |

GENERAL RESULTS (3)

| on 3 – Safety and liability | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|-------------|------------|---------|
| | | | | | |
| 3-1 The current product safety | | yes | no | | |
| | Cyber risks | XXXX | | | |
| an extended concept of | Personal security risks | xxxx | | | |
| safety protecting against all | | | | | |
| kind of risks arising from the | Risks related to the loss of connectivity | XX | XX | | |
| product according to its use. | Mental health risks | Х | XXX | | |
| However, which particular | | | I | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | no opinion | |
| | Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the | 703 | 110 | по оринон | |
| | White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered | | | | |
| | high-risk in addition to existing legislation? | XXX | | xx | |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding risk assessment | | <u> </u> | | |
| | procedures? | | | | |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | no opinion | |
| | | | | | |
| | Do you think that the current EU legislative framework for liability | | | | |
| | (Product Liability Directive) should be amended to better cover the | | | | |
| | risks engendered by certain AI applications? | XXX | | XX | |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? | | | | |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Yes, for all AI | Yes, for | 20 | no opir |
| | | applications | specific AI | no | по орп |
| | Do you think that the current national liability rules should be adapted | | | | |
| | for the operation of AI to better ensure proper compensation for | | | | |
| | damage and a fair allocation of liability? | х | х | | XXX |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? | | | | |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | | | | |
| | Joo character(3) maximum | | | | |

CITY OF HELSINKI (1)

| Γ | | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
|----------|--|--|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|
| | | Working with Member states | | | | , | | |
| | | WORKING WITH WEITIDET States | | | | ^ | | |
| | | Focussing the efforts of the research and innovation community Skills | | | | v | x | |
| | 1-1 In your opinion, how important are the six | Focus on SMEs | | | | ^ | | x |
| | actions proposed in section 4 of the White Paper on AI? | . 5005 511 51112 | | | | | | |
| | · | Partnership with the private sector | | | | | | X |
| | | Promoting the adoption of AI by the public sector | | | х | | | |
| | | Are there other actions that should be considered? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | | | |
| \dashv | | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | | Strengthen excellence in research | | | | | х | |
| | 1-2 Revising the Coordinated Plan on AI (Action 1) | Establish world-reference testing facilities for AI | | | | | | x |
| | In your opinion, how important is it in each of these areas to align policies and strengthen coordination as described in section 4.A of the White Paper | Promote the uptake of AI by business and the public sector | | | | | | x |
| | Willie Lupe. | Increase the financing for start-ups innovating in AI | | | | x | | |
| | | Develop skills for AI and adapt existing training programmes | | | | x | | |
| | | Build up the European data space Are there other areas that that should be considered? 500 character(s) n | | | x | | | |
| | | Are there other areas that that should be considered. 500 that deter(s) i | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | 1-3 A united and strengthened research and | Support the establishment of a lighthouse research centre that is world class and able to attract the best minds | | | | | | x |
| | <u>innovation community striving for excellence</u> In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of | Network of existing AI research excellence centres | | | | x | | |
| | al a sad to a Reconstruction | Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research | | | x | | | |
| | | Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| j | | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | | | | | | | , . | |
| | | Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI | | | x | | | |
| | 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises | Provide access to testing and reference facilities | | | | х | | |
| | (SMEs) In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital Innovation | Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs | | | | x | | |
| | Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of the White | Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | | | х | | | |
| | | Provide information about equity financing for AI startups | | | х | | | |
| | | Are there any other tasks that you consider important for specialised Digital Innovations Hubs? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |

CITY OF HELSINKI (2)

Section 2 - An ecosystem of trust 1 - Not important at all 2 - Not important 3 - Neutral 4 - Important 5 - Very important AI may endanger safety Al may breach fundamental rights (such as human dignity, privacy, date protection, freedom of expression, workers' rights etc.) The use of AI may lead to discriminatory outcomes 2-1 In your opinion, how important are the following concerns about AI Al may take actions for which the rationale cannot be explained AI may make it more difficult for persons having suffered harm to obtain compensation Al is not always accurate Do you have any other concerns about AI that are not mentioned above? Please specify:500 character(s) maximum other no opinion Do you think that the concerns expressed above can be addressed by applicable EU legislation? If not, do you think that there should be specific new rules for Al Current legislation is fully sufficient Current legislation may have some gaps There is a need for a new legislation Other No opinion other no opinion yes If you think that new rules are necessary for AI system, do you agree that the introduction of new compulsory requirements should be limited to high-risk applications (where the possible harm caused b If you wish, please indicate the AI application or use that is most concerning ("high-risk") from your perspective:500 character(s) maximum 1 - Not important at all 2 - Not important 3 - Neutral 4 - Important 5 - Very important The quality of training data sets 2-2 In your opinion, how important are the The keeping of records and data llowing mandatory requirements of a possibl Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems future regulatory framework for AI (as section Robustness and accuracy of AI systems 5.D of the White Paper) Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules other no opinion No further guidelines or regulations are needed 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly ccessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are including the General Data Protection fulfilled (please specify) Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the requirements foreseen above (see question question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face ecognition) and other technologies which may by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should no take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level guidelines or regulation: Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces Very much much rather not Inot at all no opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of th White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure 2-5 What is the best way to ensure that AI is Ex-post market surveillance after the Al-enabled high-risk product or trustworthy, secure and in respect of Europear service has been put on the market and, where needed, enforcement values and rules? by relevant competent authorities A combination of ex-ante compliance and ex-post enforcement Other enforcement system

CITY OF HELSINKI (3)

