

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 SYNTHETIC CONTENT PROVENANCE

governs

Art. 50(2) — provider machine-readable marking obligation; Art. 50(4) — deployer disclosure for deep fakes (distinct from the `deepfakes` topic which focuses on mis-use-harms)

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

CN · BINDING REGULATION

Interim Measures for Generative AI Service Management

CN-GENAI-2023

TREATMENT OF SYNTHETIC CONTENT PROVENANCE

governs

Art. 12 — mandatory marking of generative-AI output; aligns with Deep Synthesis Rules (2022) tagging requirements

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 provenance be a model-provider obligation (watermark at generation), a platform obligation (label at distribution), or a recipient right (declare on request)? Each jurisdiction is currently selecting a different burden allocation.

Bibliography

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