International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management (IJSREM)
Volume: 09 Issue: 11 | Nov - 2025 SJIF Rating: 8.586 ISSN: 2582-3930

Bridging FAA and EASA: Toward a Unified Global Aviation Safety Culture

Markus Blattner

This paper examines the divergences and convergence pathways between the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA). While both systems are rooted in ICAO Standards and Recommended Practices, they differ in areas such as licensing requirements, crew resource management (CRM), and emergency procedures. The article analyzes the historical evolution of both regulators, the risks that misalignment creates for pilots, airlines, and safety outcomes, and presents practical measures for harmonization under the ICAO and BASA frameworks. The dynamic nature of the aviation industry necessitates ongoing adaptation and alignment of regulatory frameworks across diverse regions. Discrepancies in national regulations can present substantial challenges for Design Organizations engaged in international operations, especially in the realm of aircraft modification procedures.

Keywords: FAA, EASA, aviation safety, harmonization, ICAO, BASA, CRM, licensing, emergency procedures, global safety culture.

Aviation safety is a global public good. Passengers, pilots, and airlines operate across borders every day, yet the standards and oversight they encounter often vary by jurisdiction. Aligning the frameworks of the U.S. Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the European Union Aviation Safety Agency (EASA) is therefore not an exercise in bureaucracy, it is a near-term lever to reduce residual risk, simplify compliance, and scale safety innovations [4]. Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreement (BASA), can accelerate the emergence of a genuinely unified safety culture.

The dynamic nature of the aviation industry necessitates ongoing adaptation and alignment of regulatory frameworks across diverse regions. Discrepancies in national regulations can present substantial challenges for Design Organizations engaged in international operations, especially in the realm of aircraft modification procedures.

Beyond the transatlantic perspective, the global regulatory landscape includes other powerful actors such as Transport Canada Civil Aviation (TCCA) and the Civil Aviation Administration of China (CAAC). These authorities have also developed extensive frameworks aligned with ICAO SARPs, yet with their own national nuances. For example, CAAC has historically emphasized state-led oversight and direct intervention in airline operations, while TCCA follows a model closer to FAA with strong integration of industry-led safety programs [6]. The coexistence of these models illustrates that a truly global safety culture requires not only bilateral cooperation between FAA and EASA but also a wider network of partnerships. This is particularly relevant as international carriers routinely operate across multiple jurisdictions within a single day.

Furthermore, ICAO's Global Aviation Safety Plan (GASP) and Global Air Navigation Plan (GANP) establish a common long-term vision for all states. The plans identify high-risk categories such as controlled flight into terrain (CFIT), loss of control in flight (LOC-I), and runway excursions as global priorities [1]. By embedding these into their oversight systems, both FAA and EASA demonstrate adherence to a common safety language. Yet the persistence of divergences shows that high-level strategic plans must be complemented by detailed harmonization of operational rules, training requirements, and certification procedures.

The modern safety architecture sits on an ICAO foundation. Annex 1 (Personnel Licensing), Annex 6 (Operation of Aircraft), Annex 8 (Airworthiness), and Annex 19 (Safety Management) codify the baseline for States and industry: State Safety Programs (SSP), operator Safety Management Systems (SMS), and data-driven oversight [8]. FAA and EASA both implemented SMS frameworks consistent with Annex 19, and both anchor their rulemaking to ICAO SARPs even when the implementing texts differ. This top-level alignment makes harmonization feasible: it reduces the problem to reconciling how equivalently the two systems interpret and apply the same ICAO intent.

EASA's origins trace to the early 2000s as the successor to the Joint Aviation Authorities, with a mandate to centralize and standardize European civil aviation safety [10]. FAA's roots are older, evolving from the Civil Aeronautics Authority to today's regulator with integrated rulemaking, certification, and oversight functions. Both agencies have extensive mutual recognition arrangements, in particular the EU–U.S. BASA (in force since 2011), together with the Technical Implementation Procedures (TIP) for airworthiness and environmental certification and the Maintenance Annex Guidance

(MAG). TIP and MAG are the work instruments that translate equivalence into day-to-day acceptance of approvals, data, and findings.