Section 3 – Safety and liability implications of AI, IoT and robotics 3-1 The current product safety legislation no yes already supports an extended concept of safety Cyber risks protecting against all kind of risks arising from Personal security risks the product according to its use. However, Risks related to the loss of connectivity Mental health risks which particular risks stemming from the use of artificial intelligence do you think should be no opinion no Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? Do you have any further considerations regarding risk assessment procedures? 500 character(s) maximum no opinion yes no Do you think that the current EU legislative framework for liability (Product Liability Directive) should be amended to better cover the risks engendered by certain AI applications? Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? 500 character(s) maximum Yes, for specific AI no no opinion Yes, for all AI applications applications for the operation of AI to better ensure proper compensation for damage and a fair allocation of liability? Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? 500 character(s) maximum

UNIONE ROMAGNA FAENTINA (1)

| | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
|---|---|--------------------------|--------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | Working with Member states | | | | | Х | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Focussing the efforts of the research and innovation community | | | | X | | |
| 1-1 In your opinion, how important are the six actions proposed in section 4 of the White | Skills Focus on SMEs | | | | X | | |
| Paper on Al ? | POCUS OII SIMES | | | | ^ | | |
| rapei oli Ai : | Partnership with the private sector | | | | x | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Promoting the adoption of AI by the public sector | | | | х | | |
| | | | , | | | | |
| | Are there other actions that should be considered? | | | | | | |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | Strengthen excellence in research | | | | X | | |
| | Establish world-reference testing facilities for AI | | | | | | |
| 1-2 Revising the Coordinated Plan on AI (Action | Total Color Coloring (World Coloring) | | | | Х | | |
| <u>1)</u> | Dramate the untake of Al by business and the auditors and | | | | | | |
| In your opinion, how important is it in each of | Promote the uptake of AI by business and the public sector | | | | Х | | |
| these areas to align policies and strengthen | | | | | | | |
| coordination as described in section 4.A of the | Increase the financing for start-ups innovating in AI | | | | x | | |
| White Paper | | | | | X | | |
| | Develop skills for AI and adapt existing training programmes | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | X | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Build up the European data space | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Are there other areas that that should be considered? 500 character(s) maximum | | 1 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | | 1 - Not important at an | 2 - Not important | 3- Neutrai | 4-IIIIportant | 3- very important | о- но ориноп |
| | Support the establishment of a lighthouse research centre that is world class and able to | | | | | | |
| | attract the best minds | | | | X | | |
| 1-3 A united and strengthened research and | | | | | | | |
| innovation community striving for excellence | Network of existing Al research excellence centres | | | | | X | |
| In your opinion how important are the three | | | | | | | |
| actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of | | | | | | | |
| the White Paper on Al | Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research | | | | Х | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that | | | | | | |
| | should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 Notimett-t !! | 2 Notice establish | 2 November | 4 Ime | F Vancionates | 6 No arizina |
| | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of Al | | | Х | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Provide access to testing and reference facilities | | | | Х | | |
| 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises | | | | | | | |
| (SMEs) | Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs | | | | Х | | |
| In your opinion, how important are each of | | | | | | | |
| these tasks of the specialised Digital | | | | | | | |
| these tasks of the specialised Digital | Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | | | | | | |
| Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of | Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | | | X | | | |
| | Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | | | X | | | |
| Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of | | | | X | X | | |
| Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of | Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects Provide information about equity financing for AI startups | | | X | X | | |
| Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of | Provide information about equity financing for AI startups | | | X | Х | | |
| Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of | Provide information about equity financing for AI startups Are there any other tasks that you consider important for specialised Digital Innovations | | | X | х | | |
| Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of | Provide information about equity financing for AI startups | | | X | Х | | |

UNIONE ROMAGNA FAENTINA (2)

| | Carting 2. An accountage of the st | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| | Section 2 - An ecosystem of trust | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | | | | | | o toly important | |
| | AI may endanger safety | | | | Х | | |
| | Al may breach fundamental rights (such as human dignity, privacy, data protection, freedom | | | | | , | |
| | of expression, workers' rights etc.) | | | | | X | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2-1 In your opinion, how important are the following concerns about Al | The use of AI may lead to discriminatory outcomes | | | | | X | |
| 2-1 iii your opinion, now important are the following concerns about Ai | | | | | | | |
| | AI may take actions for which the rationale cannot be explained | | | | Х | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | AI may make it more difficult for persons having suffered harm to obtain compensation AI is not always accurate | | | | X | | |
| | Do you have any other concerns about AI that are not mentioned above? Please specify:500 | | - | - | ^ | | |
| | character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | other | no opinion | | |
| | | , | | | , | | |
| | Danish the state and the state of the state | | | MAY BE NOT | | | |
| | Do you think that the concerns expressed above can be addressed by applicable EU legislation? | | | ENOUGH | | | |
| | regionation | | | ENOUGH | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | If not, do you think that there should be specific new rules for AI systems? | | | | | | |
| | Current legislation is fully sufficient | | | | | | |
| | Compatible side the complete company | | | V | | | |
| <u>T</u> | Current legislation may have some gaps | | | X | | | |
| | There is a need for a new legislation | | | | | | |
| | Other | | | | | | |
| | No opinion | | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | other | no opinion | 1 | |
| | If you think that new rules are necessary for AI system, do you agree that the introduction of | yes | 110 | otilei | по оришон | | |
| | new compulsory requirements should be limited to high-risk applications (where the | | | | | | |
| | possible harm caused by the AI system is particularly high)? | | | | | | |
| | If you wish, please indicate the AI application or use that is most concerning ("high-risk") | | | | | | |
| | from your perspective:500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | _ | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | The quality of training data sets | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | | 4 - Important x | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| 2-2 In your opinion, how important are the following mandatory requirements of a | The keeping of records and data | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | 3 - Neutral | X | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| 2-2 In your opinion, how important are the following mandatory requirements of a possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) | | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | | | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | х | X | 5 - Very important | 6- No opinion |
| | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems | 1 - Not important at all | 2 - Not important | х | X | | 6- No opinion |
| | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight | 1 - Not important at all | 2- Not important | х | X | | 6- No opinion |
| | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight | 1 - Not important at all | 2- Not important | х | X | | 6- No opinion |
| | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules | | | x | x x | | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight | | | x | x x | | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in | | | x | x x | | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unter-special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be | | | x | x x | | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) | | | x | x x | | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to | | | x | x x | | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation | | | x | x x | | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Uther special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. | | | x | x x | | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation | | | x | x x | | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces | yes | no | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Uther special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion | | | x | x x no opinion | | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Uther special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces. No opinion | yes | no | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Uther special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion | yes | no | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| possible future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Uther special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces. No opinion | yes | no | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unterspecial requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.6 of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unterspecial requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unter special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unterspecial requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level guidelines or regulation: | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unterspecial requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU- | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unter special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces. No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure Ex-post market surveillance after the AI-enabled high-risk product or service has been put | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level guidelines or regulation: 2-5 What is the best way to ensure that Al is trustworthy, secure and in respect of | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote binometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level guidelines or regulation: 2-5 What is the best way to ensure that Al is trustworthy, secure and in respect of | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unterspecial requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure Ex-post market surveillance after the AI-enabled high-risk product or service has been put on the market and, where needed, enforcement by relevant competent authorities | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level guidelines or regulation: 2-5 What is the best way to ensure that Al is trustworthy, secure and in respect of | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unter special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces. No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure Ex-post market surveillance after the AI-enabled high-risk product or service has been put | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level guidelines or regulation: 2-5 What is the best way to ensure that Al is trustworthy, secure and in respect of | The keeping of records and data Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems Robustness and accuracy of AI systems Human oversight Clear liability and safety rules No further guidelines or regulations are needed Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) Unterspecial requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above should be imposed (please specify) Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European values and rules? Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external conformity assessment procedure Ex-post market surveillance after the AI-enabled high-risk product or service has been put on the market and, where needed, enforcement by relevant competent authorities | yes x | no no much | x x other | x x no opinion | X | 6- No opinion |

