European Parliament
2024-2029

TEXTS ADOPTED

P10_TA(2026)0378

Institutional aspects of artificial intelligence in the context of European integration

European Parliament resolution of 12 November 2026 ‘Institutional aspects of artificial intelligence in the context of European integration’ (2025/2118(INI))

The European Parliament,

– having regard to the Treaty on European Union (TEU), and in particular Articles 2, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 thereof,

– having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), and in particular Articles 16, 114, 173, 179, 180 and 181 thereof,

– having regard to the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the European Pillar of Social Rights, the European Social Charter and the European Convention on Human Rights,

– having regard to the Commission joint communication of 12 November 2025 entitled ‘European Democracy Shield: Empowering Strong and Resilient Democracies’ (JOIN/2025/0791),

– having regard to its resolution of 15 September 2026 on the findings and recommendations of the Special Committee on the European Democracy Shield[1],

– having regard to the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law, signed on 5 September 2024 (CoE Framework Convention on AI, Vilnius Declaration),

– having regard to Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives

[1] Texts adopted, P10_TA(2026)0286.

2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act)[2],

– having regard to the Commission proposal of 19 November 2025 for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EU) 2016/679, (EU) 2018/1724, (EU) 2018/1725, (EU) 2023/2854 and Directives 2002/58/EC, (EU) 2022/2555 and (EU) 2022/2557 as regards the simplification of the digital legislative framework, and repealing Regulations (EU) 2018/1807, (EU) 2019/1150, (EU) 2022/868, and Directive (EU) 2019/1024 (Digital Omnibus) (COM(2025)0837),

– having regard to the Commission proposal of 19 November 2025 for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulations (EU) 2024/1689 and (EU) 2018/1139 as regards the simplification of the implementation of harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Digital Omnibus on AI) (COM(2025)0836),

– having regard to the Commission communication of 9 April 2025 entitled ‘AI Continent Action Plan’ (COM(2025)0165),

– having regard to the Commission communication of 8 October 2025 entitled ‘Apply AI Strategy’ (COM(2025)0723),

– having regard to the Council conclusions of 21 May 2024 on the future of EU digital policy,

– having regard to the Council conclusions of 20 November 2025 on advancing the International Digital Strategy for the European Union,

– having regard to the European Declaration on Digital Rights and Principles for the Digital Decade,

– having regard to the annual UN global summit entitled ‘AI for Good’, a global forum for dialogue on the governance, ethical use and societal impact of artificial intelligence,

– having regard to the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (AFCO) ad hoc delegation to the United States (Washington) and the UN (New York) on 20-23 July 2026,

– having regard to the UN General Assembly Resolution of 21 March 2024 entitled ‘Seizing the opportunities of safe, secure and trustworthy artificial intelligence systems for sustainable development’,

---

[2] OJ L, 2024/1689, 12.7.2024, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj.

– having regard to the Artificial Intelligence (AI) Principles of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD),

– having regard to the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, adopted in 2021,

– having regard to Annex VI to its Rules of Procedure,

– having regard to Rule 55 of its Rules of Procedure,

– having regard to the opinions of the Committee on the Internal Market and Consumer Protection and the Committee on Civil Liberties, Justice and Home Affairs,

– having regard to the report of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (A10-0280/2026),

A. whereas Article 2 TEU lays down the founding common values on which the EU is based, and provides an important constitutional framework for Parliament’s scrutiny of AI on the basis of those core values;

B. whereas the Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union provide the foundation for the protection of fundamental rights in the EU; whereas these principles form an important guiding framework for EU policymaking, including in the field of AI;

C. whereas in accordance with Articles 10, 11 and 14 TEU, Parliament bears a specific responsibility to ensure democratic accountability, transparency and effective scrutiny of technological developments affecting the functioning of the EU’s institutions; whereas the safe, ethical and lawful development and deployment of any technology, particularly AI, require robust governance frameworks grounded in EU legislation, the EU Treaties and international conventions;

D. whereas Parliament must first and foremost continue to develop and adopt its own internal regulatory framework for the proper use of AI by its services;

E. whereas the EU’s institutional approach to AI must ensure that regulatory frameworks remain proportionate and do not create unnecessary administrative burdens; whereas the EU’s AI governance structures should actively promote innovation-enabling environments that help European innovators to compete globally while upholding fundamental rights; whereas such an approach to AI is paramount not only for the EU’s competitiveness, but also for its security, technological sovereignty and strategic autonomy;

F. whereas the Artificial Intelligence Act (AI Act) introduces the world’s first comprehensive regulatory framework for AI; whereas the full

implementation of the AI Act is a decisive factor for the EU's digital sovereignty, as well as for the preservation of its democratic processes; whereas the AI Act consists of a robust set of rules governing the provision and deployment of AI in the internal market, supporting innovation and promoting the uptake of human-centric and trustworthy AI, setting a high standard globally; whereas AI is advancing at an unprecedented pace, reshaping economic and professional activity, public administration and societal interactions, and profoundly affecting labour markets and working conditions;

G. whereas AI can create significant opportunities for economic growth, scientific progress, administrative efficiency and evidence-based policymaking, and can strengthen the EU's competitiveness, technological sovereignty and capacity for innovation; whereas competitive European technological capacity is essential to the EU's strategic autonomy and democratic integrity; whereas having EU-grown, competitive technological capacity, particularly in the area of AI and large language models (LLMs) is paramount for the EU's strategic sovereignty and democratic integrity;

H. whereas consumers' and citizens' trust is a precondition for the broad adoption of AI-powered products and services across the internal market; whereas clear, predictable and proportionate rules for AI systems in business-to-consumer contexts, within an efficient regulatory context, are important for avoiding unnecessary burdens, providing the legal certainty for businesses to innovate and scale up, and empowering consumers to make informed choices; whereas unnecessary compliance costs and administrative burdens risk discouraging investment and slowing the development and deployment of AI-driven solutions that benefit EU citizens;

