

Comments

Consultation on the European White Paper on Artificial Intelligence

Register of Interest Representatives (EU) Identification number in the register: 52646912360-95

Contact:

Arkadiusz Rzepka

Telephone: +49 30 2021-2115 Telefax: +49 30 2021-19 -2100

E-mail: a.rzepka@bvr.de

Berlin, 11. June 2020

The German Banking Industry Committee is the joint committee operated by the central associations of the German banking industry. These associations are the Bundesverband der Deutschen Volksbanken und Raiffeisenbanken (BVR), for the cooperative banks, the Bundesverband deutscher Banken (BdB), for the private commercial banks, the Bundesverband Öffentlicher Banken Deutschlands (VÖB), for the public-sector banks, the Deutscher Sparkassen- und Giroverband (DSGV), for the savings banks finance group, and the Verband deutscher Pfandbriefbanken (vdp), for the Pfandbrief banks. Collectively, they represent approximately 1,700 banks.

Coordinator:

National Association of German Cooperative Banks Schellingstraße 4 | 10785 Berlin | Germany

Telephone: +49 30 2021-0 Fax: +49 30 2021-1900

www.die-deutsche-kreditwirtschaft.de

Contribution ID: 59a849d4-eac7-4b16-9f23-cdc9a067f036

Date: 11/06/2020 13:18:05

Consultation on the White Paper on Artificial Intelligence - A European Approach

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a strategic technology that offers many benefits for citizens and the economy. It will change our lives by improving healthcare (e.g. making diagnosis more precise, enabling better prevention of diseases), increasing the efficiency of farming, contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation, improving the efficiency of production systems through predictive maintenance, increasing the security of Europeans and the protection of workers, and in many other ways that we can only begin to imagine.

At the same time, AI entails a number of potential risks, such as risks to safety, gender-based or other kinds of discrimination, opaque decision-making, or intrusion in our private lives.

The <u>European approach for AI</u> aims to promote Europe's innovation capacity in the area of AI while supporting the development and uptake of ethical and trustworthy AI across the EU. According to this approach, AI should work for people and be a force for good in society.

For Europe to seize fully the opportunities that AI offers, it must develop and reinforce the necessary industrial and technological capacities. As set out in the accompanying European strategy for data, this also requires measures that will enable the EU to become a global hub for data.

The current public consultation comes along with the White Paper on Artificial Intelligence - A European Approach aimed to foster a European ecosystem of excellence and trust in Al and a Report on the safety and liability aspects of Al. The White Paper proposes:

- Measures that will streamline research, foster collaboration between Member States and increase investment into AI development and deployment;
- Policy options for a future EU regulatory framework that would determine the types of legal requirements that would apply to relevant actors, with a particular focus on high-risk applications.

This consultation enables all European citizens, Member States and relevant stakeholders (including civil society, industry and academics) to provide their opinion on the White Paper and contribute to a European approach for AI. To this end, the following questionnaire is divided in three sections:

- Section 1 refers to the specific actions, proposed in the White Paper's Chapter 4 for the building of an ecosystem of excellence that can support the development and uptake of AI across the EU economy and public administration;
- Section 2 refers to a series of options for a regulatory framework for AI, set up in the White Paper's Chapter 5:
- Section 3 refers to the Report on the safety and liability aspects of Al.

Respondents can provide their opinion by choosing the most appropriate answer among the ones suggested for each question or suggesting their own ideas in dedicated text boxes.

Feedback can be provided in one of the following languages:

BG | CS | DE | DA | EL | EN | ES | ET | FI | FR | HR | HU | IT | LT | LV | MT | NL | PL | PT | RO | SK | SL | SV

Written feedback provided in other document formats, can be uploaded through the button made available at the end of the questionnaire.

The survey will remain open until 14 June 2020.

