Asset Intelligence

THE ASSET INTELLIGENCE FRAMEWORK

Asset Intelligence Maturity 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/maturity-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 Maturity 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 Maturity 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/maturity-model."

If you adapt this document, you must say so, for example: "Adapted from Asset Intelligence Maturity 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 Architecture defines the fifteen capability areas across the five functions of Asset Intelligence. This Maturity Model describes how far along an organisation is in practising the discipline.

The model is evidence-based. Level assignment at each function is determined by whether the organisation can evidence that defined transition conditions hold, not by recognition against narrative descriptions. The model carries the conversation-level summary that supports discovery, and the structured assessment detail that supports adoption planning. Both layers sit in the same document.

Information Governance is singled out here because it is the function on which the discipline structurally depends. Practitioner and adopter input consistently ranks Information Governance as the top or joint-top function the discipline must hold. The Maturity Model carries that weight in two places: in the assessment of the Information Governance function itself (Section 5.3), and in the enabler layer (Section 6), where governance authority is the enabler most often missing when an organisation stalls at a level boundary.

The model comes first and the methodology follows. The document opens with the five levels and the capability set, then sets out the transition conditions that make up the model. The methodology comes after the model, where it serves operational use.

2. The five levels at a glance

Maturity across the five functions is expressed as five independent level ratings. Uneven profiles are the norm. The unevenness is diagnostically valuable.

Level	Name	Summary
1	Absent	No structured approach to asset information. Information exists in scattered, person-dependent silos.
2	Fragmented	Some structured activity exists but it is inconsistent, disconnected, and dependent on individual initiative.
3	Structured	Defined processes and standards exist. Functions operate with consistency within their scope but are not yet connected across the organisation.

© 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/

Level	Name	Summary
4	Managed	Asset information is governed as an organisational discipline with clear accountability, connected functions, and measurable outcomes.
5	Intelligent	Asset information drives continuous improvement, predictive decision-making, and strategic value at board level.

The Maturity Model assesses an organisation across all four outcome domains (Environmental, Social, Safety, Economic). The Definition sets them out in full, and this model does not restate them.

Level 1: Absent

Function	What it looks like
Requirements	No formal articulation of what asset information the organisation needs. Requirements exist implicitly or are defined reactively. No connection between information needs and organisational objectives. No information obligations carried into procurement.
Capture	No managed approach to information production or intake. Information enters through uncontrolled channels. No one is responsible for ensuring supply chains produce information to any defined standard. Legacy estates have no structured information or rely on paper records.
Information Governance	No asset-centric data model. Information stored in folders, drives, inboxes, filing cabinets. No validation against requirements. No clear accountability for information accuracy or currency. Changes happen without audit trail. Sensitive information uncontrolled.
Delivery	Information retrieved by asking people who might know. No integration with operational systems. Reporting is manual and unreliable. Critical information inaccessible when needed.
Use	No structured use of asset information for decision-making. Performance not measured against design intent. The Performance Gap is invisible.

Level 2: Fragmented

Function	What it looks like
Requirements	Information requirements defined for some projects or compliance obligations but not systematically. Different teams define requirements differently. No organisation-wide standard. Procurement carries information clauses occasionally, not consistently.

© 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/

Function	What it looks like
Capture	Some structured handover processes exist, often driven by mandates rather than organisational commitment. Information production managed informally. Recovery happens project-by-project when crises force it. Operational updates captured in some systems but not connected to a governed layer.
Information Governance	Multiple data models exist across different systems and teams. Some validation occurs against inconsistent standards. Accountability unclear or informal. Change control ad hoc. Information quality varies dramatically across the estate. Data security applied to specific systems but not as a coherent classification scheme.
Delivery	Some integration between specific systems, typically CAFM and asset registers. Information exchange manual or semi-automated. Reporting covers compliance basics but not operational intelligence.
Use	Occasional use of asset information for specific decisions, usually reactive. No systematic performance measurement. Value of information assumed, not demonstrated. The Performance Gap is felt but not quantified.

Level 3: Structured

Function	What it looks like
Requirements	Information requirements formally defined and documented. For new projects, requirements specified in procurement terms. For existing estates, recovery programmes have defined scope. Supply chain procurement carries information obligations as scoreable deliverables. Requirements connect to at least some organisational objectives. The gap is cross-function connection and coverage across all outcome domains.
Capture	Information production actively managed with defined processes. For Create: supply chain deliverables tracked against work packages with formal review cycles. For Recover: survey programmes planned and resourced with defined scope. Structured handover consistently applied to new projects. Operational update mechanisms exist in at least one system. The gap is completeness and consistency across the full estate.
Information Governance	Asset-centric data model established covering a defined scope. Validation processes exist with defined standards. Accountability formally assigned. Change control is formal within the governed scope. A documented data classification scheme exists with access control implemented. The gap is coverage: governance works within scope but does not yet cover the full estate or all information types (data, documents, geometry).
Delivery	Integration architecture connects the information layer to key operational systems, including the smart-buildings layer where present. Reporting is structured and repeatable. Information exchange follows defined standards. The gap is reach: not all systems or stakeholders are connected.

© 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/

Function	What it looks like
Use	Decision support exists for defined use cases. Some performance measurement against operational targets. The gap is systematic feedback: information drives some decisions but does not yet close the loop between requirements and outcomes.

Level 4: Managed

Function	What it looks like
Requirements	Information requirements defined, specified, and systematically connected to all four outcome domains. Requirements drive procurement specifications, validation standards, and performance targets. Supply chain procurement embeds information obligations as enforceable terms with performance measured and rewarded. Requirements reviewed and updated as organisational objectives evolve.
Capture	Information production management operates as an organisational capability, not a project-by-project activity. Supply chain compliance tracked across the full programme with consistent standards, quality assurance, and clear escalation. All intake routes (handover, recovery, operational update) produce information to consistent, governed standards. Information quality measured at the point of capture.
Information Governance	Single, coherent data model covers the full estate across all information types. Validation systematic and automated where possible. Accountability clear and enforced. Change control governed with full audit trail. Information quality measured and reported as a governance metric. Data security operates as a managed regime covering classification, access, audit, and incident response.
Delivery	Information layer integrated with all critical operational systems, including smart-building systems where they operate. Information exchange standards-based and automated where volume or frequency demands it. Reporting covers operational, compliance, and strategic needs. All relevant stakeholders can access the information they need when they need it.
Use	Asset information systematically supports operational, compliance, and investment decisions. Performance measured across all four outcome domains. Feedback from use informs requirements refinement. The value of asset information is demonstrable and demonstrated.

© 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/

Level 5: Intelligent

Function	What it looks like
Requirements	Requirements evolve dynamically based on performance intelligence. New information needs identified through outcome analysis, not just operational demand. The Requirements function anticipates future needs based on portfolio trends and strategic direction. Supply chain procurement scoring weights information delivery alongside cost, quality, and programme.
Capture	Information production increasingly automated and continuous. Supply chain compliance assured through automated validation at point of submission, with exceptions managed rather than deliverables chased. The boundary between production management, intake, and operational update dissolves into continuous information flow.
Information Governance	Information quality continuously assured through automated validation, anomaly detection, and predictive maintenance of the information layer itself. Governance is proactive rather than reactive. The governed information layer is treated as an appreciating asset with its own investment cycle. Data security operates with continuous monitoring, integrated identity, and risk-based controls.
Delivery	Information flows optimised based on usage patterns and decision outcomes. Adjacent systems consume information through intelligent interfaces that adapt to context. The smart-buildings layer exchanges operational context with the Asset Intelligence layer in real time and informs decisions accordingly.
Use	Performance intelligence drives predictive decision-making. The organisation can quantify the value of its information investment. Outcomes benchmarked across the portfolio. Asset Intelligence informs capital planning, sustainability strategy, and operational optimisation at board level.

3. The five functions and their capabilities

The Maturity Model assesses an organisation at function level: five function ratings, not a single score. Each function is composed of one or more capabilities specified in the Architecture. The transition conditions in Section 5 reference the capabilities. This section sets out the capability set the assessment covers.