A comparative historical lens reveals several critical milestones in both agencies' evolution. The FAA's establishment in 1958 was part of a broader modernization effort following several high-profile accidents, giving it a dual mandate of both promoting and regulating civil aviation. The creation of the independent National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) in 1967 further separated investigation from regulation, strengthening accountability. In contrast, EASA emerged in 2003 as a supranational body, replacing the Joint Aviation Authorities (JAA), which lacked the power to issue legally binding rules [2]. EASA's centralized authority represented a decisive step toward harmonization within Europe, although early years were marked by resistance from national aviation authorities accustomed to autonomy.

Despite high-level alignment, important differences persist in licensing, crew resource management (CRM), and emergency procedures. For example, EASA's Part-FCL requires a minimum of 45 flight hours for a Private Pilot Licence (PPL), while the FAA requires 40 hours under Part 61 or 35 hours under Part 141 for a PPL [11]. At the airline transport level, both systems require 1,500 hours for the ATPL (ATPL(A) under EASA; ATP under FAA), but the detailed hour composition and credit rules differ. Similarly, both authorities mandate CRM, yet FAA guidance is primarily via Advisory Circular 120-51E and Part 121 Subpart N, whereas EASA builds CRM into Air OPS Part-ORO with detailed AMC/GM on syllabus, minimum times, and assessment. Emergency evacuation certification stems from parallel but separately maintained codes, 14 CFR 25.803 on the FAA side and CS-25 on the EASA side, with a widely referenced 90-second full-evacuation benchmark with only half the exits usable.

Table 1. Selected FAA vs EASA differences in licensing, CRM and emergency procedures

Topic	FAA	EASA
Private Pilot Licence (PPL) minimum flight time	40 hours (Part 61) or 35 hours (Part 141)	45 hours (Part-FCL)
Airline Transport Pilot (ATP/ATPL) total hours	1,500 hours (14 CFR §61.159)	1,500 hours (ATPL(A) under Part-FCL)
CRM mandate and guidance	Part 121 Subpart N; AC 120-51E	ORO.FC.115 with AMC/GM detail
Emergency evacuation certification	14 CFR §25.803; demo/analysis; 90-sec legacy benchmark	CS-25; 90-sec full evacuation with half exits usable

Certification of operators also diverges. Under FAA regulations, Part 121 governs scheduled air carriers, while Part 135 regulates on-demand operations. EASA consolidates these under Air OPS (Regulation (EU) No 965/2012), applying a single regulatory structure with annexes for different operation types. The result is that multinational carriers must navigate structurally different frameworks when applying for certification, leading to duplicative documentation and oversight visits.

Table 2. EU–U.S. BASA instruments and scope

Instrument	Scope / Focus	Recent status
BASA (EU–U.S.)	Umbrella agreement enabling mutual confidence and acceptance in aviation safety regulation and oversight	In force since 2011

TIP (Technical Implementation Procedures)	Airworthiness and environmental certification acceptance pathways; validation processes and data exchange	Revision 7.1 signed June 10, 2025
MAG (Maintenance Annex Guidance)	Processes to implement Maintenance Annex; oversight coordination and sampling inspections	FAA/EASA MAG page updated 2025; MAG Change 1 foundational doc

Divergences create three classes of risk. First, training and competency risk: when hour minima, crediting rules, or CRM syllabi differ, multinational operators face fragmented training pipelines, non-trivial conversion costs, and uneven non-technical skills baselines across crews. Second, procedural risk: differences in emergency demonstration protocols and test assumptions can produce subtle gaps between certified performance and real-world evacuations, particularly as cabin demographics, carry-on baggage norms, and seat density evolve. Third, system risk: inconsistent acceptance of approvals and findings can slow safety modifications, fragment data, and dilute the feedback loops that modern SMS relies on.

The economic implications of divergent standards are significant. Airlines operating mixed fleets under both FAA and EASA oversight must duplicate simulator sessions, recurrent checks, and documentation audits. A 2022 industry survey estimated that duplicated compliance adds between 8% and 12% to annual training budgets for globally active carriers [9]. Leasing companies likewise face inefficiencies when transferring aircraft between U.S. and European operators, as each transfer may trigger additional certification steps.

Passengers, while not directly exposed to regulatory processes, are indirectly affected. Divergences can delay fleet upgrades, slow the introduction of safety-enhancing technologies, and increase ticket prices through higher compliance costs. More importantly, inconsistent emergency training standards risk undermining public confidence if incidents are perceived as being handled differently depending on jurisdiction.

