Asset Intelligence

THE ASSET INTELLIGENCE FRAMEWORK

Asset Intelligence Adoption Model

Framework-level model

PART OF	**The Asset Intelligence framework: Thesis, Definition, Architecture, Maturity Model, Adoption Model, Value Realisation Model**
EDITION	**Edition 1**
PUBLISHED	**18 November 2026**
PERMANENT ADDRESS	**https://assetintelligencediscipline.org/framework/adoption-model**
CREATED BY	**Glider Technology Limited**

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Asset Intelligence Adoption Model, Edition 1, 18 November 2026

The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. Some rights reserved.

This document is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence (CC BY 4.0). You may copy, share and adapt it, including for commercial purposes, provided that you credit Glider Technology Limited as the creator, link to the licence and indicate if you have made changes. The full licence is at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode.en.

How to credit this document: "Asset Intelligence Adoption Model, Edition 1, from The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited. Licensed under CC BY 4.0. Available at https://assetintelligencediscipline.org/framework/adoption-model."

If you adapt this document, you must say so, for example: "Adapted from Asset Intelligence Adoption Model, Edition 1, from The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited, licensed under CC BY 4.0. Changes have been made." Glider's published edition is the reference edition of the framework. You must not present an adaptation as Glider's, or as approved or endorsed by Glider.

What the licence does not cover. The licence applies to the text of this document. It does not cover the Asset Intelligence mark or the Glider logo that appear on it. It also does not give you any right to use the names, logos or trade marks of Glider Technology Limited, including the phrase "find, trust, act", as a trade mark or brand, or in a way that suggests your work comes from or is endorsed by Glider. You are free to quote that phrase, and the rest of the text, under the licence.

No warranty. This document is reference material. It is provided as is, without warranties of any kind, as set out in section 5 of the licence, and it is not professional advice.

Questions about this licence or the framework: info@glidertech.com.

1. Purpose

The Asset Intelligence framework has six documents. The Thesis explains why the problem exists. The Definition names the discipline and what it enables. The Architecture describes what the discipline requires. The Maturity Model describes where an organisation stands and what evidence confirms a transition. The Value Realisation Model describes why the discipline is worth investing in. This document answers the question that connects them: **what do I do next, and in what order?**

The Maturity Model produces the diagnosis: a five-function profile, the conditions met and unmet at each boundary, and the enabler gaps. The Adoption Model turns that diagnosis into a plan. It sets out the mechanisms that drive investment, the moments when those mechanisms have most leverage, how to prioritise across an uneven profile, what the route looks like for different types of organisation, how to scale from pilot to portfolio, and what cultural and behavioural conditions must hold for the discipline to take root.

The gap between diagnosis and action applies with equal force to estate owners (where do I start, what first, how do I sequence?), constructors (how do I make this the default on every project, not just the showcase ones?), and FM providers (how do I build the capability and change procurement behaviour?).

The Adoption Model works at the discipline level, not the product level. An organisation should be able to use it whatever platform it runs. If it reads like an implementation guide for one vendor, it has failed.

2. How the framework documents connect

The six documents answer six questions and form an actionable sequence.

Document	Question it answers
Thesis	Why does this problem exist?
Definition	What is the discipline, and what does it enable?
Architecture	What does the discipline require?

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Document	Question it answers
Maturity Model	Where does my organisation stand, and what does the next level require?
Value Realisation Model	Why is it worth investing?
Adoption Model	**What do I do next, and in what order?**

For a given organisation the sequence runs like this. The Definition establishes what the discipline is and the outcomes it serves. The Architecture specifies what the discipline is composed of: the five functions and the fifteen capabilities they exercise. The Maturity Model assesses the organisation against that capability set and produces a profile: five function-level ratings with pathway context, a record of which transition conditions are met and unmet at the current and next boundary, and the enabler gaps. The Value Realisation Model sets out what the investment returns. The Adoption Model takes all of that and answers which function to invest in first, which mechanisms apply, what the route looks like given organisation type, and how to move from a pilot to portfolio-level practice.

The split between the two models is clean. "Where are you, and what does the next level require?" sits in the Maturity Model. "What do you invest in first, how do you sequence, and how do you scale?" sits here. The Maturity Model assesses. The Adoption Model plans.

