

# EU AI Act vs Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI

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](#)

US · EXECUTIVE ORDER

## Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI

US-EO-14110

TREATMENT OF SYNTHETIC CONTENT PROVENANCE

**governs**

§4.5(a) — content authentication + watermarking standards via NIST + Commerce

Primary source: [Exec. Order No. 14110, 88 Fed. Reg. 75191 \(Nov. 1, 2023\)](#)

## 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

1. [Regulation \(EU\) 2024/1689](#) — EU AI Act.
2. [Exec. Order No. 14110, 88 Fed. Reg. 75191 \(Nov. 1, 2023\)](#) — Executive Order 14110 on Safe, Secure, Trustworthy AI.
3. [Policy Window — Synthetic Content Provenance](#) (cross-jurisdiction topic article with full coverage matrix).