



RESOURCES

Insights, frameworks and practical tools
for better data decisions.

A18 PRACTICAL DATA RESOURCE

Enterprise Data Maturity Assessment Toolkit

How Mature Is Your Organization's Data Environment?

An evidence-led assessment of strategy, governance, metadata, quality, discoverability, analytics, data products and AI readiness.

VERSION 1.0	RELEASE July 2026
DESIGNED FOR Public-sector, regulated and medium-to-large organizations	

A18 ANALYTICS

About this toolkit

The A18 Enterprise Data Maturity Assessment Toolkit helps organizations determine whether their data environment can consistently support operations, regulation, analytics, decision-making and artificial intelligence. It evaluates institutional capability rather than treating technology acquisition as evidence of maturity.

The central question is not whether the organization owns modern data tools. It is whether people can find, understand, trust, govern and use data repeatedly - with clear accountability and measurable outcomes.

What the toolkit contains

- A structured questionnaire covering eight dimensions and 40 sub-capabilities
- Five evidence-based maturity levels, from Fragmented to Adaptive
- A scoring worksheet and validation guardrails
- Capability heat-map and stakeholder-alignment templates
- An improvement-priority matrix
- A 90-day action-plan template
- A method for an A18-facilitated enterprise assessment

Public-sector alignment

The toolkit is designed around capability needs commonly expressed in Canadian public-sector procurements: departmental data maturity, ownership, documentation, discoverability, structured analysis, dashboards and reports, data-product delivery, and responsible use of statistical and machine-learning methods.

Use and limitations

This toolkit supports self-assessment, facilitated diagnosis and improvement planning. It is not a regulatory audit, assurance opinion or certification. Results are meaningful only within the agreed organizational scope and should be interpreted alongside the quality of available evidence.

Copyright 2026 A18 Analytics Inc. This toolkit may be used internally by the organization that obtained it. Redistribution, resale or removal of A18 attribution is not permitted without written authorization.

Contents

About this toolkit	2
What the toolkit contains	2
Public-sector alignment	2
Use and limitations	2
Contents	3
1. Assessment Foundation	8
Questions the assessment answers	8
Assessment principles	8
Assessment modes	8
Recommended respondent groups	8
Evidence confidence	8
Organizational Profile	9
Assessment drivers	9
2. Five-Level Maturity Model	10
Cross-cutting maturity lenses	10
Rating rules	10
Maturity guardrails	10
3. Capability Architecture	11
Data Strategy and Ownership	11
Governance and Accountability	11
Metadata and Documentation	11
Data Quality	12
Discoverability and Access	12
Analytics Delivery	12
Data-Product Management	12

AI and Machine-Learning Readiness	13
4. Assessment Questionnaire	14
DS1 - Strategic alignment	16
DS2 - Executive sponsorship	17
DS3 - Enterprise data operating model	18
DS4 - Investment and roadmap	19
DS5 - Value and outcome management	20
GA1 - Governance structure	22
GA2 - Decision rights	23
GA3 - Ownership and stewardship	24
GA4 - Policies and standards	25
GA5 - Issue resolution and escalation	26
MD1 - Metadata standards	28
MD2 - Business glossary	29
MD3 - Data catalogue and inventory	30
MD4 - Data lineage	31
MD5 - Documentation lifecycle	32
DQ1 - Critical-data identification	34
DQ2 - Quality rules and thresholds	35
DQ3 - Profiling and monitoring	36
DQ4 - Issue management and root-cause remediation	37
DQ5 - Quality performance reporting	38
DA1 - Search and discovery	40
DA2 - Authoritative-source identification	41
DA3 - Access request and provisioning	42

DA4 - Classification, privacy and security	43
DA5 - Governed self-service	44
AN1 - Demand management and prioritization	46
AN2 - Delivery lifecycle and quality assurance	47
AN3 - Architecture, tools and reuse	48
AN4 - Metric and semantic consistency	49
AN5 - Adoption and outcome measurement	50
DP1 - User and problem discovery	52
DP2 - Product ownership and cross-functional delivery	53
DP3 - Product lifecycle and roadmap	54
DP4 - Service expectations and product health	55
DP5 - Portfolio and investment management	56
AI1 - Use-case identification and prioritization	58
AI2 - Data suitability and preparation	59
AI3 - Responsible-AI governance	60
AI4 - Model delivery and monitoring	61
AI5 - Skills, adoption and organizational readiness	62
5. Scoring Methodology	63
Current maturity and validation	63
Classification bands	63
Foundational-capability ceiling	63
Evidence-confidence score	63
Stakeholder-alignment analysis	64
Unknown and not-applicable responses	64
Target maturity	64

Business importance and urgency	64
Capability-priority index	64
Improvement effort	65
6. Heat Maps and Priority Matrix	66
Executive maturity scorecard	66
Dimension-level heat map	66
Maturity colour system	66
Detailed Scoring Worksheet	67
Improvement-Priority Matrix	68
7. 90-Day Action Plan	69
Three-phase structure	69
Action-plan portfolio	69
Initiative charter	69
Milestone Plan	70
Success measures	70
Risk, assumption, issue and dependency log	70
Governance cadence	70
8. A18-Facilitated Assessment	71
Standard six-week lifecycle	71
Evidence-review criteria	71
Calibration rule	71
Final deliverables	71
Quality controls	71
Service Pathways	72
Recommended reassessment cadence	72
Appendix A: Evidence Register	73
Appendix B: Calibration Record	74

Appendix C: Day-90 Review	75
Appendix D: Glossary	76

1. Assessment Foundation

The assessment examines how consistently data practices are established, documented, governed, measured and connected to organizational outcomes.

Questions the assessment answers

- How mature is the current data environment?
- Which capabilities are strongest and weakest?
- Which weaknesses create the greatest operational or strategic risk?
- Where do leadership, business, data and technology stakeholders disagree?
- What should improve during the next 90 days?

Assessment principles

Principle	Meaning
Capability before technology	People, process, accountability, standards, technology and adoption are assessed together.
Evidence before perception	Scores should be supported by current artefacts, records, systems or observable practice.
Consistency before isolated excellence	One strong team does not establish enterprise maturity.
Outcomes before activity	Committees, catalogues and dashboards matter only when they improve performance, trust or service.
Improvement before certification	The assessment establishes a baseline and a practical pathway forward.

Assessment modes

Mode	How it works	Primary output
Self-assessment	One leader or team completes the instrument.	Preliminary maturity profile
Collaborative	Business, data and technology complete it together.	Agreed organizational baseline
Facilitated	Stakeholders respond separately; evidence is reviewed and calibrated.	Validated assessment and roadmap

Recommended respondent groups

- Executive or departmental leadership
- Data management and governance
- Information technology and architecture
- Analytics and business intelligence
- Business and operational units
- Privacy, security, risk and compliance
- Digital transformation, data-product and AI teams

Evidence confidence

Rating	Standard
Low	The response is primarily based on individual perception.
Moderate	The practice is observable, but documentation or adoption is incomplete.
High	Current documentation, ownership and operational evidence support the rating across scope.

Organizational Profile

Profile field	Response
Organization name	
Sector and organization type	
Employees and geographic scope	
Primary mandate or services	
Assessment sponsor	
Assessment purpose	
Included organizational areas	
Excluded organizational areas	
Included data domains and systems	
Decisions the results will inform	
Participants and respondent groups	
Evidence reviewed	
Target reassessment date	

Assessment drivers

☐ Enterprise data strategy	☐ Digital transformation
☐ Regulatory or policy requirements	☐ Data governance
☐ Data-quality improvement	☐ Metadata and documentation
☐ Discoverability and access	☐ Analytics modernization
☐ Data-platform implementation	☐ Data-product development
☐ AI and machine-learning readiness	☐ Investment or procurement planning

2. Five-Level Maturity Model

Respondents select the level that most closely represents current operating reality. The levels are cumulative: higher maturity requires the foundational practices of the levels below it.

Level	Classification	Central characteristic
1	Fragmented	Practices are informal, reactive and dependent on individuals.
2	Emerging	Useful practices exist, but implementation is limited or inconsistent.
3	Defined	Standard practices, responsibilities and controls are formally established.
4	Managed	Capabilities are measured, integrated and continuously improved.
5	Adaptive	Data capabilities actively shape strategy, operations and innovation.