UNIONE ROMAGNA FAENTINA (3)

| | Section 3 – Safety and liability implications of AI, IoT and robo | otics | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|----------------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | | |
| | Cyber risks | Х | | | |
| e current product safety legislation already supports an | Personal security risks | х | | | |
| ded concept of safety protecting against all kind of risks | | | | | |
| | Risks related to the loss of connectivity | | х | | |
| ar risks stemming from the use of artificial intelligence do | Mental health risks | | х | | |
| nink should be further spelled out to provide more legal | | | | | |
| certainty? | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | ves | no | no opinion | |
| | Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would be | yes | III0 | Πυ υμπποπ | |
| | useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing legislation? | | | Х | l |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding risk assessment procedures? | | | , | |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | | | | l |
| | Joo Character(3) maximum | | | | |
| | | ves | no | no opinion | |
| | Do you think that the current EU legislative framework for liability (Product Liability | yes | 110 | Πουριποπ | |
| | Directive) should be amended to better cover the risks engendered by certain Al | x | | | l |
| | | | | | |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? 500 character(s) | | | | I |
| | maximum | | T T | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | Yes, for specific AI | no | no opinion |
| | | Yes, for all AI applications | applications | | |
| | Do you think that the current national liability rules should be adapted for the operation of | | | | |
| | Al to better ensure proper compensation for damage and a fair allocation of liability? | | | | Х |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? 500 character(s) | | | | |
| | maximum | | | | |
| | THOMIT OF THE PARTY OF THE PART | | | | |

CITY OF MECHELEN (1)

| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very | 6- No |
|--|---|----------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------|---------|
| | | all | important | 3- Neutrai | 4-Important | important | opinion |
| | Working with Member states | | | | X | | |
| | Focussing the efforts of the research and innovation community | | | | | Χ | |
| 1-1 In your opinion, how important are the six actions proposed in section 4 of the White | Skills | | X | | | | |
| Paper on AI ? | Focus on SMEs | | | X | | | |
| | Partnership with the private sector | | | | Х | | |
| | Promoting the adoption of AI by the public sector | | X | | | | |
| | Are there other actions that should be considered? | | | | | | |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | 2 Navitual | 4 (| 5 - Very | 6- No |
| 4.2 Particles Also Counting And Planton At (Austral 4) | | all | important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | important | opinion |
| 1-2 Revising the Coordinated Plan on Al (Action 1) | Strengthen excellence in research | | | | Х | | |
| In your opinion, how important is it in each of these areas to align policies and strengthen | Establish world-reference testing facilities for Al | | | | X | | |
| coordination as described in section 4.A of the White Paper | Promote the uptake of AI by business and the public sector | | Х | | | | |
| | Increase the financing for start-ups innovating in AI | | | | X | | |
| | Develop skills for AI and adapt existing training programmes | | | | | Х | |
| | Build up the European data space | | | | | | |
| | Are there other areas that that should be considered? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | | | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | | all | important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | important | opinion |
| | Support the establishment of a lighthouse research centre that is world class and able to | | | | | • | |
| 1-3 A united and strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence | attract the best minds | | | | х | | |
| In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E | Network of existing AI research excellence centres | | | | | Χ | |
| of the White Paper on AI | Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research | | | | | Х | |
| | Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that | | | • | • | | |
| | should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | | | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | | all | important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | important | opinion |
| | Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI | | | | | X | |
| | Provide access to testing and reference facilities | | | | | X | |
| 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) | Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs | | | | | Х | |
| In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital | | | | | | | |
| Innovation Hubs mentioned in section 4.D of the White Paper in relation to SMEs | Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | | Х | | | | |
| | Provide information about equity financing for AI startups | | | | Х | | |
| | Are there any other tasks that you consider important for specialised Digital Innovations | | | | | | |
| | Hubs? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | ., | | | | | | |