I. whereas the Digital Omnibus on AI introduces targeted simplification measures to ensure the timely, smooth and proportionate implementation of certain provisions of the AI Act; whereas the separate proposal for the Digital Omnibus further looks at the need to clarify how personal data may be used for AI training and development; whereas both proposals reflect the need to adapt the EU's legal framework in view of the rapid advancement of AI in the EU and globally;

J. whereas the CoE Framework Convention on AI puts forward rules to ensure that AI systems adhere to strict ethical standards throughout their life cycles, promote transparency, auditability and effective oversight, and strengthen safeguards to protect fundamental rights, democracy and the rule of law; whereas the Framework Convention on AI, which non-European countries can accede to, promotes a global baseline for AI governance that focuses on protecting rights; whereas, at EU level, the principles and obligations laid down in the Framework Convention on AI have already been implemented by a

coherent body of legislation that sets a higher and more detailed level of protection, including, in particular, the AI Act;

K. whereas fostering trustworthy and human-centric AI is essential for strengthening the EU’s competitiveness, innovation capacity, technological sovereignty and strategic autonomy in an increasingly competitive global environment;

L. whereas the use of AI has direct implications for the exercise of fundamental rights and freedoms, including the freedom of thought and conscience, freedom of expression, the right to privacy, data protection, non-discrimination and the right to good administration;

M. whereas recent calls from leading AI laboratories have highlighted the need for a more cautious approach to the pace of development and deployment of increasingly capable AI systems, as progress in the field is advancing at an unprecedented rate; whereas the increasing capabilities of frontier AI models may give rise to new and potentially systemic risks, including from autonomous and self-recursive systems; whereas technological progress should remain compatible with effective human oversight, democratic accountability and the ability of the public authorities to put in place appropriate safeguards before potentially irreversible risks materialise; whereas technological innovation, safety and European competitiveness should be pursued as mutually reinforcing objectives;

N. whereas the UN Global Digital Compact calls for strengthened international cooperation on the governance of AI and highlights the role of global forums in facilitating dialogue on the societal and ethical implications of AI, including the need to ensure that technological development contributes to social progress, reduces inequalities and fully respects fundamental rights; whereas these are important alongside cooperation with relevant authorities such as data protection, consumer protection and competition authorities; whereas the effective and consistent application of EU regulatory frameworks across the Member States is essential to ensure a level playing field, protect consumers and prevent market fragmentation, as well as to strengthen trust in public institutions; whereas the effective deployment of AI technologies across the EU requires a genuinely integrated digital single market, free from regulatory fragmentation and administrative barriers, so as to enable businesses of all sizes, including small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and start-ups, to operate and scale up across borders on equal terms; whereas global governance, along with ambitious regulatory frameworks, are necessary to ensure the safe, ethical and human-centred deployment of AI worldwide;

O. whereas international cooperation on AI must prevent digital extractivism, ensure equitable access to technological benefits and

address the concentration of power in the hands of a small number of private actors; whereas global governance and regulatory frameworks should also encompass the significant and constantly increasing ecological footprint of AI development and deployment, characterised by high electricity demand, high water consumption and large volumes of e-waste;

P. whereas the Vilnius Declaration underlines that AI governance must be human-centric and grounded in fundamental rights, democratic accountability and the rule of law; whereas transparency, public oversight and safeguards against discrimination, bias and social inequalities are important, particularly in the use of AI in the public sector;

Q. whereas Parliament, as the EU's representative democratic institution, has a legitimate role in contributing to such global discussions, in line with Articles 10, 11 and 13 TEU; whereas Parliament bears a responsibility to ensure that international AI governance protects democratic values, social justice, human rights, personal data and human dignity; whereas Parliament's engagement in global discussions should safeguard and prioritise the integrity of public debate, transparency, inclusiveness and democratic accountability in global digital rule-making and institutional coherence in the EU's external engagement;

R. whereas Parliament should participate in annual UN AI summits, holding dedicated events and presenting its work in this area, including cooperation with other bodies active in the field, such as the OECD's AI Policy Observatory, the Council of Europe's Steering Committee for New and Emerging Digital Technologies, and AI-related initiatives of the G7 and the G20; whereas Parliament's participation in such forums would be in accordance with the principle of sincere cooperation, as stipulated by Article 13(2) TEU;

S. whereas the Council conclusions of 20 November 2025 on advancing the International Digital Strategy for the European Union emphasise that digital policy and AI policy have become core components of the EU's external action, according to the rules-based global order, and to the defence of its fundamental values; whereas the EU's external AI engagement must avoid reinforcing global asymmetries, prevent digital extractivism and ensure that technological cooperation promotes fair, inclusive and sustainable development;

T. whereas despite the differences between the EU and the United States in their approaches to the regulation and governance of AI, there are shared interests in addressing AI's growing impact on democratic societies; whereas these differences underscore the importance of sustained transatlantic dialogue and the need for the EU to play a leading role in shaping common international principles and effective global governance frameworks for AI;

U. whereas monitoring global AI developments at EU level, in close cooperation with the European AI Office, the European Artificial Intelligence Board (AI Board), the national competent authorities, observing developments in the Member States, maintaining regular exchanges between the European Parliament and national parliaments, and identifying potential cross-sectoral overlaps and gaps in the legal framework for AI with a view to improving coherence, legal certainty and innovation-friendly implementation across the EU, will be of the utmost importance; whereas, building on the outcomes of the recent interparliamentary committee meetings (ICM) on AI with national parliaments where AI was discussed more broadly, the establishment of a regular exchange of policy approaches and best practices with national parliaments would further strengthen interparliamentary cooperation in this area;

V. whereas the proposed European Parliament AI Observatory or a dedicated administrative unit should play a central role in this regard, including by coordinating and supporting such exchanges; whereas the proposed AI Observatory or a dedicated administrative unit could build on the work of the AI Act Working Group; whereas it could further play a central role in Parliament’s institutional AI governance regarding accountability and the explainability of the implications of the AI systems deployed within the institution; whereas this could also contribute to achieving an adequate level of AI literacy among Parliament’s staff;

