RESEARCH PARTNERSHIP DISCUSSION PACK

Universal Readiness Engine Research Partnership Alignment Brief

A practical collaboration model for co-design, domain validation and commercial translation

> **One engine. Domain-specific readiness applications. Evidence first. Human judgement retained.**

PREPARED BY	Axiom Systems Pty Ltd
PLATFORM	**Universal Readiness Engine**
ISSUE DATE	19 August 2026
STATUS	NON-CONFIDENTIAL OVERVIEW

Purpose. This document is a non-confidential discussion aid for prospective research, industry and commercialisation partners. It does not constitute a product certification, regulatory opinion, funding commitment or offer of legal terms.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

Executive proposition

Axiom Systems Pty Ltd is seeking research and industry partners to co-design and validate domain-specific applications of the Universal Readiness Engine. The platform foundation converts a defined target state, contextual evidence and human decisions into a structured workflow of requirements, gaps, review, actions and a traceable readiness outcome.

> **The partnership question**
>
> Where does your research or industry network face a recurring decision that is slowed, weakened or made opaque by fragmented evidence, uncertain requirements and poorly owned follow-up?

Axiom is not approaching partners with a fixed vertical product that must be adopted unchanged. The proposition is to identify a meaningful domain problem, configure the proven orchestration pattern around it, and conduct a credible evaluation with domain experts and representative users.

1. Why this partnership can be useful

Partnership advantage	What it means in practice
A tested starting point	The underlying evidence/review/readiness architecture is grounded in an existing cloud-deployed planning-readiness vertical rather than a concept-only slide deck.
Researchable questions	Transferability, evidence quality, provenance, human–AI review, workflow efficiency, action closure and user trust can be measured.
Domain ownership stays with experts	The research partner defines valid domain semantics, methods, evidence expectations, safeguards and evaluation design.
Industry relevance	The collaboration begins with a recurring operational decision and a measurable current-state workflow.
Commercial translation path	A successful domain configuration can progress from research prototype to controlled pilot, licensing, service delivery or a joint go-to-market arrangement subject to agreed terms.
No system-replacement premise	URE can sit above existing repositories and specialist systems, preserving authoritative sources and reducing integration overreach.

2. Collaboration model

Participant	Primary contribution
Axiom Systems	Provides the URE architecture, configurable workflow, prototype engineering, integration pattern, technical delivery, product discipline and commercialisation capability.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

Participant	Primary contribution
Research partner	Provides domain method, research leadership, literature and standards context, evaluation design, subject-matter review, ethics/data-governance input and publication credibility.
Industry / service partner	Provides the recurring problem, representative cases, current workflow, operational users, authoritative evidence sources and deployment context.
Authorised reviewers	Retain the professional, operational, regulatory or clinical judgement represented in the readiness decision.

> **Role boundary**
>
> Axiom supplies the technology foundation and engineering capability. The research partner should not be positioned as a reseller, and Axiom should not present itself as the source of domain authority. The strongest project makes each role explicit.

3. Three engagement shapes

Shape	Indicative duration	Objective	Typical outputs
A. Research scoping sprint	4–8 weeks	Define the target decision, evidence map, research questions, baseline and minimum domain pack.	Research brief, workflow map, feasibility/risk assessment, pilot plan.
B. Co-designed research prototype	3–6 months	Configure a bounded vertical using representative or controlled data and expert review.	Prototype, domain schema, evaluation protocol, preliminary findings.
C. Controlled operational pilot	6–12 months	Deploy with invited users/cases, measure against baseline and refine for translation.	Validated workflow, outcome report, implementation model, commercialisation options.

Timing note. Durations are planning ranges only. Scope, ethics, data access, integrations and partner availability determine the actual schedule.

