Asset Intelligence

THE ASSET INTELLIGENCE FRAMEWORK

Asset Intelligence Thesis

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/thesis**
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 Thesis, 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 Thesis, Edition 1, from The Asset Intelligence framework, created by Glider Technology Limited. Licensed under CC BY 4.0. Available at https://assetintelligencediscipline.org/framework/thesis."

If you adapt this document, you must say so, for example: "Adapted from Asset Intelligence Thesis, 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.

The case for Asset Intelligence

The built environment has an information problem. It is not a technology problem. It is a structural one.

Every building generates vast amounts of information across its lifecycle: maintenance histories, condition assessments, compliance certificates, statutory inspection records, energy performance data, equipment manuals, as-built drawings, design specifications, construction records. Most of it is generated during the decades a building is in operation, created by dozens of parties, at different times, in different formats, for different purposes. Some of it fragments over time, as fit-out projects, maintenance programmes, and FM re-procurements each create their own information without reconciling it to what already exists. Some of it was never created in the first place. Some of it exists, correct and complete, but lies buried in a volume of undifferentiated data so vast that the people who need it cannot find it. Some of it is lost at handover, when project-structured data fails to translate into operationally useful information.

These are the four conditions: information fragmenting through operational life, information never created, information buried in the volume, and information lost at handover. They are not edge cases. They are the norm across the UK's operational estate. The industry's response to all four has been fragmented, phase-specific, and ultimately inadequate.

The information that should hold across a building's lifecycle fragments at every transition. At every transition, the cost of the next decision goes up.

Three pillars: ISO 55001, ISO 19650, and Asset Intelligence

The international frameworks that should solve this problem already exist.

ISO 55001 is the international standard for asset management as a strategic discipline. It requires organisations to determine and manage the information needed to support asset management objectives, and to realise value from assets through coordinated management activity.

© 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/

ISO 19650 is the international standard for information management across the lifecycle of a built asset. It establishes the governance framework, roles, and processes for structuring and exchanging information during delivery and operation. Its forthcoming revision is expected to merge delivery and operational phases into a single lifecycle process and to require whole-lifecycle information management explicitly.

Asset Intelligence is the practising discipline that operationalises both standards at lifecycle scale. It is the third pillar. ISO 55001 says why information matters strategically and what it has to enable. ISO 19650 says how information about a built asset should be structured and governed. Asset Intelligence is the discipline that makes both real in operations.

The three pillars are complementary, not competitive. Asset Intelligence does not replace either standard. It is the discipline that emerges when both are practised at scale, particularly for the existing operational estate where the standards have set ambition the industry has not yet delivered.

The standards alone are insufficient. ISO 55001 has driven significant improvements in infrastructure, utilities, and transport, sectors with more coherent ownership structures and longer traditions of whole-lifecycle asset management. For buildings, adoption has been negligible. In buildings, ownership, operation, and maintenance are typically performed by different organisations with misaligned incentives. That fragmented supply chain has made whole-lifecycle asset management, as ISO 55001 describes it, structurally difficult to implement.

ISO 19650 has been adopted almost exclusively in the construction phase, where it governs information exchange during design and build. Adoption in operations remains negligible. The standard increasingly describes what should happen across the entire lifecycle. It still does not make it happen.

Both standards exist. Neither has been adopted at scale in building operations. The industry does not lack knowledge of what good asset information management looks like. It lacks the practising discipline to deliver it. That practising discipline is Asset Intelligence.

The discipline draws on both standards' lineages. Information Management practitioners bring the structuring, governance, and exchange competencies that ISO 19650 codifies. Asset Management practitioners bring the strategic-asset, lifecycle-cost, and risk competencies that ISO 55001 codifies. Asset Intelligence does not collapse into either lineage. It is the discipline that holds both together at lifecycle scale.

© 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 Performance Gap

The structural failure produces a specific, persistent consequence: organisations responsible for buildings cannot confidently act on what they know about them. This gap takes four forms across the UK's operational estate.

