



VEYRUM ROBOTICS STANDARD



VRS-GEN-003

Governance Charter and Independence Statement

What the Veyrum Robotics Standard is, who governs it, and the independence commitments — across the three assurance tiers and the three equivalent Certified routes — that make it trustworthy.

VEYRUM RESEARCH INSTITUTE

DOCUMENT
VRS-GEN-003

VERSION
1.0

STATUS
Draft

DATE
16 September 2026

Contents

1	Introduction	
2	1 Scope	
3	2 Normative references	
4	3 Terms and definitions	
5	4 Purpose	
6	5 Separation of functions	
7	6 Independence commitments	
8	7 Decision authority	
9	8 Precedent basis (informative)	
10	9 Worked example — resolving an independence challenge	
11	Bibliography	
12	Change history	

Foreword. This Charter defines the purpose, governance, and independence commitments of the Veyrum Robotics Standard (VRS). The structural separations here follow the proven pattern of the trusted rating institutions: the standard is distinct from the assessor, and both are firewalled from commercial influence over outcomes. Requirements use “shall”.

1 Introduction

A rating system is only worth adopting if no rated party can buy its outcome. This Charter states, publicly and bindingly, how that is guaranteed.

2 1 Scope

This Charter defines: the purpose of VRS (Clause 4); the separation of functions (Clause 5); independence commitments (Clause 6); and decision authority (Clause 7). It excludes document mechanics (VRS-GEN-002), change governance (VRS-GEN-004), and rating lifecycle (VRS-GEN-008).

3 2 Normative references

- **VRS-GEN-004**, Change, Edition and Review Policy (undated).
- Anchoring decisions DEC-VRS-01 (governance alignment), DEC-VRS-03 (ratings-as-opinions liability posture), DEC-VRS-05 (scope: standard + rating + registry + data) — internal, controlling until superseded by editions of this Charter.

4 3 Terms and definitions

Per VRS-GEN-001.

5 4 Purpose

4.1 VRS exists to translate robotics engineering and operating evidence into **comparable, priced economic risk**: one Intrinsic Rating per model and Application Rating letters per applicable sector, consumable by insurers, financiers, buyers, and operators.

4.2 A VRS rating is an **independent opinion**, not a safety certification, warranty, or guarantee (DEC-VRS-03). VRS rates **above** the mandatory compliance floor: a fully CE-marked/ISO-compliant robot may receive any rating. VRS does not replace regulation; it discriminates among compliant products.

6 5 Separation of functions

5.1 The following functions shall be structurally separate:

- **The Standard** — the public document library (this library), governed by VRS-GEN-002/004;
- **Assessment** — the application of the standard to a model (Veyrum or accredited assessors);

- **Commercial data products** — analytics built on the dataset.

5.2 The standard shall be published openly; assessment and data products are the commercial layer. No commercial arrangement shall alter the content of the standard or the outcome of an assessment.

5.3 Methodology development shall be firewalled from manufacturer advocacy (DEC-VRS-01): rated parties may comment (VRS-GEN-011) but shall hold no approval authority over methodology.

5.4 The three functions, their performer, and the firewall that protects each outcome:

FUNCTION	PERFORMED BY	GOVERNED BY	FIREWALL (WHAT IT MAY NOT DO)
The Standard	Editorial governance (this library)	VRS-GEN-002, VRS-GEN-004	Content shall not be altered by any commercial arrangement (5.2).
Assessment	Veyrum or accredited assessors	VRS-GEN-005 (IR), sector -201 (AR)	An assessor shall not rate a model in which they hold an interest (6.2); no fee may depend on outcome (6.1).
Commercial data products	Analytics layer	Commercial terms	Data-product revenue shall not reach the methodology or an assessment outcome (5.2, 6.1).

5.5 No individual shall simultaneously hold decision authority over methodology and a commercial target in the same assessment; role separation shall be recorded.

