Integrated Velocity Readiness (IVR) Score: A First-Principles Metric for Rapid Technology Scaling

Vladimir Stefanovski @vladi3ir

September 28, 2025

Abstract

Traditional Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) and Manufacturing Readiness Levels (MRL) offer sequential, deterministic assessments suitable for legacy aerospace acquisition, but fail to account for the speed, capital efficiency, and market dynamics critical to high-velocity hardware development. We propose the **Integrated Velocity Readiness (IVR) Score**, a composite, prescriptive metric that forces parallel maturity across three non-negotiable axes—Technical Certainty, Production Scalability, and Capital Viability. Crucially, the IVR is tempered by a *Velocity Factor*, rewarding the organization's demonstrated rate of risk retirement and capital efficiency. The system is designed to identify the absolute development bottleneck and prioritize the fastest, most effective pathway to scalable production.

1 Introduction: The Need for Velocity in Hardware

The strategic evaluation of technology investment requires moving beyond simple, linear measures of technical maturity (TRL 1-9) which often neglect manufacturing feasibility and market viability. For entities prioritizing high-volume production, rapid iteration, and capital efficiency—often adopting Lean Startup and Agile methodologies in hardware a single prototype validation (TRL 6) is insufficient if the underlying production method is immature (low MRL) or if the business model remains unvalidated (low CRL).

The Integrated Velocity Readiness (IVR) Score addresses this gap by defining a new, integrated framework for maturity assessment, where speed of execution is valued equally with technical achievement.

2 The Integrated Velocity Readiness (IVR) Methodology

The IVR Score is calculated in two primary parts: a Static Assessment of Maturity (the Bottleneck Principle) and a Dynamic Assessment of Speed (the Velocity Multiplier).

Table 1: Foundational Readiness Level Definitions (1-9) for Engineers

Level	**TRL (Technology Readiness Level)**	**MRL (Manufacturing Readiness Level)**	**CRL (Commercialization Readiness Level)**
1	Basic principles observed and reported (Paper Stage).	Manufacturing research identified (No defined process).	Basic hypothesis of commercial viability (Market unknown).
2	Technology concept formulated; practical application defined.	Manufacturing process concept identified; initial materials defined.	Market awareness demonstrated; applications found.
3	Analytical and experimental critical function/proof-of-concept demonstrated (Lab scale).	Manufacturing proof-of-concept demonstrated (Early process identified).	Value proposition mapped against initial customer needs.
4	Component/subsystem validated in a laboratory environment (Breadboard).	Process validated in a production-relevant environment (Pilot line planning).	Early financial model established (Cost/price targets defined).
5	Component/subsystem validated in a relevant environment (Simulated operational context).	Process validated for Low-Rate Initial Production (LRIP) quantities (Preliminary Quality Management System, QMS).	Business model validated for low-volume (Initial sales/contracts).
6	System model/prototype demonstrated in a relevant environment.	Process capable of producing system prototype quantities (Preliminary cost targets met).	Exploitation routes confirmed (Key value chain partnerships formed).
7	System prototype demonstrated in an operational environment (Flight or field testing).	Pilot line demonstrated at low volume; early QMS implemented; yield verified.	Commercial model validated; secure initial contracts for scaling.
8	Actual system completed and flight qualified/mission proven (Near production).	Lean, mature manufacturing process capable of meeting all production rates (Stable yield).	Business model and commercial viability validated and scalable.
9	Actual system proven through successful mission operations (Full deployment).	Full-rate production demonstrated and sustained (Optimized, continuous improvement).	Business model proven, capital-efficient, and fully scaled in continuous practice.

2.1 IVR Core Axes and the Bottleneck Principle

These axes synthesize the foundational levels into the prescriptive $\mathrm{IVR}_{\mathrm{Maturity}}$ score.

Table 2: IVR Core Axes Definitions and the Bottleneck Principle (1-9)

Level	TC (Technical Certainty)	PS (Production Scalability)	CV (Capital Viability)
1	Scientific research beginning; no experimental proof of concept.	No defined production process; supply chain is non-existent.	Initial product hypothesis defined; market segmentation is unknown.
3	Analytical proof-of-concept achieved. Key component functions demonstrated in a lab.	Production process demonstrated only at a basic lab level. Initial materials sourced.	Value proposition validated with early customer feedback.
5	Component validated in a relevant, simulated operating environment.	Low-rate production capacity validated for small builds. Preliminary quality metrics established.	Early financial model validated with initial sales. Viability is demonstrated.
7	Full system demonstrated in its intended operational environment. Performance is confirmed.	Pilot line demonstrated at low volume; early Quality Management System (QMS) implemented.	Commercial model validated: established route to market with secure initial contracts.
9	Technology fully mature, integrated into existing systems. Performance verified over time.	Full-rate production running efficiently, stable yield ($> 95\%$), robust QMS, and stable supply chain.	Business model proven, scalable, and capital-efficient in continuous practice.

