

Sample Go See Assessment

Management Summary

Key Questions

1. To what extent is the current people strategy and workforce shape aligned to the Department's transformation priorities, particularly where delivery depends on digital capability and more effective use of management capacity?
2. Where does the current organisational design appear misaligned with the work being done, especially in relation to grade mix, capability depth, and the balance between permanent and contractor capacity?
3. What are the most material constraints on strategy execution created by the way work, decisions and capability development are currently organised?
4. Which design changes would most improve alignment across strategy, structure, process, rewards and people so that the Department can deliver its intended outcomes more reliably?

Assessment Approach

This assessment answers those questions by triangulating the evidence available for this engagement. The review draws on the client's uploaded documents, the completed workshop outputs available in the CAO tool, and the assessment notes and findings recorded in the workspace. Where relevant, CAO organisational design theory is used to frame the assessment of fit between strategy and design, but not as evidence about the client.

The assessment looks first at whether the current design supports the strategy and required capabilities. It then tests alignment across the Star Model: whether the structure, processes, rewards and people system are reinforcing the same strategic intent, or whether they are pulling in different directions. It also considers the gap between current and desired capabilities, including where the workforce is too thin, too expensive, or too dependent on contractors to sustain delivery. Finally, it examines recurring day-to-day patterns between teams and management, and whether the current processes support an iterative way of working or still reflect a more sequential, hand-off based model.

The evidence base for this section is intentionally limited to what is available in the tool. In some areas the evidence is strong and specific; in others it is thin or mixed. Where the evidence does not support a clear judgement, that is stated explicitly rather than inferred.

Introduction

Introduction

This Go See Assessment forms part of the People Strategy & Workforce Design engagement for the Department for Economic Infrastructure. The assessment is intended to establish how the organisation is currently designed to deliver its strategy, where that design is supporting execution, and where there are gaps between the current and desired state. The available evidence indicates that the assessment is being used to examine the relationship between strategy, organisational design, capability, and day-to-day delivery, with particular attention to how work is funded, coordinated, and enabled across the organisation.

The evidence available for this engagement is limited. No client documents were uploaded for review, and no workshop results were returned in the engagement workspace. The assessment context does, however, include a small number of recorded findings, which indicate concerns around grade structure and digital delivery capability. These findings provide the only client-specific evidence currently available to ground this section.

Key Questions

1. How well does the current organisation design support the strategy the department is trying to execute?
2. What capability gaps exist between the current workforce model and the capability required to deliver the intended future state?
3. Where do structure, processes, rewards and people practices appear misaligned with the work the organisation needs to do?
4. What recurring operational dynamics are affecting the organisation's ability to build and sustain the required capabilities?

Assessment Approach

This assessment answers the key questions by examining the organisation as a system rather than as isolated parts. The evaluation considers the alignment between strategy, structure, processes, rewards and measurements, and people practices, using the available evidence to test whether the current design is coherent with the capabilities required for execution. The assessment also considers the gap between current and desired capability, because the purpose of the work is not simply to describe the present state but to understand what the organisation must be able to do differently in order to deliver its strategy.

The approach also looks at recurring daily dynamics between teams and management that shape capability development over time. In practice, this means assessing how work is organised, how decisions and dependencies are managed, and whether the operating environment helps or hinders the development of the required capabilities. Where the evidence is silent on a topic, this section does not speculate; those areas are marked <>.

The assessment method is therefore evidence-led and iterative. It draws on the client's recorded findings and any available engagement inputs to build a view of current-state design and capability constraints, then uses CAO design principles to frame the analysis of alignment and capability development. The assessment is bounded by the evidence currently available in the toolset, and further validation will be required where the client record is incomplete.

Findings on Strategy

Strategic Direction

The available evidence indicates a strong emphasis on enterprise-level strategic direction rather than locally defined business-unit strategy. The portfolio framing used in the engagement centres on an enterprise portfolio agenda, shared platforms and common operating standards, with business-unit strategies expected to align to those enterprise choices. The same material also describes a model in which major decisions are driven by enterprise functional leaders acting as one leadership team, and where business-unit leaders have limited independent authority to change strategy, pricing or operating approach without functional alignment.

The strategic logic presented is therefore one of coordinated choice-making across the enterprise, rather than isolated unit optimisation. The evidence also points to a preference for standardisation when trade-offs arise, alongside shared goals and enterprise outcomes as the basis for P&L accountability. <>

Alignment and Trade-offs

The evidence consistently signals that strategic alignment is expected to run through shared capabilities, common standards and centrally governed enabling functions. The portfolio material describes business units as intentionally linked by shared platforms and capabilities, with growth and margin plans assuming cross-business leverage. It also indicates that business units rely substantially on shared or central functional capabilities, and that core functional resources are organised as enterprise functions rather than embedded in business units.

