UDC: 004.8:34(4-672EU) DOI: 10.56461/iup_rlrc.2024.5.ch12

***David MOLNAR****
**Faculty of Law, University of Pécs, Hungary**

# AI UNLEASHED: MASTERING THE MAZE OF THE EU AI ACT

*The European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act represents a pioneering endeavour to align the utilization of artificial intelligence (AI) with stringent ethical and safety norms, heralding a transformative phase for various professions. This paper delves into the Act's deliberate attempt to strike a delicate equilibrium between encouraging technological innovation and imposing strict accountability measures, especially in contexts where AI is deemed high-risk. By analyzing the repercussions for critical sectors including healthcare, finance, and technology, we expose the paradoxical nature of compliance: it poses a formidable challenge necessitating comprehensive ethical guidelines, yet simultaneously acts as a stimulus for the development of groundbreaking ethical AI methodologies. Furthermore, we accentuate the worldwide influence of the EU's regulatory framework, providing key strategic recommendations for adeptly manoeuvring through the dynamic AI regulatory environment. In essence, "AI Unleashed: Mastering the Maze of the EU AI Act" encapsulates the transformative potential of regulatory obstacles as avenues for fostering ethical innovation and propelling professional growth.*

***Keywords:*** AI regulation, ethical innovation, high-risk AI, compliance, global impact.

## 1. INTRODUCTION: OVERVIEW OF AI AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE IN MODERN SOCIETY

Artificial intelligence (AI) represents one of the most transformative technologies of the 21st century, profoundly impacting various aspects of modern society. AI refers to the simulation of human intelligence processes by machines, particularly computer systems. This encompasses the processes of learning (the acquisition of information and rules for using the information), reasoning (using rules to reach approximate or definite conclusions), and self-correction (Russell & Norvig, 2021, p. 25). The applications of AI are diverse and pervasive, extending across a range of fields, including healthcare (Jiang

* LLM, ORCID: 0009-0000-5836-4825, e-mail: *molnardavid836@gmail.com*

*et al.*, 2017, p. 235), finance (D'Acunto, Prabhala, & Rossi, 2019, p. 225), transportation (Goodall *et al.*, 2017, p. 210), and entertainment (Sharma & Kumar, 2021, p. 115). This underscores the technology's pervasive influence and ubiquitous presence.

In the field of healthcare, AI technologies have transformed diagnostic processes, personalized treatment plans, and predictive analytics, resulting in enhanced patient outcomes and operational efficiency. For instance, AI-driven diagnostic tools can analyse medical images with remarkable accuracy, often exceeding human capabilities in detecting abnormalities such as tumours (Esteva *et al.*, 2017, p. 117). Similarly, AI-driven predictive analytics in finance facilitate risk assessment and fraud detection, thereby ensuring economic stability and improving decision-making processes (Ngai *et al.*, 2011, p. 565).

Moreover, AI's role in autonomous vehicles and smart infrastructure is poised to reshape urban mobility and logistics, offering solutions to longstanding challenges such as traffic congestion and environmental sustainability (Litman, 2018, p. 5). In the entertainment industry, AI algorithms curate personalized content, thereby transforming user experiences and redefining content consumption patterns (Gomez-Uribe & Hunt, 2015, p. 10).

The societal implications of AI extend beyond mere efficiency and convenience. AI has the potential to address complex global challenges, including climate change, resource management, and public health crises. For example, AI models can predict environmental changes and optimize resource allocation, thereby contributing to sustainable development goals (Rolnick *et al.*, 2019, p. 12). Additionally, during the COVID-19 pandemic, AI played a critical role in tracking the virus's spread, developing vaccines, and managing public health responses (Bullock *et al.*, 2020, p. 810).

However, the rapid advancement of AI also raises significant ethical and safety concerns. Issues such as bias in AI algorithms, data privacy, and the displacement of human labour necessitate robust regulatory frameworks to ensure that AI technologies are developed and deployed responsibly. The European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act represents a pioneering effort to address these challenges, aiming to balance the promotion of technological innovation with the imposition of stringent ethical and safety standards.

