TRANSLATE IDEAS™ INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Readiness Framework™ Brief

A practical architecture for diagnosing future capability across mindset, capability, culture, technology and execution.

PUBLICATION	Brief 01 · August 2026
PURPOSE	A field-facing summary of the core Readiness Framework™.

> **Readiness is not the amount of training delivered. It is the ability of people and systems to act effectively when the future arrives.**

Why readiness needs a framework

Transformation programmes often measure activity: courses completed, workshops delivered, tools deployed or communications sent. Those measures matter, but they do not tell us whether people and systems are actually ready to perform differently.

The Readiness Framework™ gives Translate IDEAS™ a shared language for diagnosing where future capability is strong, where it is exposed and what must move next.

THE MODEL

Five dimensions of future capability

Dimension	Core question	Evidence to look for
Mindset	How do people interpret the change?	Beliefs, confidence, willingness, trust and meaning-making.
Capability	What can people actually do?	Knowledge, skill, judgement, practice quality and role-specific performance.
Culture	What does the system repeatedly reinforce?	Leadership signals, norms, rituals, recognition, feedback and standards.
Technology	How do tools amplify or constrain work?	Access, usability, workflow integration, fluency and governance.
Execution	How does intent become consistent results?	Decisions, routines, handoffs, accountability, speed and outcomes.

A diagnostic, not a scorecard

The five dimensions are not assumed to carry equal weight in every situation. Their purpose is to stop teams from reducing transformation to a single intervention when the real friction may sit elsewhere in the system.

FROM DIAGNOSIS TO EVIDENCE

Discover → Diagnose → Design → Demonstrate

Stage	What happens	Output
Discover	Clarify the future state and why it matters.	A shared readiness question.
Diagnose	Assess the five dimensions and identify friction.	Readiness gaps, strengths and risk areas.
Design	Build only what is required to move the identified gaps.	Targeted readiness interventions.
Demonstrate	Capture evidence of behaviour, capability and system movement.	A defensible story of progress.

What changes in practice

- Training becomes one possible response, not the automatic starting point.
- Leaders define the future behaviour and system conditions required for success.
- Technology adoption is treated as a human-and-system change problem, not only a tool rollout.
- Evidence is defined before activity so success is not reduced to attendance or completion.

> **A useful readiness question is not “What training do people need?” It is “What future must they be ready to perform in - and what is preventing that today?”**

EVIDENCE BASE

References & source discipline

External research informs the problem landscape. It is not presented as validation of Translate IDEAS™ proprietary frameworks.

1. McKinsey & Company (2026). From adoption to impact: Three horizons of AI transformation.

2. Boston Consulting Group (2025). AI at Work: Momentum Builds, but Gaps Remain.

3. Michelotto, F. & Joia, L. A. (2024). Organizational Digital Transformation Readiness. Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research, 19(4), 3283-3304.

4. McKinsey & Company (2026). Reimagine learning and development for the AI age.

> **The framework is strongest when it helps teams ask better questions before they design a programme.**