



— THE CLAUDE SKILL

AI Adoption Change Playbook

Describe your AI rollout and get a scored diagnosis of the people-side frictions standard change management doesn't surface, plus the tactical artifacts ADKAR application requires but doesn't prescribe.

01

Scores the Five Frictions every AI rollout produces, from Existential to Equity.

02

Maps each Friction to the ADKAR element it blocks, in the language your plan speaks.

03

Detects Concentrated Desire Resistance™, the pattern standard assessment misses.

04

Builds four integrated artifacts: Diagnostic, Trust Blueprint, Metrics, Manager Playbook.

05

Discloses thin inputs and calls its scores a hypothesis to test, not a verdict.



AI Friction
Diagnostic:
What You Get

Awareness landed. Training scored well. Nobody is using the tool. This map is why.

THE DIAGNOSIS AT A GLANCE

Friction Severity Map

Friction	Severity	ADKAR element
Existential. "Will this make me redundant?"	Critical	Desire (primary), Awareness (secondary)
Trust. "How do I know when AI is wrong?"	High	Ability (primary), Knowledge (secondary)
Skill Decay. "Will I lose the ability to do this myself?"	High	Reinforcement (primary), Ability (secondary)
Verification. "I am still accountable for AI's mistakes."	High	Ability (primary), Knowledge (secondary)
Equity. "Who gets it first? Who gets left behind?"	Low	Desire (primary), Awareness (secondary)

Severity scale

Critical High Medium Low Not Present

Northgate Distribution, ten weeks from a new WMS go-live.

01 The company

Northgate Distribution. 640 staff, national footprint, one distribution network.

02 The change

A warehouse management system replacement that owns all of the program's attention.

03 The AI inside it

The new WMS ships with an AI demand forecasting module. Separate change, same go-live.

04 The group

Twelve inventory planners. The module proposes the forecast that defines their role.

05 The runway

Ten weeks to go-live, one change practitioner, one contract PM whose role ends at cutover.

06 The series

Same Northgate as the Town Hall demos. Different change, different problem.

Northgate Distribution: AI Demand Forecasting Rollout Diagnostic

Fictional case study - Change readiness - Inventory planning - Go-live in 10 weeks

1. Executive diagnosis

Overall assessment: High change risk — targeted intervention required immediately.

The AI demand forecasting module is not simply a new software feature. It changes how 12 inventory planners make decisions, apply their professional judgement, and demonstrate their value to the business.

The biggest risk is not that planners cannot learn the new screens. It is that they may not trust the AI-generated forecasts, may feel that their expertise is being displaced, or may quietly maintain their own forecasts outside the new system.

Northgate also has a significant historical obstacle: the abandoned ERP implementation, still referred to as “the ghost project.” That experience may make staff sceptical of management assurances, training plans and the promised go-live date.

With ten weeks remaining and no dedicated change resource beyond you, the priority is to establish trust, involve planners in validating the AI, and demonstrate genuine operational readiness before go-live.

Initial risk profile

High

Trust and adoption

Overall risk

AI recommendations replace a familiar, manually built forecast. Trust must be earned through evidence.

High

Change fatigue and credibility

Readiness risk

The failed ERP project may have damaged confidence in large-scale change.

Medium–High

Limited change capacity

Delivery risk

One person is covering change across a 640-person, three-site transformation, alongside a contract PM.

These are preliminary qualitative ratings based on the scenario, not measured survey results. The diagnostic below distinguishes known facts from hypotheses that need testing.

2. Diagnostic: the seven dimensions that matter

Rating scale: Low / Medium / High risk. Ratings reflect the current evidence and should be validated with the 12 planners.

Dimension	Initial risk	Evidence and diagnosis
1. Awareness and rationale	Medium–High	Planners need to understand why forecasting is changing, what problem AI solves, and why the business is making this investment now.
2. Desire and willingness	High	Hand-built forecasting is being replaced by AI proposals. This may threaten autonomy, expertise, status or job security. Actual sentiment is unknown.
3. Knowledge and skills	Medium–High	Planners must learn to interpret forecasts, understand confidence and exceptions, challenge recommendations and use the new workflow. Training needs are unassessed.
4. Ability to perform	High	Planners must demonstrate that they can use the module in realistic planning scenarios, including unusual demand patterns and forecast errors. Knowing the screens is not enough.
5. Reinforcement and sustained use	High	Without agreed operating rules, management follow-through and performance measures, planners may revert to spreadsheets and manual forecasts.
6. Trust in the change and AI	High	The “ghost project” creates a credibility hurdle. Planners may question whether this implementation will finish and whether the AI is reliable enough for operational decisions.
7. Leadership and change capacity	High	The COO sponsors the programme, but the contract PM and a single change resource create a potential gap between executive intent and day-to-day support.