W. whereas the proposed European Parliament AI Observatory could qualify as an EU body that may be invited to the meetings of the AI Board, in accordance with Article 65(2) of the Artificial Intelligence Act, without overlapping with current structures, and should contribute to a structured, transparent and reliable flow of information to Parliament on AI-related developments across the EU, while facilitating fast and direct access for Parliament to relevant information and to fragmented responses from national authorities;

X. whereas the drafting of legal rules, the development of case-law and the adoption of administrative decisions within the EU institutions and the Member States inherently involve the exercise of direct, identifiable human responsibility subject to democratic oversight; whereas algorithmic systems can be prone to errors and hallucinations, vulnerable to manipulation, and they can lack transparency and rely on data of varying quality, which can, in some contexts, make them less reliable than human assessment, particularly in sensitive areas such as public policymaking, law enforcement or administrative decision-making;

Y. whereas the democratic legislative process is exclusively a human domain exercised by elected individuals through the mandate conferred on them by voters; whereas the legislative process

requires human discretion, ethical trade-offs and political compromise; whereas over-reliance on AI in this process risks introducing algorithmic bias and ‘black-box’ logic into the heart of EU lawmaking, which could undermine the quality and legitimacy of legislation; whereas ‘LLM grooming’ is often used by malicious actors to introduce bias in LLMs and sway democratic, fact-based narratives;

Z. whereas Parliament must continue to develop its own internal regulatory framework for the proper and effective use of AI by its services, in line with the EU’s values and principles; whereas AI systems in public administration must foster EU digital sovereignty, remain human-centric and complement human expertise and should be complemented by meaningful safeguards such as identifiable human oversight, accountability, transparency and effective redress where decisions affect citizens, consumers or businesses; whereas human skills, experience and legal responsibility constitute essential safeguards against systemic errors, algorithmic biases and the risk of the decision-making process being distorted as a result of the opaque or improper use of such systems;

AA. whereas AI**,** with effective human oversight and in carefully weighted and protocoled cases, could support parliamentary scrutiny of the implementation and application of EU law by reducing information asymmetries and mitigating Parliament’s recurring difficulties in accessing the relevant data, as well as by potentially contributing to the improvement of the EU’s legislative processes**,** including by streamlining them and making them more efficient and responsive;

AB. whereas the responsible use of AI systems, in accordance with a robust regulatory and governance framework, can improve the quality, accessibility and efficiency of legislative and administrative processes by supporting evidence-based policymaking, facilitating the analysis of complex regulatory frameworks and improving access to information that is relevant for democratic scrutiny;

AC. whereas the rapid evolution of AI technologies requires continuous analytical capacity in order to assess their institutional, democratic and legal implications for the functioning of the EU; whereas Parliament should therefore strengthen its internal expertise and monitoring and verification capacities in this field in cooperation with other EU and European institutions, as well as with the EU candidate and potential candidate countries; whereas there should be no doubling or fragmentation of capabilities in this area, and a coherent institutional strategy should be developed and institutional memory built to anticipate systemic risks and governance challenges – including through thorough AI literacy training – and to support the informed, efficient and responsible use of AI technologies;

AD. whereas maintaining effective, meaningful and verifiable human oversight of AI systems is essential to ensure respect for fundamental rights, administrative accountability and the principles of the rule of law; whereas such oversight requires staff to have the appropriate skills and to continuously update these skills to keep pace with rapid technological developments; whereas Parliament should therefore invest in the continuous training, upskilling and reskilling of its staff, ensure broad and inclusive access to training in digital skills, and allocate adequate resources to building internal capacity to use, evaluate and oversee AI systems, promoting a responsible, efficient, fundamental rights-driven, human-centric and ethical approach to AI use, accompanied by transparent, efficient and coherent use of resources in line with current structures; whereas the development of Parliament's analytical capacities, including through the creation of an AI Observatory, should be undertaken in full transparency and with budget responsibility, with the aim of supporting parliamentary work through AI tools, reducing information asymmetries without replacing human expertise, and helping relieve staff of repetitive, technical or low-value-added tasks; whereas the use of AI should enhance the value of human work while avoiding duplications of current structures, making efficient use of current resources and enabling staff to focus on essential functions such as critical analysis, decision-making and strategic orientation;

AE. whereas divergences in national interpretations and implementation of EU AI-related legislation risk creating regulatory fragmentation, causing legal uncertainty and creating barriers to cross-border AI deployment within the internal market, particularly for SMEs and start-ups operating across several Member States; whereas AI, under appropriate human oversight, can strengthen Parliament's capacity for effective and evidence-based scrutiny of the implementation and application of EU law by reducing information asymmetries, improving the analysis of relevant information and helping to address recurring difficulties in accessing the data necessary for democratic oversight;

AF. whereas disparities between Member States in digital infrastructure, data capacities and administrative resources, as well as divergences in the interpretation and implementation of the EU's AI legislative framework at national level, risk leading to uneven enforcement, regulatory fragmentation, legal uncertainty and barriers to cross-border AI deployment in the internal market, particularly for SMEs and start-ups; whereas EU-level support, capacity building and cooperation are necessary to ensure a level playing field, protect consumers and businesses and prevent fragmentation;

AG. whereas the rapid deployment of AI technologies is profoundly transforming public debate, electoral campaigning, political communication and the wider media landscape, often at very low cost; whereas AI drastically lowers the barriers for malicious

interference, both from within and outside the EU, enabling non-state actors to conduct sophisticated manipulation campaigns at unprecedented scale and speed;

