The Trinity Model®

A bounded diagnostic framework for early-trading business configuration

CONCEPTUAL WHITE PAPER · EDITORIAL REVIEW · NOVEMBER 2026

Abstract

This conceptual white paper specifies the Trinity Model®, a practitioner-originated framework for examining the current commercial configuration of a business entering early trading. It distinguishes three connected lenses: Value Proposition, Business Model and Market Reach. The proposed contribution is a decision-bounded way to identify incompatibilities among the terms on which customers buy, the conditions under which the business delivers and collects payment, and the routes through which those customers can purchase. Each lens has a separate ordinal gauge supported by an evidence narrative. Commercial coherence is treated as a qualified judgement about a defined transaction or commitment at a stated date. A worked case shows how evidence of demand can coexist with an operating loss or an infeasible cash requirement. Three research propositions address issue recognition, non-compensation and review burden. The paper proposes a comparative evaluation and states the limits of inference from practitioner experience.

1. Research problem and unit of analysis

A venture can have an attractive product, interested users and technically feasible delivery while still lacking a workable transaction. The purchaser may have different incentives from the user. A delivery promise may depend on costs or lead times the price cannot sustain. A channel may reach many potential users while reaching few people able to approve expenditure. Each problem has different implications for the founder’s next commitment.

The unit of analysis is a commercial configuration at a stated review date. It comprises the offer, intended purchaser, price and terms, operating and supplier arrangements, payment mechanics and route to purchase. The examination is anchored to a specified commercial cycle or contemplated commitment. In early trading, the configuration is being assembled and exercised with customers. Its evidence can range from proposals and quotations to orders, fulfilment records and cleared payments.

The central question is whether the conditions required for that cycle are compatible on current evidence. Commercial coherence is a qualified judgement that the examination has found no material incompatibility among those conditions. Its scope depends on the transaction examined, the evidence available and the thoroughness of the review. Sufficient demand, repeatability and long-run viability are further questions.

2. Practitioner provenance and relationship to the literature

The framework's practitioner provenance is commercial lending and risk examination. Lee Tumbridge describes using a related examination in established businesses to identify weaknesses before considering lending. That account motivates the framework's concern with the present business and the exposure attached to a decision. It is practitioner testimony. Establishing diagnostic reliability or credit performance would require independently examinable case records and outcome data.

The early-trading application shares the concern with commercial fit but operates with different evidence. An established borrower may have transaction histories, contractual commitments and financial records. An early venture may have only proposed terms, a supplier quotation and a few transactions. The logic of examining connected conditions can be carried across settings. The confidence and nature of the judgement depend on the evidence and on the decision at stake. In lending, this examination occupies one part of a broader process involving information, underwriting, contract design and monitoring (Udell, 2015).

Business-model research supplies relevant antecedents. Teece (2010) treats the creation, delivery and capture of value as connected. Zott and Amit (2010) treat the firm and its partners as an interdependent activity system. Trinity's Business Model lens has a deliberately narrower local meaning than the term often carries in that literature. It concerns operating arrangements and economics within a wider examination that also includes the offer and customer access.

This paper specifies a practitioner framework through targeted conceptual synthesis, drawing on Jaakkola (2020) for the explicit use of prior theory in conceptual work. The proposed contribution is the disciplined organisation of established commercial concerns into a small set of connected questions for a particular early-trading decision. Its incremental usefulness over established structured alternatives is an empirical question.

3. The three lenses and their interfaces

Value Proposition

The Value Proposition lens examines the relationship between the offer and the intended customer's reason to choose it under actual terms and alternatives. Where they differ, identify the user, payer, purchasing decision-maker and beneficiary. An enthusiastic user can supply evidence about utility. A purchase at an agreed price and scope supplies a different kind of evidence, about a particular purchasing decision.

Business Model

The Business Model lens examines how the offer is fulfilled and how money moves through the transaction. Relevant conditions include delivery capacity, supplier terms, direct costs, founder labour where material, recurring obligations, billing and collection. Transaction contribution and whole-business profitability are distinct. Timing also matters. A positive contribution can coexist with a cash shortfall if delivery costs fall due before collection.

Market Reach

The Market Reach lens examines how relevant customers find, understand, access and buy the offer. A route may be a referral network, a distributor, a local site or a digital channel. Its examination includes access to the actual decision-maker, the purchase mechanism and acquisition cost where observable. Activity at the beginning of that route, such as an enquiry, supports a claim about that step. Evidence of later commercial commitment must come from the later step.

The canonical reading order is Value Proposition, Business Model and then Market Reach. This is an order of examination. Findings can travel in either direction. A partner's commission changes transaction economics. A delivery constraint can change the offer that a customer will accept. A purchasing requirement may make the intended route inaccessible. The lenses organise the examination of those relationships. They are causally connected.

4. Evidence and the three gauges

Evidence needs a defined object. A quotation supports a claim about the price and conditions offered by a supplier. A paid order supports a claim about a buyer and the terms agreed. A fulfilment record supports claims about that delivery. Evidence may transfer to another customer, offer or route where the relevant conditions are comparable and the basis for that comparison is explicit. A missing observation remains an uncertainty. A contradictory observation can establish a specific weakness.

The canonical scale describes how established each lens is on current evidence.

1. Barely established or predominantly unknown.
2. Partly understood but materially incomplete.
3. Sufficiently established for the venture's present maturity.
4. Clearly established with meaningful current support.
5. Strongly established with substantial current support.