About you

- *Language of my contribution
 - Bulgarian
 - Croatian
 - Czech
 - Danish
 - Dutch
 - English
 - Estonian
 - Finnish
 - French
 - Gaelic
 - German
 - Greek
 - Hungarian
 - Italian
 - Latvian
 - Lithuanian
 - Maltese
 - Polish
 - Portuguese
 - Romanian
 - Slovak
 - Slovenian
 - Spanish
 - Swedish

 Academic/research institution Business association Company/business organisation Consumer organisation EU citizen Environmental organisation Non-EU citizen Non-governmental organisation (NGO) Public authority Trade union Other
*First name
Arkadiusz
*Surname
Rzepka
*Email (this won't be published)
a.rzepka@bvr.de
* Organisation name 255 character(s) maximum Die Deutsche Kreditwirtschaft
 Organisation size Micro (1 to 9 employees) Small (10 to 49 employees) Medium (50 to 249 employees) Large (250 or more)
Transparency register number 255 character(s) maximum Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.
52646912360-95
*Country of origin Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation. Afghanistan Aland Islands Dominica *Country of origin Libya Saint Martin Liechtenstein

Albania	DominicanRepublic	Lithuania	Saint Pierre and Miquelon Saint Vincent and the Grenadines
AlgeriaAmericanSamoa	EcuadorEgypt	LuxembourgMacau	SamoaSan Marino
Andorra	El Salvador	Madagascar	São Tomé and Príncipe
Angola	EquatorialGuinea	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
Anguilla	Eritrea	Malaysia	Senegal
Antarctica	Estonia	Maldives	Serbia
Antigua and Barbuda	Eswatini	Mali	Seychelles
Argentina	Ethiopia	Malta	Sierra Leone
Armenia	Falkland Islands	Marshall Islands	Singapore
Aruba	Faroe Islands	Martinique	Sint Maarten
Australia	© Fiji	Mauritania	Slovakia
Austria	Finland	Mauritius	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	France	Mayotte	Solomon Islands
Bahamas	French Guiana	Mexico	Somalia
Bahrain	FrenchPolynesia	Micronesia	South Africa
Bangladesh	French Southern and Antarctic Lands	Moldova	 South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
Barbados	Gabon	Monaco	South Korea
Belarus	Georgia	Mongolia	South Sudan
Belgium	Germany	Montenegro	Spain
Belize	Ghana	Montserrat	Sri Lanka
Benin	Gibraltar	Morocco	Sudan
Bermuda	Greece	Mozambique	Suriname
Bhutan	Greenland	Myanmar	Svalbard and
. D. III I		/Burma	Jan Mayen
Bolivia	Grenada	Namibia	Sweden
Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	Guadeloupe	Nauru	Switzerland
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Guam	Nepal	Syria
Botswana	Guatemala	Netherlands	Taiwan
Bouvet Island	Guernsey	New Caledonia	Tajikistan
Brazil	Guinea	New Zealand	Tanzania

British IndianOcean Territory	Guinea-Bissau	Nicaragua	Thailand
British VirginIslands	Guyana	Niger	The Gambia
Brunei	Haiti	Nigeria	Timor-Leste
Bulgaria	Heard Island and McDonald Islands	Niue	Togo
Burkina Faso	Honduras	Norfolk Island	Tokelau
Burundi	Hong Kong	Northern	Tonga
		Mariana Islands	- T : : : : : :
Cambodia	Hungary	North Korea	Trinidad andTobago
Cameroon	Iceland	North	Tobago © Tunisia
Gameroon	lociario	Macedonia	Turnsia
Canada	India	Norway	Turkey
Cape Verde	Indonesia	Oman	Turkmenistan
Cayman Islands	Iran	Pakistan	Turks and
			Caicos Islands
Central AfricanRepublic	Iraq	Palau	Tuvalu
Chad	Ireland	Palestine	Uganda
Chile	Isle of Man	Panama	Ukraine
China	Israel	Papua New Guinea	United ArabEmirates
Christmas Island	Italy	Paraguay	UnitedKingdom
Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
Cocos (Keeling)	Japan	Philippines	United States
Islands			Minor Outlying
Colombia	loroov	Ditagira Islanda	Islands
ColombiaComoros	JerseyJordan	Pitcairn IslandsPoland	UruguayUS Virgin
Comoros	Joidan	o i dianu	Islands
Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	Uzbekistan
Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico	Vanuatu
Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	Vatican City
Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and
			Futuna
Curação	Laos	Rwanda	Western
© Cyprus	Latvia	Saint	Sahara © Yemen
Cyprus	Laivia	Barthélemy	- I CITICII
Czechia	Lebanon		Zambia

Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha

Saint Lucia

DemocraticRepublic of the Congo

Saint Kitts andZimbabwe Nevis

* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Denmark

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

Liberia

Section 1 - An ecosystem of excellence

To build an ecosystem of excellence that can support the development and uptake of Al across the EU economy, the White Paper proposes a series of actions.