Information fragmenting through operational life. A building's information is at its most complete on the day it enters operation. From then on, every fit-out project, equipment replacement, maintenance contract change, and FM re-procurement creates new information that is rarely reconciled with what already exists. Buildings transition into new phases of life whilst still being managed in line with their original design intent. Operational change generates its own project information models that are never integrated back into the operational record.

Over years of operation, the estate accumulates multiple conflicting versions of truth across disconnected systems. Confidence in the information erodes progressively, not because nobody captured it, but because nobody governed it. Even organisations with good initial data find themselves unable to trust it within months or even weeks of uncoordinated change. These operational events recur for the life of the building, which is why this condition does the most cumulative damage across the estate.

Information never created. For the majority of the UK's operational estate, built before digital information management existed in any meaningful form, structured information was never established in the first place. It is the dominant condition, and the existing estate section below treats it in detail.

Information buried in the volume. The other conditions describe information that is broken, was never made, or is lost. This condition is different, and easier to miss. The information exists, is correct, is whole, was handed over properly, and has not fragmented. Still, no one who needs it can find it, because it is one item among many thousands and its significance is lost in the noise.

It is signal-to-noise: a usability failure. It is the condition that shows most clearly why the discipline is about intelligence, not retrieval. An organisation can hold every record it needs, correctly, and still be unable to act, because the one that matters is buried. More storage does not close that gap, and neither does more search. The discipline closes it by making information usable at the point of decision, not merely present in a repository.

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

Information lost at handover. Every building is designed with intent around energy consumption, occupant comfort, maintenance efficiency, safety, and operational cost. These targets are set during briefing, refined during design, and verified during commissioning. The moment a building enters operation, the connection between that intent and operational reality begins to break. Information produced during construction is structured for project delivery, not for decades of operational use. The UK Government's Soft Landings framework was created because public-sector buildings were consistently failing to perform as designed. The cause was not poor design or construction. The information required to operate them to their designed performance was not reaching the people who needed it.

Better handover does not solve this. In the last decade, digitally mature constructors have delivered increasingly complex and data-rich asset information models at handover, models that meet the client's contractual mandate and satisfy the requirements of ISO 19650. In practice, these AIMs rarely survive into operations.

The requirements that shaped them were set without meaningful input from the people who would use them. The deliverables are overwhelming in volume and structured for project close-out, not for operational decision-making. They arrive locked inside 3D models that operations teams cannot navigate and have no reason to open. The receiving organisation often has no system capable of ingesting the model and restructuring it for operational use, and lacks the skills to do so even if the technology existed. Even the best-executed handover produces information that is technically delivered but functionally unusable from day one. Handover is the largest single loss event in a building's information life. It happens once, while the operational conditions above recur for decades.

The Performance Gap is the common consequence of all four conditions. Whether information has fragmented, was never created, lies buried in the volume, or was lost at handover, the outcome is the same: buildings that cost more to run than they should, that consume more energy than they were designed to, that cannot demonstrate compliance with confidence, and that fail to deliver the outcomes their owners paid for.

The Recover pathway is the dominant condition. The overwhelming majority of operational buildings will never go through another capital project that could establish structured information from scratch. For most estates, recovery is the primary pathway. The framework's pragmatism on information requirements follows from this: requirements are central to the discipline, but they are not a precondition to value. For organisations recovering structured information from existing estates, requirements are determined

© 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/

iteratively as the recovery itself surfaces what is known, what is missing, and what must be specified. The discipline starts where the estate is, not where a project would have started.

The existing estate problem

The never-created condition deserves its own treatment because it describes the majority of the UK's operational estate, and because the industry's response to it has been the weakest.

The majority of the UK's operational estate was built before digital information management existed in any meaningful form. These buildings were designed on paper, constructed without structured data standards, and handed over with lever-arch files, if anything at all. Over decades of operation, even those paper records have been lost, misfiled, or rendered obsolete by undocumented refurbishments, plant replacements, and changes of ownership.

For these estates, the information problem is not degradation. It is absence. There is no structured asset register. There are no linked compliance records. There is no verified baseline of what is installed, what condition it is in, or what documentation exists. Estates teams operate on institutional memory, manual surveys conducted years ago, and whatever fragments of information they can piece together from shared drives, email archives, and the knowledge of long-serving staff.

