

PROVENANCE FRAMEWORK

Public consultation draft v0.2

Public consultation copy: 14 August 2026

Source prepared: 21 July 2026

Revision: Tier X-led summary + right-to-reply clarification

These classifications are independent editorial assessments of evidenced production routes. They are not legal country-of-origin determinations, certification of British Made status, accredited standards, approvals or endorsements, or assessments of compliance with origin, advertising or consumer-protection rules. Tier level does not judge quality, company nationality or lawfulness.

The 14 August consultation revision keeps every physical tier threshold unchanged, adds a derived maker summary for directory presentation, and clarifies that maker participation can strengthen the evidence record but is not a prerequisite to responsible classification. Physical product classifications remain authoritative.

Evidence and consultation comments: thebritishbench.com/corrections

Document control

This document defines the proposed editorial methodology used by The British Bench to describe where and how modern watches associated with Britain are designed, manufactured, assembled, regulated, tested and serviced.

Version 0.2 incorporates the first five-maker pilot. It remains a working draft and should be tested across a broader maker sample before becoming The British Bench Provenance Framework v1.0. Direct maker evidence may strengthen or correct a record but is not a prerequisite where sufficient current evidence already supports a responsible classification.

The standard is intended to create:

- consistent classifications;
- model-specific provenance records;
- clear evidence requirements;
- precise production terminology;
- transparent reasons for every tier;
- a practical route showing what prevents a maker from reaching the next tier.

It is not currently an accredited certification scheme, legal country-of-origin ruling, quality award, warranty, endorsement or judgement of value.

1. Research basis

The framework has been informed by the following standards, legal approaches and certification systems:

- ISO 22095:2020, Chain of custody — General terminology and models, including its 2026 amendment;
- ISO 22095-2:2026, concerning mass-balance chain-of-custody systems;
- ISO 22095-3:2026, concerning book-and-claim systems;
- the Swiss legal framework governing the use of “Swiss” and “Swiss Made” for watches;
- UK consumer and advertising requirements concerning accurate, non-misleading country-of-origin claims and documentary substantiation;
- the Made in Britain collective trademark’s concept of substantial and transformative manufacturing;
- ISO 3159, concerning mechanical wrist chronometers;
- ISO 22810, concerning water-resistant watches;
- COSC, METAS Master Chronometer, Poinçon de Genève and Fondation Qualité Fleurier approaches to controlled testing, reference records, inspections and complete-watch assessment.

1.1 Conclusions drawn from the research

No existing standard performs this exact task

No reviewed framework provides a graded, model-level scale showing the depth of British involvement in a watch’s movement, case, dial, hands, assembly, regulation and testing.

The British Bench therefore requires a purpose-built editorial classification.

Chain of custody alone does not prove a claim

A provenance system must define:

- the precise claim being made;
- the product or model to which it applies;
- the relevant geographic and production boundaries;
- the evidence supporting the claim;
- the method used to connect that evidence to the finished product.

A record-keeping system is not, by itself, evidence that a component was made in a stated location.

Cost percentages are not suitable as the primary tier test

The Swiss Made system uses manufacturing-cost thresholds alongside required Swiss activities. That is appropriate for a legally protected national indication, but it does not answer The British Bench's central editorial question: what physical work was performed, and where?

Luxury pricing, research expenditure, overheads and finishing costs could cause a cost-based percentage to obscure the physical origin of major components.

The British Bench will therefore classify makers primarily through documented production activities, not percentages of retail price or manufacturing cost.

Transformation matters

The concept of a substantial and transformative change is useful when distinguishing component manufacture from decoration or finishing.

The standard must distinguish:

- making a dial from a blank;
- substantially transforming a genuine unfinished component;
- decorating, printing, painting or polishing a substantially complete imported component.

Provenance and performance must remain separate

Chronometer certification, water-resistance testing, magnetic resistance and durability standards concern performance or conformity. They may strengthen a maker's testing record but must not raise its provenance tier.

A watch can be technically excellent and sit in Tier IV or Tier V. A Tier I watch is not automatically more accurate, durable or better value.

Product-specific records are preferable to mass balance

The British Bench will not allow a maker to attribute British production to one model merely because equivalent British work occurs elsewhere in its total output.

Classification must be connected to the actual model, collection or clearly defined production run being described.

2. Purpose

The standard answers one primary question:

What substantive work relating to this watch is verifiably performed within The British Bench's qualifying territory?

It records the provenance of:

- technical development;
- movement and movement components;
- case;
- dial;
- hands;
- external components;
- movement assembly;
- watch assembly;
- regulation and timing;
- testing and final quality control;
- servicing and after-sales support.