AH. whereas when exploited by hostile actors, such technologies can interfere with the integrity of electoral processes and undermine trust in democratic institutions, including in the context of European elections, in particular through disinformation, deepfakes, microtargeting and manipulation of voters; whereas AI technologies may also offer technical solutions capable of streamlining electoral processes; whereas permitted use of AI for electoral processes should prioritise European AI models that demonstrate data and algorithmic transparency and operate using European data infrastructure that is not subject to the laws and influence of non-EU countries; whereas the use of AI in such processes must fully safeguard democratic integrity, transparency, accountability and digital sovereignty;

AI. whereas very large online platforms and search engines are subject to obligations under EU law, such as strict systemic risk assessments, proactive mechanisms for detecting and eliminating coordinated manipulation networks, and full transparency in relation to recommendation systems and the funding of political content, as well as independent audits, to prevent external interference and distortion of the electoral process within the EU;

AJ. whereas the use of AI systems in public administration may involve the processing of personal data and may lead to the adoption of automated decisions that have a direct impact on citizens; whereas such systems should ensure an appropriate level of accountability, accuracy, data governance, safety and transparency; whereas AI systems reflect the data, models and design choices on which they are based and should therefore be subject to appropriate human oversight, in accordance with the AI Act, in particular high-risk AI systems used in the context of public administration;

AK. whereas Article 77 of the AI Act provides for national public authorities or bodies to have a key role in supervising or enforcing the respect of obligations under EU law protecting fundamental rights, including the right to non-discrimination;

1. Stresses that AI governance is not solely a matter of technical regulation, but also a matter of EU strategic digital autonomy and constitutional applicability, affecting the exercise of public authority, democratic legitimacy and the EU’s institutional balance as defined in Article13 TEU, as well as a matter of EU strategic sovereignty; stresses, therefore, that, in addition to solid EU and national regulatory frameworks, AI governance requires robust and sustained parliamentary scrutiny, within the scope of Parliament’s competences and with full respect for Parliament’s prerogatives as a

co-legislator and budgetary authority, ensuring that AI does not undermine the EU's values and democratic processes;

2. Stresses that the rapid deployment of advanced AI systems must not create legal grey zones or weaken the enforcement of current laws; emphasises that technological innovation must never come at the expense of the rule of law, public security or democratic accountability; calls for the EU's AI governance structures to incorporate mechanisms to enable structured consultation with European innovators and emphasises that fostering AI innovation is paramount not only for strengthening the EU's competitiveness but also for safeguarding its security, technological sovereignty and strategic autonomy; calls on the Commission to ensure that the AI Act is implemented in a systematic and transparent way;

3. Insists that the democratic principle of a 'human decision-maker' must be upheld in all situations as a core element of EU institutional law and democracy to prevent the gradual and silent relinquishment of democratic mandates from elected representatives to automated systems;

4. Reaffirms that the EU's approach to AI must be fully aligned with the values provided for under Article2 TEU, including democracy, the rule of law, human dignity, equality, fundamental rights and the protection of personal data, and that AI deployment and use within institutions must remain human-centred and remain under full human oversight, meaning that a person must effectively supervise any AI tool while it is in use, thus serving to strengthen citizens' trust in democratic institutions and public administration;

5. Stresses that AI is of crucial importance for EU digital sovereignty, contributing to prosperity, productivity and opportunities for EU citizens and workers; insists, therefore, that the EU must preserve and advance its strategic autonomy by ensuring independent European capabilities in the development and deployment of AI technologies, while ensuring that these technologies are subject to careful oversight and democratic and human-centric standards; commits to further developing a robust internal regulatory and ethical framework for the use of AI in order to maximise efficiency, innovation and public value, while safeguarding fundamental rights, data protection, transparency, accountability and human oversight in all parliamentary activities;

6. Calls for the amendment of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU in order to include new rights and freedoms that have emerged as a consequence of the extensive use of AI, such as the right to the protection of personal identity and likeness (against deepfakes), the right to algorithmic transparency and digital self-determination and protection from algorithmic discrimination; insists that the principle of accountability and responsibility for potential damages should also

be included in order to safeguard the aforementioned rights and freedoms;

7. Points out that the EU’s policy approach to AI has a direct impact on its geostrategic position and the sovereignty of its institutions and Member States; underscores that, while international harmonisation is indispensable, the EU must at all times pursue its own strategic interests and autonomy in both the development and the deployment of these new technologies on EU soil and leverage its soft power to set an example for the global community;

8. Points out that disparities between EU Member States in terms of digital infrastructure, data capacities and technical expertise risk fragmenting the internal market for AI and restrict innovation; stresses, therefore, the importance of establishing a genuine internal market for AI in order to reduce fragmentation, enable the scaling up of EU innovation and investment, and foster secure, interoperable and trustworthy EU AI solutions, thereby strengthening the EU’s technological sovereignty, competitiveness and resilience;

9. Stresses the potential of AI to support evidence-based policymaking, strategic foresight and policy planning, and to facilitate the exchange of alerts and best practice; stresses the potential of AI to streamline decision-making and improve the operational efficiency of the EU institutions by reducing administrative burdens; calls, therefore, for the responsible integration of AI tools across the EU institutions to handle routine administrative tasks, while ensuring human oversight and accountability;

10. Recalls the Council conclusions calling for a higher level of ambition, investment and cooperation in the field of AI at EU level, including with international organisations, while ensuring that such engagement is grounded in a human-rights approach; considers that Parliament should have stronger institutional capacity to scrutinise the EU’s global engagement in AI and its consequences for the EU’s sovereignty and democratic accountability, including through enhanced access to information and regular reporting by the Commission and the Council; stresses that the deployment of AI could help boost the effectiveness of the internal market and contribute to making it more competitive globally;

11. Commits to further develop and adopt a robust internal regulatory and ethical framework for the use of AI by its own services in order to maximise efficiency, innovation and public value, while safeguarding fundamental rights, data protection, transparency, accountability and human oversight within Parliament’s own functioning; points out that this internal framework should keep pace with internal regulatory approaches in other EU institutions;