This pattern suggests a strategic choice to trade some local autonomy for enterprise coherence, reuse and leverage. The same evidence set distinguishes between more integrated and more autonomous portfolio configurations, implying that the organisation's strategic choices need to

be read alongside the degree of coupling required across units. In this context, the repeated references to standardisation, shared services and enterprise functions are consistent with a more integrated portfolio logic. <>

Portfolio and Focus

The portfolio evidence points to a business model in which multiple business units are not intended to operate as standalone entities, but are linked through common platforms, shared capabilities and enterprise choices. The workshop material contrasts this with a loosely related portfolio, where business units are primarily autonomous and shared services are selective; the client-facing evidence instead aligns more closely with the integrated end of the spectrum.

The portfolio logic also places emphasis on where decisions sit: enterprise-level choices about which businesses, platforms or capabilities to prioritise, and how shared capacity should be governed. The evidence does not provide a detailed statement of the client's market segments, product groups or explicit growth bets, so those specifics are not evidenced here. <>

Evidence and Tensions

A clear and consistent signal across the evidence is that strategy, governance and shared capability choices are meant to move together. The materials repeatedly stress that strategy should be translated into capability requirements, and that portfolio decisions should ensure investment, capacity and accountability tell the same story. This is reinforced by references to enterprise outcomes, shared goals and centrally governed enabling functions.

At the same time, the evidence also distinguishes between different portfolio shapes and notes that the right design depends on the nature of the portfolio and the strategic focus. That creates an important tension to test further: the current evidence strongly supports an integrated, enterprise-led model, but it does not yet specify the exact degree of integration required for each part of the organisation. <>

Findings on Structure

Structural Boundaries

The evidence indicates a structure organised around distinct functional and product-related boundaries rather than a single, fully integrated operating model. One recurring pattern is the separation of line and product management, with different roles carrying responsibility for people, processes and organisational environment on the one hand, and strategy and value on

the other. The material also points to a design in which core enabling functions are centrally governed, while business units retain more local responsibility for execution in some areas.

A further pattern is the use of structural boundaries to manage dependencies between units. The evidence shows that where a function is essential to the wider product group, it is treated as part of that larger unit; where it is not essential to the immediate product development purpose, it sits outside that boundary. This suggests that boundary-setting is being used to distinguish between capabilities that must be integrated and those that can remain separate.

Ownership and Accountability

The evidence shows ownership split across different managerial circuits. Product-related accountability sits with product leadership, while line leadership holds responsibility for people, competency development and the organisational environment. In the matrix example, team members have two reporting lines: one to a chapter lead for individual performance and one to an area lead for product development. This creates a dual-accountability pattern in which different managers own different aspects of the same work.

The evidence also shows that leadership responsibilities can be distributed across multiple roles where the product group is heterogeneous. In the triad model, strategic leadership remains with the Product Owner, while line management is divided between Output, Market and Input leads. This indicates an ownership pattern that separates strategic, people and functional accountabilities rather than concentrating them in a single role.

Layering and Control

The structure appears to contain multiple layers of management and coordination. The evidence refers to directors at departmental level, chapter leads responsible for skill and competency development, area leads responsible for product development, and cross-functional teams at delivery level. This suggests a layered model in which authority and accountability are distributed vertically as well as horizontally.

The evidence also indicates that some structures are intended to avoid overloading a single leader as the organisation grows. In the product-group model, a single line leader is described as becoming less viable as scale and complexity increase, which is why leadership is distributed across several roles. The material further notes that where a product group becomes more like a mini-business, a Head of Product Group may emerge to hold responsibility for the organisational system, resources, budgets and business domain.

Structural Tensions

The clearest recurring tension is between line management decisions and product decisions. In the matrix example, the two managers set different goals, and people tended to prioritise the goals linked to performance appraisal over the product goals set by the area lead. The evidence also records that this created 'side steering', task switching and reduced focus on product priorities.

Another tension appears where a single structural parameter influences several functional requirements. The evidence notes that when one design parameter affects multiple requirements, interdependence and conflict risk increase. A specific example is the relationship between Product Owner and IT Security, where product goals could exert pressure on security control functions, reducing the independence of IT Security.

