

Navigating the EU AI Act: Foreseeable Challenges in Qualifying Deep Learning-Based Automated Inspections of Class III Medical Devices

Julio Zanon Diaz^{1*}, Tommy Brennan^{2†} and Peter Corcoran^{1†}

^{1*}School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, University Of Galway, University Road, Galway, H91 TK33, Ireland.

²Visual-Cognitive Manufacturing Group, Digital Manufacturing Ireland, Castletroy, V94 237R, Co. Limerick, Ireland.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s):

J.ZanonDiaz1@UniversityOfGalway.ie;

Contributing authors: Tommy.Brennan@DMIreland.org;

Peter.Corcoran@UniversityOfGalway.ie;

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

As deep learning (DL) technologies advance, their application in automated visual inspection for Class III medical devices offers significant potential to enhance quality assurance and reduce human error. However, the adoption of such AI-based systems introduces new regulatory complexities—particularly under the EU Artificial Intelligence (AI) Act, which imposes high-risk system obligations that differ in scope and depth from established regulatory frameworks such as the Medical Device Regulation (MDR) and the U.S. FDA Quality System Regulation (QSR). This paper presents a high-level technical assessment of the foreseeable challenges that manufacturers are likely to encounter when qualifying DL-based automated inspections within the existing medical device compliance landscape. It examines divergences in risk management principles, dataset governance, model validation, explainability requirements, and post-deployment monitoring obligations. The discussion also explores potential implementation strategies and highlights areas of uncertainty, including data retention burdens, global compliance implications, and the practical difficulties of achieving statistical significance in validation with limited defect data. Disclaimer: This publication is intended solely as an academic and technical evaluation. It is not a substitute for legal advice or official regulatory interpretation. The information

presented here should not be relied upon to demonstrate compliance with the EU AI Act or any other statutory obligation. Manufacturers are encouraged to consult appropriate regulatory authorities and legal experts to determine specific compliance pathways.

Keywords: Manufacturing, Medical Devices, Deep Learning, Automated Inspections, EU AI Act

1 Automated Visual Inspection of Class III Medical Devices

The commercialisation and manufacture of medical devices are subject to regulation by various authorities, each corresponding to a specific geographical jurisdiction. These regulatory bodies implement distinct frameworks that generally include a risk-based classification system, grouping devices by product family or level of risk. Devices assigned to the highest classification tier are subject to the most stringent regulatory oversight. Typically, these include devices that are life-sustaining, life-supporting, implanted, or those that pose a significant risk of illness or injury if they fail. Examples include implantable stents, pacemakers, heart valves, and deep brain stimulators. Table A1 in Annex A presents a summary of the principal regulatory authorities and the corresponding medical device classification systems employed by each.

This paper will concentrate exclusively on devices within the highest risk category, as these present the most pronounced challenges in qualification and regulatory compliance. Despite notable regional differences in regulations governing both commercialisation and manufacturing, requirements concerning manufacturing practices—particularly those related to visual inspection—are closely harmonised. For the purposes of this analysis, the focus will be on Class III devices as defined by European Commission under the Medical Device Regulation (MDR), specifically Article 51 and Annex VIII – Classification Rules[1], and by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) under 21 CFR Part 860 – Medical Device Classification Procedures [2].

Visual inspection is a widely employed method of quality assurance in the manufacturing of Class III medical devices. These inspections continue to play a critical role in ensuring product quality and are predominantly performed by human operators, owing to their unique capabilities and contextual judgement, as noted by Charles et al. [3]. For conciseness, we will refer to human-conducted visual inspections as Human-Visual Inspections (HVI), and those performed using computerised logic as Automated-Visual Inspections (AVI).

Manufacturers in this sector typically implement multiple inspection stages to verify compliance with strict specifications. Rodriguez-Perez [4] underscores the industry’s reliance on such inspections and highlights a significant prevalence of human error—estimated to contribute to approximately one-third of all non-conformances in medical device and pharmaceutical manufacturing. Consequently, over the past decade, there

has been a marked trend toward investing in AVIs through the application of conventional computer vision technologies. However, these systems face challenges when dealing with complex inspection tasks, particularly due to their reliance on precisely defined, objective defect criteria. In contrast, HVIs often operates on subjective criteria that are readily interpreted by humans but difficult to encode into software.

The emergence of Deep Learning (DL), particularly through the use of Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) for image analysis, has enabled engineers to explore the automation of inspections even when subjectivity is involved. These technologies can learn from labelled image data, previously annotated by human experts, thereby bridging the gap between subjective human judgement and machine-based analysis. While this development represents a significant opportunity for innovation in manufacturing, it also introduces new challenges—chiefly, the absence of comprehensive regulatory guidance for the qualification and deployment of DL-based inspection systems within the medical device manufacturing framework.

2 Applicable Medical Device Regulatory Framework

This chapter explores the principal regulations and standards applicable to automated inspection systems employed in the manufacture of Class III medical devices, with particular reference to the frameworks established by European and United States regulatory authorities. Within the European Union, the principal legislative instrument governing the manufacture of medical devices is the Medical Device Regulation (MDR) (EU) 2017/745. For the purposes of a focused and relevant discussion, special cases such as drug–device combinations, where Class III implantable devices are used to deliver medicinal substances—for example, drug-eluting stents (DES)—will be excluded. In such instances, while the device remains subject to the Medical Device Regulation (MDR), a scientific consultation with the European Medicines Agency (EMA) or a national medicines authority may be required regarding the medicinal component. Compliance with the MDR is generally achieved through adherence to designated harmonised standards, which serve as a presumption of conformity. Among the most relevant harmonised standards for manufacturing are:

- **EN ISO 13485:2016+A11:2021** – *Quality management systems – Requirements for regulatory purposes* [5].
- **EN ISO 14971:2019+A11:2021** – *Application of risk management to medical devices* [6].

It is also important to acknowledge the existence of standards tailored to Software as a Medical Device (SaMD), some of which address specific requirements for machine learning applications. These standards however are not applicable for software used to manufacture Medical Devices and therefore has not been included in the assessment. In the United States, the primary regulatory framework for medical device manufacture is established by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and includes:

- **21 CFR Part 820** – *Quality System Regulation (QSR)* [7].
- **21 CFR Part 11** – *Electronic Records and Signatures* [8].

