Global AI Governance in Aviation

--MOHD ANAS

United States (FAA): The U.S. FAA has begun outlining an AI safety framework. In July 2024 the FAA released its first *Roadmap for Artificial Intelligence Safety Assurance*, emphasizing safety above all. Its guiding principles include working within existing risk-managed aviation requirements, focusing on safety enhancements, treating AI strictly as a tool (avoiding "personification"), ensuring human oversight of AI functions, introducing AI incrementally, and leveraging international harmonization faa.govfedscoop.com. The roadmap notes the FAA is collaborating with NASA (to develop AI certification methods) and with EASA/ICAO on a joint AI roadmap fedscoop.com. In practice the FAA is proceeding cautiously: experts note "it's still very early days" for AI in aviation and the agency is taking a "conservative, cautious approach"fedscoop.com. Several modest AI projects (e.g. predictive analytics for safety, decision-support tools, voice recognition in simulators) are in research or limited use fedscoop.com, but full autonomous cockpit functions remain unapproved. Notably, FAA guidance explicitly requires any AI in aircraft to meet conventional safety assurance (treating it like any other certified system) and to address special AI challenges, but it has deferred treatment of broader "ethical use" to safety considerations faa.govfaa.gov.

Europe (EASA & EU): The EU is moving faster with formal AI regulation. The EU AI Act (adopted Dec. 2023) establishes a risk-based regime: AI used as a *safety component* in "civil aviation" is automatically **high-risk**, subject to strict requirements (risk management, data governance, transparency, third-party conformity assessments, post-market monitoring, etc.) wilmerhale.com. In parallel, EASA (the European Union Aviation Safety Agency) has published an *AI Roadmap 2.0* (May 2023) adopting a **human-centric** approach to AI in aviation easa.europa.eu. EASA's work includes concept papers and guidance on machine learning (ML) applications, aiming for full compatibility with the EU AI Act easa.europa.eu. EASA's trustworthiness framework stresses that any AI-based cockpit or avionics function must remain under human oversight and not employ uncontrolled self-learning easa.europa.eu. Privacy and data issues are also addressed: EASA guidance explicitly requires compliance with GDPR (involving Data Protection Officers and impact assessments) for any personal data used by AI easa.europa.eu. In short, Europe is treating AI aviation systems as high-value safety assets: they must meet defined performance and ethics objectives throughout design and operation, mirroring the EU's "trustworthy AI" principles. Ongoing EU initiatives (Eurocontrol's *FLY AI* reports, SESAR research, EASA concept papers) further explore AI in air traffic management and maintenance under this umbrella.

International (ICAO) and Other Regions: ICAO has not issued binding SARPs on AI yet, but is actively promoting global coordination. ICAO highlights the need for a unified regulatory framework and hosts forums on AI's aviation impact icao.int. It collaborates with stakeholders (e.g. Eurocontrol, EASA, ITU) in workshops and research to understand AI's potential and risks. For example, Eurocontrol's *FLY AI* report (2020) mapped how AI could transform ATM functions (predictive traffic management, network optimization) while noting challenges (data sharing, cybersecurity, safety assurance) eurocontrol.inteurocontrol.int. Similarly, the U.K. CAA published an *AI strategy* (2023) for aerospace, launching reviews of liability models and stressing explainability, human-in-command, and accountability in autonomous systems caa.co.ukcaa.co.uk. Other national regulators (Canada, Australia, China, etc.) are beginning to explore AI use and safety requirements in aviation, though no unified global standards exist. In practice, existing safety and airworthiness regulations still apply: e.g. aircraft certification (DO-178C software assurance, CS-25 or 23 for new avionics) and ATM/ANS regulations remain in force, even as authorities consider how to adapt them for AI.

