

A measurable decision layer for embodied AI

EVAMIND® · Systemic Decisions by Evgeniya Pavlovskaya

| A human-tested authored method, now proposed for a controlled robotics research pilot.

| Not a robot controller. Not a validated robot benchmark result.

| Contact: info@system-mind.ru

From a command to the right bounded action

Robotics already has powerful vision-language-action models. The next research question is how a system handles novel multi-step tasks and human intent under explicit constraints.

- | Generalize to unfamiliar objects and settings.

- | Ask when an instruction is ambiguous.

- | Choose a safe handoff instead of guessing.

This is a research gap, not a claim that labs lack intelligence

DeepMind publishes a separate high-level embodied-reasoning model alongside its VLA stack; NVIDIA and Figure document generalization and training-data challenges.

- | The buyer problem is measurable planning and interaction quality.
- | No cited organization has endorsed EVAMIND® or requested our method.
- | A partner-specific baseline is essential.

A human-use method and a digital delivery path

Evgeniya Pavlovskaya is a Doctor of Economic Sciences and author of the Systemic Decisions method. She has applied it with humans for 13 years, supported by books, licensed education programs and EVAMIND® human-use workflows.

- | Evidence of human-use assets $\neq$ evidence of robotic transfer.
- | No robot policy, robot-training dataset, certification or embodied benchmark is claimed.
- | The proprietary method is not disclosed in this non-confidential deck.

Evaluate a high-level method layer above the robotics stack

Can method-guided reasoning improve bounded next actions and help people experience the robot's response as respectful and recognising their situation?

- | The partner keeps perception, VLA motor control and physical safety systems.
- | We compare the same partner model with and without a method-guided planning/evaluation layer.
- | Start offline or in simulation; hardware work only after partner safety review.

One use case. One baseline. Reproducible evidence.

Choose one partner-owned scenario in which natural-language instructions can be ambiguous and actions have observable consequences.

- | Agree on scenario set, constraints, baseline and blinded held-out tasks.
- | Score completion, useful clarification, unsupported action, handoff and robustness.
- | Publish only agreed non-confidential aggregate results after IP and privacy review.

Different robotics teams need different experiments

This is not a universal robot “mind”. A collaboration begins where the partner has an actual test harness and ownership of safety.

- | Social/assistive robots → clarity and respectful human interaction.
- | Embodied-reasoning research → reasoning and uncertainty evaluation.
- | Developer platforms → non-invasive high-level interface prototype.

Protect the method. Test the claim.

No proprietary decision rules or private customer data are supplied through this public material.
Robot execution remains under the partner's hardware and safety controls.

Human-perceived respect is a testable outcome; “human-facing dimension” is a metaphor, not new model weights or robot emotion.

Research licenses and model/data rights require a separate agreement.

No patient, child or public-space deployment is proposed before safety review.

Let us define the first falsifiable test.

Centre for Systemic Decisions · EVAMIND®

| Author: Evgeniya Pavlovskaya

| Research/partnership email: info@system-mind.ru

| Public brief: <https://platform.system-mind.ru/robotics/>