

Stakeholder consultation on the draft Guidelines on the transparency requirements for certain AI systems under Article 50 AI Act

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Stakeholder consultation on the draft Guidelines on the transparency requirements for certain AI systems under Article 50 AI Act

Disclaimer: This document of the AI Office is prepared for the purpose of consultation and does not prejudge the final decision that the Commission may take on the final text of the guidelines on transparency requirements under Article 50 AI Act. The responses to this consultation will provide input for the guidelines on the transparency requirements for certain AI systems under Article 50 AI Act.

This consultation is targeted to stakeholders of different categories, including, but not limited to, providers and deployers of interactive and generative AI models and systems, providers and deployers of biometric categorisation and emotion recognition systems, private and public sector organisations using such interactive and generative AI systems, as well as academia and research institutions, civil society organisations, governments, supervisory authorities and the general public.

The Artificial Intelligence Act ('the AI Act'), which entered into force on 1 August 2024, creates a single market and harmonised rules for trustworthy and human-centric Artificial Intelligence (AI) in the EU. It aims to promote innovation and the uptake of AI, while ensuring a high level of protection of health, safety and fundamental rights, including democracy and the rule of law.

Among various obligations, trustworthiness of AI systems is ensured through a set of transparency obligations in Article 50 AI Act. These transparency obligations are applicable as of 2 August 2026.

They aim to enable natural persons to recognise interaction with and content generated or manipulated by AI systems, thus reducing the risks of impersonation, deception or anthropomorphisation and fostering trust and integrity in the information ecosystem.

Pursuant to Article 96(1)(d) AI Act, the Commission shall issue guidelines on the practical implementation of transparency obligations laid down in Article 50 AI Act.

The purpose of the present targeted stakeholder consultation is to collect input from a wide range of stakeholders on the draft Commission guidelines on the application of the transparency obligations in Article 50 AI Act.

The drafting of these Guidelines was informed by input from a variety of stakeholders collected during a broad consultation organised by the Commission and input from the Member States in the AI Board. The draft guidelines are now published for additional stakeholder feedback before they are formally adopted by the Commission.

The targeted consultation **is available in English only** and will be **open for 4 weeks starting on 8 May until 3 June 2026**.

All contributions to this consultation may be made publicly available. Therefore, please do not share any personal or confidential information in your contribution. It is your responsibility to avoid personal data and any reference in your contribution itself that would reveal your identity.

The guidelines will be complemented with a Code of Practice that is under development to support the practical and effective implementation of the requirements in Article 50(2) and (4) on marking and labelling of AI generated content.

This consultation accompanies the draft Guidelines on the transparency obligations under Article 50, which aim to support a consistent interpretation and effective implementation of the transparency requirements applicable to certain AI systems and AI-generated or manipulated content across the Union.

This consultation seeks to collect targeted feedback on the draft Guidelines prepared by the Commission based on broad stakeholder input. In particular, the Commission seeks feedback on whether the explanations, concepts and examples provided sufficiently support stakeholders in understanding and complying with the transparency obligations laid down in Article 50 AI Act, including when and how such obligations apply in practice. The draft Guidelines address the transparency obligations under Article 50 AI Act and are structured as follows:

- **Section I** presents an introduction outlining the background, objectives and legal context of the present Guidelines. It recalls the rationale of transparency within the AI Act, including its links to fundamental rights, user awareness and trust, and situates Article 50 within the broader risk-based framework of the AI Act.