Notably, the FDA recognises ISO 13485 and ISO 14971 as acceptable standards for demonstrating regulatory compliance, and significant efforts are underway to formally harmonise ISO 13485 within the forthcoming Quality Management System Regulation (QMSR) framework [9]. Beyond these legally binding regulatory requirements, specific to medical devices, several generic quality standard and non-harmonised but widely accepted industry guidelines are often used by manufacturers to strengthen internal quality procedures. Although these are not covered in detail within this assessment, it is useful to acknowledge the most commonly referenced:

- **ISO 9000:2015** – *Quality Management Systems – Fundamentals and vocabulary* [10].
- **ISO/TR 80002-2:2017** – *Guidance on validating software used in quality systems (non-product software)* [11].
- **ISPE GAMP 5** – *Good Automated Manufacturing Practice* [12].
- **GHTF SG3/N99-10:2004** – *Quality Management Systems – Process Validation Guidance* [13].
- **FDA Guidance** – *Process Validation: General Principles and Practices (2011)* [14].

2.1 Quality Management System and Risk Management

Automated inspection systems must be implemented within a documented and validated Quality Management System (QMS) and governed by a risk-based approach. The combined expectations include:

- [ISO 13485:2016 [5], Clauses 4.1, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 7.1, 8.1] A QMS must be established that is tailored to medical devices, incorporating document and record control, traceability, change control, and regulatory compliance.
- [ISO 13485:2016 [5], Clauses 7.5.1, 7.5.6; 21 CFR §820.70, §820.75 [7]] Inspection processes (manual or automated) must be defined using pre-approved, objective, and risk-aligned acceptance criteria, and validated if their outputs cannot be verified through subsequent inspection.
- [ISO 13485:2016 [5], Clause 4.1.6; 21 CFR §820.70(i) [7]; 21 CFR §11.10(a) [8]] Inspection software (e.g., machine vision) must be validated for its intended use, with documented protocols, verification results, and version control.
- [ISO 13485:2016 [5], Clause 7.6; 21 CFR §820.72 [7]] Inspection equipment (e.g., image acquisition apparatus, measurement tools) must be qualified, calibrated, and maintained to ensure accuracy and suitability.
- [ISO 14971:2019 [6], Clause 7, 7.2, 7.3, 10] Inspection processes must be embedded in the device risk management strategy, with documented identification of potential failure modes, including:
 - Environmental factors (e.g., lighting),
 - Operator error (for semi-automated systems),
 - Software limitations (e.g., misclassification).

- [ISO 14971:2019 [6], Clause 7.3, Clause 10] Effectiveness of risk control measures must be verified and monitored for residual risk throughout production and post-market phases.

2.2 Data Integrity and Inspection Results

Where inspection systems generate or rely on electronic records, full compliance with data integrity, traceability, and security controls is mandatory:

- [21 CFR §11.10(b)-(k) [8]] Electronic records, including pass/fail outcomes and batch disposition data, must be:
 - Secure, retrievable, and human/electronically readable,
 - Audit-trailed with timestamps, operator identity, and record of parameter changes,
 - Protected against unauthorised access via role-based permissions.
- [21 CFR §11.10(f),(g) [8]; ISO 13485:2016 [5], Clause 6.2] Access control and device checks must be enforced, and operators must be trained on inspection system operation and limitations.
- [21 CFR §11.10(j)-(k) [8]] Documentation control procedures must manage system updates, change history, and user accountability.
- [ISO 13485:2016 [5], Clauses 7.5.1, 8.2.6; 21 CFR §820.80, §820.181 [7]] Inspection outcomes must be recorded and linked to product identifiers in the Device History Record (DHR), retained for regulatory inspection.
- [ISO 13485:2016 [5], Clause 8.3; 21 CFR §820.100 [7]] Failed inspection results must be subject to nonconformance handling and root cause analysis as part of the Corrective and Preventive Action (CAPA) system.
- [ISO 13485:2016 [5], Clause 4.1.6; 21 CFR §820.70(i) [7]; 21 CFR §11.10(a) [8]] Any modification to inspection software, acceptance limits, or configuration workflows must follow change control and revalidation protocols.

2.3 Qualification Activities

- [GAMP 5, Appendix D] Installation Qualification (IQ) – Verifies correct system setup, including:
 - Hardware (e.g., camera models, GPU types),
 - Firmware (e.g., driver/firmware versions),
 - Calibration validation (e.g., pixel-to-millimetre transformations),
 - Software code traceability (e.g., script version used for build).
- [GAMP 5] Operational Qualification (OQ) – Confirms functionality under expected operating conditions, verifying that:
 - Inputs generate valid outputs,
 - Inspection logic performs within defined ranges,
 - Records comply with Part 11 or ISO 13485 data requirements.

- [GAMP 5; ISO 13485:2016 [5], Clause 7.5.6] Performance Qualification (PQ) – Also referred to as process validation, Ensures repeatability and consistency in production, typically involving Test Method Validation (TMV) with variable and/or attribute data under normal use conditions.
- [GHTF SG3/N99-10:2004, Clause 6.3] Sampling plans used in PQ and TMV must be statistically justified, particularly where inspection is a critical process.
- [Taylor [15]] Risk, Confidence, Reliability: Organisations should classify inspection risks based on severity and detection likelihood. Sample sizes for validation should be calculated using statistical methods. The Success-Run Theorem is an example of a widely accepted method for calculating sample sizes for process validation of attribute inspection methods. This approach assumes no false negatives are permitted during the validation study. There are alternative statistical methods that allow for a defined number of false negatives, these typically require significantly larger sample sizes.

$$n = \left\lceil \frac{\ln(1 - \textit{Confidence})}{\ln(\textit{Reliability})} \right\rceil \quad (1)$$

where,

Confidence is the statistical likelihood that the validation conclusion is correct. In TMV, it reflects how sure we are that the test method performs as intended, based on the validation data. For example, if the confidence level is 95%, then if the validation were repeated many times, 95% of those validations would correctly confirm the method’s performance.

Reliability is the probability that the test method will consistently detect a defect or produce a correct result under defined conditions. For example, if Reliability is 99%, then the test method will correctly detect the defect (or give the correct result) 99 times out of 100 in routine use.

Typical values for High-risk inspections are Confidence= 95% and Reliability = 99%.