12. Calls for structured, regular and transparent interinstitutional coordination between Parliament, the Commission and the Council on the institutional implications of AI, and for dialogue with relevant stakeholders, including regular exchanges on the implementation of EU AI legislation, administrative coordination and the impact of AI systems on the coherence of the internal market; points out that this coordination or dialogue should facilitate the sharing of alerts, best practices and other information pertaining to AI; suggests that an interinstitutional agreement could formalise such cooperation, in full respect of transparency, information-sharing and the timely involvement of Parliament;

13. Highlights the need to prioritise the use of AI tools that are developed in the EU, by European actors and hosted within the EU, in order to ensure their secure and trustworthy use, particularly when such tools are deployed within European institutions; stresses that this approach contributes to safeguarding sensitive data, reinforcing technological sovereignty and ensuring compliance with EU standards on sustainability, data protection, cybersecurity and democratic integrity;

14. Stresses that EU institutional sovereignty in the field of AI can only be achieved and preserved if the EU actively promotes and scales up ‘European technology’, including by fostering a globally competitive European tech sector and the deployment of secure, interoperable and sovereign cloud infrastructures, while ensuring strategic autonomy across the entire AI value chain – from access to high-quality data and advanced computing capacity to the design, deployment and scaling up of trustworthy AI systems – and by reducing critical dependencies on non-EU providers through strengthened coordination, investment and common governance among Member States;

15. Stresses that the EU’s growing engagement in international digital and AI governance, including partnerships, multilateral initiatives and global standard-setting, has institutional implications that require strengthened democratic oversight, transparency and accountability; in particular given the global risks that could stem from AI, such as in the area of cybersecurity;

16. Stresses, furthermore, that providers, deployers and other actors across the AI value chain should assume responsibility in accordance with their respective role and degree of control, and that responsibility for the effects of AI systems should not be unfairly transferred to end users, consumers or workers;

17. Stresses that AI, on account of its scale and cross-border impact, requires effective international cooperation and coordination; underlines that, in an increasingly complex geopolitical context, the EU should promote a rules-based approach to the governance of AI

and digital technologies, based on democracy, the rule of law and fundamental rights; emphasises the importance of strengthening cooperation with international partners and like-minded countries in order to exchange best practices, foster regulatory interoperability and contribute to the development of a global level playing field grounded in clear and shared principles; highlights that such cooperation should build on current international frameworks, including the OECD AI Principles and UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, while ensuring coherence with the EU's internal legal and institutional framework;

18. Draws attention to recent Member State initiatives on the use of cloud services by public authorities, highlighting decisions to prioritise and make use of European cloud providers, particularly for sensitive and strategic data, in order to strengthen digital sovereignty, security and resilience; commits to launching a debate with the other institutions on the deployment of these services at EU level as soon as possible;

19. Stresses the importance of broad participation by European representatives in global AI governance discussions; strongly supports, therefore, Parliament's engagement in multilateral forums such as the UN annual summit 'AI for Good'; stresses the need for the EU to speak with one voice on the international arena and that Parliament, as the directly elected co-legislator, has a mandate to lead this process; acknowledges that by engaging globally with a clear set of values and ethical principles, Parliament is strengthening its democratic role and credibility, while fully respecting the Commission's competences in the field and in accordance with the principle of sincere cooperation, as stipulated by Article 13(2) TEU;

20. Underlines that, in an era of intensifying great-power competition over AI capabilities, Parliament's participation in international forums is essential; stresses that AI practices and technologies shared externally must support innovation and competitiveness and comply with Parliament's commitments to transparency, sustainability, privacy and the protection of personal data, strong cybersecurity standards, democratic oversight, fundamental rights and ethical principles; emphasises, moreover, the importance of promoting trustworthy and human-centric AI and addressing destabilising systemic risks related to the reliability and accuracy of AI, including biased algorithms and foreign interference, the generation of inaccurate or non-existent outputs ('hallucinations'), and the uncontrolled proliferation of advanced capabilities and loss-of-control scenarios, which may undermine the reliability and accuracy of information;

21. Stresses, furthermore, the need to assess the broader socio-economic impact of AI, in particular in terms of labour market disruption; highlights, in this context, the need to develop EU

citizens’ skills to raise awareness of the benefits of AI and the related risks; stresses that AI systems used in public administration must not lead to purely automated decisions in areas that have legal or social impacts on consumers and must be subject to meaningful safeguards in line with EU law;

22. Underlines that, by virtue of its scale, speed and cross-border impact, AI constitutes a transformative technology with wide-ranging strategic implications that create the potential to significantly boost economic growth, enhance productivity and transform various industries by automating tasks and improving decision-making; stresses, however, that by virtue of its scale, speed of deployment and cross-border impact, AI constitutes both a systemic global challenge as well as an opportunity, requiring responsible governance;

23. Suggests that AI technologies with global security and societal implications require an international convention or treaty on AI, together with effective oversight mechanisms at global level to ensure compliance and to prevent and mitigate risks arising from the development and deployment of AI systems, as illustrated by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; calls for the EU to take a leading role in shaping international efforts in this area and to ensure that global AI governance is grounded in democratic values, human rights and effective accountability;

24. Takes note of the recent calls that the development and deployment of the most advanced AI systems should proceed at a pace that would allow for effective independent evaluation, democratic oversight and the implementation of adequate safety and security safeguards; stresses that, where the development of AI capabilities significantly outpaces the capacity to assess, understand and mitigate their potential systemic risks, appropriate safeguards, enhanced evaluation and monitoring mechanisms should be developed and implemented in parallel with technological progress, without unnecessarily slowing innovation or undermining the EU’s technological competitiveness;

25. Takes note of the Council of Europe Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence; highlights that the AI Act and other relevant EU legislation already set a higher, more detailed level of protection and harmonisation within the internal market; considers that, given the global systemic nature of AI technologies, regular reflection should take place on promoting international cooperation and effective, innovation-enabling governance with adequate resources, and strengthening democratic accountability, including through the establishment of an international convention or treaty at a global level, while ensuring respect for the current legal frameworks;