Cross-cutting maturity lenses

Lens	What the assessment examines
Strategy and leadership	Connection to priorities and active sponsorship
Roles and accountability	Ownership, responsibility and decision rights
Processes and standards	Documented, repeatable and consistently applied practices
Technology and enablement	Appropriate platforms, architecture and automation
Measurement and control	Performance, risk, compliance and outcome monitoring
Adoption and value	Observable use and organizational benefit

Rating rules

- Rate the current state, not the intended future state.
- Assess the defined organizational scope, not the strongest team.
- Treat an isolated pilot as Emerging unless it is operating at scale.
- Do not rate a capability Managed unless performance is measured.
- Do not rate a capability Adaptive unless evidence drives continuing improvement.
- Use Not known when information is insufficient; use Not applicable only when the capability genuinely falls outside scope.

Maturity guardrails

Guardrail	Requirement
Evidence	A capability cannot receive a validated rating above Level 2 without supporting evidence.
Documentation	Level 3 requires documented roles and repeatable practices.
Measurement	Level 4 requires active performance measurement.
Improvement	Level 5 requires evidence-led adaptation and continuous improvement.

3. Capability Architecture

The eight dimensions contain 40 sub-capabilities. Each receives a maturity score, evidence-confidence rating, target level, business-importance rating, improvement-urgency rating and effort estimate.

Data Strategy and Ownership

ID	Sub-capability	Diagnostic focus
DS1	Strategic alignment	To what extent are the organization's data priorities formally connected to its mandate, strategic objectives, operational requirements and user needs?
DS2	Executive sponsorship	To what extent do executive leaders actively sponsor, govern and remain accountable for the organization's data agenda?
DS3	Enterprise data operating model	To what extent has the organization defined how business, data, technology, privacy, security and risk functions work together to manage data?
DS4	Investment and roadmap	To what extent are data initiatives prioritized, sequenced, funded and managed as a coordinated portfolio?
DS5	Value and outcome management	To what extent does the organization define, measure and use evidence of value from its data investments?

Governance and Accountability

ID	Sub-capability	Diagnostic focus
GA1	Governance structure	To what extent has the organization established effective governance bodies with the authority and capacity to make enterprise data decisions?
GA2	Decision rights	To what extent are decision rights for defining, creating, accessing, sharing, changing and retiring data clearly assigned?
GA3	Ownership and stewardship	To what extent are accountable data owners and operational data stewards formally assigned, enabled and held responsible?
GA4	Policies and standards	To what extent does the organization maintain and enforce coherent policies and standards governing the management and use of data?
GA5	Issue resolution and escalation	To what extent can the organization identify, assign, escalate and resolve enterprise data issues?

Metadata and Documentation

ID	Sub-capability	Diagnostic focus
MD1	Metadata standards	To what extent has the organization defined and implemented consistent requirements for business, technical and operational metadata?
MD2	Business glossary	To what extent does the organization maintain agreed and governed definitions for important business terms, measures and data concepts?
MD3	Data catalogue and inventory	To what extent does the organization maintain a complete, searchable and usable inventory of its data assets?
MD4	Data lineage	To what extent can the organization trace data from its origin through transformations and dependencies to its final uses?
MD5	Documentation lifecycle	To what extent is data documentation created, reviewed, updated and retired throughout the lifecycle of a data asset?

Data Quality

ID	Sub-capability	Diagnostic focus
DQ1	Critical-data identification	To what extent has the organization identified and prioritized the data elements most important to operations, reporting, compliance, analytics and decision-making?
DQ2	Quality rules and thresholds	To what extent are data-quality expectations translated into measurable rules, thresholds and responsibilities?
DQ3	Profiling and monitoring	To what extent does the organization systematically profile and monitor data against established quality expectations?
DQ4	Issue management and root-cause remediation	To what extent does the organization resolve data-quality issues at their source and prevent recurrence?
DQ5	Quality performance reporting	To what extent is data-quality performance reported and used to support accountability and improvement?

Discoverability and Access

ID	Sub-capability	Diagnostic focus
DA1	Search and discovery	To what extent can users find relevant data assets without already knowing their location, system or technical name?
DA2	Authoritative-source identification	To what extent can users distinguish trusted and approved sources from duplicates, extracts, obsolete assets and unofficial alternatives?
DA3	Access request and provisioning	To what extent is data access requested, evaluated, approved, provisioned, reviewed and removed through an efficient and controlled process?
DA4	Classification, privacy and security	To what extent do data classification, privacy and security requirements determine how data can be discovered, accessed, shared and used?
DA5	Governed self-service	To what extent can appropriate users independently access and use trusted data within established governance controls?

Analytics Delivery

ID	Sub-capability	Diagnostic focus
AN1	Demand management and prioritization	To what extent are analytics requests captured, evaluated and prioritized using transparent criteria?
AN2	Delivery lifecycle and quality assurance	To what extent does analytics work follow a consistent lifecycle from problem definition through testing, release, maintenance and retirement?
AN3	Architecture, tools and reuse	To what extent does the analytics environment support scalable delivery, appropriate tool use and reuse of trusted components?
AN4	Metric and semantic consistency	To what extent do analytical products use consistent, approved definitions and calculation logic?
AN5	Adoption and outcome measurement	To what extent does the organization measure whether analytical products are used, trusted and connected to better decisions or outcomes?

Data-Product Management

ID	Sub-capability	Diagnostic focus
DP1	User and problem discovery	To what extent do data initiatives begin with a validated understanding of users, decisions, needs and problems?
DP2	Product ownership and cross-functional delivery	To what extent do important data products have accountable ownership and cross-functional delivery responsibility?
DP3	Product lifecycle and roadmap	To what extent are data products intentionally designed, released, maintained, improved and retired?
DP4	Service expectations and product health	To what extent are the reliability, quality, freshness, availability, support and usage expectations of data products defined and monitored?
DP5	Portfolio and investment management	To what extent are data products managed collectively to maximize value, reuse and strategic alignment?

AI and Machine-Learning Readiness

ID	Sub-capability	Diagnostic focus
AI1	Use-case identification and prioritization	To what extent does the organization select AI use cases based on clearly defined problems, feasibility, risk and expected value?
AI2	Data suitability and preparation	To what extent can the organization demonstrate that data used by AI systems is appropriate, lawful, representative, documented and sufficiently reliable?
AI3	Responsible-AI governance	To what extent does the organization govern AI risks, responsibilities and acceptable use throughout the solution lifecycle?
AI4	Model delivery and monitoring	To what extent are AI models tested, approved, deployed, versioned, monitored and retired through controlled lifecycle practices?
AI5	Skills, adoption and organizational readiness	To what extent does the organization possess the skills, processes and change capacity required to use AI effectively and responsibly?

4. Assessment Questionnaire

Complete each sub-capability independently before group discussion. Select the anchor best supported by current evidence, then record target maturity, confidence, importance, urgency and effort.

Do not negotiate an average during initial scoring. Separate responses expose material differences between leadership, business, data, technology and control functions.

SECTION 4.1

Data Strategy and Ownership

Determine whether the organization has a coherent direction for data and clear responsibility for executing it.

ID	Sub-capability
DS1	Strategic alignment
DS2	Executive sponsorship
DS3	Enterprise data operating model
DS4	Investment and roadmap
DS5	Value and outcome management

The following five assessment pages provide maturity anchors, suggested evidence, facilitation prompts and a response record.