Onboard AI Systems (Autopilots, Flight Control)

Current airliners use automated *autopilots* and flight management computers, but these are largely deterministic control systems, not adaptive AI. No commercial aircraft presently relies on machine-learning to fly itself without a pilot. Proposed AI-enabled cockpit functions (e.g. *digital copilots*, vision-based hazard detection) are being explored, but regulators insist on strict oversight. EASA's guidance explicitly requires that any AI assisting pilots remains fully transparent to the crew and under human command; "self-learning" flight systems are *not* yet permitted easa.europa.eu. Existing certification standards (e.g. DO-178C/ED-12C) still govern software development, so AI/ML components must fit into those frameworks or new ones. In effect, aviation regulators are treating on-board AI the same as any safety-critical avionics: it must have a rigorous safety case, proven reliability under all conditions, fallback safe modes, and human override. IEEE's *Ethically Aligned Design* guidelines reinforce this human-centric principle: AI systems should align with pilot values and well-being, and maintain human supervisory controlstandards.ieee.org. In practical terms, governance might demand explainable AI, documented training data, and redundant architectures for any future autonomous flight features.

Ground-Based AI Applications (ATM, Maintenance, Airports)

On the ground, AI is already being applied in air traffic management (ATM), airlines and airports. For example, FAA and Eurocontrol have researched AI tools for flow optimization, weather prediction, and collision avoidance support fedscoop.comoraclelawglobal.com. These systems typically start in decision-support roles (pilots and controllers still make final calls). Both FAA and EASA consider AI in ATM as *automation aids* under existing ATM/ANS certification rules; EASA's Level-1 ML guidance explicitly covers ATM use cases like 4D trajectory prediction and time-based separation easa.europa.eueurocontrol.int. In maintenance, airlines and OEMs use AI for *predictive maintenance*: ML algorithms analyze sensor data to foresee parts wear and prevent failures. (For instance, Airbus's 2023 investment in an AI maintenance firm reflects this trend oraclelawglobal.com.) There are few new regulations specifically for predictive maintenance AI, but these systems must still comply with quality and data rules. Notably, any personal or operational data used must satisfy privacy laws (GDPR in Europe, for example) and cybersecurity standards. Airport operations (FOD detection, surveillance, biometrics) also employ AI, raising additional privacy/ethics concerns. Overall, regulators apply existing safety and data-protection laws to these ground AI applications, while encouraging research into their safety and security implications eurocontrol.intoraclelawglobal.com.

Gaps, Challenges and Recent Developments

Despite progress, significant gaps and challenges remain in AI aviation governance. **Safety Assurance:** Traditional certification processes are poorly suited to adaptive AI/ML. Ensuring that a neural network behaves correctly in *all* foreseeable flight scenarios is hard; verifying learning-based systems is an open problem. EASA notes that new methods are needed for ML assurance (testing, monitoring, explainability) beyond conventional means eurocontrol.int. **Data and Explainability:** AI depends on large data sets, but aviation data (flights, maintenance logs, sensor feeds) may be proprietary or siloed. Harmonizing data-sharing frameworks for safety without compromising privacy is unresolved eurocontrol.int. Furthermore, AI "black box" logic conflicts with the need for post-accident investigation and root-cause analysis; industry stresses that AI must be auditable and transparent caa.co.ukstandards.ieee.org. **Ethics and Privacy:** Though less of a public issue than in social domains, fairness and privacy do arise (e.g. facial recognition at airports must work equitably). Europe's GDPR and U.S. civil aviation rules require that any use of personal data by AI (e.g. passenger profiles for personalization) respect user rights easa.europa.euoraclelawglobal.com. **Cybersecurity:** AI systems (like any software) introduce new attack surfaces. The *Fly AI* report highlights "cyber-resilience" as a key challenge: AI can both improve security and create new vulnerabilities eurocontrol.int. **Liability and Regulation:** It remains unclear who is legally responsible if an AI-controlled system errs – the manufacturer, the airline, the developer? The CAA is even reviewing liability models for autonomous flight caa.co.uk. Finally, **pace of technology vs policy:** AI tech evolves rapidly, but regulatory change is slow. By the time rules are in place, systems may have advanced. Recent efforts (FAA/NASA workshops, ICAO conferences, industry forums) show stakeholders striving to keep up.