3. Consuming the Maturity Model assessment

The Adoption Model carries no assessment methodology or transition conditions of its own. Those live in the Maturity Model, which defines the evidence-based assessment, the transition conditions across all twenty level boundaries, and the enabler requirements at each transition. The Adoption Model consumes the assessment output.

There are two ways into the prioritisation logic. The first is the full evidence-based assessment, which produces a profile against transition conditions with pathway splits and enabler gaps. The second is the public Maturity Indicator, a lightweight self-report that produces a directional five-function profile in minutes. The Indicator is directional and is not a substitute for the evidence-based assessment. It is enough to reach a defensible first move, and that is what makes the framework usable without external support.

The assessment output provides five things this document needs.

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

A maturity profile. Five function-level ratings, with pathway splits where applicable. An organisation at Level 3 in Capture (Create) but Level 1 in Capture (Recover) has a specific shape that implies a specific path. The unevenness is diagnostically valuable and feeds the prioritisation logic in Section 6.

Unmet conditions at the next boundary. For each function, the assessment records which conditions are met and unmet at the next level boundary. These become the transition roadmap. The Adoption Model does not restate the conditions. It uses them to sequence investment.

Enabler gaps. The Maturity Model assesses three enablers at each transition: competency, governance authority, and leadership commitment. Where an enabler is missing, the transition is impossible or fragile regardless of function-level progress. An organisation whose only barrier to Level 3 Information Governance is governance authority has a different path from one that also lacks the function-level conditions.

Pathway context. Create-dominant, Recover-dominant, or dual-pathway, recorded alongside the profile. It shapes prioritisation (Section 6), audience routes (Section 7), and scaling (Section 8).

Boundary judgement calls. Where a [Judgement]-flagged condition decided a boundary, the assessment records the rationale. A judgement that went in the organisation's favour may flag a fragile transition that needs reinforcement. One that went against it may flag a near-miss that needs targeted investment.

4. Adoption mechanisms

Transition conditions describe what must be true. Adoption mechanisms describe what drives organisations to invest in making those conditions true. Six mechanisms operate across the market, and a seventh is specific to the Recover pathway. Their weight differs by audience and context.

Most organisations do not adopt the discipline voluntarily. They adopt it because something external compels or rewards it. Knowing which mechanisms apply to an organisation shapes the conversation, the business case, the sequencing, and the politics of getting investment approved.

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

4.1 Contractual requirements

Information delivery specifications embedded in procurement contracts. The underlying organisational capability is Architecture Capability 1.3 (Supply chain procurement). Mechanism 4.1 is the lever that exercises it. It applies on both pathways:

- **Create pathway.** Exchange Information Requirements (EIR) and supply-chain obligations in construction contracts: what information must be produced, to what standard, and when.
- **Recover pathway.** Contractual change across operational, FM, and supplier contracts during recovery, specifying the standard the supply chain delivers against from the point of change forward. This stops the gap widening while the historical estate is being recovered. The hard work of putting contractual requirements in place during recovery pays forward.

How it drives adoption: Contractual requirements create obligation. An organisation that specifies its information requirements forces its supply chain to deliver structured information whether or not the supplier values the discipline. It is the most powerful mechanism for the Capture function because it shifts the burden from voluntary investment to contractual compliance.

Current state: Weak. Procurement scoring for information delivery quality is rare across the supply chain. Most clients do not know what good information requirements look like in practice, so they do not embed them strongly enough. The mechanism exists in principle but is little used.

4.2 Procurement scoring

Supply chain performance measurement for information delivery quality: scoring handover completeness, accuracy, and timeliness alongside cost and programme. It exercises the same Capability 1.3 from the buyer's side.

How it drives adoption: It creates competitive pressure inside the supply chain. If information delivery quality affects future work allocation, suppliers invest in capability. The mechanism operates mainly on the Create pathway and moves Capture maturity across the market, not just within one organisation.

Current state: Absent in most contexts. A few contractors have invested in production management capability, but this is exceptional. Procurement scoring for information quality is not yet established practice in any sector.

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

4.3 Regulatory compliance

Building Safety Act obligations, the Golden Thread of information, the Government Functional Standard for estates, ISO 19650 information management requirements, and equivalent standards-based obligations that mandate structured asset information.