DS1 - Strategic alignment

Assessment question: To what extent are the organization's data priorities formally connected to its mandate, strategic objectives, operational requirements and user needs?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	There is no shared enterprise direction for data. Teams pursue activities in response to immediate problems, projects or technology requirements.
2 - Emerging	Data priorities exist within some departments or transformation initiatives, but they are not consistently coordinated or connected to an approved enterprise strategy.
3 - Defined	An approved data strategy defines enterprise objectives, priority capabilities, guiding principles and a roadmap connected to organizational priorities.
4 - Managed	Delivery against the data strategy is measured using outcomes, risks and performance indicators. Results are reviewed and priorities are adjusted.
5 - Adaptive	Data considerations are embedded in enterprise planning and major investment decisions. Strategy evolves with performance evidence, user needs and organizational change.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Approved data strategy • Corporate plan • Data principles and capability roadmap • Strategy performance reports	• Which priorities require better data? • How were data priorities selected? • When was the strategy last reviewed? • What changed because of the strategy?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DS2 - Executive sponsorship

Assessment question: To what extent do executive leaders actively sponsor, govern and remain accountable for the organization's data agenda?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	No executive has clear responsibility for the enterprise data agenda. Sponsorship is informal or limited to individual projects.
2 - Emerging	One or more leaders advocate for improvement, but involvement is intermittent, dependent on personal interest or limited to specific initiatives.
3 - Defined	A named executive sponsor has documented accountability and regularly communicates priorities, convenes stakeholders and oversees progress.
4 - Managed	Executive leaders collectively review data performance, remove cross-functional barriers and hold accountable owners responsible for outcomes.
5 - Adaptive	Data accountability is embedded across executive leadership. Evidence about data capabilities, risks and opportunities routinely shapes decisions and investment.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Executive role descriptions - Governance mandates - Executive review records - Performance commitments	- Who is ultimately accountable? - What decisions can the sponsor make? - How often is progress reviewed? - What happens when agreed actions are not implemented?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DS3 - Enterprise data operating model

Assessment question: To what extent has the organization defined how business, data, technology, privacy, security and risk functions work together to manage data?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Responsibilities and working relationships are unclear. Teams manage data independently and rely on individual knowledge and informal coordination.
2 - Emerging	Selected roles and arrangements exist within projects or departments, but responsibilities, handoffs and enterprise authority remain inconsistent.
3 - Defined	A documented operating model defines enterprise and departmental responsibilities, decision rights, delivery relationships, escalation paths and required capabilities.
4 - Managed	The operating model is implemented across scope. Capacity, handoffs, decision times, accountability and delivery performance are monitored and improved.
5 - Adaptive	The model responds efficiently to new priorities, technologies and regulation. Responsibilities and resources adjust using performance and demand evidence.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Operating model • Organization and role charts • Responsibility matrix • Capacity and workforce plans	• Where do responsibilities begin and end? • Where do handoffs fail? • Is sufficient capacity assigned? • How are privacy, security and risk involved?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DS4 - Investment and roadmap

Assessment question: To what extent are data initiatives prioritized, sequenced, funded and managed as a coordinated portfolio?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Work is funded and initiated reactively. Projects compete independently and dependencies or duplication are rarely considered.
2 - Emerging	A partial initiative list or selected pilots exist, but prioritization criteria, dependencies and long-term commitments are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	A documented roadmap identifies priorities, sponsors, dependencies, capabilities, resources, milestones and expected outcomes.
4 - Managed	The portfolio is reviewed using delivery performance, capacity, risk, cost and benefits. Initiatives are reprioritized using transparent criteria.
5 - Adaptive	Investment adjusts dynamically using demand, product performance, emerging risk and opportunity. Reusable capabilities are favoured over duplication.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Data investment portfolio • Approved roadmap • Prioritization criteria • Funding and dependency records	• How are initiatives compared? • Who can stop or reprioritize work? • How are dependencies identified? • How is duplication prevented?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DS5 - Value and outcome management

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization define, measure and use evidence of value from its data investments?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Initiatives are justified by immediate requests or technical needs. Expected outcomes and value measures are rarely defined.
2 - Emerging	Some initiatives identify benefits, but measurement focuses mainly on outputs such as platforms, reports or training delivered.
3 - Defined	Important initiatives have documented users, outcomes, baseline measures, benefit owners and methods for evaluating value.
4 - Managed	Benefits, adoption, cost, service performance and outcomes are routinely measured and reviewed with accountable sponsors and owners.
5 - Adaptive	Value evidence continuously shapes investment, roadmaps, resource allocation and retirement decisions. Cumulative portfolio value can be demonstrated.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Business cases and benefit maps • Baseline measures • Adoption and outcome reports • Post-implementation reviews	• What result should each investment improve? • Was a baseline recorded? • Who owns benefit realization? • What happens when value is not realized?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

SECTION 4.2

Governance and Accountability

Determine whether the organization has effective decision rights, accountability structures and controls for managing data.

ID	Sub-capability
GA1	Governance structure
GA2	Decision rights
GA3	Ownership and stewardship
GA4	Policies and standards
GA5	Issue resolution and escalation

The following five assessment pages provide maturity anchors, suggested evidence, facilitation prompts and a response record.

GA1 - Governance structure

Assessment question: To what extent has the organization established effective governance bodies with the authority and capacity to make enterprise data decisions?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	No formal enterprise structure exists. Projects, system owners or departments make decisions independently.
2 - Emerging	Committees or working groups exist for selected initiatives, but mandates, membership, authority or continuity are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	Formal governance bodies operate under approved mandates defining scope, membership, authority, cadence, decision procedures and reporting relationships.
4 - Managed	Governance performance is monitored using decision timeliness, attendance, action completion, issue resolution and policy implementation.
5 - Adaptive	Governance adapts to changing priorities and risks. Authority is delegated to the appropriate level while enterprise oversight remains effective.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Governance framework • Terms of reference • Decision and action logs • Governance performance measures	• What authority does each body possess? • Are the right functions represented? • How are decisions implemented? • Is governance producing decisions or discussion?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

GA2 - Decision rights

Assessment question: To what extent are decision rights for defining, creating, accessing, sharing, changing and retiring data clearly assigned?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Decision rights depend on system control, seniority, personal relationships or local convention.
2 - Emerging	Some responsibilities are understood within systems or departments, but overlaps, gaps and disputes remain common.
3 - Defined	Documented decision rights specify who recommends, approves, implements, reviews and is informed about important decisions.
4 - Managed	Decision effectiveness is monitored through approval times, disputes, exceptions and implementation outcomes. Gaps are corrected.
5 - Adaptive	Authority is assigned to the lowest appropriate level. Enterprise decisions remain coordinated while routine decisions occur within guardrails.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Decision-rights framework - Responsibility matrices - Approval workflows - Exception and decision records	- Who approves definitions and access? - Who designates authoritative sources? - How are disputes resolved? - Are business representatives accountable?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

GA3 - Ownership and stewardship

Assessment question: To what extent are accountable data owners and operational data stewards formally assigned, enabled and held responsible?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Ownership and stewardship are not formally recognized. Responsibility falls to whoever maintains a system, report or issue.
2 - Emerging	Owners or stewards are identified for selected systems, projects or datasets, but responsibilities, authority and capacity are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	Data domains and critical assets have assigned owners and stewards with documented responsibilities, authority, competencies and escalation paths.
4 - Managed	Coverage, activity, capacity and performance are monitored. Leaders review unresolved issues and completion of assigned responsibilities.
5 - Adaptive	Ownership and stewardship are embedded in operational management and workforce planning and evolve as products, regulation and responsibilities change.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Owner and steward register - Role descriptions - Data-domain model - Training and performance records	- Are owners business leaders with authority? - Do stewards have capacity? - What percentage of critical data has an owner? - Are owners accountable in practice?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

GA4 - Policies and standards

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization maintain and enforce coherent policies and standards governing the management and use of data?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Requirements are informal, undocumented or inconsistently embedded in projects and technology practices.
2 - Emerging	Some policies, procedures or technical standards exist, but coverage, ownership and adoption vary.
3 - Defined	Approved policies and standards cover ownership, quality, metadata, access, sharing, retention, protection and appropriate use.
4 - Managed	Compliance is monitored through controls, reviews, exceptions, audits and measures. Policies follow defined review cycles.
5 - Adaptive	Requirements are increasingly embedded in platforms and workflows and respond efficiently to regulatory, technological and operational change.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Enterprise data policy - Management standards - Compliance assessments - Exceptions and review calendar	- Which practices are mandatory? - Who owns each policy? - How is compliance tested? - What happens when a unit cannot comply?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

GA5 - Issue resolution and escalation

Assessment question: To what extent can the organization identify, assign, escalate and resolve enterprise data issues?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Issues are handled informally when disruptive. There is no shared record, ownership model or escalation process.
2 - Emerging	Some teams record and resolve issues, but classifications, priorities and escalation routes vary.
3 - Defined	A common process governs submission, classification, prioritization, ownership, investigation, escalation, resolution and closure.
4 - Managed	Issue volume, ageing, recurrence, impact and resolution performance are monitored. Systemic trends are reported to governance bodies.
5 - Adaptive	Issue evidence prevents recurring problems, improves controls and redirects investment. Potential problems are increasingly identified early.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Enterprise issue register - Priority and escalation criteria - Root-cause records - Resolution performance reports	- Where are issues recorded? - How is impact used to prioritize? - Who resolves cross-system issues? - Is root-cause resolution distinguished from correction?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

SECTION 4.3

Metadata and Documentation

Determine whether the organization can describe its data, systems, meaning, origins, movement and documentation lifecycle.

