SENTINEL AUTHORITY

Ten Domains, Zero Standards

The Autonomous System Certification Gap

February 2026 — Public Document

Autonomous systems are being deployed across at least ten safety-critical domains with no standardized mechanism for independent behavioral verification. In aerospace, independent certification prevented a generation of 737 MAX crashes. In autonomous vehicles, healthcare AI, industrial robotics, and seven other domains, that certification infrastructure does not exist—and incidents are accumulating. ODDC provides a single, domain-agnostic certification architecture across all ten domains.

Field	Details
Document	Ten Domains, Zero Standards
Classification	Public Document — Informative
Effective Date	February 2026
Category	White Paper
Owner	Sentinel Authority
Contact	info@sentinelauthority.org

1. The Lesson of Aviation

The Boeing 737 MAX disasters illustrate what happens when self-certification replaces independent verification in the most regulated industry on Earth. In October 2018 and March 2019, two crashes killed 346 people. The Maneuvering Characteristics Augmentation System (MCAS) activated based on data from a single angle-of-attack sensor and pushed the aircraft nose down repeatedly. Under the Organization Designation Authorization (ODA) program, Boeing employees acting as FAA designees had certified MCAS safety. The entity being evaluated was also the entity performing the evaluation.

Congress passed the Aircraft Safety and Certification Reform Act of 2020, strengthening FAA oversight. The lesson: even in the most heavily regulated industry, self-certification is insufficient for safety-critical automated systems. Yet today, autonomous systems in at least ten domains operate with less independent oversight than the pre-MAX aviation regime that Congress determined was inadequate.

2. Domain-by-Domain Analysis

2.1 Autonomous Vehicles

Deployment Scale: Waymo operates over 2,500 vehicles across six cities, completing 450,000+ rides per week and accumulating 2 million autonomous miles weekly. Aurora launched the first driver-out long-haul autonomous trucking service on I-45. Tesla announced robotaxi operations in Austin beginning June 2025.

Regulatory Framework: Fragmented across federal and state jurisdictions. NHTSA’s framework remains voluntary. The Autonomous Vehicle Acceleration Act (S. 1798) would modernize FMVSS but contains no independent conformance requirements.

Incidents: $243M Tesla Autopilot verdict (2025). Waymo recalled 1,212 robotaxis for stationary object collisions (May 2025). Waymo recalled 3,067 robotaxis for school bus violations (December 2025). Cruise robotaxi dragged pedestrian 20 feet (2023). NHTSA data: ~400 crashes involving ADS in one year.

Gap: No independent mechanism verifies ODD correctness, operational compliance, or software update conformance maintenance. NHTSA’s enforcement is reactive—recalls occur after failures, not before.

2.2 Industrial Robotics

Scale: Over 4 million operational industrial robots globally (IFR, 2024). ~541,000 new installations annually. Amazon operates over 750,000 robotic units. Framework: OSHA General Duty Clause + ISO 10218, ISO/TS 15066, ANSI/RIA R15.06. Standards govern design, not runtime behavior. Incidents: Tesla-Fanuc $51M lawsuit (September 2025). OSHA: 77 accidents, 93 injuries (2015–2022). NIOSH: 61 fatalities (1992–2015). Amazon injury rates in robotic facilities up to 50% higher. OSHA’s largest-ever corporate settlement with Amazon (December 2024). Gap: No independent runtime behavioral verification.

2.3 Healthcare AI

Scale: FDA has authorized over 950 AI/ML-enabled medical devices (2024). Surgical robotics perform over 1.5 million procedures annually. Framework: FDA SaMD framework, post-market MDR (manufacturer self-reporting). Incidents: ECRI ranked AI without oversight as #1 health technology hazard for 2025. DOJ subpoenas to pharma/digital health companies. 51 court cases involving software-related patient injuries. Gap: Pre-market testing on curated datasets does not verify real-world behavioral conformance.

2.4 Data Centers and Cloud Infrastructure

Scale: AI workloads driving rack densities from 30–50 kW to projected 250 kW by 2030. Global data center power consumption projected to exceed 1,000 TWh by 2028. Framework: Uptime Institute Tier classifications address redundancy, not autonomous system behavior. SOC 2 verifies infrastructure, not AI decisions. Incidents: CyrusOne cooling failure disrupted CME Group derivatives trading (2025). AWS US-EAST-1 major outage (October 2025). Cloudflare incidents (November–December 2025). Gap: No independent verification of autonomous cooling, power, and workload management behavior.