CITY OF MECHELEN (2)

| | Section 2. An econystem of tweet | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|----------|
| | Section 2 - An ecosystem of trust | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | Al may endanger safety | all | important | X | | important | opinion |
| | Al may breach fundamental rights (such as human dignity, privacy, data protection, | | | | | | |
| | freedom of expression, workers' rights etc.) | | | Х | | | |
| | The use of AI may lead to discriminatory outcomes AI may take actions for which the rationale cannot be explained | | | | | X | |
| 2-1 In your opinion, how important are the following concerns about Al | Al may take actions for which the rationale cannot be explained | | | | | X | |
| | Al may make it more difficult for persons having suffered harm to obtain compensation | | | | | X | |
| | Al is not always accurate | | X | | | | |
| | Do you have any other concerns about AI that are not mentioned above? Please | | | | 7 | | |
| | specify:500 character(s) maximum | Al itself should be see | | | | | |
| | | methods. All itself can | _ | | | | |
| | | AI we should be verry | away or our ow | /n biases, peca | use those plases | Will be imple | menteu. |
| | | yes | no | other | no opinion | | |
| | Do you think that the concerns expressed above can be addressed by applicable EU | | | | | | |
| | legislation? | Х | | | | | |
| | If not, do you think that there should be specific new rules for AI systems? | | | | | | - |
| | Current legislation is fully sufficient Current legislation may have some gaps | v | <u>/</u> | | | \vdash | |
| | There is a need for a new legislation | X | x | | | | |
| | Other | | | | | | |
| | No opinion | | | | | 1 | |
| | | | | | | - | |
| | the state of the s | yes | no | other | no opinion | | - |
| | If you think that new rules are necessary for AI system, do you agree that the introduction of new compulsory requirements should be limited to high-risk | | | 1 | | 4 | |
| | applications (where the possible harm caused by the AI system is particularly high)? | x | | 1 | | 4 | |
| | If you wish, please indicate the Al application or use that is most concerning ("high-risk") | ^ | | | | 4 | |
| | from your perspective:500 character(s) maximum | | | | | 4 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | The quality of training data sets | all | important | | | important | opinion |
| | The keeping of records and data | | | | | x | |
| | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems | | | | | X | |
| | Robustness and accuracy of AI systems | | | | X | | |
| | Human oversight | | | | | X | |
| | Clear liability and safety rules | - | | - | X | | |
| | | + | | - | + | + | |
| | | yes | no | other | no opinion | | |
| | No further guidelines or regulations are needed | | X | | | 4 | |
| | | | | | | 4 | |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, | | X, only used in | | 4 | 4 | 4 | |
| including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, | | vulnerable locations | | | | _ | |
| where relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question | Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above | X: human oversights | | 4 | 4 | 4 | |
| | | remains the norm | | | | 4! | |
| recognition) and other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be | Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of | | | | | | |
| | exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific | | | | | 4 | |
| l l | guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. | X | v | | | \vdash | |
| | Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces No opinion | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | No opinion | | | | | | |
| | | Very much | much | rather not | not at all | no opinion | |
| | 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) | | | | | | 4 |
| | would be useful for Al systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing | | | 4 | 4 | | <u> </u> |
| | legislation? | | | - | | X | 1 |
| | <u> </u> | yes | no | d ' | 1 | 1 | |
| | What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European | yes | 10 | 4 | | | |
| | values and rules? | | | 4 | | | |
| | Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external | | | 4 | | | |
| l l | conformity assessment procedure | | | 4 | | | |
| 2-5 What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of | A second | | | 4 | | | |
| | Ex-post market surveillance after the AI-enabled high-risk product or service has been put on the market and, where needed, enforcement by relevant competent authorities | | | 4 | | | |
| | A combination of ex-ante compliance and ex-post enforcement mechanisms | - | | 4 | | | |
| | Other enforcement system | | | 4 | | - | |
| | No opinion | X | | A | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

CITY OF MECHELEN (3)

| | Section 3 – Safety and liability implications of AI, IoT and roboti | CS | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | | |
| 3-1 The current product safety legislation already supports | Cyber risks | | | | |
| an extended concept of safety protecting against all kind of | Personal security risks | | | | |
| risks arising from the product according to its use. | Risks related to the loss of connectivity | | | | |
| However, which particular risks stemming from the use of | Mental health risks | | | | |
| artificial intelligence do you think should be further | | | | | |
| spelled out to provide more legal certainty? | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | De very halians that a valuation labelling anatom (Costian C.C. of the White Dance) would | yes | no | no opinion | |
| | Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would | | | | |
| | be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing | v | | | |
| | legislation? Do you have any further considerations regarding risk assessment procedures? | ۸ | | | |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | | | | |
| | 300 character(3) maximum | | | | |
| | | V0C | no | no oninion | |
| | Do you think that the current EU legislative framework for liability (Product Liability | yes | 110 | no opinion | |
| | Directive) should be amended to better cover the risks engendered by certain Al | | | | |
| | applications? | | | | |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? 500 character(s) | | | | |
| | maximum | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | Yes, for | | |
| | | Yes, for all AI | specific Al | no | no opinion |
| | | applications | applications | 110 | по ориноп |
| | | арричасто | арричастопо | | |
| | Do you think that the current national liability rules should be adapted for the operation | | | | |
| | of AI to better ensure proper compensation for damage and a fair allocation of liability? | | | | |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? 500 character(s) | | | | |
| | maximum | | | | |
| | | | | | |