ID	Sub-capability
MD1	Metadata standards
MD2	Business glossary
MD3	Data catalogue and inventory
MD4	Data lineage
MD5	Documentation lifecycle

The following five assessment pages provide maturity anchors, suggested evidence, facilitation prompts and a response record.

MD1 - Metadata standards

Assessment question: To what extent has the organization defined and implemented consistent requirements for business, technical and operational metadata?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Metadata is created inconsistently or not at all. Documentation depends on teams, tools and personal knowledge.
2 - Emerging	Some systems or projects capture metadata, but required fields, terminology, formats, ownership and quality expectations vary.
3 - Defined	Enterprise standards define required business, technical and operational metadata, ownership, classifications, formats and maintenance responsibilities.
4 - Managed	Metadata completeness, accuracy, currency and compliance are monitored. Gaps are assigned and tracked to resolution.
5 - Adaptive	Metadata requirements are embedded in development and governance workflows. Capture and validation are automated where practical.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Metadata standard • Required-field definitions • Naming and classification conventions • Metadata quality reports	• What must be recorded for a new asset? • Who completes and approves metadata? • How is completeness measured? • Do standards cover legacy assets?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

MD2 - Business glossary

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization maintain agreed and governed definitions for important business terms, measures and data concepts?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Terms and measures are interpreted locally. Teams may use the same term differently without formal resolution.
2 - Emerging	Selected projects or departments maintain glossaries or metric definitions, but coverage and approval are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	A governed glossary contains approved definitions, owners, related terms, calculation rules and appropriate-use guidance.
4 - Managed	Coverage, usage, changes, conflicts and review cycles are monitored. Definitions connect to reports, datasets and processes.
5 - Adaptive	The glossary operates as an active semantic resource. Changes propagate through connected assets and usage evidence drives refinement.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Business glossary • KPI dictionary • Approval workflow • Usage and change records	• Where are approved definitions found? • Who can approve a change? • Are definitions connected to data and reports? • How are competing definitions resolved?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

MD3 - Data catalogue and inventory

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization maintain a complete, searchable and usable inventory of its data assets?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	No reliable enterprise inventory exists. Users locate data through personal knowledge, folders, system familiarity or technical assistance.
2 - Emerging	Inventories or catalogues exist for selected systems, reports or projects, but coverage, searchability, ownership and maintenance are limited.
3 - Defined	A governed catalogue records important datasets, systems, reports, models and data products using defined metadata and ownership requirements.
4 - Managed	Coverage, search success, metadata completeness, activity and certification are monitored and integrated with governance and delivery processes.
5 - Adaptive	Assets are automatically discovered and enriched where practical. Context-aware search and governed recommendations improve discovery.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Data catalogue • System and report inventories • Coverage and search measures • Certification records	• What assets are included? • What percentage of priority assets is covered? • Can users search in business language? • How are obsolete assets identified?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

MD4 - Data lineage

Assessment question: To what extent can the organization trace data from its origin through transformations and dependencies to its final uses?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Movement and transformation knowledge is undocumented or held by individual specialists.
2 - Emerging	Lineage diagrams or transformation documentation exist for selected reports, interfaces or projects, but formats and maintenance vary.
3 - Defined	Lineage requirements cover critical data sources, transformations, interfaces, dependencies and downstream uses.
4 - Managed	Coverage, accuracy and currency are monitored. Lineage supports change impact, quality, audit, privacy and incident analysis.
5 - Adaptive	Technical lineage is captured automatically where practical and connected to business meaning, controls and product dependencies.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Lineage diagrams - Source-to-target mappings - Data-flow and dependency records - Change-impact assessments	- Can an executive metric be traced to source? - Are manual transformations included? - What triggers updates? - Can downstream users be identified before change?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

MD5 - Documentation lifecycle

Assessment question: To what extent is data documentation created, reviewed, updated and retired throughout the lifecycle of a data asset?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Documentation is inconsistent and often becomes outdated after project delivery or staff changes.
2 - Emerging	Some projects require documentation, but review cycles, ownership, version control and retirement are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	Requirements are embedded in the lifecycle with owners, approvals, version controls, review schedules and retirement procedures.
4 - Managed	Currency, review completion, unresolved gaps and user feedback are monitored. Asset changes trigger documentation updates.
5 - Adaptive	Documentation is integrated into the environment. Automated updates, validation and workflow controls reduce drift.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Documentation procedures - Assigned owners - Version and approval history - Currency and retirement records	- When must documentation be created? - Who owns it after project closure? - What triggers review? - How is obsolete content removed?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

SECTION 4.4

Data Quality

Determine whether the organization can define, monitor, improve and sustain data that is fit for its intended use.

ID	Sub-capability
DQ1	Critical-data identification
DQ2	Quality rules and thresholds
DQ3	Profiling and monitoring
DQ4	Issue management and root-cause remediation
DQ5	Quality performance reporting

The following five assessment pages provide maturity anchors, suggested evidence, facilitation prompts and a response record.

DQ1 - Critical-data identification

Assessment question: To what extent has the organization identified and prioritized the data elements most important to operations, reporting, compliance, analytics and decision-making?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Critical data is not formally identified. Attention follows whichever data causes an immediate problem.
2 - Emerging	Some departments, systems or projects identify important elements, but criteria and enterprise coverage are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	Documented criteria identify critical elements and connect them to processes, reports, obligations, owners and authoritative sources.
4 - Managed	Coverage, risks and dependencies are reviewed. Priorities adjust using operational impact, compliance and quality performance.
5 - Adaptive	Critical designations evolve with priorities, products, regulation and risk, informed by dependency and usage evidence.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Critical-data register - Criticality criteria - Process and reporting dependencies - Risk and review records	- What makes data critical? - Which decisions depend on it? - Who approves designations? - How often is the register reviewed?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DQ2 - Quality rules and thresholds

Assessment question: To what extent are data-quality expectations translated into measurable rules, thresholds and responsibilities?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Data is described as good or poor without consistently defined rules or acceptable thresholds.
2 - Emerging	Selected teams use validation checks, but definitions, approval, ownership and thresholds vary.
3 - Defined	Critical data has rules covering relevant quality dimensions, with thresholds, owners, calculation methods, frequency and escalation.
4 - Managed	Rules and thresholds are reviewed using trends, user requirements, false alerts and consequences through governed change.
5 - Adaptive	Expectations are tailored to products and uses and evolve with risk, usage and performance; controls increasingly operate at creation.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Quality rule catalogue - Rule specifications - Approved thresholds - Control and change records	- Who defines fitness for purpose? - Are rules measurable? - Are thresholds based on impact? - What happens when a threshold is exceeded?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DQ3 - Profiling and monitoring

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization systematically profile and monitor data against established quality expectations?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Problems are usually discovered manually after they affect reports, services or decisions.
2 - Emerging	Teams profile or validate selected projects and reports, but monitoring is limited, manual or inconsistent.
3 - Defined	Critical data is profiled and monitored on a defined schedule using approved rules, thresholds, controls and notifications.
4 - Managed	Monitoring is integrated into pipelines and processes. Trends, recurring exceptions, control failures and service impacts are analysed.
5 - Adaptive	Preventive controls and anomaly detection identify emerging problems early. Monitoring adapts to usage, risk and data behaviour.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Profiling reports • Automated validation results • Quality dashboards • Exception and trend records	• When is quality tested? • Which critical data is unmonitored? • How quickly are owners notified? • Are manual processes included?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DQ4 - Issue management and root-cause remediation