26. Is of the view that Parliament should spearhead such initiatives to urgently address the lack of global frameworks that mitigate systemic risks stemming from AI; believes that any such convention or treaty must set forth the non-proliferation of high-risk or harmful AI technology and address all risks posed by AI systems through a human-rights approach; takes the view that the EU's participation in international conventions should serve to promote its vision of AI, its regulatory approach and its competitiveness at global level;

27. Believes that in order to safeguard the EU's foundational values, as enshrined in Article 2 TEU, in the context of the deployment and use of AI systems, the EU needs to drastically improve its efforts related to AI-related innovation, research and education that give rise to AI systems that are in line with EU values; calls for a decisive push for technological sovereignty in the EU and for an alliance with like-minded powers in order to cooperate efficiently in these fields;

28. Insists that the EU's digital transformation must be fully compatible with the European Green Deal and the EU's climate neutrality objectives;

29. Recalls that, in accordance with Articles 10, 13 and 14 TEU, Parliament exercises democratic scrutiny over the functioning of the EU and its institutions and that such scrutiny should be adapted given the profound institutional and democratic implications of AI deployment; stresses that the increasing deployment of AI systems within public administrations and EU institutions requires Parliament's analytical capacity and AI literacy to be enhanced in order to better address any risk posed by such systems, including the prevention of discriminatory outcomes, and to ensure transparency, democratic accountability and effective oversight consistent with the Treaties, including the prevention of discriminatory outcomes and oversight of the use of AI systems in decision-making, risk assessment and administrative procedures within the EU institutions, bodies and agencies; stresses that inaccuracy, opacity, bias and hallucination tendencies distort evidence, undermine legal certainty and weaken democratic decision-making;

30. Highlights that the effective and inclusive deployment of AI and other digital technologies in the EU requires that persistent digital divides across Member States and regions be addressed through targeted measures to strengthen skills and ensure a strong foundation in digital and civic education, guarantee accessibility and support the inclusion of older persons, persons with disabilities, individuals with limited digital competences and those living in disadvantaged or remote areas, in order to ensure that the benefits of AI are broadly shared and do not exacerbate existing inequalities; underlines that these conditions are essential to support democratic participation, equal access to EU processes and the proper functioning of the EU's constitutional framework;

31. Calls for consideration to be given to enhancing Parliament’s internal analytical and governance capacity within its administration in matters specifically related to AI with a dedicated administrative unit; suggests that the unit could be called the European Parliament AI Observatory; stresses that this unit should build upon and complement existing expertise and services, including those provided by the European Parliamentary Research Service and the Panel for the Future of Science and Technology, thereby allowing it to be organised in a budget-neutral manner;

32. Stresses that this unit should operate as a horizontal capacity-building service across parliamentary committees, supporting them in matters related to AI and its governance, with a clear mandate to support parliamentary scrutiny, including the ex post evaluation of AI-related legislation with a view to ensuring its consistency and coherence, the monitoring of institutional practices, and the analysis of the impact of AI on the EU’s institutional balance and democratic processes, as well as strengthening AI literacy and technical expertise; further highlights that the unit should have a clear analytical and governance structure to guide its priorities and to ensure horizontal capacity; underlines that the proposed unit would be of a supporting rather than regulatory nature, while its full independence should be ensured and its deployment of robust verification mechanisms should be enabled;

33. Stresses that the effective implementation and enforcement of EU rules on AI, in particular those related to general-purpose AI systems and AI systems embedded in very large online platforms and very large search engines, require the Commission’s AI Office to be strong, central and adequately resourced; welcomes the growing role of the AI Office in ensuring consistent supervision at EU level and reducing fragmentation across Member States, and underlines that any expansion of its competences must be matched by commensurate operational capacity; calls on the Commission to equip the AI Office with sufficient and stable financial, technical and human resources, including highly specialised expertise, and to set out a concrete plan to reinforce its capacity through the annual budget and the upcoming multiannual financial framework, including appropriate staffing, operational funding and technical tools necessary to carry out its tasks effectively;

34. Stresses that the analytical work carried out within Parliament, including by the proposed unit, could contribute to identifying cross-sectoral gaps, overlaps and inconsistencies in the EU’s broader legal framework for AI; recalls the analytical work currently being carried out within Parliament, including by the AI Act Working Group established with the purpose of monitoring and scrutinising the implementation and enforcement of the AI Act, as well as of monitoring new AI-related developments and challenges;

35. Stresses that enhancing Parliament’s internal analytical and governance capacity could further contribute to the monitoring and evaluation of institutional AI governance, accountability and explainability and of the implications of AI systems deployed within the institution; notes that the proposed unit should support Parliament’s follow-up to the relevant Council conclusions; highlights that the unit should provide regular reports to Parliament’s competent committees, in particular the Committee on Constitutional Affairs (AFCO), on the institutional and constitutional implications of AI developments;

36. Stresses that the EU is heavily reliant on foreign-designed AI models and systems and that the increasing deployment of AI systems within public administrations, including the EU institutions, increases the efficiency of internal processes, but also raises important questions relating to transparency, accountability, security of the systems and administrative due process; emphasises that Parliament should create sufficient internal analytical capacity to assess such deployment and related developments independently in order to safeguard its institutional prerogatives and oversight functions and build its own institutional memory in this field, using existing parliamentary services and expertise where possible, while maintaining full control over its cybersecurity and the security of all infrastructure and systems;

37. Stresses that this effort should be complemented by thorough AI literacy training programmes; calls, furthermore, for regular assessments of the impact of AI deployment on fundamental rights and privacy; highlights, moreover, that Parliament should lead by example and establish a framework of good governance for parliamentary work assisted by AI, including which tasks should and should not be outsourced to such technologies; insists that it should be ensured that the use of AI within the EU institutions must uphold the principles of good administration, transparency and accountability, including the right to an explanation and human review of automated decisions;

