

EU AI Act vs Interim Measures for Generative AI Service Management

Editorial verdict: **asymmetric** — see comparison narrative below.

EU · BINDING REGULATION

EU AI Act

EU-AIA-2024

TREATMENT OF COMPUTE-THRESHOLD REPORTING

governs

Art. 52 + Annex XIII (10^{2u} FLOP presumption)

Primary source: [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1689](#)

CN · BINDING REGULATION

Interim Measures for Generative AI Service Management

CN-GENAI-2023

TREATMENT OF COMPUTE-THRESHOLD REPORTING

silent

Service-deployment trigger, not compute

Primary source: [CAC Order No. 15](#)

What this comparison shows

One regime addresses the topic explicitly while the other covers it only implicitly or not at all. This is a likely site of regulatory arbitrage and a candidate for comparative-law follow-up.

Contested question: Are compute thresholds (10^{2u} FLOPs EU, 10^{2v} FLOPs US) a defensible proxy for governance-relevant capability, given algorithmic-efficiency improvements? Field is split.

Bibliography

1. [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1689](#) — EU AI Act.
2. [CAC Order No. 15](#) — Interim Measures for Generative AI Service Management.
3. [Policy Window — Compute-Threshold Reporting](#) (cross-jurisdiction topic article with full coverage matrix).