2.5 Energy Grid

Scale: Data centers consumed 20% of Ireland’s total electricity in 2024. Average U.S. large power transformer age exceeds 40 years. Framework: FERC/NERC CIP standards address grid operator procedures, not AI system behavior. Gap: AI systems consuming the most power are also managing the infrastructure delivering it, with no independent verification they operate within safe parameters for grid stability.

2.6 Aviation and Drones

Scale: Zipline targeting one million deliveries per day by 2027. Walmart completed over 150,000 drone deliveries. Congress mandated Part 108 BVLOS rulemaking. Framework: FAA Part 107/108 is the most developed framework. Gap: Explosive growth of drone delivery creates certification backlogs. BVLOS waivers grant permission without continuous behavioral verification.

2.7 Defense and Military

Scale: DoD Replicator initiative deploying autonomous systems at scale. Ukraine conflict accelerated operational use. Framework: DoD Directive 3000.09. NATO AI Strategy. Gap: Speed of deployment creates pressure to deploy before comprehensive behavioral verification is complete. Consequences measured in international law and strategic stability.

2.8 Construction and Mining

Scale: Caterpillar's autonomous fleet has hauled over 5 billion metric tons since 2013. Framework: MSHA/OSHA with no specific autonomous equipment standards. Gap: Autonomous haul trucks share space with human workers. Geofencing configured by operator, not independently verified.

2.9 Logistics and Warehousing

Scale: Amazon operates 750,000+ robotic units. Warehouse robotics market growing 14% annually. Framework: OSHA General Duty + voluntary ANSI/RIA R15.08. Incidents: Amazon injury rates nearly double the non-Amazon warehouse average. Senate HELP Committee: workers injured at 2.6x industry rate. SDNY investigating concealment of injury data. Gap: No independent runtime behavioral verification for AMRs sharing space with human workers.

2.10 Oil and Gas

Scale: Autonomous inspection drones, AI drilling optimization, autonomous underwater vehicles. Framework: BSEE, PHMSA, API standards—none address autonomous decision-making. Gap: When an AI system managing drilling parameters contributes to a well control incident, no independent record establishes whether the system was within design specifications. Deepwater Horizon demonstrated the consequences.

3. The Cross-Domain Pattern

Domain	Autonomous Systems	Current Oversight	Independent Behavioral Verification

Autonomous Vehicles	AVs, ADAS, trucks	NHTSA voluntary + state patchwork	None
Industrial Robotics	Industrial robots, cobots	OSHA + ISO design standards	None
Healthcare AI	Diagnostics, CDS, surgical	FDA SaMD + post-market MDR	None
Data Centers	Cooling, power, workload	SOC 2 + Uptime Tier	None
Energy Grid	Load balancing, demand	FERC/NERC CIP	None
Aviation/Drones	Delivery drones, BVLOS	FAA Part 107/108	Partial (type cert)
Defense	ISR, targeting, logistics	DoD 3000.09 + service policies	None
Construction/Mining	Haul trucks, excavators	MSHA/OSHA + manufacturer specs	None
Logistics	Warehouse AMRs, drones	OSHA + voluntary ANSI	None
Oil & Gas	Drilling AI, inspection, AUVs	BSEE/PHMSA + API	None

Of ten domains deploying autonomous systems in safety-critical applications, nine have no independent behavioral verification whatsoever. The tenth—aviation—has partial verification through FAA type certification but is rapidly scaling beyond that framework's capacity as drone operations proliferate.

4. Why ODDC Is Domain-Agnostic by Design

The temptation is to propose domain-specific solutions: separate standards for autonomous vehicles, healthcare AI, industrial robotics. This approach would take decades and produce inconsistent patchwork—exactly the regulatory fragmentation that already exists. ODDC takes a fundamentally different approach. It certifies behavioral conformance to a formally specified Operational Design Domain—regardless of what that domain contains.

The certification framework asks three universal questions:

- Is the system's ODD formally specified? Whether the ODD describes road conditions, temperature parameters, or patient populations, the specification is formal, machine-readable, and independently verifiable.
- Is the system's behavior enforced within that ODD? Whether the ENVELO Interlock prevents a vehicle from operating on unmapped roads, a robot from exceeding force limits, or an AI from recommending outside its scope, the enforcement is non-bypassable and independently verified.
- Does the system maintain conformance under sustained operation? Whether CAT-72 testing subjects a truck to 72 cumulative hours of highway operation, a warehouse robot to 72 cumulative hours of picking cycles, or a clinical AI to 72 cumulative hours of recommendation generation, the Conformance Assurance Test verifies sustained behavioral conformance with tamper-evident results.

