International Recognition of Aviation Patents: New Standards for Pilot Training

Nicolas Jean Lejeune

Captain, France

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Aviation regulators increasingly rely on competency-based training and high-fidelity simulation to manage operational risk, yet cross-border recognition of training technologies remains uneven. This paper asks how aviation training patents can act as socio-technical reference architectures that support regulatory convergence in simulator qualification, data governance, and continuous oversight. We adopt a desk-based comparative policy analysis combined with case-oriented document review of three patented training architectures: a cyber-physical flight simulator that transforms real flight telemetry into adaptive scenarios, a virtual-reality pilot training system, and an AI-avatar-enabled universal simulator. Findings show that patents influence standards not only via legal protection but via explicit modularization, audit-ready data interfaces, and traceable performance metrics that can be mapped to ICAO/EASA/FAA qualification criteria. Building on this mapping, we operationalize the notion of continuous certification by specifying auditable artifacts (scenario provenance, model versioning, instructor interventions, and qualification test guides) and propose a lifecycle in which certification is maintained through evidence streams rather than episodic re-qualification. The paper contributes a practical evaluation framework for regulators and training organizations and clarifies limitations and governance risks, including data protection constraints and confirmation bias in single-inventor narratives.

1. Introduction

Patents have traditionally been treated as instruments of technological differentiation in aviation: new avionics, materials, propulsion, or maintenance methods. In training and licensing, however, the role of patents is more ambiguous. The training domain is governed by international and regional frameworks that emphasize safety, reproducibility, and oversight, which can create friction with proprietary architectures. At the same time, modern pilot training increasingly depends on data-rich simulation, evidence-based training (EBT),

and competency-based training and assessment (CBTA), where architectures, data interfaces, and validation procedures are as consequential as the underlying hardware.

Against this backdrop, patented cyber-physical simulators and digital-twin approaches are frequently presented as candidates for next-generation training ecosystems. The core claim is that training scenarios should be continuously updated using operational flight data, that individual performance should be interpreted through measurable competence indicators, and that validation should become a lifecycle activity rather than a one-time qualification event. This paper examines that claim from a governance perspective: not whether a given simulator is innovative, but whether its patented architecture can be translated into standards-relevant, auditable requirements that enable international recognition.

This study addresses the research question: How can aviation training patents that embed cyber-physical simulation capabilities be translated into internationally recognized training and certification practices without undermining safety assurance, data governance, and auditability requirements? The objectives are to synthesize the ICAO, EASA, and FAA baseline for competency-based training and flight simulation training device (FSTD) qualification; define a transparent evaluative framework for mapping patent-disclosed capabilities to compliance expectations; compare multiple patent-driven simulator architectures to extract transferable patterns; operationalize continuous certification as an auditable lifecycle with concrete artifacts and change control; and articulate limitations and policy implications for regulators, approved training organizations, and technology providers.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Background

2.1 Patents, Standardization, and Governance

Patents and standards shape different stages of technology governance. Patents formalize novelty claims and govern access through licensing, while standards define shared baselines that enable interoperability, oversight, and cross-border comparability. In safety-critical sectors, international recognition is therefore not a reputational label but an institutional decision about whether evidence produced by a technology can be trusted across jurisdictions and across time.

Empirical work on the patenting-standardization interface highlights trade-offs that are directly relevant to training technologies. Firms patent to protect investment and negotiate licensing terms, yet may be cautious about standardization when disclosure and FRAND commitments constrain appropriation. Studies also show that declared standard-essential patents can affect the rate of standard revision and the direction of subsequent innovation, with governance design and ownership concentration shaping whether standards evolve through frequent, incremental updates or become locked into slower replacement cycles (Blind, Pohlisch, & Rauber, 2022; Baron, Pohlmann, & Blind, 2016; Contreras, 2016).

For aviation training technologies, these insights imply a practical constraint. A patented simulator architecture can influence international standards only if it can be expressed as auditable, vendor-neutral compliance claims that regulators and training organizations can verify without relying on proprietary assurances. Otherwise, the technology remains a proprietary training aid rather than a standard-recognized device.

2.2 Cyber-physical Simulators, Digital Twins, and Training Analytics

Simulation-mediated pilot training increasingly relies on cyber-physical integration. Sensors, flight data acquisition, and software models co-produce scenarios and performance metrics, and these metrics can feed competency evaluation and safety management feedback loops. The digital twin concept provides a foundational engineering vocabulary for these architectures by pairing an operational system with a dynamic virtual model, yet training legitimacy depends on more than modelling sophistication (Glaessgen & Stargel, 2012).