3. What the standard does not measure

A tier does not measure:

- quality;
- beauty;
- finishing standard;
- accuracy;
- durability;
- water resistance;
- innovation;
- heritage;
- rarity;
- price;
- value for money;
- production volume;
- employment created;
- company ownership;
- the nationality of a founder;
- whether a reader should buy the watch.

These may be reported separately but do not increase a provenance tier.

4. Proposed geographic scope

4.1 Qualifying territory

For pilot testing, the proposed qualifying territory is:

- England;
- Scotland;
- Wales;
- Northern Ireland;
- Isle of Man;
- Bailiwick of Jersey;
- Bailiwick of Guernsey.

This is an editorial scope designed to include the United Kingdom and Crown Dependencies while preserving exact geographic descriptions.

4.2 Mandatory location wording

The site must not replace a precise location with the word “British” where greater accuracy is available.

Examples:

- “Glasgow, Scotland”
- “Stamford, England”
- “Isle of Man”
- “Belfast, Northern Ireland”
- “Biel, Switzerland”

4.3 Open decision before v1.0

The final public standard must decide whether the phrase British manufacture is appropriate as the umbrella term for the full proposed territory, or whether public wording should instead use:

“manufactured within The British Bench qualifying territory”

The exact production location will always remain visible.

5. Unit and scope of classification

5.1 Primary unit: model or defined collection

The primary classification unit is the current watch model or a collection whose models share the same evidenced production route.

A classification must not be awarded solely at company level where watches use different suppliers, movements, workshops or assembly arrangements.

5.2 Permitted scopes

Every classification must carry one scope label:

- Model
- Collection
- Defined production run
- Uniform maker
- Split-tier maker

5.3 Uniform maker classification

A single physical maker-level tier may be displayed only where all current regular-production families share the same qualifying tier.

Minor cosmetic differences do not create a separate family. A change in principal component origin, movement manufacture, assembly location or qualifying production process does.

5.4 Derived maker summary

Where current production routes differ, The British Bench may publish a separate directory aid labelled Tier [X]-led. This is not a physical provenance tier and must never replace the classifications of the individual models, collections or production routes.

A Tier [X]-led summary may be shown only where all three conditions are met:

- at least 80% of the maker's complete current regular-production family denominator has a published physical tier;
- Tier [X] is the unique predominant (most-common) published physical tier among those classified families; and
- at least 70% of the complete current regular-production family denominator qualifies at Tier [X] or a higher physical tier.

The predominant-tier condition prevents a catalogue from being labelled Tier III-led, for example, merely because every Tier II watch also satisfies the weaker Tier III threshold. Current eligible families without a published physical tier remain in the denominator. They must not be removed because research is incomplete.

Public copy should normally state the underlying family count, for example:

Tier II-led

5 of 6 current production families qualify at Tier II or above.

The percentage may be retained as an internal calculation or methodology disclosure, but the maker directory should prefer the family count so the result is not presented as a quality score or league table.

5.5 Current classified range

Where more than one current physical tier has actually been published, the profile must also show the classified range.

Example:

Current classified range: Tier II–III

An Under review or Unverified family does not create an inferred endpoint in that range. Only published physical tiers may appear in the range.

5.6 Maker-summary family denominator

The denominator is based on distinct current regular-production model families or production routes, not shop SKUs. Cosmetic dial colours, straps or other variants sharing the same evidenced production route count as one family.

A distinct principal component origin, movement-manufacturing route, assembly location or qualifying production process normally creates a separate family.

Special editions, prototypes, bespoke commissions, discontinued models and historical production methods do not normally count in the current maker-summary denominator. They remain visible at their proper model or historical scope.

Sales volume, flagship status, retail price and marketing prominence do not alter the family weighting. Each eligible family counts once.

5.7 Directory and filter treatment

A maker with a Tier [X]-led summary should be labelled explicitly as Tier [X]-led, never simply Tier [X] unless a uniform physical maker classification exists.

Where current classified routes span more than one physical tier, the maker should remain discoverable through each represented tier filter. The detailed profile must identify the models or collections supporting every physical tier.

5.8 Production status

Every classified model or collection must use one production-status label:

- Current and orderable
- Current made to order
- Current — order book paused
- Temporarily unavailable
- Discontinued
- Historical production route
- Announced or planned
- Status not confirmed

Announced capability and historical production must not classify a current model.

6. Core classification principles

6.1 Physical work takes priority

Ownership, nationality, brand identity and design do not substitute for physical manufacture or watchmaking.

6.2 Highest fully satisfied tier

A watch receives the highest physical tier for which every mandatory activity requirement is evidenced.