4. Work-package blueprint

Work package	Purpose
WP1 - Problem framing	Define users, target state, decision authority, current process, recurring friction and non-goals.
WP2 - State-of-art and domain method	Confirm relevant standards, research, existing tools, evidence criteria and safety boundaries.
WP3 - Evidence and configuration model	Create requirement catalogue, evidence profiles, provenance fields, roles, gates and outputs.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

Work package	Purpose
WP4 - Prototype configuration	Configure the URE workflow, UI language, imports/adapters, review proposal and reporting.
WP5 - Validation	Run expert review and representative cases; compare against baseline using agreed performance and guardrail measures.
WP6 - Translation assessment	Evaluate deployment requirements, data/IP terms, partner roles, adoption barriers and commercial options.
WP7 - Dissemination and next decision	Produce approved findings, demonstration assets and a go/no-go or next-stage recommendation.

5. Research questions suited to collaboration

- How should evidence sufficiency and uncertainty be represented for a particular professional decision?
- What is the minimum provenance model that materially improves review and auditability without overburdening users?
- Which requirements can be evaluated deterministically and which must remain reviewer judgements?
- Does explicit accept/edit/reject/defer review reduce automation bias in AI-assisted evidence preparation?
- Can a common orchestration core transfer between domains without erasing domain-specific semantics?
- Does the configured workflow reduce repeated searching, re-entry, handover loss and late discovery of gaps?
- How does the engine affect reviewer agreement, workload, confidence and accountability?
- When is URE better as an independent product, an embedded component or a layer integrated with an existing platform?

6. Candidate application catalogue

The catalogue is intentionally broad to stimulate partner-led selection. Each item is a candidate research application; only the planning-readiness vertical currently has documented TRL 6 evidence.

6.1 Planning & Development

Turn dispersed site and project evidence into a reviewable development-readiness record.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	A defined planning or development milestone is supported by current, attributable evidence, with unresolved matters visible and owned.
Research opening	How can evidence provenance, structured review and bounded AI assistance reduce repeated due-diligence work without displacing professional planning judgement?
Pilot shape	Configure one repeatable site-assessment workflow, benchmark the current manual process, and evaluate time, completeness, rework and reviewer confidence.
Potential disciplines	urban planning, housing research, geospatial analytics, public-sector innovation

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

Dimension	Description
Candidate measures	elapsed preparation time, manual source lookups, rework caused by missing baseline information, provenance completeness, reviewer confidence

6.2 Construction Compliance & Digital Engineering

Connect design requirements, BIM/CAD evidence, inspections and approvals to a visible compliance-readiness state.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	The evidence required for a nominated design, certification, construction or handover gate is assembled, reviewed and traceable.
Research opening	Can a configurable evidence graph improve traceability across BIM, documents and human review while reducing manual compliance reconciliation?
Pilot shape	Select one certification or handover gate, map the evidence schema, ingest representative artefacts and compare readiness assessment quality with the current coordination method.
Potential disciplines	built environment, construction informatics, BIM and digital twins, building compliance
Candidate measures	missing artefacts found, review cycle time, version conflicts, closure time for findings, handover completeness

6.3 Cybersecurity & Operational Resilience

Translate control frameworks into evidence-backed remediation and executive readiness.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	A selected cyber-resilience baseline is supported by reviewed control evidence, explicit exceptions and owned remediation.
Research opening	How should evidence quality and reviewer confidence be represented so a cyber-readiness status is useful without becoming a misleading compliance score?
Pilot shape	Configure a bounded baseline such as Essential Eight or an internal control set and validate evidence sufficiency, inter-reviewer agreement and remediation follow-through.
Potential disciplines	cybersecurity, risk and resilience, SME digital capability, critical infrastructure

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

Dimension	Description
Candidate measures	control evidence coverage, stale evidence detected, reviewer agreement, remediation closure, time to prepare assurance reporting

6.4 AI Governance & Responsible AI

Make AI-system obligations, evidence, risks and human approvals visible from concept to operation.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	An AI use case is demonstrably ready for an agreed lifecycle gate, subject to authorised human approval and documented residual risk.
Research opening	Can a human-review-gated evidence workflow operationalise AI governance frameworks while preserving context-specific judgement and avoiding automated self-certification?
Pilot shape	Apply the engine to two or three AI use cases at different risk levels and evaluate consistency, evidence burden, reviewer usability and change traceability.
Potential disciplines	responsible AI, technology law and policy, data governance, human-centred computing
Candidate measures	evidence coverage, unresolved risks surfaced, review effort, change traceability, stakeholder confidence