© 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/

Function	Capability	What is assessed
Requirements	1.1 Information requirements definition	Whether the organisation has determined what asset information it needs, why, and to what level. Connection to the four outcome domains.
	1.2 Requirements specification	Whether requirements are translated into enforceable terms for procurement (EIR for Create; recovery programme briefs and survey specs for Recover). For Recover: whether the organisation recognises and assesses existing information before commissioning recovery.
	1.3 Supply chain procurement	Whether information obligations are embedded in supply chain contracts and scored as procurement deliverables, not treated as a courtesy.
Capture	2.1 Asset Information Production Management (AIPM)	Whether information production is orchestrated against requirements across supply chains and programmes, with quality managed in flight.
	2.2 Structured handover	Whether information is captured from capital projects and transferred into operational use at handover (Create pathway intake), and transferred between providers at FM contract transitions.
	2.3 Retrospective recovery	Whether structured information is established for existing estates through survey, legacy extraction, and reconciliation (Recover pathway intake).
	2.4 Operational update	Whether changes to asset information during operation (maintenance, modifications, replacements, compliance events) enter the governed layer.
Information Governance	3.1 Information structuring	Whether asset information is organised into an asset-centric data model anchored on the Unique Asset Identifier (UAID).
	3.2 Validation and assurance	Whether information is verified complete, accurate, and current against defined requirements.
	3.3 Accountability and change control	Whether ownership of information accuracy is clearly assigned and changes follow a governed process.

© 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/

Function	Capability	What is assessed
	3.4 Data security	Whether sensitive asset information is classified, access-controlled, audited, and protected.
Delivery	4.1 System integration	Whether the Asset Intelligence layer is integrated with adjacent operational systems (CAFM, digital twin, BMS/BAS, IoT sensors, and workplace and space-utilisation tooling).
	4.2 Information exchange	Whether information is shared with people and organisations through standards-based reporting, dashboards, and structured exchange.
Use	5.1 Decision support	Whether structured asset information is available at the point operational, compliance, and investment decisions are made.
	5.2 Performance intelligence	Whether outcomes across the four domains are measured, verified, and reported, and whether the loop back to requirements is closed.

The assessment runs at function level. Capability-level findings inform the function rating and the transition roadmap, but the headline output is the function profile.

4. Pathway context

Before assessing individual functions, the assessor establishes the organisation's dominant pathway context. Recover and Create are different entry points into the same architecture, not separate disciplines.

Recover-dominant organisations are managing existing estates where structured information was never created, has been lost, has fragmented beyond trust, or exists but cannot be found and used in the volume it sits within. Their primary information flow is from survey, extraction, and reconciliation into a governed layer. Entry points are typically Requirements or Information Governance. In practice the majority of operational buildings will never go through another capital project that could establish structured information from scratch. Recover is the dominant condition.

Create-dominant organisations are actively producing new buildings or assets. Their primary information flow is from construction into operations. Entry points are typically

© 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/

Capture or Requirements, driven by project delivery obligations and handover specifications.

Dual-pathway organisations operate both contexts. Most large estates are dual-pathway. Supplementary "create" events (fit-outs, equipment replacements, tenant works, technology installations) sit alongside the primary pathway and create the same information governance demand at smaller scale.

For dual-pathway organisations, Requirements, Capture, and parts of Information Governance are assessed separately for each pathway. Delivery and Use are assessed once, because these functions are pathway-neutral in practice: information is delivered and used regardless of how it was produced.

The assessment records the pathway context alongside the maturity profile. A profile of "Capture: Level 3 (Create) / Level 1 (Recover)" is more diagnostically useful than "Capture: Level 2" averaged across pathways.

5. Transition conditions

This section defines the evidence-based assessment layer. For each function at each level boundary (four transitions per function, twenty transitions total), it specifies the conditions that must hold, the evidence type, the specific evidence test, and the enablers required.

Conditions are diagnostic, not prescriptive. They describe what must be true for an organisation to credibly claim it has passed a boundary. They do not prescribe how the organisation gets there.

Where a condition applies differently depending on pathway (Create or Recover), the evidence test includes a pathway annotation. Where a condition applies differently depending on information type (data, documents, geometry), the evidence test specifies what coverage is required.

Conditions flagged **[Judgement]** require calibrated assessment rather than binary determination. The evidence test for these conditions defines what "good enough" looks like.

A small number of evidence tests are marked **indicative**. An indicative test describes what good evidence looks like for the condition but has not yet been calibrated against

© 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/

assessment practice. The assessor applies it with judgement and records the basis of the call.

5.1 Requirements

Level 1 → Level 2: From Absent to Fragmented

The organisation has acknowledged that it has asset information needs and has begun defining them in at least one context.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
R1.1	At least one business function has formally articulated what asset information it needs and why	Documentary	Written information requirements document exists, linked to at least one operational objective. The document specifies information types (data, documents, or geometry) and their intended use.
R1.2	Requirements are defined for at least one project or programme (Create) or at least one building or site (Recover)	Documentary	For Create: specification document exists with defined scope for at least one active project. For Recover: information recovery scope document exists for at least one building or site, identifying what information is needed and what currently exists.
R1.3	At least one procurement event has included an information clause that the supplier must meet	Documentary	Contract, framework call-off, or purchase order exists in which an information delivery requirement is named as a deliverable. May be informal but must be evidenced in writing.
R1.4	Someone is accountable for the requirements that have been defined	Operational	Named individual can be identified and confirmed through interview. Accountability is documented, even if informally.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	At least one individual understands the concept of information requirements as distinct from data collection. Competence may be held through direct employment, external partnership, or managed service (see Section 6.1).

© 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/

Enabler	Requirement
Governance authority	Senior sponsorship exists for the principle that information requirements should be deliberate, not inherited.
Leadership commitment	Willingness to invest time in articulating requirements before initiating capture activity.

Level 2 → Level 3: From Fragmented to Structured

The organisation has moved from ad hoc requirements definition to a systematic, organisation-level approach with formal processes, cross-function connection, and information embedded in supply chain procurement.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
R2.1	Information requirements are formally defined and documented as an organisational standard	Documentary	Organisation-level information requirements document or standard exists, covering the scope of the estate (not just individual projects or sites). The document addresses at least two of the three information types (data, documents, geometry).
R2.2	Requirements are specified in procurement terms (Create) or recovery programme briefs (Recover)	Documentary	For Create: contract clauses or EIR templates reference the organisational requirements standard. For Recover: survey or recovery programme specifications reference the organisational requirements standard.
R2.3	Information delivery is a scoreable element of supply chain procurement	Documentary	Procurement scoring matrix, tender evaluation criteria, or framework call-off process explicitly weights information delivery as a scored deliverable. Evidence from at least one procurement event in the past twelve months.
R2.4	Requirements connect to at least two of the four outcome domains (Environmental, Social, Safety, Economic)	Documentary	Traceable link exists between at least two outcome domains and specific information requirements. "Traceable" means the connection is documented, not assumed.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
R2.5	A process exists for reviewing and updating requirements as organisational objectives change	Operational	Review cycle is defined with a documented schedule. Evidence that at least one review has occurred and produced a documented outcome (even if the outcome was "no changes required").

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Cross-functional understanding of what information requirements mean in practice. At least one individual with the skill to translate operational objectives into information specifications. The competence may sit in an IM lineage (rooted in ISO 19650) or an AM lineage (rooted in ISO 55001); both are valid.
Governance authority	Procurement involvement in requirements specification. Authority to embed information requirements in contracts or programme briefs.
Leadership commitment	Executive understanding that information requirements are a strategic investment, not a technical exercise. Budget allocated for requirements definition activity.