There is no points system and no averaging between tiers.

6.3 Physical tier and evidence status are separate

Every record must publish two independent conclusions:

Physical tier

- Tier I
- Tier II
- Tier III
- Tier IV
- Tier V

Evidence status

- Confirmed — independently documented
- Confirmed — direct maker evidence
- Confirmed — detailed published primary evidence
- Provisional — strong evidence with defined gaps
- Under review
- Unverified

Missing evidence must not be disguised as a lower physical tier. Where the apparent activity is clear but a mandatory detail remains unresolved, the record may state a provisional tier.

6.4 No assumed processes

A process not evidenced is recorded as:

- Not publicly stated
- Claimed but process undisclosed
- Evidence incomplete
- Conflicting evidence
- Does not occur within the qualifying territory

It is not inferred from company location, job titles, photographs, machinery ownership or marketing wording.

6.5 Broad marketing phrases are investigation leads

The following phrases do not establish a tier by themselves:

- hand built;
- assembled in Britain;
- made in Britain;
- British made;
- in-house;
- manufactured movement;
- end-to-end manufacture;
- tested in Britain;
- regulated to chronometer grade.

Each phrase must be translated into defined, model-specific physical processes.

6.6 Current production takes priority

Current model evidence outranks:

- historical production;
- discontinued models;
- old press releases;
- former suppliers;
- prototype announcements;
- future capacity.

A live webpage is not sufficient proof that the described process remains current.

6.7 Capability is not production

Owning machinery or employing a watchmaker does not prove that the machinery or person is used for the classified model.

6.8 Supplier work may qualify

Qualifying work does not have to be performed in-house.

Work by a supplier within the qualifying territory may qualify where:

- the supplier and location are identified or confidentially verified;
- the process is described;
- the component is traceable to the classified model;
- the maker controls or specifies the relevant production requirements.

The public record may protect a supplier's identity where commercial confidentiality is justified, but The British Bench must know enough to verify the claim.

6.9 Provenance and process depth remain distinct

Timing positions, accuracy tolerances, pressure-test methods, observation periods and certification may be published as process-depth fields.

They do not raise a tier beyond the physical production activities required by that tier.

7. The five provenance tiers

Tier I — Integrated Manufacture

Brief definition

The movement is substantially manufactured within the qualifying territory, multiple other principal component families are made there, and the complete watch is assembled, regulated and tested there.

Mandatory requirements

All of the following must be met.

A. Substantial movement manufacture

The movement's architecture may be original, licensed or collaboratively developed, but the classified movement must be physically manufactured to a substantial degree within the qualifying territory.

At minimum, the evidence must establish:

- manufacture of the mainplate;
- manufacture of the principal bridges;
- manufacture within the qualifying territory of at least three substantial functional groups from the following list:
 - going train;
 - barrel and power-delivery components;
 - winding and keyless works;
 - escapement or regulating-organ components, excluding commercially sourced hairsprings;
 - calendar, chronograph or other principal complication mechanism.

An alternative may be accepted where the maker evidences that a clear majority of the movement's functional components, excluding jewels, mainsprings, hairsprings and other recognised specialist components, are manufactured within the qualifying territory.

Movement assembly from a purchased kit does not satisfy this requirement.

B. Two further principal component families

At least two of the following must also be materially manufactured within the qualifying territory:

- case;
- dial;
- complete hand set.

C. Complete domestic watchmaking

The following must occur within the qualifying territory:

- movement assembly;
- movement finishing necessary to complete the calibre;
- lubrication;
- dial fitting;
- hand fitting;
- casing-up;
- post-casing timing;
- regulation or rejection where outside tolerance;
- functional testing;
- final quality control.

D. Current regular production

The qualifying process must apply to a current regular-production model, clearly defined made-to-order model, or repeatable bespoke production method.

E. Imported specialist parts disclosed

Imported specialist parts are permitted, including:

- jewels;
- mainsprings;
- hairsprings;
- crystals;
- seals;
- straps;
- certain bearings, screws or industrial components.

Their use must be stated clearly and must not be presented as domestic manufacture.

Does not qualify

- decorating a finished imported movement;
- replacing a rotor or bridge;
- assembling a complete imported movement;
- manufacturing only the case, dial or hands;
- manufacturing an isolated movement component;
- restoring historical movements;
- one experimental prototype;

- a single exceptional limited edition used to classify the whole maker.

Published tier wording

The tier must include a qualifier such as:

Tier I — Integrated manufacture: movement, case, dial and hands

Route to Tier I

A Tier II maker must bring substantial, repeatable movement manufacture into the qualifying territory and satisfy the two-additional-component requirement.