This paper explores the EU AI Act's structured approach to regulating AI, focusing on its three-tier framework and the implications for high-risk AI applications. By examining the impact on critical sectors and the broader global context, this study seeks to provide strategic insights for navigating the dynamic regulatory landscape and fostering ethical AI innovation.

## *2. HISTORICAL CONTEXT*

### *2.1. The Evolution of Artificial Intelligence Technologies*

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has a rich history, marked by significant milestones that have transformed it from a theoretical concept to a practical and influential tool in modern society. The term "artificial intelligence" was first used in 1956 by John McCarthy, who is regarded as one of the founding figures of AI. This period, known as the Dartmouth Conference, is widely regarded as the birth of artificial intelligence as a field of research (McCarthy *et al.*, 1955). The initial research

in the field of artificial intelligence concentrated on symbolic AI, which involved the manipulation of symbols and the creation of rule-based systems that simulated human thought (Moor, 2006, p. 88).

The 1960s and 1970s saw the development of fundamental algorithms and the first AI programs capable of performing tasks such as playing chess and solving algebraic problems. Notable examples include Logic Theorist, which was capable of proving mathematical theorems (Newell & Simon, 2016, p. 285), and ELIZA, an early natural language processing program designed to simulate conversation (Weizenbaum, 1966, p. 40).

The 1980s marked the advent of the expert systems era, which aimed to emulate the decision-making abilities of human experts in specific domains. These systems, such as MYCIN for medical diagnostics, demonstrated the potential of artificial intelligence to handle complex, specialized tasks (Feigenbaum, 1981, p. 95). However, the limitations of rule-based systems and the computational power required led to a decline in enthusiasm, often referred to as the "artificial intelligence winter" (Smith & Tsotsos, 1998, p. 21).

The 1990s and 2000s saw a resurgence in artificial intelligence, brought about by the development of machine learning, a subfield of artificial intelligence that focuses on developing algorithms that allow computers to learn from data and make predictions based on that data. The advancement of more powerful computers and the accessibility of voluminous data facilitated breakthroughs in neural networks, leading to the modern era of deep learning (LeCun, Bengio & Hinton, 2015, p. 438).

The incorporation of these AI technologies into a wide range of applications is a current trend. These include autonomous vehicles like Teslas, health diagnostics, financial modelling, and personalized digital assistants like Amazon's Alexa or Apple's Siri on iPhones. These advances are underpinned by sophisticated algorithms, vast amounts of data, and significant computational resources. This highlights the transformative potential of AI across sectors (Russell & Norvig, 2021, p. 580).

### *2.2. Previous Regulatory Experiments and Their Results*

The rapid development and widespread deployment of AI technologies have necessitated the development of regulatory frameworks to address the ethical, legal, and societal implications. Early regulatory attempts focused primarily on data protection and privacy, exemplified by the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which entered into force in 2018. The GDPR established rigorous guidelines for data collection, processing, and storage, with the objective of safeguarding individuals' privacy rights in the context of the growing prevalence of big data and artificial intelligence (Center for Information Policy Leadership - Hunton Andrews Kurth, 2020, p. 3).

One of the earliest significant initiatives to directly address AI was the publication of the European Commission's High-Level Expert Group on Trusted AI Ethical Guidelines in 2019. These guidelines emphasized principles such as human agency, transparency, accountability, and robustness, laying the groundwork for more comprehensive regulatory action (European Commission, 2019).

In 2020, the European Commission presented a White Paper on Artificial Intelligence, which outlined policy options to foster the development of AI, while also addressing the potential risks. This document served as a precursor to the proposed AI law, emphasizing the necessity for a risk-based regulatory approach that differentiates between various applications of AI based on their potential societal impact (European Commission, 2020).

The outcomes of these regulatory experiments have been somewhat inconsistent. While the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) has significantly enhanced data protection standards on a global scale, it has also imposed significant compliance costs on organizations. The ethical guidelines for trusted AI have been lauded for their comprehensive approach, yet they have also been criticized for their non-binding nature, which limits their enforceability (Binns, 2018, p. 152).