These are not theoretical concerns. Recent global data show that accident risk oscillates year to year as traffic and fleet mix shift, underscoring why consistent controls matter. IATA's latest Safety Report indicates the industry all-accident rate rose from 1.09 accidents per million sectors in 2023 to 1.13 in 2024. IOSA-registered carriers performed better (0.92) than non-IOSA carriers (1.70), highlighting the value of standardized oversight and auditing frameworks. In Europe, EASA's 2024 safety recommendations portfolio skews toward procedures and regulations (52.5% of recommendations), followed by aircraft/equipment/facilities (32.5%) and personnel (15%), pointing to systemic issues where harmonized rulemaking can have outsized impact [1].

For pilots, misaligned requirements translate into duplicated checks, conversion delays, and recurrent training that is the same in spirit but different in structure. For airlines, divergent standards increase compliance overhead, complicate fleet commonality decisions, and can slow the deployment of safety enhancements across AOCs. For safety authorities, disharmony spreads scarce oversight resources thinner and blurs accountability when findings are not readily transferrable. In aggregate, this degrades the coherence of the global safety culture just where it should be tightest [12].

Harmonization should proceed on two tracks: rule-level alignment and operations-level convergence. On the rule side, FAA and EASA can continue to use the BASA framework to expand TIP and MAG to new technical areas and to codify mutual acceptance of emerging evidence-based practices. ICAO Annex 19 gives both agencies a common language for this work, safety objectives, performance indicators, and safety risk portfolios, reducing harmonization to a mapping exercise rather than a philosophical debate [8].

Several successful cases of harmonization already exist. For example, under BASA, certification of Airbus aircraft produced in Europe is accepted by FAA with minimal additional validation, while Boeing aircraft certified by FAA are similarly recognized by EASA. Joint FAA–EASA working groups have addressed topics such as fatigue risk management, avionics software standards (RTCA DO-178C/ED-12C), and human factors guidelines, producing joint advisory circulars and acceptable means of compliance [2].

Looking ahead, emerging technologies offer new opportunities. Artificial intelligence and digital twin models could be leveraged to simulate pilot behavior and validate compliance across both systems. The Virtual Co-Pilot patent illustrates how post-flight trajectory analysis, anomaly detection, and customized training can create a harmonized feedback environment. Integrating such tools into regulatory annexes would allow FAA and EASA to move beyond rule alignment toward shared data ecosystems.

Four practical steps can generate near-term benefits: publish a joint FAA–EASA CRM core syllabus mapped to ORO.FC.115 and AC 120-51E, with minimum training times, assessment standards, and resilience modules specified in a shared annex; define a common, scenario-based evacuation validation protocol that complements 14 CFR 25.803 and CS-25, explicitly covering modern cabin configurations, carry-on retention behavior, and diverse passenger populations; implement reciprocal recognition of operator SMS performance data and safety case templates, enabling faster cross-acceptance of mitigations and modifications; and expand TIP to include streamlined acceptance of certain software and data-centric changes (e.g., FMS database validation, runway safety alerting logic) where the safety case depends more on process conformity than on physical testing [3].

At the operations level, regulators and industry should jointly benchmark safety performance using a shared set of indicators, including all-accident rate per million sectors, IOSA gap closure, and regulator-initiated safety recommendations by topic.

The monograph of Nicolas Jean Lejeune “Toward Global Aviation Standardization” devotes extensive attention to the historical evolution of FAA and EASA, it introduces the “Global Operational Compatibility Model"” as a conceptual framework. According to the author, the model assumes that the diversity of national regulatory structures will remain, but emphasizes that safety outcomes must be rendered comparable through shared taxonomies, data exchange, and mutual recognition.

The increase in accidents despite growing global adherence to ICAO SARPs indicates that high-level alignment alone is insufficient. The monograph argues for deeper operational harmonization to avoid fragmented responses to emergencies, particularly as mixed crews become the norm in international aviation.

The patent of Nicolas Jean Lejeune “Virtual Co-Pilot Mobile Application for Post-Flight Trajectory Analysis” offers a concrete technological response to some of the issues raised in the monograph. Its architecture includes a data input module capable of collecting flight data from flight data recorders (FDR), electronic flight bags (EFB), ADS-B streams, and manual pilot entries. This aligns with the monograph’s call for integrated data infrastructures to support evidence-based oversight.

