

D.1 Functional Completeness

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.64, DS=0.80 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.80, DS=0.75 → Comprehensive and strong. EU AI Act: CR=1.00, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: AIA (CR 1.00); SOTIF (0.80) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.64). No gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.80): technical prescriptions (e.g., 9.3.5(b) reporting of limited input-space fulfillment; 12.3.5 safety-aware testing incl. OOD and underrepresented data). SOTIF (DS 0.75): system-oriented guidance (e.g., 9.1(a)(2) sufficient scenario-space coverage; 12.1(a) review for completeness). AIA (DS 1.00): principle-based yet strict obligations (e.g., Art. 9(6) testing to perform consistently for the intended purpose).
Synergies	Input-space view (ISO/PAS 8800, 9.3.1) complements scenario-space view (SOTIF, 9.1(a)(2)); together address functional completeness from functionality and operational-environment angles. Requirement-centric articulation (ISO/PAS 8800, 9.3.3) supports system-level assurance (SOTIF, 12.1(c)), providing technical evidence underpinning AIA obligations.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.25$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.60$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.25$.
Normative Alignment	Combine ISO/PAS 8800 (technical evidence) and SOTIF (system-level completeness) to operationalize and substantiate AIA's very strong requirements for this sub-attribute.
Conclusion	Dominant framework: AIA (CR 1.00, DS 1.00). ISO/PAS 8800: higher depth (DS 0.80) with lower breadth (CR 0.64). SOTIF: broad coverage (CR 0.80) with solid depth (DS 0.75).

D.2 Functional Correctness

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.50, DS=0.70 → Balanced but strong. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=1.00, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.70, DS=0.40 → Broad, moderate detail.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: SOTIF (CR 1.00) > AIA (0.70) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.50). No gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.70): technical controls and error handling; e.g., 10.3.4 measures for AI errors; 15.3.2 tool confidence. SOTIF (DS 1.00): very strong, detailed specification; e.g., 10.1(b) behavior in hazardous scenarios; 12.1(a) reviews for correctness. AIA (DS 0.40): principle-based obligations; e.g., Art. 15(1) accuracy and consistency; Art. 17(1)(c) techniques, procedures, systematic actions.
Synergies	Internal functional perspective (ISO/PAS 8800, 10.3.4) complements external behavioral perspective (SOTIF, 10.1(b)). Process- and evidence-oriented detail (ISO/PAS 8800, SOTIF) substantiates AIA obligations, enabling demonstrable conformity.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.25$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.75$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.75$.
Normative Alignment	Use ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF to operationalize and evidence AIA requirements on correctness (Art. 15, Art. 17).
Conclusion	Primary framework: SOTIF (CR 1.00, DS 1.00). AIA provides broader obligations with moderate depth (CR 0.70, DS 0.40). ISO/PAS 8800 offers stronger technical depth than AIA but narrower coverage (CR 0.50, DS 0.70).

D.3 Functional Adaptability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three standards; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three standards show no coverage; sub-attribute highlights a regulatory gap.

D.4 Faultlessness

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.20, DS=0.20 → Narrow, shallow. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=1.00, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.70, DS=0.80 → Broad and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: SOTIF (CR 1.00) > AIA (0.70) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.20). No gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.20): supporting, process-focused; e.g., 15.3.2 objective for error-free tools. SOTIF (DS 1.00): very strong, testable behavior requirements; e.g., 10.1(b) specified behavior in hazardous scenarios. AIA (DS 0.80): high-level but detailed obligations; e.g., Art. 9(6) complete functionality; Art. 15(4) resilience against errors and faults.
Synergies	Preventive process perspective (ISO/PAS 8800, 15.3.2) aligns with behavioral verification (SOTIF, 10.1(b)) and product-level resilience (AIA, 15(4)). Combined application supports faultlessness from process, behavior, and resilience angles.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=1.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.50$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.50$.
Normative Alignment	Use SOTIF to specify and verify behavior under hazardous scenarios; apply AIA to enforce resilience obligations; use ISO/PAS 8800 to strengthen process reliability.
Conclusion	Primary framework: SOTIF (CR 1.00, DS 1.00). AIA provides broad, detailed resilience obligations (CR 0.70, DS 0.80). ISO/PAS 8800 plays a limited, process-supporting role (CR 0.20, DS 0.20).

D.5 Availability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three standards; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three standards show no coverage; sub-attribute represents a complete gap.

D.6 Fault Tolerance

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.40, DS=0.40 → Balanced coverage. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.60, DS=0.70 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: AIA (CR 0.60) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.40) > SOTIF (0.00). Clear gap for SOTIF.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.40): corrective fault-handling mechanisms where faults are identified; operational containment and mitigation principles. SOTIF (DS 0.00): no guidance identified. AIA (DS 0.70): resilience-by-design obligations; fault tolerance as part of reliable, consistent system performance.
Synergies	Preventive design perspective (AIA) complemented by corrective operational handling (ISO/PAS 8800).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=1.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	AIA requires preventive, resilient design; ISO/PAS 8800 complements with corrective fault-handling measures.
Conclusion	Primary framework: AIA (CR 0.60, DS 0.70). ISO/PAS 8800 provides limited, corrective coverage (CR 0.40, DS 0.40). SOTIF shows a complete gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.7 Recoverability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.40, DS=0.40 → Balanced coverage. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.40, DS=0.40 → Balanced coverage.
Coverage and Gaps	ISO/PAS 8800 and AIA show limited, balanced coverage (0.40); SOTIF absent.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.40): process-level references; e.g., 14.3.1 (Note 2) on resolution procedures potentially covering recovery. SOTIF (DS 0.00): no guidance identified. AIA (DS 0.40): principle-level robustness and fallback obligations; e.g., Art. 15 (robustness, resilience, backup/fail-safe planning).
Synergies	AIA sets robustness/fallback obligations; ISO/PAS 8800 provides the process framework to plan and execute recovery actions.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=1.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Use ISO/PAS 8800 to plan and evidence recovery procedures that satisfy AIA robustness/fail-safe obligations.
Conclusion	No dominant framework: ISO/PAS 8800 and AIA tied (CR 0.40, DS 0.40). SOTIF gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.8 Robustness