- [AIAG MSA [16]] – TMV Sample Composition- Best Practices: TMV must include a representative mix of defective and non-defective units, ideally:
 - 25–50% defective,
 - A mix of marginal cases and clearly nonconforming items,
 - Artificial defects if real samples are unavailable.

3 AI Regulatory Framework

3.1 EU AI Act

The EU Artificial Intelligence (AI) Act [17], which partially entered into force on 2 August 2024, will become applicable after a transitional period of two to three years, with the majority of its provisions taking effect on 2 August 2026, as set out in Article 113. However, the full enforcement of the Act is phased. Notably, provisions related to high-risk AI systems, as defined under Article 6(1), will not come into effect until 2 August 2027. For AI systems that were already placed on the market or put into

service prior to 2 August 2026, the obligations of the Act will only apply if those systems undergo significant design modifications after this date, in accordance with Article 111(2).

3.1.1 Harmonised Standards

To support the effective implementation of the AI Act, the European Commission has mandated the development of harmonised standards under the responsibility of CEN-CENELEC Joint Technical Committee 21 (JTC 21) [18]. These standards aim to provide technical specifications that facilitate compliance with the Act. The committee's work is focused on the following areas of the legislation:

- **AI Trustworthiness Framework:** Defining criteria for the development of trustworthy AI systems; standards are currently under development.
- **AI Risk Management:** Addressing operational risks inherent to AI systems; standards are currently under development.
- **AI Quality Management System:** Supporting the establishment of structured and consistent AI development processes; development has not yet commenced at the time of this assessment.
- **AI Conformity Assessment:** Establishing procedures for the verification of compliance; development has not yet commenced at the time of this assessment.
- **Data Governance and Quality:** Developing standards for the responsible management and high quality of data used in AI systems; development has not yet commenced at the time of this assessment.
- **Record-Keeping and Logging:** Ensuring comprehensive documentation of AI system operations to support transparency and accountability; standards are currently under development.
- **Transparency and Information Provision:** Standardising the information that should be provided to users and stakeholders; standards are currently under development.
- **Human Oversight:** Defining principles for effective human control and intervention in AI system operations; standards are currently under development.
- **Accuracy, Robustness, and Cybersecurity:** Setting out performance and security requirements for AI systems; standards are currently under development.
- **Sector-Specific Standards:** Addressing domain-specific needs such as those for machine vision applications; development has not yet commenced at the time of this assessment.

The following standards have already been published and are expected to be harmonised with the AI Act [19] [18]:

- ISO/IEC 22989:2022 – *Information technology – Artificial intelligence – Concepts and terminology* [20].
- ISO/IEC 23053:2022 – *Framework for AI systems using machine learning* [21].
- ISO/IEC 23894:2024 – *Guidance on risk management for AI systems* [22].
- ISO/IEC 27001:2013 – *Information security management systems, supporting both AI management and risk management frameworks* [23].

- ISO/IEC 5259 Parts 1–4:2025 – *Data quality for analytics and machine learning* [24], [25], [26], [27].
- ISO/IEC 42001:2023 – *Artificial Intelligence Management System* [28].

Although no explicit declarations have been made confirming harmonisation for the following standards, they have been referred by JTC 21 and are therefore expected to inform future standardisation activities in support of the AI Act [18]:

- CEN/CLC/TR 18115:2024 – *Data governance and quality for AI in the European context* [29].
- CEN/CLC ISO/IEC/TR 24027:2023 – *Bias in AI systems and AI-aided decision-making* [30].
- CEN/CLC ISO/IEC/TR 24029-1:2023 – *Assessment of the robustness of neural networks – Part 1: Overview* [31].
- EN ISO/IEC 8183:2024 – *Data lifecycle framework for AI* [32].
- CEN/CLC/TR 17894:2024 – *AI Conformity Assessment* [33].
- EN ISO/IEC 25059:2024 – *Quality model for AI systems* [34].
- CEN/CLC ISO/IEC/TS 12791:2024 – *Treatment of unwanted bias in classification and regression machine learning tasks* [35].

In Annex A, Table A2 we provide a list of JTC 21 projects that are either in the planning stage or currently in progress to complete the set of harmonised standards required under the AI Act. While this list is subject to change as the Act approaches full enforcement, it is worth noting that one such planned standard pertains specifically to computer vision: JT021025 – *Artificial Intelligence – Evaluation Methods for Accurate Computer Vision Systems*. This standard seeks to establish methodologies for assessing the accuracy of computer vision systems, thereby supporting compliance with the performance requirements of the EU AI Act.

3.1.2 Scope and Assumptions of the Assessment

To assess the regulatory requirements under the EU Artificial Intelligence (AI) Act pertaining to the use of Deep Learning (DL) for automated defect inspections in Class III medical device manufacturing, it is necessary to define a specific use case and make several simplifying assumptions. These assumptions establish the boundaries of the analysis presented in this paper:

1. High-Risk Classification Assumption: Although not all defects inspected by automated systems pose high-risk failure modes, this paper assumes that each automated inspection includes at least one defect associated with a high-risk condition. Medical devices classified under Class III fall within the scope of Union harmonisation legislation, specifically Regulation (EU) 2017/745 on medical devices (MDR), which is referenced in Annex II of the AI Act. Consequently, any AI system that functions as a safety component in the manufacturing process of such devices meets the criteria for high-risk classification under Article 6(1) of the AI Act. It is acknowledged that this is an inferred classification, as neither the MDR nor current harmonised standards under the AI Act explicitly reference automated inspections.

Nonetheless, it is reasonable to anticipate that future revisions of these standards will formally clarify the regulatory status of such systems.

2. **Model Lifecycle Assumption:** It is assumed that automated inspection systems are subject to rigorous pre-deployment validation, both at the software and process level, as is standard practice in medical device manufacturing. Accordingly, DL models used in this context are treated as “static” systems—that is, models that do not undergo continual or periodic retraining once deployed into production. In the event that retraining becomes necessary, a comprehensive revalidation process would be required in accordance with regulatory expectations.

3. **Application Domain Assumption:** Automated inspection systems are often used for both variable inspections (assessing measurable parameters) and attribute inspections (assessing pass/fail characteristics). In this paper, it is assumed that traditional computer vision techniques are generally preferred for variable inspections due to their calibration capabilities and alignment with recognised metrological standards. In contrast, DL models are assumed to be used primarily for attribute inspections, where the system learns to recognise features or patterns indicative of nonconformities. In some cases, these DL-derived classifications may serve as input to traditional vision algorithms, which then compute dimensional outputs.