6.5 Agriculture & Farm Operations

Join observations, plans, constraints and adviser decisions into practical farm-readiness workflows.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	A defined operational decision or seasonal plan is supported by appropriate evidence, reviewed assumptions and assigned next actions.
Research opening	Can an evidence-and-review layer improve adoption of digital agriculture by making uncertainty, provenance and action ownership explicit rather than merely adding another data dashboard?
Pilot shape	Co-design two or three high-value decisions, begin with manual/CSV inputs, and test with a small cohort before deeper integrations.
Potential disciplines	digital agriculture, agronomy, regional innovation, agricultural economics

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

Dimension	Description
Candidate measures	record completeness, decision cycle time, follow-up completion, data reuse, producer/adviser usability

6.6 Biosecurity & Traceability

Convert plans, observations, movement records and response actions into auditable biosecurity readiness.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	The enterprise or facility can demonstrate readiness for the agreed biosecurity scenario, including evidence, roles, triggers and response actions.
Research opening	How can a configurable readiness model support proportionate biosecurity assurance across heterogeneous enterprises without imposing a one-size-fits-all checklist?
Pilot shape	Model one priority threat or assurance scheme, conduct a baseline review, run a tabletop exercise and measure evidence and action improvement.
Potential disciplines	biosecurity, veterinary and plant science, supply-chain traceability, regional extension
Candidate measures	plan and control coverage, exercise findings, action closure, time to retrieve evidence, participant confidence

6.7 Energy Transition & Project Assurance

Track technical, regulatory, community and delivery evidence for clean-energy project gates.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	A nominated project gate is supported by current cross-discipline evidence, accepted dependencies and visible residual risks.
Research opening	Can evidence-centred readiness orchestration improve cross-discipline project assurance and reduce late discovery of unresolved dependencies?
Pilot shape	Configure one early-development or pre-delivery gate and test the approach on representative project records with domain reviewers.
Potential disciplines	energy systems, project management, environmental approvals, industrial decarbonisation
Candidate measures	dependencies surfaced, late rework avoided, review cycle time, evidence currency, stakeholder alignment

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

6.8 Environmental Compliance & Natural Capital

Link obligations, monitoring evidence, exceptions and remediation to an explicit environmental readiness state.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	The organisation can demonstrate that relevant environmental obligations are understood, evidenced, reviewed and actively managed.
Research opening	How can provenance-aware readiness workflows improve confidence in environmental evidence while accommodating evolving obligations and site-specific professional judgement?
Pilot shape	Select a bounded approval or environmental management plan, map obligations to evidence and test review efficiency and exception handling.
Potential disciplines	environmental science, natural capital, sustainability assurance, remote sensing
Candidate measures	obligation coverage, missing evidence, exception resolution, audit preparation time, reviewer confidence

6.9 Manufacturing & Quality Systems

Make process qualification, quality evidence and production-release decisions traceable.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	A product, process or production run is ready for the agreed release gate with reviewed quality evidence and controlled deviations.
Research opening	Can configurable evidence sufficiency rules and human review reduce release delays while maintaining or improving quality assurance?
Pilot shape	Apply the engine to one product or process release, compare evidence retrieval and review time, and analyse missed or late quality issues.
Potential disciplines	advanced manufacturing, quality engineering, supply chains, industrial AI
Candidate measures	review time, missing evidence found, deviation closure, first-pass release rate, audit retrieval time