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.87, DS=0.87 → Comprehensive and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.87, DS=0.93 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=1.00, DS=0.90 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: AIA (CR 1.00). ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF tied (0.87). No gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.87): verification-oriented robustness controls; e.g., 10.3.4 measures against AI errors; 15.3.2 tool confidence. SOTIF (DS 0.93): validation focus on hazardous scenarios and foreseeable misuse; e.g., 10.1(b); 12.1(a) reviews for completeness. AIA (DS 0.90): binding objectives; e.g., Art. 15(1) appropriate robustness, accuracy, consistency.
Synergies	Verification perspective (ISO/PAS 8800) and regulatory objectives (AIA) anchored by validation across operating scenarios (SOTIF). Internal system hardening (ISO/PAS 8800, AIA) complemented by external environment coverage and misuse reasoning (SOTIF).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.56$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.50$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.67$.
Normative Alignment	Use ISO/PAS 8800 for technical verification evidence; leverage SOTIF for scenario-driven validation; together substantiate AIA robustness obligations.
Conclusion	AIA leads coverage (CR 1.00) with very strong depth (DS 0.90). SOTIF shows the strongest depth (DS 0.93) at slightly lower coverage (CR 0.87). ISO/PAS 8800 mirrors strong, detailed robustness (CR 0.87, DS 0.87). Combined, they form a coherent robustness assurance.

D.9 Self Monitoring

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.60, DS=0.60 → Broad and strong. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.50, DS=0.70 → Balanced but strong. EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	ISO/PAS 8800 slightly broader than SOTIF; complete ISO–SOTIF overlap on this sub-attribute; AIA gap.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.60): operational monitoring process; issue identification and resolution procedures (e.g., 14.3.1). SOTIF (DS 0.70): goal-oriented monitoring; requires a “field monitoring process” (e.g., 13.1). AIA (DS 0.00): no guidance.
Synergies	ISO/PAS 8800 (e.g., 14.3.1) provides concrete process steps implementing SOTIF’s monitoring goal (e.g., 8.1(a), 13.1(1)).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, \text{SOTIF})=1.00$; $J(8800, \text{AIA})=0.00$; $J(\text{SOTIF}, \text{AIA})=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Use ISO/PAS 8800’s detailed process to operationalize SOTIF’s monitoring objectives; AIA offers no requirements on this sub-attribute.
Conclusion	Joint leadership by ISO/PAS 8800 (broader coverage) and SOTIF (greater depth); AIA exhibits a complete gap.

D.10 Time Behaviour

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF) = 0.00$; $J(8800, AIA) = 0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA) = 0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	Complete gap across all three frameworks for this sub-attribute.

D.11 Resource Utilization

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF) = 0.00$; $J(8800, AIA) = 0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA) = 0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	Complete gap across ISO/PAS 8800, SOTIF, and the EU AI Act for this sub-attribute.

D.12 Capacity

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	Complete gap across ISO/PAS 8800, SOTIF, and AIA for this sub-attribute.

D.13 Co-existence

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF) = 0.00$; $J(8800, AIA) = 0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA) = 0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	Complete gap across ISO/PAS 8800, SOTIF, and the EU AI Act for this sub-attribute.

D.14 Interoperability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	Complete gap across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks exhibit a complete gap for this sub-attribute.

D.15 User Assistance

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.80, DS=0.80 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	Only SOTIF covers this sub-attribute; ISO/PAS 8800 and AIA absent.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): no guidance. SOTIF (DS 0.80): detailed user assistance/self-monitoring provisions; e.g., Clause 8.3.4 on self-monitoring. AIA (DS 0.00): no guidance.
Synergies	No overlap; no contradictions identified.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Prioritize SOTIF requirements (e.g., 8.3.4) to cover user assistance; ISO/PAS 8800 and AIA provide no requirements.
Conclusion	Sole responsibility lies with SOTIF (CR 0.80, DS 0.80). ISO/PAS 8800 and AIA show complete gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.16 Operability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.60, DS=0.80 → Broad and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.80, DS=0.80 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: AIA (CR 0.80) > SOTIF (0.60) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.00). Gap: ISO/PAS 8800.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): no guidance. SOTIF (DS 0.80): detailed, system-level prescriptions; e.g., Clause 8.3.5(2). AIA (DS 0.80): binding obligations; e.g., Art. 14(1) requires human-machine interface tools for effective oversight.
Synergies	SOTIF's system-level operability guidance complements AIA's legal obligations on human oversight (Clause 8.3.5(2) ↔ Art. 14(1)). No contradictions identified.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800,SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800,AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF,AIA)=1.00$.
Normative Alignment	AIA mandates operability (Art. 14(1)); SOTIF provides detailed practices to realize oversight; ISO/PAS 8800 absent.
Conclusion	Primary framework: AIA (CR 0.80, DS 0.80). SOTIF provides strong, detailed complement (CR 0.60, DS 0.80). ISO/PAS 8800: no contribution.

