

Building Trust in Physical AI

Independent, granular evidence of how machines perform in the physical world.

1 If Physical AI is already operating in industrial and commercial settings, why has adoption remained limited?

Physical AI operates across industry and commerce, yet adoption remains limited by unresolved questions of reliability, integration, uptime, safety and workforce impact. Buyers need evidence that a machine performs consistently in their tasks, sites and conditions—not only in a demonstration. The adoption gap is partly a proof-and-trust gap.

2 What evidence do operators and buyers need to trust that a Physical AI system will perform as promised?

Operators and buyers need repeatable evidence that physical behavior aligns with commanded and reported state; that shows how performance varies, where drift appears and whether upgrades improve results. It must be independent, comparable and auditable while protecting proprietary technology and privacy. Trust grows from demonstrated performance, not claims alone.

3 How can BoundaryScore™ independently validate Physical AI performance without exposing proprietary technology?

BoundaryScore™ time-aligns direct motion with selected machine-reported state and context. Its Motion Validation Envelope™ identifies alignment and discrepancy without opening perception, planning or control code—or capturing PII. It evaluates physical outcomes rather than prescribing architecture, making validation vendor-neutral and protective of intellectual property.

4 How granular can BoundaryScore™ be—by machine, task, movement, software version, site and operating condition?

BoundaryScore™ need not stop at one fleet-level score. Performance can be examined by machine, movement, task, software version, site, shift, surface, load and operating condition. That shows where a system performs well, where it degrades and what changed—supporting procurement, deployment, maintenance, engineering and improvement.

5 Who benefits beyond the customer—including manufacturers, engineers, operators, safety officers, insurers and regulators?

Manufacturers gain independent validation and version-to-version evidence. Engineers see drift and performance gaps. Operators gain task, uptime and maintenance insight. Safety officers receive earlier signals. Customers gain credible proof of efficacy; insurers gain better risk evidence; and regulators and standards bodies gain a common operational record. The value extends across the deployment ecosystem.

6 How can an industry-governed performance rating accelerate adoption without replacing testing, certification or internal safety systems?

An industry-governed, disclosed and consistent methodology can reduce duplicated due diligence and create a common language for performance. That supports procurement, scaling and continuing trust. BoundaryScore™ does not replace testing, certification, internal controls or safety management; it adds independent, continuous evidence that those mechanisms generally do not provide.