6.10 Infrastructure & Asset Readiness

Bring asset data, inspections, maintenance, risk and handover evidence into one readiness view.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	An asset, facility or operating transition is ready for service, handover, maintenance intervention or resilience testing.
Research opening	Can a readiness layer across existing asset systems improve handover quality and operational resilience without duplicating systems of record?
Pilot shape	Choose one asset class or handover event, connect a limited evidence set and evaluate gap detection, review effort and action closure.
Potential disciplines	infrastructure systems, asset management, digital twins, resilience engineering
Candidate measures	handover gaps, defect closure, evidence retrieval time, operational acceptance cycle, resilience findings

6.11 Research Commercialisation & TRL Progression

Connect hypotheses, evidence, risks, milestones and partner decisions across the path from research to deployment.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	A research outcome or venture is ready for a defined translation, pilot, investment or deployment decision with evidence and assumptions visible.
Research opening	Can evidence-linked readiness improve the quality and transparency of research translation decisions compared with stage-gate checklists alone?
Pilot shape	Use the engine with a small portfolio of projects at different maturity levels and compare decision clarity, evidence gaps and next-step quality.
Potential disciplines	research translation, entrepreneurship, technology transfer, implementation science
Candidate measures	assumptions made explicit, evidence gaps identified, decision turnaround, next-step completion, partner alignment

6.12 Procurement & Supplier Assurance

Move from document collection to evidence-backed supplier and procurement readiness.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	A procurement or supplier decision is supported by current, reviewed evidence, transparent evaluation and owned conditions.
Research opening	How can evidence provenance and review controls improve supplier assurance while limiting automation bias in evaluation?
Pilot shape	Configure one category or supplier onboarding workflow and compare evidence completeness, clarification cycles and review consistency.
Potential disciplines	procurement, supply-chain risk, public administration, SME capability
Candidate measures	clarification cycles, missing evidence, evaluation consistency, onboarding time, auditability

6.13 Health Service Innovation

Coordinate implementation evidence, governance, workforce and safety readiness for service change.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	A service innovation is ready for a defined pilot or implementation gate, with clinical authority retained by authorised professionals.
Research opening	Can a human-controlled readiness workflow improve implementation transparency and reduce missed dependencies in complex service change?
Pilot shape	Co-design around a non-diagnostic service innovation and evaluate implementation completeness, stakeholder coordination and action closure.
Potential disciplines	implementation science, health services research, digital health, human factors
Candidate measures	dependencies identified, approval cycle time, training coverage, action closure, stakeholder confidence

6.14 Emergency & Community Resilience

Turn plans, capabilities, exercises and recovery actions into a living preparedness record.

Dimension	Description
Readiness question	A community, organisation or facility can demonstrate readiness for an agreed hazard or continuity scenario.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

Dimension	Description
Research opening	How can readiness evidence remain current between exercises and incidents, and how should uncertainty be communicated to decision makers?
Pilot shape	Configure one hazard or continuity scenario, run a tabletop exercise and compare preparedness evidence before and after action closure.
Potential disciplines	disaster resilience, public policy, critical infrastructure, community engagement
Candidate measures	capability gaps, contact and plan currency, exercise action closure, time to assemble status, participant confidence

7. Selecting the strongest first project

Selection criterion	Positive signal
Recurring decision	The same type of readiness judgement occurs repeatedly and causes visible friction.
Evidence fragmentation	Relevant evidence spans multiple artefacts, systems or contributors.
Human authority	A named professional or operational role owns the final decision.
Measurable baseline	The current process can be observed or reconstructed and compared.
Bounded scope	A first pilot can focus on one target state, cohort and evidence set.
Data feasibility	Representative data can be shared under workable governance arrangements.
Research value	The project can test a generalisable question, not just build a custom form.
Industry pull	A user organisation has a real operational need and willingness to participate.
Commercial pathway	A successful result has a plausible user, buyer or licensing route.

