

EU AI Act vs Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI

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

EU · BINDING REGULATION

EU AI Act

EU-AIA-2024

TREATMENT OF AGENTIC AI GOVERNANCE

implicit

Arts. 26-29 deployer obligations apply to agent operators;
Arts. 51-55 GPAI obligations capture the underlying model

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

US · EXECUTIVE ORDER

Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI

US-EO-14110

TREATMENT OF AGENTIC AI GOVERNANCE

silent

§4.2(a) reporting captures the model layer, not autonomous-action behaviour

Primary source: [Exec. Order No. 14110, 88 Fed. Reg. 75191 \(Nov. 1, 2023\)](#)

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: Should governance attach to the AGENT (multi-step actions, tool use, recursion) or to the model that powers it? Capability-tier vs action-tier frames are unresolved across jurisdictions.

Bibliography

1. [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1689](#) — EU AI Act.
2. [Exec. Order No. 14110, 88 Fed. Reg. 75191 \(Nov. 1, 2023\)](#) — Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI.
3. [Policy Window — Agentic AI Governance](#) (cross-jurisdiction topic article with full coverage matrix).