- **Section II** provides an overview of the transparency obligations and related horizontal topics. It includes an explanation of the different obligations under Article 50, the actors responsible for their compliance, exclusions from scope (such as purely personal non-professional activities, research and development), and the interplay with other provisions of the AI Act, including prohibited practices and high-risk AI systems and general-purpose AI models and systems.
- **Section III** addresses transparency obligations for AI systems intended to interact directly with natural persons under Article 50(1) AI Act. It sets out the main concepts and scope of application, details the information obligation, and explains the relevant exceptions (including cases of obvious interaction and certain law enforcement uses), as well as the interplay with other Union legal acts.
- **Section IV** provides guidance on the marking and detection of AI-generated or manipulated content under Article 50(2) AI Act. It clarifies the scope of application, including different modalities of synthetic content, and explains the transparency obligation (marking and detection) and the technical requirements (effectiveness, reliability, robustness and interoperability). It also addresses relevant exceptions and the interaction with other Union legal frameworks.
- **Section V** covers transparency obligations for emotion recognition systems and biometric categorisation systems under Article 50(3) AI Act. It outlines the main concepts, scope and applicable obligations, as well as situations falling outside the scope and the interaction with other Union legal acts.
- **Section VI** addresses the labelling of deep fakes and AI-generated or manipulated text published to inform the public on matters of public interest under Article 50(4) AI Act. It provides clarification on the notions of e.g. deep fakes and matters of public interest, the applicable disclosure obligations (including for evidently creative, artistic, satirical, fictional or analogous works or programmes), and the relevant exceptions. It also explains the relationship with other Union legal acts.
- **Section VII** sets out horizontal requirements applicable to the information provided under Article 50(5) AI Act, including general principles ensuring that transparency information is clear, meaningful and accessible to users.

All participants are invited to provide feedback on the particular sections of the draft Guidelines they are interested in. As not all sections may be relevant for all stakeholders, respondents may reply only to the section (s) they would like. Respondents are encouraged to provide explanations and practical cases as part of their responses to support the practical usefulness of the Guidelines. We kindly ask the respondents to specify the exact section and paragraph of the draft Guidelines to which their comments refer.

The feedback collected through this consultation will support the Commission in refining and finalising the Guidelines, with the objective of ensuring that they are clear, comprehensive and practically useful for all stakeholders involved in the development, deployment and supervision of AI systems within the scope of Article 50 of the AI Act.

All contributions to this consultation may be made publicly available.

Therefore, please do not share any personal or confidential information in your contribution (your written feedback). It is your responsibility to avoid personal data and any reference in your written feedback itself that would reveal your identity.

For information on how the Commission processes your personal data please read our Privacy Statement [7_5_26_Public_Consultation_Transparency50_PrivacyStatement.pdf](#)

Introductory section. Information about the respondent

* First name

* Surname

* Email address

* Do you agree that we may publish your identity together with your contribution in the instance that all contributions are made publicly available?

If you act in your personal capacity: All contributions to this consultation may be made publicly available. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous. The respondent category that you selected for this consultation, your answer regarding residence, and your contribution may be published as received. Should you choose to remain anonymous, your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself.

If you represent one or more organisations: All contributions to this consultation may be made publicly available. You can choose whether you would like respondent details to be made public or to remain anonymous. Only the following organisation details may be published: The respondent category that you selected for this consultation, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its size, its presence in or outside the EU and your

contribution as received. Should you choose to remain anonymous, your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

- Yes
- No

* Do you agree that we may contact you in the event of follow-up questions or if we want to learn more about your responses?

- Yes
- No

* Do you represent an organisation (e.g., a public organisation, a company, a think tank or a civil society /consumer organisation) or act in your personal capacity (e.g., independent expert)?

- Organisation
- In a personal capacity

* If you are representing an organisation, please specify the name of the organisation:

Finnish Music Creators (Suomen Musiikintekijät)

* Type of organisation

Association

* Is a representation of the organisation located in the EU?

- The organisation's headquarter is located in the EU
- A branch office, or any representation of the organisation is located in the EU
- None of the representations of the organisation is located in the EU

* Select the EU Member State where the organisation's headquarter, or representation is located

FI - Finland

* Select the size of the organisation

Micro (0-9 employees)

* Sector(s) of activity

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information technology | <input type="checkbox"/> Employment | <input type="checkbox"/> Transport |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public administration | <input type="checkbox"/> Education and training | <input type="checkbox"/> Telecommunications |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Law enforcement | <input type="checkbox"/> Consumer services | <input type="checkbox"/> Retail |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Justice sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Business services | <input type="checkbox"/> E-commerce |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal services sector | <input type="checkbox"/> Banking and finances | <input type="checkbox"/> Advertising |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural and creative sector, including media | <input type="checkbox"/> Manufacturing | <input type="checkbox"/> Consumer protection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Healthcare | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Others |

* Describe the activities of your organisation or yourself

1300 character(s) maximum

We promote the economic and professional interests, social recognition, and sense of community of Finnish composers, lyricists, and arrangers.

When providing feedback, please ensure that your responses are concise and clearly reference the relevant section, subsection and/or paragraph number(s) of the draft Guidelines.

This will support the Commission in efficiently analysing stakeholder input and refining the Guidelines to ensure they are clear, comprehensive and practically usable.

* **On which part(s) of the draft Guidelines would like comment?** *Multiple answers are possible. Please note that selecting a particular answer will direct you to a set of questions specifically related to subject specified.*

- Section I - Background and objectives**
- Section II - Overview of transparency obligations and horizontal topics**
- Section III - Article 50(1): Transparency for interactive AI systems**
- Section IV - Article 50(2): Marking and detection of AI-generated or manipulated content**
- Section V - Article 50(3): Emotion recognition and biometric categorisation systems**
- Section VI - Article 50(4): Labelling of deep fakes and certain text publications**
- Section VII - Horizontal requirements (Article 50(5))**

Section I - Background and objectives

Question A. Are there any aspects / paragraphs of this Section of the draft Guidelines that you believe require further clarification?

- Yes
- No
- NA

If so, how would you suggest they be improved to ensure effective implementation and compliance?

2000 character(s) maximum

The Guidelines should more clearly clarify how Article 50 obligations work in practice across the value chain, especially as regards downstream platforms and other service providers, as well as clarify certain aspects in relation to copyright and the meaning of “first interaction or exposure” in digital environments. The objectives of user awareness, trust and integrity are explained, but the Guidelines do not clearly explain how these objectives translate into concrete mechanisms to implement the obligations of the AI Act for providers and deployers while ensuring compliance with other relevant EU legislation. In particular, the interaction with other legal frameworks, such as copyright law, needs further clarification. This is especially important for music creators and the wider cultural and creative sectors, where transparency obligations affect both the identification and use of protected works and the public’s ability to understand the nature of the content they are exposed to, or choose to see, hear or search. The Guidelines address very little about copyright beyond limited references, such as deep fakes, despite the significant and likely harmful impact of AI-generated content that unfairly competes with original works and, in many instances, misleads consumers as to the authenticity and source of content, both online and offline. The Guidelines do not address copyright considerations related to labelling, such as whether and to what extent labelling affects the copyrightability of parts or all of the content, nor the need for cooperation with creators and other rightholders to make marking and labelling effective.

Section II - Overview of transparency obligations and horizontal topics

Question A. Are there any aspects / sections / paragraphs that require further clarification or refinement?

- Yes
- No

Please indicate specific parts.

2000 character(s) maximum

The Guidelines should clarify the difference between providers and deployers in complex value chains, especially where several actors create, modify or distribute content (e.g. where GenAI outputs are further modified or distributed by third parties). They should also explain responsibility across the AI content value chain more clearly. The role of platforms, intermediaries and other downstream actors should be made clearer. They are important for making transparency work in practice, but the Guidelines do not define their responsibilities clearly enough. Article 50(2) requires AI-generated content to be machine-readable and detectable. Comparable machine-readable mechanisms already exist in EU law, including Article 4(3) of the CDSM Directive, under which rightholders may reserve their works against text-and-data mining by machine-readable means – a reservation downstream operators must respect. However, the framework does not yet clearly require downstream actors, such as online platforms or digital service providers, to preserve, display or keep intact the machine-readable marking under Article 50(2). As a result, it is unclear how effective these measures will be in practice: if downstream actors have no clear responsibility to keep labels intact and meaningful, the transparency framework may fail.

Section III - Article 50(1): Transparency for interactive AI systems

Question A. Are there aspects requiring further clarification for effective implementation and compliance?

- Yes
- No

Please indicate specific parts.