Input from Change Manager into AI Adoption Change Playbook Skill

This scenario is completely fictitious, including company name & description

Context for this session, all fictional:

Northgate Distribution, a mid-size warehousing and distribution business, 640 staff across three sites. We are replacing a 15-year-old warehouse management system with a new WMS. The new system includes an AI-driven demand forecasting module. Go-live is in ten weeks.

Impacted groups:

- Warehouse operatives, 280 people, their daily scanning and picking workflow changes completely
- Shift supervisors, 24 people, lose their legacy exception reports and must learn new dashboards
- Inventory planners, 12 people, the AI module now proposes the forecast they used to build by hand
- Customer service, 30 people, order status screens change

Change history: an ERP implementation was abandoned 18 months ago after nine months of work. Staff refers to it as “the ghost project.”

Sponsor: the COO. Program lead: a contract PM. There is no dedicated change resource other than me.

Run the diagnostic on the AI demand forecasting module rollout to the inventory planners.

AI Friction
Diagnostic:
What You Get

Five Frictions, scored for this rollout, each mapped to the ADKAR element it blocks.

1

THE DIAGNOSIS AT A GLANCE

Friction Severity Map

Friction	Severity	ADKAR element
Existential. "Will this make me redundant?"	Critical	Desire (primary), Awareness (secondary)
Trust. "How do I know when AI is wrong?"	High	Ability (primary), Knowledge (secondary)
Skill Decay. "Will I lose the ability to do this myself?"	High	Reinforcement (primary), Ability (secondary)
Verification. "I am still accountable for AI's mistakes."	High	Ability (primary), Knowledge (secondary)
Equity. "Who gets it first? Who gets left behind?"	Low	Desire (primary), Awareness (secondary)

Severity scale

Critical High Medium Low Not Present

Scores are structurally derived from the rollout characteristics, not yet from observed behavior. Diagnostic confidence is Medium because three intake inputs were thin: rollout stage, on-the-ground signals, and the practitioner concern. Treat these as the hypothesis to test in the next two weeks, not as an evidenced finding.

All five Frictions drain Desire. Standard assessment only catches two of them doing it.

AI Friction Diagnostic: What You Get

Concentrated Desire Resistance™

Gretchen Asher's term for this pattern

WHERE THE RESISTANCE ACTUALLY SITS

Friction Profile by ADKAR Element

ADKAR element distribution

By primary element

- Awareness: 0 Frictions
- Desire: 2. Existential (Critical), Equity (Low)
- Knowledge: 0 Frictions
- Ability: 2. Trust (High), Verification (High)
- Reinforcement: 1. Skill Decay (High)

Desire suppression by contribution

The reading that matters

- Existential suppresses Desire directly. The AI proposes the deliverable that defines the role.
- Trust suppresses it indirectly. Nobody adopts a forecast engine whose failure modes they cannot recognize.
- Verification suppresses it through a workload reframe. Same accountability, new checking on top.
- Skill Decay suppresses future-state Desire. Giving up the judgment is giving up the defense.

Concentrated Desire Resistance

Four of the five Frictions suppress Desire, and all four are at High or Critical. Desire is the hardest ADKAR element to move and the one most commonly under-addressed, because it cannot be trained for. Interventions weighted toward Knowledge and Ability work will land cleanly and change nothing.

Group concentration

Inventory planners (12): four Frictions at Medium or higher. Existential Critical, Trust High, Skill Decay High, Verification High.

That concentration is what you act on first, and twelve people is small enough to work by name.



AI Friction Diagnostic: What You Get

It tells you which of its scores aren't evidenced yet, and the cheapest way to test them.

Thin inputs, and what they cost you

Three inputs were not supplied and defaults were applied per this skill's fallback logic.

- **Rollout stage.** Assumed active deployment. If the planners have not yet been told what the AI module will propose, this is pre-announcement and the Existential intervention window is wider than the analysis below assumes. Re-run if so.
- **Ground reality.** No sentiment or behavioral signals for the planner group. The analysis below is built on rollout characteristics, not on observed behavior. This is the input that most affects accuracy, and it is the one you can close cheapest: four conversations with four planners.
- **Practitioner concern.** No weighting applied.