Tier II — Principal Component Manufacture

Brief definition

At least one principal horological component family is genuinely manufactured within the qualifying territory, and the finished watch is assembled, regulated and tested there.

Mandatory requirements

All of the following must be met.

A. One principal component family manufactured

At least one of the following must be materially manufactured within the qualifying territory:

- movement or a substantial movement mechanism;
- case;
- dial;
- complete hand set.

B. Substantial transformation

The domestic process must create the component from raw material, stock or a genuine unfinished blank, or produce a substantial functional transformation.

Examples that may qualify:

- machining a case body from metal stock or a genuine forging blank;
- creating a vitreous enamel dial from a metal blank;
- forming and completing a porcelain dial;
- cutting and shaping a complete hand set;
- manufacturing movement plates, bridges, wheels or a substantial mechanism.

C. Complete British watch assembly

The model must also undergo within the qualifying territory:

- dial fitting;
- hand fitting;
- casing-up;
- post-casing timing;
- regulation or rejection where outside tolerance;
- functional testing;
- final quality control.

D. Repeatable current production

The qualifying component must be used in current, repeatable production and be traceable to the classified model or collection.

Does not qualify as principal component manufacture

- painting a substantially complete imported dial;
- printing a logo or indices on a substantially complete imported dial;
- applying lume alone;
- engraving an imported case;
- polishing or coating an imported finished case;
- heat-bluing or polishing imported finished hands;
- installing a decorative rotor;
- making a strap, box or packaging;
- manufacturing only a buckle or caseback;
- performing repair or restoration work.

These activities may be credited as domestic finishing, decoration or customisation.

Published tier wording

Examples:

Tier II — Dial manufacture and British assembly

Tier II — Case manufacture and British assembly

Route to Tier I

The maker must add substantial domestic movement manufacture and manufacture at least one further principal component family so that the Tier I movement and component requirements are met.

Tier III — British Watch Assembly and Regulation

Brief definition

The principal components are manufactured internationally, while the complete watch is materially assembled, timed, regulated and released within the qualifying territory.

Mandatory requirements

All of the following must form part of the normal production route for the classified model.

A. Watch assembly

The qualifying workshop must perform:

- incoming component inspection;
- dial fitting;
- hand fitting;
- casing-up;
- stem and crown fitting or verification;
- complete functional operation after casing.

A completed imported watch head does not satisfy this requirement.

B. Post-casing timing

Every completed mechanical watch must be measured after final casing against a documented house acceptance tolerance.

The public record must state, where available:

- timing equipment;
- number of positions;
- measurement duration;
- acceptance tolerance.

The number of positions is a process-depth disclosure, not a universal tier threshold.

C. Corrective regulation or controlled rejection

Where a watch falls outside the house tolerance, the British workshop must:

- mechanically regulate it;
- perform defined rework; or
- reject it from release.

Taking a reading without a corrective or rejection process is timing measurement, not regulation.

The final result must be rechecked after intervention.

D. Functional testing

Each completed watch must be checked for all applicable functions, including:

- winding;
- setting;
- crown positions;
- hacking;
- date or calendar change;
- chronograph or other complications;
- hand clearance;
- hand and indication alignment.

E. Final release quality control

Every completed watch must receive:

- final visual inspection;
- final functional inspection;
- a defined pass/fail release decision;
- authority to reject or return the watch for rework;
- a record linked to the serial number or a controlled production batch.

Water-resistance disclosure

For every model carrying a water-resistance rating, the record must state:

- whether every watch or production samples are tested;
- method;
- test pressure;
- testing location;
- traceability.

Individual domestic pressure testing strengthens the process record but is not a universal Tier III gate.

A watch assembled and regulated within the qualifying territory but pressure tested abroad may remain Tier III. The overseas testing must be clearly disclosed.

Does not qualify

- importing a completed watch head;
- attaching a strap;
- replacing a caseback;
- packaging or dispatch;
- checking only whether the watch runs;
- taking one timing reading without a tolerance or corrective process;
- relying solely on an overseas factory's assembly and QC;
- checking occasional finished watches while the remainder arrive complete.

Permitted qualifier

Domestic dial painting, engraving, polishing, hand finishing or other meaningful work should be stated:

Tier III — British assembly and regulation with in-house dial painting

It does not elevate the watch to Tier II unless a principal component is genuinely manufactured.

Route to Tier II

The maker must establish repeatable manufacture of at least one principal component family within the qualifying territory and connect it to the classified model.

Tier IV — British Design and Product Development

Brief definition

Original model design and substantive product definition are led by a British-based team, while physical manufacture and final assembly occur abroad.