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization resolve data-quality issues at their source and prevent recurrence?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Teams manually correct data or reports. Issues and causes are rarely documented.
2 - Emerging	Some teams record and investigate recurring issues, but ownership, prioritization and remediation vary.
3 - Defined	A common process governs classification, impact, ownership, root-cause analysis, remediation, validation and closure.
4 - Managed	Ageing, recurrence, impact, cost and resolution are monitored. Systemic causes influence governance and investment.
5 - Adaptive	Patterns redesign upstream processes and preventive controls. Recurrent error classes are progressively eliminated.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Quality issue register - Root-cause analyses - Remediation and validation records - Recurrence reports	- Does remediation fix the record or process? - Who owns upstream causes? - How is priority set? - How is successful remediation verified?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DQ5 - Quality performance reporting

Assessment question: To what extent is data-quality performance reported and used to support accountability and improvement?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	No consistent reporting exists. Leaders hear about quality only when an issue becomes disruptive.
2 - Emerging	Selected teams produce statistics, but reporting is inconsistent and lacks business context or accountable ownership.
3 - Defined	Standard reporting shows performance, breaches, affected processes, issue status, owners and actions for critical data.
4 - Managed	Trends, risks, service impacts and remediation outcomes are reviewed. Performance shapes priorities and resources.
5 - Adaptive	Reporting is tailored to users, products and decisions. Predictive insight and cost-of-poor-quality evidence support prevention.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Quality scorecards • Threshold and trend reports • Governance materials • Cost and benefit measures	• Who receives the reports? • Do they explain business impact? • Are owners accountable? • Can improvement be demonstrated?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

SECTION 4.5

Discoverability and Access

Determine whether authorized users can locate, understand and obtain appropriate data efficiently.

ID	Sub-capability
DA1	Search and discovery
DA2	Authoritative-source identification
DA3	Access request and provisioning
DA4	Classification, privacy and security
DA5	Governed self-service

The following five assessment pages provide maturity anchors, suggested evidence, facilitation prompts and a response record.

DA1 - Search and discovery

Assessment question: To what extent can users find relevant data assets without already knowing their location, system or technical name?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Users rely on personal knowledge, colleagues, shared folders or technical teams to locate data. Available assets and search routes are largely undocumented.
2 - Emerging	Selected departments maintain inventories, portals or repositories, but search coverage and metadata vary and users often need assistance.
3 - Defined	Users can search a governed inventory or catalogue using business terms, subject areas, asset types, owners, classifications and standard metadata.
4 - Managed	Search activity, unsuccessful searches, time to discovery, feedback and catalogue coverage are monitored and used to improve discovery.
5 - Adaptive	Discovery is integrated into everyday workflows. Context, relationships, usage patterns and governed recommendations help users identify suitable assets.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Catalogue search - Asset inventories - Search analytics - User feedback and time-to-discovery measures	- How would a new employee find data? - Can users search in business language? - What happens when search fails? - Are restricted assets safely discoverable?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DA2 - Authoritative-source identification

Assessment question: To what extent can users distinguish trusted and approved sources from duplicates, extracts, obsolete assets and unofficial alternatives?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Users select sources based on familiarity, convenience or previous use. Conflicting datasets and reports are common.
2 - Emerging	Some teams identify preferred sources, but certification criteria, ownership and communication are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	Authoritative assets are formally designated and display ownership, purpose, quality status, approved uses and update information.
4 - Managed	Certification coverage, duplicate usage, quality performance, adoption and exceptions are monitored. Obsolete assets are actively managed.
5 - Adaptive	Authoritative status responds to product health, quality, lineage and usage evidence. Users are proactively redirected when sources change.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Authoritative-source register • Certification standard • Quality and freshness indicators • Deprecation and usage records	• What makes a source authoritative? • Who approves that status? • Can users see limitations? • How are duplicates and obsolete assets managed?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DA3 - Access request and provisioning

Assessment question: To what extent is data access requested, evaluated, approved, provisioned, reviewed and removed through an efficient and controlled process?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Access depends on informal requests, local administrators or relationships. Approval criteria and records are inconsistent.
2 - Emerging	Standard request processes exist for selected platforms or departments, but requirements, turnaround and reviews vary.
3 - Defined	A documented process governs justification, owner approval, privacy and security review, provisioning, recertification and removal.
4 - Managed	Request volume, approval time, rejection reasons, exceptions, recertification and inactive access are monitored. Automation improves consistency.
5 - Adaptive	Access is dynamically managed using verified roles, policy rules, classifications and changing responsibilities. Low-risk access is accelerated.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Access procedures • Request and approval records • Role-based access model • Recertification and performance reports	• How long does normal access take? • Who approves each domain? • Is access removed after role change? • Are controls proportionate to risk?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DA4 - Classification, privacy and security

Assessment question: To what extent do data classification, privacy and security requirements determine how data can be discovered, accessed, shared and used?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Sensitivity and privacy are interpreted locally. Data may be over-restricted, under-protected or shared without consistent assessment.
2 - Emerging	Classification and privacy practices exist for selected systems or sensitive data, but coverage and implementation vary.
3 - Defined	Data is classified using approved criteria and controls reflect sensitivity, privacy, confidentiality, residency, retention and permitted use.
4 - Managed	Coverage, control effectiveness, exceptions, privacy risks and inappropriate-use indicators are monitored and reviewed.
5 - Adaptive	Classification and policy controls are embedded in workflows and platforms and respond efficiently to context, use, risk and regulatory change.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Classification standard • Privacy impact assessments • Sharing agreements • Control reviews and exceptions	• Can users see sensitivity before requesting access? • Are decisions consistent? • How is intended use assessed? • Does over-restriction create workarounds?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DA5 - Governed self-service

Assessment question: To what extent can appropriate users independently access and use trusted data within established governance controls?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Users depend heavily on specialists for extracts, reports and access. Informal copies and local workarounds are common.
2 - Emerging	Selected users have self-service tools or shared datasets, but training, certification, support, controls and consistency vary.
3 - Defined	Governed self-service provides approved data, definitions, appropriate access, guidance, reusable tools and defined support.
4 - Managed	Adoption, performance, duplicate creation, support demand, competency and compliance are monitored and improved.
5 - Adaptive	Self-service is personalized by role and competency. Trusted products, automated controls and user communities enable rapid analysis.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Self-service operating model - Certified datasets - Training and competency records - Usage and duplication analysis	- What can users do independently? - Which assets are approved? - How are users trained? - Does self-service reduce queues or increase duplication?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

SECTION 4.6

Analytics Delivery

Determine whether the organization can convert data into reliable, reusable and decision-relevant analytical outputs.

ID	Sub-capability
AN1	Demand management and prioritization
AN2	Delivery lifecycle and quality assurance
AN3	Architecture, tools and reuse
AN4	Metric and semantic consistency
AN5	Adoption and outcome measurement

The following five assessment pages provide maturity anchors, suggested evidence, facilitation prompts and a response record.

AN1 - Demand management and prioritization

Assessment question: To what extent are analytics requests captured, evaluated and prioritized using transparent criteria?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Requests arrive through conversations, email or direct approaches. Work is prioritized by urgency, seniority or availability.
2 - Emerging	Some teams maintain request lists or backlogs, but intake requirements, criteria and visibility vary.
3 - Defined	A standard process captures user, decision, problem, requirements, urgency, value, risk, dependencies and outcome. Transparent criteria set priority.
4 - Managed	Demand, backlog age, capacity, cycle time, value and outcomes are monitored. Priorities are regularly adjusted.
5 - Adaptive	Investment responds dynamically to strategy, product evidence and emerging needs. Reusable solutions are checked before new work is approved.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Analytics intake form - Prioritization criteria - Delivery backlog - Demand and capacity reports	- How does a user request support? - Who accepts and prioritizes work? - How is urgency balanced with strategy? - Is reuse checked first?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