D.17 User Error Protection

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.80, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.80, DS=0.60 → Comprehensive and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: SOTIF = AIA (CR 0.80) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.00). Gap: ISO/PAS 8800.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): no guidance identified. SOTIF (DS 1.00): very strong, operational measures; e.g., 8.3.4–8.3.5 (HMI improvements, driver monitoring and warning), 8.1(a) operational mitigations. AIA (DS 0.60): strong legal obligations; e.g., Art. 14(2) defines the aim and means of human oversight.
Synergies	SOTIF's technical mitigations (e.g., HMI, monitoring, warnings) operationalize AIA's human-oversight objectives; together they provide user-error protection in design and operation.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=1.00$.
Normative Alignment	AIA sets oversight obligations; SOTIF supplies implementable technical measures; ISO/PAS 8800 not applicable for this sub-attribute.
Conclusion	Primary framework: SOTIF (CR 0.80, DS 1.00). AIA complementary with equal coverage but lower depth (CR 0.80, DS 0.60). ISO/PAS 8800 shows a coverage gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.18 Learnability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.40, DS=0.60 → Balanced but strong. EU AI Act: CR=0.40, DS=0.60 → Balanced but strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Moderate coverage by SOTIF and AIA; clear gap in ISO/PAS 8800.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): no explicit guidance on user learnability. SOTIF (DS 0.60): selected guidance on information for use, HMI considerations, and review activities supporting user understanding. AIA (DS 0.60): human-oversight obligations and transparency/instructions to users (e.g., Art. 14 and related transparency duties) supporting learnability.
Synergies	SOTIF's end-user and operational guidance complements AIA's human-oversight and user-information obligations; together they strengthen learnability practices.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=1.00$.
Normative Alignment	Apply SOTIF guidance to structure content and verification of user-facing information; use AIA human-oversight requirements to institutionalize roles, procedures, and accountability.
Conclusion	Primary contributors: SOTIF and AIA (CR 0.40, DS 0.60). ISO/PAS 8800: gap. Combined SOTIF–AIA address learnability from operational and governance angles.

D.19 User Controllability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.80, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=1.00, DS=0.90 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: AIA (CR 1.00) > SOTIF (0.80) ≫ ISO/PAS 8800 (0.00). Gap in ISO/PAS 8800.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): no guidance. SOTIF (DS 1.00): very strong strategic guidance on authority handover (e.g., Clause 8.3.4). AIA (DS 0.90): actionable human-oversight controls; e.g., Art. 14(4)(e) stop button; Art. 14(4)(d) user override/reverse output.
Synergies	SOTIF provides the strategic framework for user control transfer; AIA adds concrete design measures (stop/override).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=1.00$.
Normative Alignment	Apply SOTIF to structure user controllability; satisfy AIA by implementing binding design requirements for human oversight.
Conclusion	Responsibility shared by SOTIF and AIA. ISO/PAS 8800 shows a complete gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.20 User Transparency

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.60, DS=0.80 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.83, DS=0.83 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: AIA (CR 0.83) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.60) > SOTIF (0.00). SOTIF gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.80): general safety-driven user notifications; Note 1 to Clause 14.3.1 (notify users when safety support ends). SOTIF (DS 0.00): no guidance. AIA (DS 0.83): binding transparency duties; e.g., Art. 13(2) instructions for use; Art. 14(4)(b) human overseer awareness; Art. 26(7) worker information; Art. 26(11) informing affected persons.
Synergies	Safety perspective (ISO/PAS 8800, 14.3.1 Note 1) complements legal transparency obligations (AIA, Art. 13(2), 26(11)). ISO/PAS 8800 operational guidance supports demonstrable compliance with AIA duties.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.33$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Apply ISO/PAS 8800 user-notification practices to implement and evidence AIA transparency requirements.
Conclusion	Primary framework: AIA (CR 0.83, DS 0.83). ISO/PAS 8800 adds operational safety context (CR 0.60, DS 0.80). SOTIF: gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.21 Documentability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.65, DS=0.80 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.66, DS=0.69 → Broad and strong. EU AI Act: CR=0.88, DS=0.88 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: AIA (CR 0.88); 8800 (0.65) and SOTIF (0.66) close. No gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.80): concrete documentation artefacts and records; e.g., 7.3.1 (documentation planning/management), 7.3.4 (safety-related documentation), 9.3.3 (input specification records). SOTIF (DS 0.69): principles ensuring documentability; e.g., 5.1(a)(b) (sufficient specification information and maintained work products), 9.1(a)(3) (strategy/work-product documentation). AIA (DS 0.88): lifecycle- and justification-oriented documentation; e.g., Art. 11 (technical documentation), Art. 17 (quality management and evidence), Art. 53(1)(b)(ii) (transparency information to authorities).
Synergies	Process perspective (ISO/PAS 8800: 7.3.1) + quality perspective (SOTIF: 5.1(a)(b)) + purpose/legal frame (AIA: Arts. 11, 17). Input/specification records (ISO/PAS 8800: 9.3.3) + strategy documentation (SOTIF: 9.1(a)(3)) + external conformity/transparency (AIA: Art. 11; Art. 53(1)(b)(ii)). Safety-specific documentation (ISO/PAS 8800: 7.3.4; SOTIF: 5.1) with generic, framework-wide obligations (AIA: Arts. 11, 17).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.08$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.28$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.16$.
Normative Alignment	Use ISO/PAS 8800 artefacts as substantive evidence; apply SOTIF to assure adequacy and maintenance; satisfy AIA's legally binding conformity documentation.
Conclusion	AIA leads on breadth and depth (CR 0.88, DS 0.88); SOTIF is close on coverage with solid depth (CR 0.66, DS 0.69); 8800 slightly lower coverage but very detailed artefacts (CR 0.65, DS 0.80).