4. **Standards Coverage Assumption:** The overview of regulatory and technical requirements presented in this assessment is based on the currently available versions of harmonised and supporting standards, including those under the EU AI Act and general quality and risk management frameworks. In the absence of specific guidance or updates to vertical standards, such as those under the Medical Device Regulation (MDR), which may eventually be revised to align more explicitly with the AI Act in the context of manufacturing, it is assumed that existing standards provide sufficient coverage of the core requirements relevant to automated inspections for the purposes of this analysis. Future iterations of MDR-related standards are expected to offer greater clarity on compliance pathways for AI-enabled manufacturing systems, but until such guidance is formally published, this assessment proceeds on the basis that the current corpus of standards reflects the applicable regulatory expectations.

3.2 Quality Management System and Risk Management

High-risk AI systems—such as DL-based visual inspection tools—must operate under a documented AI Management System (AIMS), incorporate full lifecycle risk governance, and fulfil obligations under the EU AI Act and applicable harmonised standards.

- [EU AI Act, Art. 9 [19]; ISO/IEC 42001:2023 [28], Clauses 4–6] A formal AIMS must define objectives, roles, risk tolerances, and compliance procedures across the AI lifecycle. This includes change control, ethical risk appraisal, and linkage to QMS-level activities in ISO 13485.
- [ISO/IEC 23894:2023 [22], Clauses 5.2–5.4] AI risk management must explicitly address model-specific hazards, such as:
 - Dataset shift or concept drift,

- Adversarial vulnerability,
 - Overfitting to test datasets,
 - Automation bias or unwarranted confidence in model outputs.
- [CEN/CLC ISO/IEC/TS 12791:2024 [35], Clause 7] Systems must be evaluated for social, ethical, and safety impacts, especially when involved in product acceptance decisions. Human oversight must be designed and documented.
 - [ISO/IEC 22989:2022 [20], Clause 4.3; CEN/CLC ISO/IEC/TR 24027:2023 [30], Clause 6] The system must document how it mitigates dataset bias and ensures fairness, particularly for defect variability across product variants or manufacturing sites.
 - [EN ISO/IEC 8183:2024 [32], Clause 5.2] The AIMS should incorporate a data lifecycle strategy, ensuring that governance, risk control, and quality assurance are maintained from data acquisition to model decommissioning.

3.3 Data Integrity and Inspection Results

Data used by High-Risk AI systems must meet curation, protection, integrity, and auditability requirements, both during development and in production.

- [EU AI Act, Art. 10; ISO/IEC 5259-2:2024 [25], Clauses 5–6] Datasets used for training, validation, and testing must be statistically representative, relevant, accurate, and free from bias. Documentation must include data sources, preprocessing logic, and exclusion rules.
- [ISO/IEC 23894:2023, Clause 6.4 [22]; ISO/IEC 42001:2023 [28], Clause 8.1.2] Data privacy must be preserved during acquisition and use, especially for image data that could reveal traceable features. Anonymisation or synthetic data should be considered where applicable.
- [CEN/CLC/TR 18115:2024 [29], Clause 5.3; ISO/IEC 27001:2013 [23], Annex A.9–A.12] Training and test data must be stored securely, encrypted in transit and at rest, with access control. Retention duration should be defined, and must comply with the system’s traceability and revalidation policies.
- [EN ISO/IEC 25059:2024 [34], Clause 5.5] Inspection results (e.g., defect classifications, confidence levels) must be interpretable, traceable to a model version, and evaluated for reproducibility across datasets.
- [EN ISO/IEC 8183:2024 [32], Clauses 6.3 and 6.5] A structured data lifecycle must be established to ensure that data integrity and consistency are preserved during ingestion, transformation, storage, and archival. The framework must include procedures for data versioning, audit trails, and data quality metrics at each lifecycle phase.

3.4 Qualification Activities and Performance Validation

High-risk AI systems must be qualified with statistical rigour, validated against performance targets, and monitored post-deployment to detect degradation or unintended behaviour.

- [EU AI Act, Art. 15; ISO/IEC 5259-1:2022 [24], Clause 4.2; ISO/IEC 5259-4:2024 [27], Clause 6.2] Validation must include:
 - Predefined metrics such as accuracy, precision, recall, F1-score, and false positive/negative rates,
 - Systematic testing across realistic variability conditions,
 - Detection of overfitting, such as inflated test performance without generalisation.
- [ISO/IEC 5259-3:2024 [26], Clauses 5–6; ISO/IEC 23053:2022 [21], Clauses 6.4–6.7] Validation protocols must be statistically sound, repeatable, and transparent. Acceptable statistical approaches include:
 - Cross-validation,
 - Stratified sampling of defect cases,
 - Application of Success-Run Theorem where binary (pass/fail) outputs are used.
- [ISO/IEC 23894:2023 [22], Clause 8.3; ISO/IEC 42001:2023 [28], Clause 10.2] Post-deployment monitoring requirements vary based on model adaptability:
 - Static AI systems (no retraining) require:
 - * Periodic reviews,
 - * Revalidation after environment/configuration changes,
 - * Surveillance of drift in input data distributions.
 - Retractable AI systems must:
 - * Define criteria and approval workflows for retraining,
 - * Maintain audit trails of all updated model versions,
 - * Conduct revalidation after each retraining cycle.
- [CEN/CLC/TR 17894:2024 [33], Clause 5.2.3] A post-market monitoring plan must be in place, including:
 - Key performance indicators (e.g. inspection yield, defect recall),
 - Root-cause investigations for out-of-tolerance inspection outcomes,
 - Processes to trigger model updates based on performance degradation.
- [CEN/CLC ISO/IEC/TR 24029-1:2023 [31], Clauses 5.2 and 6.2] AI robustness must be validated through stress testing and adversarial analysis. This includes simulating edge-case scenarios, applying input perturbations, and evaluating the system’s tolerance to environmental variation and noise—critical in manufacturing inspection environments.