Level 3 → Level 4: From Structured to Managed

Requirements are connected to all four outcome domains and drive procurement, validation, and performance measurement as a coherent system. Supply chain procurement enforces information obligations as scored, measurable deliverables.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
R3.1	Requirements are systematically connected to all four outcome domains	Documentary	Documented mapping from requirements to Environmental, Social, Safety, and Economic objectives. Each outcome domain is served by at least one defined information requirement.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
R3.2	Requirements drive procurement specifications across all relevant contracts	Operational	**[Judgement]**. "All relevant contracts" means contracts where asset information is a material deliverable. The assessor reviews a sample per the sampling rules (Appendix A) from procurements in the past twelve months. Each sampled contract must embed information requirements by reference to the organisational standard. Threshold: requirements are embedded in at least 80% of relevant contracts (per the "systematic" definition in Appendix A).
R3.3	Supply chain performance against information obligations is measured and used at procurement decisions	Outcome	Evidence that supplier performance against information obligations is recorded, reported, and used at re-tender or framework call-off decisions. At least one documented instance in the past twelve months where a supplier's information performance influenced a procurement decision.
R3.4	Requirements are used as the basis for validation standards (connection to Information Governance function)	Operational	Validation criteria explicitly reference the requirements standard. Assessor can trace from a specific requirement to the standard used to validate information delivered against it.
R3.5	Requirements inform performance targets (connection to Use function)	Documentary	Performance measurement framework references requirements as the baseline for at least one outcome domain.
R3.6	Requirements are reviewed and updated on a defined cycle with documented outcomes	Operational	Evidence of regular review (at least annual). Amendments documented with rationale. At least one substantive change evidenced from the most recent cycle.

Enablers at this transition:

© 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/

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Requirements management capability that spans procurement, operational, and strategic functions. Ability to define requirements that are specific enough to be validated and measured.
Governance authority	Board-level mandate for information requirements as an organisational standard. Procurement authority to embed information requirements in contracts as enforceable terms with measurable consequences.
Leadership commitment	Cross-function governance structure that connects requirements definition to validation and use. Information requirements treated as a board-level concern, not delegated to FM or IT.

Level 4 → Level 5: From Managed to Intelligent

Requirements evolve dynamically based on performance intelligence and anticipate future needs.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
R4.1	Performance intelligence (from Use) feeds back into requirements refinement	Outcome	At least two documented instances where measured outcomes have led to requirements being updated. The updates are traceable to specific performance data.
R4.2	New information needs are identified through outcome analysis, not just operational demand	Outcome	At least one requirement added or modified based on performance data rather than a reactive request. The evidence shows the requirement was anticipated, not triggered by a problem.
R4.3	Supply chain scoring weights information delivery alongside cost, quality, and programme as a standard procurement criterion	Outcome	Information delivery scoring is embedded in standard procurement templates across the organisation. Evidence from at least two distinct procurement categories in the past twelve months.
R4.4	A requirements roadmap exists that extends beyond current operational needs	Documentary	Documented forward-looking requirements plan that references portfolio trends, strategic direction, or emerging outcome domains. The roadmap is reviewed and updated on a defined cycle.

Enablers at this transition:

© 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/

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Analytical capability to derive requirements implications from performance intelligence. Strategic planning capability to anticipate future information needs.
Governance authority	Authority to modify requirements based on performance data without requiring a reactive trigger. Requirements function has standing to initiate change, not just respond to it.
Leadership commitment	Organisational culture that treats requirements as a living standard. Board-level engagement with the requirements roadmap as a strategic input.

5.2 Capture

Level 1 → Level 2: From Absent to Fragmented

At least one structured capture mechanism exists and someone is responsible for the quality of information entering the system.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
C1.1	At least one structured capture mechanism exists	Operational	For Create: process documentation exists for structured handover on at least one project, with evidence of at least one execution. For Recover: a defined survey or information recovery programme exists for at least one building or site, with evidence of at least one execution.
C1.2	Someone is responsible for the quality of information entering the system in at least one context	Operational	Named individual with defined accountability for information quality at capture. Accountability confirmed through interview.
C1.3	A defined information delivery specification exists for at least one context	Documentary	For Create: EIR or equivalent exists for at least one active project, specifying what information must be delivered, in what format, and to what standard. For Recover: survey specification exists for at least one building or site, defining scope, information types, and quality criteria.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
C1.4	Budget has been allocated specifically to information capture	Documentary	Evidence that information capture is a funded activity, not buried in project contingency or treated as unfunded overhead. Can be a line item in a project budget, a dedicated programme budget, or an allocated resource.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	At least one individual understands the difference between information capture as a managed activity and information capture as a byproduct of other work.
Governance authority	Authority to define and enforce information delivery specifications on at least one project or programme.
Leadership commitment	Recognition that information capture requires deliberate investment. Willingness to fund capture as a distinct activity.

Level 2 → Level 3: From Fragmented to Structured

Information production is actively managed across multiple projects or programmes with defined processes and quality expectations.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
C2.1	Information production is actively managed with defined processes across multiple projects (Create) or across a defined estate programme (Recover)	Operational	For Create: programme-level tracking of information deliverables exists across at least three active projects. For Recover: an estate-level programme plan exists with defined scope covering multiple buildings or sites.
C2.2	Supply chain deliverables are tracked with formal review cycles (Create) or survey programmes are planned with defined quality expectations (Recover)	Operational	For Create: evidence of compliance tracking, resubmission management, and programme-level reporting across multiple projects. For Recover: programme plan exists with prioritisation logic, resource allocation, and quality criteria.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
C2.3	Structured handover is consistently applied to new projects, and to FM contract transitions where they occur, with defined quality expectations	Operational	**[Judgement]**. Handover is a governed process applied to new projects per the "consistent" definition (Appendix A): the same standards are applied to all projects within scope. The assessor reviews a sample per the sampling rules and confirms that each sampled handover followed the defined process with documented quality expectations. Where an FM contract transition took place in the assessment period, the assessor confirms that the outgoing provider returned the record it maintained and that the incoming provider verified and accepted it against the same standard. Threshold: at least 80% of handovers in the assessment period followed the governed process.
C2.4	Operational update mechanisms exist in at least one system	Operational	Changes to assets (maintenance, replacement, modification) are captured in a structured form that connects to the governed information layer. Evidence that at least one type of operational change is routinely recorded.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Information production management capability distinct from project management. Individuals who understand quality assurance applied to information, not just physical works.
Governance authority	Contractual terms that make information quality enforceable in the supply chain. Authority to reject or require resubmission of non-compliant deliverables.
Leadership commitment	Quality assurance culture applied to information. Willingness to hold the supply chain to information standards even when it creates programme friction.

© 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/

Level 3 → Level 4: From Structured to Managed

Information production management operates as an organisational capability with consistent standards across all intake routes.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
C3.1	Information production management operates as an organisational capability, not project-by-project	Operational	Consistent standards, processes, and reporting exist across all active projects or programmes. Evidence that a new project or programme inherits the organisational standard rather than defining its own.
C3.2	Supply chain compliance is tracked across the full programme (Create) or programme management covers the full estate (Recover)	Operational	For Create: programme-level reporting shows compliance rates across all active projects, not just selected ones. For Recover: estate-wide programme exists with completion tracking by building or site and prioritised delivery plan.
C3.3	All intake routes produce information to consistent, governed standards	Operational	**[Judgement]**. Handover (Create, and at FM contract transitions), recovery (Recover), and operational update all produce information that passes the same validation criteria. The assessor selects a sample per the sampling rules (Appendix A) from each active intake route and confirms that the same governance standards were applied. "Consistent" per the definition in Appendix A: variance in application is less than 10%. Where information from one intake route routinely fails validation that another route passes, the condition is not met.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
C3.4	Information quality is measured at the point of capture	Outcome	Quality metrics exist and are reported at the point of capture, not discovered downstream. Metrics cover at least completeness and accuracy for each information type within scope (data, documents, geometry).

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Organisational information production management capability with dedicated resources, not reliant on individual expertise.
Governance authority	Contractual frameworks that enforce information quality across the full supply chain. Authority to standardise capture processes across all projects and programmes.
Leadership commitment	Organisational commitment to information production as a standing capability with its own budget, resources, and performance targets.

