

Recommendations for Trilogues Negotiations on the Digital Omnibus on AI

As a global Business-to-Business (B2B) cloud, Artificial Intelligence (AI) and software company with a significant European footprint, Salesforce plays a pivotal role in the digital transformation of European industries, enabling our customers to benefit from the power of their own data.

The final negotiations of the EU's AI Omnibus represent a pivotal moment for Europe to secure its position as a global leader in trusted digital innovation. We fully support a risk-based approach that establishes essential guardrails for responsible AI while fostering a pro-innovation ecosystem. To realize this ambition and ensure the Act's long-term integrity, negotiators must prioritize a framework that is clear, predictable, and globally competitive.

Our core recommendations focus on three critical priorities:

- eliminating unnecessary red tape for non-high-risk AI registration
- establishing clear, workable timelines for transparency and high-risk AI
- ensuring the EU remains an attractive hub for cutting-edge AI enterprise.

Issue	Commission proposal	Council mandate	European Parliament mandate
Timelines: High-risk AI	Article 1(31) (a) in the third paragraph, point (d) is added: ‘(d) Chapter III, Sections 1, 2, and 3, shall apply following the adoption of a decision of the Commission confirming that adequate measures in support of compliance with Chapter III are available, from the following dates: (i) 6 months after the adoption of that decision as regards AI systems classified as high-risk pursuant to Article 6(2) and Annex III, and (ii) 12 months after the adoption of the decision as regards AI systems classified as high-risk pursuant to Article 6(1) and Annex I.	Article 1 (31) (a) in the third paragraph, (c) is replaced by the following: (c) Chapter III, Sections 1, 2, and 3, shall apply: (i) on 2 December 2027 as regards AI systems classified as high-risk pursuant to Article 6(2) and Annex III, and (ii) on 2 August 2028 as regards AI systems classified as high-risk pursuant to Article 6(1) and Annex I.’	Article 1 (31) (a) in the third paragraph, point (d) is added: (d) Chapter III, Sections 1, 2, and 3, with the exception of Article 6(5), shall apply (i) on 2 December 2027 as regards AI systems classified as high-risk pursuant to Article 6(2) and Annex III, and (ii) on 2 August 2028 as regards AI systems classified as high-risk pursuant to Article 6(1) and Annex I.’;

	In the absence of the adoption of the decision within the meaning of subparagraph 1, or where the dates below are earlier than those that follow the adoption of that decision, Chapter III, Sections 1, 2, and 3, shall apply: (i) on 2 December 2027 as regards AI systems classified as high-risk pursuant to Article 6(2) and Annex III, and (ii) on 2 August 2028 as regards AI systems classified as high-risk pursuant to Article 6(1) and Annex I.';"		
	Recommendation: Support the Council and Parliament's positions. A fixed deadline of December 2027 for Annex III high-risk AI systems is crucial for legal certainty and predictability. As harmonized standards for high-risk AI are expected not before the end of 2026, a fixed date allows providers sufficient time to operationalize technical requirements. We therefore urge the rejection of the Commission's conditional approach.		
Registration non-high-risk AI in Annex III	Article 1(6)	Article 1 (6) Deleted	Article 1 (6) Deleted

	In Article 6(4), paragraph 4 is replaced by the following: ‘4. A provider who considers that an AI system referred to in Annex III is not high-risk shall document its assessment before that system is placed on the market or put into service. Upon request of national competent authorities, the provider shall provide the documentation of the assessment.’” Article 1(14) (14) in Article 49, paragraph 2 is deleted.	Article 1(14) Deleted Article 1(32) (32) in Annex VIII, section B, points 7 and 9 are deleted. Recital 9 The registration of AI systems referred to in Article 6(3) of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 in the EU database pursuant to Article 49(2) of that Regulation should be simplified by streamlining the required content in Section B of Annex VIII to that Regulation.	Article 1(14) Deleted Article 1(32) (32) in Annex VIII, section B, points 7 and 9 are deleted.
	Recommendation: Support the European Commission’s proposal. The Commission’s proposal reflects the proportionate and risk-based approach of the EU AI Act, by exempting from registration those AI systems that are not in scope of high-risk requirements, even if they are intended to be used in areas listed in Annex III – in line with relevant exemptions in Article 6. This would reduce administrative burden and security risks, as well as more proportionately calibrate the impact of the AI Act on non-high-risk AI systems.		