How it drives adoption: Regulation and mandatory standards create non-discretionary demand. Organisations subject to the Building Safety Act must maintain a Golden Thread. Government estates must comply with the functional standard. ISO 19650 defines information management processes across the lifecycle. Where it is specified in contracts or mandated by public-sector clients, it creates enforceable obligations. Regulatory compliance is the most effective mechanism for the Requirements and Information Governance functions because it sets a minimum that does not depend on commercial justification. Asset Intelligence is the practising discipline that puts ISO 55001 and ISO 19650 into practice. Adoption here builds on those standards, not around them.

Current state: Growing but uneven. The Building Safety Act creates hard obligations for higher-risk residential buildings, and the functional standard does the same for government estates. ISO 19650 is widespread in public-sector construction procurement but less consistent in operations and across the private sector. Enforcement is patchy, and many organisations treat compliance as box-ticking rather than a catalyst. Even in regulated environments, compliance does not automatically become maturity.

4.4 Competitive differentiation

The commercial advantage that accrues to organisations that practise the discipline better than their peers. For constructors, it means winning work on demonstrably better information delivery. For estate owners, it means lower cost and higher performance because information supports better decisions. For FM providers, it means retaining and winning contracts because service quality is visibly grounded in structured information.

How it drives adoption: Competitive pressure drives investment when an organisation can see a peer gaining advantage through the discipline. The advantage exists. The challenge is making it visible enough that organisations invest before they are forced to.

Current state: Emerging. A small number of organisations have invested in information management capability as a differentiator. Most have not. Early adopters gain advantage, but the pressure is not yet strong enough to force fast followers.

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

4.5 Commercial incentive

The Value Realisation Model's four value mechanisms (risk reduction, cost avoidance, decision quality and speed, outcome achievement) used as business-case arguments for adoption investment.

How it drives adoption: Commercial incentive drives adoption when the business case is compelling enough to justify investment. The VRM provides the commercial logic. The Adoption Model provides the route to implementation. Together they answer "why invest?" and "what first?" The strength of the incentive depends on the organisation's ability to quantify the cost of inaction, which the VRM addresses through its cost-of-inaction framing.

Current state: Underused. Beyond FM and real estate functions, the default senior response is "everything's fine now, isn't it?" The commercial case exists but is not yet sharp enough to cross from FM and estates into C-suite budget decisions.

4.6 Peer influence and market education

The market-level effect of more organisations adopting the discipline, creating normative pressure on the rest: conference presentations, industry body endorsements, published case studies, visible peer adoption, and industry frameworks that set expectations for good practice.

How it drives adoption: Peer influence lowers the perceived risk of adoption. When an organisation sees comparable peers practising the discipline and reporting benefits, the barrier drops. Industry frameworks such as the Information Management Initiative (IMI) Framework contribute by setting a sector-level vision. They are not regulatory obligations, but they shift what "good" looks like. This mechanism is slow but durable, and it is the primary driver of market-wide progression beyond the early-adopter phase.

Current state: Very early. Asset Intelligence as a named discipline is new. The IMI Framework articulates the sector-level ambition, but the organisational-level practice that makes it real is not yet established. Peer influence needs visible, credible examples that do not yet exist at scale.

4.7 Evidence-led continuation

This is a Recover-pathway mechanism. Recovery has no capital project to carry the cost of the information work, so the investment must stand on its own evidence base and be re-funded phase by phase. Evidence-led continuation re-funds the next phase of recovery on the measured outcomes of the last. The evidence comes from performance intelligence

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

(Architecture Capability 5.2: outcome verification, value quantification, portfolio benchmarking), and the VRM's per-stakeholder value treatment turns it into business-case language.

How it drives adoption: It keeps Recover-pathway investment alive past the first internal review. Without evidence of value, recovery funding lapses once the initial urgency fades. With it, each phase earns the next.

Current state: Rare. Most recovery is funded as one-off remediation rather than a continuing evidence-led programme, which is why so much of it stalls after the first phase.

4.8 Sequencing mechanisms for adoption planning

An organisation rarely faces one mechanism in isolation. In practice several apply at once, with different weight at different points in the journey. The guidance below connects mechanism selection to adoption stage.

Getting started (Level 1 to Level 2). The most effective triggers are regulatory compliance and contractual requirements: they create non-discretionary demand that justifies initial investment without a complex internal case. Commercial incentive (cost-of-inaction framing) supports the case where regulation alone is insufficient. The organisation is moving from "we do not do this" to "we do this in at least one context", and the mechanism needs to create enough obligation or urgency to break inertia.