The majority of buildings in operation today are in this condition. The industry's technology market, and its entire conversation about asset information, remains anchored to the construction phase. CDEs, BIM standards, handover protocols, and digital twin aspirations all assume that a building's information journey begins with a design and construction project. For existing estates, that assumption is wrong.

The consequences are severe and compounding. Without structured asset information, estates leaders cannot comply with the Building Safety Act's Golden Thread requirements with confidence. They cannot demonstrate progress against net-zero targets because they lack reliable baseline data. They cannot make evidence-based decisions about capital investment because they do not have accurate condition data. They cannot benchmark performance across their portfolio because the information is inconsistent, incomplete, or simply missing.

These organisations are not waiting for a construction project to generate good data. They need a credible path to structured asset intelligence for buildings that already exist, as they

© 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/

are, today. Any approach that claims to address the built environment's information problem must serve these estates as well as it serves new builds. If it does not, it is solving only half the problem, and the smaller half at that.

Two pathways to Asset Intelligence

Asset Intelligence is the destination: structured, governed, lifecycle-wide information that enables measurement, accountability, and informed decision-making. There are two distinct pathways to reaching it.

The Recover pathway applies where a building is already in operation and structured asset information has never been established, has degraded to the point of being unusable, or exists but cannot be found and used in the volume it sits within. Recovery is a deliberate programme of work: establishing a structured asset information baseline for an existing estate through a combination of physical survey, data extraction from legacy sources, and validation against current standards. The starting point is not a construction project. It is the estate as it exists today, with all its gaps, inconsistencies, and accumulated information debt.

The Create pathway applies where a building is being designed and constructed, or where a major capital project provides the opportunity to establish structured asset information from the outset. Information is captured during design, governed during construction, verified at commissioning, and handed over in a form that is immediately usable for operational purposes. This pathway addresses the handover problem: ensuring that the information generated during capital projects survives the transition into operations and serves the building for its entire lifecycle. It aligns with Government Soft Landings, ISO 19650, and the emerging expectations of informed clients who understand that a building's information is as important as its physical fabric.

Both pathways lead to the same outcome: a governed, structured, lifecycle-wide asset information layer. They start from different places, involve different activities, and respond to different buying triggers. The Recover pathway is driven by regulatory pressure, portfolio-wide performance programmes, and the growing recognition that existing estates cannot afford to operate without structured information any longer. The Create pathway is driven by capital project programmes and procurement requirements.

A complete discipline must encompass both. An organisation with a mixed portfolio, some buildings newly delivered, others decades old, needs a single coherent approach to asset

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

intelligence that works regardless of how or when a building was built. The discipline cannot privilege one pathway over the other without excluding the majority of the operational estate from its scope.

Supplementary "create" events. The Create / Recover binary is a useful structural distinction at discipline level. In practice, supplementary events sit between the two and require the same Create-pathway discipline applied within an operational estate. Fit-outs, equipment replacements, tenant works, regional installations of innovative technology, and supply-chain capacity additions all generate new information that, if not governed at the point of creation, becomes a Recover-pathway problem despite originating as a Create-style activity. The Architecture and Adoption Model treat these supplementary events directly. The lifecycle information layer is exposed to creation events throughout operations, not only at the originating capital project.

Why existing categories fail

The built environment has developed several technology categories to manage aspects of this problem. None addresses the whole.

CAFM systems manage work orders, planned maintenance, and day-to-day operational tasks. They are essential operational tools. They depend on accurate, complete asset data to function properly, and they do not create, govern, or assure that data. A CAFM system can schedule maintenance on an air handling unit. It cannot tell you whether the original installation records exist, whether the unit was replaced during a refurbishment, or whether the compliance certificates are current and accessible.

CDEs serve the construction phase. They manage document workflows during design and build. Their scope ends at handover. The information they contain is structured for project delivery, not for decades of operational use. When a project completes, the CDE's value diminishes rapidly, and the information it held must be restructured for operations, if it is transferred at all. ISO 19650 describes a CDE that should sustain asset information through the building's life, and the standard is evolving towards defining this as a whole-lifecycle concept rather than a project-phase tool. In practice, the operational CDE the standard describes almost never exists. Asset Intelligence provides the operational information layer that serves the function the standard intends for the lifecycle CDE, with an asset-centric rather than document-centric architecture.