CITY OF MADRID (1)

| | Section 1 - An ecosystem of excellence | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|-----------|---------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | | all | important | o meatra | · important | important | opinion |
| | Working with Member states | | | | | Х | |
| | Focussing the efforts of the research and innovation community | | | | | Х | |
| , , . , . , | Skills | | | | | X | |
| on Al ? | Focus on SMEs | | | | Х | | |
| | Partnership with the private sector | | | | | X | |
| | Promoting the adoption of AI by the public sector | | | | | X | |
| | Are there other actions that should be considered? | | | | | | |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| 1-2 Revising the Coordinated Plan on AI (Action 1) | | all | important | | | important | opinion |
| In your opinion, how important is it in each of these areas to align policies and strengthen | Strengthen excellence in research | | | | | X | |
| coordination as described in section 4.A of the White Paper | Establish world-reference testing facilities for AI | | | | | X | |
| | Promote the uptake of AI by business and the public sector | | | | | X | |
| | Increase the financing for start-ups innovating in Al | | | | | X | |
| | Develop skills for AI and adapt existing training programmes | | | | | X | |
| | Build up the European data space | | | | | X | |
| | Are there other areas that that should be considered? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | | all | important | o meatra. | · important | important | opinion |
| 1-3 A united and strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence | Support the establishment of a lighthouse research centre that is world class and able to | | | | | | |
| In your opinion how important are the three actions proposed in sections 4.B, 4.C and 4.E of the | attract the best minds | | | | | Χ | |
| White Paper on Al | Network of existing AI research excellence centres | | | | | X | |
| | Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research | | | | Χ | | |
| | Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that | | | | | | |
| | should be given a priority ? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | | all | important | 3-INCULIAI | 4- IIIIportant | important | opinion |
| | Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of Al | | | | | Х | |
| 1-4 Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) | Provide access to testing and reference facilities | | | | | Х | |
| In your opinion, how important are each of these tasks of the specialised Digital Innovation Hubs | Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs | | | | | X | |
| mentioned in section 4.D of the White Paper in relation to SMEs | Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects | | | | | х | |
| | Provide information about equity financing for Al startups | | | | Х | | |
| | Are there any other tasks that you consider important for specialised Digital Innovations | | | | | | |
| | Hubs? 500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

CITY OF MADRID (2)

| | Section 2 - An ecosystem of trust | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|------------|---------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | | all | important | 5 140000 | 4 miportune | important | opinion |
| | Al may endanger safety | | | | | X | |
| | Al may breach fundamental rights (such as human dignity, privacy, data protection, | | | | | | |
| | freedom of expression, workers' rights etc.) | | | X | | | |
| | The use of AI may lead to discriminatory outcomes | | | | X | | |
| 2-1 In your opinion, how important are the following concerns about AI | Al may take actions for which the rationale cannot be explained | | | X | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Al may make it more difficult for persons having suffered harm to obtain compensation | | | X | | | |
| | Al is not always accurate | | | Х | | | |
| | Do you have any other concerns about AI that are not mentioned above? Please | | | - | | | |
| | specify:500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | other | no opinion | | |
| | Do you think that the concerns expressed above can be addressed by applicable EU | 700 | | | | | |
| | legislation? | × | | | | | |
| | If not, do you think that there should be specific new rules for AI systems? | Α | | | | | |
| | Current legislation is fully sufficient | | Y | | | | |
| | Current legislation may have some gaps | v | ^ | | | | |
| | | ^ | | | | | |
| | There is a need for a new legislation | ^ | | | | | |
| | Other No opinion | | | | | | |
| | No opinion | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | other | no opinion | | |
| | If you think that new rules are necessary for AI system, do you agree that the | | | | | | |
| | introduction of new compulsory requirements should be limited to high-risk | | | | | | |
| | applications (where the possible harm caused by the AI system is particularly high)? | X | | | | | |
| | If you wish, please indicate the AI application or use that is most concerning ("high-risk") | | | • | | | |
| | from your perspective:500 character(s) maximum | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Not important at | 2 - Not | | | 5 - Very | 6- No |
| | | all | important | 3 - Neutral | 4 - Important | important | opinion |
| | The quality of training data sets | all | IIIIportant | | | v | оринон |
| 2.21 | | | | | | ^ | |
| 2-2 In your opinion, how important are the following mandatory requirements of a possible | The keeping of records and data | | | | | X | |
| future regulatory framework for AI (as section 5.D of the White Paper) | Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems | | | | | X | |
| | Robustness and accuracy of AI systems | | | | | Х | |
| | Human oversight | | | | | X | |
| | Clear liability and safety rules | | | | | X | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | other | no opinion | | |
| | No further guidelines or regulations are needed | | Х | | | | |
| 2.2 to addition to the college PHI college to a selection by data and a few college. | Biometric identification systems should be allowed in publicly accessible spaces only in | | | | | | |
| 2-3 In addition to the existing EU legislation, in particular the data protection framework, | certain cases or if certain conditions are fulfilled (please specify) | Х | | | | | |
| including the General Data Protection Regulation and the Law Enforcement Directive, or, where | Other special requirements in addition to those mentioned in the question above | | | | | | |
| relevant, the new possibly mandatory requirements foreseen above (see question above), do | should be imposed (please specify) | | x | | | | |
| you think that the use of remote biometric identification systems (e.g. face recognition) and | Use of Biometric identification systems in publicly accessible spaces, by way of | | | | | | |
| other technologies which may be used in public spaces need to be subject to further EU-level | exception to the current general prohibition, should not take place until a specific | | | | | | |
| guidelines or regulation: | guideline or legislation at EU level is in place. | X | | | | | |
| | Biometric identification systems should never be allowed in publicly accessible spaces | | x | | | | |
| | No opinion | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2.4 De veu helieve thet a velunten lehelling | Very much | much | rather not | not at all | no opinion | |
| | 2-4 Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) | | | | | | |
| | would be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing | | | | | | |
| | legislation? | | X | | | | |
| | | | | 1 | | | |
| | | yes | no | | | | |
| | What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European | | | | | | |
| | values and rules? | X | | | | | |
| | Compliance of high-risk applications should be assessed ex-ante by means of an external | | | | | | |
| | conformity assessment procedure | x | | | | | |
| 2-5 What is the best way to ensure that AI is trustworthy, secure and in respect of European | | | | 1 | | | |
| values and rules? | | | | 1 | | | |
| | Ev noct market curveillance after the AL enabled high rick product as consider has been | | | | | | |
| values and rules? | Ex-post market surveillance after the Al-enabled high-risk product or service has been | v | | | | | |
| values and rules? | put on the market and, where needed, enforcement by relevant competent authorities | х | | | | | |
| values and fules? | | x x | V | - | | | |