5. The Regulatory Opportunity

5.1 Congressional Action

The Commerce Committee (autonomous vehicles), Armed Services Committee (defense), Energy and Commerce Committee (healthcare AI, energy grid), and Transportation Committee (drones, autonomous trucks) all face the same structural problem. ODDC provides a common solution that can be referenced in legislation, guidance, or oversight without requiring each committee to develop sector-specific certification standards.

5.2 Agency Reference

Federal agencies can incorporate ODDC conformance into existing frameworks without new rulemaking. NHTSA can reference ODDC in its AV Framework. FDA can reference it in SaMD post-market surveillance. OSHA can reference it for workplaces deploying autonomous systems. MSHA can reference it for autonomous mining equipment. Each reference leverages existing enforcement infrastructure.

5.3 International Alignment

The EU AI Act's conformity assessment requirements apply across all high-risk domains. ODDC's domain-agnostic architecture aligns naturally with this cross-sectoral approach. For companies operating in both U.S. and EU markets, a single ODDC certification can support regulatory compliance across both jurisdictions.

6. Conclusion

The 737 MAX taught the world that self-certification is insufficient for automated safety-critical systems—even in the most regulated industry on Earth. Today, autonomous systems in ten other domains operate with less independent oversight than the pre-MAX regime that Congress found inadequate. ODDC provides a single, deployable, domain-agnostic certification infrastructure that closes this gap across every sector simultaneously. The standard exists. The need is documented. What remains is the institutional will to act.

References

[1] U.S. House Transportation Committee. Boeing 737 MAX Final Report. September 2020.
[2] Aircraft Safety and Certification Reform Act of 2020. Pub. L. 116-260.
[3] Florida Jury Verdict, Tesla Autopilot. $243M award. 2025.
[4] Waymo Recall of 1,212 Robotaxis. Stationary object collisions. May 2025.
[5] Waymo Recall of 3,067 Robotaxis. School bus violations. December 2025.
[6] Austin ISD. 20 documented violations. 2025–2026.
[7] Cruise Robotaxi Pedestrian Incident. ~1,000 vehicles recalled. 2023.
[8] NHTSA. Standing General Order ADS Incident Data. ~400 crashes in one year.
[9] Aurora Innovation. First driver-out autonomous trucking, I-45. 2025.
[10] Tesla-Fanuc $51M Lawsuit. Giga Texas. September 2025.
[11] OSHA. Robot-Related Accidents: 77 incidents, 93 injuries (2015–2022).
[12] NIOSH. Robot-Related Fatalities: 61 deaths (1992–2015).
[13] Korean Ministry of Employment and Labor. 369 robot-related accidents.
[14] OSHA and Amazon. Corporate-wide settlement, December 2024.
[15] Strategic Organizing Center. Amazon Safety Report. 2024.
[16] U.S. Senate HELP Committee. Amazon Warehouse Investigation.
[17] SDNY. Investigation into Amazon injury data concealment.
[18] ECRI. Top 10 Health Technology Hazards for 2025.
[19] Stanford HAI. Assessment of Trustworthy AI in Healthcare.
[20] DOJ. Subpoenas to pharma/digital health over AI in EMR. 2024.
[21] Bates, D. et al. Software-Related Patient Injuries. 51 cases. 2024.
[22] CyrusOne Cooling Failure. CME Group disruption. 2025.
[23] AWS US-EAST-1 Outage. October 2025.

[24] Cloudflare. Two incidents, November–December 2025.

[25] EirGrid/SEAI. Data centers: 20% of Ireland's electricity. 2024.

[26] Zipline. P2 system, target 1M deliveries/day by 2027.

[27] Walmart. 150,000+ drone deliveries through 2025.

[28] FAA Part 108 BVLOS Rulemaking. Mandated January 2026.

[29] RAND Corporation. Autonomous truck liability analysis.

[30] Long, B. et al. Tort Liability Frameworks. World Electric Vehicle Journal, January 2026.

[31] EU Regulation 2024/1689 (AI Act). High-risk obligations August 2, 2026.

[32] NIST AI 100-5e2025. Conformity assessment Tier 2 priority.

[33] Sentinel Authority. ODDC Overview v4.0, ENVELO Requirements v3.0, CAT-72 Procedure v5.0.

— End of Document —