The proposed AI Act seeks to build upon previous efforts by introducing binding regulations that address the specific challenges posed by AI technologies. The Act establishes a legal framework that categorizes AI applications according to their level of risk, thereby attempting to achieve a balance between the need to promote innovation and the need to protect public interests and fundamental rights. The emphasis on harmonized regulations across the EU is designed to prevent market fragmentation and ensure legal certainty for AI developers and users (EU AI Act, 2024).

## 3. THE STRUCTURE OF THE EU AI ACT

The structure of the EU legal act is based on a three-tier framework for categorizing AI systems according to their level of risk. This approach provides a balanced regulatory framework that allows for innovation while simultaneously protecting the public interest, ethical standards, and safety norms. The framework categorizes AI applications into three distinct categories: minimal and limited risk, high risk, and unacceptable risk. Each category is associated with specific regulatory requirements and consequences (EU AI Act, 2024).

### *3.1. Level 1 and 2: Low-Risk AI Systems (Minimal and Limited Risk)*

Artificial intelligence systems classified under Level 1 are deemed to present minimal or limited risk to users and society at large. These systems are not associated with significant implications for fundamental rights, safety, or the well-being of individuals like the high-risk and unacceptable systems. Consequently, they are subject to the most lenient regulatory requirements. This level is further subdivided into two categories: minimal risk and limited risk AI systems. Each category is subject to distinct regulatory implications (Menengola, Gabardo & González Sanmiguel, 2023, p. 50).

Minimal-risk AI systems are those that pose virtually no risk to users and society. Examples of these systems include applications such as AI-enabled video games and spam filters. These systems are free to be used without regulatory intervention, as they represent only minimal or no risk to citizens' rights or safety. The vast majority of AI

systems currently used in the EU fall into this category. For instance, spam filters help manage and organize email inboxes by filtering out unwanted or harmful messages, while AI-powered games offer entertainment without posing significant risks to players (European Commission, 2024a).

The implications of this classification for minimal-risk AI systems are profound for both developers and users. Developers benefit from a reduced regulatory burden, facilitating rapid innovation and deployment of a wide range of AI applications. For users, this translates to enhanced services and products that are safe and trustworthy, without the delay often associated with stringent compliance processes. The EU AI Act's approach to minimal-risk AI systems reflects a broader trend in technology regulation, where flexibility and innovation are encouraged in areas deemed to pose lower risks (Labadze, Grigolia & Machaidze, 2023; Finocchiaro, 2024; Ebers & Schaar, 2023).

While still considered low-risk, limited-risk AI systems are subject to minimal transparency obligations. This classification includes applications like customer service chatbots, which enhance user experience without making critical decisions. These chatbots must disclose their AI nature, allowing users to decide whether to continue using them. The regulatory approach for limited-risk AI systems ensures that users are informed about the AI they interact with, which is essential for building trust and maintaining ethical standards (European Commission, 2024b; Labadze, Grigolia & Machaidze, 2023; Finocchiaro, 2024; Ebers & Schaar, 2023).

The EU AI Act provides a balanced approach to regulation, distinguishing between minimal and limited-risk AI systems. Minimal risk systems enjoy regulatory freedom, fostering innovation, while limited-risk systems must meet basic transparency requirements to ensure user trust. This framework allows developers to create valuable AI applications without excessive regulation, while users can trust in their safety and ethical compliance.

### *3.2. Level 3: High-Risk AI Systems*

Artificial intelligence systems classified as Level 3 are regarded as posing a considerable risk or systemic risk due to their capacity to exert a profound impact on the rights, security, and well-being of individuals and they can also impact the Union's market significantly. These systems are typically utilized in critical sectors such as healthcare, finance, and transportation, where errors or biases can have grave consequences. Examples of high-risk AI applications include medical diagnostic tools, automatic credit authorization systems, and autonomous driving technologies (EU AI Act, 2024; European Commission, 2024b).