In your opinion, how important are the six actions proposed in section 4 of the White Paper on AI (1-5: 1 is not important at all, 5 is very important)?

	1 - Not important at all	2 - Not important	3 - Neutral	4 - Important	5 - Very important	No opinion
Working with Member states	0	0	0	0	•	0
Focussing the efforts of the research and innovation community	0	0	0	0	•	0
Skills	0	0	0	0	•	0
Focus on SMEs	0	0	0	0	•	0
Partnership with the private sector	0	0	0	0	•	0
Promoting the adoption of Al by the public sector	0	0	0	0	•	0

Are there other actions that should be considered?

500 character(s) maximum

The creation of a data pool for testing & training AI applications under clear regulatory conditions. This would enable providers to respond more quickly to market developments and customer needs and to gain new insights on a broader data basis. This could also improve their innovation and competitiveness in international comparison.

In addition, the development of AI applications should take place within the framework of the EU-value system.

Revising the Coordinated Plan on AI (Action 1)

The Commission, taking into account the results of the public consultation on the White Paper, will propose to Member States a revision of the Coordinated Plan to be adopted by end 2020.

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 (1-5: 1 is not important at all, 5 is very important)?

	1 - Not important at all	2 - Not important	3 - Neutral	4 - Important	5 - Very important	No opinion
Strengthen excellence in research	0	0	0	•	0	0
Establish world-reference testing facilities for AI	0	0	0	•	0	0
Promote the uptake of AI by business and the public sector	0	0	0	0	•	0
Increase the financing for start-ups innovating in Al	0	0	0	•	0	0
Develop skills for AI and adapt existing training programmes	0	0	0	•	0	0
Build up the European data space	0	0	0	0	•	0

Are there other areas that that should be considered?

500 character(s) maximum

Al-relevant basic education in colleges and universities should be promoted.

However, the strengthening of AI-specific competencies must not be at the expense of training in basic disciplines (MINT). In practice, it often turns out that there is a much higher demand and a supply deficit for specialists with a sound mathematical/statistical education than for highly specialised AI experts.

A united and strengthened research and innovation community striving for excellence

Joining forces at all levels, from basic research to deployment, will be key to overcome fragmentation and create synergies between the existing networks of 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 AI (1-5: 1 is not important at all, 5 is very important)?

	1 - Not important at all	2 - Not important	3 - Neutral	4 - Important	5 - Very important	No opinion
Support the establishment of a lighthouse research centre that is world class and able to attract the best minds	•	•	0	•	•	0
Network of existing AI research excellence centres	0	0	0	•	0	0
Set up a public-private partnership for industrial research	0	0	0	0	•	0

Are there any other actions to strengthen the research and innovation community that should be given a priority?

500 character(s) maximum

European companies and institutions must be supported not only in research, but also in the use and operation of applications in order to reduce the outflow of know-how and promote implementation in Europe

Focusing on Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)

The Commission will work with Member States to ensure that at least one digital innovation hub per Member State has a high degree of specialisation on AI.

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 (1-5: 1 is not important at all, 5 is very important)?

	1 - Not important at all	2 - Not important	3 - Neutral	4 - Important	5 - Very important	No opinion
Help to raise SME's awareness about potential benefits of AI	0	0	0	0	•	0
Provide access to testing and reference facilities	0	0	0	0	•	0
Promote knowledge transfer and support the development of AI expertise for SMEs	•	0	•	0	•	•
Support partnerships between SMEs, larger enterprises and academia around AI projects	•	0	•	0	•	•
Provide information about equity financing for Al startups	0	0	0	•	0	0

Are there any other tasks that you consider important for specialised Digital Innovations Hubs?

500 character(s) maximum

The focus and the core competences of SMEs are regularly not the development of Al applications. European competence centres should develop solutions in partnership with companies and also offer their development competence to companies as a service.

In common European research projects, the challenges and practical solutions between regulation and technology could be examined more intensively.