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

Document management systems store files in folder structures. They are repositories, not intelligence systems. They can tell you that a document exists. They cannot tell you which asset it relates to, whether it is current, or whether it is the authoritative version. As estates grow and age, folder-based systems become progressively less usable.

Digital twin is an aspirational category that promises a virtual replica of the physical asset. A digital twin without structured, governed, complete asset data is a visualisation layer over a void. Most organisations lack the data foundation required to make digital twins operationally useful.

Each of these categories performs an essential function, like organs in a body. None provides the circulatory system: the structured, governed, lifecycle-wide information layer that connects them and ensures every system has the data it needs to function.

None of these categories provides a credible answer to the existing estate problem. CDEs assume a construction project. CAFM systems assume the data already exists. Document management systems preserve disorder rather than resolving it. Digital twins require a data foundation that most existing estates do not have. The technology market has been built around the assumption that information begins with a capital project. For the majority of operational buildings, that assumption does not hold.

Artificial Intelligence: an enabler of the discipline

Asset Intelligence is the practising discipline that operationalises ISO 55001 and ISO 19650 at lifecycle scale. Artificial Intelligence is a method that accelerates the discipline. It is not a discipline of its own, and it is not a flavour of information management.

Artificial Intelligence accelerates work across both pathways and across both pillars the discipline operationalises. On the Information Management side, machine learning extracts structured data from legacy documents, reads unstructured information at scale, supports intelligent search across the asset record, and automates quality and compliance checks. On the Asset Management side, predictive analytics support condition assessment, lifecycle cost modelling, risk forecasting, and capital-allocation insight. Both sides depend on a structured, governed, trustworthy information layer to operate safely.

© 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/

Without the practising discipline, Artificial Intelligence applied to fragmented information produces the wrong outcomes faster. The discipline is what makes Artificial Intelligence investment safe. Artificial Intelligence applied to information that is incomplete, inconsistent, or ungoverned reproduces and amplifies the failures of the underlying information. This is the same failure mode as a digital twin without a structured data foundation.

Artificial Intelligence neither replaces nor constitutes a pillar. It accelerates the discipline that makes the standards real in operations. Organisations investing in Artificial Intelligence for the built environment without first investing in the practising discipline will find that their Artificial Intelligence investment compounds the cost of poor information rather than reducing it.

The consequences

The absence of the practising discipline creates consequences for every participant in the supply chain.

For asset owners, the gap means investment decisions, often involving millions of pounds, are made on incomplete or inaccurate data. Capital expenditure is allocated based on assumptions rather than evidence. Compliance risk is managed through manual processes that do not scale and cannot be audited with confidence.

For operators, the gap means hours spent searching for information that should be instantly accessible. Emergency procedures are scattered across shared drives, and compliance certificates are buried in email chains. Every new building handover is a scramble to reconstruct what should have been delivered in usable form.

For maintainers, the gap means working from asset registers that are incomplete, condition data that is outdated, and maintenance manuals that may not reflect the equipment actually installed.

For constructors, the lack of a clear operational data standard means handover requirements are ambiguous, inconsistent, and often contested. Information is produced to close out a project, not to serve the building. This creates friction, delays final account settlement, and damages client relationships.

For the supply chain, specialist subcontractors and equipment suppliers face different information demands on every project with no consistent quality bar against which delivery can be measured or rewarded. Information delivered well carries no commercial advantage.

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

Information delivered poorly carries no consequence. The mechanism that would let the supply chain compete on information quality does not yet exist, so the discipline is denied the market signal that, in most industries, would drive performance.

The economic consequences compound over time. The maintenance and operational costs of a building over its lifecycle far exceed the original capital cost of construction. This is well understood in principle, but poorly managed in practice, precisely because organisations lack the structured information needed to make whole-life cost decisions with confidence. Without reliable data on asset condition, remaining useful life, and maintenance history, capital investment is reactive rather than strategic. Organisations replace assets too late, maintain them inefficiently, or invest in the wrong priorities, all because the information to do otherwise does not flow from construction through to operations in a usable form.

