COMPARATIVE JURISDICTIONAL MEMO · COMPUTE-THRESHOLD REPORTING

EU AI Act vs UK Pro-Innovation Approach to AI Regulation (White Paper)

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 (10²u FLOP presumption)

Primary source: Regulation (EU) 2024/1689

UK · POLICY STATEMENT

UK Pro-Innovation Approach to AI Regulation (White Paper)

UK-WHITEPAPER-2023

TREATMENT OF COMPUTE-THRESHOLD REPORTING

silent

Voluntary AISI testing instead; no statutory reporting

Primary source: CP 815 (2023)

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 (10²u FLOPs EU, 10²v 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. CP 815 (2023) — UK Pro-Innovation Approach to AI Regulation (White Paper).
3. Policy Window — Compute-Threshold Reporting (cross-jurisdiction topic article with full coverage matrix).