

HELMETSURE

Helmet Certification Claim Verification Template

A structured S5 diagnostic worksheet for evaluating whether available evidence supports a specific helmet certification claim.

What this template verifies

It evaluates the strength and consistency of evidence behind one certification claim for one defined helmet verification target. It does not certify the helmet, reproduce laboratory testing, or determine overall helmet safety.

Template owner

HelmetSure

Version: 1.0 | Working document

How to Use This Template

This template is designed around the S5 diagnostic sequence: define one central problem, isolate the evidence variables and controls, record quantitative evidence, analyze the results, and finish with a testable next verification action.

	Single-claim rule Run one copy of this template for one certification claim only. If the helmet carries multiple claims, complete a separate verification record for each claim so evidence does not get mixed.
--	---

Recommended Workflow

1	Define the claim - Identify the exact helmet, market, and certification claim you are checking.
2	Collect evidence - Capture physical markings, documentation, and any credible corroborating record available to you.
3	Score evidence - Apply the same 0-3 evidence-strength scale to each core evidence channel.
4	Check consistency - Look for identity mismatches or contradictory information before interpreting the score.
5	Classify and re-test - Assign a bounded result, identify the biggest evidence gap, and define the next verification test.

Evidence-Scoring Boundary

The scoring logic in this template is an operational documentation tool, not an official certification, approval, homologation, legal-compliance, or laboratory-testing standard. A high score cannot override a material identity conflict.

Result Categories

Strongly Supported by Available Evidence	Multiple evidence channels align and no material conflict remains.
Partially Supported / Verification Incomplete	Relevant evidence exists, but one or more important gaps remain.
Evidence Conflict	A material mismatch or contradiction prevents a clean verification result.
Unsupported by Available Evidence	The claim cannot be adequately supported from the evidence collected.
Wrong Verification Target	The evidence belongs to a different model, variant, market, or certification target.

PHASE 1

Research Protocol

Define one certification claim and one exact verification target.

1.1 Central Problem Entity

Unverified Helmet Certification Claim

Everything recorded in this worksheet must serve one question: how well does the available evidence support this specific certification claim for this exact helmet verification target?

1.2 Claim & Helmet Identification

Helmet brand

Helmet model

Model variant / version Include generation, trim, shell version, or other differentiator if shown.

Helmet type / intended activity

Country or market being evaluated

Claimed standard / certification

Certification / approval / homologation / reference number shown Record exactly as displayed; write "Not shown" if absent.

1.3 Exact Claim Capture

Exact certification claim as displayed Transcribe the claim rather than paraphrasing it.

Where the claim appears

☐ Helmet label or marking☐ Owner manual☐ Seller listing☐ Official or certification database☐ Packaging☐ Manufacturer website☐ Certificate / declaration☐ Other: _____

1.4 Problem Statement

Complete the sentence below.

Problem statement

A helmet is presented as complying with or being certified to _____, but the available evidence has not yet been sufficiently checked to determine whether that claim can be supported.

1.5 Primary Objective

Primary question

Does the available evidence consistently support the specific certification claim made for this exact helmet model, variant, and market?

PHASE 2

Variable Identification

Score three evidence channels and hold the verification controls constant.

For this diagnostic, the three core variables are evidence channels. Each is scored from 0 to 3 using the same strength logic: 0 = no usable evidence, 1 = weak, 2 = partial, 3 = strong.

Variable A - Physical Marking Evidence

Record what is physically present on the helmet or its permanently associated labeling. Focus on information that can be connected to the exact product being checked.

- | | |
|--|---|
| ☐ Certification / standard designation | ☐ Certification mark |
| ☐ Approval or reference number | ☐ Model designation |
| ☐ Manufacturer identification | ☐ Production information |
| ☐ Label location recorded | ☐ Markings are legible |
| ☐ Separate markings are internally consistent | |

A SCORE

0 = no usable evidence

—

3 = strong traceable evidence

Physical evidence notes

Variable B - Documentation & Traceability Evidence

Record documentation that can be connected to the exact helmet model or variant being checked.

- | | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Manufacturer documentation | ☐ Product manual |
| ☐ Technical documentation | ☐ Declaration or certificate |
| ☐ Product-specific certification information | ☐ Model / variant references |
| ☐ Approval / reference numbers | ☐ Market information |

B SCORE

0 = no usable documentation

—

3 = strong traceable documentation

Documentation evidence notes

Variable C - Independent Corroboration Evidence

Record whether another credible source supports the same claim. This template does not assume that every certification system provides the same type of public lookup or approval record.

- | | |
|--|--|
| ☐ Certification-body record | ☐ Approval / homologation record |
| ☐ Regulator resource | ☐ Testing / certification database |
| ☐ Official product listing | ☐ Other authoritative verification source |
| ☐ Exact identifiers match | ☐ Source applies to this target |

C SCORE

0 = no corroboration located

—

3 = strong independent corroboration

Corroboration evidence notes

PHASE 2

Verification Controls

Prevent false matches by keeping product identity and claim context stable.

Control 1 - Exact model identity

Do not substitute a similar model.

Recorded model

Control 2 - Variant identity

Do not assume different versions or generations share identical evidence.

Recorded variant

Control 3 - Market / jurisdiction

Keep the market being evaluated fixed throughout the check.

Recorded market

Control 4 - Certification target

Verify only the certification named in Phase 1.

Certification claim

Control 5 - Identification numbers

Copy any approval, certificate, homologation, product, or reference number exactly.

Number shown

Second check completed: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Control 6 - Evidence source

Prefer the original source of a claim or document rather than a copied summary.

Primary source used

Control rule

If a model, variant, market, or key identifier changes during the investigation, stop and redefine the verification target before continuing. Do not merge evidence from different targets into one score.

PHASE 3

Quantitative Evidence Log

Record measurable evidence strength and keep contextual notes separate.

Use the table below as the core evidence log. Score each row 0-3, record the identifier or evidence captured, and mark whether it matches the exact helmet verification target.

Evidence Check	Score 0-3	Identifier / Evidence Found	Matches Exact Target?	Conflict?	Notes / Source
Physical certification marking	—	_____	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	☐ Yes ☐ No	_____
Helmet model identification	—	_____	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	☐ Yes ☐ No	_____
Manufacturer documentation	—	_____	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	☐ Yes ☐ No	_____
Certification documentation	—	_____	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	☐ Yes ☐ No	_____
External / independent record	—	_____	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	☐ Yes ☐ No	_____
Approval / reference number traceability	—	_____	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown	☐ Yes ☐ No	_____

Evidence Source Register

#	Source / Document	Source Type	Identifier Used	Date Checked	Key Finding
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					

PHASE 4

Analysis & Insight Generation

Convert the evidence log into a bounded, explainable result.

4.1 Calculate the Three Core Scores

Evidence Variable	Score	Maximum
A - Physical Marking Evidence	—	3
B - Documentation & Traceability	—	3
C - Independent Corroboration	—	3
	Verification Evidence Score A + B + C = _____ / 9	

4.2 Interpret the Evidence Score

0-2	Insufficient evidence	Not enough usable evidence has been collected to support the claim.
3-5	Limited evidence	Some relevant evidence exists, but important verification gaps remain.
6-7	Substantial evidence	Multiple evidence channels support the claim, but at least one meaningful element remains unresolved.
8-9	Strong supporting evidence	Physical, documentary, and corroborating evidence strongly align.

Important: this score measures evidence strength inside this worksheet. It is not a certification, approval, legal determination, or test result.

4.3 Run the Consistency Check

Consistency Check	Yes	No	Unknown / N/A
Manufacturer name matches across the evidence	☐	☐	☐
Model name / number matches	☐	☐	☐
Variant / version matches	☐	☐	☐
Claimed standard / certification matches	☐	☐	☐
Relevant approval / reference numbers match	☐	☐	☐
Evidence applies to the market being investigated	☐	☐	☐

PHASE 4

Conflict Review & Classification

Do not let a high score override a material mismatch.