AN2 - Delivery lifecycle and quality assurance

Assessment question: To what extent does analytics work follow a consistent lifecycle from problem definition through testing, release, maintenance and retirement?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Analysts use individual methods. Requirements, calculations, testing, approvals and maintenance are inconsistently documented.
2 - Emerging	Some teams use templates, peer review or development practices, but standards vary by analyst, tool and department.
3 - Defined	A documented lifecycle covers problem definition, requirements, design, development, testing, acceptance, release, documentation, support and retirement.
4 - Managed	Quality, defects, cycle time, rework, release performance and maintenance are monitored. Automated testing and controlled deployment are used appropriately.
5 - Adaptive	Delivery continuously improves using product and user evidence. Reusable automated controls enable rapid delivery without reducing quality.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Delivery methodology • Requirements and test records • Release and version-control records • Defect and rework reports	• How are requirements validated? • Who approves calculations? • Who supports assets after delivery? • How are obsolete products retired?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

AN3 - Architecture, tools and reuse

Assessment question: To what extent does the analytics environment support scalable delivery, appropriate tool use and reuse of trusted components?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Teams select tools and create datasets independently. Manual extracts, duplicated transformations and isolated solutions are common.
2 - Emerging	Preferred platforms and shared datasets exist, but adoption, integration, scalability and reuse are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	Approved architecture patterns, tool standards, shared models, reusable components and integration requirements guide development.
4 - Managed	Performance, cost, reliability, reuse, technical debt and duplication are monitored. Shared capabilities improve according to demand.
5 - Adaptive	Composable platforms and reusable products enable efficient delivery. Architecture evolves using product, performance and cost evidence.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Reference architecture • Approved-tool standards • Shared models and repositories • Cost, reuse and technical-debt reports	• How often is logic rebuilt? • Are tools matched to use cases? • Can components be reused safely? • Is technical debt visible?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

AN4 - Metric and semantic consistency

Assessment question: To what extent do analytical products use consistent, approved definitions and calculation logic?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Reports and departments define measures independently. Conflicting values and repeated reconciliation are common.
2 - Emerging	Important reports use documented definitions or shared calculations, but consistency is limited to selected teams or subjects.
3 - Defined	Priority metrics have approved definitions, owners, calculation rules, dimensions, source mappings and appropriate-use guidance.
4 - Managed	Metric usage, conflicting calculations, changes and reconciliation are monitored. Changes are governed and communicated.
5 - Adaptive	Governed metrics are reusable enterprise components. Logic changes propagate through connected products with impact analysis.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- KPI dictionary - Calculation specifications - Semantic models - Reconciliation and change records	- Can approved reports conflict? - Who owns each metric? - Are filters documented? - Can affected reports be identified after change?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

AN5 - Adoption and outcome measurement

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization measure whether analytical products are used, trusted and connected to better decisions or outcomes?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Success means that a report or dashboard was delivered. Usage and decision impact are rarely assessed.
2 - Emerging	Some teams collect usage statistics or informal feedback, but findings are not consistently connected to product decisions.
3 - Defined	Important products have target users, intended decisions, adoption measures, feedback methods, performance expectations and outcomes.
4 - Managed	Usage, satisfaction, decision impact, support demand, cost and outcomes are reviewed and shape enhancement, consolidation and retirement.
5 - Adoptive	Products are continuously optimized using behavioural, operational and outcome evidence. Decision and service improvements are demonstrable.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Usage and adoption reports • User feedback • Decision and outcome measures • Enhancement and retirement records	• Which decisions should improve? • Who are the actual users? • What happens to low-adoption products? • Can value be demonstrated?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

SECTION 4.7

Data-Product Management

Determine whether important datasets, analytics and reusable data services are managed as products with owners, users and measurable value.

ID	Sub-capability
DP1	User and problem discovery
DP2	Product ownership and cross-functional delivery
DP3	Product lifecycle and roadmap
DP4	Service expectations and product health
DP5	Portfolio and investment management

The following five assessment pages provide maturity anchors, suggested evidence, facilitation prompts and a response record.

DP1 - User and problem discovery

Assessment question: To what extent do data initiatives begin with a validated understanding of users, decisions, needs and problems?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Solutions begin from technical requests, assumed requirements or instructions to build an output. User problems are rarely investigated.
2 - Emerging	Some teams conduct interviews or workshops, but discovery varies and often focuses on requested features.
3 - Defined	A standard process identifies users, decisions, workflows, pain points, outcomes, constraints and success measures before development.
4 - Managed	Findings are validated using behaviour, prototypes, adoption and outcomes. Product assumptions are recorded and tested.
5 - Adaptive	Continuous discovery operates throughout the lifecycle. Emerging user needs and performance evidence shape product strategy and investment.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• User research • Problem and decision maps • Prototypes and hypotheses • Success measures	• What problem is being solved? • Who experiences it? • What evidence shows importance? • Was the requested solution challenged?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DP2 - Product ownership and cross-functional delivery

Assessment question: To what extent do important data products have accountable ownership and cross-functional delivery responsibility?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Ownership ends at project delivery. Responsibility defaults to the analyst, developer or system team that created the asset.
2 - Emerging	Product-like ownership exists for selected solutions, but authority, capacity, expectations and team composition are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	Important products have accountable owners with authority over outcomes, priorities, quality, access, lifecycle and stakeholder engagement.
4 - Managed	Owner capacity, decision timeliness, team performance and dependencies are monitored. Evidence guides priorities.
5 - Adaptive	Product ownership is embedded in the operating model and workforce strategy. Teams reorganize around changing users and priorities.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Product-owner register - Product charters - Responsibility matrices - Decision and capacity records	- Who remains accountable after delivery? - Can the owner change priorities? - Who owns quality and service? - Does the owner have authority and capacity?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DP3 - Product lifecycle and roadmap

Assessment question: To what extent are data products intentionally designed, released, maintained, improved and retired?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Assets are delivered as projects with limited planning for adoption, maintenance, improvement or retirement.
2 - Emerging	Some products maintain enhancement lists or release plans, but lifecycle stages, funding and retirement vary.
3 - Defined	Each priority product has a lifecycle, roadmap, release approach, maintenance model, dependencies, funding needs and retirement criteria.
4 - Managed	Roadmaps use usage, service performance, feedback, risk, cost and outcomes. Releases and lifecycle decisions are measured.
5 - Adaptive	Roadmaps evolve continuously. Products and components are rapidly improved, combined, repositioned or retired when conditions change.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Product strategy and roadmap - Release and backlog records - Maintenance and funding plans - Retirement criteria	- Is there a roadmap after launch? - How are enhancements prioritized? - Who funds operations? - What triggers retirement?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DP4 - Service expectations and product health

Assessment question: To what extent are the reliability, quality, freshness, availability, support and usage expectations of data products defined and monitored?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Expectations are implicit. Users discover quality, freshness or availability limitations through experience or failure.
2 - Emerging	Selected products document refresh schedules, support contacts or quality expectations, but monitoring and accountability vary.
3 - Defined	Priority products document quality, freshness, availability, access, support, changes, appropriate use and incident response.
4 - Managed	Health is monitored through service measures, incidents, usage, feedback, cost and outcomes. Breaches trigger defined responses.
5 - Adaptive	Controls are increasingly automated and tailored to user needs. Predictive evidence supports preventive maintenance and improvement.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Service-level objectives - Data contracts and metadata - Health scorecards - Incident and usage reports	- Can users see freshness? - What follows a threshold breach? - Are upstream expectations documented? - Who responds to incidents?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

DP5 - Portfolio and investment management

Assessment question: To what extent are data products managed collectively to maximize value, reuse and strategic alignment?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	No reliable product view exists. Projects and departments make investment decisions independently.
2 - Emerging	Some products are inventoried or reviewed together, but ownership, cost, value, dependencies and duplication are not consistently visible.
3 - Defined	A governed portfolio records each priority product's owner, users, purpose, lifecycle, dependencies, cost, risk, performance and alignment.
4 - Managed	Decisions use adoption, value, cost, health, duplication and strategic contribution. Investment changes when evidence changes.
5 - Adaptive	The portfolio operates as an ecosystem of reusable products. New capabilities assemble from trusted products and investment follows enterprise value.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Product portfolio - Cost and funding records - Dependency maps - Portfolio and retirement decisions	- How many active products exist? - Which products overlap? - Can total cost be seen? - What evidence continues investment?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

SECTION 4.8

AI and Machine-Learning Readiness

Determine whether the organization has the foundations, controls and workforce capabilities required to adopt AI responsibly.