4 Assessing Foreseeable Challenges for Deep Learning Automated Inspections of Class III Medical Devices

This section explores the foreseeable challenges in adopting the EU Artificial Intelligence (AI) Act for qualifying deep learning (DL)-based automated inspections of Class

III medical devices, specifically for companies that already comply with existing regulatory frameworks such as the Medical Device Regulation (MDR) and the U.S. FDA Regulation. Rather than providing a comprehensive list of new requirements—which has been addressed in earlier sections—this analysis focuses on areas of implementation that may prove difficult to align with existing practices. It draws on findings from the literature as well as expert consultation. Given that harmonised standards under the AI Act are still evolving and that the obligations for high-risk systems are not yet fully in force, there remains some degree of subjectivity in this analysis, which is expected to be clarified in future guidance and revisions.

4.1 Quality Management System Requirements

Many requirements related to establishing an AI Management System (AIMS)—including AI-specific risk management—overlap with existing QMS practices under MDR and FDA. However, the two frameworks are grounded in distinct conceptual foundations. For example, EN ISO 14971:2019 (MDR) is derived from ISO Guide 51:2014 [36] and centres on product safety and engineering risks, whereas ISO/IEC 23894:2024 is built on ISO Guide 73:2009 [37], reflecting a broader enterprise risk management approach. Though these frameworks are not incompatible, their differing scopes and terminologies may pose challenges for alignment. It is likely that EN ISO 14971:2019, ISO 13485:2016, or both will require revision to better harmonise with AI-specific risk frameworks such as ISO/IEC 23894:2024.

There is also a fundamental shift in the requirement to define roles, responsibilities, and policies across the entire AI lifecycle—from development through to deployment and retirement. In manufacturing, this presents a challenge: policies cannot be confined to inspection use cases alone, but must also account for other applications (e.g. large language models used in documentation, causal inference for root cause analysis, or DL-based supply chain prediction tools). While smaller organisations may scale policies incrementally, larger enterprises with numerous concurrent initiatives may struggle to develop AIMS documentation (e.g., SOPs, work instructions) that is sufficiently comprehensive and future-proof.

4.2 Image curation: Ethical Considerations and Privacy

Images used for DL-based inspection systems typically do not pose privacy risks, especially when generated in controlled manufacturing environments without identifiable human content. However, it is possible for background footage to unintentionally include workers, particularly in constrained physical layouts. While GDPR [38] already addresses this issue for EU-based manufacturers, compliance with the AI Act’s privacy provisions is not expected to introduce additional burdens in this context. However, for manufacturers operating under U.S. state-level privacy laws—which offer varied and less prescriptive coverage for workplace surveillance—additional safeguards may be required to ensure AI Act alignment.

Emerging applications where AI is used to monitor worker activity (e.g. to confirm safety-critical steps in a procedure) may trigger more complex ethical considerations. However, as this use case extends beyond product inspection, it is excluded from this assessment.

4.3 Image Curation: Bias and Fairness

Under MDR and FDA frameworks, bias and fairness are indirectly addressed through Test Method Validation (TMV) supported by statistically sound sampling plans. These methods are sufficient for rule-based computer vision, where functions are explicit and interpretable. For instance, in a rule-based traditional approach, verifying that a function correctly classifies samples based on the average brightness of a defined region of pixels, requires only a small sample of boundary cases.

However, Deep Learning models operate on latent features and cannot be dissected in the same way. Their ability to generalise post-deployment depends entirely on training data representativeness. Ensuring performance thus requires training and validation datasets that are statistically significant and representative of future inspection scenarios. This is a notable departure from current practice, particularly in the medical device sector where defect images are rare and difficult to simulate.

The EU AI Act introduces rigorous expectations to mitigate bias across the system lifecycle—from training and testing to TMV and post-deployment monitoring. Meeting these expectations will require manufacturers to establish new processes capable of demonstrating that their data is both representative and balanced.

4.4 Image Storage for Training and Inference Data

Emerging standards (e.g. EN ISO/IEC 8183:2024, CEN/CLC/TR 18115:2024) imply that training datasets and associated metadata must be retained to ensure traceability, auditability, and revalidation capability. Under MDR and FDA, manufacturers already retain software artefacts, model documentation, and validation records—often for periods aligned with patient life expectancy (i.e., 70+ years). However, these regulations do not require the retention of raw training images.

This presents a significant challenge as typically training and validation images are high-resolution, and datasets are large. The cost of secure long-term storage as quality records can be prohibitive, particularly at scale. Manufacturers with thousands of inspection points may find that compliance with this requirement becomes a barrier to full AI adoption in visual inspection.

4.5 System Output and Explainability

While the AI Act does not explicitly require the storage of inferencing images, it does require that systems support traceability and retrospective decision analysis. For inspection systems, this may necessitate storing inference-stage images alongside model decisions to enable review and audit.

Moreover, harmonised standards (e.g. EN ISO/IEC 25059:2024) recommend the use of explainability tools, such as saliency maps or surrogate models. Although framed as a "should" rather than a "shall", in the context of high-risk applications, this requirement is likely to be interpreted as effectively mandatory. The challenge is twofold:

- Not all models support these explainability techniques.

- Validation of the explainability output itself (i.e., demonstrating that heatmaps or surrogate approximations are trustworthy) is currently undefined by the standards.

In this context, it is noteworthy that the FDA’s draft guidance on the use of artificial intelligence to support regulatory decision-making [39] outlines a structured documentation framework aimed at enhancing model interpretability, with no mention of explainability tools. Instead, it emphasises the importance of thoroughly detailing the development process of the models, elucidating how they generate conclusions, reporting performance metrics accompanied by confidence intervals, and disclosing known limitations, including potential sources of bias. It should be observed that this guidance document had not been finalised at the time of writing and is not intended to serve as a harmonised standard under the EU AI Act.

4.6 Software and Process Validation: Sampling and Performance Requirements

While AI validation may imply the need for larger validation datasets than traditional computer vision systems, the AI Act stops short of defining quantitative thresholds. Instead, it requires that training and validation data be of sufficient quality and representative of operational conditions.

This requirement is compatible with MDR and FDA TMV practices. For example, high-risk inspection processes can be validated using the Success-Run Theorem, setting confidence and reliability thresholds (e.g., 95% and 99%, respectively). Manufacturers are therefore unlikely to face philosophical contradictions but may require greater test volumes to compensate for Deep Learning opacity and performance variability.

4.7 Model Monitoring After Deployment

This assessment focuses on static AI models—those that are not retrained post-deployment. While these models offer stability, they remain subject to performance drift due to shifts in input distributions or environmental factors.