D.22 Modularity

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.23 Reusability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.24 Analysability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.72, DS=0.82 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.68, DS=0.84 → Broad and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.73, DS=0.63 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Broad coverage across all frameworks; limited pairwise overlap per Jaccard (0.11–0.17); no gap.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.82): technical prescriptions for analysis; e.g., 10.3.6 (test execution), 13.3.1 (analysis approach), 13.3.2 (error identification), 13.3.3 (fault/insufficiency analysis). SOTIF (DS 0.84): strategic analysis and validation planning; e.g., 7.1(a) (identify insufficiencies/triggering conditions), 9.1(a)(1) (validation strategy for hazardous scenarios). AIA (DS 0.63): principle-based analysis obligations; e.g., Art. 17(1)(b)(c) (QMS techniques and verification), Art. 20(2) (risk investigation), Art. 72(2) (post-market monitoring and analysis).
Synergies	Cause analysis (ISO/PAS 8800 13.3.3; SOTIF 7.1(a)) with effect/risk analysis (AIA 20(2)). Internal safety methodology (ISO/PAS 8800 10.3.6/13.3.1) aligned with external QMS obligations (AIA 17(1)(b)(c)). Scenario assessment and validation planning (SOTIF 9.1(a)(1)) supported by test execution (ISO/PAS 8800 10.3.6).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.11$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.17$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.13$.
Normative Alignment	ISO/PAS 8800 supplies concrete analysis methods; SOTIF provides strategy and planning; AIA sets overarching obligations operationalized via 8800/SOTIF outputs.
Conclusion	Responsibility distributed: SOTIF highest depth (CR 0.68, DS 0.84); ISO/PAS 8800 strong technical methods (CR 0.72, DS 0.82); AIA broad obligations with lower depth (CR 0.73, DS 0.63).

D.25 Modifiability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.60, DS=0.80 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	Only ISO/PAS 8800 covers this sub-attribute; SOTIF and AIA absent.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.80): explicit modification/change-management requirements; e.g., 7.3.4 (safety-related change control and documentation), with processes adapted from ISO 26262-2 for AI safety management. SOTIF (DS 0.00): none. AIA (DS 0.00): none.
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, \text{SOTIF})=0.00$; $J(8800, \text{AIA})=0.00$; $J(\text{SOTIF}, \text{AIA})=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Apply ISO/PAS 8800 change-management controls (e.g., 7.3.4) to govern modifications without degrading safety or quality; SOTIF and AIA provide no specific provisions.
Conclusion	ISO/PAS 8800 solely addresses modifiability (CR 0.60, DS 0.80); SOTIF and AIA show a complete gap.

D.26 Testability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.72, DS=0.88 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.60, DS=0.70 → Broad and strong. EU AI Act: CR=0.80, DS=0.80 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: AIA (CR 0.80) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.72) > SOTIF (0.60). No gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.88): concrete test design and evaluation; e.g., 12.3.3 (test case derivation), 12.3.4 (pass/fail criteria), 12.3.5 (detailed testing incl. OOD and safety-aware metrics). SOTIF (DS 0.70): strategy- and assurance-oriented testing; e.g., 10.1(d) (scenario coverage), 10.1(e) (validation results), 11.1 (acceptable risk with confidence). AIA (DS 0.80): principle-based but prescriptive obligations; e.g., Art. 9(6),(8) (consistent performance, metrics/thresholds), Art. 15 (accuracy/robustness requirements), Art. 17(1)(d) (testing procedures).
Synergies	ISO/PAS 8800's detailed test prescriptions underpin AIA's system-level obligations and evidence needs. SOTIF's V&V strategy links scenario coverage and risk acceptance with 8800's concrete test artefacts and AIA's conformity focus.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.39$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.27$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.30$.
Normative Alignment	Use ISO/PAS 8800 for technical test design and metrics; apply SOTIF to structure validation goals and acceptable risk; satisfy AIA's legal compliance via documented procedures and thresholds.
Conclusion	AIA leads on breadth with strong depth (CR 0.80, DS 0.80); ISO/PAS 8800 provides the highest technical depth (DS 0.88) with broad coverage (CR 0.72); SOTIF offers strategic testing outcomes with solid depth (CR 0.60, DS 0.70).

D.27 Adaptability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.28 Installability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.29 Replaceability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.30 Scalability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.31 Operational Constraint

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.70, DS=0.83 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.90, DS=0.90 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.71, DS=0.74 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: SOTIF (CR 0.90) > AIA (0.71) ≈ ISO/PAS 8800 (0.70). No gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.83): technical and process constraints; e.g., 9.3.6; 10.3.3; 10.3.4; 13.3.4; 14.3.2; 14.3.3. SOTIF (DS 0.90): hazard parameters and operational measures; e.g., 6.1(b); 8.1(a). AIA (DS 0.74): risk-management and principle-based operational duties; e.g., Art. 9(2)(d); 9(5)(a); 9(5)(b).
Synergies	Proactive hazard parameterization (SOTIF 6.1(b), 8.1(a)) with reactive/operational controls (ISO/PAS 8800 14.3.2–14.3.3). Technical/process-level constraints (ISO/PAS 8800 9.3.6, 10.3.3–10.3.4) underpin AIA's risk-management obligations (Art. 9(2)(d), 9(5)(a)(b)). General AI safety (ISO/PAS 8800) complements safety of intended functionality (SOTIF) and product conformity duties (AIA).
Jaccard Similarity Index	J(8800,SOTIF)=0.31; J(8800,AIA)=0.31; J(SOTIF,AIA)=0.44.
Normative Alignment	Translate SOTIF's strategic constraints and AIA's risk-management duties into operational measures via ISO/PAS 8800.
Conclusion	Primary framework: SOTIF (CR 0.90, DS 0.90). ISO/PAS 8800 offers comparable coverage with higher technical detail than AIA (CR 0.70, DS 0.83). AIA provides broad, principle-based obligations (CR 0.71, DS 0.74).

