

Robotics fleets: credit, recovery and continuity risk

Where emerging fleet financings depart from conventional equipment analysis

SUMMARY

- Specialist robotics financing remains predominantly private and early-stage. Capital-markets structures are beginning to appear: Circus SE placed an asset-backed robot financing in April 2026. No publicly rated robot-fleet ABS has been identified to date.
- For emerging proprietary fleets the distinctive credit issue is **servicer-collateral correlation**. Where the manufacturer also supplies software, maintenance and integration capability, its distress can impair servicing continuity and the productive value of the equipment at the same time.
- Physical recoverability therefore needs to be assessed separately from **productive recoverability**. In-place value may depend on software rights, credentials, tooling, spares, hosted services and customer arrangements surviving or transferring through enforcement.
- Public robotics-specific default and recovery history remains limited. Until it develops, analysis would need to rely more heavily on observable asset-level performance, continuity arrangements, analogous equipment data and conservative recovery scenarios.

1. Where the asset class currently sits

Venture investment in global robotics and physical AI reached \$26B in 2025 and had passed \$23B by 20 May 2026.¹ Most of that is equity. The debt alongside it is predominantly private: equipment lease lines, vendor finance, and specialist lessors purchasing fleets onto their own balance sheets to lease to end users.

Capital-markets structures have begun to appear. In April 2026 Circus SE placed a seven-figure asset-backed bond through Finexity, in which a special purpose vehicle acquired the company's autonomous kitchen units and leased them back under a long-term arrangement, alongside a framework for further tranches of up to €50M.² The placement was retail and unrated.

The market shows several characteristics associated with an early-stage securitisable asset class: increasingly deployed fleets, multi-year customer contracts and specialist balance-sheet financing, set against limited standardised performance data and little demonstrated secondary-market recovery. Whether these portfolios become securitisable will depend in part on whether the risks below can be made observable and transferable.

Transaction archetype

This note considers fleet financings in which a robotics manufacturer or operator originates deployed equipment or long-term service contracts and remains materially involved in software, maintenance or fleet operation after financing. The end customer may be the contractual obligor; a special purpose vehicle may own the units; and the manufacturer may simultaneously be sponsor, servicer and technology provider. The Circus structure, in which the manufacturer is also the operator and lessee, is an unusually concentrated example of that overlap. The decomposition below maps onto a conventional structured-finance split, with recovery risk in place of market value risk and continuity risk covering operational and technology risk.

2. Credit risk

Much of this is conventional: obligor quality, liquidity and runway, contracted backlog, counterparty credit, and utilisation against contracted capacity. Concentration is often pronounced, since these transactions are frequently supported by a small number of large customer contracts.

The distinctive feature follows from the role overlap. Customer default and manufacturer distress are different events with different consequences. If the customer defaults, the manufacturer's support capability is unaffected, and the units may be redeployed. If the manufacturer fails, servicing capacity and the productive value of the collateral can deteriorate together.

In mature equipment markets, obligor default and asset recovery can usually be analysed as distinct drivers, even where they become correlated in stress. Certain emerging robotics structures introduce a more direct dependency: **where the manufacturer is also the primary servicer and technology provider, its distress can simultaneously impair servicing capacity and the collateral's productive value**. Recovery assumptions would therefore need to contemplate a joint sponsor and servicer distress scenario rather than an orderly asset sale in isolation.

3. Recovery risk

Residual value for a deployed robotics fleet follows age, condition and market depth, and is joined by a further variable: whether the operating stack behind the units continues to be supported. A fleet in good physical order with an unsupported control stack may be worth materially less than the same fleet with its operating stack intact.

Three recovery states are worth separating: **in place**, with firmware support, spares, tooling and customer arrangements intact; **redesigned** to another operator; and **liquidated** as hardware. Which state is available depends not only on physical condition but on whether software, service and customer arrangements survive or transfer through enforcement. Physical recoverability and productive recoverability should be assessed separately.

Secondary-market evidence is uneven. Established industrial platforms have functioning aftermarkets supported by integrators and independent service organisations; for newer proprietary platforms evidence can be thin and configuration-specific, and recoverability may depend on how much of a deployed configuration transfers without the original manufacturer.

OBSERVABLE AT ASSET LEVEL · serial-level install base and configuration; spares inventory and lead times; third-party maintainability and the presence of independent service providers; comparable secondary transactions for the specific platform and generation; dependency of unit function on vendor-hosted services.

4. Continuity risk

Equipment-finance frameworks already recognise servicing and originator-continuity risk, including where a lessor carries maintenance or service obligations. Robotics can make that dependence deeper. Productive operation may rely not only on maintenance but on proprietary software, credentials, calibration data, hosted services, integration knowledge and site-specific configuration, none of which transfers automatically with the physical asset. The question is whether that warrants an explicit analytical layer between credit and recovery.

