

EU AI Act vs Interim Measures for Generative AI Service Management

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

EU · BINDING REGULATION

EU AI Act

EU-AIA-2024

TREATMENT OF AGENTIC AI GOVERNANCE

implicit

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

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

CN · BINDING REGULATION

Interim Measures for Generative AI Service Management

CN-GENAI-2023

TREATMENT OF AGENTIC AI GOVERNANCE

implicit

Arts. 4, 8 (service-provision scope) — agent-like generative services fall within registration + safety-assessment obligations

Primary source: [CAC Order No. 15](#)

What this comparison shows

The two regimes take the same position. This is a candidate for cross-jurisdictional alignment in industry guidance, voluntary codes, and harmonisation tracks.

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

Bibliography

1. [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1689](#) — EU AI Act.
2. [CAC Order No. 15](#) — Interim Measures for Generative AI Service Management.
3. [Policy Window — Agentic AI Governance](#) (cross-jurisdiction topic article with full coverage matrix).