Avoid the “technology looking for a problem” trap

The landing page should open conversations, but the project should be chosen only after a domain expert and industry participant confirm that the readiness problem is real, recurring and measurable.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

8. Validation framework

Evaluation dimension	Illustrative measures
Baseline efficiency	Elapsed time, active effort, manual lookups, re-entry and clarification cycles.
Evidence quality	Completeness, currency, conflicts, provenance coverage and scope fit.
Decision quality	Blocking matters found, false-ready outcomes, reviewer agreement and rationale completeness.
Action performance	Ownership, due-state visibility, closure rate and closure evidence.
Human factors	Usability, workload, trust, automation bias and perceived accountability.
Technical performance	Job completion, error visibility, deterministic replay, integration reliability and security events.
Translation	Adoption barriers, deployment cost, partner willingness, repeatability and commercial pathway.

9. Data, ethics, IP and publication principles

These principles are a discussion starting point and require project-specific legal and institutional approval:

- Background IP remains with the party that brings it to the collaboration.
- Project IP, configuration ownership, licensing and commercialisation rights are agreed before substantive build work.
- Research use, operational use and productisation rights are distinguished rather than assumed to be identical.
- Personal, confidential, commercially sensitive and regulated data are minimised and governed through approved arrangements.
- Publication is encouraged where appropriate, subject to confidentiality, IP protection, security and reasonable pre-publication review.
- Domain experts retain responsibility for methods, professional interpretation and any regulated conclusion.
- Axiom does not require partner source systems to be replaced; data exchange can be bounded and reversible.
- Pilot exit and data return/deletion obligations are agreed at commencement.

10. Suggested first conversation

1. Select one candidate domain or invite the research group to propose a stronger one.
2. Describe one recurring decision and the current evidence workflow in concrete terms.
3. Identify the authorised reviewer and what “ready” means for that decision.
4. List the systems, artefacts and data owners involved.
5. Agree the biggest uncertainty: evidence quality, process time, handover, automation bias, action closure or another issue.
6. Choose a 4–8 week scoping output and nominate the smallest representative dataset.
7. Only after fit is established, discuss project structure, funding pathway, IP and contracting.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

10.1 Thirty-minute discovery agenda

Time	Topic
0–5 min	Research group priorities and the industry problem they most want to solve.
5–10 min	URE operating model and demonstrated AxiomReady vertical.
10–20 min	One candidate domain decision, evidence flow and research hypothesis.
20–25 min	Data, users, baseline and safeguards.
25–30 min	Referral, scoping workshop or decision not to proceed.

11. What Axiom can bring to an initial scoping session

- non-confidential platform specification and state-of-art synthesis;
- interactive multi-domain landing-page demonstration;
- reference target-state, evidence, finding, action and review-proposal model;
- existing planning-readiness prototype evidence and testing boundary;
- example domain pack and pilot measurement template;
- technical feasibility assessment for files, APIs, OCR and bounded AI assistance;
- draft work-package, role and commercialisation options for partner review.

12. Next-step proposition

> **A low-friction first step**
>
> Nominate one research lead and one industry-facing colleague for a 30-minute discussion. We will bring one tailored readiness hypothesis, a minimal evidence map and a proposed validation question. The objective is to determine fit-not to force a pre-defined project.

Contact details and a partner-specific outreach pack are provided separately so this document can remain shareable across institutions.

Internal evidence basis

ID	Internal record	Date/baseline	Use in this pack
E1	Axiom Universal Readiness Engine Product Brief	August 2026	Defines the URE operating model, value proposition and human-decision boundary.
E2	AxiomReady - HIN0027 TRL 6 and Prototype Evidence	12 August 2026 baseline	Records a functional cloud-deployed planning-readiness vertical, its bounded workflow and 204/204 passing backend tests.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.

ID	Internal record	Date/baseline	Use in this pack
E3	AxiomReady Deployment and Pilot Readiness Statement	15 August 2026	Records deployment, private workspaces, controlled support and current pre-commercial status.

Boundary. The demonstrated maturity claim applies to the existing AxiomReady planning-readiness implementation and its bounded tested workflow. Other domain implementations in this package are prospective configurations requiring co-design, domain verification and pilot validation.

© 2026 Axiom Systems Pty Ltd. All rights reserved.