38. Highlights the potential of AI to strengthen Parliament’s scrutiny and oversight capacities by facilitating access to relevant information, improving the analysis of complex legislative and regulatory developments and supporting the monitoring of the implementation and enforcement of EU law; underlines that the responsible use of AI could contribute to reducing information asymmetries, enhancing legislative coherence and improving the quality, efficiency and predictability of the EU’s decision-making processes, while fully respecting democratic accountability, transparency and meaningful human oversight;

39. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the internal market by mobilising current EU instruments and to establish robust and

targeted mechanisms that help to develop common infrastructure and administrative capacity-building programmes, prevent distortions of competition and guarantee a level playing field; calls for it to be ensured that the implementation of the EU's AI framework is uniform and innovation-friendly, avoiding unnecessary administrative burdens, overlapping reporting obligations and national measures that could fragment the internal market and hinder the scaling-up of trustworthy European AI solutions;

40. Stresses that AI must remain strictly an auxiliary tool in the legal field, used for administrative support, legal research or the streamlining of technical activities, without participating in the judicial decision-making process and without in any way substituting for human judgement or the role of the courts;

41. Calls for the careful and calculated use of AI tools to support the monitoring, implementation, and enforcement of EU legislation that has already been adopted; notes, in particular, their potential to help to identify national and regional legal acts requiring amendment; highlights, moreover, their capacity to detect potential inconsistencies, gold-plating, overlaps or risks of legal fragmentation, thereby enhancing legal coherence across levels of governance, addressing implementation gaps in the Member States and improving the effectiveness and predictability of EU law;

42. Underlines that AI tools may also support evidence-based policymaking, simplification efforts and ex post evaluation of EU legislation, including disproportionate administrative burdens affecting citizens, businesses and public administrations; emphasises, in this context, the importance of a human-centric approach, which includes human oversight, auditability, strict verification safeguards, transparency requirements, explainability, non-discrimination safeguards and effective redress mechanisms when such tools are deployed; stresses that AI systems must never replace the political responsibility or democratic accountability of human beings;

43. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to ensure a uniform, proportionate and coherent implementation of the EU's AI framework in a way that supports innovation and competitiveness while fully respecting fundamental rights, as well as intellectual property rights and copyright rules, and avoiding unnecessary administrative burdens, overlapping reporting obligations and national gold-plating measures that could fragment the internal market and hinder the scaling-up of trustworthy EU AI solutions;

44. Underlines that effective supervision and enforcement of EU rules on AI are essential to ensure legal certainty, foster trust among users and citizens and create the conditions for responsible innovation and the uptake of AI technologies in the EU; emphasises, in this context,

that the EU has established a comprehensive regulatory framework, and that the priority must now be its effective, coherent and uniform application across the Member States as a key condition for the credibility of the EU’s legal order and the proper functioning of its institutional framework; stresses that simplification and the reduction of administrative burdens should not weaken enforcement or undermine the consistent application of EU law, and cannot be regarded as an alternative to ensuring a level playing field and maintaining trust in the EU’s regulatory system;

45. Calls for analysis of overlaps, gaps and inconsistencies between the numerous AI-related legislative and policy instruments and their implementation in order to reduce fragmentation and avoid an excessive burden, while ensuring coherent application across sectoral domains, including coherent institutional implementation; considers that such analysis should explicitly be aimed at ensuring a level playing field in the internal market and simplifying the compliance environment for businesses operating across the EU, including through the use of AI tools to support evidence-based policymaking, simplification and the ex post evaluation of EU legislation, thereby helping to reduce administrative burdens and compliance costs, particularly for SMEs;

46. Recalls that AI is not a silver bullet to solve all EU policy and legal inconsistencies but rather a collection of emerging and still deeply flawed technological tools that need to be used cautiously, critically and in moderation in order not to discredit Parliament’s democratic role and introduce biases, errors and malicious interference in legislative processes and administrative work;

47. Stresses that the analytical work carried out within Parliament, including by the proposed European Parliament AI Observatory, could contribute to identifying cross-sectoral gaps, overlaps and inconsistencies in the EU’s broader legal framework for AI;

48. Stresses that the European Parliament AI Observatory could contribute to the monitoring of institutional AI governance, accountability and explainability, and of the implications of AI systems deployed within the institution, and could support Parliament’s follow-up to the relevant Council conclusions;

49. Calls on the Chair of the AI Board to invite the European Parliament AI Observatory, if established, to the board’s meetings to ensure parliamentary scrutiny and interinstitutional coherence in the EU’s AI policy;

50. Underlines that strengthened cooperation in the field of AI governance between the European Parliament, national parliaments and the national competent authorities, established in accordance with Article 70 of the AI Act, is essential to ensure the effective

enforcement of the AI Act, exchange best practice, prevent legal fragmentation, ensure democratic accountability, improve legislative coherence, contribute to identifying and eliminating overlaps and unnecessary red tape, and support parliamentary scrutiny of AI deployment across the EU;

51. Welcomes, in this context, the outcomes of the ICMs on AI with national parliaments; calls for the establishment of a regular exchange of policy approaches and best practices with national parliaments, to be coordinated and supported by the proposed European Parliament AI Observatory or a dedicated administrative unit; stresses the need to expand cooperation in the field of AI governance to candidate countries;

52. Stresses that the effective governance of AI in the EU requires strong and structured cooperation between EU bodies and national competent authorities; emphasises, in particular, the importance of ensuring close coordination between the European AI Office, the Commission’s AI Board, the European Data Protection Board, the European Data Protection Supervisor and other relevant EU agencies and authorities, as well as with national supervisory authorities; underlines that such cooperation is essential to ensure the consistent interpretation and application of EU law, avoid regulatory fragmentation and overlaps, and strengthen legal certainty and democratic accountability within the EU’s institutional framework;