7 Independence commitments

6.1 Fees shall be **fixed and non-contingent**: no fee may depend on the rating outcome.

6.2 No assessor shall rate a model in which they hold a financial interest; conflicts shall be declared and recorded.

6.3 Methodology changes shall follow VRS-GEN-004 (pre-announced, justified, versioned); no out-of-band changes for any party.

6.4 Ratings shall be recorded with their edition stamp, assurance tier, and evidence basis (VRS-GEN-005 §6; VRS-GEN-009) — defensibility by transparency.

6.5 A rating shall be withdrawable for evidence retraction or mark misuse regardless of the rated party's commercial relationship (VRS-GEN-008, VRS-GEN-010).

6.6 Every conflict of interest shall be declared before an assessment begins and recorded in a durable register; an undeclared conflict discovered later is grounds for withdrawal (6.5). The recognised conflict classes and the mandatory control for each:

CONFLICT CLASS	EXAMPLE	MANDATORY CONTROL
Financial interest	Assessor holds equity in the rated manufacturer	Recusal (6.2); reassignment to an unconflicted assessor.
Contingent fee	Fee offered as a share of value, payable only on a target rating	Prohibited (6.1); arrangement void, engagement declined.
Advocacy capture	Rated party seeks methodology change in its favour	Comment only, no approval authority (5.3, VRS-GEN-011).
Role concentration	One person controls both methodology and a commercial target	Role separation recorded (5.5).
Data-product pressure	Analytics client seeks to influence an outcome	Firewall (5.4); outcome unchanged, request recorded.

6.7 The controls in 6.1–6.6 shall apply identically to Veyrum assessors and to accredited third-party assessors; accreditation shall not relax any independence commitment.

6.8 Independence across assurance tiers. Every rating carries one of three assurance tiers, which differ in the evidence witnessed, not in the independence obligations that govern the outcome. The controls in 6.1–6.7 shall apply identically at every tier.

TIER	MANUFACTURER INVOLVEMENT	WHO INITIATES	ASSESSOR'S INDEPENDENCE OBLIGATION
Unverified	None	Veyrum	Assessment on public evidence only; no manufacturer contact shall influence the outcome.
Verified	Information pack + officer attestation (6.10)	Manufacturer	The paid engagement shall not alter the outcome (6.1); conflicts declared and recorded (6.6).
Certified	Verified pack + witnessed demonstration (6.9)	Manufacturer	As Verified; the witness shall be observer-paced and shall not coach the demonstration.

6.9 Certified routes and route parity. The Certified demonstration may be witnessed by any of three routes, which shall be evidentially equivalent — **same tier, same attainable points** — so that no route confers a rating advantage:

ROUTE	DESCRIPTION
In-person witness	A Veyrum assessor witnesses at the manufacturer’s facility.
Remote live-video witness	The manufacturer demonstrates over a live session; a Veyrum observer paces the script.
Independent laboratory	An accredited laboratory runs or witnesses the protocol and produces the same Session Record.

6.9.1 Route parity shall be preserved by these controls, which apply on every route: the session code is shown on camera at open and close; the recording is unbroken; steps are observer-paced; artefacts are hashed in-session; and a single fixed-format Session Record (VRS-GEN-009) is produced regardless of route. No route-based distinction shall be recorded in the rating.

6.10 Attestation. A Verified or Certified assessment shall proceed only on an information pack whose completeness and truthfulness are attested by an officer of the manufacturer; an incomplete pack yields no Verified rating. A false or materially incomplete attestation discovered later is grounds for withdrawal (6.5).

6.11 Certified is a **rating tier, not a safety certification** (restating 4.2 for the highest tier): a witnessed demonstration evidences the rated claims, it does not certify regulatory compliance or fitness for a purpose. Tier and edition shall accompany every published rating statement (6.4, VRS-GEN-010).