Mandatory requirements

A. Original product definition

A British-based team must control the original specification of the watch rather than select a substantially complete catalogue product.

B. Model-specific design responsibility

Published or directly confirmed evidence must establish British responsibility for several of the following:

- case geometry and dimensions;
- dial layout and construction;
- hand design;
- movement or complication specification;
- materials and finishes;
- bracelet or strap integration;
- performance and acceptance requirements.

Internal CAD files and supplier documents are strong evidence but are not mandatory public artefacts.

C. Development responsibility

The British-based team must lead or materially control several of the following:

- prototyping;

- technical revisions;
- supplier feedback;
- sample approval;
- production acceptance criteria;
- final product sign-off.

This may be established through detailed primary evidence or direct maker confirmation.

D. Overseas production disclosed

The manufacturing and assembly countries must be stated where known.

Does not qualify

- UK company registration alone;
- British ownership alone;
- a British founder alone;
- applying a logo to a catalogue watch;
- selecting colours and straps from a supplier catalogue;
- UK marketing, warehousing or distribution;
- heritage claims without current development activity.

Route to Tier III

The maker must move the complete assembly, post-casing timing, regulation, functional testing and final release process described in Tier III into the qualifying territory.

Tier V — British Brand or Identity

Brief definition

The verified British connection is principally ownership, headquarters, heritage, naming, retail or marketing rather than substantive design, manufacture or watch assembly.

A Tier V record may include:

- British company ownership;
- a British founder;
- British headquarters;
- a historical British name;
- British retail, distribution or customer service;
- British-themed product naming or design cues.

Requirements

- The British connection must be real and accurately described.

- There must be insufficient evidence to satisfy Tier IV.
- Known overseas manufacturing and assembly locations must be stated.

What Tier V does not mean

Tier V does not mean that a watch is:

- poor quality;
- deceptive;
- overpriced;
- unoriginal;
- undesirable;
- mass-produced;
- unworthy of coverage.

Route to Tier IV

The maker must establish and evidence original, substantive British product design and technical development meeting all Tier IV requirements.

Unverified — Outside the tier system

Definition

Available evidence is insufficient, stale, conflicting or too broad to support a responsible classification.

Unverified must be used where:

- claims are vague;
- public evidence remains insufficient after process-specific questions remain unanswered or unresolved;
- sources conflict;
- evidence relates only to discontinued models;
- supplier or location changes cannot be resolved;
- the process cannot be connected to the classified model;
- a maker claims work but provides no adequate documentary or direct evidence.

Unverified is not Tier VI and must not be presented as a negative score.

8. Production terminology

The following terms have fixed meanings within this standard.

8.1 Manufactured

A component is manufactured where raw material, stock or a genuine unfinished blank undergoes processes that create its essential geometry, structure or functional identity.

8.2 Substantially transformed

A component is substantially transformed where domestic work changes an unfinished input into the recognisable, functional principal component used in the completed watch.

Surface treatment alone is normally insufficient.

8.3 Finished or decorated

Finishing or decoration alters appearance or surface condition without creating the component's essential structure.

Examples include:

- painting;
- printing;
- polishing;
- engraving;
- coating;
- heat treatment for colour;
- decorative movement finishing.

8.4 Movement manufacture

Creation of functional movement components from raw material or unfinished stock.

8.5 Movement assembly

Construction of a functioning movement from separate movement components, including fitting, lubrication and functional checks.

Installing a complete movement into a case is not movement assembly.

8.6 Watch assembly

The process of creating the complete watch head from movement, dial, hands, case and related components.

8.7 Dial fitting

Securing and aligning the dial to the movement or holder, including clearance and function checks.

8.8 Hand fitting

Installing the hands at correct heights and alignment, followed by clearance and indication checks through an appropriate operating cycle.

8.9 Casing-up

Installing the dialled and handed movement into the case, completing stem and crown arrangements, securing the movement and closing the case.

8.10 Timing measurement

Measuring rate, amplitude, beat error or positional variation.

Measurement alone is not regulation.

8.11 Regulation

An intentional mechanical correction, rework or controlled rejection process used to bring a movement or completed watch within a documented acceptance tolerance.

8.12 Adjusted to positions

Technical work intended to reduce rate differences between multiple orientations.

This is a stronger claim than measuring or regulating in several positions.

8.13 Post-casing timing

Timing performed after final assembly and case closure.

8.14 Observation period

A documented period during which the complete watch is allowed to operate so intermittent faults, rate drift or functional issues may be detected.

The duration must be stated.

8.15 Pressure or leak testing

Testing of the completed case at a defined pressure or vacuum using an identified method and pass/fail result.