Building capability (Level 2 to Level 3). Regulatory compliance provides the floor, but the move from fragmented to structured practice needs internal commitment that regulation cannot create. Commercial incentive becomes the primary driver. Procurement scoring begins to apply for organisations with supply chains. Competitive differentiation starts to show as peers move up. The mechanisms shift from "we must" to "it is in our interest to do this well."

Embedding and optimising (Level 3 to Level 4 and beyond). Competitive differentiation and commercial incentive dominate. Regulatory compliance is a baseline, not a driver. Peer influence accelerates as more organisations operate at Level 3 and above. The mechanisms shift from "we should" to "this is how we compete."

The point is not that organisations should activate mechanisms in this order. It is that different mechanisms have different leverage at different stages. An organisation trying to move from Level 1 to Level 2 on a competitive-differentiation argument is working against the grain. One at Level 3 still framing investment purely as regulatory compliance is leaving value on the table.

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

5. When to adopt: moments where mechanism leverage peaks

Mechanisms describe what drives investment. This section names the moments when their leverage peaks. Adoption is most achievable at specific points in an organisation's commercial and operational cycle. Miss them and the same change costs more and lands harder.

Each moment names the dominant mechanism it activates and the first move the prioritisation logic typically points to, so the timing axis and the sequencing axis connect.

Procurement boundaries. Re-procurement of FM contracts and capital programme contract awards, whatever the procurement route. Mechanisms 4.1 (contractual requirements) and 4.2 (procurement scoring) are at their strongest. The estate owner uses re-procurement to embed information requirements. The constructor uses procurement scoring as a competitive lever. The FM contractor uses re-procurement to differentiate. First move: a contractual reset of information requirements.

Contract changes. FM renewal or transition, supplier replacement, novation. Accumulated information governance failure becomes visible to a fresh party. This is the strongest opportunity to reset standards and to evidence the cost of inaction. First move: Requirements, restated against the inherited position.

Capital programme starts. Feasibility, business case, gateway one. This is the moment to specify information requirements before they are inherited from the previous programme. First move: Requirements.

PFI expiries and concessions handover. This is the point at which 25-year operational concessions return assets to the public sector. It is an underused window. First move: Requirements across the returning estate before any survey.

Regulatory triggers. Building Safety Act registration, Awaab's Law compliance in housing, ISO 19650 certification commitments. Each moves information requirements from optional to necessary. First move: Requirements and Information Governance against the specific obligation.

Resource pressure and operational constraint. Reduced resources, constrained budgets, efficiency targets. Efficiency-under-constraint is a primary trigger, particularly at the Level 1 to Level 2 transition: the discipline gives constrained organisations a way to do more with

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

less. Resource pressure often drives the move toward better information management more strongly than compliance or capability-investment framing does. It usually works through commercial incentive (Mechanism 4.5). First move: the weakest function that blocks the most value, framed as cost taken out.

Strategic reviews. Net-zero baseline programmes, portfolio rebalancing, M&A due diligence, board scrutiny after an incident. Each opens the widest window for leadership commitment, the enabler that gates everything above Level 2. Commercial incentive (Mechanism 4.5) carries the case. First move: usually the binding constraint the review has exposed, or closing the Use loop where the review is about performance.

These moments create leverage. They do not gate the first move. An organisation can reach that on its own through the Maturity Indicator and the prioritisation logic. That is the self-serve path the open framework promises.

6. Prioritisation logic

Not every organisation should start with the same function. The Maturity Model reveals an uneven profile. The Adoption Model gives structured guidance on where to invest first.

The public demonstration of the flow is the live Maturity Indicator.

6.1 General prioritisation principles

Invest in the weakest link that blocks the most value. An organisation at Level 3 in Capture but Level 1 in Information Governance is capturing information that degrades because it is not governed. Further Capture investment before Information Governance produces diminishing returns. The priority is the function whose weakness constrains the value of the functions around it.

Requirements before Capture for new programmes. Capturing information without knowing what you need produces expensive data with no decision value. For any new programme, Create or Recover, Requirements should come before or alongside Capture.

Information Governance is nearly always urgent. It is consistently the weakest or second-weakest function across organisations of all types, and it is the function that protects every other investment. Capturing information without governing it creates a liability, not an asset.

Use is the payoff, not the starting point. Use sits at Level 1 for most organisations and holds the highest unrealised value. But investing in Use before Information Governance and

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Delivery reach Level 3 and above produces analytics built on untrustworthy information. Use investment should follow upstream maturity, not precede it.