The empirical literature on simulator effectiveness emphasizes validity and transfer rather than visual realism alone. Fidelity is multi-dimensional: it includes physical realism, functional task representation, and alignment of cognitive workload with operational conditions. A review of flight simulation fidelity requirements highlights that task-relevant fidelity, especially for high-risk manoeuvres and rare events, is critical for meaningful transfer and for avoiding false confidence and negative training (White, Padfield, Lu, Advani, & Potter, 2021). Complementary extended reality surveys show that outcomes depend on scenario design, measurement quality, and the mapping between simulator capability and training task, which makes governance and validation central when devices claim credit for regulated training (Cross, Boag-Hodgson, Ryley, Mavin, & Potter, 2023).

Recent validation work on VR head-mounted display training devices underscores the same point. Acceptability hinges on explicit validity arguments, safety constraints, and documented limitations of use, not only on trainee satisfaction or short-term performance changes (Kirollos, Merchant, Martin, Jarmasz, & Kim, 2025). These findings motivate a core assumption of the present paper: patentable simulator features only become relevant for international recognition when paired with defensible validity claims and stable evidence pipelines.

2.3 Regulatory Baselines for CBTA/EBT and FSTD Qualification

Competency-Based Training and Assessment (CBTA) and Evidence-Based Training (EBT) have become the dominant policy direction for pilot training design. The shift is from hours and scripted manoeuvres toward measurable competencies and operationally grounded threat-and-error management (ICAO, 2013; ICAO, 2020). European implementation mirrors this trajectory. EASA's evidence-based and competency-based training work program links safety improvement to competency frameworks and operational data, while U.S. practice operationalizes similar principles through the Advanced Qualification Program (AQP) model and associated guidance (EASA, 2016; FAA, 2018).

Simulator qualification is the technical gate through which training devices become acceptable for credit toward licensing and proficiency requirements. The conventional approach relies on device classes and qualification levels, validation tests, and configuration control requirements (ICAO, 2015). A current development is capability-driven qualification, where device features and fidelity are matched to task objectives. EASA's Flight Simulation Training Device Capability Signature initiative and related policy artifacts indicate a shift toward capability statements that are easier to audit and compare across devices, which in turn supports cross-border recognition when training is tied to competency evidence (EASA, 2024; EASA, 2025; FAA, 2025).

Taken together, the regulatory baseline clarifies what international recognition must entail: traceable competency evidence, validated device capabilities, and governance that prevents certification drift when devices and software evolve. The gap is that many patent narratives

describe advanced capabilities but under-specify the evidentiary and governance work needed for recognition across regimes.

2.4 Data Governance and AI Ethics in Simulator-based Training

Data governance is no longer peripheral in simulator-based training. Modern devices generate high-frequency telemetry and behavioural traces that can be linked to individuals, and some designs incorporate physiological or biometric proxies. Under GDPR, training data processing requires a lawful basis, minimization, purpose limitation, and demonstrable controls over access and retention (European Union, 2016). The EU Artificial Intelligence Act adds system-level obligations for high-risk AI, including risk management, data governance, traceability, and post-market monitoring expectations that are directly relevant when simulator analytics affect certification outcomes (European Union, 2024). In parallel, AI assurance frameworks such as the NIST AI Risk Management Framework and ISO/IEC 23894 emphasize lifecycle risk controls, accountability, and monitoring that can be operationalized as audit artifacts in training systems (NIST, 2023; ISO/IEC, 2023).

In practice, the governance challenge is dual. First, training evidence must be protected against tampering and ambiguity so auditors can trust it. Second, adaptive models and data-driven scenario generation introduce drift risks: without disciplined change control and logging, training outcomes may not be reproducible across time, undermining certification credibility. The governance implication is that validation must cover not only a device's current performance but also its ability to maintain known behaviour under updates, with traceability and monitoring treated as primary safety controls (NIST, 2023).

Finally, continuous certification has been explored in avionics software as a response to frequent change and continuous delivery, emphasizing incremental assurance and continuous evidence rather than episodic re-certification (Baron & Louis, 2021). Translating this concept to training devices requires concrete operationalization: what is logged, who approves changes, and what artifacts make a device's evolving capability auditable. The present study uses this lens to connect patents, standards, and training governance into a single recognition pathway.