High-risk AI systems are those that can affect essential aspects of people's lives and liberties. For example, an AI system used in healthcare to diagnose diseases must be accurate and reliable because a wrong diagnosis can lead to inadequate treatment, posing serious health risks to patients (Rajkomar *et al*., 2018, p. 868). Similarly, AI applications in finance, such as those used for credit scoring, must ensure fairness and transparency to prevent discriminatory practices that could unjustly deny individuals access

to financial services (Bono, Croxon & Kites, 2020, p. 590). The significant influence of these systems on critical decisions underscores the need for rigorous oversight and stringent regulatory measures.

High-risk AI systems are subject to rigorous regulatory requirements to ensure their safe and ethical deployment. These include mandatory risk assessments, transparency obligations, and robust data governance measures. Providers of high-risk AI systems must ensure that their products are designed and implemented in a manner that mitigates potential risks. This often involves adhering to specific standards for accuracy, robustness, and cybersecurity. The European Commission highlights in the regulation that these requirements are essential for maintaining the integrity and reliability of AI systems in critical applications (EU AI Act, 2024).

Compliance also entails continuous monitoring and reporting of the AI system's performance and impact. Developers must establish mechanisms for human oversight and intervention to address any unforeseen issues that may arise during the system's operation. These stringent requirements are intended to prevent harm and promote trust in AI technologies deployed in sensitive areas. The focus on transparency and accountability helps ensure that high-risk AI systems are used responsibly and that their benefits are maximized while minimizing potential harm (EU AI Act, 2024).

The EU AI Act mandates that high-risk AI systems undergo conformity assessments to verify that they meet the necessary standards before they can be deployed. These assessments are designed to evaluate the system's compliance with regulatory requirements and to identify and address any potential risks. By implementing these measures, the EU aims to create a safe and trustworthy environment for the use of high-risk AI systems. This comprehensive approach is intended to mitigate the risks associated with high-impact AI applications, ensuring that they operate within defined ethical and safety boundaries (EU AI Act, 2024).

For example, in the healthcare sector, AI diagnostic tools must be rigorously tested to ensure they do not produce false positives or negatives, which could lead to serious medical consequences. The EU AI Act stipulates that such systems must be transparent in their decision-making processes, providing clear information on how diagnoses are determined. This transparency allows medical professionals to understand and trust the AI's recommendations, integrating them effectively into patient care (Antun *et al.*, 2020, p. 30092; EU AI Act, 2024).

In the financial sector, AI systems used for credit scoring must be designed to prevent bias and discrimination. The Act requires that these systems undergo regular audits to ensure compliance with fairness standards. Transparency is also crucial here, as individuals affected by AI decisions must be able to understand and challenge those decisions if necessary. By mandating these practices, the EU AI Act aims to prevent the perpetuation of existing biases and promote equitable treatment across all demographic groups (EU AI Act, 2024).

Autonomous driving technologies represent another high-risk application of AI. These systems must adhere to the highest standards of safety and reliability, as any failure could result in significant harm to individuals and property. The EU AI Act requires

that autonomous vehicles be subject to rigorous testing and continuous monitoring to ensure they operate safely in all conditions. Moreover, the Act mandates the inclusion of fail-safe mechanisms that allow human intervention if the AI system encounters unforeseen issues (EU AI Act, 2024).

The EU's approach to regulating high-risk AI systems is informed by a broader commitment to ethical AI development. As noted by Floridi *et al*. (2018, pp. 689-707), ethical guidelines for AI emphasize the need for transparency, accountability, and fairness in AI applications. These principles are embedded within the regulatory framework of the EU AI Act, ensuring that high-risk AI systems are developed and deployed in a manner that respects fundamental rights and societal values (EU AI Act, 2024).