D.32 Risk Identification

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.75, DS=0.82 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.86, DS=0.97 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.91, DS=0.83 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	High coverage across all three frameworks. AIA (CR 0.91) > SOTIF (0.86) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.75).
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.82): identification and feedback from faults and field events; e.g., 13.3.3 (safety-related faults), 14.3.3 (evaluation of field events). SOTIF (DS 0.97): systematic risk and scenario identification for hazardous behaviour; e.g., 6.1(b) (systematic identification of risks/scenarios), 7.1(a) (potential insufficiencies and triggers). AIA (DS 0.83): lifecycle risk management; e.g., Art. 9(2)(a) (identification of known and foreseeable risks), Art. 55(1)(a) (adversarial testing for systemic risks).
Synergies	Preventive perspective (SOTIF 6.1(b)) with reactive feedback (ISO/PAS 8800 14.3.3). Scenario-based view (SOTIF) complements data-/fault-oriented analyses (ISO/PAS 8800). Fundamental/social risk frame (AIA) aligns with functional-operational safety (ISO/PAS 8800, SOTIF).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.26$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.13$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.29$.
Normative Alignment	Use SOTIF to drive preventive scenario/risk discovery; leverage ISO/PAS 8800 for technical analyses and field-event feedback; satisfy AIA's lifecycle risk management obligations.
Conclusion	AIA leads on coverage with strong depth (CR 0.91, DS 0.83); SOTIF provides the most detailed preventive methodology (CR 0.86, DS 0.97); ISO/PAS 8800 adds technical processes and operational feedback (CR 0.75, DS 0.82).

D.33 Fail Safe

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.60, DS=0.40 → Broad, moderate detail. EU AI Act: CR=0.60, DS=0.80 → Broad and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Gap in ISO/PAS 8800. SOTIF and AIA both cover the sub-attribute (CR 0.60 each).
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): none. SOTIF (DS 0.40): functional restriction as a mitigation; e.g., 8.1(a). AIA (DS 0.80): risk control and mitigation duties; e.g., Art. 9(5)(b).
Synergies	SOTIF 8.1(a) concretizes the mitigation/control obligation in AIA Art. 9(5)(b).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=1.00$.
Normative Alignment	Apply SOTIF's functional restriction to operationalize AIA's mitigation/control requirement; ISO/PAS 8800 not applicable.
Conclusion	AIA leads on depth (CR 0.60, DS 0.80); SOTIF provides moderate detail (CR 0.60, DS 0.40); ISO/PAS 8800 shows a gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.34 Hazard Warning

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=1.00, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.40, DS=0.55 → Balanced coverage.
Coverage and Gaps	SOTIF complete coverage; AIA moderate coverage; ISO/PAS 8800 gap. Limited overlap between SOTIF and AIA due to partial AIA coverage.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): none. SOTIF (DS 1.00): measures for SOTIF-related risks and driver interaction; e.g., 8.1(a) risk-reduction measures; 8.3.4 handover to driver; 8.3.5 driver monitoring and warning. AIA (DS 0.55): procedural obligations for incident handling and escalation; e.g., Art. 20(2) investigation/authority notification; Art. 26(5) suspend use and inform; Art. 17(1)(i) formal reporting procedures.
Synergies	Prevention and in-use warning (SOTIF 8.1(a), 8.3.4–8.3.5) aligned with corrective reporting and escalation (AIA Art. 20(2), 17(1)(i), 26(5)).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.75$.
Normative Alignment	SOTIF provides preventive technical detection and warning; AIA mandates organizational reporting and escalation; ISO/PAS 8800 not applicable.
Conclusion	SOTIF achieves complete coverage with very strong depth (CR 1.00, DS 1.00). AIA offers balanced coverage with moderate depth (CR 0.40, DS 0.55). ISO/PAS 8800 shows no coverage.

D.35 Safe Integration

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.96, DS=0.96 → Comprehensive and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.60, DS=0.60 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: ISO/PAS 8800 (CR 0.96) > AIA (0.60); SOTIF gap (0.00). Limited overlap between 8800 and AIA.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.96): defined integration process and evidential steps; 12.3.6 (integration approach, hierarchical steps), 12.3.7 (verification of architectural conformance & AI safety requirements), 12.3.8 (post-integration validation). SOTIF (DS 0.00): no guidance AIA (DS 0.60): integrator-facing obligations and transparency; e.g., Art. 53(1)(b) (information/documentation for authorities and integrators), Art. 11 (technical documentation supporting integration).
Synergies	Operational integration and verification (ISO/PAS 8800: 12.3.6–12.3.8) complemented by regulatory documentation and transparency duties (AIA: Arts. 11, 53(1)(b)).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.20$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Apply ISO/PAS 8800 for integration, verification, and validation; use AIA obligations to structure information flows and external conformity evidence.
Conclusion	Primary framework: ISO/PAS 8800 (CR 0.96, DS 0.96). AIA provides a complementary regulatory layer (CR 0.60, DS 0.60). SOTIF shows a complete gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.36 Data Completeness

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.60, DS=0.60 → Broad and strong. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.84, DS=0.84 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	AIA leads (CR 0.84) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.60); SOTIF gap (0.00).
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.60): dataset insufficiencies and controls; e.g., 11.3.6 (handling insufficient datasets). SOTIF (DS 0.00): no guidance. AIA (DS 0.84): lifecycle and governance for completeness; e.g., Art. 10(3) (completeness for intended purpose), Art. 10(2)(h) (identification of data gaps), Art. 17(1)(f) (systems and procedures for data management).
Synergies	Technical safety perspective (ISO/PAS 8800, 11.3.6) aligns with regulatory data-governance duties (AIA, Art. 10(2)(h)). Operational activities (ISO/PAS 8800, 11.3.6) supported by management-system scaffolding (AIA, Art. 17(1)(f)).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.75$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	AIA sets the baseline for data completeness; ISO/PAS 8800 complements with safety-critical implementation controls.
Conclusion	AIA primary (CR 0.84, DS 0.84); ISO/PAS 8800 complementary (CR 0.60, DS 0.60); SOTIF gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.37 Currentness