CITY OF MADRID (3)

| | Costing 2. Cofety and liability implications of Al LeT and values | | | | |
|---|--|-----------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| | Section 3 – Safety and liability implications of AI, IoT and robot | CS | | | |
| | | VOS | no | | |
| | Cyber risks | yes v | 110 | | |
| | Personal security risks | Y | | | |
| | Risks related to the loss of connectivity | X | | | |
| extended concept of safety protecting against all kind of risks | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | Х | | | |
| arising from the product according to its use. However, which | | | | | |
| particular risks stemming from the use of artificial | | | | | |
| intelligence do you think should be further spelled out to | | | | | |
| provide more legal certainty? | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | no opinion | |
| | Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White Paper) would | | | | |
| | be useful for AI systems that are not considered high-risk in addition to existing | | | | |
| | legislation? | Х | | | |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding risk assessment procedures? | | | | |
| | 500 character(s) maximum | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | yes | no | no opinion | |
| | Do you think that the current EU legislative framework for liability (Product Liability | | | | |
| | Directive) should be amended to better cover the risks engendered by certain Al | | | | |
| | applications? | X | | | |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? 500 character(s) | | | | |
| | maximum | | | | |
| | | | Yes, for | | |
| | | Yes, for all AI | specific Al | no | no opinion |
| | | applications | applications | 110 | по ориноп |
| | | αρριτατίστιο | аррпсацииз | | |
| | Do you think that the current national liability rules should be adapted for the operation | | | | |
| | of AI to better ensure proper compensation for damage and a fair allocation of liability? | | Х | | |
| | Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above? 500 character(s) | | | | |
| | maximum | | | | |
| | | | | | |

CITY OF NICE (1)

Section 1 - Un écosystème d'excellence

| | | 1 - Pas important | 2 - Pas | 3 - Neutre | 4 - Important | 5 - Très | Pas |
|--|---|--|----------------------|------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | | du tout | important | 3 Neutre | 4 important | important | d'opinion |
| | Travailler avec les États membres | | | | | Х | |
| | Concentrer les efforts de la communauté de la recherche et de l'innovation | | | | | Х | |
| | Compétences | | | | | Х | |
| | Focus sur les PME | | | | | Х | |
| 1-1 À votre avis, quelle est l'importance des six actions | Partenariat avec le secteur privé | | | | Х | | |
| proposées dans la section 4 du Livre blanc sur l'IA ? | Promouvoir l'adoption de l'IA par le secteur public | | | | | Х | |
| | Y a-t-il d'autres actions qui devraient être envisagées? 500 caractère (s) maximum | Autoriser et règlementer les expérimentations pour le secteur public des nouvelles technologies à des fins de sécurité. Objectif : En complément de la sécurité "by design", permettre aux territoires d'expérimenter les technologies dans le respect du RGPD et évaluer les impacts de la mise en oeuvre des technologies ainsi que les résultats. | | | | | esign", |
| | | 1 - Pas important | 2 - Pas | | | 5 - Très | Pas |
| | | du tout | important | 3 - Neutre | 4 - Important | important | d'opinion |
| 1-2 Révision du plan coordonné sur l'IA (action 1) | Renforcer l'excellence en recherche | uu tout | important | | | X | и оринон |
| À votre avis, dans quelle mesure est-il important dans | Établir des installations de test de référence mondiale pour l'IA | | | | | X | |
| chacun de ces domaines d'aligner les politiques et de | Promouvoir l'adoption de l'IA par les entreprises et le secteur public | | | | | X | |
| renforcer la coordination comme décrit dans la section | Augmenter le financement des start-ups innovantes en IA | | | | Х | | |
| 4.A du Livre blanc | Développer des compétences pour l'IA et adapter les programmes de | | | | | | |
| | formation existants | | | | | Х | |
| | Construire l'espace de données européen | | | | | Х | |
| | Y a-t-il d'autres domaines à considérer? 500 caractère (s) maximum | | | | | I. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 1-3 Une communauté de recherche et d'innovation unie | | 1 - Pas important du tout | 2 - Pas important | 3 - Neutre | 4 - Important | 5 - Très important | Pas d'opinion |
| et renforcée, en quête d'excellence | Soutenir la création d'un centre de recherche sur les phares de classe | | | | | | |
| Selon vous, quelle est l'importance des trois actions | mondiale et capable d'attirer les meilleurs esprits | | | | | Х | |
| proposées dans les sections 4.B, 4.C et 4.E du Livre blanc | Réseau de centres d'excellence en recherche sur l'IA existants | | | | Х | | |
| sur l'IA ? | Mettre en place un partenariat public-privé pour la recherche industrielle | | | | Х | | |
| cadre du programme Horizon Europe au titre du cadre financier pluriannuel pour la période 2021-2027. | Y a-t-il d'autres actions pour renforcer la communauté de la recherche et de l'innovation qui devraient être prioritaires? 500 caractère (s) maximum | Permettre aux territoires d'utiliser le produit expérimenté et développé en partenariat avec les entreprises en dehors des marchés publics classiques, si technologie autorisée pour l'usage par les territoires. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 1-4 Mettre l'accent sur les petites et moyennes | | 1 - Pas important du tout | 2 - Pas important | 3 - Neutre | 4 - Important | 5 - Très important | Pas d'opinion |
| | Aider à sensibiliser les PME aux avantages potentiels de l'IA | | | X | | | |
| | Donner accès aux installations de test et de référence | | | | | X | |
| | Promouvoir le transfert de connaissances et soutenir le développement de | | | | | | |
| À votre avis, quelle est l'importance de chacune de ces | l'expertise en IA pour les PME | | | | X | | |
| tâches des pôles d'innovation numérique spécialisés | Soutenir les partenariats entre PME, grandes entreprises et universités | | | | | | |
| mentionnés dans la section 4.D du Livre blanc en relation | | | | | | X | |
| avec les PME ? | Fournir des informations sur le financement par actions pour les startups IA | | | | | | |
| | Y a-t-il d'autres tâches que vous jugez importantes pour les centres d'innovation numérique spécialisés? 500 caractère (s) maximum | Permettre aux centres d'innovation numérique l'accès au BIG DATA des collectivités pour développer les logiciels avec de véritables données | | | | | |