Address enabler gaps before or alongside function-level investment. An organisation that lacks governance authority cannot sustain Level 3 Information Governance however well the function-level conditions are designed. Where the Maturity Model assessment identifies enabler gaps at the target transition, the adoption plan must address them. Enabler gaps are often the binding constraint, not a secondary concern.

Pitch each step at the next level, in the simplest form that achieves the outcome. The requirements, processes, standards and systems put in place at each step should be no more complex than the organisation can adopt at its current level. A design specified for Managed or Intelligent practice, put to an organisation at Absent or Fragmented, goes unadopted however sound it is. Some complexity is unavoidable, given the breadth and importance of the information the discipline governs. The test for each element is whether the outcome at the next level needs it. The design grows as maturity rises.

6.2 Pathway-specific prioritisation

Recover pathway entry. Typically driven by operational pain: compliance exposure, maintenance inefficiency, capital planning uncertainty, or an incident that exposed information gaps. The typical sequence starts with Requirements: define what is needed about the existing estate, and assess it against what already exists, recognising and evaluating current holdings before commissioning surveys. Information Governance comes next: structure and validate what already exists before new capture. Many organisations hold more than they realise, scattered and untrusted rather than absent. Then Capture: commission recovery surveys and operational update for the genuine gaps. Then Delivery: make the recovered information accessible at the point of decision. Then Use: measure whether the recovery is delivering operational value. The Recover pathway has different economics: there is no construction project to absorb the cost, so the investment stands on its own. For that reason performance intelligence (Architecture Capability 5.2) should be established early, not held back as the final payoff. It is the evidence capability that keeps the recovery funded across a sustained programme. Without it the Recover business case fails at the first internal review. This is the basis of Mechanism 4.7, Evidence-led continuation.

Create pathway entry. Typically driven by project delivery: BIM mandates, employer's information requirements, construction contract obligations. The typical sequence starts with Requirements: define what the project must produce and why, tied to operational

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

objectives, not just compliance. Then Capture: production management so the supply chain delivers against requirements. Then Information Governance: structure handover information into an asset-centric model with validation and accountability. Then Delivery: connect the governed layer to operational systems. Then Use: measure whether the information drives the outcomes it was created to serve. The Create pathway has a structural advantage: the construction project is a natural forcing function for Requirements and Capture. The risk is that investment stops at handover. Information captured during construction degrades the moment the building is operational unless operational update mechanisms are adopted alongside handover.

Dual-pathway prioritisation. Prioritise where the greatest risk or value concentration sits, which is almost always the existing estate (Recover pathway). The existing estate typically carries the majority of operational risk, cost, and compliance exposure. New builds benefit from structured handover but are a small share of the portfolio. In practice, apply Create-pathway discipline to active projects through to handover, while investing the strategic effort in Recover-pathway maturity for the existing estate. The two run in parallel because they converge on the same governed information layer and share Delivery and Use infrastructure.

6.3 Decision framework for uneven profiles

The general principles and pathway sequences describe the common patterns. In practice most organisations present uneven profiles. The framework below addresses the five most common.

Pattern 1: one function significantly behind the others. Example: Level 3 in Capture and Information Governance, Level 1 in Requirements. The organisation does things well but does not know whether it is doing the right things. The lagging function is almost certainly the binding constraint. Bring it to Level 2, then Level 3, before investing further in the functions already ahead.

Pattern 2: upstream functions ahead, downstream behind. Example: Level 3 in Requirements and Capture, Level 1 in Information Governance and Delivery. The organisation captures information but does not govern or deliver it, so the upstream investment is depreciating. Information Governance first (protect the investment already made), then Delivery. Do not invest further upstream until Information Governance reaches at least Level 2.

Pattern 3: downstream functions ahead, upstream behind. Example: Level 3 in Delivery, Level 1 in Information Governance, Level 2 in Capture. This pattern is rarer. It occurs where

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

an organisation has built integration and reporting on information it has not governed. The dashboards look sophisticated but the information behind them is unreliable. Information Governance first, then work back to Requirements and Capture. This usually needs a difficult conversation with stakeholders who believe the organisation is more mature than it is.

Pattern 4: enabler gaps blocking transition. Example: Level 2 across the board, with no governance authority beyond the estates team. The organisation can evidence Level 2 but cannot sustain Level 3 anywhere because Level 3 needs cross-functional governance authority that does not exist. Address the enabler gap directly: this is an organisational design problem requiring leadership commitment, not a technical one. No function-level investment crosses the Level 3 boundary until the structural authority is in place.