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.90, DS=0.80 → Comprehensive and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	Only ISO/PAS 8800 covers this sub-attribute; SOTIF and AIA absent.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.80): process-oriented requirements; e.g., 11.3.2 mandates dataset lifecycle updates reflecting changing AI safety requirements and deployment insufficiencies. SOTIF: none. AIA: none.
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, \text{SOTIF})=0.00$; $J(8800, \text{AIA})=0.00$; $J(\text{SOTIF}, \text{AIA})=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	ISO/PAS 8800 defines the sole framework for Currentness; SOTIF and AIA provide no requirements.
Conclusion	Sole responsibility lies with ISO/PAS 8800 (CR 0.90, DS 0.80); SOTIF and AIA are complete gaps (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.38 Consistency

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.30, DS=0.60 → Narrow but strong focus. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.60, DS=1.00 → Broad and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Coverage ranking: AIA (0.60) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.30); SOTIF (0.00) gap. Limited potential overlap (AIA–8800).
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.60): process-oriented consistency controls; e.g., 11.3.5 mandates dataset lifecycle safety analyses. SOTIF (DS 0.00): none. AIA (DS 1.00): explicit data-governance and performance obligations; e.g., Art. 10(2)(c) (annotation, labelling, cleaning, updating), Art. 15(1) (accuracy and consistency).
Synergies	Process safety framework (ISO/PAS 8800) with operational data practices (AIA) yields enforceable consistency across the lifecycle.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.50$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Use ISO/PAS 8800 to structure consistency assurance; apply AIA Arts. 10 and 15 to operationalize and evidence consistent data and model behavior.
Conclusion	Leading framework: AIA (CR 0.60, DS 1.00). ISO/PAS 8800 supports with process-level controls (CR 0.30, DS 0.60). SOTIF: gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.39 Accuracy

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.60, DS=0.80 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.67, DS=0.73 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	AIA (CR 0.67) and 8800 (CR 0.60) provide broad coverage; SOTIF lacks coverage (CR 0.00).
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.80): procedural controls for data quality; e.g., 11.3.3 (dataset lifecycle governance). SOTIF (DS 0.00): no guidance identified. AIA (DS 0.73): explicit data quality properties; Art. 10(3) (relevance, representativeness, error-free, completeness, statistical properties).
Synergies	Process-oriented dataset lifecycle (ISO/PAS 8800, 11.3.3) complements prescriptive quality criteria (AIA, Art. 10(3)).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.50$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Apply 8800 lifecycle governance to operationalize and evidence AIA Art. 10(3) accuracy requirements.
Conclusion	AIA primary on explicit accuracy properties (CR 0.67, DS 0.73). 8800 complementary via procedural assurance (CR 0.60, DS 0.80). SOTIF gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.40 Data Accessibility

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.41 Credibility

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.60, DS=0.60 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Only AIA provides coverage; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF show a complete gap.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): None. SOTIF (DS 0.00): None. AIA (DS 0.60): credibility via data governance and assurance duties; e.g., Art. 10(2)(b) (processes for data collection/origin); Art. 15(1) (accuracy, robustness, cybersecurity).
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	AIA provides the binding framework for credibility; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF do not address this sub-attribute.
Conclusion	AIA is the sole framework with coverage (CR 0.60, DS 0.60); ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF provide no coverage.

D.42 Compliance

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.40, DS=0.40 → Balanced coverage. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.70, DS=0.70 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Coverage led by AIA (CR 0.70) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.40); SOTIF gap (0.00).
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.40): lifecycle-oriented controls; e.g., 11.3.1 (dataset lifecycle definition). SOTIF (DS 0.00): none. AIA (DS 0.70): binding governance obligations; e.g., Art. 10(2) (data governance/management), Art. 10(5)(f) (rules for special categories; justification/necessity documentation).
Synergies	ISO/PAS 8800 lifecycle structure underpins AIA compliance governance; SOTIF provides no complementary provisions.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.50$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	AIA as legal baseline; implement 8800 lifecycle structures to operationalize and evidence compliance with Art. 10.
Conclusion	AIA primary (CR 0.70, DS 0.70); ISO/PAS 8800 complementary with moderate depth (CR 0.40, DS 0.40); SOTIF gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.43 Confidentiality

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.93, DS=0.93 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Only AIA provides coverage; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF absent.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800: None SOTIF: None AIA (DS 0.93): concrete obligations on confidentiality and data handling; e.g., Art. 10(5)(b) state-of-the-art privacy/data-governance measures; Art. 10(5)(c) access control and documentation; Art. 10(5)(d) restrictions on data transfer.
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, \text{SOTIF})=0.00$; $J(8800, \text{AIA})=0.00$; $J(\text{SOTIF}, \text{AIA})=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	AIA provides the binding confidentiality requirements; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF not applicable.
Conclusion	Sole responsibility lies with AIA (CR 0.93, DS 0.93); ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF show complete gaps (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.44 Efficiency