Level 4 → Level 5: From Managed to Intelligent

Information production is increasingly automated and continuous, with quality assured at submission rather than discovered at review.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
C4.1	Information production is increasingly automated and continuous	Operational	Evidence of automated validation, sensor integration, or technology-assisted capture reducing manual effort. At least one capture process has been materially automated compared to its Level 4 state.
C4.2	Supply chain compliance is assured through automated validation at point of submission	Operational	Exceptions are managed rather than deliverables chased. Evidence that the default state is compliant submission, not manual quality checking after receipt.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
C4.3	The boundary between production management, intake, and operational update is dissolving into continuous information flow	Operational	**[Judgement]**. Information enters the governed layer through at least three distinct automated or semi-automated channels (e.g. automated handover validation, sensor feeds, automated operational update capture). The assessor confirms that at least one intake route operates continuously (not batch-oriented) and that information from different intake routes is governed under a single quality framework rather than separate processes. The threshold: the organisation can demonstrate that more information enters the governed layer through automated channels than through manual processes.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Technology capability to implement and maintain automated capture and validation. Supply chain digital maturity sufficient to participate in automated workflows.
Governance authority	Authority to mandate automated submission and validation standards across the supply chain.
Leadership commitment	Investment in information production infrastructure as a long-term organisational capability, not a project cost.

5.3 Information Governance

Information Governance is the function on which all other functions structurally depend. The transition conditions in this section are the most consequential in the assessment. The most common stall point across the market is the Level 2 to Level 3 boundary in Information Governance, because the enabler escalation from departmental to cross-functional governance authority is the hardest organisational change to make.

The Architecture carries a reference governance pattern as guidance on what good looks like. Section 6.2 sets out how it relates to the assessment.

© 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/

Level 1 → Level 2: From Absent to Fragmented

The organisation has moved beyond unstructured storage to at least one structured system with some validation activity.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
IG1.1	At least one system holds asset information in a structured form	Documentary	System exists with identifiable asset records, beyond folders, spreadsheets, and shared drives. At least one information type (data, documents, or geometry) is held in a structured, queryable form.
IG1.2	Some validation of information accuracy occurs	Operational	Evidence of at least one validation activity (audit, reconciliation, spot check) in the past twelve months. The validation was against a defined standard, even if the standard is informal.
IG1.3	At least one person has de facto accountability for information accuracy	Operational	Named individual can be identified through interview. The individual recognises and accepts the accountability, even if it is not formally documented.
IG1.4	Some control exists over who can access sensitive asset information	Operational	At least one access control mechanism is in place for asset information judged sensitive (operational schematics, security-critical detail, personal data). Mechanism may be informal but must be evidenced (named user lists, system permissions, manual sign-out).

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	At least one individual understands the difference between storing information and governing it.
Governance authority	Willingness to invest in structuring and validating information, not just storing it.
Leadership commitment	Recognition that having data and having governed, trustworthy information are different things.

© 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/

Level 2 → Level 3: From Fragmented to Structured

A governed information layer exists with a defined data model, formal validation, assigned accountability, controlled change management within a defined scope, and a documented data classification scheme with access control implemented.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
IG2.1	An asset-centric data model is established covering a defined scope, anchored on the Unique Asset Identifier (UAID)	Documentary	Data model documentation exists. The model is implemented in at least one system. The scope of coverage is defined (which buildings, sites, or asset types are included). The model addresses at least two of the three information types (data, documents, geometry). UAID or equivalent persistent identifier is in use across the model.
IG2.2	Validation processes exist with defined standards	Documentary	Validation criteria are documented. The process for applying them is defined and assigned. Evidence that validation has been performed against these criteria.
IG2.3	Accountability for information accuracy is formally assigned	Documentary	Roles and responsibilities document exists. Accountability is explicit, not just de facto. The accountable individual or role has authority to act on quality issues.
IG2.4	Change control is formal within the governed scope	Operational	Changes to asset information follow a defined process with audit trail. Evidence of at least three changes processed through the formal mechanism.
IG2.5	A documented data classification scheme is in operation with access control implemented	Documentary	Classification scheme exists (commonly Public / Internal / Confidential / Restricted or equivalent), with definitions and handling rules. Access control is enforced at least at system level for at least one tier above the lowest.

Enablers at this transition:

© 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/

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Data architecture capability (internal or external) to design and maintain the asset-centric data model. Capability may sit in IM (ISO 19650) or AM (ISO 55001) lineage; both are valid.
Governance authority	Organisational authority to enforce governance standards across departments and teams that contribute to or consume asset information.
Leadership commitment	Willingness to address the question of who owns information accuracy and to back that ownership with authority and resources.

Level 3 → Level 4: From Structured to Managed

A single, coherent data model covers the full estate with systematic validation, enforced accountability, measured information quality, and a managed data security regime covering classification, access, audit, and incident response.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
IG3.1	A single, coherent data model covers the full estate	Documentary	One data model, not multiple inconsistent models across systems or sites. The model covers all three information types (data, documents, geometry) across the full estate within scope.
IG3.2	Validation is systematic and automated where possible	Operational	Evidence of automated validation rules for high-volume or routine checks. Manual validation follows defined procedures for checks that require human judgement. Validation covers all three information types.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
IG3.3	Accountability is clear, enforced, and has consequences	Operational	**[Judgement]**. Evidence that accountability has been exercised in practice: at least two documented instances in the past twelve months where quality failures led to escalation, correction, or performance management action. The assessor confirms through interview that the accountable individual or team has the authority and willingness to act. If no enforcement action has occurred and no quality failures have been identified, the assessor probes whether the absence of action reflects genuine quality or undetected problems.
IG3.4	Change control is governed with full audit trail across the estate	Operational	Audit trail is complete and reviewable. No material changes to the information layer occur outside the governed process.
IG3.5	Information quality is measured and reported as a governance metric	Outcome	**[Judgement]**. Quality dashboards or reports exist covering at least completeness and accuracy. Trends are tracked over at least two reporting periods. Reporting covers at least the core information types within scope. The assessor confirms that the metrics have been reviewed by someone with governance authority and that at least one action has been taken in response to a quality finding in the past twelve months. If metrics are produced but never reviewed or acted upon, the condition is not met.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
IG3.6	Data security operates as a managed regime: classification applied, access controlled, audit trail produced, integrity protected	Operational	**[Judgement]**. Classification scheme is applied across all information types in scope. Access control is enforced through identity-based mechanisms (not just shared credentials). Audit trail captures access events for sensitive material. At least one defined incident response procedure exists, with evidence of at least one tabletop exercise or live invocation in the past twelve months.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Enterprise data governance capability with the skill to maintain a single coherent model across a complex estate. Security competence sufficient to operate the classification and access regime.
Governance authority	Enterprise-level governance authority that is not limited to a single department or system. Authority to enforce governance standards on all contributors to the information layer.
Leadership commitment	Cultural acceptance that information governance is operational infrastructure, not optional overhead. Board-level visibility of information quality as a governance concern.

Level 4 → Level 5: From Managed to Intelligent

Governance is proactive and predictive, with the information layer treated as an appreciating organisational asset and data security operating with continuous monitoring and risk-based controls.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
IG4.1	Information quality is continuously assured through automated validation and anomaly detection	Operational	Proactive quality management rather than periodic audit. Evidence that potential quality issues are identified before they affect 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
IG4.2	Governance is predictive: potential quality issues identified before they cause downstream impact	Outcome	Evidence of early intervention based on governance intelligence. At least two instances where a quality issue was identified and resolved proactively.
IG4.3	The governed information layer is treated as an appreciating asset with its own maintenance and investment cycle	Documentary	Information asset management is a defined organisational function with dedicated budget, accountability, and a forward investment plan.
IG4.4	Data security operates with continuous monitoring, integrated identity, and risk-based controls	Outcome	**Indicative.** Continuous monitoring of access patterns produces actionable alerts; identity integration extends across all systems consuming asset information; access decisions are calibrated to information sensitivity rather than uniform.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Advanced data quality management capability including predictive analytics and anomaly detection.
Governance authority	Governance function has standing to invest in and maintain the information layer proactively, not just reactively.
Leadership commitment	Board-level treatment of information as an asset class with its own investment case, not a cost centre.