87 Decision authority

7.1 Constitutional acts (the stability contract’s immutable list, rescales, sector-set changes) require explicit CEO authority (VRS-GEN-004 §8, VRS-GEN-007 §6).

7.2 Edition publication requires the review defined in VRS-GEN-004 Clause 5 and recorded approval.

7.3 Every governance act shall be recorded in the affected documents’ change histories.

98 Precedent basis (informative)

The separations of Clause 5 and the commitments of Clause 6 are not novel to VRS; they restate, for robotics risk, the impartiality architecture that trusted conformity-assessment and rating institutions already operate. Naming that precedent lowers adoption cost: an underwriter or a manufacturer’s quality function already recognises the pattern and the evidence it produces.

VRS COMMITMENT	ESTABLISHED PRECEDENT (DATED)	WHAT THE PRECEDENT REQUIRES
Impartiality of the assessor (6.2)	ISO/IEC 17065:2012; ISO/IEC 17020:2012; ISO/IEC 17025:2017	Bodies certifying products, inspecting, or testing shall be impartial; conflicts identified and managed.
Independence of the accreditation layer (6.7)	ISO/IEC 17011:2017	Bodies that accredit assessors shall themselves be impartial and independent.
Shared vocabulary of independence (3)	ISO/IEC 17000:2020	Common definitions of impartiality and conformity-assessment functions.
Fee non-contingency and conflict management (6.1, 6.6)	IOSCO Code of Conduct Fundamentals for CRAs, 2004/2008/2015; Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009, Annex I	Rating fees and analyst roles shall not create outcome-dependent incentives; conflicts disclosed and mitigated.
Methodology change governed, not ad hoc (6.3)	Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009	Rating methodologies shall be rigorous, systematic, and subject to governed revision.

VRS differs from a credit-rating agency in object (a robot model, not a debt issuer) and in status (an opinion above the compliance floor, not a regulatory gatekeeper), but the independence obligations transfer directly. Where a manufacturer already holds an ISO/IEC 17025:2017 test report or an ISO/IEC 17065:2012 certification, the impartiality of that evidence is presumed and need not be re-established for VRS purposes.

10 9 Worked example — resolving an independence challenge

A manufacturer requests a **Certified** Application Rating for a model and proposes a fee equal to **3%** of the fleet's declared value, **payable only if the model achieves IR ≥ 80 points**. The assigned assessor also privately holds shares in the manufacturer.

Two independence commitments are triggered. First, the fee is contingent on the outcome, which Clause 6.1 prohibits and Clause 6.6 classes as a contingent-fee conflict: the proposed arrangement is void and, if not restructured to a fixed non-contingent fee, the engagement is declined. Second, the assessor's equity holding is a financial-interest conflict under Clauses 6.2 and 6.6: it shall be declared before the assessment begins and recorded, and the assessor shall recuse, with the work reassigned to an unconflicted assessor. Neither the paid engagement nor the Certified tier relaxes these obligations (6.8).

The assessment then proceeds on a fixed fee with an unconflicted assessor. The Certified demonstration is witnessed over the remote live-video route; the session code is shown on camera at

open and close, the recording is unbroken, and the Session Record is produced in the one fixed format (6.9.1), so the outcome would have been identical on any of the three routes. The manufacturer's officer attests the information pack (6.10). The resulting rating — whatever its value — is recorded with its edition stamp, assurance tier, and evidence basis (6.4). The record shows the declared conflict, the refusal, and the fee restructuring, so a third party can confirm the outcome was not bought. Had the conflict surfaced only after publication, Clause 6.5 permits withdrawal. No step of this example depends on the rating value, and none implies that any real robot holds a VRS rating.