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.45 Precision

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF) = 0.00$; $J(8800, AIA) = 0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA) = 0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.46 Data Traceability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.87, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.87, DS=0.80 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: tie between 8800 (0.87) and AIA (0.87); SOTIF gap. Potential overlap between 8800 and AIA.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 1.00): technical traceability prescriptions; e.g., 9.3.2 (trace safety requirements to influencing factors); 11.3.7 (mandatory dataset–safety-requirement traceability). SOTIF (DS 0.00): none. AIA (DS 0.80): governance-oriented traceability; e.g., Art. 10(2)(b) (track data collection and origin); Art. 10(5)(f) (records of processing activities and reasons).
Synergies	Technical dataset→requirement traceability (8800: 9.3.2; 11.3.7) complements provenance and record-keeping duties (AIA: Art. 10(2)(b); 10(5)(f)); combined, they provide end-to-end traceability.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.22$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Implement 8800's technical traceability; satisfy AIA's provenance and records obligations; no SOTIF provisions.
Conclusion	Primary framework: 8800 (CR 0.87, DS 1.00). AIA close on coverage with strong governance depth (CR 0.87, DS 0.80). SOTIF: complete gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.47 Understandability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.80, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	AIA is the only framework with coverage. 8800 and SOTIF show complete gaps.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): no guidance. SOTIF (DS 0.00): no guidance. AIA (DS 1.00): explicit dataset practice requirements supporting understandability, e.g., Art. 10(2)(c) (annotation, labelling, cleaning, updating, enrichment, aggregation).
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Fulfilment relies on AIA obligations; no complementary provisions in 8800 or SOTIF.
Conclusion	AIA is the sole framework with coverage (CR 0.80) and very strong depth (DS 1.00). 8800 and SOTIF: gaps (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.48 Availability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=1.00, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Only AIA covers this sub-attribute; 8800 and SOTIF show complete gaps.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): None. SOTIF (DS 0.00): None. AIA (DS 1.00): explicit obligation to assess dataset availability for training, validation, and testing (Art. 10(2)(e)).
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, \text{SOTIF})=0.00$; $J(8800, \text{AIA})=0.00$; $J(\text{SOTIF}, \text{AIA})=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Fulfilment relies entirely on AIA requirements.
Conclusion	AIA is the only framework with very strong coverage and depth (CR 1.00, DS 1.00); ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF constitute complete gaps (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.49 Data Portability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.50 Data Recoverability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	No coverage across all three frameworks; no potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	None
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	None
Conclusion	All three frameworks show no coverage; the sub-attribute constitutes a complete regulatory gap.

D.51 Representativeness

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.87, DS=0.87 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Only AIA covers this sub-attribute; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF show no coverage.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800: None SOTIF: None AIA: multiple prescriptions — Art. 10(3) (datasets sufficiently representative with appropriate statistical properties); Art. 10(2)(f) (examination for biases affecting safety or rights); Art. 10(4) (datasets reflect geographical, contextual, behavioural, functional factors); Art. 26(4) (responsibility for relevant and sufficiently representative input data).
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Responsibility lies with AIA; binding requirements ensure representativeness.
Conclusion	AIA is the sole framework with comprehensive coverage (CR 0.87, DS 0.87); ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF show complete gaps.

D.52 Independence

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=1.00, DS=1.00 → Comprehensive and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.67, DS=0.73 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: ISO/PAS 8800 (CR 1.00) > AIA (0.67) > SOTIF (0.00). SOTIF gap.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 1.00): explicit dataset separation; e.g., 10.3.8 (train on training dataset; evaluate on validation dataset). SOTIF (DS 0.00): no guidance. AIA (DS 0.73): legal obligations on data lifecycle separation and controlled environments; e.g., Art. 10(1) (training/validation/testing data separation and governance), Art. 59(1)(d) (sandbox isolation and safeguards).
Synergies	8800's technical prescriptions for dataset independence operationalize AIA's legal requirements on data separation and controlled experimentation. SOTIF provides no complementary perspective here.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.33$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Apply ISO/PAS 8800's train/validation split and evaluation controls to produce evidence of compliance with AIA Art. 10; use sandbox practices (AIA Art. 59) for isolated verification.
Conclusion	Primary framework: ISO/PAS 8800 (CR 1.00, DS 1.00). AIA provides strong, principle-based backing (CR 0.67, DS 0.73). SOTIF is a complete gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.53 Integrity

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=1.00, DS=0.80 → Comprehensive and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap).
Coverage and Gaps	Only ISO/PAS 8800 covers this sub-attribute; SOTIF and AIA absent.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.80): dataset verification and traceability from dataset requirements to design and implementation (11.3.3). SOTIF (DS 0.00): None. AIA (DS 0.00): None.
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF) = 0.00$; $J(8800, AIA) = 0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA) = 0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Fulfillment depends entirely on ISO/PAS 8800 requirements.
Conclusion	ISO/PAS 8800 leads (CR 1.00, DS 0.80). SOTIF and AIA show complete gaps (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.54 Temporality

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.50, DS=0.60 → Balanced but strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Only AIA shows coverage; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF are gaps.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): none. SOTIF (DS 0.00): none. AIA (DS 0.60): temporal obligations for data lifecycle; e.g., Art. 10(5)(e) (deletion after correction/retention end), Art. 59(1)(g) (deletion after sandbox termination/retention end).
Synergies	None.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Fulfilment rests on AIA provisions only.
Conclusion	AIA is the sole covering framework (CR 0.50, DS 0.60). ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF provide no coverage.

D.55 Intervenability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.80, DS=0.80 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.87, DS=0.87 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Strong coverage by SOTIF (0.80) and AIA (0.87); complete gap in ISO/PAS 8800 (0.00). High SOTIF–AIA overlap.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800: None. SOTIF (DS 0.80): intervention/controllability measures; e.g., 8.1(a) (controllability strategy) with 8.3.4 (handover of authority, driver/operator intervention). AIA (DS 0.87): explicit human-oversight controls; e.g., Art. 14(4)(d) operator override, 14(4)(e) stop button; Art. 60(4)(k) reversal/neutralization of outputs during real-world testing.
Synergies	SOTIF's controllability concept (8.1(a), 8.3.4) aligns with AIA's human-oversight safeguards (Art. 14(4)(d)(e)), yielding design + legal enforceability. AIA's real-world testing control (Art. 60(4)(k)) operationalizes SOTIF's intervention intent under actual use conditions.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, \text{SOTIF})=0.00$; $J(8800, \text{AIA})=0.00$; $J(\text{SOTIF}, \text{AIA})=1.00$.
Normative Alignment	Use SOTIF to architect intervention and handover mechanisms; implement AIA's override/stop and real-world test controls to ensure enforceable oversight.
Conclusion	Primary frameworks: SOTIF and AIA (high coverage, high depth, full overlap). ISO/PAS 8800 shows a complete gap (CR 0.00, DS 0.00).