For existing estates without structured information, these consequences are already the daily reality. Every decision is made with incomplete data. Every compliance obligation is met through manual effort that does not scale. Every year that passes without a structured information foundation increases the cost, complexity, and risk of establishing one.

The regulatory environment

The regulatory environment is making these consequences more acute. The legislative drivers connect directly to the business outcomes the discipline enables.

Building Safety Act, the Golden Thread, and fire safety regulation. The Building Safety Act requires building owners to maintain accurate, accessible, and up-to-date information throughout a building's lifecycle for higher-risk buildings. The Fire Safety Act 2021 and the Fire Safety (England) Regulations 2022 sit alongside the BSA. They extend the duty to maintain accurate building safety information across the wider stock, and place specific obligations on responsible persons for fire-risk assessment, evacuation planning, and external-wall systems. Failure to comply carries personal liability for accountable persons. The business outcome the legislation protects is safety, and the post-Grenfell legislative environment is the primary reason boards now treat information performance as their concern, not just their estates director's.

Awaab's Law. The Social Housing (Regulation) Act 2023 and the Awaab's Law provisions require social-housing landlords to investigate and address hazards within strict timescales. Compliance depends on accurate, current information about the asset, the hazard, the response, and the resolution. For housing-sector estates, including major housing portfolios across local authorities and registered providers, Awaab's Law is the dominant near-term driver of structured asset information. The business outcome the legislation protects is

© 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/

occupant health and safety, with compliance failure carrying both regulatory and reputational consequences.

Government Soft Landings and Information Management Plan. The UK Government's Soft Landings framework and Information Management Plan requirements are explicit recognitions that this problem exists and requires a structured response. The business outcome is operating-cost reduction and energy performance against design intent.

ISO 19650 and ISO 55001. The standards themselves are a regulatory and procurement lever. ISO 19650 certification appears increasingly in public-sector procurements as a baseline expectation. ISO 55001 alignment appears in critical-asset-owner procurements where lifecycle accountability matters. The business outcomes are commercial credibility and procurement access.

The industry cannot meet these requirements with spreadsheets, shared drives, and disconnected systems. The regulatory environment, taken in aggregate, is the strongest external force pushing organisations from "information management is a nice idea" to "information management is a board-level accountability."

Why this has persisted

The problem is well understood by anyone who has managed a building or an estate.

The old way of thinking is structurally inefficient and outdated. It is BIM-centric, anchored in the construction phase, shaped by the assumption that project delivery is the only entry point, and measured by handover compliance. The new way must be lifecycle-centric: starting from the 50-year operational reality of a building and working backwards to define what information is needed, how it should be structured, and who is accountable for it at each stage. It must also be estate-centric: recognising that most buildings will never go through a construction-phase information process, and providing a credible alternative for establishing structured information where none exists.

The old way persists for four structural reasons.

First, the assumption that asset intelligence requires a construction project. The industry's information management conversation, BIM, CDEs, digital handover, remains anchored to the design and construction process. ISO 19650 is evolving to challenge this assumption directly, introducing pre-project organisational steps and explicitly permitting information management to start at any point in the lifecycle. The standard's expanding scope has not

© 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/

yet changed practice. Adoption remains concentrated in the delivery phase, and the industry's technology market still treats the construction project as the starting point for structured information.

There is a structural reason for this. During construction, the digital model leads the physical asset: the design exists before the building does, which gives the information model primacy. In operations, this relationship inverts: the physical asset leads and the digital record plays catch-up. The standard is evolving to acknowledge both conditions, but the processes, procurement models, and skills required for each remain fundamentally different. A standard that covers both conditions is not the same thing as a discipline that can deliver both.

This has created an implicit assumption that structured asset information can only be established as a by-product of a capital project. For existing estates, this assumption is paralysing. It suggests that without a major construction programme, there is no credible route to good asset data. That is not true, but the absence of a recognised recovery discipline has left most estates leaders without a viable path forward. The result is inertia: organisations know their information is inadequate but see no practical way to address it.