8.16 Functional testing

Checking every applicable user-operated and mechanical function of the completed watch.

8.17 Final quality control

A documented per-watch release decision after completion of all required inspections and tests.

A casual visual glance is not final quality control.

8.18 Servicing

Diagnosis, disassembly, cleaning, replacement or repair, lubrication, reassembly, regulation and testing performed after sale or use.

Customer-service administration alone is not servicing.

9. Evidence standard

9.1 Evidence hierarchy

Level A — Independently documented or directly observed

Examples:

- a documented workshop visit by The British Bench;
- production records inspected by The British Bench;
- traceable test records;
- independent certification or audit covering the relevant process;
- verifiable supplier confirmation.

Level B — Detailed direct maker confirmation

A dated written response from an authorised technical or production representative that:

- identifies the model or collection;
- identifies the location;
- describes the process;
- distinguishes in-house and supplier work;
- identifies imported inputs;
- permits publication or confidential editorial reliance.

Level C — Detailed published primary evidence

Examples:

- current technical product pages;
- official workshop pages;
- manuals;
- current technical documents;
- official process videos;
- company-authored production descriptions.

Level C evidence may confirm a tier where it is sufficiently detailed, current, model-connected and internally consistent.

Level D — Reliable secondary evidence

Examples:

- detailed interviews;
- independent workshop reporting;
- reputable specialist publications;
- supplier case studies.

Level D evidence may support a record but should not normally establish Tier I or Tier II without primary evidence.

Level E — Unverified claim

Examples:

- unsourced marketing language;
- retailer descriptions;
- repeated press-release wording without process detail;
- photographs without context;
- forum statements.

Level E evidence cannot establish a mandatory requirement.

9.2 Minimum evidence by tier

Tier I

One of:

- Level A evidence supported by Level B or C;
- Level B evidence supported by current Level C;
- multiple detailed Level C sources that identify the integrated process, model or production method, location and material imported exceptions.

Tier II

Level A, B or detailed Level C evidence specifically describing the qualifying component manufacture and its connection to the model.

Tier III

Level B or detailed Level C evidence covering the assembly, post-casing timing, corrective regulation process, functional testing and final release.

Where one defined detail is absent but the physical route is otherwise strongly evidenced, the record may be Provisional Tier III.

Tier IV

Level B or detailed Level C evidence establishing British-led model design and product development, alongside evidence of overseas manufacture and assembly.

Tier V

Reliable evidence of the stated British company, ownership, headquarters, heritage or operating connection, with insufficient evidence for Tier IV.

9.3 Evidence-status rules

Confirmed — detailed published primary evidence

May be used where Level C evidence is:

- current;
- model-specific or production-method-specific;
- process-specific;
- internally consistent;
- sufficient to satisfy every mandatory tier requirement.

Provisional

Used where:

- the apparent physical tier is strongly supported;
- one or more defined mandatory details remain unresolved;
- the unresolved point could change the final classification or qualifier.

The public record must list the gap.

Under review

Used during an active evidence challenge, supplier change or production transition.

Unverified

Used where the physical tier cannot responsibly be determined.

9.4 Public claim labels

Each significant production claim must use one of:

- Verified — independently documented
- Verified — directly confirmed by maker
- Verified — published primary evidence
- Supported — reliable secondary evidence
- Claimed — process not disclosed
- Not publicly stated
- Conflicting evidence
- Historical only

- Does not occur within qualifying territory

9.5 Confidential evidence

Confidential evidence may support a classification only when:

- The British Bench has inspected enough information to verify the process;
- the reason for confidentiality is credible;
- the public record states that confidential evidence was relied upon;
- the classification can be rechecked;
- confidentiality does not prevent disclosure of the broad activity and location.

A request for secrecy is not evidence.

10. Evidence boundaries and traceability

Every classification record must define:

- maker;
- model or collection;
- production period;
- movement reference;
- relevant suppliers or supplier status;
- production locations;
- qualifying activities;
- excluded activities;
- evidence dates;
- standard version used.

Evidence must connect the claimed activity to the finished model.

The following are insufficient:

- showing that the company performs the activity for some products;
- owning the machinery required;
- employing a person capable of the work;
- stating total British production without model allocation;
- using British-made components in a different collection.

11. Evidence age and review periods

11.1 Normal review period

A published classification should normally be reviewed every 12 months.

11.2 Higher-risk review period

A six-month review should apply where:

- suppliers are changing;
- production is being transferred;
- a new facility is being commissioned;
- the record relies on a temporary arrangement;
- major claims are caveated;
- the maker has announced future domestic production.