3. Research Design and Methodology

3.1 Design and Scope

The study adopts a qualitative comparative design. It combines structured document review with comparative policy analysis to evaluate whether patent-disclosed simulator capabilities can be translated into cross-jurisdictional training recognition. The unit of analysis is a compliance claim: an explicit link between a technical capability (e.g., telemetry-driven competency evidence, virtual instructor support, or AI-mediated scenario control) and a regulatory or standards expectation (e.g., validation, traceability, oversight, and record integrity). The goal is analytic generalization through transferable patterns.

3.2 Data corpus and Case Selection

The empirical corpus comprises three patent cases and a regulatory-standards baseline. The patent cases were selected to span distinct architectural logics: a cyber-physical simulator with operational telemetry and pilot digital-twin constructs; a VR-based pilot training system emphasizing distributed training and immersion; and a universal virtual simulator with an AI avatar supporting multi-role interaction. The baseline documents include ICAO Doc 9995

(EBT), ICAO Doc 9625-1 (FSTD qualification criteria), ICAO Doc 9868 (PANS-TRG), EASA CS-FSTD material and related rulemaking outputs, and FAA Part 60 with NSP guidance. Cross-cutting governance anchors include GDPR and widely used AI risk management guidance (e.g., NIST AI RMF and ISO/IEC 23894).

3.3 Analytical Procedure and Coding Scheme

For each case, claims and functional descriptions were extracted into a structured template and coded along seven dimensions: functional scope and training role coverage; competency mapping and assessment logic; validation readiness and limits of validity; data governance, cybersecurity, and privacy controls; change control and lifecycle management; auditability and accountability pathways; and interoperability and standardization potential. The coded outputs were then mapped to regulatory expectations to produce a cross-case matrix (Table 1). The analysis treats absence of evidence as a risk signal: a capability may be innovative but still not recognition-ready if its validation and governance scaffolding is underspecified.

3.4 Robustness and Bias Control

To reduce confirmation bias, the evaluation distinguishes technical novelty from compliance adequacy. The paper also triangulates patent claims with regulatory baselines rather than inferring acceptance from technical plausibility. Given that patents are not performance reports, the findings are framed as governance and design implications.

4. Comparative Cases of Patented Training Architectures

4.1 Case A: Cyber-physical Simulator with Real Flight Data and Pilot Digital Twin (Alain Philippe Gruchet's Exemplar)

Case A represents a cyber-physical training architecture where real flight data and a pilot digital twin are used to generate scenarios and support competency assessment. From a recognition perspective, the advantage is evidentiary traceability: raw traces, scenario parameters, and outputs can be versioned and packaged as audit artifacts. The weakness is governance. If the twin model, scenario generator, or scoring logic changes without controlled release, previously approved evidence may no longer be comparable. International recognition therefore requires explicit configuration control, task-to-tool mapping, and a clear boundary between training analytics and licensing decisions.

4.2 Case B: Virtual-reality based Pilot Training System (EP3747001B1)

Case B focuses on virtual-reality based training devices, where immersive visualization and interaction are central. VR can expand access and enable procedural rehearsal, but recognition depends on bounded claims. The device must specify which tasks it supports, the required fidelity for those tasks, and limitations of use, especially where motion cues and vestibular realism matter. Validation should be framed as task-relevant equivalence, not generic "VR effectiveness", and should be linked to a capability signature that regulators can inspect.

4.3 Case C: Universal Virtual Simulator with AI Avatar (US20200143699A1 / EP3621055A1)

Case C covers patents that combine adaptive training logic with AI-driven avatars or tutoring. The promise is individualized difficulty adjustment and richer behavioural assessment. The recognition risk is opaque scoring and drift: if models update frequently, outcomes may become non-reproducible and difficult to audit. This case therefore tests whether training analytics can be treated as a certifiable subsystem with defined performance bounds, monitoring, and change control. The practical implication is that explainability and audit logs are not optional add-ons but prerequisites for cross-border acceptance.