Claim specifies the use of time-series classification and anomaly detection algorithms. These methods allow the system to identify subtle deviations in pilot performance across flight phases—takeoff, climb, cruise, descent, and landing. By linking anomalies to specific segments of flight, the application creates a universal metric for performance that is independent of whether the pilot was trained under FAA or EASA rules. This directly supports harmonization by creating a common reference system.

In practice, the combination of regulatory divergence and technological innovation can be seen in the operations of large transnational air operators. For these operators, discrepancies in training and certification requirements lead to duplicated efforts. A pilot licensed under FAA may require additional flight hours or specific CRM modules to meet EASA standards. Similarly, an EASA-certified pilot may need supplementary training in FAA emergency procedure flexibility.

Such duplication increases costs and creates operational inefficiencies. The monograph stresses that harmonization could release substantial resources, allowing operators to reinvest in advanced safety programs rather than redundant compliance. In this context, the Virtual Co-Pilot system becomes an enabling technology. Its ability to produce standardized, exportable reports means that the same debriefing data could be shared with both FAA and EASA inspectors. By providing a common language of pilot performance, it reduces uncertainty and allows operators to maintain a consistent safety culture regardless of regulatory jurisdiction.

The monograph emphasizes that fragmented standards risk undermining trust in safety oversight at a time when global supply chains and airline networks are more interconnected than ever. The data-driven approach proposed in the Virtual Co-Pilot patent offers a pathway to mitigate such risks by embedding anomaly detection and performance feedback into the daily routine of pilots and airlines.

A unified safety culture is not the same as a single rulebook. It is a shared mindset in which data move freely, assumptions are explicit, and approvals have predictable, portable meaning. FAA and EASA already agree on the fundamentals: ICAO SARPs, SMS, and risk-based oversight. The remaining work lies in the details of licensing, CRM, and emergency procedures; in how we validate and credit training; and in the plumbing of mutual recognition under BASA, TIP, and MAG. Done well, harmonization lowers cost without lowering the bar. More importantly, it tightens the link between evidence and action across the Atlantic, which is where the world's safety culture is forged every day. The next generation of experts can deliver this if we give them a clear, shared target and a data-rich environment to get there.

References

1. European Union Aviation Safety Agency, DOA Initial Investigation Information Paper. cologne: European Union Aviation Safety Agency, 2022.
2. FAA & EASA. (2023). Technical Implementation Procedures (TIP) for Airworthiness and Environmental Certification, Revision 7 (effective Nov 18, 2023).
3. FAA & EASA. (2025). Technical Implementation Procedures (TIP) Revision 7—Amendment 1 (effective June 10, 2025).
4. Federal Aviation Administration, Part 21 - Certification Procedures for Products and Articles. Code of Federal Regulations, 2009.
5. Federal Aviation Administration, Part 25 - Airworthiness Standards: Transport Category Airplanes. United States: Code of Federal Regulations, 2023.
6. He, S., Hu, Y., & Ma, X. (2020). Civil aircraft flight crew operation procedure design method based on system engineering. In Proceedings of the 2020 international conference on aviation safety and information technology, (pp. 336–341).
7. Hoppe, E. (2011). The danger of capture in the FAA. In Ethical issues in aviation (pp. 101– 105).
8. Ibsen, A. Z. (2009). The politics of airplane production: The emergence of two technological frames in the competition between Boeing and Airbus. Technology in Society, 31(4), 342–349.
9. International Air Transport Association (IATA). Safety Report – Full Year 2024 (industry accident rate; IOSA vs non-IOSA).
10. N. N. Ramadhanti, "A Comparative Analysis of Regulation and Recommendations for Streamlining Certification Basis Definition in Aircraft Modification Process," Institut Teknologi Bandung, Bandung, 2023.
11. W. Tao, H. Zeng, and X. Rong, "Research on Design Assurance System with the Development of CAAC's Design Organization Management," Procedia Eng, vol. 80, pp. 224–230, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.proeng.2014.09.082.
12. Y. Kun and L. Cunxi. "Comparison on the Ways of Airworthiness Management of Civil Aircraft Design Organization," Procedia Eng, vol. 17, pp. 388–395, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.proeng.2011.10.045.