ID	Sub-capability
AI1	Use-case identification and prioritization
AI2	Data suitability and preparation
AI3	Responsible-AI governance
AI4	Model delivery and monitoring
AI5	Skills, adoption and organizational readiness

The following five assessment pages provide maturity anchors, suggested evidence, facilitation prompts and a response record.

AI1 - Use-case identification and prioritization

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization select AI use cases based on clearly defined problems, feasibility, risk and expected value?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Activity is driven by technology interest, vendors or isolated experiments. Problems, users and outcomes are often unclear.
2 - Emerging	Some use cases are documented and piloted, but selection criteria, strategic alignment and oversight are inconsistent.
3 - Defined	A standard process evaluates user need, value, data suitability, feasibility, risk, cost, explainability and readiness.
4 - Managed	Use-case performance, cost, risk, adoption and outcomes are reviewed across a portfolio. Evidence determines progression.
5 - Adaptive	Investment responds continuously to priorities and product evidence. Reusable capabilities accelerate validated opportunities and unsuitable uses stop early.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• AI use-case inventory • Opportunity framework • Feasibility and business cases • Portfolio decisions	• Why AI instead of simpler analytics? • Who uses the output? • What evidence justifies scale? • What conditions stop the use case?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

AI2 - Data suitability and preparation

Assessment question: To what extent can the organization demonstrate that data used by AI systems is appropriate, lawful, representative, documented and sufficiently reliable?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Teams use available data without consistently assessing provenance, quality, permissions, representativeness or suitability.
2 - Emerging	Selected pilots assess quality and availability, but criteria, documentation and approval vary.
3 - Defined	AI data is assessed for provenance, quality, completeness, relevance, representativeness, lawful use, privacy, security and retention.
4 - Managed	Training, validation and operational data are versioned and monitored. Drift, quality, lineage, access and suitability are reviewed.
5 - Adaptive	Governed reusable data products accelerate delivery. Automated controls identify changes in behaviour, suitability and risk early.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Data-readiness assessments • Lineage and quality profiles • Dataset versions • Drift and approval records	• Where did training data originate? • Is it representative? • Is use permitted? • Can the exact model dataset be reproduced?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

AI3 - Responsible-AI governance

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization govern AI risks, responsibilities and acceptable use throughout the solution lifecycle?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Decisions occur within individual projects. Accountability, acceptable use and risk review are unclear.
2 - Emerging	General privacy, security or technology controls apply to selected initiatives, but AI-specific requirements are incomplete.
3 - Defined	Approved requirements address accountability, privacy, security, fairness, transparency, explainability, human oversight, recordkeeping and third-party risk.
4 - Managed	Systems are inventoried and classified by impact or risk. Controls, exceptions, incidents and reviews are monitored by accountable bodies.
5 - Adaptive	Governance responds to changing technology, use, evidence and regulation. Controls are embedded in development and procurement workflows.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- Responsible-AI policy - AI system inventory - Risk and impact assessments - Approval and incident records	- Who is accountable for AI-assisted decisions? - Which systems require enhanced review? - What human oversight is required? - Are vendor systems equally governed?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

AI4 - Model delivery and monitoring

Assessment question: To what extent are AI models tested, approved, deployed, versioned, monitored and retired through controlled lifecycle practices?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Models are adopted without consistent testing, deployment, versioning, monitoring or support.
2 - Emerging	Selected teams apply development controls and performance testing, but practices depend on tool, vendor or project.
3 - Defined	A documented lifecycle governs development, validation, approval, deployment, versioning, monitoring, change, incidents and retirement.
4 - Managed	Performance, drift, availability, cost, usage, controls and incidents are monitored. Breaches trigger defined intervention.
5 - Adaptive	Automated lifecycle controls enable reliable delivery and early detection. Models improve, restrict, replace or retire using product and risk evidence.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
• Model development standard • Inventory and version records • Validation and monitoring reports • Change and retirement records	• Can the deployed model be reproduced? • Who validates it? • What is monitored? • What follows a threshold breach?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

AI5 - Skills, adoption and organizational readiness

Assessment question: To what extent does the organization possess the skills, processes and change capacity required to use AI effectively and responsibly?

Level	Maturity anchor
1 - Fragmented	Knowledge is concentrated among a few individuals or vendors. Leaders, users and control functions have limited understanding.
2 - Emerging	Training and specialist capacity exist for selected teams, but competencies, workforce planning, support and change practices vary.
3 - Defined	Competencies are defined for leaders, developers, owners, control functions and users. Training, support, communication and adoption plans exist.
4 - Managed	Competency, adoption, appropriate use, confidence, support demand and workforce impact are monitored and shape operating changes.
5 - Adaptive	AI literacy is embedded across relevant roles. Teams learn continuously from product, risk and adoption evidence as capabilities evolve.

SUGGESTED EVIDENCE	FACILITATION PROMPTS
- AI competency framework - Skills assessment - Training and adoption records - Workforce and knowledge-transfer plans	- Which skills must remain internal? - Can leaders challenge use cases? - Do users know when not to rely on output? - Is training role-specific?

Current	Target	Confidence	Importance	Urgency	Effort
1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	Low Mod High	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

Supporting evidence and observations

5. Scoring Methodology

Current maturity and validation

Each respondent assigns an integer score from 1 to 5. For multiple respondents, the preliminary sub-capability score is the median. Following evidence review and calibration, a validated score is assigned and the reason for any adjustment is recorded.

Dimension score	Calculation
Sub-capability	Validated integer score from 1 to 5
Dimension	Sum of applicable validated sub-capability scores divided by applicable capabilities
Enterprise	Sum of eight dimension scores divided by eight

Classification bands

Score	Validated classification
1.00 - 1.99	Level 1 - Fragmented
2.00 - 2.99	Level 2 - Emerging
3.00 - 3.99	Level 3 - Defined
4.00 - 4.99	Level 4 - Managed
5.00	Level 5 - Adaptive

Scores are not rounded upward when the validated level is reported. A score of 2.80 is approaching Level 3 but remains Level 2 - Emerging.

Foundational-capability ceiling

Strong analytics or AI performance cannot conceal weak foundations. The overall validated level cannot exceed more than one level above the lowest of Data Strategy, Governance, Metadata, Data Quality, and Discoverability and Access.

Evidence-confidence score

Average	Confidence
1.00 - 1.49	Low
1.50 - 2.49	Moderate
2.50 - 3.00	High

Stakeholder-alignment analysis

Response spread = highest response - lowest response

Spread	Interpretation
0	Strong alignment
1	Minor variation
2	Material perception gap
3 - 4	Major perception gap

A perception-gap flag is raised when the spread is 2 or greater, or when at least 25 percent of respondents score two or more levels away from the median.

Unknown and not-applicable responses

- Not known is excluded from the maturity calculation but retained as an evidence gap.
- More than 20 percent unknown within a dimension makes the score provisional.
- More than 30 percent unknown across the assessment makes the overall result insufficiently evidenced.
- Not applicable is excluded only when the capability genuinely falls outside the agreed scope.

Target maturity

Target maturity represents the capability required within the planning horizon, normally 12 to 24 months. Level 5 is not an automatic target; the appropriate level depends on mandate, regulation, risk, user need, capacity and cost.

Maturity gap = maximum of (target maturity - validated maturity) and zero.

Business importance and urgency

Rating	Business importance	Improvement urgency
1	Minimal connection to priorities	No immediate action required
2	Useful but limited in scope	Address through normal planning
3	Important to several material processes	Begin within 12 months
4	Essential to major services or obligations	Begin within six months
5	Mission-critical or regulatory	Immediate attention required

Capability-priority index

Priority score = maturity gap x business importance x improvement urgency. Maximum score: 100.

Score	Classification
60 - 100	Critical
40 - 59	High
20 - 39	Moderate
1 - 19	Low
0	Maintain current capability

Improvement effort

Rating	Effort
1	Minor procedural or documentation change
2	Limited effort within one team
3	Moderate cross-functional initiative
4	Significant enterprise change or technology investment
5	Multi-phase transformation with substantial dependencies

6. Heat Maps and Priority Matrix

The visual results should answer three questions: where are we now, where are the most consequential gaps, and what should we do first?

