

# 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:

IMPF - the global trade and advocacy body for independent music publishers

\* 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

BE - Belgium

\* 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

IMPF is the global trade and advocacy body for independent music publishers, helping to stimulate a more favourable business environment in different territories and jurisdictions for artistic, cultural, and commercial diversity for songwriters, composers, and music publishers everywhere.

Independent music publishing continues to assert its critical role within the global music industry, as an important partner for creators, a key agent of cultural diversity, and a custodian of songs. According to the IMPF Global Market View 2025, Independent publishers captured a 26.3% global market share in 2024 and generated revenues of €2.7bn, an increase of 5.1% year-on-year. This reflects both robust market fundamentals and the expanding role of independents as active contributors to creativity, cultural diversity and economic value worldwide, supported by a healthy copyright framework.

---

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 make clear that transparency obligations in Art 50 serve two distinct but concurrent interests: the protection of individuals who engage with system outputs, and the protection of rightsholders whose works may be used, ingested, in the creation of those outputs. For our sector the integrity of the information ecosystem cannot be separated from the integrity of the cultural ecosystem including the training process reflected in the input and the output process. The Guidelines seem to expressly exclude such transparency obligations at the training stage, including disclosure of dataset composition, TDM practices, and the operation of opt out mechanisms. Their treatment of “generated content” is limited to the observable output and does not address the provenance or legality of the materials used during development. This output centred construction leaves a predictable and material gap for rightsholders attempting to determine whether protected works have been incorporated into training processes. Without express consideration of the second aspect the Guidelines are incomplete. We also respectfully invite the Commission to acknowledge the cultural and creative sector as a relevant co-protected interest; to state that Art 50 must be read coherently with the related EU copyright framework, including the AI Act's GPAI obligations on copyright policies and training content summaries, the CDSM Directive and the DSA and to confirm that the Guidelines do not derogate from, and operate cumulatively with, copyright, moral rights and personality-rights protections. Art 50 should not be presented as creating a new copyright infringement standard. To the contrary its role is to support the ability of music publishers and other rightsholders to identify whether copyright-relevant acts may have occurred including reproduction, adaptation or communication to the public of protected expression and thus supporting the creation of a legitimate licensing market.

## 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*

Three points require strengthening. The first is the value-chain allocation. The Guidelines correctly distinguish providers and deployers, but they should better address the actors that host, transcode, normalise, distribute, playlist, recommend or monetise AI-generated or AI-manipulated content. Art 50 may not impose identical deployer obligations on every purely disseminating actor. But where such actors control the technical environment in which content is uploaded, processed, displayed or monetised, it cannot be acceptable for them to strip, overwrite or degrade marks and labels applied upstream. Such conduct is also relevant to risk-mitigation duties under the DSA.

The second is the interplay with other Union law. The Guidelines should state expressly that Art 50 is without prejudice to copyright and related rights (the rights harmonised in the InfoSoc Directive -in particular reproduction and communication to the public), and in particular the DSM Directive (Arti 17 thereof). The third is the scope of the research and development and “purely personal, non-professional” exclusions. These should not be interpreted to cover outputs that are subsequently published, distributed, recommended, monetised or made available through commercial platforms, including via personal accounts. Finally, the regime must be workable for SMEs. Independent music publishers need transparency tools that are scalable and accessible to the representative organisations acting on their behalf — not only via individual manual checks.

## 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*

The reliance on an undefined notion of “obviousness” is not workable in this context. What is “obvious” to a system designer is rarely obvious to an end user, and the concept provides no stable basis for supervision or enforcement. Empirical work at national, European and international level consistently shows that end users, i.e. consumers, express a clear preference for human created content. They should therefore be able to identify such works unambiguously, without recourse to vague and non transparent constructs such as “obviousness”. To avoid ambiguity, the Guidelines should require providers and deployers to identify generated content clearly and consistently, irrespective of whether they consider the synthetic nature of the output self evident. A uniform disclosure obligation is the only way to ensure that users can recognise non human outputs and that the transparency requirement in Art 50(1) is met in practice.

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

- Yes
- No

Please specify:

*2000 character(s) maximum*

A further point concerns commercial use. Clear identification of AI generated music is not only relevant for listeners who have a stated preference for human created works. It also matters for professional users. Music supervisors, advertisers and other licensees can easily be misled into acquiring synthetic tracks for synchronisation or other commercial uses without realising that such material carries no copyright value. Synthetic works function, in practice, like public domain material: they cannot support exclusive licensing, do not generate publishing income and offer no enforceable rights. Without disclosure at the level of the work, commercial users risk paying for material that has no commercial or legal substance, and the market is distorted by the substitution of unprotected synthetic tracks for protected repertoire.

## 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 distinguish more clearly between different levels of AI involvement. Content that is wholly or primarily AI-generated should not be treated in the same way as content where AI has been used only as an assistive tool in a limited or ancillary manner.