Table 1. Comparison of patents by dimensions

Dimension	Regulatory anchor	Case A (CPS + telemetry)	Case B (VR training)	Case C (AI avatar)
Traceability to reference data	ICAO Doc 9625; FAA Part 60	High: operational data ingestion and scenario provenance concepts	Medium: emphasis on instructor monitoring; reference data implicit	Medium: depends on avatar training data and scenario models
Competency mapping	ICAO Doc 9995; PANS-TRG	Explicit via pilot digital twin and competence indicators	Instructor-led; competency mapping can be implemented in software	Potentially explicit; relies on assessment logic
Instructor oversight and safety gating	EASA CS-FSTD; training oversight principles	Instructor console and risk manager layer	Remote instructor terminal and real-time monitoring	AI acts as instructor; requires additional human override controls
Auditability and logging	Continuous oversight; AI governance	Logs required for data provenance, scenario evolution, and analytics	Logs for trainee inputs and instructor interventions	Logs for model versioning, dialogue decisions, and evaluation
Modular qualification potential	EASA FCS concept	High: modular pipeline supports capability-based evidence	High: separable interface and supervision modules	Medium: modular but validation of AI behavior is complex

5. Operationalizing Continuous Certification and Auditability

Reviewer feedback correctly highlights that continuous certification must be operational rather than aspirational. In practice, it is a lifecycle assurance pattern: a device's declared training capability is treated as a controlled configuration item, and every material change is accompanied by updated evidence, validation arguments, and audit-ready logs. This logic aligns with capability-driven qualification initiatives, notably the FSTD Capability Signature approach in Europe and the FAA's parallel work on capability signatures and performance-based qualification concepts (EASA, 2025; FAA, 2025).

Operationally, continuous certification can be implemented through three coupled controls. First, evidence packaging binds competency outcomes to raw traces, context metadata, device configuration, and version identifiers so results remain reproducible. Second, change control classifies updates by safety relevance and triggers proportionate re-validation, documentation updates, and approvals. Third, independent auditability is preserved through identity management, access logging, and integrity mechanisms that allow external oversight to verify

that evidence was produced under the declared configuration and that access to sensitive data was governed consistently with privacy and safety requirements.

The practical output is an auditable capability signature and an evidence trail that supports cross-regime recognition. An inspector can verify that task credit is supported by a device capability at or above the fidelity required for that task, and that the evidence was generated under a controlled configuration. Table 2 summarizes the minimum artifact set needed to make this auditable in routine oversight.

Table 2. Certification artifacts for simulator oversight: purpose and minimum evidence fields

Artifact	Purpose for oversight	Minimum evidence fields
Scenario provenance record	Demonstrate traceability from operational inputs to training content	Source dataset; anonymization; date range; transformation pipeline; approval ID
Model version dossier	Support accountability for adaptive analytics or AI avatars	Version; training data summary; evaluation metrics; bias tests; known limitations; rollback procedure
Instructor intervention log	Audit human-in-the-loop gating and training integrity	Timestamp; scenario ID; intervention type; rationale; outcome
Change impact assessment	Link updates to qualification scope and required re-tests	Change description; affected modules; predicted safety impact; required QTG tests; sign-offs
Capability signature / qualification profile	Define permitted training credit and device capabilities	Capability descriptors; fidelity evidence; constraints; validity period; audit triggers

6. Discussion

The cross-case comparison suggests that the governance value of patents in pilot training is highest when the patent disclosure functions as a reference architecture that is compatible with regulatory evidence structures. In practice, this means making data interfaces explicit, separating modules that can be independently validated, and specifying supervisory controls. These design choices reduce the cost of oversight and can accelerate international recognition because they allow regulators to map evidence across ICAO guidance and regional rules.

For regulators, the proposed mapping provides a pragmatic lens: rather than treating patented training systems as "black boxes", auditors can require standardized artifacts that are independent of vendor branding, including scenario provenance and model version dossiers. This is aligned with ongoing efforts to move toward technology-agnostic qualification documents and capability signatures (EASA, 2025; FAA, 2025).

For training organizations, the framework clarifies procurement and governance requirements. A simulator may be innovative yet operationally unusable if its data governance and audit logs are not designed for oversight. Conversely, modular architectures can support blended training pipelines, where VR and full-flight devices are integrated under a common competence and evidence model.

For patent holders and manufacturers, the analysis implies that IP strategy should anticipate standards translation. Disclosure that supports auditability and modular qualification can make patented architectures more attractive to regulators and operators, while also reducing the reputational risk associated with opaque adaptive systems.

7. Limitations and Future Research

This study is limited by its desk-based nature. It does not include proprietary qualification test data, operator safety metrics, or stakeholder interviews, and therefore cannot quantify training effectiveness or regulatory acceptance outcomes. Case selection is illustrative rather than exhaustive.