5.4 Delivery

Level 1 → Level 2: From Absent to Fragmented

At least one integration exists and some stakeholders can access information without relying on individuals.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
D1.1	At least one integration exists between the information layer and an operational system	Operational	Data flows between at least two systems without requiring manual re-entry. The integration is repeatable, not a one-off data migration.
D1.2	Some reporting exists, even if manual and inconsistent	Operational	Reports are produced that draw on structured asset information. At least one report type is produced regularly (even if "regularly" means quarterly).
D1.3	At least some stakeholders can access asset information without asking someone else to find it	Operational	Self-service access exists for at least one user group through a defined system or interface.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Basic integration capability to connect systems and maintain data flows.
Governance authority	Authority to grant information access to stakeholders beyond the team that manages it.
Leadership commitment	Recognition that information access is a service the organisation provides, not a favour individual teams grant.

Level 2 → Level 3: From Fragmented to Structured

A defined integration architecture connects the information layer to key operational systems with structured reporting and standards-based exchange. Smart-building systems, where they operate, are integrated as part of the same architecture.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
D2.1	Integration architecture connects the information layer to key operational systems with defined data flows	Documentary	Integration map exists documenting which systems are connected, what data flows between them, and how. Data flows are governed (not ad hoc file transfers).

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
D2.2	Smart-building systems (BMS, IoT, BAS, smart spaces), where present in the estate, are connected to the Asset Intelligence layer through defined data flows	Operational	For organisations operating smart-building systems: at least one bidirectional data flow exists between the smart-buildings layer and the Asset Intelligence layer (e.g. equipment records feeding BMS, operational data feeding back into the information layer). For organisations without smart-building systems in scope: condition does not apply and is marked N/A.
D2.3	Reporting is structured and repeatable across defined use cases	Operational	Standard reports exist for at least three defined use cases. Reports are produced consistently on a defined schedule or on demand through a repeatable process.
D2.4	Information exchange follows defined standards	Documentary	Standards are documented for how information is shared, in what format, and between which systems. Standards cover at least two of the three information types.
D2.5	Multiple stakeholder groups can access the information they need through defined channels	Operational	At least three distinct stakeholder groups have defined access to the information they need. Access is not limited to the team that manages the information layer.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Integration architecture capability to design and maintain system connections. Understanding of information exchange standards relevant to the built environment.
Governance authority	Authority to define and enforce information exchange standards across systems and teams.
Leadership commitment	Investment in integration infrastructure as an enabler of information value, not just a technology cost. Stakeholder engagement to understand what information is needed at which decision points.

Level 3 → Level 4: From Structured to Managed

© 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/

The information layer is integrated with all critical operational systems, including smart-building systems where they operate. Standards-based automated exchange serves operational, compliance, and strategic needs.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
D3.1	The information layer is integrated with all critical operational systems	Operational	**[Judgement]**. The assessor obtains or constructs a list of systems that handle asset-related decisions (e.g. CAFM, maintenance management, capital planning, compliance reporting, BMS where it informs decisions). "Critical" means systems where asset information is a required input for decisions, not an optional reference. For each critical system, the assessor confirms a documented integration point with the information layer. Integration means a governed, repeatable data flow (real-time, daily batch, or scheduled refresh), not manual re-entry or ad hoc file transfer. Latency must be defined and appropriate to the decision context. All critical systems must be integrated; the threshold is 100%.
D3.2	The smart-buildings layer (BMS, IoT, BAS, smart spaces), where it operates, is treated as a critical system within the integration architecture	Operational	For organisations operating smart-building systems: integration with the Asset Intelligence layer is bidirectional, governed by defined data flows, and supports operational decision-making. Equipment records, operational parameters, and compliance thresholds flow outward; sensor and operational data flow inward. For organisations without smart-building systems in scope: condition does not apply.
D3.3	Information exchange is standards-based and automated where volume or frequency demands it	Operational	Automated data flows exist for high-volume or high-frequency exchanges. Manual exchange is limited to exceptions or low-volume contexts.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
D3.4	Reporting covers operational, compliance, and strategic needs from the same information layer	Operational	Evidence of reports serving all three purposes. A single governed information layer supports all reporting, not separate data sources for different report types.
D3.5	All relevant stakeholders can access the information they need when they need it	Outcome	**[Judgement]**. The assessor identifies the principal stakeholder groups that consume asset information for decisions (e.g. maintenance teams, compliance officers, capital planners, operational managers). For each group, the assessor confirms through interview that information is accessible at the point of decision without requiring manual retrieval by another team. The assessor interviews at least three stakeholder groups. If any group reports that critical information is routinely inaccessible or delayed beyond the decision window, the condition is not met.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Enterprise integration infrastructure capability. Standards-based information exchange expertise.
Governance authority	Authority to mandate integration standards across all systems that consume or contribute asset information.
Leadership commitment	Investment in user experience and accessibility for non-specialist users. Commitment to information delivery as an organisational service.

Level 4 → Level 5: From Managed to Intelligent

Information flows are optimised based on usage patterns and decision outcomes, with intelligent delivery that adapts to context. The smart-buildings layer exchanges operational context with the Asset Intelligence layer in real time.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
D4.1	Information flows are optimised based on usage patterns and decision outcomes	Outcome	Evidence that delivery has been adapted based on how information is actually used. At least one delivery mechanism has been modified in response to usage data or decision outcome analysis.
D4.2	Adjacent systems consume information through intelligent, context-aware interfaces	Operational	Systems receive information tailored to their consumption needs, not raw data exports. Evidence of at least two interfaces that adapt information format or content to the consuming system's context.
D4.3	The smart-buildings layer exchanges operational context with the Asset Intelligence layer in real time and informs decisions	Outcome	For organisations operating smart-building systems: operational telemetry from the smart-buildings layer flows into the Asset Intelligence layer and triggers actionable decision support (alerts, prioritisation changes, maintenance triggers). Evidence of at least one decision class where the integration materially changes the decision. For organisations without smart-building systems in scope: condition does not apply.
D4.4	Information delivery supports real-time or near-real-time decision-making for operational contexts	Operational	**[Judgement]**. The organisation has defined latency targets for information delivery based on decision context (e.g. real-time for safety-critical, near-real-time for operational, periodic for strategic). Latency is measured against these targets. The assessor confirms that at least one operational decision context receives information within its defined latency target and that latency performance is monitored.

Enablers at this transition:

© 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/

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Advanced integration capability including context-aware delivery and usage analytics.
Governance authority	Authority to invest in continuous improvement of information delivery based on usage intelligence.
Leadership commitment	Organisational commitment to information delivery as a continuously improving service, not a static integration layer.

5.5 Use

Use is the fifth function. It is where the discipline turns governed information into action and outcome.

Level 1 → Level 2: From Absent to Fragmented

Asset information is used to support at least one defined decision type and someone is actively connecting information quality to decision quality.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
U1.1	Asset information is used to support at least one defined decision type	Operational	Evidence of a repeatable decision process that draws on structured asset information (e.g. maintenance planning, compliance reporting, condition assessment). The decision process is identifiable, not incidental.
U1.2	At least one performance metric is tracked using asset information	Outcome	A metric exists that is calculated from or informed by structured asset information. The metric is reported, even if ad hoc or irregular.
U1.3	The question of whether information is helping the organisation make better decisions has been formally raised	Documentary	Evidence of at least one documented review, discussion, or report connecting information availability or quality to decision outcomes. This may be a meeting minute, a report section, or a business case.

Enablers at this transition:

© 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/

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	At least one individual who can connect information management to operational decision-making. Analytical capability to derive basic metrics from structured information.
Governance authority	Operational leadership that treats information as a decision input, not just a record.
Leadership commitment	Willingness to measure outcomes, not just activity. Willingness to ask whether information investment is producing value.