CITY OF NICE (2)

| | Section 2 - Un écosystème de confiance | | | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| | | | 2.2 | | | > | |
| | | 1 - Pas important du tout | 2 - Pas important | 3 - Neutre | 4 - Important | 5 - Très important | Pas d'opinio |
| | L'IA peut mettre en danger la sécurité | du tout | important | | x | important | и орино |
| | L'IA peut violer les droits fondamentaux (tels que la dignité humaine, la vie | | | | | | |
| | privée, la protection des données, la liberté d'expression, les droits des | | | | | | |
| | travailleurs, etc.) | | | | x | | |
| 2-1 À votre avis, quelle est l'importance des | L'utilisation de l'IA peut conduire à des résultats discriminatoires | | | | x | | |
| préoccupations suivantes au sujet de l'IA? | L'IA peut prendre des mesures dont la justification ne peut être expliquée | | | Х | | | |
| , | L'IA peut rendre plus difficile pour les personnes ayant subi un préjudice d'obtenir une indemnisation | | | v | | | |
| | L'IA n'est pas toujours précise | | | X | v | | |
| | EINTEST pas todjours precise | | | 1 | Α | | <u> </u> |
| | | Nécessité de dévelo | | | | | |
| | Avez-vous d'autres préoccupations concernant l'IA qui ne sont pas | entreprises d'utiliser | | bliques pour d | évelopper l'IA av | ec des donnée | es fibales |
| | mentionnées ci-dessus? Veuillez préciser:500 caractère (s) maximum | adaptées au contexte | ž. | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | oui | non | autre | pas d'opinion | | |
| | Pensez-vous que les préoccupations exprimées ci-dessus peuvent être | | | | | | |
| | traitées par la législation européenne applicable? | х | | | | | |
| | Sinon, pensez-vous qu'il devrait y avoir de nouvelles règles spécifiques pour | V | | | | | |
| | les systèmes d'IA? La législation actuelle est pleinement suffisante | X | v | | | | |
| | La législation actuelle est piernement surrisante | X | | | | | |
| | Il faut une nouvelle législation | Х | | | | | |
| | Autre | | | | | | |
| | Pas d'opinion | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | i | |
| | | oui | non | autre | pas d'opinion | | |
| | Si vous pensez que de nouvelles règles sont nécessaires pour le système d'IA, | | | | | | |
| | acceptez-vous que l'introduction de nouvelles exigences obligatoires devrait | | | | | | |
| | être limitée aux applications à haut risque (où les dommages possibles causés par le système d'IA sont particulièrement élevés)? | v | | | | | |
| | Si vous le souhaitez, veuillez indiquer l'application ou l'utilisation de l'IA la | X | | | I. | | |
| | plus préoccupante («à haut risque») de votre point de vue: 500 caractère (s) | II est à définir le seui | | ntion "à haut ri | sque" de | | |
| | maximum | manière spécifique e | et exhaustive | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 - Pas important | 2 - Pas | 3 - Neutre | 4 - Important | 5 - Très | Pas |
| | | du tout | important | 3 Weddie | 4 important | important | d'opinio |
| 2-2 À votre avis, quelle est l'importance des exigences | La qualité des ensembles de données de formation | | | X | | | |
| obligatoires suivantes d'un éventuel futur cadre | La conservation des enregistrements et des données | | | | X | | |
| réglementaire pour l'IA (comme la section 5.D du Livre blanc)? | Informations sur le but et la nature des systèmes d'IA Robustesse et précision des systèmes d'IA | | | | | X | |
| biancy: | Surveillance humaine | | | | x | ^ | |
| | Des règles claires en matière de responsabilité et de sécurité | | | | | X | |
| | · | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | oui | non | autre | pas d'opinion | | |
| 2-3 Outre la législation européenne existante, en | Aucune autre directive ou réglementation n'est nécessaire | | х | | | | |
| particulier le cadre de protection des donnees, y compris le règlement général sur la protection des données et la | Les systèmes d'identification biométrique ne devraient être autorisés dans | | | | | | |
| directive relative à l'application des lois, ou, le cas | les espaces accessibles au public que dans certains cas ou si certaines conditions sont remplies (veuillez préciser) | | v | | | | |
| échéant, les nouvelles exigences éventuellement | D'autres exigences spéciales en plus de celles mentionnées dans la question | | X | | | | |
| obligatoires prévues ci-dessus (voir question ci-dessus), | | | х | | | | |
| pensez-vous que le l'utilisation de systèmes | L'utilisation de systèmes d'identification biométrique dans des espaces | | | | | | |
| l'identification biométrique à distance (par exemple, la | The state of the s | | | | | | |
| econnaissance faciale) et d'autres technologies pouvant | | | | | | | |
| être utilisées dans les espaces publics doivent être | de l'UE n'est pas en place. | | Х | | | | |
| soumises à d'autres directives ou réglementations au | Les systèmes d'identification biométrique ne devraient jamais être autorisés | | v | | | | |
| niveau de l'UE: | dans les espaces accessibles au public Pas d'opinion | | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | <u></u> | Beaucoup | Beaucoup | Plutôt pas | Pas du tout | Pas d'opinion | |
| | 2-4 Pensez-vous qu'un système d'étiquetage volontaire (section 5.G du Livre | | | | | | |
| | blanc) serait utile pour les systèmes d'IA qui ne sont pas considérés à haut | | | | | | |
| | risque en plus de la législation existante? | | | Х | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | oui | non | Ī | | | |
| | la conformité des applications à baut risque avec les evirences identifiée | oui | | 1 | | | |
| | La conformité des applications à haut risque avec les exigences identifiées | | | | | | |
| | doit être auto-évaluée ex ante (avant de mettre le système sur le marché) | X | | | | | |
| | doit être auto-évaluée ex ante (avant de mettre le système sur le marché) La conformité des applications à haut risque doit être évaluée ex ante au | х | | | | | |
| 25 Quelle est la meilleure facen de caractir que l'14 soit | doit être auto-évaluée ex ante (avant de mettre le système sur le marché) La conformité des applications à haut risque doit être évaluée ex ante au moyen d'une procédure externe d'évaluation de la conformité | | | | | | |
| | doit être auto-évaluée ex ante (avant de mettre le système sur le marché) La conformité des applications à haut risque doit être évaluée ex ante au moyen d'une procédure externe d'évaluation de la conformité Surveillance ex post du marché après la mise sur le marché du produit ou | х | | | | | |
| :-5 Quelle est la meilleure façon de garantir que l'IA soit fiable, sûre et respectueuse des valeurs et des règles européennes? | doit être auto-évaluée ex ante (avant de mettre le système sur le marché) La conformité des applications à haut risque doit être évaluée ex ante au moyen d'une procédure externe d'évaluation de la conformité | х | | | | | |
| fiable, sûre et respectueuse des valeurs et des règles | doit être auto-évaluée ex ante (avant de mettre le système sur le marché) La conformité des applications à haut risque doit être évaluée ex ante au moyen d'une procédure externe d'évaluation de la conformité Surveillance ex post du marché après la mise sur le marché du produit ou service à haut risque compatible avec l'IA et, si nécessaire, mise en | x x | | | | | |
| fiable, sûre et respectueuse des valeurs et des règles | doit être auto-évaluée ex ante (avant de mettre le système sur le marché) La conformité des applications à haut risque doit être évaluée ex ante au moyen d'une procédure externe d'évaluation de la conformité Surveillance ex post du marché après la mise sur le marché du produit ou service à haut risque compatible avec l'IA et, si nécessaire, mise en application par les autorités compétentes concernées | x x | | | | | |
| • | doit être auto-évaluée ex ante (avant de mettre le système sur le marché) La conformité des applications à haut risque doit être évaluée ex ante au moyen d'une procédure externe d'évaluation de la conformité Surveillance ex post du marché après la mise sur le marché du produit ou service à haut risque compatible avec l'IA et, si nécessaire, mise en application par les autorités compétentes concernées Une combinaison de mécanismes de conformité ex ante et d'application ex | x x | | | | | |