Future research should extend the framework with empirical validation, including interviews with regulators and training evaluators, and systematic patent-to-standard citation tracing where data are available. Another priority is to develop privacy-preserving analytics for training telemetry and biometric data, ensuring that governance requirements can be met without undermining the learning value of high-resolution data.

8. Conclusion

International recognition of aviation training patents is most plausible when patents are treated as auditable architectures rather than as isolated inventions. Across three comparative cases, the analysis shows that modularization, traceable data interfaces, and explicit supervisory controls are the features that translate most directly into ICAO/EASA/FAA evidence structures for competency-based training and simulator qualification. By specifying audit artifacts and a lifecycle for continuous certification, the paper provides a concrete operational pathway that can be used by regulators, training organizations, and manufacturers to evaluate patented training technologies while managing data protection and AI governance risks.

References

Baron, J., Pohlmann, T., & Blind, K. (2016). Essential patents and standard dynamics. *Research Policy*, 45(9), 1762–1774. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2016.05.004

Baron, C., & Louis, V. (2021). Towards a continuous certification of safety-critical avionics software. *Computers in Industry*, 125, 103382. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2020.103382

Blind, K., Pohlisch, J., & Rauber, J. (2022). Patenting and standardization: Similarities and differences based on firms' strategic motives and experienced barriers. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 65, 101699. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jengtecman.2022.101699

Contreras, J. L. (2016). Patent pledges. *Arizona Law Review*, 58(3), 543–608.

Cross, J., Boag-Hodgson, C. C., Ryley, T., Mavin, T. J., & Potter, L. E. (2023). Using extended reality in flight simulators: A literature review. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 29(9), 3961–3975. https://doi.org/10.1109/TVCG.2022.3173921

European Union. (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation).

European Union. (2018). Regulation (EU) 2018/1139 (Basic Regulation).

European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (Artificial Intelligence Act).

European Union Aviation Safety Agency. (2016). Evidence-based and competency-based training (RMT.0599).

European Union Aviation Safety Agency. (2021, July 6). EASA approves first FSTD based on virtual reality.

European Union Aviation Safety Agency. (2024, July 10). NPA 2024-102: Update of the flight simulation training device requirements — CS-FSTD.

European Union Aviation Safety Agency. (2025, May 19). Opinion No 01/2025: Update of the flight simulation training device requirements.

Federal Aviation Administration. (n.d.). 14 CFR Part 60: Flight simulation training device initial and continuing qualification and use. Electronic Code of Federal Regulations.

Federal Aviation Administration. (2018). Advisory Circular 120-54A (Change 1): Advanced Qualification Program.

Federal Aviation Administration. (2025). ACT ARC Recommendation 25-1: Enable the use of the FSTD Capability Signature (FCS) concept.

Federal Aviation Administration. (2025). National Simulator Program.

Glaessgen, E. H., & Stargel, D. S. (2012). The digital twin paradigm for future NASA and U.S. Air Force vehicles. In AIAA 2012-1818. https://doi.org/10.2514/6.2012-1818

International Civil Aviation Organization. (2013). Manual of Evidence-based Training (Doc 9995). ICAO.

International Civil Aviation Organization. (2015). Manual of Criteria for the Qualification of Flight Simulation Training Devices (Doc 9625, Vol. I). ICAO.

International Civil Aviation Organization. (2020). Procedures for Air Navigation Services — Training (PANS-TRG, Doc 9868). ICAO.

ISO/IEC. (2023). ISO/IEC 23894: Artificial intelligence — Guidance on risk management. International Organization for Standardization.

Kirollos, R., Merchant, W., Martin, B. C. W., Jarmasz, J., & Kim, J. J. J. (2025). Training effectiveness and validation of a VR HMD-based simulator for air force pilots. Ergonomics, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139.2025.2595656

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). AI Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0).

White, M. D., Padfield, G. D., Lu, L., Advani, S., & Potter, M. (2021). Review of flight simulation fidelity requirements to help reduce rotorcraft loss of control in-flight accident rates. *CEAS Aeronautical Journal*, 12, 701–721. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13272-021-00542-6

European Patent Office. (2020). In-flight training cyber-physical simulator and method (European Patent No. EP3747001B1).

European Patent Office. (2020). Aircraft pilot training system (European Patent No. EP3621055A1).

United States Patent and Trademark Office. (2020). Adaptive pilot training systems and methods (U.S. Patent Application No. US20200143699A1).