The AI Act and associated standards (ISO/IEC 23894:2023, ISO/IEC 42001:2023) do not explicitly differentiate static vs. retrainable models. Instead, they impose universal monitoring requirements, including:

- Regular performance reviews,
- Revalidation following any significant changes,
- Mechanisms for detecting data drift.

This represents a novel requirement for manufacturers. Under MDR and FDA, routine verification applies only to calibration of variable inspection tools; attribute-based inspections are typically exempt from revalidation unless defects arise. Therefore, the shift toward continuous performance surveillance—even for static systems—will require new procedures and tooling.

5 Conclusions and Discussions

This assessment has explored the foreseeable challenges facing medical device manufacturers—particularly those already compliant with MDR and FDA regulations—in adopting the EU Artificial Intelligence (AI) Act for the qualification of deep learning (DL)-based automated inspection systems used in the manufacture of Class III medical devices. Given that the AI Act’s obligations for high-risk systems are not yet fully in force, and that harmonised standards are still evolving, a degree of interpretation and subjectivity remains. It is anticipated that forthcoming regulatory guidance, updates to vertical standards, and industry experience will help clarify these requirements over time.

While there is significant overlap between the AI Act and existing regulatory frameworks, especially in areas such as validation methodology and documentation practices, several provisions represent a substantial departure from traditional quality system paradigms. Notably, new expectations around data governance, bias mitigation, model transparency, and post-market performance monitoring are likely to pose practical implementation challenges. As a result, manufacturers will need to invest in:

- Cross-functional AI governance structures,
- Enhanced dataset engineering and curation processes, and
- New tools and frameworks for AI validation and lifecycle oversight.

Until clearer regulatory frameworks are formalised, compliance efforts must be guided by best practices, risk-based interpretation of standards, and robust documentation that reflects the intent of both current and future obligations.

5.1 Data Representativeness and Bias Mitigation

The AI Act introduces a lifecycle approach to data governance, setting the expectation that training, testing, and validation datasets be demonstrably unbiased and representative of real-world conditions. This raises considerable challenges in sectors like medical device manufacturing, where defects are rare, and natural data scarcity can undermine statistical robustness.

To mitigate these risks, manufacturers may consider the following strategies:

- Developing procedures for image curation, including defect variability analysis and labelling protocols;
- Retaining metadata describing dataset composition, feature distributions, and labelling methods;
- Creating sampling methodologies that account for latent feature representations, which are not interpretable via conventional means;
- Extending TMV phases post-deployment with human-in-the-loop review, increasing validation set sizes and reinforcing statistical power.

5.2 Data Retention Challenges

Another emerging challenge is the expectation of long-term data retention for training, validation, and inferencing images. While MDR and FDA practices already enforce

long-term storage of validation records and source code, they do not extend this requirement to the data used during model development.

To reduce this burden, the following approaches may be viable:

- Seek future regulatory guidance clarifying retention guidance, distinguishing between datasets used for training and those constituting regulatory records (e.g. DHR);
- AI methodologies can support retention of intermediate representations (e.g. latent features), rather than full-resolution images, to enable revalidation without high storage costs.

5.3 Explainability Requirements

The AI Act further introduces the expectation that high-risk systems support explainability mechanisms, such as saliency maps or surrogate models. While this may be technically feasible, it presents new challenges in regulated environments:

- The explainability tools themselves would need to be validated for intended use and reliability.
- There are currently no clear guidelines on how such validation should be structured, or how to define acceptable outputs.

To support implementation, the following could be considered:

- Seek future regulatory guidance clarifying acceptable approaches for the qualification of explainability tools;
- Develop new generations of DL models which include inherently explainable features, reducing reliance on post-hoc interpretability.

5.4 Monitoring Static Models

While the AI Act does not distinguish between static and retrainable models, it sets clear expectations for post-deployment monitoring of all high-risk AI systems. For static models, performance drift can occur due to external factors such as changes in imaging conditions or input variability—not retraining.

To address this, manufacturers may:

- Implement supervisory systems to detect input drift or image feature anomalies;
- Seek future regulatory guidance clarifying QMS expectations for static models, particularly regarding incident handling and revalidation triggers.

5.5 Global Compliance Uncertainty

A final challenge pertains to the geographic scope of applicability. Although the AI system may not be part of the device itself, the AI Act applies to high-risk systems that act as safety components. It is therefore reasonable to infer that medical devices manufactured outside the EU—but inspected using AI systems to verify high-risk features and subsequently placed on the EU market—would fall within the scope of the Act as inferred in Article 2(1) [17]. This raises important compliance considerations for

non-EU manufacturers, particularly regarding documentation, lifecycle traceability, and conformity assessment. Further regulatory guidance would be required to address this concern.

It is worth noting that the FDA has recently published a draft guidance document outlining recommendations for the qualification of AI systems used to support regulatory decision-making [39]. Although this document is not intended to be harmonised under the EU AI Act and remains in draft form, it reflects a number of parallels with the requirements set out in the EU framework. This suggests a degree of conceptual alignment between the two regions, which may contribute to greater regulatory convergence in the future.

5.6 Closing Reflection and Future Work

The EU AI Act represents a paradigm shift in the regulatory oversight of AI in safety-critical applications. Its intersection with MDR and FDA practices offers both continuity and divergence, challenging manufacturers to evolve their quality systems while maintaining alignment with core medical device principles. While further clarity will emerge through future revisions and implementation guidance, proactive engagement, robust governance, and industry-wide collaboration will be essential in navigating this new regulatory landscape.

Future work should focus on developing practical tools and methods to support compliance with the EU AI Act in DL-based inspection systems. Priorities include validation frameworks for latent-feature-based models, metrics for dataset statistical representativeness, and procedures to qualify explainability tools in high-risk settings. As standards like JT021025 for computer vision evolve, industry collaboration and regulatory engagement will be key to clarifying requirements for static model monitoring, data retention, and global applicability.

Declarations

Competing interest: The authors declare no competing interests.

