

# The Global Governance Divide: How Major Jurisdictions are Regulating AI for a Safer Future

Rasit Dinc

*Rasit Dinc Digital Health & AI Research*

Published: December 13, 2022 | AI Diagnostics

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.17997680](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17997680)

## Abstract

The Global Governance Divide: How Major Jurisdictions are Regulating AI for a Safer Future The rapid proliferation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) across...

## The Global Governance Divide: How Major Jurisdictions are Regulating AI for a Safer Future

The rapid proliferation of Artificial Intelligence (AI) across sectors, particularly in **digital health**, has brought immense promise alongside complex ethical and safety challenges. As AI systems become increasingly integrated into critical infrastructure and decision-making processes, the need for robust regulatory frameworks has become paramount. However, a unified global approach is notably absent. Instead, major world powers are adopting distinct, often contrasting, regulatory philosophies, creating a complex and fragmented global governance landscape. This article compares the emerging models from the European Union, the United States, and China, highlighting their core differences and implications for the future of AI.

### The European Union: The Risk-Based, Centralized Model

The European Union has positioned itself as the global frontrunner in comprehensive AI regulation with the landmark **EU AI Act** [1]. This legislation is the world's first comprehensive legal framework on AI, operationalizing a **risk-based approach** that categorizes AI systems into four levels: unacceptable risk (banned), high risk (subject to strict requirements), limited risk (subject to transparency obligations), and minimal risk (largely unregulated).

The Act's impact on digital health is profound. AI systems used as medical devices, such as those for diagnosis or treatment, are automatically classified as **high-risk**. This designation mandates rigorous compliance requirements, including data governance, technical documentation, human oversight, and accuracy testing. The EU's centralized approach aims to protect fundamental

rights and ensure a high level of safety and trust, setting a global standard that has been dubbed the "Brussels Effect" [2].

### The United States: A Decentralized, Sector-Specific Approach

---

In stark contrast to the EU's centralized model, the United States has adopted a more **decentralized and sector-specific approach**. The US lacks a single, comprehensive federal AI law. Instead, regulation is a patchwork of existing laws, state-level initiatives, and executive actions.

Federal agencies like the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulate AI in digital health through existing frameworks for medical devices, specifically focusing on **Software as a Medical Device (SaMD)** [3]. Data privacy is governed by laws like HIPAA. At the federal level, recent developments, such as the **Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence** (EO 14110), focus on setting standards for safety, security, and innovation, particularly for frontier AI models. This approach prioritizes fostering innovation and flexibility, often relying on voluntary frameworks and industry self-regulation rather than immediate, broad-based legislation [4].

### China: The Vertical, Algorithm-Specific Regulation

---

China's regulatory strategy represents a third distinct model, characterized by **vertical, algorithm-specific regulation** aimed at balancing technological advancement with social stability and state control. Rather than a single overarching law, China has introduced a series of targeted regulations for specific AI applications.

Key examples include the **Provisions on the Management of Deep Synthesis Internet Information Services** (Deep Synthesis Rules) and the **Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services** [5]. These rules focus heavily on content governance, data security, and ensuring that AI-generated content adheres to socialist core values. In the digital health context, China imposes strict data localization and security requirements for health data, reflecting a strong emphasis on national security and data sovereignty. This approach allows for rapid, targeted intervention in specific areas of concern, contrasting sharply with the EU's horizontal, risk-based framework.

### Navigating the Global Regulatory Patchwork

---

The divergence in global AI regulation presents significant challenges for multinational organizations, particularly those operating in the sensitive digital health sector. Companies must navigate the EU's strict compliance burden, the US's complex web of sector-specific rules, and China's stringent data and content controls.

| Jurisdiction | Primary Regulatory Model | Key Legislation/Action | Focus in Digital Health | | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | **European Union** | Centralized, Risk-Based | EU AI Act | High-risk classification for SaMD; fundamental rights

protection. | | **United States** | Decentralized, Sector-Specific | FDA SaMD framework, EO 14110 | Innovation, safety standards, existing regulatory compliance (HIPAA). | | **China** | Vertical, Algorithm-Specific | Deep Synthesis Rules, Generative AI Measures | Data sovereignty, content governance, national security. |

Understanding the nuances of these divergent regulatory paths is critical for professionals in digital health. The future of AI governance will likely be shaped by the interplay and potential convergence of these three major models. For more in-depth analysis on this topic, the resources at [www.rasitdinc.com](https://www.rasitdinc.com) provide expert commentary on the convergence of technology, policy, and health.

## Conclusion

---

Global AI regulation is currently a patchwork of approaches—centralized, decentralized, and vertical. While the EU seeks to regulate the technology itself, the US focuses on its applications within existing sectors, and China targets specific algorithmic services. The next few years will be crucial in determining which models succeed in fostering innovation while ensuring safety, ethical compliance, and public trust in AI systems worldwide.

\*\*

## References

- [1] *European Parliament*. The EU AI Act: first regulation on artificial intelligence. Available at: [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/society/20230601STO93804/eu-ai-act-first-regulation-on-artificial-intelligence] (https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/society/20230601STO93804/eu-ai-act-first-regulation-on-artificial-intelligence) [2] *Bradford, A. (2020)*. The Brussels Effect: How the European Union Rules the World. *Oxford University Press*. [3] *U.S. Food and Drug Administration*. Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning in Software as a Medical Device (SaMD). Available at: [https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/software-medical-device-samd/artificial-intelligence-and-machine-learning-software-medical-device-samd] (https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/software-medical-device-samd/artificial-intelligence-and-machine-learning-software-medical-device-samd) [4] *The White House. (2023)*. Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence. Available at: [https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2023/10/30/executive-order-on-the-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and-use-of-artificial-intelligence/] (https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2023/10/30/executive-order-on-the-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and-use-of-artificial-intelligence/) [5] *Cyberspace Administration of China*. Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services\*. (Translated summary available from various legal firms).
-

**Rasit Dinc Digital Health & AI Research**

<https://rasitdinc.com>

© 2022 Rasit Dinc