D.56 Accountability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.70, DS=0.75 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Only AIA covers this sub-attribute; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF show no coverage.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): None. SOTIF (DS 0.00): None. AIA (DS 0.75): specific accountability obligations; e.g., Art. 12(3)(d) logging of verification personnel; Art. 13(3)(a) provider identity within instructions; Art. 14(5) dual verification by two persons.
Synergies	None
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Fulfilment rests entirely on compliance with AIA accountability provisions.
Conclusion	AIA is the sole framework with binding requirements (CR 0.70, DS 0.75); ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF are complete gaps.

D.57 Monitorability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.60, DS=1.00 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.87, DS=0.93 → Comprehensive and very detailed. EU AI Act: CR=0.78, DS=0.70 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Highest coverage: SOTIF (CR 0.87) > AIA (0.78) > ISO/PAS 8800 (0.60). No gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 1.00): effectiveness assessment of countermeasures; e.g., 14.3.4 (evaluate effectiveness using monitoring outputs). SOTIF (DS 0.93): process-oriented monitoring; e.g., 13.1 (field monitoring process before release and during operation). AIA (DS 0.70): concrete obligations enabling monitoring; e.g., Art. 12(2)(b)(c) logging, Art. 14(4) human oversight, Art. 26(5) monitoring duty, Art. 17(1)(h) post-market monitoring system.
Synergies	Process perspective (SOTIF 13.1) pairs with technical logging (AIA 12(2)(b)(c)); monitoring becomes actionable and auditable. Human-centred oversight (AIA 14(4)) aligns with system-level effectiveness evaluation (ISO/PAS 8800 14.3.4).
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=1.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.40$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.23$.
Normative Alignment	Use SOTIF procedures to operationalize monitoring; satisfy AIA obligations with logging/oversight/PMS; feed outputs into 8800 effectiveness evaluation.
Conclusion	Coverage led by SOTIF (CR 0.87) with very strong depth (DS 0.93); AIA provides enforceable obligations (CR 0.78, DS 0.70); ISO/PAS 8800 offers the strongest depth signal for effectiveness assessment (CR 0.60, DS 1.00).

D.58 Interpretability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.71, DS=0.71 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	AIA is the only framework with coverage; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF show no coverage.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): None. SOTIF (DS 0.00): None. AIA (DS 0.71): explicit prescriptions for interpretability and transparency; e.g., Art. 13(1) (output interpretability for users), Art. 13(3)(b)(vi) (data specifications), Art. 13(3)(b)(vii) (output interpretation), Art. 13(3)(d) (technical measures), Art. 13(3)(f) (log interpretation), Art. 14(4)(c) (human oversight interpretation tools).
Synergies	None.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Implement AIA provisions; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF provide no requirements for this sub-attribute.
Conclusion	AIA is the sole framework with binding coverage (CR 0.71, DS 0.71); ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF constitute a complete gap.

D.59 Traceability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.76, DS=0.91 → Broad and very detailed. ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.60, DS=0.60 → Broad and strong. EU AI Act: CR=0.80, DS=0.84 → Comprehensive and very detailed.
Coverage and Gaps	Potential overlap across the frameworks; no gap for this sub-attribute.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.91): process-centric traceability via managed documentation and records; e.g., 7.3.1 (documentation planning/management), 7.3.4 (safety-related documentation), 9.3.3 (input/specification records). SOTIF (DS 0.60): argument-level traceability; e.g., 12.1(b) (evaluation of the safety argument linking work products and evidence). AIA (DS 0.84): binding logging and documentation; e.g., Art. 12(1) & 12(3) (logging/records), Art. 13(3) (information to users supporting traceability).
Synergies	ISO/PAS 8800 defines artefacts and record structures; SOTIF integrates them into a safety argument; AIA mandates logs and external-facing documentation. Process perspective (8800) + argumentation perspective (SOTIF) + legal/compliance perspective (AIA) yield end-to-end traceability. No contradictions reported.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.44$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.06$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.11$.
Normative Alignment	Use 8800 work products and records to supply SOTIF's safety case; ensure AIA logging and documentation obligations for demonstrable traceability.
Conclusion	AIA leads on comprehensive, enforceable traceability (CR 0.80, DS 0.84). ISO/PAS 8800 provides detailed process/record structures (CR 0.76, DS 0.91). SOTIF contributes argument-level linkage and assessment (CR 0.60, DS 0.60).

D.60 Explainability

Quantitative Summary	ISO/PAS 8800: CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). ISO 21448 (SOTIF): CR=0.00, DS=0.00 → No coverage (Gap). EU AI Act: CR=0.74, DS=0.74 → Broad and strong.
Coverage and Gaps	Only AIA provides coverage; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF show no coverage. No potential overlap.
Depth & Detail	ISO/PAS 8800 (DS 0.00): None. SOTIF (DS 0.00): None. AIA (DS 0.74): specific, binding prescriptions — Art. 13(1) (transparency enabling output interpretation); Art. 13(3)(b)(iv) (instructions on technical capabilities relevant to explaining outputs); Art. 13(3)(b)(vii) (output interpretation guidance); Art. 13(3)(d) (technical measures supporting interpretability); Art. 13(3)(f) (log interpretation); Art. 14(4)(b)(c) (human oversight awareness and interpretation tools); Art. 53(1)(b)(i) (documentation of capabilities and limitations).
Synergies	None.
Jaccard Similarity Index	$J(8800, SOTIF)=0.00$; $J(8800, AIA)=0.00$; $J(SOTIF, AIA)=0.00$.
Normative Alignment	Implement AIA provisions; ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF provide no requirements for this sub-attribute.
Conclusion	AIA is the sole framework with enforceable requirements (CR 0.74, DS 0.74); ISO/PAS 8800 and SOTIF constitute a complete gap.