References

- [1] Parliament, E., Council: Regulation (EU) 2017/745 on medical devices. Official Journal of the European Union (2017)
- [2] Food, U.S., Administration, D.: Medical Device Classification Procedures. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 21, Part 860 (2023)
- [3] Charles, R.L., Johnson, T.L., Fletcher, S.R.: The use of job aids for visual inspection in manufacturing and maintenance. *Procedia CIRP* **38**, 90–93 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2015.08.056>
- [4] Rodríguez-Pérez, J.: *Human Error Reduction in Manufacturing*. Quality Press, Milwaukee, USA (2023)

- [5] Standardization, I.O.: En iso 13485:2016+a11:2021 – medical devices – quality management systems – re-quirements for regulatory purposes. Standard, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, CH (2021). <https://www.iso.org/>
- [6] Standardization, I.O.: En iso 14971:2019+a11:2021 - medical devices - application of risk management to medical devices. Standard, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, CH (2021). <https://www.iso.org/>
- [7] Food, U.S., Administration, D.: 21 CFR Part 820 – Quality System Regulation (2023)
- [8] Food, U.S., Administration, D.: 21 CFR Part 11 – Electronic Records and Electronic Signatures (2023)
- [9] Food, U.S., Administration, D.: Quality Management System Regulation – Frequently Asked Questions (2024)
- [10] Standardization, I.O.: Iso 9000:2015 - quality management systems - fundamentals and vocabulary. Standard, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, CH (2015). <https://www.iso.org/>
- [11] Standardization, I.O.: Iso/tr 80002-2:2017 - medical device software - part 2: Validation of software for medical device quality systems. Standard, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, CH (2017). <https://www.iso.org/>
- [12] Pharmaceutical Engineering, I.S.: GAMP 5: A Risk-Based Approach to Compliant GxP Computerized Systems, 2nd edn. ISPE, Tampa, FL, USA (2022)
- [13] Force, G.H.T.: Ghtf sg3/n99-10:2004 – quality management systems: Process validation guidance. Technical report, Global Harmonization Task Force (2004)
- [14] Food, U.S., Administration, D.: Process Validation: General Principles and Practices (2011)
- [15] Taylor, W.A.: Statistical Procedures for the Medical Device Industry, 2nd edn. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, USA (2011)
- [16] Group, A.I.A.: Measurement Systems Analysis (MSA) Manual, 4th edn. Southfield, MI, USA (2010)
- [17] Union, E.: Regulation (EU) 2024/1684 – Artificial Intelligence Act. Official Journal of the European Union L 164 (2024)
- [18] 21, C.J.: Artificial intelligence (ai) – work programme. Technical report, CEN-CENELEC, Brussels, Belgium (2025)
- [19] Bezombes, P.: European standardization in support of the european artificial

- intelligence regulation. In: Euroshnet Conference Proceedings (2022)
- [20] ISO/IEC: Iso/iec 22989:2022 – artificial intelligence – concepts and terminology. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2022). <https://www.iso.org/>
 - [21] ISO/IEC: Iso/iec 23053:2022 – framework for ai systems using machine learning. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2022). <https://www.iso.org/>
 - [22] ISO/IEC: Iso/iec 23894:2023 – artificial intelligence – guidance on risk management. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2023). <https://www.iso.org/>
 - [23] ISO/IEC: Iso/iec 27001:2013 – information security management systems – requirements. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2013). <https://www.iso.org/>
 - [24] ISO/IEC: Iso/iec 5259-1:2022 – quality evaluation guidelines for ai systems – part 1: Overview and metrics. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2022). <https://www.iso.org/>
 - [25] ISO/IEC: Iso/iec 5259-2:2024 – quality evaluation guidelines for ai systems – part 2: Data quality. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2024). <https://www.iso.org/>
 - [26] ISO/IEC: Iso/iec 5259-3:2024 – quality evaluation guidelines for ai systems – part 3: Evaluation process. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2024). <https://www.iso.org/>
 - [27] ISO/IEC: Iso/iec 5259-4:2024 – quality evaluation guidelines for ai systems – part 4: Use case specific guidelines. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2024). <https://www.iso.org/>
 - [28] ISO/IEC: Iso/iec 42001:2023 – artificial intelligence – management system. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2023). <https://www.iso.org/>
 - [29] CEN-CENELEC: Cen/clc/tr 18115:2024 – artificial intelligence – traceability and documentation in high-risk ai systems. Technical report, CEN-CENELEC Joint Technical Committee 21 (JTC 21), Brussels, Belgium (2024)
 - [30] CEN-CENELEC: Cen/clc iso/iec/tr 24027:2023 – artificial intelligence – bias in ai systems and datasets. Technical report, CEN-CENELEC Joint Technical Committee 21 (JTC 21), Brussels, Belgium (2023)
 - [31] CEN-CENELEC: Cen/clc iso/iec/tr 24029-1:2023 – artificial intelligence – assessment of the robustness of neural networks – part 1: Overview. Technical report, CEN-CENELEC Joint Technical Committee 21 (JTC 21), Brussels, Belgium (2023)
 - [32] ISO/IEC: En iso/iec 8183:2024 – artificial intelligence – data lifecycle framework. Standard, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2024). <https://www.iso.org/>

- [33] CEN-CENELEC: Cen/clc/tr 17894:2024 – artificial intelligence – post-market monitoring for high-risk ai systems. Technical report, CEN-CENELEC Joint Technical Committee 21 (JTC 21), Brussels, Belgium (2024)
- [34] ISO/IEC: En iso/iec 25059:2024 – software and systems engineering – quality model for ai systems. Standard bib42, ISO/IEC, Geneva, CH (2024). <https://www.iso.org/>
- [35] CEN-CENELEC: Cen/clc iso/iec/ts 12791:2024 – artificial intelligence – guidance for risk assessment of ai systems from a human-centred perspective. Technical report, CEN-CENELEC Joint Technical Committee 21 (JTC 21), Brussels, Belgium (2024)
- [36] Standardization, I.O.: Iso guide 51:2014 – safety aspects – guidelines for their inclusion in standards. Standard bib44, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, CH (2014). <https://www.iso.org/>
- [37] Standardization, I.O.: Iso guide 73:2009 – risk management – vocabulary. Standard bib45, International Organization for Standardization, Geneva, CH (2009). <https://www.iso.org/>
- [38] Union, E.: Regulation (EU) 2016/679 – General Data Protection Regulation. Official Journal of the European Union L 119. pp.1–88 (2016)
- [39] Food, U.S., Administration, D.: Considerations for the use of artificial intelligence to support regulatory decision-making for drug and biological products. Technical report, U.S. Food and Drug Administration (Jan 2025). Draft guidance. <https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/considerations-use-artificial-intelligence-support-regulatory-decision-making-drug-and-biological>
- [40] Medicines, Regulatory Agency, H.: Medical Devices Regulations 2002 (SI 2002 No 618, as amended) (2002)
- [41] Administration, N.M.P.: Rules for Classification of Medical Devices (Decree No. 15). Beijing, China (2016)
- [42] Pharmaceuticals, Agency, M.D.: Japanese Medical Device Nomenclature (JMDN). Accessed 4 Jun 2025 (2025)
- [43] Canada, H.: Guidance on the risk-based classification system for non-in vitro diagnostic devices (non-IVDDs) (2015)
- [44] ANVISA: Collegiate Board Resolution RDC No. 751/2022. Brasília: Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency (2022)
- [45] Food, M., Safety, D.: Medical Device Regulatory System in Korea (2016)