The severity scores below are structurally derived. They are defensible, and they are not yet evidenced. Treat them as the hypothesis you go and test in the next two weeks.

AI Friction Diagnostic: What You Get



The three wrong calls you are most likely to make, named before you make them.

WHAT TO STEER AWAY FROM

Most Likely Misdiagnoses for This Profile

1 Training and communications

The tempting read, because those are the two things one change resource can build in ten weeks. Both will be delivered competently, Desire will not move, and adoption will then be reported as a training failure.

2 Coding caution as resistance

With four Frictions on twelve people you will see quiet non-adoption, selective refusal and parallel manual forecasting. All three read as resistance and none of them are. Treating them as resistance escalates the wrong response and burns credibility with the group you most need.

3 Running it as a WMS workstream

The module is not a WMS feature with a training requirement. It is a separate change that alters the role definition of twelve people, and it needs its own intervention plan with its own sponsor moment.

AI Friction Diagnostic: What You Get



The one move everything else waits on sits outside this skill, and the skill says so.

IN PRIORITY ORDER FOR THIS FRICTION PROFILE

Recommended Next Outputs

Start here. The commitment the COO makes to the twelve inventory planners.

The Existential findings say it must be specific, time-bound and tripwire-defined, must name what the planners still own after go-live rather than promising unspecified higher-value work, and must avoid the six reassurance patterns this Diagnostic lists. This is the gating intervention for Existential Friction and it sits outside what this skill produces. Everything below underperforms until it lands. Take the Existential findings to your communications partner or draft it yourself; they are exactly the input the narrative needs.

1 Trust Calibration Training Blueprint

Training design that closes the gap between knowing how to use the module and knowing when to trust what it gives back. Carries a calibrated scenario library, learning objectives by role tier, assessment design and a reinforcement schedule. How to ask for it: "Generate the Trust Calibration Training Blueprint for this rollout."

2 Manager Enablement Playbook for AI Workflows

Coaching scripts, a work review framework and escalation logic for the people managers who carry daily reinforcement. Built for managers running AI-augmented teams, not for the project team. How to ask for it: "Generate the Manager Enablement Playbook for AI workflows for this project."

3 Quality-of-Use Metrics Framework

Replaces adoption counts with leading and lagging indicators that measure judgment and outcomes, across five categories, with a measurement cadence and a companion workbook for your analytics partner. How to ask for it: "Build the Quality-of-Use Metrics Framework for this rollout."

Trust Calibration Training Blueprint: What You Get

Training the judgment, not the buttons: when to trust, when to verify, when to override.

2

THE FRAMEWORK THE TRAINING TEACHES

The Three Calibration Domains

1 Trust Without Verification

Accept as proposed and move on

In your context: a stable, high-volume SKU with several years of clean history, no promotion in the window, no supply constraint, no customer contract change. The module proposes a number consistent with the trend.

Verification required: none beyond a magnitude sense-check. If it looks like last year plus the trend, it is.

2 Trust With Verification

Plausibly right, check one thing

In your context: the operational majority. A category with a promotion running, a seasonal ramp, a customer whose volumes have moved, a SKU affected by a supplier lead-time change.

Verification required: an independent check against one named source, not a rebuild. The promotional calendar. The commercial team. The supplier lead time. Targeted and finite.

3 Override or Reject

Produce it manually

In your context: a new SKU with no history. A customer who has announced a site closure or contract change the data cannot contain. A period whose history is distorted by a one-off event.

Verification required: none. Do not verify a forecast that should not exist. Produce it yourself.

The distinction that matters most in your rollout is between Domain 2 and Domain 3, because the module will produce a confident number in both, and only the planner's own knowledge separates them.

Quality-of-Use Metrics Framework: What You Get

If your dashboard is login counts, you are measuring attendance, not adoption.

