

PRACTICAL BRIEF

The Workplace Technology Readiness Check

A practical self-assessment before an organization pilots, buys or scales a new tool

The Canadian Forum on Workplace Innovation · September 2026

PURPOSE

Create a structured conversation about whether the foundations for a responsible, useful technology decision are in place — and identify the preparation work required next.

PROBLEM

ACCOUNTABILITY

PARTICIPATION

SAFEGUARDS

CAPACITY

MEASUREMENT

How to use the check

Complete the check with the people responsible for the work, implementation and key safeguards. Discuss differences in scores; the conversation and supporting evidence matter more than the total.

SCORE	MEANING
0 — Not in place	No evidence, owner or agreed approach.
1 — Partly in place	Some evidence or activity, but material gaps remain.
2 — In place	Clear evidence, an accountable owner and a workable process.

IMPORTANT BOUNDARY

This is a directional self-assessment — not a validated maturity model, legal-compliance assessment, certification or guarantee of success. A high score may inform a bounded pilot decision; it does not establish organizational readiness or justify scaling.

Interpret the total carefully

TOTAL	INTERPRETATION	IMMEDIATE RESPONSE
0–16	Foundations missing	Do not proceed. Define the problem, ownership and critical safeguards.
17–32	Prepare before piloting	Close priority gaps and document minimum conditions.
33–41	Pilot with explicit conditions	Use a bounded test, named owners and a decision rule.
42–48	Potentially ready for a bounded pilot	Proceed only if no stop condition applies; verify performance and unintended effects before scaling.

Stop conditions

Pause regardless of the total if there is no defined problem, no accountable owner, no meaningful worker participation, uncontrolled sensitive data, no safe fallback for a consequential use case, or no baseline and decision rule.

The scoring worksheet begins on the next page. Print the worksheet or use your PDF reader's annotation tools to mark responses and add evidence or follow-up notes.

01 | DIRECTION AND PARTICIPATION

Score each statement: 0, 1 or 2

A. Problem and value

STATEMENT	0	1	2	EVIDENCE / ACTION
A specific workplace problem, task or service need is documented.	☐	☐	☐	
The affected workers, roles, locations and operating conditions are defined.	☐	☐	☐	
A baseline exists for the outcome the technology is intended to improve.	☐	☐	☐	
The expected value and acceptable trade-offs are clear enough to test.	☐	☐	☐	

B. Accountability and governance

STATEMENT	0	1	2	EVIDENCE / ACTION
One person is accountable for the pilot decision and follow-up.	☐	☐	☐	
Operations, safety, privacy, security, accessibility and purchasing responsibilities are assigned.	☐	☐	☐	
Decision rights, escalation and human oversight are defined.	☐	☐	☐	
The organization can document why it proceeded, revised or stopped.	☐	☐	☐	

C. Worker participation and trust

STATEMENT	0	1	2	EVIDENCE / ACTION
Affected workers or representatives helped define the problem and requirements.	☐	☐	☐	
The intended use, data practices and boundaries can be explained clearly.	☐	☐	☐	
Workers have a practical way to raise concerns or challenge an output.	☐	☐	☐	
Feedback will be reviewed and visibly influence implementation decisions.	☐	☐	☐	

PAGE SUBTOTAL

Domains A-C: ____ / 24

02 | SAFEGUARDS AND DELIVERY CAPACITY

Continue the same 0–2 scale

D. Safety, privacy, security and accessibility

STATEMENT	0	1	2	EVIDENCE / ACTION
Relevant hazards and work-design changes have been reviewed.	☐	☐	☐	
Data collection, access, retention, sharing and deletion are defined and proportionate.	☐	☐	☐	
Cybersecurity, vendor, incident and continuity requirements are documented.	☐	☐	☐	
Accessibility requirements and accommodation implications will be tested with affected users.	☐	☐	☐	

E. Implementation capacity

STATEMENT	0	1	2	EVIDENCE / ACTION
The pilot has enough staff time, budget, technical support and leadership attention.	☐	☐	☐	
Users and supervisors will receive relevant training and practice.	☐	☐	☐	
Integration, maintenance, updates and support responsibilities are clear.	☐	☐	☐	
A safe fallback and exit path can be maintained during the test.	☐	☐	☐	