Second, misaligned incentives. In operation, FM suppliers have little contractual incentive to maintain the quality of their client's asset information. Clients rarely embed strong enough information requirements in FM contracts because they do not know what good looks like in practice. Information quality degrades through every FM procurement cycle, with incoming suppliers starting from scratch because they cannot accept liability for information they did not produce.

The misalignment originates further upstream. Constructors are contractually incentivised to complete projects, not to ensure data quality for operations. The party that creates the information is not the party that bears the cost of poor information. This misalignment is embedded in procurement models and contract structures across the industry. Government frameworks like Soft Landings have attempted to address this through extended aftercare requirements and post-occupancy evaluation, but without a structured information foundation, even these well-intentioned processes produce limited results.

Third, fragmented technology adoption. Each phase of the lifecycle has its own technology, its own standards, and its own data formats. These were developed independently and are not designed to interoperate across the lifecycle. The transition from a project information model to an asset information model should be the point at which construction data becomes operational intelligence. It remains one of the most poorly executed handoffs in the industry.

© 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/

Fourth, the absence of a practising discipline. ISO 55001 and ISO 19650 between them describe what good asset management and information management look like. What the industry has lacked is the practising discipline that delivers what the standards describe. Asset Intelligence is that discipline. The pull is toward operationalising what the standards describe, not toward inventing a new domain. Without a recognised discipline for lifecycle-wide asset information management, the problem has no home. It falls between practitioner tribes: too operational for the construction technologists, too technical for the facilities managers, too niche for the enterprise software vendors. Every organisation solves or fails to solve the problem independently, with no shared vocabulary, no maturity benchmarks, and no market pressure to adopt a coherent approach.

Why the built environment

Asset Intelligence is not a generic data management concept. It is specific to the built environment for four reasons.

Lifecycle duration. A commercial building may be in operation for 50 to 100 years, across multiple owners, operators, and technology generations. Information must remain usable and trustworthy across decades, a requirement that distinguishes the built environment from virtually every other asset class.

Regulatory intensity. Building safety legislation, fire safety regulation, environmental compliance, and accessibility standards create a complex web of obligations that depend on accurate, current asset information. The Building Safety Act, the Fire Safety Act 2021 and Fire Safety (England) Regulations 2022, Awaab's Law, Government Soft Landings, and the forthcoming ISO 19650 revision all accelerate this.

Consequence severity. Poor asset information in the built environment is a safety problem as well as an efficiency problem. Grenfell Tower demonstrated the fatal consequences of information failures in building management. The Building Safety Act was a direct response. Personal liability for compliance failures means this is no longer an abstract operational risk.

Supply chain fragmentation. No other industry has such a pronounced disconnection between the parties that create assets, the parties that own them, and the parties that operate and maintain them. This fragmentation is what makes a lifecycle-wide intelligence layer necessary, and what makes it so difficult to achieve without deliberate, industry-level intervention.

© 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/

What Asset Intelligence enables

The absence of lifecycle-wide asset intelligence is a performance problem as well as a data problem. Organisations that lack structured, governed asset information cannot reliably measure or demonstrate outcomes across four critical domains.

Environmental outcomes. Without accurate baseline data on operational and embodied carbon, energy consumption, water use, biodiversity, and circularity, organisations cannot measure actual performance against design targets, cannot identify where buildings are underperforming, and cannot make evidence-based decisions about retrofit and improvement. Net-zero commitments become aspirational statements rather than measurable programmes.

Social outcomes. Buildings exist to serve people, and they sit within communities. Occupant comfort, productivity, accessibility, and satisfaction are the outcomes the building delivers to the people who use it. Community value, social value, and equitable access are the outcomes the building delivers to the place it sits within. Both depend on understanding how a building is actually performing, not how it was designed to perform. Without structured information connecting design intent to operational reality, organisations have no reliable way to evaluate whether their facilities are meeting the needs of the people they serve.