3

WHAT TO STOP REPORTING

Vanity Metrics Audit

Vanity metric	What it looks like	Why it misleads here
Module acceptance rate	"94 percent of module forecasts accepted without amendment"	The most dangerous number in this rollout, because it will be reported as success. Across a portfolio with new SKUs, promotions and supply constraints, 94 percent acceptance means Domain 3 recognition has failed. High acceptance is the failure mode.
Login or session counts	"All 12 planners active daily"	They have to log into the WMS to do their job. This measures employment, not adoption.
Training completion	"100 percent completed the module training"	Completion is not calibration. The assessment scores measure calibration; the completion figure measures attendance.
Forecast volume processed	"3,400 SKU forecasts generated this month"	Volume is a property of the catalog, not of anything the rollout changed.
User satisfaction score	"Planners rate the module 4.1 out of 5"	Early satisfaction measures novelty and relief at the old WMS being gone. Uncorrelated with judgment quality.
Percentage of SKUs on AI forecasting	"78 percent of the catalog now AI-forecast"	Coverage is a configuration decision made by the implementation team, not a behavior. It can reach 100 percent without a single planner changing how they work.

Keep login counts and coverage as inputs. Strip them out of anything that goes to the COO.

Calibration Quality

Indicator Name	Type	Description
Domain classification accuracy	Leading	Whether an approved forecast was handled in the right calibration domain
Override rate	Leading	How often planners produce a forecast manually against a module proposal
Verification touch rate, Tier 2	Leading	Proportion of consequential forecasts showing evidence of a named SME check
Manager coaching events on calibration	Leading	Count of logged calibration coaching conversations
Self-reported calibration confidence	Leading	Planner confidence in recognizing when module output needs verification

Manager Enablement Playbook: What You Get

The first refusal lands on a manager. This is the conversation they are not ready for.

4

RESPONSE BRANCHES • 2 OF 3

The Refusal Conversation

Branch A

Reasonable refusal or Skill Decay

They say: "For my categories it doesn't actually help," or "I don't want to lose the ability to do this myself."

"OK. That's a coherent position and I want to take it seriously. Walk me through your categories and let's identify the specific lines where you have decided the module wouldn't help, and the reasoning behind each one. I am not going to argue with the conclusion. I want us both clear on what you're choosing not to hand over, and why."

The manager treats the refusal as professional judgment that deserves examination. This branch is also where the practice preservation schedule gets written, by the person best placed to write it.

Branch B

Trust or Existential Friction

They say: "I tried it and it gave me nonsense," or "I'm not convinced this isn't how the planning team gets smaller."

"Thank you for telling me that. Both of those are real. The trust point is real because the module is genuinely fallible. The redundancy point is real because it's a question being asked across this business and I'm not going to pretend otherwise. So let's separate them. Tell me which of the two is doing more of the work in why you haven't adopted."

Validating both and forcing a separation. A manager who addresses both at once fails at both.

Branch C

Genuine or principled refusal

They say: "I just don't want to," or "I don't see why I should have to use it because everyone else is."

"That's a fair answer to give. The team has this tool now and the cadence of work is going to shift. I'm not asking you to use it in ways that violate your judgment and I'm not going to force you. But I need to understand whether your position is 'not for the work where I have a substantive reason' or 'not on principle.' Those are different conversations. Which is closer?"

Honest without threatening. Pretending the refusal has no consequence is a lie the planner will see through.

A hard constraint on Branch B, specific to Northgate. If the COO has not yet made the role commitment, the manager cannot answer the redundancy question. The honest line is: "I don't have that answer yet. I have asked for it, and I will tell you what it is the day I have it, including if that's a no."

What NOT to say

- "You're going to have to get on board with this eventually." Treats a position as a fact to be overcome. Changes nothing and closes the conversation
- "Everyone else has adopted it." Social pressure framing, and in a team of twelve it may simply be false
- "AI is the future." A slogan, not a coaching move. Tells the planner the manager has not engaged
- "You're going to fall behind." A threat dressed as concern, aimed straight at the Existential Friction the planner is already carrying. The single most damaging sentence available in this rollout

From the same script: What NOT to say



The eight-slide steering committee deck, when you ask for it. ask for it.

01 The reframe

Not a WMS feature with a training need. A role redefinition for twelve named people.

02 The risk of inaction

What quiet non-adoption costs in stockouts, overstock, and working capital.

03 The resource ask

The sponsor moment and the capacity the ten-week window actually needs.

04 The decision

What the committee is being asked to approve, stated on one slide.

Not produced by default, and carries no output badge on purpose: it sits outside the four core outputs, generated when you ask.

One diagnosis. Four artifacts you walk into Monday holding.

01 AI Friction Diagnostic

Runs first. The Friction profile every other output is calibrated against.