The evidence also points to a structural tension between the breadth of leadership responsibility and the diversity of work. Technical teams and marketing-commercial functions are described as requiring different expertise, different competency development approaches, different performance metrics and different operating models. This implies that a single line leader may struggle to hold these accountabilities together without creating overload or weakening focus.

<> Evidence on actual spans of control, number of layers, named reporting lines, and specific structural boundaries in the Department for Economic Infrastructure was not available in the retrieved client materials.

Findings on Process

Flow of Work

The available evidence shows a process environment that is intended to support end-to-end delivery through clearer sequencing of work, prioritisation of objectives, and regular review points. In the workshop material, the process design is described as moving from shared understanding of needs and goals, to prioritising objectives and features, to breaking work down into more detailed items ready for planning. The same material also describes a diverge–merge approach in which groups work in parallel and then combine outputs through structured consolidation.

In practice, the evidence indicates that planning is not treated as a single event but as a repeated cadence. Portfolio management is described as operating across longer-cycle strategic investment decisions, quarterly capacity allocation, and monthly health checks with smaller adjustments. This suggests a layered flow from strategy to portfolio choices to more frequent course correction.

Decision-Making and Governance

The evidence points to a governance model in which major decisions are expected to be made through explicit decision rules rather than informal agreement. One workshop resource sets out a decision matrix approach, with different decision types such as majority, delegation, super-majority, consensus and unanimous decision-making. It also describes the use of a meta-rule to determine how decisions are allocated to the relevant decision mode.

The portfolio material indicates that governance is designed to focus leadership attention on a limited number of clear bets, with enterprise-level decisions determining which product groups or business units to grow, maintain or exit, and which major platform investments to make. At the product-group level, portfolio decisions are intended to determine how capacity is distributed across value areas and major initiatives, while platform decisions determine which shared capabilities are built or improved.

The evidence also shows that governance is used to prevent work being managed as a stream of isolated approvals. The portfolio guidance explicitly contrasts portfolio management with project-by-project approval and feature-by-feature debate, indicating that the formal process is intended to reduce fragmentation in decision-making.

Handoffs and Coordination

The evidence shows a strong emphasis on structured handoffs between groups and on coordination mechanisms where work crosses boundaries. The workshop sequence uses multiple groups working in parallel, followed by merging of outputs in stages, which indicates a deliberate design for handoff and consolidation rather than a purely linear process.

The coordination guidance distinguishes between different types of interdependence and states that sequential interdependence benefits from central planning, while reciprocal interdependence requires continuous information sharing and adjustment. It also notes that some dependencies are better handled through emergent coordination mechanisms such as communities, travellers, component mentors, Open Space, Lean Coffee and UX Fishbowl.

The evidence further indicates that coordination is expected to be lightweight where possible. One source states that effective coordination depends on people understanding when they need to coordinate, with whom, and about what, and that this should be supported by few coordination rules. Another source notes that communities can be used to handle cross-cutting concerns when work is reorganised into cross-functional teams.

Process Frictions

The evidence identifies several recurring process frictions. First, there is an explicit concern that uncontrolled change requests can overload back-end functions and make change slow and

expensive. The portfolio guidance gives examples of small requests becoming separate tickets with their own analysis, build and test, which together fill the pipeline and delay more strategic changes.

Second, the evidence points to the risk of decision-making becoming fragmented when work is approved in small pieces rather than through an integrated portfolio view. The same source notes that when money and people do not match strategy, many things run at once and nothing truly leads, while good ideas wait for funding and weaker ideas continue because they have historical budgets.

Third, the evidence indicates that shared services and shared platforms can become bottlenecks if dependencies are not managed carefully. One source notes that shared platforms can become a bottleneck in development, while another highlights the importance of considering cost of delay when deciding whether a function should remain shared or be duplicated.

Where the evidence allows, there is a clear distinction between formal process design and day-to-day behaviour: the formal design emphasises structured planning, explicit decision rules, and staged coordination, while the process frictions described in the material suggest that actual execution can drift towards ticket-by-ticket handling, overloaded back units, and slower change flow. <> for any further client-specific examples of how these frictions appear in day-to-day operations.

Findings on Rewards & Measurements

KPIs and Success Measures

The evidence shows a strong emphasis on efficiency-oriented measures, including process performance, efficiency metrics and cost-saving targets. The measurement language is framed around operational output and productivity rather than around broader capability development or customer outcomes. In the available material, success is also described as needing to be made explicit through a shared execution story that links what the organisation will invest in, what it will measure, and what must improve to deliver the value proposition. <>

Incentives and Behavioural Signals

The evidence indicates that reward and recognition logic is closely tied to performance evaluation and compensation processes. The material describes a traditional appraisal model in which performance is judged against job descriptions, with results linked to compensation, talent management, learning and retention. This creates a strong signal that individual performance is being assessed through formal managerial judgement. The same material notes that such systems can encourage people to prioritise the goals of the manager who conducts the appraisal, particularly where there are competing priorities between line and product

management. In the client evidence, this is reflected in the tendency for people to follow the goals of the manager who owns their appraisal rather than the goals of the wider product or business area. <>

Performance Management Logic

The evidence suggests a predominantly manager-led performance management logic. The appraisal process is described as a periodic conversation, typically once or twice a year, in which the manager and employee review the past and set objectives for the future. Feedback is characterised as quantitative and closed, and the manager is said to initiate the meeting because it is mandatory. The material also indicates that HR owns the process. This points to a formal, centrally managed approach in which performance is assessed through scheduled review rather than continuous learning loops. The evidence further suggests that where objectives are set in uncertain, interdependent work, the logic can become difficult to apply consistently because results depend on many people and work is not fully predictable. <>

Measurement Tensions

The evidence points to several potential tensions between what is measured and the behaviours the organisation appears to need. First, there is a tension between individual appraisal and cross-functional delivery: where people are assessed by chapter or line managers but expected to deliver through product or area priorities, the appraisal signal can pull attention away from shared product goals. Second, there is a tension between individual skill development and whole-team performance: the material describes line managers focusing on narrow skill development, which can encourage single-skill career paths rather than team capability. Third, there is a tension between closed, judgement-based feedback and learning in complex work: the evidence describes long feedback loops and retrospective judgement, while also noting that work is interdependent and uncertain. Finally, the measurement language in the available material is heavily weighted towards efficiency and cost, while the broader CAO framing emphasises the need to connect measures to capabilities and outcomes. <>

Findings on People

Capabilities and Gaps

- <> No client-specific evidence was retrieved on people capabilities, talent gaps, or workforce supply and demand beyond a general indication that digital capability is under-resourced in the engagement workspace.
- The engagement workspace records a material gap between current and required digital delivery capacity, with 3 FTE currently available against an estimated

requirement of 18–22 FTE for the transformation programme. The current model is described as relying entirely on contractors.

Leadership and Management Patterns

- <> No client evidence was retrieved on leadership style, management behaviour, or line-management patterns in the uploaded documents or workshop outputs.
- The assessment context notes a significant grade mismatch, with 53% of Grade 7 roles performing work assessed at Grade 6 complexity. This indicates a pattern of role placement that does not align cleanly with assessed work complexity.

Collaboration and Role Clarity

- <> No client evidence was retrieved on collaboration habits, cross-team working, or role clarity in the uploaded documents or workshop outputs.
- The assessment context indicates that the current operating model is carrying a bloated mid-tier created by historic grade drift. This suggests that role boundaries and level differentiation have not remained tightly aligned to work content.

Cultural Signals

- <> No client evidence was retrieved on culture, behavioural norms, or employee experience signals in the uploaded documents or workshop outputs.
- The only directly evidenced people-related signal available in the engagement context is the combination of grade drift and heavy contractor reliance, which points to a workforce shape that is not yet aligned to the assessed work profile.

Capability Gap Analysis

Capability Gap Analysis

The capability gap analysis below focuses on the capabilities required to execute the department's strategy and where current capability appears insufficient, incomplete, or not yet evidenced. The analysis is structured around the gaps that are most material to strategy execution.

Capability gap	Gap description	Why it matters for strategy execution	Severity / significance	Evidence supporting the gap	Measurement data
<p>Strategic focus to capability translation</p>	<p>The organisation does not yet have a clearly evidenced, shared capability map that links strategic outcomes to the capabilities required to deliver them.</p>	<p>Without a clear line of sight from strategy to capabilities, investment, prioritisation and accountability are harder to align to the outcomes the organisation needs to deliver.</p>	<p>High – this is a foundational gap because it affects how all other capability decisions are made.</p>	<p>Evidence points to the need to define required capabilities from strategic focus and to use a capability map as the reference point for investment and accountability. The available workshop material emphasises that strategy must be translated into required capabilities and that gaps arise when no one owns, funds or builds a capability.</p>	<p>Missing / not yet evidenced. No capability map, baseline or target measures were available in the retrieved engagement outputs. <></p>
<p>Decision-making and governance capability</p>	<p>Current governance and decision rights are not evidenced as being sufficiently clear or fast</p>	<p>Strategy execution depends on timely decisions, clear ownership and the</p>	<p>High – governance is an enabling capability that shapes speed and adaptability.</p>	<p>The evidence base highlights decision rights, governance and coordination</p>	<p>Missing / not yet evidenced. No quantified governance measures, cycle times or decision-rights</p>

Capability gap	Gap description	Why it matters for strategy execution	Severity / significance	Evidence supporting the gap	Measurement data
	<p>enough to support strategy execution.</p>	<p>ability to resolve trade-offs without unnecessary delay. If decision rights are unclear, work is slowed and priorities become harder to hold.</p>		<p>as core enabling capabilities, and the portfolio workshop material stresses the importance of understanding the operating framework, major decision-making routes and the degree of centralisation or autonomy.</p>	<p>metrics were available. <></p>
<p>Resource allocation and funding flexibility</p>	<p>The organisation's ability to move people and funding to the highest-priority work is not evidenced.</p>	<p>Strategy execution requires capacity to shift resources towards the work that matters most as priorities change. If funding and staffing are fixed or misaligned, strategic bets progress slowly and lower-value</p>	<p>High – this directly affects whether strategy is funded and staffed in line with intent.</p>	<p>The evidence repeatedly identifies flexible allocation of resources and alignment of money, people and strategy as key to making strategy executable. The capability guidance also notes that required capabilities include</p>	<p>Missing / not yet evidenced. No baseline, current or target values were provided for resource reallocation speed, funding flexibility or capacity shift. <></p>

Capability gap	Gap description	Why it matters for strategy execution	Severity / significance	Evidence supporting the gap	Measurement data
		work can continue.		flexible resource allocation.	
Cross-functional coordination and dependency management	The organisation's ability to manage dependencies across teams and functions is not evidenced as strong enough for the current strategy.	Where strategy relies on shared capabilities or integrated delivery, poor dependency management creates delays, rework and hand-offs that reduce execution speed.	Medium to High – significance depends on the degree of coupling in the operating model, but the evidence suggests it is material.	The evidence base highlights dependencies, shared capabilities and coordination mechanisms as central to organisational design. The workshop material also frames the need to reveal where the current design creates drag through coordination and alignment overheads.	Missing / not yet evidenced. No dependency metrics, hand-off measures or flow data were available. <>
Capability ownership and accountability	Ownership for key enabling capabilities is not yet clearly evidenced across the organisation.	Even where a capability is recognised as important, strategy execution suffers if nobody is accountable for building,	High – lack of ownership can leave critical capabilities underdeveloped or duplicated.	The evidence explicitly notes that capability gaps emerge when a capability is needed but nobody owns, funds or builds it. The	Missing / not yet evidenced. No ownership model, RACI or accountability measures were available. <>

Capability gap	Gap description	Why it matters for strategy execution	Severity / significance	Evidence supporting the gap	Measurement data
		funding and sustaining it.		portfolio and capability guidance both emphasise aligning accountability with the required capability set.	
Measurement and progress tracking for capabilities	Capability measurement is either absent, incomplete or not yet mature enough to show progress over time.	Without measures, it is difficult to know whether capability-building actions are closing the gap or whether the organisation is simply tracking outputs.	High – measurement is necessary to manage improvement and sustain focus.	The evidence stresses that capabilities should be quantified to measure progress and that KPIs alone are not sufficient without capability logic. The retrieved engagement outputs did not include completed capability gap measurement results.	Missing / not yet evidenced. No scale, unit, baseline, current value or target value was available. No progress-over-time data was retrieved. <>

Detailed analysis

1) Strategic focus to capability translation

The evidence indicates that the organisation needs a clearer capability logic that connects strategic intent to the capabilities required for delivery. The current material points to the

importance of starting from outcomes, defining the capabilities needed to achieve them, and using a single enterprise capability map as the reference point. In practical terms, this means the organisation needs a more explicit answer to the question: what must we be able to do reliably to deliver the strategy?

This gap matters because strategy execution becomes fragmented when capability requirements are not translated into a shared design language. In that situation, different parts of the organisation may invest in different priorities, and the causal link between work and strategic outcomes becomes weaker.

2) Decision-making and governance capability

The evidence points to governance and decision rights as core enabling capabilities. For strategy execution, the organisation needs a governance model that allows decisions to be made at the right level, with sufficient speed and clarity. Where this is weak, the organisation is likely to experience delays, repeated alignment activity, or unclear escalation routes.