Safety outcomes. Building safety, fire safety, structural safety, and regulatory compliance all depend on accurate, current information about building systems, access arrangements, and maintenance status. The Golden Thread requirement exists because the consequences of information failures in this domain can be fatal as well as financial. Post-Grenfell legislation has made safety the outcome domain that boards engage with most directly: the Building Safety Act, the Fire Safety Act 2021 and Fire Safety (England) Regulations 2022, and Awaab's Law in housing.

Economic outcomes. Whole-life cost optimisation, the ability to make strategic decisions about maintenance, replacement, and capital investment based on evidence rather than assumption, requires structured information flowing from construction through decades of operation. Without it, asset owners are making multi-million pound investment decisions with incomplete data, every year, across their entire portfolio.

The four domains and their sub-components, measurement anchors, and external crosswalks (to ESG, Four Capitals, RIBA Sustainable Outcomes, and GRESB) are articulated

© 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/

in full in the Definition. Resilience runs as a cross-cutting attribute of all four domains rather than as a separate domain.

These four domains are the outcomes that boards, regulators, and stakeholders are already demanding. Most organisations cannot deliver against them because they lack the structured information foundation that makes measurement and accountability possible, rather than ambition or technology.

None of these outcomes can be realised if intelligence remains locked inside specialist systems or buried in the volume of undifferentiated data that operational users cannot navigate. This is the buried-in-the-volume condition seen from the outcome side: information that is present and correct but cannot be found or acted on in the volume it sits within. Asset intelligence must be accessible to the operational and strategic users whose decisions it exists to serve. If the people responsible for buildings cannot quickly find, trust, and act on what their estate's information tells them, the discipline has failed regardless of how well the information is structured underneath.

For existing estates, the path to these outcomes begins with information recovery. Without a structured baseline, none of these domains can be addressed with confidence. Establishing that baseline is the real work, and the point at which an estate moves from operating in the dark to operating with intelligence.

Disposal as a recognised lifecycle stage

The Institute of Asset Management (IAM) treats disposal as a valid stage of the asset lifecycle alongside acquisition, operation, and maintenance. Asset Intelligence honours this. Disposal generates information that affects the integrity of the lifecycle record and the value an organisation can realise from the asset at the end of its operational life: evidence of decommissioning, environmental clearance, residual value, and repurposing potential. The discipline holds across acquisition, operation, modification, and disposal. The framework's whole-life position requires that disposal is named, even though how to practise it is not yet set out.

© 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 gap no existing category fills

The information required to operate buildings with confidence has fragmented beyond trust through uncoordinated change, was never created in the first place, lies buried in a volume no one can navigate, or was lost at handover. That is not a document management problem. It is not a CAFM problem. It is not a BIM problem. It is an intelligence problem.

Asset Intelligence is the name for the practising discipline that the built environment lacks: a structured, governed, lifecycle-wide information layer that ensures the people responsible for buildings can find, trust and act on the information they need to keep them safe, compliant and performing.

It sits as the third pillar alongside ISO 55001 (the asset management standard) and ISO 19650 (the information management standard). It does not replace either. It operationalises both at lifecycle scale.

It is not CAFM. It is not a CDE. It is not a document management system. It is not a digital twin. It is not Artificial Intelligence. It is the foundation that makes each of those systems and methods more effective, the circulatory system that carries trusted information to every organ that needs it.

The market needs this discipline because the problem is structural, the consequences are severe and increasing, and no existing category addresses it. The discipline must serve existing buildings that have never had structured information and new buildings delivered through capital projects. It must encompass the Recover pathway and the Create pathway as equal, complementary dimensions of a single discipline.

Some organisations already practise elements of Asset Intelligence, typically those with large, regulated estates and mature operational leadership. They have developed their own approaches to structuring, governing, and sustaining asset information. They do so without a shared vocabulary, without a common maturity framework, and without the market infrastructure that would let them benchmark, procure, or scale the discipline. What is missing is a name, a coherent scope, and an end-to-end articulation of the discipline. Naming the discipline does not invent the problem. It gives the industry the language and structure to address it systematically.

The problem is solvable. Existing estates are not condemned to operate without intelligence. Solving it requires naming the discipline, defining it, and building the tools, methods, and market expectations to address it at scale. That is what this framework is for.

© 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/