02 Trust Calibration Blueprint

Built because Trust and Verification both came back High.

03 Quality-of-Use Metrics

Weighted by the same profile. Judgment and outcomes, not logins.

04 Manager Enablement Playbook

Written for the one manager who carries daily reinforcement.

Same rollout. Two answers.

2. Diagnostic: the seven dimensions that matter

Rating scale: Low / Medium / High risk. Ratings reflect the current evidence and should be validated with the 12 planners.

Dimension	Initial risk	Evidence and diagnosis
1. Awareness and rationale	Medium–High	Planners need to understand why forecasting is changing, what problem AI solves, and why the business is making this investment now.
2. Desire and willingness	High	Hand-built forecasting is being replaced by AI proposals. This may threaten autonomy, expertise, status or job security. Actual sentiment is unknown.
3. Knowledge and skills	Medium–High	Planners must learn to interpret forecasts, understand confidence and exceptions, challenge recommendations and use the new workflow. Training needs are unassessed.
4. Ability to perform	High	Planners must demonstrate that they can use the module in realistic planning scenarios, including unusual demand patterns and forecast errors. Knowing the screens is not enough.
5. Reinforcement and sustained use	High	Without agreed operating rules, management follow-through and performance measures, planners may revert to spreadsheets and manual forecasts.
6. Trust in the change and AI	High	The "ghost project" creates a credibility hurdle. Planners may question whether this implementation will finish and whether the AI is reliable enough for operational decisions.
7. Leadership and change capacity	High	The COO sponsors the programme, but the contract PM and a single change resource create a potential gap between executive intent and day-to-day support.

Standard chatbot, same prompt

THE DIAGNOSIS AT A GLANCE

Friction Severity Map

Friction	Severity	ADKAR element
Existential. "Will this make me redundant?"	Critical	Desire (primary), Awareness (secondary)
Trust. "How do I know when AI is wrong?"	High	Ability (primary), Knowledge (secondary)
Skill Decay. "Will I lose the ability to do this myself?"	High	Reinforcement (primary), Ability (secondary)
Verification. "I am still accountable for AI's mistakes."	High	Ability (primary), Knowledge (secondary)
Equity. "Who gets it first? Who gets left behind?"	Low	Desire (primary), Awareness (secondary)

Severity scale

Critical

High

Medium

Low

Not Present

Scores are structurally derived from the rollout characteristics, not yet from observed behavior. Diagnostic confidence is Medium because three intake inputs were thin: rollout stage, on-the-ground signals, and the practitioner concern. Treat these as the hypothesis to test in the next two weeks, not as an evidenced finding.

AI Friction Diagnostic

14 Change Management Specialized AI Agents

AI Adoption Change Playbook Playbook

Manage the people side of AI adoption, the part a standard standard ERP rollout playbook was never built for.

for Change Narrative Architect
Architect the announcement announcement that moves your workforce, not just informs informs it.

Resistance Playbook

Diagnose the resistance and get and get the exact conversation conversation to turn it around. around.

Stakeholder Landscape Mapper

Read where they stand. Detect what is not spoken. Drive engagement.

Adoption Barrier Predictor
Predict exactly what will block adoption, by group, and the tactics to clear it.

Change Impact Translator

Maps exactly what changes are for every job group; in language they will actually hear.

Town Hall Q&A Predictor

Walk into the town hall ready for the hardest question in the room ... and the ones that follow.

Multi-Channel Cascade Mapper Mapper

Turn one announcement into six into six channel-native messages that all say the same same thing with no drift.

Stakeholder Pulse Interpreter

Reads what your people feel, not just what they wrote on the survey.

Benefits Realization Tracker

Sustain promised benefits post-go-live by tracing outcomes to departmental behaviors and surfacing unanchored goals.

Training Needs Assessment
Turn what's changing and who's impacted into the training plan a go-live actually needs.

The Change Champion Network

Anyone can name a few champions. This runs the whole network, kickoff to roll off with gamification.

Leadership Alignment Playbook

Build the coalition of leaders your change depends on and keep it healthy to the finish.

Change Communication Audit
Know exactly where your message is strong. Know exactly where it's exposed.



Adoption stalls on Desire, not Knowledge. Now you can name exactly where.

A link to the PDF download of this presentation is in the first comment below this post.

Next in this series: The Diagnostic, up close. The Five Frictions, one by one.

changeessentialsai.com | Gretchen Asher