Pattern 5: a single function rating masks a Create/Recover split. Example: Capture reads Structured on the strength of project delivery, while the inherited or existing estate is effectively Absent. The single rating flatters the organisation and points the first move at the wrong function. The rule: where pathway context is dual, test each function rating against both pathways before sequencing, and treat the weaker pathway as the binding constraint wherever the existing estate carries the risk and value concentration. This is the pattern the function-level Indicator cannot resolve on its own. That is why the dual-pathway note and the Recover-first logic carry the load until an evidence-based assessment splits the pathways.

In all cases the framework runs on one principle: invest where the return is highest and the constraint is binding. Functions and enablers already at or above the organisation's practical ceiling are lower priority than those actively preventing progression.

7. Audience-specific adoption routes

The discipline is one discipline. The route differs by starting position and organisation type. Three routes operate within the single model. Each targets the specific Maturity Model transition conditions for the functions named.

7.1 Estate owners

Estate owners hold buildings as long-term investments or operational necessities. Their horizon is decades. They capture value from all four VRM mechanisms, with decision quality and speed, and outcome achievement, disproportionately valuable because the decisions

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

they inform (capital allocation, disposal timing, major refurbishment) are the largest in the lifecycle.

Typical entry point: Recover pathway. Most estate owners manage existing buildings where structured information was never created or has degraded. Entry is Requirements (what do we need about our existing estate?) or Information Governance (how do we structure and trust what we already hold?).

Adoption pattern: Diagnosis comes first: assess current state across the five functions. For most estate owners the profile reveals Information Governance or Requirements as the weakest function, and governance authority as the most common enabler gap. Then a pilot takes a representative subset to Level 3, producing evidence against the transition conditions, not just process adoption. Then portfolio rollout extends the work by risk, compliance exposure, or value concentration. This is where the compounding effect begins.

Capabilities to watch: Data security (Architecture Capability 3.4) sits under Information Governance. Estate owners need a data security policy for sensitive asset information as part of the governed layer, not as an afterthought.

Scaling constraint: Usually organisational capacity, not technology: governance authority, budget across cost centres, and the willingness to treat information investment as a portfolio programme rather than a building-by-building project.

Dominant mechanisms: Regulatory compliance for initial justification, commercial incentive (cost-of-inaction) for scaling beyond the regulatory minimum, and competitive differentiation for those treating information as a strategic asset.

Value narrative: The VRM compounding effect is strongest here. Every year of governed information makes the next year's decisions better. The cost of delay is not linear. Start now, because the information asset appreciates from the moment you begin governing it.

7.2 Constructors

Constructors operate on project timescales with margin pressure and handover obligations. Value runs mainly through risk reduction and cost avoidance, with competitive differentiation as the strategic upside.

Typical entry point: Create pathway. Entry is Capture (how do we produce information to standard on every project?) and Requirements (how do we help clients specify what they need, so we deliver against clear expectations?).

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Adoption pattern: Codification comes first. A mature constructor starts from existing capability that has not been formally codified, not from deficiency. Many Tier 1 contractors already manage information better than their clients require, so the question is how to codify and scale what they already do well. Standardisation follows: extend codified processes across all projects, not just showcase ones. The key move is Capture and Information Governance from Level 2 to Level 3, against the specific Maturity Model transition conditions. Then differentiation: use the codified capability as a competitive lever. The message is that we hand over buildings that perform in operations because we manage the information that enables performance.

Capabilities to watch: Supply chain procurement (Architecture Capability 1.3) is the constructor-side capability for specifying information obligations into supply chain contracts. It is the practice underneath Mechanisms 4.1 and 4.2 and the lever that makes supply chain compliance enforceable rather than aspirational.

Scaling constraint: Supply chain consistency. Every subcontractor, work package, and project must operate to the same information standard. This is an information production management challenge (Capability 2.1).

Value narrative: Codifying and differentiating existing capability, not catching up. Risk reduction and cost avoidance provide the immediate case (less handover remediation, lower contractual risk). Competitive differentiation provides the strategic one.

7.3 FM providers

FM providers operate buildings under service agreements with defined SLAs, margin targets, and contractual risk. Their horizon is the contract term, typically three to seven years.