11.3 Immediate recheck triggers

A record must be rechecked when:

- a model is materially revised;
- the movement changes;
- a principal supplier changes;
- assembly moves;
- a maker closes or opens a facility;
- credible contradictory evidence is received;
- the maker challenges the classification with new evidence.

11.4 Expired evidence

A classification is not automatically removed when its review date passes, but it must display:

Review overdue

A materially stale record may be moved to Unverified.

12. Classification procedure

Step 1 — Define the claim unit

Identify the model, collection or defined production run.

Step 2 — Record production status

Determine whether it is current, made to order, paused, unavailable, discontinued, historical or planned.

Step 3 — Map the production chain

Record:

- technical development;
- movement;
- case;

- dial;
- hands;
- watch assembly;
- regulation;
- testing;
- final quality control;
- servicing.

Step 4 — Assign evidence to each activity

Record source level, date, location, model connection and any unresolved gap.

Step 5 — Test Tier I

Determine whether every physical Tier I requirement is met.

Step 6 — Test Tier II

Where Tier I fails, test Tier II in full.

Step 7 — Test Tier III

Where Tier II fails, test complete British watch assembly and regulation.

Step 8 — Test Tier IV

Where Tier III fails, test substantive British design and development.

Step 9 — Test Tier V

Where Tier IV fails, document the genuine British identity or company connection.

Step 10 — Assign evidence status

Choose confirmed, provisional, under review or unverified independently from the tier outcome.

Step 11 — Determine maker scope and summary

If all current regular-production families share one published physical tier, a uniform maker tier may be shown.

If routes differ, preserve each model or collection classification and calculate the separate maker summary only from explicitly eligible current regular-production families.

A Tier [X]-led summary requires at least 80% classification coverage, Tier [X] to be the unique predominant published physical tier, and at least 70% of the complete current family denominator at Tier [X] or above.

Unclassified current families remain in the denominator.

Display a current classified range only from physical tiers that are actually published.

Step 12 — Produce the decision statement

Every decision must explain:

- physical tier;
- evidence status;
- classification scope;
- production status;
- why the watch qualifies;
- exact qualifying work;
- imported components and overseas work;
- why the next tier is not met;
- unresolved evidence gaps;
- review date.

13. Maker-facing tier decision

Every public profile should publish the following block.

Current physical classification

Tier [number] — [name]

or, where routes differ:

Current classified range: Tier [number]–[number]

Derived maker summary

Where the Section 5.4 thresholds are met, the profile may additionally show:

Tier [number]-led

[X] of [Y] current production families qualify at Tier [number] or above.

This summary is a directory aid. It is not a physical tier awarded to every watch from the maker.

Evidence status

Confirmed / Provisional / Under review / Unverified

Classification scope

Model / collection / defined run / uniform maker / split-tier maker

Production status

Current and orderable / made to order / paused / unavailable / discontinued / historical / planned

Why it qualifies

A concise list of every mandatory requirement evidenced.

Qualifying work

The exact production activities occurring within the qualifying territory.

International work and imported components

The movement, components and processes performed elsewhere.

Process depth

Where known:

- timing tolerance;
- timing positions;
- regulation process;
- observation duration;
- pressure-test method and location;
- final QC traceability.

These fields do not act as a hidden quality score.

Why the next tier is not currently met

A factual gap statement, not criticism.

Route to the next tier

The additional physical production and evidence required.

Evidence gaps

Any unresolved point preventing confirmed status.

Evidence and review

Source level, source date, next review date and methodology version.

14. Route-to-next-tier rules

The route must describe production requirements, not marketing improvements.

It must not say:

- provide better wording;
- change the website claim;
- call the process “manufacture”;
- increase British branding.

It may say:

- manufacture a regular-production principal component domestically;
- move dial and hand fitting, casing and regulation into a British workshop;
- introduce documented post-casing multi-position timing;
- implement per-watch final QC records;
- manufacture movement plates, bridges and functional groups domestically;
- provide model-specific evidence connecting the activity to production.

Supplying stronger evidence may change a tier only where the underlying qualifying activity already occurs.

15. Testing and quality disclosures

Performance and testing claims are recorded separately from provenance tier.

Fields may include:

- house timing tolerance;
- number of timing positions;
- timing duration;
- post-casing timing;
- actual regulation process;
- positional adjustment;
- COSC or other certification;
- pressure-test method;
- individual or sampled testing;
- test pressure and location;
- power-reserve testing;
- magnetic-resistance testing;
- shock testing;
- observation period;
- final QC record type.

These fields must be evidenced.

They do not raise a provenance tier beyond the physical production activities required by that tier.

A maker may have a deeper testing programme without receiving a higher provenance tier. A maker may also receive Tier III while disclosing that a specialist pressure test occurs abroad, provided the mandatory British assembly, timing, corrective regulation and final release processes occur within the qualifying territory.

16. Corrections, challenges and appeals

16.1 Right to submit evidence

Makers, suppliers, employees, watchmakers, collectors and readers may submit corrections or supporting evidence.

A maker response is not required where sufficient current evidence already supports a responsible classification. Non-response is not negative evidence and does not by itself lower a tier or create an Unverified outcome. Where a mandatory point genuinely remains unresolved, the record must reflect that evidence gap through the appropriate Provisional, Under review or Unverified status.

16.2 No right to editorial control

A maker may correct factual errors and provide evidence but cannot approve the final editorial conclusion.

16.3 Review process

A challenge must be assessed against:

- the standard version in force;
- current model-specific evidence;
- the same requirements applied to other makers.

16.4 Temporary status

A classification may be marked:

- Under review
- Evidence requested
- Reclassification pending

16.5 Public change record

Material changes must be recorded publicly with:

- date;
- previous tier;
- new tier;
- reason;
- evidence basis;
- methodology version.

17. Version control

17.1 Minor revisions

A minor version, such as v1.1, may:

- clarify wording;
- add examples;
- improve evidence labels;
- define an existing process more precisely.

It must not materially change tier thresholds without a full recheck.

17.2 Major revisions

A major version, such as v2.0, is required where:

- tier requirements change;
- new tiers are introduced;
- qualifying geography changes;
- evidence thresholds change materially;
- classification outcomes may change.

All active records must be reviewed when a major version takes effect.

18. First pilot findings incorporated into v0.2

The first pilot tested:

- Roger W. Smith;
- anOrdain;
- Fears;
- Christopher Ward;
- Bremont.

The pilot produced the following principal revisions:

1. uniform and split-tier maker classifications;
2. tier outcome separated from evidence status;
3. production-status labels;
4. Tier III refocused on provenance rather than fixed quality thresholds;
5. water-resistance testing moved to a mandatory disclosure rather than a universal tier gate;
6. detailed published primary evidence allowed to confirm a tier;
7. Tier IV internal design documents treated as strong evidence rather than mandatory public artefacts;
8. broad marketing wording expressly excluded as standalone proof.

19. Direct evidence and right-to-reply testing

Before v1.0, the revised standard should continue to be tested across makers with materially different production routes. Current public primary evidence may support a classification without maker participation where it is sufficiently detailed, current, route-connected and internally consistent.

Makers should still be invited to correct, clarify or supplement the record. Direct process questions should seek:

- current model scope;
- component starting form and manufacturing location;
- exact assembly operations;
- post-casing timing and regulation policy;
- pressure-testing method and location;
- final release and traceability records;
- current versus historical production status;
- permission to publish or rely confidentially on any additional evidence supplied.

A response may strengthen, correct or change a classification, but silence is not treated as evidence against the maker and does not give a maker editorial control over the outcome.

20. Questions still open before v1.0

1. Should a complete domestically manufactured hand set remain sufficient as the sole Tier II principal component?
2. What minimum proportion or functional scope should satisfy the alternative Tier I movement-majority test?
3. How should quartz, hybrid and electronic movements adapt the Tier I and Tier III timing rules?
4. When is a controlled batch QC record sufficient instead of a serial-level record?
5. How should partially domestic cases be treated where rough machining and final machining occur in different countries?
6. Should a domestically manufactured complication module qualify for Tier II when the base movement is imported?
7. What exact public umbrella wording should cover the UK and Crown Dependencies?
8. How should confidential supplier evidence be presented without creating an unverifiable public claim?
9. When should a provisional classification expire when defined mandatory evidence gaps remain unresolved?
10. Do the 80% classification-coverage gate, predominant-tier safeguard and 70% Tier-led threshold remain appropriately conservative after a broader maker sample is completed?

21. Provisional decision statement

Version 0.2 adopts the following governing principle:

A tier describes evidenced physical production connected to the classified watch. Evidence status describes how securely that conclusion is supported. Neither is a judgement of quality.

And the following scope principle:

Physical tiers remain model-, collection- or route-specific. Where current routes differ, a maker may receive a clearly labelled Tier [X]-led directory summary only when the 80% classification-coverage gate, unique predominant-tier safeguard and 70% whole-range threshold are met. The summary does not transfer provenance between watches.

End of Public Consultation Draft v0.2

Next action: Continue maker-by-maker application of v0.2 using current primary evidence, invite makers to correct or supplement the record, broaden the sample across different production models, and review the consultation thresholds before v1.0.