	Should co-legislators reject this amendment, we strongly urge a radically simplified registration requirement, demanding further legal clarity in Annex VIII beyond the Council's current compromise.		
Timelines: Transparency	Article 1 (30) (b) (b) the following paragraph 4 is added: ‘4. Providers of AI systems, including general-purpose AI systems, generating synthetic audio, image, video or text content, that have been placed on the market before 2 August 2026 shall take the necessary steps in order to comply with Article 50(2) by 2 February 2027.’”	Article 1 (30) (b) (b) the following paragraph 4 is added: ‘4. Providers of AI systems, including general-purpose AI systems, generating synthetic audio, image, video or text content, that have been placed on the market before 2 August 2026 shall take the necessary steps in order to comply with Article 50(2) by 2 February 2027.’	Article 1 (30) (b) (b) the following paragraph 4 is added: ‘Providers of AI systems, including general-purpose AI systems, generating synthetic audio, image, video or text content, that have been placed on the market before 2 August 2026 shall take the necessary steps in order to comply with Article 50(2) by 2 November 2026.’
	Recommendation: Expand the deadlines and scope of Article 50; however at a minimum, support the Commission and Council positions. First of all, the grace period should be extended to 12 months. The requirements on marking and labelling for generative AI in the AI Act will need to be further specified in a Code of Practice, which is currently under preparation, and expected to be finalized in the summer of 2026. The Code of Practice is an important tool to provide technical and legal clarity on a complex and nascent subject matter – and companies will need several months after its finalization to implement it in existing and new products.		

	Second, the grace period should be extended to all systems – not just those already in the market. Since the current proposals limit the grace period to systems that have been placed on the market before 2 August 2026, any system placed in the EU market after 2 August would have to be compliant immediately. This would be technically unfeasible and could delay the placement in the EU market of new and innovative generative AI systems. This is why we recommend extending the grace period to any system that has been placed in the market between 2 August 2026 and the (extended) grace period.		
Value Chain (Article 25)	N/A	N/A	Article 1 (9) (b) 2. Where the circumstances referred to in paragraph 1 occur, the provider that initially placed the AI system on the market or put it into service shall no longer be considered to be a provider of that specific AI system for the purposes of this Regulation. That initial provider, as well as providers of general-purpose AI models whose models are integrated into high-risk AI systems, shall closely cooperate with new providers and shall make available the necessary information and provide the reasonably expected technical

			access and other assistance that are required for the fulfilment of the obligations set out in this Regulation, in particular regarding the compliance with the conformity assessment of high risk AI systems. This obligation shall include: (a) Technical documentation sufficient to assess compliance with Article 16 requirements; (b) Known limitations and failure modes that could affect high-risk applications; (c) Reasonable technical access for testing and validation purposes. This paragraph shall not apply in cases where the initial provider has clearly specified that its AI system is not to be changed into a high-risk AI system and therefore does not
--	--	--	---

			fall under the obligation to hand over the documentation.
	Recommendation: Reject the Parliament amendment. While we are supportive of information sharing across the value chain, this amendment compromises the efforts and balance already achieved in Article 25 of the EU AI Act and the Code of Practice on GPAI models, particularly regarding <i>'reasonable technical access.'</i> Adding this provision creates legal uncertainty and undermines the standard-setting process and runs counter to the Omnibus objective of regulatory simplification. Further, as the European Commission is developing guidance on Article 25 to provide additional legal clarity and certainty, there is no need for further language on this point.		