Typical entry point: Information Governance (how do we structure and trust the information we inherit?) or Delivery (how do we make it accessible to operational teams at the point of decision?). FM providers often inherit information at contract start and must rapidly assess its quality and fill gaps.

Adoption pattern: Baseline comes first. At mobilisation, assess the quality and completeness of inherited information against operational requirements. The critical question is whether it is a foundation to build on or a liability to manage around, and most FM providers do not ask it formally. Then capability: build information management into service delivery as a standing capability, covering operational update, validation, and governed change control. The FM provider is both consumer and producer of asset

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

information. Genuine capability means governing all operationally relevant information, not just the compliance minimum in the CAFM. Then service differentiation: position the capability in renewals and bids.

Capabilities to watch: Data security (Architecture Capability 3.4) bears directly on FM contractor data handling. It is part of the governed layer the provider is accountable for, not a separate IT concern.

Scaling constraint: Methodology portability. The approach must adapt to different client contexts (systems, requirements, maturity) without being redesigned for every contract. The methodology is the intellectual property, not the data.

Value narrative: Cost avoidance and risk reduction provide the business case (engineer productivity, first-time-fix improvement, fewer SLA breaches). Contract retention and market positioning provide the strategic case.

8. Scaling patterns

Adoption without scaling is a pilot that stays a pilot. This section describes how organisations move from initial adoption to portfolio-level practice.

8.1 Why scaling fails

Most organisations that adopt at pilot level do not scale to portfolio level. Four failure modes account for the majority of stalled adoptions.

Dependency on individuals, not infrastructure. The pilot works because specific people made it work. When they move, it stalls. Portfolio operation needs infrastructure (defined processes, governance authority, embedded roles) that survives personnel change. If the pilot cannot be run by someone other than its designer, it is not ready to scale.

Business case does not survive escalation. The pilot produces good results within its scope, but portfolio investment needs board or executive approval from people who may not see why information management warrants strategic investment. The case must speak to outcomes in language and at a scale that lands at board level. The VRM provides the framework. The pilot must produce the evidence.

Governance authority does not extend. The pilot ran within a team or site where local authority was enough. Scaling needs cross-functional governance authority that often does

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

not exist, the Level 2 to Level 3 enabler gap the Maturity Model identifies. Without it, scaling is structurally impossible regardless of how well the pilot performed.

Technology deployed before process is defined. The organisation buys platform infrastructure before defining the processes, standards, and governance it should support. The technology creates an appearance of progress while the discipline gaps remain. This is common where the case was technology-led ("we need a new platform") rather than discipline-led ("we need to govern our asset information").

8.2 Pilot to portfolio

The general pattern applies across all audiences, with audience-specific variation in Section 8.3.

Phase 1: prove the methodology. Select a representative scope. Take the priority function to Level 3. Measure outcomes against the Maturity Model transition conditions, not just process adoption. The test: can you demonstrate a measurable operational, compliance, or financial outcome, and can someone other than the pilot lead replicate the method?

Phase 2: build the business case. Use the pilot evidence to construct the scaling case. The VRM provides the commercial framework, the Maturity Model the diagnostic, and the pilot the proof point. Address the enabler requirements for the next level explicitly, because portfolio investment fails without the governance authority and leadership commitment to sustain it.

Phase 3: scale the infrastructure. Extend process, governance, and technology together. Process: defined standards and workflows that do not depend on individual expertise. Governance: authority and accountability that extend across the portfolio. Technology: platform capability that supports the process and governance. Scaling technology without the other two produces the fourth failure mode above.

Phase 4: embed the discipline. Make Asset Intelligence the default, not the exception. This is organisational change, not technology deployment. The discipline is embedded when information management is how the organisation operates. The Maturity Model captures this in the Level 4 to Level 5 leadership-commitment requirement: information treated as a strategic asset that is part of the organisation's identity.

8.3 Audience-specific scaling patterns

The patterns track the audience routes in Section 7, so only the scaling-specific point is restated here. **Estate owners** scale across buildings and sites, geographically or by risk, with

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

each tranche increasing the value of cross-portfolio intelligence. The binding constraint is governance authority and budget across cost centres. **Constructors** scale across projects and supply chains by embedding information management into delivery procedures. The binding constraint is supply chain consistency, which is where procurement scoring and contractual requirements (Capability 1.3) become the enforceable levers. **FM providers** scale across contracts and clients by standardising a portable methodology. The binding constraint is adapting to different client contexts without redesigning from scratch each time.