53. Acknowledges the immense implications for copyright and ownership of AI advancements; stresses, in this regard, the need to protect Parliament’s integrity; underlines that content created by Parliament and its Members during its legislative, budgetary, scrutiny or political work must be clearly identifiable and protected; stresses that from an institutional perspective AI governance must include rules on watermarking output and the possibility of assigning ownership;

54. Highlights, in particular, the risk of false attribution of content to Parliament and of the creation of deepfakes using images, videos or audio recorded during Parliament’s activities and interventions of its Members; recalls that rapid solutions are needed to identify and combat such threats to maintain trust in Parliament and the other EU institutions;

55. Calls for the systematic parliamentary assessment of AI-related risks to and opportunities for democratic processes, including electoral integrity, disinformation, foreign information manipulation and interference, fundamental freedoms and the right to privacy, and for the European Parliament AI Observatory or a dedicated administrative unit to support the monitoring of elections and European political parties and to support the analysis of relevant AI

developments affecting democratic processes; recalls that AI-powered applications increasingly shape political communication, electoral processes, public discourse and decision-making, including through deepfakes, synthetic media and coordinated disinformation campaigns; stresses the need to enforce the AI Act's transparency obligations regarding AI-generated content in this regard;

56. Stresses that AFCO should play a leading role in monitoring these risks, including in relation to European political parties, electoral frameworks and democratic participation; recognises that AI can also enhance democratic participation, improve access to information, and strengthen evidence-based policymaking, while underlining the need to ensure that its use remains transparent, accountable and consistent with EU law; acknowledges the evolving governance challenges related to AI and current Treaty provisions governing institutional competences; stresses that priority should be given to the effective implementation and enforcement of current EU legislation in the field of AI and the internal market;

57. Is concerned about the potentially detrimental effect of AI on media pluralism, which is essential for the fair conduct of elections; calls for enhanced joint strategies at EU level with the Member States to safeguard high levels of media pluralism across the EU in the light of increased pressure caused by AI on the business models of media outlets; stresses the importance of using the applicable tools under EU competition law, including the mechanisms enshrined in the Digital Services Act[3] and in the Digital Market Act[4], to compensate for the imbalance caused by gate-keepers in the access to and fair compensation for media content's creators;

58. Stresses that, owing to its fragmentation and limited harmonisation, the current EU electoral legal framework, as reflected in Council Decision (EU, Euratom) 2018/994[5], is increasingly ill-suited to addressing current emerging risks, challenges and opportunities linked to the use of AI in electoral processes; emphasises, therefore, the importance of reform of the EU electoral law in accordance with

---

3 Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on a Single Market For Digital Services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act) (OJ L 277, 27.10.2022, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2065/oj).

4 Regulation (EU) 2022/1925 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 September 2022 on contestable and fair markets in the digital sector and amending Directives (EU) 2019/1937 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Digital Markets Act) (OJ L 265, 12.10.2022, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/1925/oj).

5 Council Decision (EU, Euratom) 2018/994 of 13 July 2018 amending the Act concerning the election of the members of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage, annexed to Council Decision 76/787/ECSC, EEC, Euratom of 20 September 1976 (OJ L 178, 16.7.2018, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/dec/2018/994/oj).

Article 223 TFEU, which would reflect the impact of AI on the EU electoral process, introduce effective safeguards and make the EU electoral process more resilient in the context of AI misinformation and manipulation, including provisions addressing the use of AI in electoral campaigning, political advertising and voter targeting;

59. Highlights the importance of schools, universities, as well as educational and training institutions across all levels of government, in enhancing AI literacy through education and research; believes that this AI literacy is the cornerstone of safeguarding democratic systems and elections from AI information manipulation and interference; calls for increased resources at EU and Member State levels to achieve adequate levels of AI literacy in society;

60. Emphasises that the rapid evolution of the governance landscape of the EU, particularly in response to the digital transformation, AI and increasingly complex regulatory frameworks, is progressively testing the adequacy and effectiveness of the current Treaty provisions governing institutional competences, democratic accountability and parliamentary scrutiny, while also highlighting the need for ensuring transparency and reducing regulatory complexity; considers that the emergence of transformative AI capabilities that could disrupt entire systems requires forward-looking institutional adaptation to maintain the EU’s democratic legitimacy and governance resilience;

61. Stresses that in the short to medium term, the rapid progress of AI development is reflected at the regulatory level by the newly adopted AI Act, which is yet to become fully applicable and the impact of which is yet to be fully observed; emphasises that the latest advancements in AI are also being addressed through the Digital Omnibus on AI, in response to the need for the simplification and clarification of certain provisions of the AI Act through a number of targeted measures to ensure its timely, smooth and proportionate implementation; highlights the fact that the Digital Omnibus on AI reflects the need to adapt to the rapid pace of AI development and to ensure that the EU’s legal framework fosters an efficient and competitive environment for organisations operating in the EU; recalls the separate proposal for the Digital Omnibus, further clarifying how personal data may be used for AI training and development; underlines, in this context, the need to implement and enforce the AI Act and the rest of the EU’s digital legislative framework, and where necessary, to update it in the light of technological developments, while avoiding unnecessary administrative burdens, overlapping reporting obligations and national gold-plating measures that could fragment the internal market and hinder the scaling-up of trustworthy EU AI solutions; stresses the need for a transparent approach in this regard;

62. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to ensure that the deployment of AI, in particular in high-risk areas such as

employment, law enforcement and access to public services, is subject to strict safeguards, including the possibility of prohibitions where fundamental rights cannot otherwise be guaranteed, and to ensure that AI contributes to reducing inequalities, promoting quality employment and strengthening the European social model;

63. Stresses that the increasing use of delegated and implementing acts in the field of AI must not undermine Parliament’s role as co-legislator; calls for enhanced scrutiny mechanisms to ensure democratic accountability and transparency in the adoption of such acts;

64. Calls for the recognition and effective enforcement of the right of individuals to meaningful human intervention in decisions taken or supported by AI systems within public administrations, in line with the principles of good administration and democratic accountability;

65. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission.