From Government Frameworks to Workforce Capability

The Government Competency Maturity Model (GCMM)

A practical model for central government, local authorities and arm's length bodies to turn professional standards into current, trusted and usable capability evidence.

1 FRAGMENTED	2 FOUNDATION	3 MANAGED	4 INTEGRATED	5 STRATEGIC
Frameworks exist in isolation	Common standards are adopted	Assessment is governed and repeated	Capability data supports decisions	Capability intelligence shapes outcomes

UK Government professions | Central and local government | ALBs | Global public-sector examples

September 2026

Executive summary

Government competency maturity is the extent to which a public body can define the capabilities it needs, assess them consistently, retain credible evidence, and use that evidence to improve public outcomes. A mature authority does not simply publish competency frameworks. It connects professional standards to posts, people, work, risk, accreditation, development, mobility, workforce planning and accountability.

Direct answer

> **Most UK public bodies are likely to sit between Level 2, Foundation, and Level 3, Managed. Central departments often have Level 3 or Level 4 practice inside established professions, while their enterprise-wide view remains less mature. Specialist and regulatory ALBs may reach Level 3 or Level 4 in mission-critical populations. Local authorities are more commonly at Level 2, with stronger pockets in statutory, regulated and operational services. These are reasoned market estimates, not survey statistics.**

The core problem is not a shortage of frameworks. The UK Government recognises more than 20 professions and publishes role, skill, behaviour and career standards across fields such as project delivery, commercial, policy, property, security, cyber, digital and data, analysis, communications, knowledge management, science and engineering. The problem is operational fragmentation: different taxonomies, uneven adoption, duplicated assessment, weak portability, inconsistent evidence and limited connection to workforce decisions. [1, 2, 3]

GCMM tests whether an authority can answer seven questions:

- What capabilities are required to deliver the authority's statutory duties, policies, services and transformation priorities?
- Which requirements apply to each post, role, profession, project or delegated authority?
- What can each person demonstrably do, at what level, and in which context?
- What evidence supports the judgement, who validated it, and when will it be reviewed?
- Where are the critical gaps, single points of failure, succession risks and contractor dependencies?
- How does capability influence accreditation, deployment, development, recruitment, pay or progression?
- Can the authority reconstruct why a material workforce decision was reasonable at the time?

Government should treat professional frameworks as shared public infrastructure, not as isolated HR content. GCMM provides the operating model around that infrastructure.

1. What is government competency maturity?

Government competency maturity describes how reliably a public organisation converts policy intent and service obligations into workforce capability. It covers individual competence, team capacity, organisational capability and the governance needed to sustain all three.

Competence, competency and capability

Term	Working definition	Government question
Competence	Demonstrated ability to perform work to the required standard in a defined context.	Can this person perform this work safely, lawfully and effectively?
Competency	An observable combination of knowledge, skills, experience and behaviours associated with effective performance.	What does effective performance look like at each level?
Capability	The combined capacity of people, leadership, systems, partners and resources to deliver an outcome.	Can the authority sustain delivery, adapt and meet future demand?
Maturity	The reliability, consistency, integration and strategic use of competency management.	Is capability understood and used across the operating model?

A government body can employ highly capable people while remaining immature as an organisation. If role requirements are unclear, assessments are stale, evidence is scattered, or workforce data is not used, leaders cannot reliably see or manage capability risk.

Why this matters now

- Public services must absorb policy change, digital transformation, AI, cyber threats and fiscal constraint without losing delivery resilience.
- Government increasingly delivers through portfolios, agencies, local partners, suppliers and temporary teams, making portable evidence more important.
- Scarce skills in digital, data, commercial, project delivery, property, engineering, security and specialist regulation create common cross-government dependencies.
- The National Audit Office now frames workforce planning around evidence, governance, demand, supply, options, implementation and evaluation, rather than headcount planning alone. [4, 5]
- Citizens and oversight bodies expect authorities to show not only that people were trained, but that appointments, delegations and deployment decisions were justified.

2. The Government Competency Maturity Model

GCMM is a five-level model. It is designed for an authority, department, profession, directorate or service. Organisations should score each dimension separately and use the weakest material control to determine the maturity of a high-risk scope.

Level	Defining condition	Typical evidence	Primary risk
1 Fragmented	Requirements are implicit, local or inconsistent.	Job descriptions, certificates and manager knowledge held in separate places.	Hidden capability risk and dependence on individuals.
2 Foundation	Common frameworks are recognised and baseline activity has started.	Mapped roles in selected areas, spreadsheets, self-assessment, development plans.	Coverage and currency are uneven; evidence is hard to aggregate.
3 Managed	Assessment, evidence, ownership and review are governed in priority populations.	Role profiles, manager validation, moderation, gap plans, dashboards and audit history.	Professional silos limit portability and enterprise insight.
4 Integrated	Capability data is reliable across services and connected to core workforce decisions.	Shared taxonomy, integrations, accreditation, deployment, succession and scenario planning.	Complexity can reduce usability or trust.
5 Strategic	Capability intelligence continuously shapes policy delivery, operating models and public value.	Leading indicators, cross-boundary mobilisation, evaluated development and responsible automation.	Complacency, automation bias and weak challenge.

Maturity is multi-dimensional

Dimension	What good looks like
Purpose and outcomes	Capability priorities are derived from statutory duties, strategy, service standards, risk and transformation plans.
Framework architecture	Core, leadership and professional frameworks use clear definitions, controlled versions and governed local extensions.
Role and work alignment	Requirements are mapped to real posts, tasks, projects, delegations and contexts, not generic grades alone.
Assessment and evidence	Methods and evidence strength are proportionate to consequence, risk and accreditation needs.
Governance and ownership	Framework owners, assessors, moderators, review cycles, exceptions and appeals are explicit.
Data and technology	Profiles are accessible, interoperable, secure and supported by audit history and data quality controls.
Use in decisions	Data informs recruitment, deployment, development, accreditation, pay, succession and workforce planning.
Culture and trust	Employees and managers understand the purpose, workload, fairness, privacy and benefit of participation.
Cross-boundary capability	The authority can understand capability across professions, locations, suppliers, partnerships and shared services.
Public value and learning	The authority tests whether capability interventions improve service, productivity, resilience and citizen outcomes.

3. The UK government framework landscape

The UK has a strong supply of government profession standards. The Government Professions structure supports recognised professions and provides a best-practice framework for profession design. Civil Service Success Profiles combine behaviours, strengths, ability, experience and technical elements for recruitment. The opportunity is to make these assets interoperable and usable throughout the employee and workforce lifecycle. [1, 2]

Framework or profession	Primary capability contribution	Typical maturity use
Project Delivery	Delivery roles, technical skills, leadership and career pathways.	Accreditation, licence to manage or practise, deployment and portfolio assurance.
Commercial	Commercial expertise across sourcing, contracting, supplier and market management.	Accreditation, pay progression, resourcing and commercial assurance.
Policy	Policy skills, standards and professional development.	Role clarity, development, quality of advice and mobility.
Property	Built environment, asset, workplace and property professional capability.	Professional standards, statutory responsibilities and estate risk.
Security	Security roles, professional standards and organisational resilience.	Role assurance, accreditation, clearances and deployment.
Cyber Security	Cyber roles, knowledge, skills and responsibility.	Workforce planning, professional pathways and critical-role coverage.
Digital and Data	Roles and ascending skill levels including awareness, working, practitioner and expert.	Job architecture, recruitment, development and career mobility.
Intelligence Analysis	Analytical tradecraft, judgement and professional standards.	Authorisation, quality assurance and professional development.
Civil Service Behaviours	Expected behaviours at different responsibility levels.	Recruitment, performance and leadership expectations.
Communications	Professional communication capability and modern operating practice.	Role standards, development and responsible use of new technology.
Analysts	Career and technical standards across government analytical communities.	Career pathways, learning and cross-profession mobility.
Knowledge and Information Management	Information governance, knowledge stewardship and access.	Compliance, corporate memory, records and AI readiness.
Science and Engineering	Scientific and engineering expertise for evidence, regulation and delivery.	Professional assurance, specialist deployment and succession.

Framework coverage is not the same as maturity

An authority may adopt several national frameworks and still remain at Level 2. GCMM looks for evidence that frameworks have been translated into current role requirements, assessed consistently, linked to decisions, and reviewed when policy, technology, regulation or delivery models change.