Theoretical Governance Models

To address these issues, a multi-layered governance framework is needed, drawing on best practices (EU AI Act, IEEE principles, ICAO cooperation). Key elements could include:

- **Risk-based classification:** Mirror the EU AI Act by classifying aviation AI by risk level. Systems integral to safety (e.g. autonomous flight controls, collision avoidance, ATM sequencing) would be "high-risk" and require strict certification wilmerhale.com. Lower-risk uses (e.g. administrative chatbots) might have lighter requirements.
- **Rigorous certification pathways:** Establish an "AI assurance case" process. This would adapt traditional airworthiness certification to ML: requiring documented training/validation datasets, stress-testing under extreme conditions, safety risk analyses, and explainability evaluations. Conformity assessment bodies (as mandated by the AI Act) would audit AI systems, possibly employing audits of data pipelines and code.
- **Continuous oversight and monitoring:** Unlike static systems, AI might change (through updates or learning). Governance models could require ongoing post-deployment monitoring (continuous safety assessment, as EASA's Concept Paper

suggests) and mandatory incident reporting. This draws on the FAA's idea of a "safety continuum" and the EU Act's post-market monitoring requirement faa.govwilmerhale.com.

- **Human-centric and ethical requirements:** Echoing IEEE's *Ethically Aligned Design*, mandate that AI systems respect human values. For example, require that AI flight assistants remain under "human-in-command" oversight and that pilots are trained for AI collaboration easa.europa.eustandards.ieee.org. Other ethical safeguards could include bias testing, privacy-by-design in data use, and accountability measures (e.g. clear logging of AI decisions).
- **Data governance and privacy:** Integrate data protection by design. Any AI handling personal or sensitive flight data must comply with GDPR or equivalent (e.g. conduct Data Protection Impact Assessments) easa.europa.eu. Shared databases for flight-safety ML could be governed by strict access and anonymization rules, learning from initiatives like SESAR's data-sharing projects.
- **International coordination:** Aviation is global, so harmonization is critical. An ICAO-led working group or treaty language on AI (similar to how autonomy is addressed) could set baseline standards. Regular forums (akin to ICAO's "AI in the Sky" event) should align national policies. Global standards bodies (EUROCAE WG-114) might publish technical standards for AI in avionics.
- **Liability and accountability frameworks:** Drawing on the CAA's work caa.co.uk, develop clear liability rules for AI failures, ensuring victims can get redress. This might involve insurance requirements or legal reform to cover AI decision-making.
- **Public transparency and stakeholder engagement:** Ensure airline and regulator sharing of AI safety information (like the FAA's AI use-case inventory, or EASA's AI Days presentations). Public discussion of AI scenarios and risks (as IEEE advocates) can build trust.

In summary, a comprehensive model would layer traditional aviation safety processes with AI-specific controls – risk-tiering from the EU Act, continuous assurance from FAA/EASA roadmaps, and ethical design principles from IEEE – under an umbrella of global oversight (ICAO). Such a framework would mandate that AI-enhanced avionics and ground systems are safe, transparent, and accountable before they enter commercial service, and remain so in operation faa.govwilmerhale.com.

Sources: Regulatory documents and reports from FAA, EASA, ICAO, Eurocontrol, and others (2020–2024)faa.govfaa.goveasa.europa.eueasa.europa.euwilmerhale.comfedscoop.com, as well as policy analyses (FedScoop 2024fedscoop.comfedscoop.com, Oracle Law 2023oraclelawglobal.comoraclelawglobal.com, CAA 2023caa.co.uk). These sources outline current laws, guidance, and challenges, and inform the above proposed governance concepts.