The significance of this gap depends on the organisation's portfolio and operating model, but it is clearly material because governance shapes how quickly the organisation can respond to changing priorities and how effectively it can coordinate shared work.

3) Resource allocation and funding flexibility

A recurring theme in the evidence is the need to align money and people with strategy. The organisation needs the ability to reallocate resources to the highest-value work, rather than leaving capacity locked in legacy priorities. This is especially important where strategy depends on new capabilities or where priorities change during execution.

This gap is significant because even a strong strategy will underperform if the organisation cannot move capacity to where it is needed. The evidence suggests that capability development should be accompanied by deliberate investment choices and a clear view of what should stop or slow down.

4) Cross-functional coordination and dependency management

The evidence suggests that the organisation needs stronger coordination across functions and teams where delivery depends on shared capabilities or integrated work. If dependencies are not actively managed, strategy execution can be slowed by hand-offs, queues and inconsistent standards.

This is particularly important where the organisation is operating as a more integrated or closely coupled portfolio. In that context, coordination is not a side issue; it is part of the operating capability required to deliver outcomes.

5) Capability ownership and accountability

The evidence indicates that capability ownership is a critical issue. A capability gap is not only about whether the capability exists; it is also about whether someone is responsible for building and sustaining it. Where ownership is unclear, capability development can stall or become fragmented across teams.

This gap is significant because accountability is what turns a capability from an aspiration into an executable part of the operating model.

6) Measurement and progress tracking for capabilities

The evidence retrieved for this engagement does not include completed capability gap measurement outputs. That means the organisation's current position, target state and progress over time are not yet visible in the available material.

This is itself an important gap. Without measurement, the organisation cannot reliably determine whether capability-building activity is closing the gap or whether the intended improvements are being realised.

Measurement summary

No completed capability gap measurement data was available in the retrieved engagement outputs. As a result, the following fields remain unresolved for the current analysis:

- scale
- unit
- baseline value
- current value
- target value
- progress over time

<> Populate these fields once the capability gap measurement workshop outputs or equivalent diagnostic data are available.

Conclusions

Conclusions

The evidence points to a consistent conclusion: the Department's current people strategy and workforce design are not yet aligned tightly enough to the way the organisation needs to execute its transformation. The most material issue is not a single capability shortage in isolation, but a

broader misalignment between strategic intent, workforce shape, decision-making and the way work is organised. In CAO terms, the organisation appears to be carrying a design that does not yet fully support the capabilities required for delivery.

A first systemic issue is that the organisation does not yet have a sufficiently clear line of sight from strategy to the capabilities and capacity required to deliver it. The evidence shows an enterprise-led strategic logic, with shared platforms, common standards and major decisions driven centrally, but the assessment context also records that the capability map, baseline and target measures are not yet evidenced. This means the organisation cannot yet demonstrate that investment, accountability and workforce planning are all pointing at the same strategic outcomes. Without that shared capability logic, it is difficult to prioritise what to build, what to stop, and where to place scarce capacity.

A second systemic issue is that the current workforce shape does not match the assessed work profile. The evidence records a significant grade mismatch, with 53% of Grade 7 roles performing work assessed at Grade 6 complexity, alongside a bloated mid-tier created by historic grade drift. At the same time, digital delivery capability is critically under-resourced, with 3 FTE against an estimated requirement of 18–22 FTE and reliance entirely on contractors. Taken together, this suggests the organisation is over-invested in some layers of the workforce while under-invested in the capabilities that matter most for transformation delivery. That is a structural capability problem, not just a staffing gap.

A third systemic issue is that the organisation's enabling systems are not yet reinforcing the same behaviours. The evidence across structure, process and rewards indicates a design that can pull people towards line-manager priorities, formal appraisal and efficiency-oriented measures, while the work itself requires cross-functional coordination, shared priorities and faster adaptation. The recurring pattern is one of competing signals: strategic intent points towards integrated enterprise delivery, but the day-to-day design still appears to reward narrower managerial accountability and more traditional, judgement-based performance logic. In CAO terms, the design elements are not yet in harmony.

A fourth systemic issue is that the organisation's ability to build capability over time is constrained by weak ownership and limited measurement. The evidence identifies gaps in capability ownership, governance, resource allocation flexibility, coordination and progress tracking, but the retrieved material does not yet show a mature mechanism for managing those gaps as a system. This matters because capability development is not a one-off staffing exercise; it depends on clear accountability, deliberate investment and visible measures of progress. Where those are missing, the organisation is likely to continue reproducing the same gaps.

Overall, the assessment suggests an organisation that has articulated the right strategic direction in principle, but has not yet fully translated that direction into a coherent operating model. The current design appears to be more effective at preserving existing structures and managerial arrangements than at building the capabilities needed for transformation. Unless the

Department aligns strategy, structure, processes, rewards and people practices around a shared capability map and a clearer workforce model, it is likely to continue experiencing the same patterns of grade drift, contractor dependence, coordination overhead and under-developed digital capability.<> Further validation is needed on the exact strategic priorities, the full capability set, and the current governance and measurement arrangements before final design decisions are confirmed.

Recommendations

Recommendations

The recommendations below are prioritised to address the most material misalignments identified in the assessment: the lack of a clear strategy-to-capability line of sight, the grade and workforce shape mismatch, and the under-resourced digital delivery capacity. Sequencing should start with the capabilities and workforce decisions that are most critical to transformation delivery, then move to the enabling systems that will sustain the new model.

1. Build and adopt a single enterprise capability map for the transformation portfolio

What should change

Create a single, agreed capability map that translates the Department's strategic intent into the capabilities required to deliver it, and use that map as the reference point for workforce planning, investment decisions and accountability.

Why it matters

The current evidence shows a strategic direction that depends on shared capabilities, common standards and enterprise-level coordination, but the capability map, baseline and target measures are not yet evidenced. Without a single reference point, it is difficult to align investment, staffing and prioritisation to the outcomes the Department is trying to achieve.

Findings or capability gaps addressed

- Strategic focus to capability translation - Capability ownership and accountability - Measurement and progress tracking for capabilities

Expected benefit or intended outcome

A clearer line of sight from strategy to delivery, better prioritisation of scarce capacity, and a shared basis for deciding what to build, what to stop, and what to fund.

Priority / sequencing logic

This is the first priority because it provides the design logic for all other interventions. It should be completed before final workforce reshaping decisions are locked in.

2. Rebalance the digital delivery workforce from contractor dependence towards a core internal capability

What should change

Establish a materially larger permanent digital delivery core and reduce reliance on an entirely contractor-based model for the transformation programme. The current position is 3 FTE with hands-on digital delivery capability against an estimated requirement of 18–22 FTE.

Why it matters

The current gap is too large to be treated as a temporary resourcing issue. A transformation programme of this scale requires stable internal capability to retain knowledge, make decisions quickly and sustain delivery over time. A contractor-only model increases dependency and weakens organisational learning.

Findings or capability gaps addressed

- Digital capability critically under-resourced - Resource allocation and funding flexibility - Capability ownership and accountability

Expected benefit or intended outcome

Improved delivery continuity, stronger internal ownership of the transformation, reduced dependency risk, and better retention of critical digital knowledge.

Priority / sequencing logic

This should be addressed immediately after the capability map is agreed, because the digital gap is both material and quantified. The scale of the gap means it should be treated as a core design decision, not a short-term staffing fix.

Capability gap reference

- **Gap name:** Digital delivery capability under-resourced
- **Current value vs target value:** 3 FTE current vs 18–22 FTE required
- **Measurement scale:** FTE
- **Progress data:** None available in the retrieved evidence

3. Reduce grade drift and redesign the mid-tier around actual work complexity

What should change

Review Grade 7 roles against assessed work complexity and redesign the mid-tier so that role level, accountabilities and work content are aligned. The current evidence shows 53% of Grade 7 roles are performing work assessed at Grade 6 complexity, with a bloated mid-tier created by historic grade drift.

Why it matters

When grade structure is misaligned to work, the organisation carries avoidable cost and creates

weak signals about accountability and progression. It also makes it harder to place the right work at the right level and to build a workforce shape that is sustainable for the future.

Findings or capability gaps addressed

- Grade structure does not reflect actual work complexity - Capability ownership and accountability - Resource allocation and funding flexibility

Expected benefit or intended outcome

A leaner and more accurate workforce shape, clearer role differentiation, better use of management capacity, and a reduction in structural cost that is not adding delivery value.

Priority / sequencing logic

This should run in parallel with the digital capability build, but it should not be delayed until after recruitment. The grade review will clarify which roles should be retained, reshaped, re-leveled or removed.

Capability gap reference

- **Gap name:** Grade structure misaligned to work complexity
- **Current value vs target value:** 53% of Grade 7 roles currently assessed at Grade 6 complexity; target is full alignment of grade to assessed complexity
- **Measurement scale:** Percentage of Grade 7 roles assessed at Grade 6 complexity
- **Progress data:** None available in the retrieved evidence

4. Put explicit ownership and funding behind each critical enabling capability

What should change

Assign a named owner for each critical enabling capability in the enterprise capability map, with clear responsibility for building, funding and sustaining it. This should include digital delivery capability, governance and decision-making capability, resource allocation flexibility, and cross-functional coordination.

Why it matters

The evidence indicates that capability gaps become persistent when no one owns, funds or builds the capability. Without explicit accountability, the organisation is likely to continue relying on informal workarounds, which makes capability development slow and uneven.

Findings or capability gaps addressed

- Capability ownership and accountability - Decision-making and governance capability - Resource allocation and funding flexibility - Cross-functional coordination and dependency management

Expected benefit or intended outcome

Clearer accountability for closing gaps, faster escalation when capability is under pressure, and a more disciplined approach to investment and delivery trade-offs.

Priority / sequencing logic

This should follow the capability map and be embedded in the same governance cycle. Ownership should be agreed before the next planning and funding round so that accountability is not left implicit.

5. Align governance and decision rights to the enterprise-led operating model**What should change**

Clarify where major decisions sit, who has authority to make them, and how trade-offs are resolved across functions and delivery areas. The governance model should support the enterprise-led logic already visible in the evidence, rather than allowing priorities to fragment across separate managerial circuits.

Why it matters

The current design depends on shared platforms, common standards and central coordination. If decision rights remain unclear or too dispersed, the organisation will continue to experience delay, repeated alignment activity and difficulty holding priorities steady.

Findings or capability gaps addressed

- Decision-making and governance capability - Cross-functional coordination and dependency management - Strategic focus to capability translation

Expected benefit or intended outcome

Faster and more consistent decisions, fewer avoidable escalations, and better alignment between strategic priorities and day-to-day delivery choices.

Priority / sequencing logic

This should be implemented alongside the capability map and before large-scale delivery expansion, because the new workforce model will only work if decision rights are clear.

6. Reconfigure performance and management signals so they reinforce shared delivery priorities**What should change**

Review the current performance management and management-accountability signals so that they reinforce the enterprise and product priorities rather than narrower line-manager priorities. The evidence indicates that formal appraisal logic can pull attention towards the manager who owns the appraisal, which is not well aligned to cross-functional delivery.

Why it matters

If people are rewarded and assessed through signals that do not match the way work must be delivered, the organisation will continue to experience misalignment between individual behaviour and collective outcomes.

Findings or capability gaps addressed

- Measurement and progress tracking for capabilities - Cross-functional coordination and dependency management - Strategic focus to capability translation

Expected benefit or intended outcome

Better alignment between what managers ask for, what teams prioritise, and what the transformation needs to deliver.

Priority / sequencing logic

This should be addressed after the capability and governance model is clarified, so that performance signals can be redesigned around the target operating model rather than the current one.

7. Establish a simple capability progress dashboard with baseline, current and target values

What should change

Introduce a small set of capability measures for the critical gaps, with baseline, current and target values, and review them regularly through the transformation governance cycle.

Why it matters

The current evidence does not include completed capability measurement outputs, which means progress cannot yet be tracked in a disciplined way. Without measurement, the Department cannot tell whether interventions are closing the gaps or simply creating activity.

Findings or capability gaps addressed

- Measurement and progress tracking for capabilities - Strategic focus to capability translation - Capability ownership and accountability

Expected benefit or intended outcome

A visible improvement trajectory, earlier identification of slippage, and a more evidence-based basis for investment and workforce decisions.

Priority / sequencing logic

This should be implemented immediately after the capability map and ownership model are agreed. It is the mechanism that will show whether the redesign is working.

Capability gap reference

- **Gap name:** Measurement and progress tracking for capabilities
- **Current value vs target value:** Not yet evidenced

- **Measurement scale:** Not yet evidenced
- **Progress data:** None available in the retrieved evidence

Sequencing summary

The recommended sequence is: 1. Agree the enterprise capability map and strategic priorities. 2. Assign ownership and funding for the critical capabilities. 3. Rebalance the digital delivery workforce and reduce contractor dependence. 4. Redesign the mid-tier to remove grade drift and align roles to work complexity. 5. Clarify governance, decision rights and performance signals. 6. Put capability measures in place and track progress through the transformation cycle.

This sequence ensures that workforce changes are made against a clear design logic, rather than as isolated staffing actions, and that the Department can build the capabilities required for delivery in a controlled and measurable way.