### *3.3. Level 4: Unacceptable Risk AI Systems*

Unacceptable risk AI systems are defined in the AI Act as those that pose a significant and irreparable threat to security, fundamental rights and public interests. These systems are banned outright due to their potential to cause significant harm. The law identifies several specific applications of AI that fall into this category, reflecting the EU's commitment to protecting human rights and societal values. Examples of AI systems that are considered to pose unacceptable risks include (EU AI Act, 2024; MIT Technology Review, 2024):

**Social Scoring Systems**: AI systems used for social scoring, which evaluate or classify individuals based on their social behaviour, economic status, or personal characteristics, are strictly prohibited. This prohibition is based on the potential for such systems to lead to widespread discrimination, social exclusion, and violation of privacy (EU AI Act, 2024; MIT Technology Review, 2024).

**Biometric Surveillance**: Real-time biometric identification systems deployed in public spaces without explicit user consent are also banned. The use of facial recognition and other biometric technologies in public surveillance raises significant concerns about privacy, mass surveillance, and the potential misuse of personal data (Clifford Chance, 2021).

**Exploitation of Vulnerabilities**: AI systems designed to exploit vulnerabilities of specific groups, such as children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, are prohibited. These systems pose unacceptable risks as they can manipulate vulnerable populations in ways that undermine their autonomy and well-being (Züehlke, 2023).

**Automated Behavioral Manipulation**: AI systems intended to manipulate human behaviour in a way that causes physical or psychological harm are also banned. This includes systems that can subtly influence users' decisions through subliminal techniques or deceptive practices (Brookings, 2024).

The rationale behind these prohibitions is rooted in the need to protect fundamental human rights and ensure that AI technologies are developed and deployed in a manner that upholds ethical standards and societal values. The AI Act's focus on preventing the deployment of AI systems with unacceptable risks is a reflection of the broader regulatory philosophy that prioritizes human dignity, privacy, and fairness. By categorically banning these high-risk applications, the AI Act aims to prevent scenarios where AI technologies could be used to harm individuals or society at large. This regulatory stance is aligned with

the EU's broader commitment to ethical AI and is intended to set a global benchmark for responsible AI governance (Shafafi & Sabel, 2024; European Commission, 2019).

In conclusion, the classification and regulation of AI systems that present unacceptable risks under the AI Act represents a rigorous and ethically informed approach to the management of the potential harms associated with advanced AI technologies. The Act's categorical prohibition of AI applications that pose significant risks to fundamental rights and public safety is intended to safeguard individuals and society from the most egregious abuses of AI.

## 4. THE INNOVATION PARADOX OF REGULATION IN THE CONTEXT OF THE AI ACT

In a rapidly evolving field of artificial intelligence, the EU AI Act plays a pivotal role in establishing a regulatory framework that ensures the ethical development and deployment of AI technologies, while safeguarding public interests. However, this regulatory imperative also highlights the so-called "innovation paradox of regulation" which posits an inherent tension between promoting innovation and regulating to achieve a balance that ensures safety, transparency, and accountability (Sabl, 2021, p. 3).

On the one hand, the regulations pertaining to AI are designed to mitigate the aforementioned risks associated with these technologies. Among the potential risks associated with AI technologies are the possibility of algorithmic bias, privacy threats, and other unintended consequences that could have adverse effects. It is imperative that regulations establish clear guidelines and standards to ensure the responsible development and use of AI systems, with the aim of protecting individuals and society from potential harm. In our case, the AI Act of the European Union is designed to establish a legal framework wherein AI systems are organized based on the risks they pose. This framework imposes more rigorous requirements for high-risk AI applications, with the aim of preventing their misapplication and ensuring their ethical use (Turk, 2024, p. 92; Pehlivan, 2024, p. 15).

On the other hand, the regulatory environment has the potential to impede innovation. The extensive compliance requirements pertaining to risk management, data governance, and technical documentation, among other aspects, are particularly onerous for developers. It is not uncommon for such requirements to necessitate significant investments in time, resources, and expertise, which can sometimes result in increased development costs and extended lead times for the commercialization of AI systems. Consequently, this could result in a reduction in the rate of innovation and an unfavourable competitive environment for companies, particularly smaller organizations and startups, in comparison to larger or more established entities (Sabl, 2021, p. 5; Wagner *et al.*, 2024, p. 24).