Section 2 - An ecosystem of trust

Chapter 5 of the White Paper sets out options for a regulatory framework for Al.

In your opinion, how important are the following concerns about AI (1-5: 1 is not important at all, 5 is very important)?

1 - Not important at all	2 - Not important	3 - Neutral	4 - Important	5 - Very important	No opinion
--------------------------------	----------------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------------	---------------

Al may endanger safety	0	0	0	•	0	0
Al may breach fundamental rights (such as human dignity, privacy, data protection, freedom of expression, workers' rights etc.)	•	•	0	•	•	0
The use of AI may lead to discriminatory outcomes	0	0	0	0	•	0
Al may take actions for which the rationale cannot be explained	0	0	0	0	•	0
Al may make it more difficult for persons having suffered harm to obtain compensation	0	0	0	•	0	0
Al is not always accurate	0	0	0	•	0	0

Do you have any other concerns about AI that are not mentioned above? Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

In order to resolve concerns about the use of Al applications, it must be ensured that discrimination and errors are avoided. Systems that interfere with people's lives or personal rights must be tested and monitored more closely than systems that merely automate repetitive work steps.

The need to adapt regulation to respond to specific risks caused by Al should strive towards a technology-neutral approach.

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 AI systems?

- Current legislation is fully sufficient
- Current legislation may have some gaps
- There is a need for a new legislation
- 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)?

- Yes
- Other
- No opinion

Other, please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

For Al-applications with high risks, higher requirements must be set than for low risk Al-applications. However, minimum standards should also be formulated for low-risk Al-applications.

	If you wish,	please	indic	ate the	Al appli	cation o	or use	that is	most o	concerr	ing
(("high-risk")	from y	our _l	perspec	ctive:						

500 cha	500 character(s) maximum							

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) (1-5: 1 is not important at all, 5 is very important)?

	1 - Not important at all	2 - Not important	3 - Neutral	4 - Important	5 - Very important	No opinion
The quality of training data sets	0	0	0	•	0	0
The keeping of records and data	0	0	0	•	0	0
Information on the purpose and the nature of AI systems	0	0	0	•	0	0
Robustness and accuracy of AI systems	0	0	0	•	0	0
Human oversight	0	0	0	•	0	0
Clear liability and safety rules	0	0	0	•	0	0

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:

- 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)

0

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

Please specify your answer:

The nature and scope of monitoring must be discussed in society. In particular, it must be demonstrated which successes are actually achieved as a result of monitoring. In addition, only systems that achieve an error rate close to 0% should be used.

Do you believe that a voluntary labelling system (Section 5.G of the White
Paper) would be useful for Al systems that are not considered high-risk in
addition to existing legislation?

- Very much
- Much
- Rather not
- Not at all
- No opinion

Do you have any further suggestion on a voluntary labelling system? 500 character(s) maximum
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 with the identified requirements should be self-assessed ex-ante (prior to putting the system on the market) 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
 A combination of ex-ante compliance and ex-post enforcement mechanisms Other enforcement system No opinion
Do you have any further suggestion on the assessment of compliance?

Section 3 - Safety and liability implications of AI, IoT and robotics

The overall objective of the safety and liability legal frameworks is to ensure that all products and services, including those integrating emerging digital technologies, operate safely, reliably and consistently and that damage having occurred is remedied efficiently.

The current product safety legislation already supports an extended concept of safety protecting against all kind of risks 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?

Cyber risks
Personal security risks
Risks related to the loss of connectivity
□ Mental health risks
In your opinion, are there any further risks to be expanded on to provide
more legal certainty?
500 character(s) maximum
Do you think that the safety legislative framework should consider new risk
assessment procedures for products subject to important changes during
their lifetime?
Yes
No
No opinion
Do you have any further considerations regarding risk assessment
procedures?
500 character(s) maximum
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?
© Yes
© No
No opinion
140 opinion
Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above?
500 character(s) maximum

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?

	Yes,	for a	all Al	apı	olicati	ons
0						

Yes, for specific Al applications

No

No opinion

Do you have any further considerations regarding the question above?

500 character(s) maximum			

Thank you for your contribution to this questionnaire. In case you want to share further ideas on these topics, you can upload a document below.

You can upload a document here:

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Contact

CNECT-AI-CONSULT@ec.europa.eu