11 Bibliography

- ISO/IEC 17000:2020, *Conformity assessment — Vocabulary and general principles* (edition 2.0) — definitions of impartiality and conformity-assessment functions.
<https://www.iso.org/standard/73029.html>
- ISO/IEC 17065:2012, *Conformity assessment — Requirements for bodies certifying products, processes and services* — competence, consistency and impartiality of certification bodies.
<https://www.iso.org/standard/46568.html>
- ISO/IEC 17025:2017, *General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories* — impartiality (Clause 4.1) and consistent operation.
<https://www.iso.org/standard/66912.html>
- ISO/IEC 17020:2012, *Conformity assessment — Requirements for the operation of various types of bodies performing inspection* — impartiality and independence (types A/B/C).
<https://www.iso.org/standard/52994.html>
- ISO/IEC 17011:2017, *Conformity assessment — Requirements for accreditation bodies accrediting conformity assessment bodies* — impartiality of the accreditation layer.
<https://www.iso.org/standard/67198.html>
- IOSCO, *Code of Conduct Fundamentals for Credit Rating Agencies*, December 2004 (revised May 2008 and March 2015; FR05/2015) — conflicts of interest, analyst independence, fee non-contingency, disclosure. <https://www.iosco.org/library/pubdocs/pdf/IOSCOPD437.pdf>
- Regulation (EC) No 1060/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 September 2009 on credit rating agencies (OJ L 302, 17.11.2009), Annex I — independence and avoidance of conflicts of interest. <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2009/1060>
- ISO/IEC Directives, Part 1, 2024 (Consolidated JTC 1 Supplement, 2024) — consensus and openness of the standard layer. <https://www.iso.org/sites/directives/current/consolidated/>

12 Change history

DATE	VERSION	STATUS	CHANGE	AUTHORITY
2026-09-16	1.0	Draft	REWRITE (VRS 2026) — Clause 6 independence recast around the three assurance tiers and the three equivalent Certified routes (PRD §4, §7.2): tier-parity of the independence controls (6.8), Certified route table + route-parity controls — session code, unbroken recording, observer pacing, hashed artefacts, single Session Record (6.9); officer-attestation and all-or-nothing pack rule (6.10); “Certified is a rating tier, not a safety certification” disclaimer (6.11). Retired form removed: “confidence band” replaced by edition stamp + assurance tier + evidence basis (6.4, worked example). Worked example re-run at the Certified tier over the remote route, arithmetic unchanged. Front matter to 1.0 (draft); subtitle recast. No constant written or changed; no rating value implied. Net words 1,628→2,194; shall 28→39.	Curator REWRITE; charter §2
2026-09-13	0.2	Draft	DEEPEN — separation-of-functions firewall table + role-separation rule (Cl.5.4–5.5); conflict-class/control table and pre-assessment disclosure register (Cl.6.6), parity of controls across Veyrum and accredited assessors (Cl.6.7); Precedent basis clause mapping VRS commitments to dated conformity-assessment and CRA independence regimes (Cl.8); worked example resolving a contingent-fee + equity conflict (Cl.9); dated Bibliography (ISO/IEC 17000:2020, 17065:2012, 17025:2017, 17020:2012, 17011:2017; IOSCO CRA Code 2004/2008/2015; Reg (EC) 1060/2009; ISO/IEC Directives Pt 1 2024). No constant written or changed; no rating value implied. Net +1,092 words (536→1,628); shall 13→28.	Curator Run #97; charter DEEPEN
2026-09-03	0.1	Draft	Initial draft — DEC-VRS-01/03/05 codified; separation-of-functions + independence commitments per framework research	Framework Design Brief v1.1

About Veyrum Research Institute

Veyrum Research Institute is the research arm of Veyrum — the independent intelligence and trust layer for the robotics industry (research, ratings and registry, advisory, data, and specialist insurance & finance introductions).

Disclaimer

The opinions in this document are independent and current as of the date of publication, based on information believed reliable; they are not guarantees or warranties of safety, fitness, or compliance, and are not engineering, legal, or financial

advice. This document may be revised. © 2026 Veyrum.

Contact: hello@veyrum.com · VRS-GEN-003 · Version 1.0