

Capability Assessment — Phase Three Report Framework

Synthesis & Analysis of Submissions

Phase three takes every domain worksheet submitted in phase two (Strategy & Direction, Decision-Making Quality, Risk & Resilience, Execution & Operational Control, People Leadership & Culture, Learning & Improvement, Governance & Accountability — each scored E1/E2/E3 against a Yes/Partially/No evidence rating) and turns it into two coherent reports.

Part 1 — The Full Assessment Report

The complete picture, built domain by domain from every E1/E2/E3 answer and evidence note submitted that cycle.

1. Executive Summary

Headline maturity story of the assessment in one page: overall organisational maturity level, the two or three domains furthest ahead, the two or three furthest behind, and the single most important thing to do next.

2. Assessment Context & Coverage

What was assessed, which business units/functions took part, how evidence was gathered (documents, interviews, records, performance data), and a coverage rate — so the reader can see how complete and reliable the evidence base is at a glance.

3. Capability Maturity Heatmap

The seven domains plotted against the four maturity levels (N–Absent, P–Ad hoc, L–Defined, F–Operational), each with a current-level marker, a target-level marker, and an Evidence Strength rating (Weak / Moderate / Strong) reflecting how well-supported the current rating is.

4. Domain-by-Domain Findings

One section per domain, each structured the same way:

- Current maturity level and one-line description (e.g. "P — Ad hoc: informal, inconsistent, person-dependent")

- E1 (Exists) — answer and supporting evidence notes
- E2 (Enabled) — answer and supporting evidence notes
- E3 (Executed) — answer and supporting evidence notes
- Gap to target — what evidence is missing to reach the next maturity level
- Representative anonymised evidence excerpts

5. **Cross-Cutting Patterns**

Pattern and frequency analysis across all seven domains, surfaced automatically — e.g. "six of seven domains score E1-Yes but E2/E3-Partial or No: frameworks and policies exist, but tracking and demonstrated outcomes are the common gap across the organisation," or clusters where the same missing artefact (a register, a review cadence, a named owner) recurs across multiple domains.

6. **Maturity Gap Analysis**

Current level vs. target level per domain, ranked by size of gap and criticality, with the specific evidence tier (E1, E2, or E3) responsible for each gap called out explicitly.

7. **Priority Actions & Roadmap**

A deduplicated action register (domain, evidence tier addressed, owner, target date, priority) so overlapping gaps across domains become one clear sequence of work rather than seven disconnected lists. Sequenced logically — e.g. close E1 gaps before E2, since E2/E3 evidence is meaningless without the foundational process it tracks.

8. **Recommendations & Next Steps**

Concrete, forward-looking guidance: which domains to prioritise in the next cycle, what evidence to start collecting now to be ready for the next assessment, and suggested cadence for reassessment.

9. **Appendix — Evidence Base**

The full anonymised evidence register underlying the assessment, organised by domain and evidence tier, for anyone who wants to trace a rating back to its source submissions.

Part 2 — The Executive Leadership Briefing

A tightened version of the same analysis — same heatmap, same gaps, same priority actions — scoped down to what a leadership group needs to make decisions quickly, without wading through the full evidence appendix.

What makes it trustworthy, not just tidy:

- **Anonymous by design** — no names or identifying roles anywhere in the report; every evidence excerpt is labelled "Anonymised submission excerpt," never attributed to an individual or team.
- **Evidence grouped by domain and tier, never by contributor** — so patterns are visible without anyone's individual submission being singled out.
- **A front-of-report confidentiality statement** on every cycle, so participants always know the rules were followed.
- **Honest ratings** — no inflated single "maturity score" headline unless the evidence genuinely supports one across all three tiers; the E1/Partially/E2/No breakdown is shown instead where that is more accurate than collapsing it into one number.
- **The heatmap and the priority roadmap carry over unchanged** from the full report — leadership sees the same picture the assessors saw, just without the underlying evidence detail.

Structure

1. One-page maturity heatmap (current vs. target, all seven domains)
 2. Top strengths and top gaps (three each, evidence-tier attributed)
 3. Cross-cutting pattern summary (condensed from Edition 1, section 5)
 4. Priority roadmap (condensed action register — domain, priority, target date, owner role only)
 5. Confidentiality statement
-

Design & Brand Notes

- Maturity levels use the four-colour scale already established: N–Absent (red/terracotta), P–Ad hoc (amber), L–Defined (teal/blue), F–Operational (green). Amber stays reserved for "in-progress / needs attention" states, consistent with the improvement-area convention used elsewhere in the brand.
- UK spelling throughout; "Organization" remains the styled product tier name only, not used in body copy about maturity levels.

- Typography and layout should stay visually coherent with the Candid Cycle report (shared teal/cream/slate palette, same heading and body font pairing) so the two products read as siblings.
 - Evidence Strength (Weak/Moderate/Strong) should always sit next to the maturity level it supports — never presented as a maturity level on its own, to avoid conflating "how mature" with "how well-evidenced."
-