FelixSchallerCOM

EU AI Act Readiness and Technical AI Governance

Advisory services for regulated, high-stakes and safety-critical AI systems

Felix Schaller • Senior advisor for AI governance, safety, autonomy, and technical compliance readiness

Executive Summary

The EU AI Act makes AI governance a board-level and engineering-level responsibility. Organizations need more than policy and legal interpretation; they need to understand which AI systems they use, how those systems are classified, what technical evidence is required, and whether governance can be implemented in practice.

FelixSchallerCOM supports organizations with technical AI governance, EU AI Act readiness, and safety-oriented compliance assessments. The focus is on translating regulatory expectations into technical requirements, architecture constraints, verification logic, and evidence structures.

Core Advisory Services

EU AI Act Readiness Assessment

- AI system inventory and preliminary risk classification support
- Provider / deployer role mapping and governance gap analysis
- Action roadmap for technical readiness and evidence needs

High-Risk AI Technical Compliance Gap Review

- Technical documentation, validation, logging, and monitoring gaps
- Human oversight, robustness, accuracy, and cybersecurity review
- Architecture-level recommendations for high-risk use cases

AI Governance Architecture Review

- Operationalization of governance beyond policy documents
- Runtime constraints, oversight loops, and accountability paths
- Architecture review for executable control logic

AI Safety Case and Evidence Framework

- Safety argument structure and evidence model for regulated AI
- Failure mode catalogue and residual risk reasoning
- Validation and monitoring strategy for audit readiness

AI Agent and Autonomy Governance Review

- Capability and permission mapping for tool-using AI systems
- Action-risk classification, escalation points, and audit trails
- Governance review for autonomous or semi-autonomous workflows

Publications and Technical Positioning

- Published work on verifiable cognitive AI and constrained autonomy
- Bridges AI governance, AI safety, and execution control
- Useful for boards, investors, and regulated engineering teams

Engagement Formats and Packages

AI Act Readiness Sprint

$4,500–7,500
2–3 days

- AI system inventory template
- risk classification snapshot
- gap map and top remediation actions

High-Risk AI Governance Review

$12,000–25,000
5–10 days

- technical gap analysis
- architecture and evidence review
- audit-readiness roadmap

AI Safety Case and Governance Architecture

€25,000+ / retainer
10–20 days or fractional

- safety argument structure
- runtime governance architecture
- validation and monitoring strategy

What This Work Covers in Practice

This work focuses on the technical side of AI governance: system inventory, risk classification support, data and validation evidence, human oversight concepts, logging and monitoring, robustness, failure modes, and audit-readiness. It is designed to complement legal counsel rather than replace it.

Typical Client Questions

- Which AI systems do we actually have in scope?
- Could any of them be high-risk under the EU AI Act?
- What technical evidence would we need to defend deployment?
- Can our architecture support logging, monitoring, and human oversight?
- Where are the hidden safety, compliance, or governance gaps?

Why FelixSchallerCOM

- 15+ years across automotive, aerospace, safety-critical systems, and autonomy
- Strong grounding in ISO 26262, SOTIF, perception, localization, and evidence generation
- Bridges strategy, regulation, technical architecture, and AI safety
- Published work on verifiable cognitive AI and constrained autonomy

Service Positioning

This is not generic compliance consulting. The advisory focus is technical AI governance for regulated and high-stakes systems: turning regulatory expectations into architecture constraints, verification logic, evidence models, and operational control mechanisms.

EU AI Act compliance will not be solved by policies alone.
It requires technical evidence, runtime governance, and verifiable control over AI behavior.

Relevant References and Thought Leadership

Medium article

"True autonomy requires cognitive AI that can verify itself" — accessible framing of verifiable autonomy and pre-execution control: https://medium.com/@felix_99550/true-autonomy-requires-cognitive-ai-that-can-verify-itself-74cb7dec1b31.

Scientific track record and published peer-reviewed papers

Technical reference on verifiable cognitive AI, autonomy, and governance-grade reasoning for real-world consequence management: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20562409
Other publications: https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=felix+schaller&user=JvzJ08YAAAAJ

Related positioning

Strong overlap with AI safety, SOTIF, autonomy governance, runtime monitoring, and evidence-based deployment in regulated environments.

Ideal Clients

Organization Types

- Enterprises deploying internal or customer-facing AI
- Providers or deployers of potentially high-risk AI systems
- Portfolio companies preparing for governance or funding scrutiny
- Government and semi-government entities evaluating AI programs

Use Cases

- AI governance readiness before procurement or scale-up
- High-risk AI documentation and evidence gap reviews
- Autonomy and agentic system governance design
- Board-level AI risk and execution briefings

Contact

Felix Schaller • FelixSchallerCOM

inquiry@felixschaller.com • felixschaller.com • Dubai, UAE / Munich, Germany