Operational continuity

For some emerging proprietary fleets, the manufacturer may initially be the only party holding the software access, tooling, spares and integration knowledge required for full-service support. Whether an independent service ecosystem has developed around a platform is observable, and it changes the analysis materially.

Backup servicing is the conventional mitigant. Appointment of a backup servicer does not by itself transfer rights to third-party cloud services, model providers, interfaces, customer systems or proprietary credentials; those dependencies need to be identified and separately secured where material. Transferability should therefore be established rather than assumed, including whether maintenance, hosting and customer agreements are assignable on enforcement and whether operational access travels with the assignment.

Technology continuity

The physical platform, the firmware and software stack, and any model or hosted layer evolve on different cadences, while the financing remains outstanding across all of them. A technical assessment performed only at origination can become stale well before the debt matures, which bears on monitoring frequency as much as on initial sizing.

Where proprietary software is material to continuity, source-code escrow may mitigate part of the risk, but code availability is not the same as restartability. A restart may also require the build environment, firmware toolchain, calibration data, model weights and agent configurations, access to required signing and authorisation mechanisms, compatible dependencies, service documentation and spares. The existence of an escrow does not establish that it is operationally sufficient.

OBSERVABLE AT ASSET LEVEL · contractual status of each key counterparty and of dependencies outside the transaction perimeter; assignability of maintenance, hosting and customer agreements; where credentials and operational access reside; familiarity of any named backup with the deployed configuration; escrow scope tested against a restart.

5. The evidentiary position

There is little publicly available, standardised robotics-specific performance history from which to derive standalone default and recovery assumptions, particularly for newer software-dependent fleets. Decades of industrial automation leasing experience exist, and some robotics exposure sits unidentified within broader equipment portfolios, but neither is organised in a form supporting platform-level calibration.

Until that history develops, analysis would need to place greater weight on structural and operational evidence, analogous asset classes and conservative scenario assumptions. Systematic asset-level diligence has a secondary effect: it produces structured observations of a class that currently has few, which is the raw material calibration later requires.

6. A worked case

When Picnic, a robotics company automating commercial pizza production, entered an assignment for the benefit of creditors on 11 May 2026, one customer reported being left with roughly \$250,000 of installed but idle equipment; the company's assets and intellectual property were subsequently sold to an undisclosed buyer.³ The public reporting does not establish which technical or contractual dependency prevented continued operation, and the same customer was sufficiently engaged to bid for the assets.

For a secured lender, the question it raises is what would have been required to keep the fleet running, and who controlled it.

7. What a methodology would need to establish

- The transaction roles of customer, obligor, sponsor, servicer and technology provider, and where they overlap.
- Whether recovery is assessed in place, after redeployment or through liquidation, and which rights preserve each state.
- The assumed correlation between manufacturer or servicer distress and collateral impairment.
- Transferability of customer, maintenance, hosting, software and other material operating rights on enforcement.
- Whether continuity arrangements are operationally sufficient rather than merely documented.
- Dependence on parties outside the transaction perimeter and the consequences of their withdrawal.
- Serial-level asset and configuration records, with independently verifiable operating data.
- Secondary-market evidence for the relevant platform, generation and configuration.
- Monitoring frequency appropriate to material change in software, support, utilisation and physical condition.

Several resolve into measurable variables, such as availability, mean time between failure and to repair, intervention rate, spare-part availability, the proportion of a fleet on supported software, redeployment time and utilisation.

Mihir Parikh · Founder, SOMA Assurance · mp@soma-assurance.com · soma-assurance.com

Instrumentation and electrical engineering, then software development, followed by fifteen years across technology, data and physical assets: connected-vehicle systems at Jaguar Land Rover; technology diligence and residual-value forecasting at LeasePlan; and predictive-maintenance analytics at The AA. Subsequently technical and operational diligence for investors in technology businesses. MBA from London Business School.

Notes. (1) PitchBook data reported by The Wall Street Journal, May 2026: global venture investment in robotics and physical AI of \$26B in 2025 and in excess of \$23B as of 20 May 2026. (2) Circus SE and Finexity AG announcements, 13 April 2026. (3) GeekWire, "Robot pizza startup runs out of dough: Picnic shuts down, sells assets to mystery buyer", May 2026. This note sets out a risk decomposition and the evidence required to support it, and is intended as a basis for discussion rather than as a rating framework.

© 2026 SOMA Assurance. All rights reserved. May be circulated in full with attribution.

Provided for information and discussion among professional counterparties. Not investment, legal or accounting advice, and not a recommendation in relation to any security or transaction. Contains no scoring thresholds, weights or calibration, and no non-public information relating to any issuer or transaction.