Level 2 → Level 3: From Fragmented to Structured

Decision support exists for defined use cases with structured information feeds, and performance measurement covers multiple outcome domains.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
U2.1	Decision support exists for defined use cases with structured information feeds	Operational	At least three defined decision processes consume structured asset information as a routine input. The information feed is structured and repeatable, not ad hoc.
U2.2	Performance measurement covers at least two of the four outcome domains (Environmental, Social, Safety, Economic)	Outcome	Metrics exist for at least two outcome domains. Metrics are reported regularly and linked to asset information.
U2.3	The connection between information quality and decision quality is recognised and documented	Documentary	The organisational case for information investment references decision outcomes, not just data management objectives. Evidence exists in a business case, strategy document, or board paper.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Analytics capability sufficient to derive insight from structured asset information. Cross-functional engagement between information management and operational decision-makers.
Governance authority	Authority to define and enforce information quality standards based on decision requirements, not just governance standards.
Leadership commitment	Executive willingness to be measured on outcomes, not just compliance. Budget allocated for performance measurement infrastructure.

© 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/

Level 3 → Level 4: From Structured to Managed

Asset information systematically supports all three decision types (operational, compliance, investment) with measurement across all four outcome domains and a functioning feedback loop to requirements.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
U3.1	Asset information systematically supports operational, compliance, and investment decisions	Operational	**[Judgement]**. The assessor identifies at least one documented decision process in each of the three categories (operational, compliance, investment). For each, the assessor confirms that asset information is a defined input to the process, meaning the process explicitly references information requirements and cannot proceed without that input. "Systematically" per the definition in Appendix A: information supports at least 80% of decision instances within each category. The assessor reviews decision documentation and interviews at least one decision-maker in each category.
U3.2	Performance is measured across all four outcome domains	Outcome	Metrics and reporting exist for Environmental, Social, Safety, and Economic outcomes. Each domain has at least one metric that is regularly reported and linked to asset information.
U3.3	Feedback from Use informs requirements refinement	Operational	Evidence of the feedback loop: at least one instance where a measured outcome has led to a documented update to information requirements. The loop is defined as a process, not just a one-off event.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
U3.4	The value of asset information is demonstrable and demonstrated	Outcome	A business case, value report, or board paper exists showing measured returns from information investment. The value is quantified (cost avoided, risk reduced, decision quality improved), not just asserted.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Analytical and reporting infrastructure covering all four outcome domains. Capability to quantify the value of information investment.
Governance authority	Mature information layer (Information Governance at Level 3 or above) providing the trusted data foundation for Use.
Leadership commitment	Board-level interest in performance intelligence as a strategic input. Willingness to invest in measurement infrastructure beyond compliance reporting.

Level 4 → Level 5: From Managed to Intelligent

Performance intelligence drives predictive decision-making, the value of information investment is routinely quantified, and outcomes are benchmarked across the portfolio.

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
U4.1	Performance intelligence drives predictive decision-making	Outcome	Evidence of decisions informed by predictive models or analysis built on asset information. At least two decision types where prediction (not just historical reporting) is the norm.
U4.2	The organisation can routinely quantify the value of its information investment	Outcome	Value measurement is a routine organisational practice, not a one-off exercise. Evidence of at least two measurement cycles.
U4.3	Outcomes are benchmarked across the portfolio	Outcome	Cross-building or cross-site benchmarking is standard practice. Benchmarks are used to identify outliers and drive improvement, not just reported.

© 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/

#	Condition	Evidence type	Evidence test
U4.4	Asset Intelligence informs capital planning, sustainability strategy, and operational optimisation at board level	Outcome	Board papers or executive reports reference Asset Intelligence outputs as inputs to strategic decisions. Evidence from at least two board cycles.

Enablers at this transition:

Enabler	Requirement
Competency	Advanced analytics and modelling capability. Sufficient temporal depth of data to support predictive modelling.
Governance authority	Authority to invest in and maintain advanced analytics infrastructure. Use function has standing to influence strategic decisions.
Leadership commitment	Board-level engagement with performance intelligence as a strategic asset. Organisational culture that treats information as a competitive advantage at the highest level.

6. Enabler layer

Three enablers operate across all transitions. They are not a sixth assessment dimension. They are requirements at each transition that the assessment records as met or unmet alongside the function-level conditions.

The Architecture names four organisational dependencies of the discipline: competency, culture and behaviour, leadership commitment, and governance authority. The Maturity Model carries three of these as assessment enablers (competency, governance authority, leadership commitment). Culture and behaviour is treated as an enabling layer in the Adoption Model rather than as a Maturity Model enabler dimension.

6.1 Competency

Do the people responsible have the skills to operate at the required level?

Competency requirements escalate through the levels. At Level 1 to Level 2, the requirement is basic: at least one individual who understands the discipline. By Level 3 to Level 4, the

© 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/

requirement is organisational: a standing capability with dedicated resources. By Level 4 to Level 5, the requirement is advanced: specialist analytical and technology skills.

Three valid paths to capability. Competency may be held through any of three paths, recognised as equally valid by the framework. The Maturity Model assesses whether the capability is reliably available to the organisation at the level required, not whether the organisation directly employs the people.

Path	Description
Direct employment	Skills held within the organisation as employed roles.
External partnership	Skills accessed through framework partner, consultancy, embedded specialist, or seconded resource. Particularly relevant for public-sector organisations operating under recruitment constraints.
Managed service	Skills delivered as a service by a contracted provider, with the organisation retaining accountability and oversight. Common in the FM context.

The framework's discipline-first principle is reflected here: practising Asset Intelligence depends on the discipline being exercised competently, not on a particular employment model.

Two practitioner lineages. The discipline draws on practitioner competence from two distinct lineages, both valid and recognised at every transition.

Lineage	Description
Information Management (IM)	Practitioners rooted in ISO 19650 and BIM-derived practice. Structuring, exchange, and governance competencies applied to asset information.
Asset Management (AM)	Practitioners rooted in ISO 55001 and IAM / GFMAM-codified discipline. Lifecycle, risk, and decision-making competencies applied to information.

The asset-owner-side practitioner often comes from an AM background. The constructor-side practitioner often comes from an IM background. Both are valid. Where competence is named in transition enablers, either lineage satisfies the test where the activity it is applied to is the same.

Competency is assessed as part of each transition, not independently. If an organisation meets all function-level conditions but lacks the competency to sustain them, the transition is fragile. The assessment notes this as a risk.

© 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/

6.2 Governance authority

Does the governance structure support the decisions required at this level?

Governance authority requirements escalate from departmental (Level 2) to cross-functional (Level 3) to enterprise-wide (Level 4) to strategic (Level 5). The critical transitions are Level 2 to Level 3 (where governance authority must extend beyond the originating team) and Level 3 to Level 4 (where it must become enterprise-wide with enforcement capability).

Governance authority is the enabler most often missing when an organisation stalls at a level boundary. The function-level conditions may be achievable, but the organisation lacks the structural authority to implement and enforce them across departments, systems, or supply chains. This is the structural reason most organisations stall at Level 2 to Level 3 in Information Governance: the departmental governance authority that worked at Level 2 cannot reach the cross-functional scope Level 3 requires.

The Architecture carries a reference governance pattern combining four characteristics: board-level accountability, executive ownership of the Asset Intelligence discipline at C-suite level, working-level information stewards with named accountability, and change control. The Maturity Model assesses against transition conditions. The reference pattern is the operational shape that consistently satisfies them.

6.3 Leadership commitment

Does the organisation's leadership treat this as a priority at the level required?

Leadership commitment escalates from sponsorship (Level 2: someone senior supports the initiative) to investment (Level 3: budget and resources are allocated) to strategic integration (Level 4: information is treated as a board-level concern) to cultural embedding (Level 5: the organisation's identity includes information as a strategic asset).