The paradox is even more striking when it comes to high-risk AI systems, which include some of the most innovative and impactful AI uses. These systems should be strictly regulated because of their potential to have a strong impact on fundamental rights, safety, and public interests. While these regulations are important for ensuring

ethical and safe AI deployment, they significantly raise the barrier of entry to any innovation, allowing very few new inventions to make it into the marketplace and establish a foothold. This can dampen diversity and dynamism in the field of AI and concentrate market power in the hands of a few large and established firms (Pehlivan, 2024, p. 20; de Graaf & Veldt, 2022, p. 832).

Furthermore, the inflexibility of the regulatory framework is ill-suited to accommodate the rapid advancements in AI technologies. As artificial intelligence continues to advance at a rapid pace, new risks and ethical challenges are emerging that existing regulations may be unable to fully address. This discrepancy may impede firms' capacity to continue innovating freely and responding to emerging challenges, thereby hindering the growth and development of the AI sector (Mendes, Doneda & Almeida, 2023, p. 35).

Notwithstanding these obstacles, the EU AI Act is oriented towards rigorous regulation rather than the promotion of innovation. The principal objective of the Act is to guarantee public confidence in AI systems among the citizens of the European Union, although this is achieved at a significant cost. The Act's objective is to establish a framework that prioritizes safety, transparency, and accountability in order to foster public trust in AI technologies. Nevertheless, this process of fostering trust entails extensive regulatory oversight, which imposes a considerable burden on developers and companies. The emphasis on ethical AI development and the protection of fundamental rights is laudable; however, it can also result in a rigid environment that may impede the dynamic nature of AI innovation (Pehlivan, 2024, p. 22; Turk, 2024, p. 52).

The EU AI Act's rigorous compliance requirements, which encompass detailed risk management, data governance, technical documentation, transparency, human oversight, robustness, and cybersecurity, necessitate significant investments in time, resources, and expertise. This comprehensive regulatory approach results in elevated development costs and extended timeframes for the introduction of AI systems to the market. This may impede innovation and diminish the competitive edge of European AI enterprises on a global scale (Turk, 2024, p. 55).

## 5. CONCLUSIONS: THE WAY FORWARD

The EU AI Act is a significant step towards creating a comprehensive regulatory framework for Artificial Intelligence, balancing its benefits with ethical and safety standards. This regulatory environment, however, will be challenging and will require constant adjustments to promote innovation while protecting public interests.

The stringent compliance requirements burden developers, especially smaller enterprises and startups. Continuous review and revision of the process are necessary. To keep the regulatory framework relevant, there should be ongoing dialogue between policymakers, developers, and stakeholders. A flexible regime of regulations that can adapt to technological improvements, incorporating research and feedback from the AI community, is essential (Mancheva, 2022).

Despite the stringent environment, regulations must support innovation. Providing financial incentives, grants, and technical assistance can help SMEs comply with

regulations without stifling their innovative potential. This support allows startups to focus on innovation while meeting regulatory requirements (Mancheva, 2022).

Continuous monitoring and stakeholder feedback in AI systems are crucial for early issue detection and ensuring safety and reliability. These measures, conducted periodically, can modify and enhance regulations, with performance evaluations through audits and user feedback systems (Figalist *et al.*, 2021, p. 106460).

In conclusion, while the AI Act is a pioneering legislative initiative, it requires ongoing analysis and adaptation. Continuous improvement of this regulatory regime will ensure AI technologies develop in a way that safeguards fundamental rights and enhances quality of life. The rapid pace of innovation demands an equally rapid evolution of regulatory frameworks. This involves balancing innovation and compliance, promoting ethical AI development, facilitating cross-border collaboration, and establishing robust monitoring and feedback mechanisms. Such measures are vital for creating a regulatory environment that supports innovation while protecting public interests and fostering responsible and beneficial AI development.

## LIST OF REFERENCES


Antun, V. *et al*. 2020. On instabilities of deep learning in image reconstruction and the potential costs of AI. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(48), pp. 30088-30095. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1907377117

Binns, R. 2018. Fairness in Machine Learning: Lessons from Political Philosophy. *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency, PMLR*, 81, pp. 149-159.

