3D route technology. Evidence before claims.

Technology licensing, protected technical evaluation and acquisition discussions.

WL4 is a route-planning technology under evaluation for discrete XYZ paths. This brief helps robotics software teams, industrial automation integrators and strategic buyers decide whether a protected technical review is worthwhile.

4,742	30/30	8/8
Archived historical result records	Completed public repeatability runs	WL4 routes passing a separate XYZ assessment

What a buyer can examine

A traceable development record, repeatability evidence and a separately implemented geometric assessment. The public site offers local route inspection and illustrative playback. The proprietary WL4 engine is not distributed or executed by the public demo.

Begin with a technical-fit conversation

Share the intended use case, route representation, units, obstacle model and acceptance criteria. Start with non-confidential information; any proprietary input should follow an agreed protected evaluation process.

Contact: smeetsdevelopments@icloud.com

https://www.wl4technology.nl/

Public brief | 22 September 2026 | No price, exclusivity, patent status, robot compatibility or performance advantage is implied.

01 / EVIDENCE

Three different levels of evidence.

Historical development records

4,742 stored records across 13 selected historical datasets: 4,282 arm-result records, 360 cascade/comparison records and 100 paired scenario records. Counts include WL4, baselines, proxies and failures. Selected files matched their existing SHA-256 manifests. This is file-integrity evidence, not 4,742 independently verified successful executions.

One v0.8.4 study contains 2,400 arm results: 100 synthetic scenarios x three OMPL planners x four budgets x two arms. A separate head-to-head dataset contains 400 results. Both are included in the historical total; derived comparison rows and identified copies were not added again.

Public repeatability

30/30 completed runs, with 120/120 cases reported internally valid. This repeats four cases rather than testing 120 distinct scenarios. Report and raw-output hashes were checked during collection. This evidence is separate from the historical total.

Separate discrete XYZ assessment

Arm	Passed / assessed
OMPL + WL4	4 / 4
VAMP + WL4	4 / 4
Raw OMPL	0 / 4
Raw VAMP	0 / 4

Scope: one four-scenario trial. The separate implementation assessed exported XYZ geometry, obstacle/clearance scope, continuity and discrete bend radius. All eight raw routes failed the bend-radius assessment. This was not third-party reproduction.

Limitations are part of the evidence.

An internal validator discrepancy remains visible

Two internal VAMP validity claims were false positives: DIST_HARD_1600 / vamp_raw and DIST_EXTREME_2600 / vamp_raw. Consecutive duplicate points obscured sharp bends in the internal bend-radius check. The original reassessment remained rejected with exit code 2; the supplemental XYZ classification does not erase this rejection.

Historical internal success flags are therefore not presented as independently approved results. The four-scenario geometric assessment cannot establish validity of the full historical benchmark.

What is not yet demonstrated

Joint limits, robot kinematics, self-collision, dynamic feasibility, controller integration and physical hardware safety are not proven. Discrete three-point bend radius is not proof of a smooth physical robot trajectory. No general superiority or speed advantage over OMPL or VAMP is claimed.

Timing and protocol

250 ms is a configured per-arm planner budget; 275 ms is the historical acceptance tolerance. It is not a website response-time guarantee. Historical experiments include other budgets and protocols, including proxy planners and cascade behaviour.

Suggested protected review sequence

1. Agree the input model, units, obstacles and acceptance criteria.
2. Verify the frozen software and input hashes.
3. Run a small predefined case set in an isolated environment.
4. Export complete available XYZ routes and freeze the outputs.
5. Independently assess each segment and bend criterion.
6. Commission external reproduction before broader claims.

Input ownership, evaluation licence, confidentiality, retention, permitted use and any fees must be agreed before a company trial.

03 / COMMERCIAL NEXT STEP

Evaluate the fit. Then discuss the deal.

For robot integrators

Explore whether the geometric route model fits an offline planning or analysis workflow. A robot-specific integration would require additional kinematic, collision and controller validation. No drop-in compatibility is promised.

For software producers

Assess the potential fit for simulation, CAD/CAM-related route analysis or motion-planning tooling. API shape, packaging, support, third-party dependencies and redistribution rights belong in the technical and licensing review.

For strategic buyers

Review the evidence chain, source provenance, dependency licences, ownership documentation and remaining development work. Licensing, an evaluation agreement or an acquisition can be discussed; this brief is not a representation that exclusive rights or patent protection have been established.

What to include in an enquiry

Company and role; intended application; current route representation; units and obstacle model; required validation scope; expected workload; and whether the interest is evaluation, licensing or acquisition. Do not send confidential route data before an agreed secure channel.

Request a technical discussion

smeetsdevelopments@icloud.com
Open the WL4 public evaluation site

Evidence basis: collected historical dataset inventory (22 September 2026), public 30-run reports and the supplemental v0.8.5 discrete XYZ classification. Underlying private records can be reviewed by arrangement. The separately deployed, authenticated live optimisation trial is a planned next stage, not a feature of this public site.