2.2 The Bottleneck Principle: Static Maturity Assessment

The overall readiness of a technology for scalable adoption is defined not by its highest achievement, but by its weakest link. Scaling a complex system cannot proceed faster than its least mature component. The $IVR_{Maturity}$ enforces this by demanding parallel maturity across three axes, each scored on a 1 (concept) to 9 (full production) scale, synthesized from established metrics:

$$IVR_{Maturity} = \min\left(\mathrm{TC}, \mathrm{PS}, \mathrm{CV}\right) \tag{1}$$

- **Technical Certainty (TC):** Derived from TRL [2, 3], this measures fundamental feasibility and performance in a relevant environment. *Does the physics work in its final context?*
- **Production Scalability (PS):** Derived from MRL [4, 5], this assesses the maturity of the manufacturing process, supply chain, and quality control systems (QMS [5]) required for volume production. This level must be directly tied to hard engineering metrics such as

demonstrated yield rates, Mean Time Between Failure (MTBF), and adherence to production tolerances. *Can we build* 10^6 *units reliably?*

- **Capital Viability (CV):** Derived from IRL and CRL [6, 7, 8], this assesses the market validation, established routes to market, and commercial risk of the venture.[9] *Is the business model proven and capital-efficient?*

2.3 The Velocity Multiplier: Dynamic Assessment

The $IVR_{Maturity}$ is static. The **Velocity Factor (V_f)** provides the dynamic component, rewarding the team's ability to execute the Lean methodology of rapid hypothesis testing and de-risking.

The Velocity Factor (V_f) quantifies the capital efficiency of the de-risking process. It measures how quickly the team retires risk (advances maturity) relative to the time and capital expenditure used—what we term the **Total Capital Burn** or **Cost of Learning**:

$$\text{Velocity Factor}(V_f) = \frac{\Delta\text{Maturity Levels Achieved}}{\text{Total Capital Expenditure (\$)} \times \text{Time Elapsed (Months)}} \tag{2}$$

This metric is highly prescriptive: a low V_f indicates the engineering effort is moving too slowly or burning excessive capital on low-impact tasks. It mandates a shift to rapid, high-consequence experiments that accelerate risk retirement, aligning with Lean and Agile principles.

2.4 The Final IVR Metric

The Final IVR Score combines the absolute risk (Maturity) with the rate of risk retirement (Velocity). The score is not just about *where* the technology is, but *how fast and efficiently* it is getting to full readiness.

$$\text{Final IVR Score} = IVR_{Maturity} \times (1 + V_f) \tag{3}$$

3 The Musk-Test Example: Scaling the High-Pressure Pump

Consider a company developing a new, next-generation, high-performance rocket engine pump that uses specialized, complex internal castings. The goal is to maximize the final IVR score to determine readiness for full production capital allocation.

Scenario: Pump Technology Alpha (Tα)

1. **Technical Certainty (TC):** Full-scale, high-pressure test-stand validation complete. $TC = 7$.

2. **Production Scalability (PS):** The unique internal casting process has poor yield (40% scrap rate) and the supply chain for the exotic metal alloy is unverified for volume. $PS = 4$.

3. **Capital Viability (CV):** Pre-order contracts for the engine are secured, validating the market demand. $CV = 8$

Calculation of Static Maturity

The pump's maturity is constrained by its weakest link: Production Scalability.

$$IVR_{Maturity} = \min(7, 4, 8) = 4$$

- **Insight:** Despite the successful high-performance prototype (TC 7), the technology is only a 4 in readiness. The IVR immediately directs management to focus 100% of resources on improving the casting yield and supply chain.

Calculation of Velocity Factor

The team recently executed a campaign to improve casting yield.

- **Levels Advanced:** The casting yield improved from PS 4 (40% yield) to PS 5 (60% yield). $\Delta\text{Levels} = 1$.
- **Capital and Time Burn:** This campaign cost $1.5 million over 1 month.

$$V_f = \frac{1 \text{ Level}}{1.5 \text{ Million} \times 1 \text{ Month}} = 0.67$$

Final IVR Score

The resulting IVR score is calculated as:

$$\text{Final IVR Score} = 4 \times (1 + 0.67) = 6.68$$

- **Decision:** A score of 6.68 signals progress, but the low $IVR_{Maturity}$ (4) indicates a need for continued, focused effort on PS. To greenlight major production capital, the score must reach a target (e.g., 9.0), which can only be achieved by raising the PS level through dedicated, high-velocity engineering to eliminate the production bottleneck.

4 Conclusion

The IVR Score provides a structured, multi-dimensional evaluation mechanism that is aligned with the rigorous scaling requirements of high-consequence hardware and the rapid iteration required for competitive innovation. By mathematically integrating TRL, MRL, and CRL principles into a single, bottleneck-enforcing metric, and by using the Velocity Factor (V_f) to mandate capital-efficient risk retirement, the IVR transforms technology assessment from a passive status report into an active, prescriptive management tool that values speed and focus above all else. The IVR mandates that technical superiority (TC) cannot mask operational weakness (PS) or commercial failure (CV).

References

[1] NASA. Technology Readiness Levels. NASA Space Communications and Navigation Program.

[2] US Department of Defense. Technology Readiness Level (TRL). AcqNotes.

[3] US Department of Defense. Manufacturing Readiness Level (MRL) Deskbook. DoDMRL.com.

[4] AcqNotes. Manufacturing Readiness Level (MRL) Definition.

[5] ISO 9001:2015 Quality management systems — Requirements.

[6] Blank, S. Investment Readiness Level. Steve Blank Blog.

[7] BINDT. Commercial Readiness Level (CRL) Definition.

[8] Abbas, A. and Nomvar, M. Commercialization Readiness Level (CRL). Wikipedia.

[9] Blank, S. How Investors Make Better Decisions: The Investment Readiness Level. Steve Blank Blog.

[10] AcqNotes. TRL Purpose and Milestone B.

[11] Wikipedia. Technology readiness level.