Bono, T., Croxson, K. & Giles, A. 2021. Algorithmic fairness in credit scoring, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 37(3), pp. 585–617. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grab020

Bullock, J. *et al*. 2020. Mapping the landscape of artificial intelligence applications against COVID-19. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 69, pp. 807-845. https://doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.12162

Clifford Chance. 2021. The future of AI regulation in Europe and its global impact. Available at: https://www.cliffordchance.com/content/dam/cliffordchance/briefings/2021/05/the-future-of-ai-regulation-in-europe-and-its-global-impact.pdf (11. 7. 2024).

D'Acunto, F., Prabhala, N. & Rossi, A. 2019. The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Financial Services Industry. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 133(2), pp. 223-251.

de Graaf, T. & Veldt, B. 2022. The AI Act and Its Impact on Product Safety, Contracts and Liability, *European Review of Private Law*, 30(5), pp. 803-834. https://doi.org/10.54648/erpl2022038

Esteva, A. *et al*. 2017. Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks. *Nature,* 542(7639), pp. 115-118. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21056

Ebers, M. & Schaar, P. 2023. Risk Management in the Artificial Intelligence Act. *European Journal of Risk Regulation*, 14(1), pp. 34-58.

Feigenbaum, E. A. 1981. Knowledge engineering: The applied side of artificial intelligence. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 426(1), pp. 91-107. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1984.tb16513.x

Figalist, I. *et al*. 2021. Fast and curious: A model for building efficient monitoring- and decision-making frameworks based on quantitative data. *Information & Software Technology*, 130, 106458. Available at: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0950584920302044 (10. 10. 2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2020.106458

Finocchiaro, G. 2024. The regulation of artificial intelligence. *AI & SOCIETY*, 39, pp. 1961-1968. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-023-01650-z

Floridi, L. *et al*. 2018. AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles, and Recommendations. *Minds & Machines*, 28, pp. 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

Goodall, N. J. *et al*. 2017. AI in Transportation: Current and Future Developments. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 77, pp. 207-225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2017.01.022

Gomez-Uribe, C. A. & Hunt, N. 2015. The Netflix Recommender System: Algorithms, Business Value, and Innovation. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems*, 6(4), pp. 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1145/2843948

Jiang, F. *et al*. 2017. Artificial intelligence in healthcare: past, present and future. *Stroke and Vascular Neurology*, 2(4), pp. 230-243. https://doi.org/10.1136/svn-2017-000101

Labadze, L., Grigolia, M. & Machaidze, L. 2023. Role of AI chatbots in education: systematic literature review. *Educational Technology Journal*, 15(2), pp. 123-145. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00426-1

LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y. & Hinton, G. 2015. Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553), pp. 436-444. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539

Mancheva, G. (2022). European regulatory framework on artificial intelligence in the SME sector – a risk based approach. In: *Artificial intelligence in the field of security – advantages and threats*, Plovdiv, pp. 175-179.

McCarthy, J. *et al*. 1955. A proposal for the Dartmouth summer research project on artificial intelligence. Available at: https://www-formal.stanford.edu/jmc/history/dartmouth/dartmouth.html (3. 7. 2024).

Menengola, E., Gabardo, E. & González Sanmiguel, N. N. 2023. The proposal of the European regulation on artificial intelligence. *Sequência: Estudos Jurídicos e Políticos*, 44(91), pp. 45-66. https://doi.org/10.5007/2177-7055.2022.e91435

Mendes, L. S., Doneda, D. & Almeida, V. 2023. On the Development of AI Governance Frameworks. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 27(1), pp. 32-40. https://doi.org/10.1109/MIC.2022.3186030

MIT Technology Review. 2024. What's next for AI regulation in 2024? Available at: https://www.technologyreview.com/2024/01/05/1086203/whats-next-ai-regulation-2024/ (11. 7. 2024).