Leadership commitment is the hardest enabler to evidence and the most consequential when absent. An organisation can have the competency and the governance authority but stall because leadership treats the discipline as a technical concern rather than a strategic one. The assessment should probe for genuine commitment (does the board discuss information quality?) rather than formal commitment (is there a policy document?).

© 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/

7. Where most organisations sit today

Most organisations managing built assets sit at Level 1 or 2 across the majority of functions. This is the structural condition the discipline exists to address.

Requirements is almost universally Level 1. Most organisations have never formally articulated what asset information they need or why. Where requirements exist, they are typically inherited from regulatory mandates or copied from previous projects rather than defined from organisational objectives. Where supply chain procurement carries information clauses at all, they are often unscored or unenforced. The concept that information requirements should be a deliberate, strategic exercise is largely absent from the market.

Capture shows the widest variance and the sharpest pathway divergence. Organisations with active construction programmes and formal handover mandates may reach Level 2 to 3 maturity in production management for the Create pathway. Information production management is the one area where some organisations have developed genuine capability, particularly those with large capital programmes and demanding handover requirements. But the same organisations are typically Level 1 for the Recover pathway. Across the UK estate, the majority of operational buildings were built before digital information management existed, and have never been systematically addressed for information recovery. Operational update is almost universally Level 1. Information degrades from the moment a building becomes operational unless it is actively maintained.

Information Governance is typically Level 1 to 2. Many organisations have asset registers in CAFM systems, but these are operational tools rather than governed information layers. The gap between having data and having governed, trustworthy information is where most organisations stall. Information Governance is also where the information type gap is most visible: organisations may govern structured data reasonably well but have no approach to documents or geometry. Data security as a managed regime, rather than ad hoc access control, is typically only present in regulated sectors. The PFI estate carries an additional pattern: structured information was often created at handover but has fragmented across operator changes and is no longer trusted.

Delivery is typically Level 2. Basic integration between CAFM and asset registers exists. Reporting covers compliance basics. But information exchange is manual, critical information is often inaccessible at the point of decision, and integration is typically point-to-point rather than architectural. Where smart-building systems are installed, they more often run as parallel infrastructure than as a connected layer.

© 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/

Use is almost universally Level 1. This is the most significant finding. Organisations are not measuring whether their buildings perform as designed. They are not using asset information to drive strategic decisions. They cannot see the Performance Gap because they cannot measure it. The feedback loop from Use back to Requirements turns the discipline from a linear process into a learning cycle. For the vast majority of organisations it does not exist in practice.

Pathway maturity. An organisation's maturity profile is almost always different between Create and Recover pathways. The typical pattern: Level 2 to 3 in Capture and Information Governance for Create (driven by project requirements and handover mandates), but Level 1 for Recover (existing estate never systematically addressed). Requirements may be Level 2 for Create but Level 1 for Recover. Delivery and Use are typically pathway-neutral because they consume information regardless of how it was produced.

The pathway divergence is diagnostically valuable. It reveals whether an organisation's maturity is driven by genuine organisational commitment or by external mandates that apply only to new construction. An organisation at Level 3 in Capture for Create but Level 1 for Recover has compliance-driven maturity, not discipline-driven maturity. The Adoption Model uses this distinction to shape the adoption route.

The structural framing. A common readout from senior practitioners is that the discipline depends on three organisational ingredients in combination: people, processes, and technology. The Maturity Model assesses all three implicitly. Process maturity sits in the function-level transition conditions. People maturity sits in the competency enabler with three valid paths and two practitioner lineages. Technology maturity is read through the conditions that require evidence of automation, integration, and continuous monitoring at higher levels. A profile that is strong on technology but weak on competency or process tends to stall at Level 3.

8. Using the model

The Maturity Model serves four operational uses. Each draws on a different layer of the model.

First conversations

Use the conversation-level summary in Section 2. Walk through the five functions at whatever level of detail the conversation supports. The summary descriptions are designed

© 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/

to be recognisable: an organisation should be able to see itself in the description. Surface pain points, identify the weakest functions, establish pathway context, and create shared language for the journey ahead.

Do not use the transition conditions (Section 5) in a first conversation. The detail is there for organisations ready to plan, not for organisations still discovering the problem.

Adoption planning

Use the full model. The assessment methodology (Section 9) structures the assessment. The transition conditions (Section 5) define what the organisation needs to evidence at each boundary. The unmet conditions at the next level boundary become the transition roadmap. The enabler layer (Section 6) identifies where the organisation lacks the structural prerequisites for progression.

The Adoption Model consumes this output. It takes the maturity profile, the unmet conditions, and the enabler gaps, and builds a prioritised adoption route based on the organisation's pathway, audience type, and context.

Measuring progress

The maturity profile is measured at the start of a programme and periodically thereafter. Progression is defined by crossing level boundaries, evidenced against the transition conditions. The enabler layer tracks whether the structural prerequisites for sustained progression are in place.

Progress is measured by whether the organisation is advancing as a practitioner of the discipline, never by technology deployment alone. The Maturity Model provides the measurement framework.

Technology selection

Many transition conditions imply platform capabilities that enable the organisation to meet it. The transition from Level 2 to Level 3 in Information Governance (condition IG2.1: an asset-centric data model anchored on UAID) implies a platform capability for data model definition and implementation. The transition from Level 3 to Level 4 in Capture (condition C3.4: information quality measured at point of capture) implies a platform capability for automated quality checking.

An organisation can derive technology procurement requirements from the transitions that matter most to it, and a platform vendor can derive roadmap priorities from the transitions

© 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/

that matter most to its market. For most of the market at Level 1 to 2, the Level 2 to Level 3 transitions define the near-term capability requirements.

9. Assessment methodology

9.1 What deterministic means here

Deterministic does not mean a numeric score. Maturity is a profile, not a number (Section 2).

Deterministic means that two competent assessors, given the same access to the same organisation, should reach materially the same conclusion about which level each function sits at. "Materially the same" means they may disagree on edge cases but not on level boundaries.

9.2 Assessor competence

A deterministic, evidence-based assessment depends on the assessor as much as on the model. Until practitioner credentialing operates at framework level (carried in operational guidance, sibling to the Architecture and Adoption Model), an assessing organisation names its assessors explicitly with declared competence rather than offering them to market as a credentialed cohort.

Competence	Requirement
Discipline knowledge	The assessor knows the Asset Intelligence framework: the Architecture (functions, capabilities, integration), the Adoption Model (mechanisms, prioritisation, pathway treatment), and the Value Realisation Model (mechanisms by stakeholder).
Methodology familiarity	The assessor can apply the evidence test architecture (documentary, operational, outcome) at each transition boundary; understands sampling rules and threshold definitions (Appendix A); calibrates [Judgement] flags consistently with other assessors.
Independence	The assessor is independent of the assessed organisation's incentive structures. External (consultancy, framework partner) or internal-with-firewall (separate reporting line, no commercial conflict). The assessor is never also the commercial owner of the relationship with the assessed organisation.

© 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/

Competence	Requirement
Practitioner lineage	The assessor's competence may sit in an IM lineage (rooted in ISO 19650) or an AM lineage (rooted in ISO 55001). Both are valid. Where the assessment crosses both lineages (typical for asset-owner-side organisations), the assessor team should include both, or the lead assessor should hold competence across both.
Practitioner credentialing	Where credentialing is in operation (carried in operational guidance), the assessor holds the appropriate credential. Until that system operates, assessors are named explicitly with declared competence.

9.3 How assessment works

For each function, the assessor works through the transition conditions (Section 5) in order, starting at Level 1 to Level 2. The question at each boundary is: can the organisation evidence that all conditions for this transition hold? If yes, the organisation has passed this boundary and the assessor moves to the next. If one or more conditions are not met, the organisation sits at the lower level for this function.

Three types of evidence apply:

Documentary evidence. Artefacts that exist and can be produced. A formally documented set of information requirements. A governed asset-centric data model. A defined validation process with assigned accountability. These are binary: the artefact either exists or it does not.