9. Culture and behaviour as an enabling layer

Organisations that adopt the discipline successfully do not just implement processes and technology. They change how people think about information. Culture, behaviour, and people decide whether the discipline takes hold or dies when sponsorship lapses.

The Adoption Model treats culture and behaviour as an enabling layer, not a sixth function. The five functions describe what needs to happen. The enabling layer describes the organisational and behavioural conditions that let it happen.

9.1 Three enablers

The Maturity Model assesses three enablers at each transition: competency, governance authority, and leadership commitment. The assessment produces an enabler profile alongside the function-level profile. The Adoption Model uses it to qualify the route and to identify where organisational change is needed before or alongside function-level investment.

Competency. The people practising the discipline must have the skills to do so, and not only the specialists: the operational staff, project managers, FM engineers, and decision-makers who consume and contribute to the information layer. If contributing or using information makes people's lives harder, they will not comply whatever the mandate. Competency is held through any of three valid paths (direct employment, external partnership, managed service). It can sit in either of two valid practitioner lineages: Information Management, rooted in ISO 19650 and BIM-derived practice, and Asset Management, rooted in ISO 55001 and IAM / GFMAM practice. The asset-owner-side practitioner often comes from an AM

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

background. The constructor-side practitioner often comes from an IM background. Both are valid, and the framework holds both. This matters for adoption planning: an asset-owner team demonstrating the discipline through AM competence applied to information should not be assessed as lacking competency because it does not hold IM-labelled credentials. The detail sits in the Maturity Model, Section 6.1.

Governance authority. Someone must hold the organisational authority to set standards, mandate compliance, and escalate non-compliance. Without it, information management is voluntary, and voluntary practice does not survive organisational pressure. Governance authority is the enabler most often missing when an organisation stalls at a boundary, particularly Level 2 to Level 3 where authority must extend beyond the originating team.

Leadership commitment. Senior leadership must treat asset information as a strategic asset, not a technical overhead. This is the precondition for sustained investment. Without it, information management is funded as a project with start and end dates rather than as a standing capability. Where the "so what?" challenge goes unanswered beyond the FM and estates function, the discipline does not take root at organisational level.

9.2 How enablers shape adoption

The enabler assessment has direct implications for the plan. The common pattern is that an organisation can evidence function-level conditions up to a point, but the enablers for the next transition are missing, creating a ceiling that no function-level investment will break through.

The plan must address enabler gaps explicitly, as organisational change work rather than information management work. **Competency gaps** are closed through recruitment, training, partnership, or managed service. Distinguish specialist competency (which can be bought) from cultural competency (which must be built over years). **Governance authority gaps** are closed through organisational design: roles with the right scope, positioned at the right level, backed by executive mandate, which usually needs leadership commitment to authorise. **Leadership commitment gaps** are the hardest and most consequential. You cannot train an executive into caring about information management. The route is evidence: pilot outcomes in terms the executive cares about. The VRM and the pilot evidence together form the case. If it does not land, the ceiling holds.

9.3 Enabler requirements by transition level

The Maturity Model holds the enabler requirements as the single source. This is the directional summary the adoption plan reads. The requirements vary by function.

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Governance authority at a Capture transition differs from governance authority at an Information Governance transition. For the precise requirement at a given function and level, refer to the Maturity Model transition conditions and its Section 6.

Transition	Competency	Governance authority	Leadership commitment
Level 1 to 2	At least one individual who understands the discipline (IM or AM lineage)	Informal, within a team or function	Sponsorship: someone senior supports the initiative
Level 2 to 3	Defined roles with information management responsibilities	Formal, cross-functional in scope	Investment: budget and resources allocated
Level 3 to 4	Standing organisational capability with dedicated resource	Enterprise-wide, with enforcement	Strategic integration: information treated as a board-level concern
Level 4 to 5	Advanced specialist analytical and technology skills	Strategic, enterprise data governance	Cultural embedding: information as part of the organisation's identity

The biggest step change is Level 2 to Level 3, where all three enablers cross a structural boundary: from individual to organisational competency, from informal to formal authority, from sponsorship to funded investment. This is why Level 3 is where most adoption stalls. The function-level conditions are achievable. The enabler requirements are a different kind of organisational commitment.

© Glider Technology Limited 2026. The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited.
Licensed under CC BY 4.0: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/