Executive maturity scorecard

Measure	Result
Overall numeric maturity	
Validated maturity level	
Target maturity	
Evidence confidence	
Highest-maturity dimension	
Lowest foundational dimension	
Critical priorities	
Material stakeholder gaps	
Assessment coverage and status	

Dimension-level heat map

Dimension	1	2	3	4	5	Average
Data Strategy and Ownership	DS1 ____	DS2 ____	DS3 ____	DS4 ____	DS5 ____	____
Governance and Accountability	GA1 ____	GA2 ____	GA3 ____	GA4 ____	GA5 ____	____
Metadata and Documentation	MD1 ____	MD2 ____	MD3 ____	MD4 ____	MD5 ____	____
Data Quality	DQ1 ____	DQ2 ____	DQ3 ____	DQ4 ____	DQ5 ____	____
Discoverability and Access	DA1 ____	DA2 ____	DA3 ____	DA4 ____	DA5 ____	____
Analytics Delivery	AN1 ____	AN2 ____	AN3 ____	AN4 ____	AN5 ____	____
Data-Product Management	DP1 ____	DP2 ____	DP3 ____	DP4 ____	DP5 ____	____
AI and Machine-Learning Readiness	AI1 ____	AI2 ____	AI3 ____	AI4 ____	AI5 ____	____

Maturity colour system

Level	Label	Use
1	Fragmented	Display the number and colour together
2	Emerging	Display the number and colour together
3	Defined	Display the number and colour together
4	Managed	Display the number and colour together
5	Adaptive	Display the number and colour together

Detailed Scoring Worksheet

ID	Current	Target	Gap	Conf.	Importance	Urgency	Priority	Effort
DS1								
DS2								
DS3								
DS4								
DS5								
GA1								
GA2								
GA3								
GA4								
GA5								
MD1								
MD2								
MD3								
MD4								
MD5								
DQ1								
DQ2								
DQ3								
DQ4								
DQ5								
DA1								
DA2								
DA3								
DA4								
DA5								
AN1								
AN2								
AN3								
AN4								
AN5								
DP1								
DP2								
DP3								
DP4								
DP5								
AI1								
AI2								
AI3								
AI4								
AI5								

Improvement-Priority Matrix

Plot implementation effort on the horizontal axis and capability-priority score on the vertical axis.



Priority score	Effort	Recommended treatment
40 - 100	1 - 3	Immediate 90-day action
40 - 100	4 - 5	Strategic programme
1 - 39	1 - 3	Opportunistic improvement
1 - 39	4 - 5	Defer or redesign
0	Any	Maintain and monitor

7. 90-Day Action Plan

The plan should normally contain three to five initiatives. It is intended to address achievable weaknesses, establish foundations for larger programmes and produce visible evidence of progress.

Three-phase structure

Period	Objective	Required outputs
Days 1 - 30	Align and mobilize	Validated priorities, sponsors, owners, baselines, charters, schedule and risks
Days 31 - 60	Build and test	Draft or implemented artefacts, pilot results, training, early measures and backlog
Days 61 - 90	Embed and scale	Approved capability, adoption evidence, roadmap, investment recommendation and reassessment

Action-plan portfolio

ID	Initiative	Capability	Current	Target	Priority	Effort	Owner	Day-90 outcome

Initiative charter

Field	Entry
Initiative title	
Related capability IDs	
Executive sponsor	
Accountable owner and delivery lead	
Assessment finding and risk of inaction	
Intended Day-90 outcome	
In scope / out of scope	
Dependencies	
Acceptance criteria	

Milestone Plan

Period	Milestone	Deliverable	Owner	Evidence of completion
Days 1 - 15				
Days 16 - 30				
Days 31 - 45				
Days 46 - 60				
Days 61 - 75				
Days 76 - 90				

Success measures

Every initiative should include a delivery measure, an adoption measure and an outcome measure. Completing an artefact does not demonstrate that the capability is operating.

Measure	Type	Baseline	Day 30	Day 60	Day 90	Owner	Source
	Delivery						
	Adoption						
	Outcome						

Risk, assumption, issue and dependency log

ID	Type	Description	Impact	Owner	Response	Due	Status
	Risk						
	Assumption						
	Issue						
	Dependency						

Governance cadence

Forum	Purpose	Recommended cadence
Delivery working session	Review work, issues and dependencies	Weekly
Owner review	Confirm decisions and remove barriers	Every two weeks
Executive checkpoint	Review outcomes, risks and investment	Monthly
Midpoint review	Evaluate pilot results and adjust scope	Day 45
Day-90 review	Approve scale, continuation, adjustment or stop	Day 90

8. A18-Facilitated Assessment

A facilitated engagement tests stakeholder perceptions against current documentary and operational evidence, reconciles conflicting views and converts findings into a sequenced improvement roadmap.

Standard six-week lifecycle

Phase	Timing	Primary outcome
Scope and mobilize	Week 1	Agreed scope, participants and evidence plan
Collect perspectives	Weeks 1 - 2	Independent stakeholder responses
Review evidence	Weeks 2 - 3	Evidence-supported preliminary findings
Interview and calibrate	Weeks 3 - 4	Validated maturity baseline
Prioritize improvements	Weeks 4 - 5	Target state and priority matrix
Deliver roadmap	Week 6	Executive report and 90-day plan

Evidence-review criteria

- Relevance to the capability being assessed
- Approval status and currency
- Coverage across the agreed scope
- Assigned ownership and consistent implementation
- Operational use and measurable performance

Calibration rule

Participants do not negotiate an average. They determine which maturity anchor is best supported by evidence across the agreed scope.

Final deliverables

- Executive maturity summary and validated enterprise level
- Eight dimension and 40 sub-capability findings
- Evidence-confidence and stakeholder-alignment analysis
- Current-to-target gap analysis and capability heat map
- Improvement-priority matrix and key dependencies
- 90-day action plan and 12-to-24-month roadmap
- Executive presentation and reassessment recommendation

Quality controls

- Use consistent maturity anchors for all respondents.
- Separate reported and validated scores.
- Record scoring adjustments, assumptions and exclusions.
- Preserve contrary stakeholder perspectives.
- Avoid technology recommendations before defining the capability problem.
- Conduct an independent review of scoring consistency and conclusions.

Service Pathways

Service	Best suited for	Core output
Guided self-assessment	Organizations seeking an initial baseline	Reviewed questionnaire and preliminary scorecard
Facilitated maturity assessment	Organizations requiring a validated enterprise view	Evidence-based report and heat map
Assessment and roadmap	Organizations preparing an improvement programme	Assessment, priority matrix and roadmap
90-day capability accelerator	Organizations ready to implement priorities	Mobilized and measured improvement
Annual reassessment	Organizations tracking progress	Comparative maturity and outcome report

Recommended reassessment cadence

A full enterprise reassessment should normally occur every 12 months. Targeted reassessments may follow a 90-day accelerator, major platform implementation, restructuring, a significant AI programme, new regulatory requirements or persistent data issues.

Request an A18-facilitated enterprise data maturity assessment.
Visit a18analytics.com to discuss organizational scope, stakeholder workshops and a tailored improvement roadmap.

Appendix A: Evidence Register

[illegible]

Appendix B: Calibration Record

Capability	Media n	Range	Evidence finding	Validate d	Rationale	Remaining action

Appendix C: Day-90 Review

What was delivered?

What evidence confirms implementation?

Was the capability adopted?

What measurable outcome changed?

Which assumptions were disproved?

What remains unresolved?

Did the capability maturity score change?

Is the improvement sustainable?

Should the initiative scale, continue, adjust, transition or stop?

What investment is required next?

Appendix D: Glossary

Term	Definition
Authoritative source	A formally approved data source for a defined use.
Business glossary	Governed definitions for business terms, measures and concepts.
Critical data element	A data element whose failure could materially affect services, obligations, reporting or decisions.
Data catalogue	A searchable inventory describing organizational data assets.
Data lineage	The documented origin, movement, transformation and downstream use of data.
Data product	A managed, reusable data capability with defined users, ownership, service expectations and value.
Evidence confidence	The degree to which current evidence supports a maturity rating.
Metadata	Information that describes the meaning, structure, operation, ownership and use of data.
Maturity anchor	An observable description of capability at a specific maturity level.
Semantic model	A reusable representation of business concepts, relationships and calculation logic.

A18 Analytics

Insights, frameworks and practical tools for better data decisions.

a18analytics.com