4. Central government, local government and ALBs

The same model applies across government, but operating context changes the maturity challenge.

Entity type	Distinctive context	Likely priority
Central departments	Multiple professions, policy and delivery responsibilities, machinery-of-government change, cross-department programmes and high contractor use.	Unify professional data, identify cross-government scarcity, connect capability to strategic workforce planning and deployment.
Local authorities	Broad statutory services, local accountability, tight budgets, regional labour markets, shared services and outsourced delivery.	Start with critical services and statutory roles; keep frameworks practical; expose resilience, succession and supplier risk.
Arm's length bodies	Diverse mandates, governance arrangements and workforce sizes, often with specialist regulatory, scientific, operational or cultural capability.	Translate sponsor and board assurance into role-level evidence while retaining specialist autonomy.
Cross-government professions	Standards span organisational boundaries but adoption and data quality vary.	Create portable role, proficiency, evidence and accreditation conventions.
Partnerships and suppliers	Delivery depends on people outside the authority's direct employment and systems.	Define minimum evidence, expiry, assurance and data-sharing requirements in contracts and mobilisation.

A reasoned UK maturity assessment

Segment	Likely centre of gravity	Why	Where higher maturity appears
Central government	Level 2 to Level 3	Strong profession frameworks and learning infrastructure, but uneven enterprise mapping, data interoperability and use.	Digital and data, project delivery, commercial, security and regulated functions can show Level 4 characteristics.
Local government	Level 2	Framework use is often service-specific; financial pressure and fragmented systems constrain enterprise practice.	Social care, building control, finance, legal, planning, public health and emergency response may be more mature.
ALBs	Level 2 to Level 3	Wide variation in mandate, scale, sponsorship and HR infrastructure.	Regulators, technical agencies and safety-critical bodies may reach Level 3 or Level 4 in core workforces.

This assessment is an inference from the strength of the framework ecosystem, NAO findings on workforce planning, and the common gap between professional practice and enterprise capability data. It should be tested through diagnostics rather than presented as measured prevalence. [4, 5]

5. From framework ownership to a capability system

Government bodies need a federated model: common enough to aggregate and portable enough to support mobility, but flexible enough to preserve professional, statutory and local context.

A practical architecture

Layer	Purpose	Examples
Public service core	Shared expectations that apply broadly across the authority.	Ethics, public value, inclusion, evidence, digital confidence, collaboration and Civil Service Behaviours.
Leadership and management	Capabilities required to lead people, systems, change and public outcomes.	Strategic thinking, stewardship, delivery, system leadership, talent and risk.
Profession and function	Technical standards shared by a recognised community.	Project delivery, policy, commercial, digital and data, security, analysis, communications.
Role or post	The specific proficiency mix needed for a job at a given responsibility level.	Role profile, grade, accountabilities, delegated authority and mandatory qualifications.
Work context	Additional requirements created by place, service, asset, project or risk.	Safeguarding, building type, operational command, data classification, contract value or regulatory scope.
Evidence and authorisation	Proof, judgement, limits and formal permission to act.	Portfolio, observation, accreditation, licence, approval, supervision and expiry.

The minimum viable government capability record

Record object	Minimum information
Requirement	Framework, competency, proficiency, role or work context, version, owner and effective date.
Person and position	Identity, employer, substantive post, assignment, profession, location and relevant organisation.
Evidence	Type, source, date, reference, relevance, validity period and access control.
Judgement	Rating or decision, assessor, moderator, rationale, confidence and date.
Limits	Scope restrictions, supervision, conflicts, dependencies, jurisdiction and expiry.
Decision	Appointment, accreditation, deployment, pay, progression, development, escalation or rejection.
History	Previous values, framework version, approvals, changes and reasons.

The record must capture decision provenance. A current score without the applicable standard, supporting evidence, assessor and limitations is weak assurance.

6. Assessment, evidence and auditability

Assessment should be proportionate to the consequence of error. Low-risk development conversations may use self-reflection and manager discussion. High-risk appointments, statutory roles, accreditation, pay or deployment require stronger evidence and clearer independence.

Evidence level	Method	Suitable use
1 Declaration	Self-assessment with examples.	Reflection, career exploration and initial baseline.
2 Review	Manager or professional discussion tests the claim.	Routine development and lower-risk role alignment.
3 Artefact	Work products, outcomes, certificates, logs or portfolios.	Professional assessment and progression decisions.
4 Observation	Practice is observed in work, simulation or supervised activity.	Operational, technical or safety-relevant competence.
5 Independent validation	An authorised assessor or body confirms competence for a defined scope.	Accreditation, licence, statutory delegation or high-consequence work.

Controls that make evidence trustworthy

- Currency: review dates and expiry rules reflect risk and pace of change.
- Traceability: every decision links to the framework and role version in force at the time.
- Consistency: moderation and calibration test assessor drift and rating inflation.
- Completeness: unknown, unassessed and expired are visible states, not converted into reassuring averages.
- Authority: assessors and approvers have defined competence and delegated authority.
- Fairness: staff can see criteria, contribute evidence and challenge material errors.
- Privacy: personal data is necessary, access-controlled, retained appropriately and used transparently.
- AI governance: inferred skills and recommendations are treated as prompts for review, not as unchallengeable facts.

A practical audit test

Select a material workforce decision, such as an accredited project director, building control appointment, cyber role, contract delegation or senior succession nomination. Can the authority reconstruct the requirement, evidence, judgement, limits, approval, outcome and later review within hours rather than weeks? If not, competency management is not yet operating as an organisational control.

7. Linking competency to government decisions

Maturity increases when the same trusted capability record is reused across decisions rather than recollected for each process.

Decision	How capability evidence should be used	GCMM maturity signal
Recruitment	Define essential capabilities, select valid assessment methods and record evidence.	Selection criteria link to maintained role profiles.
Accreditation or licence	Set entry, renewal, scope, evidence and assessor requirements.	Authorisations are current, bounded and auditable.
Competency-based pay	Link reward to transparent, verified capability and contribution, with moderation and appeal.	Pay decisions are consistent, evidence-backed and equality-tested.
Deployment	Match people to task, project, place and risk, including supervision and limitations.	Mobilisation uses current capability rather than title or availability alone.
Development	Target verified gaps and test whether learning changes performance.	Plans are prioritised and reassessment shows improvement.
Succession	Assess readiness, critical-role coverage and development time.	Boards can see bench strength and single points of failure.
Workforce planning	Compare future demand with current and forecast supply.	Options are modelled by capability, not only grade and headcount.
Supplier assurance	Specify and verify role-level evidence across delivery partners.	Contract and mobilisation controls include competence and expiry.

Competency-based pay and accreditation

Competency-based pay can strengthen professionalisation where proficiency levels are observable, evidence rules are clear, assessors are calibrated and the link between capability and reward is transparent. It becomes risky when frameworks are vague, ratings rely on unmoderated manager opinion, or access to development is unequal. Accreditation is strongest when it records scope and conditions, not merely a pass status. Renewal should consider current evidence, continuing practice and material changes in the work.

8. What other governments can teach us

International examples show that frameworks create greater value when they are connected to job architecture, assessment, development, leadership, workforce planning and agency capability review.

Government or body	Relevant model	Transferable lesson
United States	OPM competency models, proficiency levels and the Federal Workforce Competency Initiative.	Use occupational analysis to connect competencies to selection, development, performance and workforce planning. [8, 9]
Canada	Key Leadership Competencies used for selection, learning, performance and talent management.	Reuse a stable competency profile across multiple people processes. [10]
Australia	APS Job Family Framework, professions, data capability framework and agency capability reviews.	Combine common job architecture with professional depth and organisation-level review. [11, 12, 13]
New Zealand	Leadership Success Profile across public-sector leadership levels.	Define capability and outcomes together, with an inclusive system-leadership view. [14]
Singapore	Leadership, service and core digital competency frameworks supported by public-service learning.	Build whole-of-government learning around service delivery and digital readiness. [15, 16]
United Arab Emirates	Federal behavioural and professional competency frameworks.	Align core and leadership behaviours to government strategy and talent systems. [17]
Saudi Arabia	Public-sector competency, succession, HR maturity, digital skills and cybersecurity workforce initiatives.	Connect national transformation to role frameworks, professional certification and HR maturity. [18, 19, 20]
OECD	High-performing civil service and digital talent frameworks.	Treat skills, working environment and workforce evolution as a connected system. [21, 22]
World Bank	Public workforce data and guidance on job profiles and competency frameworks.	Focus on management practice and workforce performance, not framework production alone. [23, 24]

The lesson is not to copy a foreign taxonomy. It is to adopt common design principles: observable standards, job architecture, proportionate assessment, reusable evidence, accountable ownership and continuous use in workforce decisions.

9. Global maturity outlook

No international dataset assigns governments to GCMM levels. The following is a structured market hypothesis based on published frameworks, public workforce systems and the maturity characteristics described in this paper.

Market	Likely centre of gravity	Interpretation
United Kingdom	Level 2 to Level 3	Rich profession architecture and mature pockets, with integration and evidence portability as the main constraint.
Sweden and Nordic public sectors	Level 3	Strong professional, digital and learning foundations; decentralised employers can make shared taxonomy and data integration harder.
United States and Canada	Level 2 to Level 3	Strong federal competency resources, but agency scale and autonomy produce uneven adoption; mature occupational pockets reach Level 4.
Australia and New Zealand	Level 3	Common job, leadership and profession models support consistency; agency-level integration remains the maturity test.
Singapore	Level 3 to Level 4	Whole-of-government learning, leadership and service capability create strong conditions for integrated use.
Gulf governments	Level 2 to Level 3	Ambitious national transformation and strong central sponsorship coexist with uneven role architecture and evidence practice; flagship entities may reach Level 4.
Wider Asia	Level 1 to Level 3	Very high variation by country, administrative system, digital maturity and sector; advanced administrations and specialist agencies may reach Level 4.

How to interpret the outlook

- Country averages conceal differences between professions, agencies and tiers of government.
- A government can have an advanced digital capability framework while other workforces remain largely role- or qualification-based.
- Central mandates can accelerate adoption, but durable maturity requires manager practice, data quality and local ownership.
- Small, specialised bodies may achieve higher maturity in critical roles than much larger departments can achieve enterprise-wide.
- Maturity should be evidenced through a diagnostic and sample records, not inferred from published frameworks alone.

10. A practical route to maturity

Horizon	Objective	Priority actions
0 to 3 months	Baseline and focus	Choose a public outcome, statutory risk or scarce profession. Score the ten dimensions. Name executive, professional and data owners. Define measures.
3 to 12 months	Build the foundation	Adopt or rationalise frameworks. Map priority posts. Define proficiency and evidence. Capture baseline assessments and gaps.
12 to 24 months	Establish managed practice	Introduce manager review, moderation, development, accreditation where relevant, dashboards and review cycles.
24 to 36 months	Integrate decisions	Connect recruitment, deployment, pay where appropriate, succession, suppliers and workforce planning. Improve interoperability.
36 to 60 months	Use capability strategically	Model future demand, mobilise across boundaries, evaluate public value, introduce leading indicators and govern AI-supported insight.

Start where capability uncertainty has a cost

Good starting points include a major programme, a statutory service, a scarce profession, a failing recruitment market, an accreditation scheme, a succession risk, a new ALB operating model, or a shared service spanning several authorities. The pilot should be large enough to test governance and interoperability, but narrow enough to improve within one planning cycle.

Do not scale before it is usable

- Managers can understand and apply the requirements consistently.
- Employees can provide evidence without disproportionate effort.
- Moderation identifies weak or inflated judgements.
- Reports lead to visible action and ownership.
- Data remains current after the initial campaign.
- The process improves a decision, risk or outcome that leaders value.

11. Measuring maturity and public value

Measure family	Examples
Coverage	Priority posts mapped; people assessed; professions included; supplier roles covered.
Currency	Assessments in date; frameworks reviewed; expiring accreditations; stale evidence.
Quality	Evidence-backed ratings; moderation variance; assessor confidence; appeals and corrections.
Action	Gaps with funded plans; completed actions; reassessment uplift; redeployment and internal fills.
Resilience	Critical-role coverage; succession depth; regional capacity; contractor dependence; mobilisation time.
Inclusion	Assessment and progression outcomes by relevant groups; equitable access to evidence and development.
Productivity	Time to recruit, accredit, deploy or audit; duplicated assessment removed; learning spend targeted.
Public value	Service continuity, programme confidence, regulatory outcomes, citizen experience and delivery performance.

Common failure modes

- Framework accumulation: every profession creates its own language without crosswalks or governance.
- Grade substitution: grade is treated as proof of technical proficiency.
- Training substitution: course completion is treated as demonstrated competence.
- Self-assessment as assurance: reflection data is used for high-consequence decisions without validation.
- Campaign data: assessments are completed once and become stale.
- Pay before calibration: reward is linked to ratings before standards, assessor consistency and appeal are reliable.
- Technology-first implementation: a platform is configured before decisions, ownership and evidence rules are clear.
- Averages hide risk: aggregate scores conceal critical missing skills and single points of failure.
- Professional silos: excellent local practice cannot support enterprise planning or mobility.
- AI without accountability: inferred skills influence careers or deployment without transparency and human review.

12. Conclusions

Government already owns a substantial body of professional standards. The strategic opportunity is to turn those standards into a living capability system that is proportionate, evidence-led and routinely used.

> **The maturity test is simple: can an authority show that it had the right capability for the work it undertook, knew where material gaps and limitations existed, acted on that knowledge, and can reconstruct the evidence behind its decisions?**

For the UK, the likely centre of gravity is Level 2 to Level 3. The biggest step is not writing more frameworks. It is integrating existing profession standards with role requirements, evidence, governance and workforce decisions across central departments, local authorities, ALBs and delivery partners.

International examples reinforce the same conclusion. Common frameworks have most value when they support selection, development, accreditation, leadership, mobility, succession and workforce planning. The strongest public services treat competency as part of the operating model, not as a periodic HR exercise.

The next practical step

Run a scoped GCMM diagnostic across the ten dimensions, sample real role and evidence records, test usability with employees and managers, and produce a prioritised roadmap tied to one or more public outcomes. Use the diagnostic to identify what should be common, what must remain profession-specific, and which decisions need stronger evidence first.

Appendix A. GCMM diagnostic questions

Area	Diagnostic question
Purpose	Which public outcomes, statutory duties, delivery risks or workforce decisions should capability data improve?
Architecture	Which core, leadership, professional, role and contextual standards apply, and how are overlaps managed?
Roles	Are current requirements mapped to actual posts, work, projects, delegations and locations?
Evidence	What evidence is adequate for each decision and risk level, and who can validate it?
Governance	Who owns each framework, assessment, moderation, exception, review and appeal?
Currency	Can the authority identify stale standards, expired evidence and people whose context has materially changed?
Technology	Are data, permissions, integrations and audit history sufficient for the intended decisions?
Use	Which decisions consume capability data, and what changed after the last assessment cycle?
Mobility	Can evidence move sensibly across teams, professions, authorities or ALBs without unnecessary reassessment?
Suppliers	Are capability requirements and evidence controls extended to material partners and contractors?
Fairness	Can people understand, contribute to and challenge records that affect them?
Value	Which service, resilience, productivity, cost or citizen indicators should improve?

Frequently asked questions

What is a government competency framework?

A government competency framework defines the knowledge, skills, experience and behaviours required for effective performance in public-service roles. It may apply across government, to a profession, or to a specific role or service.

What is government competency maturity?

Government competency maturity measures how consistently an authority defines, assesses, evidences and uses workforce capability. It progresses from fragmented local activity to capability intelligence embedded in strategic and operational decisions.

How is a capability framework different from a competency framework?

A competency framework usually describes what individuals need to demonstrate. A capability framework may also consider teams, leadership, systems, partners and organisational capacity. Mature government workforce planning needs both.

What maturity level are most UK government organisations at?

The most defensible estimate is Level 2 to Level 3 overall. Stronger Level 3 and Level 4 practice exists in established professions and regulated or specialist functions, but enterprise integration is uneven.

How should local authorities start?

Choose a critical statutory service or scarce workforce, map the posts and requirements, agree proportionate evidence, assess the current workforce, and connect gaps to development, recruitment, succession and supplier planning.

How does GCMM apply to arm's length bodies?

ALBs can use GCMM to connect sponsor, board and regulatory assurance to role-level evidence while preserving the specialist standards needed for their mandate.

Can competency be linked to pay?

Yes, but only where standards are observable, assessments are consistent, evidence and moderation are strong, access to development is fair, and decisions can be appealed and equality-tested.

What evidence proves competence?

No single item proves competence in every context. Evidence may include self-declaration, manager review, work artefacts, observed performance and independent validation. The required strength should reflect risk and consequence.

How should government use AI in competency management?

AI can help organise evidence, identify possible gaps and recommend development, but material judgements should remain transparent, reviewable and accountable. Inferred skills should not be treated as verified facts.

What does a mature government capability audit trail contain?

It links the applicable requirement, person and position, evidence, assessor judgement, limitations, decision, approvals and change history, including the versions and dates that applied.

Research method and limitations

This paper adapts Comaea's Organisational Competency Maturity Model to public-sector operating conditions and reviews current official material from the UK Government, National Audit Office, OECD, World Bank, and government bodies in the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, the United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia. Sources were checked in September 2026.

The maturity outlook is a reasoned interpretation. Published sources use different definitions and do not provide a directly comparable distribution against GCMM. The levels should guide hypotheses, diagnostic design and improvement priorities, not be quoted as measured percentages of public bodies. Government structures vary substantially, and individual agencies, professions and services should be assessed separately.

This white paper is general information. It is not legal, employment, equality, data protection, audit or public-law advice.

References

1. **UK Government.** Government professions. Overview of recognised professions and support.
2. **Civil Service Careers.** A guide to Civil Service Success Profiles. Recruitment elements and profession-specific technical requirements.
3. **UK Government.** Government Digital and Data Profession Capability Framework. Government roles and ascending skill levels.
4. **National Audit Office.** Government workforce planning: audit framework. Questions, evidence, criteria and metrics for government workforce planning.
5. **National Audit Office.** Government workforce planning: lessons learned. Lessons for productive, resilient and affordable public services.
6. **UK Government.** Professions Best Practice Framework. Guidance for growing profession capability.
7. **UK Government.** Civil Service People Plan 2024 to 2027. People priorities for a skilled and efficient Civil Service.
8. **US Office of Personnel Management.** Competencies. Definition and workforce uses of competencies.
9. **US Office of Personnel Management.** Federal Workforce Competency Initiative. Government-wide general competencies and models.
10. **Government of Canada.** Key Leadership Competencies. Leadership behaviours used across selection, learning, performance and talent.
11. **Australian Public Service Commission.** APS Job Family Framework. Common job classification and comparison.
12. **Australian Public Service Commission.** APS Professions. Capability building through professional streams.
13. **Australian Public Service Commission.** Capability Review Framework. Structured assessment of agency capability.
14. **New Zealand Public Service Commission.** Leadership Success Profile. Leadership capabilities and outcomes across the public service.
15. **Singapore Public Service Division.** Enhancing service delivery standards through continuous learning. Service competency framework across government.
16. **Civil Service College Singapore.** Nurturing Future Leaders. Leadership competency assessment and development.
17. **UAE Federal Authority for Government Human Resources.** Federal Government Behavioral Competency Framework. Core and leadership competency expectations.
18. **Saudi Ministry of Human Resources and Social Development.** Human Capital Development Agency. Strategic workforce planning, competency, succession and HR maturity responsibilities.
19. **Saudi National Platform.** Interactive Saudi Cybersecurity Workforce Framework. Cyber roles, tasks, knowledge, skills and abilities.
20. **Saudi Future Skills Portal.** Digital Skills. SFIA-based professional skills and responsibility levels.
21. **OECD.** Skills for a High Performing Civil Service. Skills for policy, engagement, commissioning and networked delivery.
22. **OECD.** OECD Framework for Digital Talent and Skills in the Public Sector. Working environment, skills and workforce evolution.
23. **World Bank.** Public Workforce Performance and Prosperity. Cross-national evidence on public workforce management and performance.
24. **World Bank.** Guidance Note for Identifying Job Profiles and Competencies. Methodological options for central government organisations.
25. **Local Government Association.** Workforce planning. Workforce planning support for local authorities.