

EU AI ACT · DRAFT GUIDELINES · 19 MAY 2026

# High-risk AI in law enforcement

For law enforcement bodies, public-sector suppliers and organisations supporting investigative or risk-assessment workflows.

- 
- Annex III point 6
  - Practical high-risk classification
  - Commercial readiness briefing for governance teams



## CLASSIFICATION LOGIC

# 3 questions decide the route

Use this as a starting point for AI inventory, gap intake and roadmap.

01

## Intended purpose

What output does the system produce, in which context and with what effect on people or operations?

02

## High-risk route

Does the use case fall under Annex III point 6, or should Article 5 or Annex I be checked first?

03

## Readiness roadmap

Translate the classification into obligations, evidence, training and supplier actions.

**Intake question: Does this AI influence who is investigated, prioritised, assessed or treated as risky?**

# What falls in scope?

This domain version helps turn a first AI Act gap check into concrete review questions.

**AI in law enforcement is sensitive when it supports risk assessment, evidence analysis, investigation, profiling or assessment of people.**

- Risk assessment of a natural person offending or re-offending.
- Assessment of personality traits, characteristics or past behaviour.
- Evaluation of reliability of evidence during investigations.
- Detection, investigation or prosecution support for criminal offences.

# When does this become a readiness question?

You do not need a final legal conclusion before starting governance work.

## Review first

- Risk scoring of individuals or groups.
- Predictive tools used to steer investigation priority.
- Evidence reliability scoring or automated case analysis.
- AI that profiles people for enforcement intervention.

## Define first

- Administrative document search without investigative weighting.
- Generic translation or transcription without case scoring.
- Workflow planning without impact on people or evidence.
- Training simulations not used for operational decisions.

## USE CASES

# 3 situations for the intake

These examples help identify the right stakeholders, documents and evidence path.

01

## Risk scoring

AI estimates risk of offending or re-offending.

02

## Evidence

AI assesses reliability or relevance of evidence in a file.

03

## Investigation

AI prioritises leads or persons for operational follow-up.

**Use this as a scoping aid, not as a final legal conclusion.**

# What a readiness track should produce

Classification should end in actions, ownership and reviewable documents.

## Core deliverables

- AI inventory and risk classification
- Provider/deployer role split
- Gap analysis on obligations and evidence
- 30/60/90-day roadmap
- Management summary and next routes

## Domain focus

- Legal basis, necessity and proportionality.
- Strict access control, logging and audit trail.
- Human oversight and contestability where applicable.
- Bias, false positives and impact on fundamental rights.

**SOURCE STATUS**

# Based on the Commission draft guidelines

Use this as an intake and classification framework. Check final guidance before legal decisions are completed.

## Status on 8 June 2026

- The Commission published the draft guidelines on 19 May 2026.
- Annex III contains 8 areas. This briefing works out 1 area practically.
- The formal AI Act text remains leading.

Commission draft guidelines

Annex III official text

Article 6

Gap intake

**For decisions with legal consequences, a full system and context review remains necessary.**



NEXT STEP

# Classify your law enforcement AI before the roadmap gets stuck.

Embed AI helps turn a loose AI list into a defensible classification, gap analysis and concrete 30/60/90-day roadmap.

Start gap intake

View Readiness Sprint

Book a call



**Author: Zahed Ashkara**

EU AI Act expert, AI governance and compliance consultant. Zahed helps organisations classify AI systems and make governance practical.