4.4 Identify Material Conflicts

- ☐ Certification label names a different standard

☐ Variant / version differs

☐ Approval / reference number differs

☐ External record applies to another product

☐ Claim exists only in seller-provided information

☐ Evidence sources materially contradict one another
- ☐ Model number differs

☐ Manufacturer differs

☐ Documentation applies to another product

☐ Market / jurisdiction does not match

☐ Information cannot be traced to an original source

☐ Other:

Total material conflicts

Most important conflict or uncertainty

Conflict override rule

If a material identity or certification conflict remains unresolved, do not classify the claim as "Strongly Supported by Available Evidence" even when the numerical score is high.

4.5 Diagnostic Result

☐ Strongly Supported by Available Evidence

Use when multiple evidence channels align, the exact target can be traced, and no unresolved material contradiction remains.

☐ Partially Supported / Verification Incomplete

Use when relevant supporting evidence exists, but one or more important verification elements remain unavailable or unresolved.

☐ Evidence Conflict

Use when relevant evidence is materially inconsistent or identifiers fail to match.

☐ Unsupported by Available Evidence

Use when the claim cannot be adequately supported from the evidence collected. This does not automatically prove counterfeiting or non-compliance.

☐ Wrong Verification Target

Use when the evidence belongs to a different model, variant, market, or certification target. Restart using the correct target.

PHASE 5

Testable Verification Hypothesis

Turn the current finding into one specific next evidence test.

5.1 Current Finding

Diagnostic result

Verification Evidence Score _____ / 9

Primary unresolved issue

5.2 Hypothesis**Complete this hypothesis**

My hypothesis is that the certification claim for _____ can be confirmed or rejected more confidently by obtaining _____ and matching _____ against _____.

5.3 Missing Evidence to Obtain☐ Clear physical certification label☐ Exact variant identifier☐ Certification documentation☐ Independent verification record☐ Other: _____☐ Exact model identifier☐ Manufacturer documentation☐ Approval / reference number☐ Market-specific information**5.4 Verification Test Plan**

Source I will check

Identifier I will use

Evidence I expect to find

Pass condition

Fail condition

5.5 Re-Test Record

Re-test date	
New evidence obtained	
Updated A score	____ / 3
Updated B score	____ / 3
Updated C score	____ / 3
Updated total	____ / 9
Updated result	

Updated Result After Re-Test

- ☐ Strongly Supported by Available Evidence
- ☐ Partially Supported / Verification Incomplete
- ☐ Evidence Conflict
- ☐ Unsupported by Available Evidence
- ☐ Wrong Verification Target

Re-test interpretation

Remaining uncertainty

Next action after re-test

Final Verification Record

Use this page as the concise record of the completed certification-claim verification.

Helmet brand

Helmet model

Variant / version

Market / jurisdiction

Certification investigated

Certification / reference number

Final evidence score (0-9)

Number of material conflicts

Final diagnostic classification

Evidence Summary

Most important evidence supporting the result

Most important unresolved limitation

Next verification action

Completion Record

Completed by	Date
Evidence reviewed again by	Date
Record / file reference	Version

Template boundary

This template answers one question: how well does the available evidence support this specific helmet certification claim? It does not independently certify the helmet, reproduce laboratory testing, establish protective performance, assess fit or crashworthiness, or replace an appropriate official certification, regulatory, manufacturer, or testing process.

Appendix - Evidence Scoring Rubric

Use this rubric consistently across the three core evidence variables. The descriptions are intentionally generic so the template can be reused across different helmet certification systems without assuming that every system uses the same labels, databases, or approval process.

0 - No usable evidence	No relevant evidence can be located or the evidence cannot be connected to the verification target.
1 - Weak evidence	A relevant claim or record exists, but key identity, traceability, or source information is absent, unclear, or unreliable.
2 - Partial evidence	The evidence is relevant and contains useful identifying information, but one or more important verification elements remain unresolved.
3 - Strong evidence	The evidence clearly relates to the exact verification target and contains identifiers that can be cross-checked against another relevant source.

Before You Close the Record

- ☐ I verified only one certification claim in this record.
- ☐ I kept the exact model, variant, market, and claim target stable.
- ☐ I recorded evidence sources and identifiers rather than relying only on memory.
- ☐ I scored all three core evidence variables.
- ☐ I checked for material conflicts before assigning the result.
- ☐ I treated the score as evidence strength, not as an official certification result.
- ☐ I documented the next verification action when uncertainty remained.

HelmetSure

Structured helmet education and verification guidance