Moor, J. 2006. The Dartmouth College Artificial Intelligence Conference: The Next Fifty Years. *AI Magazine*, 27(4), pp. 87-89. https://doi.org/10.1609/aimag.v27i4.1911

Newell, A. & Simon, H. A. 2016. GPS, a program that simulates human thought. *Computers and Thought*, 4, pp. 279-293.
Ngai, E. W. *et al*. 2011. The application of data mining techniques in financial fraud detection: A classification framework and an academic review of literature. *Decision Support Systems*, 50(3), pp. 559-569. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2010.08.006
Pehlivan, C. N. 2024. The EU Artificial Intelligence (AI) Act: An Introduction. *Global Privacy Law Review*, 5(1), pp. 12-28. https://doi.org/10.54648/GPLR2024004
Rajkomar, A. *et al*. 2018. Ensuring Fairness in Machine Learning to Advance Health Equity. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(12), pp. 866-872. https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-1990
Rolnick, D. *et al*. 2019. Tackling climate change with machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(2), pp. 1-96. https://doi.org/10.1145/3485128
Russell, S. J. & Norvig, P. 2021. *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. New York: Pearson Education.
Sabl, A. 2021. The paradox of innovation. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 183, pp. 1-16.
Shafafi, P. & Sabel, M. 2024. So far in 2024: AI innovation, regulation, and the ethical frontier. Designit. Available at: https://www.designit.com/stories/point-of-view/so-far-in-2024-ai-innovation-regulation-ethical (11. 7. 2024).
Sharma, A. & Kumar, A. 2021. Applications of AI in Various Sectors: A Review. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Artificial Intelligence*, 10(3), pp. 112-125.
Smith, C. & Tsotsos, J. K. 1998. The History of Artificial Intelligence. *AI Magazine*, 19(3), pp. 19-31.
Turk, Ž. 2024. Regulating artificial intelligence: A technology-independent approach. *European View*, 23(1), pp. 89-104. https://doi.org/10.1177/17816858241242890
Wagner, M. *et al*. 2024. Navigating the Upcoming European Union AI Act. *IEEE Software*, 41(1), pp. 22-30. https://doi.org/10.1109/MS.2023.3322913
Weizenbaum, J. 1966. ELIZA—a computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Communications of the ACM*, 9(1), pp. 36-45. https://doi.org/10.1145/365153.365168

***Internet Sources***

Brookings. 2024. Regulating general-purpose AI: Areas of convergence and divergence across the EU and the US. Available at: https://www.brookings.edu/articles/regulating-general-purpose-ai-areas-of-convergence-and-divergence-across-the-eu-and-the-us/ (11. 7. 2024).
Center for Information Policy Leadership - Hunton Andrews Kurth. 2020. How GDPR Regulates AI'. Information Policy Centre. Available at: https://www.informationpolicycentre.com/uploads/5/7/1/0/57104281/cipl-hunton_andrews_kurth_legal_note_-_how_gdpr_regulates_ai__12_march_2020_.pdf (9.7.2024).
European Commission. 2019. Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. Available at: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai (9. 7. 2024).

European Commission. 2020. White Paper on Artificial Intelligence: a European approach to excellence and trust. Available at: https://commission.europa.eu/publications/white-paper-artificial-intelligence-european-approach-excellence-and-trust_en (11. 7. 2024).
European Commission. 2024a. Excellence and Trust in Artificial Intelligence. Available at: https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/priorities-2019-2024/europe-fit-digital-age/excellence-and-trust-artificial-intelligence_en (11. 7. 2024).
European Commission. 2024b. Regulatory framework proposal on artificial intelligence. Available at: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai (11. 7. 2024).
Züehlke. 2023. EU AI Act: how AI law will impact innovation. Available at: https://www.zuehlke.com/en/insights/how-will-the-eu-ai-act-impact-ai-innovation (11. 7. 2024).

***Legal Sources***

EU AI Act. 2024. Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonized rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2018/2002 Chapter I: General Provisions Article 1: Subject Matter) Available at: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:L_202401689 (3. 7. 2024).