These are ordinal categories. Each reading should be accompanied by reasons, evidence dates and material qualifications. A reading of 4 / 2 / 4 draws attention to an operating gap that evidence about the offer and reach cannot resolve. The three readings remain separate because a material incompatibility in one lens may prevent the commercial cycle from working. Summing or averaging them would imply compensation and numerical distances the framework does not establish. The maturity-relative anchors also limit comparisons across ventures or distant review dates.

An adverse finding needs to remain visible in the narrative. A well-evidenced delivery loss increases confidence about the loss. It does not make the commercial arrangement stronger. The importance of the finding depends on the exposure and the specific commitment under examination.

5. Worked case. A fixed-price window-display service

Consider a fictional founder supplying printed window displays to independent retailers. The offer is £240 for design, print and installation within five working days. Three retailers introduced through a local business group have each paid for a job. Two said the turnaround mattered because they were preparing for a promotion. The proposed next commitment is to advertise the same package across a larger delivery area. All figures and observations in this case are illustrative.

The three local orders are evidence that some retailers bought the package on those terms. They also identify a reason two buyers gave for choosing it. They establish neither the prevalence of that reason in the wider customer population nor the effect of altering the price or promised turnaround.

Suppose direct costs on a routine local job are £155, including print, materials, travel and an allowance for the founder's delivery time. The £85 contribution is before acquisition and overheads. When the supplier requires a £90 rush premium to meet the promise, direct costs rise to £245 and the transaction loses £5 before those other costs. Assume the printing bill falls due at order and the retailer pays on completion. Even a routine job requires cash before collection. Concurrent orders increase that requirement. Greater distance could also reduce the number of installations the founder can complete within the promised window.

The referral route has delivered three paying local customers. The evidence needed for the proposed wider route concerns who it reaches, their conversion on the actual terms, the acquisition cost, travel and capacity. Local referral sales offer little direct evidence about those conditions. The cross-lens incompatibility is specific. Under rush conditions, the delivery promise that helped win orders can eliminate the contribution, and the wider route could increase the frequency or cost of meeting it.

That finding gives the founder a better-specified decision. A limited delivery area, a different price or a longer turnaround would each change the configuration and the evidence that applies to it. Trinity makes those dependencies visible. The choice of which arrangement to consider and what to commit remains with the founder.

6. Propositions and evaluation

T1. Recognition of material incompatibilities

With equivalent information and review time, reviewers using the three lenses will identify more independently adjudicated cross-lens incompatibilities than reviewers given an unstructured examination. The proposed mechanism is explicit attention to dependencies. The evaluation should distinguish genuine findings from additional unsupported concerns.

T2. Visibility of decisive weaknesses

Separate lens judgements with evidence narratives will make decisive unresolved incompatibilities more visible than a single overall rating. A useful test should count premature acceptance, unwarranted rejection and unnecessary delay. A higher refusal rate by itself offers little information about decision quality.

T3. Examination effort

For decisions with a limited number of material dependencies, a three-lens examination may identify the relevant issues with lower review burden than a substantially more elaborate representation. Where dependencies are numerous, technically complex or widely dispersed, its advantage may disappear and specialist examination may be needed.

A first study could assign independent reviewers to Trinity, an established structured alternative or an unstructured review using matched early-trading dossiers. Reviewers would receive the same case evidence, time and decision prompt. Constructed cases can contain pre-specified contradictions. Documentary cases need independent adjudication, with disagreement recorded

rather than resolved silently. Outcomes could include correctly identified issues, unsupported concerns, evidence traceability, time and the specificity of the resulting decision question.

A later prospective study could examine specification changes, transaction breakdowns and avoidable rework over a defined early-trading window. The design would need to separate the effects of the framework from reviewer experience, additional attention and case selection. Its comparison, outcome measures and precision requirements should be specified before interpreting results as impact (HM Treasury, 2026).

7. Limits and conclusion

This is a conceptual account. Its propositions are open to testing. Three lenses will compress some relationships, and results depend on the quality of the sources, the reviewer's judgement and the choice of transaction or commitment. Sparse evidence may justify a limited conclusion even when the description of the business is detailed. Some decisions require financial, legal, technical or operational examination beyond the scope of the framework.

The defensible contribution is a way to make the current commercial configuration and its dependencies easier to inspect before commitment deepens. Its claims concern that bounded examination. Valuation, credit underwriting, prediction of venture success and decisions about continuation require their own evidence and judgement. The next research question is whether the framework helps reviewers identify the right issues at a proportionate cost.

Research and disclosure

Prepared for Active Mentor® Studio as a conceptual white paper for editorial review. The Studio has a commercial interest in use of the framework. AI assistance was used in drafting and literature discovery. The paper draws on the Studio's v3.2 framework and reported practitioner provenance. The work comprises conceptual analysis and an illustrative case. Human authorship and final responsibility are pending editorial sign-off.

References

Active Mentor® Studio (2026). The Trinity Model®. Canon v3.2. Primary framework source.

Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. AMS Review, 10, 18–26. Source

HM Treasury (2026). The Magenta Book: Central government guidance on evaluation. Source

Teece, D. J. (2010). Business models, business strategy and innovation. Long Range Planning, 43(2–3), 172–194. Source

Udell, G. F. (2015). SME access to intermediated credit: What do we know and what don't we know? Reserve Bank of Australia conference proceedings. Source

Zott, C. and Amit, R. (2010). Business model design: An activity system perspective. Long Range Planning, 43(2–3), 216–226. Source