Operational evidence. Practices that are observably happening. Supply chain deliverables tracked against requirements. Validation performed against defined standards. Information accessible at the point of decision. These require observation or interview but can be confirmed against specific criteria.

Outcome evidence. Results that can be measured. Compliance audit pass rates. First-time fix rates correlated with information availability. Capital planning decisions supported by condition data. These provide the strongest evidence of genuine maturity but are typically applicable only at higher levels where outcomes are measurable.

The balance across evidence types shifts as maturity increases. Level 1 to Level 2 transitions rely primarily on documentary evidence (does something exist?). Level 3 to Level 4 transitions rely more heavily on operational evidence (is it working consistently?). Level 4 to Level 5 transitions require outcome evidence (is it producing measurable results?).

© 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/

Most evidence tests are binary: the condition is either met or not met. Some require calibrated judgement and are flagged **[Judgement]**. For each flagged condition, the evidence test defines what "good enough" looks like, including an explicit threshold where applicable. The target: two assessors should agree on the call at least 80% of the time. Where they do not, the condition should be treated as partially met and noted in the assessment.

9.4 Participants

A full assessment requires access to people who can speak to both policy and practice across the five functions. At minimum:

- A senior sponsor or executive who can speak to organisational strategy and commitment (Requirements, Use).
- An information management or data lead who can speak to governance, standards, and accountability (Information Governance, Delivery).
- An operational or programme lead who can speak to how information is produced and consumed in practice (Capture, Delivery).
- For dual-pathway organisations: separate participants for Create and Recover contexts where activity differs materially.
- For organisations with significant supply chain procurement activity: a procurement lead who can speak to how information obligations are embedded and enforced in contracts.

The assessment should not rely on a single interviewee. The single-interviewee failure mode (different results depending on who you talk to) is addressed by triangulating across participants, not by talking to one person more carefully.

9.5 Information type handling

The assessment does not add a formal information type dimension. Assessing each function separately for data, documents, and geometry would triple the assessment surface from 25 cells to 75. The diagnostic value does not justify the complexity.

Information type is handled within evidence tests. Where a condition applies differently depending on information type, the evidence test specifies this. For example, in assessing Information Governance at Level 3, the assessor checks whether the asset-centric data model covers structured data, documents, and geometry, not whether each type is governed at the same level independently. Where the organisation governs structured data

© 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/

at Level 3 but has no approach to geometry, this is noted as a partial condition and recorded in the assessment narrative.

9.6 Resolving boundary cases

An organisation that meets most but not all conditions for a transition sits at the lower level. There is no partial credit. The boundary is defined by the full set of conditions being met.

However, the assessment should record which conditions are met and which are not. An organisation at Level 2 that meets four of five Level 3 conditions is in a different position from one that meets one of five. The unmet conditions become the transition roadmap.

Where a condition flagged as **[Judgement]** is the only unmet condition at a boundary, the assessor should apply the "good enough" definition in the evidence test. If the assessor concludes the condition is substantively met even if not perfectly evidenced, the organisation may be assessed at the higher level with the judgement noted.

9.7 Assessment output

The assessment produces:

- A maturity profile: five function-level ratings, with pathway splits where applicable.
- For each function: a record of which conditions are met and which are not at the current and next boundary.
- For each unmet condition at the next boundary: the evidence type, the specific evidence gap, and the enablers required.
- An overall pathway context statement.
- Any boundary judgement calls, documented with rationale.
- A view of where the smart-buildings dimension applies in scope (where it does not, conditions are marked N/A).

This output is the input the Adoption Model consumes to build a prioritised roadmap.

10. Design principles

The model is held against eight principles.

© 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/

1. **Discipline maturity, not technology maturity.** It assesses how well an organisation practises Asset Intelligence, not how much software it has deployed.
2. **Function-level assessment.** Maturity is assessed across five functions independently. Organisations are rarely at the same level in all five.
3. **Pathway-aware, not pathway-split.** Recover and Create are different entry points into the same architecture. Assessment is pathway-specific where activity diverges (Requirements, Capture, and parts of Information Governance) and runs once for Delivery and Use.
4. **Maturity is a profile, not a score.** The model never reduces to a single number. Uneven profiles are the norm, and the unevenness is diagnostically valuable.
5. **Product-agnostic.** A competitor should be able to use this model credibly with their own customers. If the evidence tests reference specific vendor capabilities, the model has failed.
6. **Evidence-based assessment.** Level assignment is determined by evidenceable conditions, not recognition against narrative descriptions. The question changes from "does this description sound like us?" to "can we evidence that these conditions hold?"
7. **Layered presentation.** A conversation-level summary serves discovery, and structured assessment detail serves adoption planning.
8. **Competence over employment model.** The assessment recognises three valid paths to capability (direct employment, external partnership, managed service) and two valid practitioner lineages (Information Management and Asset Management). Discipline practice is the basis of competence. Employment model is not.

Appendix A: Methodology reference

This appendix holds operational reference material used during an assessment. It sits here because the reader does not need it before reading the model.

A.1 Threshold definitions

Several evidence tests use terms that require operational definition to constrain assessor interpretation. The following definitions apply throughout Section 5.

Systematic. A practice is systematic when it applies to at least 80% of relevant instances or 90% of activity volume within the assessment scope. The assessor confirms this through

© 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/

sampling (see A.2) or documented programme reporting. A practice that covers three projects out of twelve is not systematic. A practice that covers ten out of twelve is.

Consistent. A standard is consistently applied when the same criteria are applied to all instances within scope, with variance in application of less than 10%. The assessor confirms this by reviewing evidence from multiple instances and checking that the same validation criteria, quality standards, or process steps were applied. Minor procedural differences (different personnel, different scheduling) do not break consistency. Different standards applied to different instances do.

Comprehensive. Coverage is comprehensive when it includes all material asset classes within the estate and all critical decision types within scope. "Material" means asset classes that collectively represent at least 90% of the estate by value, area, or operational significance. "Critical" means decision types where asset information is a required input, not an optional reference.

A.2 Sampling rules

Where an evidence test requires the assessor to review a sample, the following rules apply:

- Minimum sample size: three instances.
- Target coverage: at least 10% of activity in the assessment period (typically twelve months), or the minimum of three, whichever is larger.
- For organisations with fewer than ten instances in the assessment period, the assessor should review all instances.
- Samples should be selected to represent the range of activity (different project types, different sites, different teams), not cherry-picked to show the best performance.

A.3 Information type coverage

Many conditions require coverage across information types (data, documents, geometry). The following definitions apply.

Data. Structured records in a queryable system covering at least 80% of asset instances within the defined scope. Records must be individually addressable (not embedded in spreadsheets or documents).

Documents. A managed approach to asset-related documents (drawings, manuals, certificates, reports) covering the major asset types within scope. "Managed" means

© 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/

documents are stored in a defined location, linked to asset records, and retrievable without relying on individual knowledge.

Geometry. Spatial information (BIM models, floor plans, CAD records, or equivalent) that shows spatial relationships for the major asset instances within scope. Geometry does not require full BIM: floor plans or CAD records count if they are structured and retrievable.

Where a condition requires "at least two of three information types," the assessor confirms coverage against these definitions. Where an organisation has partial coverage of a type (e.g. floor plans for 40% of the estate), this counts as partial and should be noted in the assessment narrative.

A.4 Pathway annotations

Where an evidence test carries pathway-specific guidance (Create or Recover), the assessor records the pathway context for each function being assessed and applies the relevant evidence test. For dual-pathway organisations, Requirements, Capture, and parts of Information Governance are assessed separately for each pathway. Delivery and Use are assessed once.

For organisations operating supplementary "create" events (fit-outs, equipment replacements, tenant works, technology installations) within an operational estate, those events are assessed against the Create-pathway evidence tests at the function and capability they affect. The principle: any event that creates new asset information is a Create-style activity for the duration of the event, regardless of the dominant pathway of the estate as a whole.

© 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/