- [46] Administration, T.G.: Classification of medical devices that are not IVDs (Version 2.0). Australian Government Department of Health and Aged Care (2024)
- [47] Organization, C.D.S.C.: Medical Devices Rules, 2017. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India (2017)

Appendix A Medical Devices Classifications and Standards

Table A1 Medical Devices Regulatory Agencies and Classification Systems

Geographical Area	Agency	Regulations defining Classification	Classification system (Highest Risk in Bold)
EU	European Commission (EC)	Medical Device Regulation (MDR) – Article 51, Annex VIII – Classification Rules [1]	Class I, II, III
USA	Food and Drug Administration (FDA)	21 CFR Part 860 – Medical Device Classification Procedures [2]	Class I, II, III
UK	Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA)	Medical Devices Regulations (UK MDR) SI 2002 No 618, PART II General Medical Devices [40]	Class I, II, III
China	National Medical Products Administration (NMPA)	Rules for Classification of Medical Devices” (Decree No. 15) Article 4 [41]	Class I, II, III
Japan	Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA)	Japanese Medical Device Nomenclature (JMDN) [42]	Class I, II, III, IV
Canada	Health Canada	Risk-based Classification System for Non-In Vitro Diagnostic Devices (non-IVDDs) [43]	Class I, II, III, IV
Brazil	Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária (ANVISA)	Collegiate Board Resolution RDC No. 751/2022 [44]	Class I, II, III, IV
South Korea	Ministry of Food and Drug Safety (MFDS)	South Korea, as detailed in the Medical Device Regulatory System [45]	Class I, II, III, IV
Australia	Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA)	Classification of medical devices that are not IVD [46]	Class I, IIa, IIb, III
India	Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO)	Medical Devices Rules, 2017 [47]	Class A, B, C, D

Table A2 CEN/CLC/JTC 21 Work programme as published on the 11th of Jun 2025 [18]

Project	Title	Status
prCEN/CLC/TR (WI=JT021009)	XXX AI Risks - Check List for AI Risks Management	Preliminary
prCEN/TS (WI=JT021034)	Guidelines on tools for handling ethical issues in AI system life cycle	Preliminary
prEN ISO/IEC (WI=JT021021)	24970 Artificial intelligence — AI system logging	Under Drafting
EN 22989:2023/prA1 (WI=JT021031)	ISO/IEC Information technology — Artificial intelligence — Artificial intelligence concepts and terminology — Amendment 1	Under Drafting
EN 23053:2023/prA1 (WI=JT021032)	ISO/IEC Framework for Artificial Intelligence (AI) Systems Using Machine Learning (ML) — Amendment 1	Under Drafting
prEN (WI=JT021038)	XXX AI Conformity assessment framework	Under Drafting
prEN (WI=JT021044)	XXX Artificial Intelligence - Taxonomy of AI tasks in computer vision – Taxonomy of AI system methods and capabilities ¹	Under Drafting
prEN ISO/IEC (WI=JT021045)	42102 Information technology - Artificial intelligence – Taxonomy of AI system methods and capabilities	Under Drafting
prEN ISO/IEC (WI=JT021046)	25029 Artificial intelligence - AI-enhanced nudging	Under Drafting
FprEN ISO/IEC (WI=JT021022)	12792 Information technology - Artificial intelligence - Transparency taxonomy of AI systems (ISO/IEC FDIS 12792:2025)	Under Approval
prEN (WI=JT021029)	XXX Artificial intelligence - Cybersecurity specifications for AI Systems	Under Drafting
prEN (WI=JT021037)	XXX Artificial Intelligence – Quality and governance of datasets in AI	Under Drafting
prEN ISO/IEC (WI=JT021012)	23282 Artificial Intelligence - Evaluation methods for accurate natural language processing systems	Under Drafting
prEN ISO/IEC (WI=JT021027)	25059 rev Software engineering - Systems and software Quality Requirements and Evaluation (SQuaRE) - Quality model for AI systems (ISO/IEC 25059:2023)	Under Drafting
(WI=JT021030)	Contributions towards ISO/IEC 27090	Preliminary
prCEN/TS (WI=JT021033)	Guidance for upskilling organisations on AI ethics and social concerns	Preliminary
prCEN/TS (WI=JT021035)	Sustainable Artificial Intelligence – Guidelines and metrics for the environmental impact of artificial intelligence systems and services	Preliminary
prEN (WI=JT021036)	XXX Artificial Intelligence - Concepts, measures and requirements for managing bias in AI systems	Under Drafting
prEN (WI=JT021039)	XXX Artificial intelligence - Quality management system for EU AI Act regulatory purposes	Under Drafting
prEN (WI=JT021019)	XXX Competence requirements for professional AI ethicists	Under Drafting
prEN (WI=JT021008)	18229 AI trustworthiness framework	Under Drafting
prCEN/CLC/TR (WI=JT021026)	XXX Impact assessment in the context of the EU Fundamental Rights	Preliminary
prEN ISO/IEC TR (WI=JT021002)	23281 Artificial Intelligence - Overview of AI tasks and functionalities related to natural language processing	Under Drafting
prEN (WI=JT021025)	XXX Artificial Intelligence – Evaluation methods for accurate computer vision systems ¹	Under Drafting
prEN (WI=JT021024)	18228 AI Risk Management	Under Drafting

¹Computer Vision harmonised standards under JT 21 have been proposed but not started. These standards will be highly relevant to the validity of this assessment as they may introduce additional guidelines.