CITY OF NICE (3)

| | Section 3 - Conséquences en matière de sécurité et | t de responsabilité (| de l'IA. de l'IoT | et de la robo | tique |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|---------------|
| | Section 5 Consequences en manere de securite en | e de l'esponsabilité | uc : | Ct uc 10 10 00 | e.que |
| 3-1 La législation actuelle sur la sécurité des produits | | oui | non | | |
| | Cyber risques | х | | | |
| | Risques de sécurité personnelle | х | | | |
| prend déjà en charge un concept étendu de sécurité | Risques liés à la perte de connectivité | х | | | |
| protégeant contre toutes sortes de risques résultant du | Risques pour la santé mentale | | х | | |
| produit en fonction de son utilisation. Cependant, quels risques particuliers découlant de l'utilisation de l'intelligence artificielle devraient, selon vous, être précisés pour fournir une plus grande sécurité juridique? | Autres (Précisez) | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | oui | non | sans opinion | |
| | Pensez-vous que le cadre législatif de sécurité devrait envisager de nouvelles procédures d'évaluation des risques pour les produits soumis à des changements importants au cours de leur vie? | х | | | |
| | Avez-vous d'autres considérations concernant les procédures d'évaluation des risques? Précisez | | х | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | oui | non | sans opinion | |
| | Pensez-vous que le cadre législatif actuel de l'UE en matière de responsabilité (directive sur la responsabilité du fait des produits) devrait être modifié pour mieux couvrir les risques engendrés par certaines applications d'IA? | х | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Oui, pour toutes les applications Al | Oui, pour des applications IA spécifiques | non | pas d'opinion |
| | Pensez-vous que les règles nationales actuelles en matière de responsabilité devraient être adaptées au fonctionnement de l'IA afin de mieux garantir une réparation adéquate des dommages et une répartition équitable de la responsabilité? | х | | | |