2000 character(s) maximum

Transparency and compliance should not rest on providers alone. In complex value chains, AI services, GenAI services and the services that create the first user interaction or exposure also have key responsibilities. The Guidelines should reflect this more clearly, especially where these actors shape how AI outputs are used, integrated or shown to end-users. Effective transparency is not only about informing end-users. Music creators, other rightholders and relevant stakeholders also need access to information so they are able to assess uses and secure fair remuneration. This includes meaningful access to data needed to identify the use of protected content in AI-generated outputs (e.g. an original composition used in an AI-generated video), cases where AI-generated content is presented as original work, and cases where original work is wrongly labelled as AI-generated. Access to relevant information is supported by recent case law: the CJEU has confirmed that access to relevant data and meaningful processes between parties are important to ensure fair compensation (Case C-797/23, Meta Platforms Ireland (Fair compensation)). A wide range of rights-management technologies already exists in the market and is continuously developed to meet market needs. Such technologies vary by sector and repertoire, but can support practical and scalable licensing solutions. Their success depends on cooperation from GenAI services and from platforms that make AI-generated content available to the public, and requires that such services and platforms provide relevant information in alignment with existing rights-management systems. Meaningful transparency must include enforceable cooperation with rightholders. This is necessary to ensure fair remuneration and to make the transparency framework work in practice, while supporting both AI innovation and the cultural and creative sectors.

Question B. Are there additional practical examples or use-cases that should be clarified?

- Yes
- No

Please specify:

2000 character(s) maximum

See previous reply.

Section IV - Article 50(2): Marking and detection of AI-generated or manipulated content

Question A. Are there aspects requiring further clarification or refinement to ensure effective implementation of marking and detection obligations?

- Yes
- No

Please specify:

2000 character(s) maximum

The Guidelines should explain more clearly how Article 50(2) applies to mixed or layered content that combines human and AI elements – it is not clear how marking should apply in such cases, or how to distinguish fully AI-generated content from AI-assisted content, which is essential in music and the wider creative sectors. To avoid inconsistent interpretation and divergent practical implementation across providers, the Guidelines should clarify what an “effective, robust, reliable and interoperable” technical solution means in practice. They should set minimum functional requirements for labelling, including that labels remain persistent across the value chain, are machine-readable and visible to end-users, and cannot be removed, altered or manipulated. The role of downstream actors should be clearer. Effective implementation depends not only on providers, but also on platforms, DSPs and other services that distribute or display content. The Guidelines should explain how these actors must help keep labels visible and intact. The Guidelines should also address the risk of incorrect or misleading labels, for example when human-created works are marked as AI-generated. This can have serious legal and commercial effects for music creators and other rightholders. Safeguards are therefore needed to protect rightholders’ ability to control and monetise their works. The Guidelines should make clear that labelling under Article 50 only indicates the AI origin of content; it should not be treated as a statement about copyright status or clearance.

Question B. Are there additional examples, use-cases or technical approaches that should be included?

- Yes
- No

Please specify:

2000 character(s) maximum

Examples should cover layered content, especially in music and audiovisual works, where the underlying work is human-created but the voice or visual elements are AI-generated. More examples are needed for platform distribution, showing how marking should be preserved and remain visible when AI-generated content is shared through streaming services, social media or UGC platforms. Examples should also cover multimodal content, including combinations of audio, video and text, and explain how marking should apply consistently across them.

Question C. What technical approaches or solutions should be considered for the implementation of the marking and detection obligations under Article 50(2) AI Act, in particular in relation to AI agents and virtual or immersive environments (e.g. virtual reality)? Please provide concrete examples, methodologies or tools where possible.

1500 character(s) maximum

(No response.)

Section VII - Horizontal requirements (Article 50(5))

Question A. Are there aspects requiring further clarification or refinement to ensure effective implementation?

Please indicate specific parts.

2000 character(s) maximum

The concept of “first interaction or exposure” needs clearer guidance, especially in streaming, social media and immersive environments where content is constantly reshared or reused. In these settings, online platforms and digital service providers are often the main interface for end-user access to AI-generated or manipulated content, but the Guidelines do not sufficiently address their responsibilities by clearly explaining when disclosure must be shown or repeated for different users over time (i.e. when “first exposure” occurs in each instance). The Guidelines should also explain how to ensure transparency – that is, the visibility of information – across the value chain, especially when content is redistributed or reshared by platforms or third parties. It is essential to ensure that transparency information is, and remains, accessible to end-users.

Contact

[Contact Form](#)