The qualifier of “technically feasible” should not become a route to non-compliance for AI providers. Cost or competitive disadvantage are not, in themselves, sufficient defences.

It should be expressly reinforced that labelling obligations are without prejudice to underlying rights.

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

- Yes
- No

Please specify:

*2000 character(s) maximum*

The Guidelines would benefit from a broader treatment of audio and music. Two further points would strengthen the regime in practice.

First, fingerprinting and logging should not be treated merely as optional fallbacks for music and audio where watermarking or metadata alone is insufficient. Although Article 50 may not expressly mandate a single technical solution in every case, the Guidelines and the Code should recognise that fingerprinting, logging and audit trails are often necessary to make transparency effective for our sector.

Second, the free-of-charge interfaces envisaged by the parallel Code of Practice should be usable not only by individual end-users but also by music publishers, CMOs and authorised technical partners at scale, through bulk querying, reasonable rate limits, audit trails and interoperability with ISRC and ISWC.

Relevant use-cases include AI lyric translation, AI lyric adaptation, AI “covers”, synthetic vocal performances over existing compositions, AI-generated songs incorporating protected expression from musical or literary works, and AI outputs combining human compositions with synthetic voices or arrangements.

Finally, providers and intermediaries that control upload, transcoding, display, monetisation or recommendation should not strip, overwrite or degrade marks already attached to content moving through their systems. These constitute TPMs and/ or RMI protected under Articles 6 and 7 InfoSoc Directive.

**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*

The Guidelines should encourage a layered approach, combining cryptographically signed provenance metadata with imperceptible watermarking and, where appropriate, content fingerprinting, logging and audit trails. No single technique is currently sufficient on its own, and a layered design is more resilient to the transformations content undergoes in the wild.

For AI agents and immersive environments, the Guidelines should require a persistent indicator that the user is interacting with an AI system, available in the modality the user is actually using, visual, audible or both. Agent-to-agent and agent-to-third-party communications should carry a machine-readable identifier confirming the AI nature of the agent.

These tools should support copyright compliance, a precondition of a legitimate licensing based market. A match provides evidence enabling rightsholders to assess whether protected expression has been used and whether any authorisation, exception or limitation applies.

The section should be strengthened in several respects. It should mandate persistent watermarking for audio, given that workable methods already exist. It should require platforms to preserve and enforce such markings rather than treating output labelling as a one off activity. Provenance metadata should be embedded in audio files and retained throughout processing. Platforms should also be under a clear duty to detect unlabelled synthetic music, consistent with Article 50(2).

## Section VI - Article 50(4): Labelling of deep fakes and certain text

---

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

- Yes
- No

Please indicate specific parts

*2000 character(s) maximum*

The current treatment of “deepfakes” is framed almost entirely around visual and political contexts, yet the same concerns arise in audio. Synthetic vocals and sound alike recordings perform the same function as visual deepfakes but are not explicitly recognised as such. This gap matters: A more complete approach would acknowledge that audio manipulation raises equivalent risks and requires equivalent safeguards.

As a matter of principle IMPF supports calls by artists for protection of their image and voice. For music publishers, these personality and performer-related rights are not identical to the rights in musical and literary works that publishers represent, but music publishers understand from the songwriters and composers they represent who are also performers that these rights matter to them. IMPF therefore supports clearer protection against digital replicas and deep fakes, and we ask the Commission to coordinate the Guidelines with any related EU initiative in this area.

The Guidelines should make clear that the definition of deep fake is fully applicable to audio and musical content, including outputs that imitate the voice, likeness, performance identity or authorship of a real person in a manner likely to mislead. Worked examples for audio and music are needed.

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

- Yes
- No

Please specify:

2000 character(s) maximum

The Guidelines would benefit from examples for audio and music, an area where deepfake risks are particularly acute and where the current drafting is heavily image- and video-oriented. Relevant categories include AI outputs that imitate a named artist's voice, AI renditions purporting to be by a real artist whether living or deceased, AI duets with real or deceased performers, AI "covers", and AI versions of existing songs in which the voice or arrangement is AI-generated while the underlying composition is human.

For these categories the Guidelines should confirm: treatment in the same way as deep fakes where the legal resemblance and likelihood-to-mislead tests are met; the deployer's labelling obligation; the need to assess the artistic, creative, satirical or fictional carve-out carefully where the use is monetised, commercially distributed, platform-recommended or otherwise commercial; and the responsibility of platforms and other intermediaries that control display, monetisation or recommendation to preserve, display and propagate labels rather than degrade them in the course of distribution.

Placement should be designed for the modality in which the content is consumed. A label visible only in a player interface is insufficient where audio is consumed through voice-only channels, embedded players, playlists or third-party integrations.

## 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 Guidelines should clarify that adherence to a Code of Practice assessed as adequate by the AI Office may be relevant in demonstrating compliance with the obligations under Article 50 but should not be treated as conclusive proof of such compliance.

### Contact

[Contact Form](#)