F. Measurement and learning

STATEMENT	0	1	2	EVIDENCE / ACTION
The pilot has a bounded use case, duration, user group and review date.	☐	☐	☐	
Measures cover outcome, safeguards, implementation, cost/effort and worker experience.	☐	☐	☐	
Success, revision and stop conditions are defined before the pilot begins.	☐	☐	☐	
The organization will record uncertainty, unintended effects and lessons before scaling.	☐	☐	☐	

PAGE SUBTOTAL

Domains D–F: ____ / 24 • Total score: ____ / 48

03 | CONVERT THE SCORE INTO ACTION

Prioritize conditions, not points

Begin with every item scored 0, then review items scored 1 that could affect safety, privacy, security, accessibility, human oversight or operational continuity. Do not spend effort improving the total while a critical condition remains unresolved.

TECHNOLOGY IN PRACTICE · ILLUSTRATIVE, NOT AN ENDORSEMENT**Toyota Motor Manufacturing Canada and Digit (February 2026): beyond the pilot**

In February 2026, Agility Robotics announced that Toyota Motor Manufacturing Canada had signed a Robots-as-a-Service agreement for its Digit humanoid robot after a pilot, with planned use in manufacturing, supply-chain and logistics operations. The announcement confirms a decision to move beyond the pilot; it does not disclose the local evidence on safety, worker participation, data practices, training, fallback or evaluation thresholds.

Decision lesson. A commercial agreement is not the same as proof of local readiness. Before scaling, decision-makers still need evidence for the safeguards, operating capacity and review conditions in this check.

Source [7]: [Agility Robotics — TMMC commercial agreement](#). Company- or industry-reported implementation; results should not be generalized.

Readiness action record

PRIORITY GAP	OWNER	NEXT ACTION / EVIDENCE	REVIEW DATE

Minimum conditions for a bounded pilot

- A defined problem, use case, accountable owner and affected worker group.
- Documented mandatory safeguards and a safe fallback for consequential use.
- A vendor or technical option that meets the screening requirements.
- Adequate time, training and support for representative users.
- A baseline, balanced measures, review date and stop/revise/proceed rule.

DECISION RECORD

Decision: ☐ Stop ☐ Continue preparing ☐ Run bounded pilot ☐ Extend existing pilot

Conditions and rationale: _____

BOTTOM LINE

Readiness is not the absence of uncertainty. It is the ability to run a bounded test with clear ownership, meaningful participation, essential safeguards, enough delivery capacity and a decision process that can respond to evidence.

Sources and evidence notes

1. CCOHS, [Introducing New Technology at the Workplace](#). Canadian guidance on assessment, worker involvement, hazards, controls and training.
 2. CCOHS, [Risk Assessment](#). Canadian guidance for identifying hazards, assessing risk and reviewing controls.
 3. Federal, provincial and territorial privacy commissioners, [Protecting Employee Privacy in the Modern Workplace](#). Joint Canadian principles for privacy, monitoring, impact assessment, transparency and human involvement.
 4. Canadian Centre for Cyber Security, [Cross-Sector Cyber Security Readiness Goals Toolkit](#). Canadian guidance developed for critical-infrastructure owners and operators; selected governance, vendor and incident-response practices are applied here proportionately.
 5. Accessibility Standards Canada, [CAN/ASC-EN 301 549:2024](#). Canadian voluntary standard with functional accessibility requirements and test methods for ICT products and services.
 6. NIST, [AI Risk Management Framework](#). Voluntary framework organized around Govern, Map, Measure and Manage.
 7. Agility Robotics, [TMMC commercial agreement](#). Vendor announcement of a Canadian manufacturing deployment following a pilot; used to distinguish a scale decision from the local readiness evidence still required.
-

EVIDENCE STANDARD

This brief synthesizes public guidance and selected evidence for practical decision support. It is not legal advice, a compliance determination, a product endorsement or a substitute for qualified professional judgment. Requirements vary by workplace and jurisdiction.

© 2026 The Canadian Forum on Workplace Innovation