FORZI

A FRAMEWORK PUBLICATION · 2026

The Universal Organizational Capability Maturity Framework.

A capability-centric framework for organizational maturity in the AI-native era — universal across archetype, industry, and geography.

PUBLICATION EDITION · UOCMF V1.0

By Wale Adekanla

Founder, Forzi AI

F O R Z I A I

The Universal Organizational Capability Maturity Framework

U O C M F

A capability-centric framework for organizational maturity in the AI-native era.

BY

Wale Adekanla

Founder, Forzi AI · Fellow, Institute of Leadership Coaching and Strategy · Member, Forbes Coaches Council

PUBLISHED BY FORZI AI · FORZI.AI

FORZI

The Universal Organizational
Capability Maturity Framework

Publication Edition · UOCMF v1.0

Published by Forzi · 2026
forzi.ai

© 2026 Forzi. All rights reserved.
Written by Wale Adekanla

This publication may be cited, referenced, and taught with attribution. For inquiries regarding academic collaboration, consulting application, government adoption, or executive practice, contact Forzi through forzi.ai.

ABSTRACT

The framework in brief.

The Universal Organizational Capability Maturity Framework (UOCMF) is a capability-centric model for measuring, diagnosing, and advancing organizational maturity in the artificial-intelligence-native era. UOCMF defines seven stages through which every organization — commercial, mission-driven, or governmental — evolves as its capacity to create value, coordinate action, make decisions, adapt to complexity, govern itself, and renew across time develops.

UOCMF departs from prior lifecycle frameworks by centering on capability rather than event, on complexity management rather than size, and on decision maturity rather than revenue. It integrates the intellectual disciplines of the Capability Maturity Model (Humphrey, Software Engineering Institute), the Viable System Model (Beer), the Law of Requisite Variety (Ashby), and the institution-building work of Drucker, Collins, Porter, Charan, and Barber.

Within each stage, UOCMF measures organizational maturity across seven capability dimensions independently:

Leadership, Strategy, Execution, Finance, Technology, Intelligence, and Governance. An organization's overall stage is the weighted composite of its dimensional maturity, adjusted for archetype, industry, and geography. Regression risk is continuously monitored across all seven dimensions.

This publication presents the framework in full, grounds it in the intellectual traditions from which it draws, and demonstrates its application across the three universal organizational archetypes: for-profit enterprises, mission-driven organizations, and government institutions. UOCMF is the operating framework of Forzi, the organizational intelligence infrastructure platform, offered here as a citable framework for use by academic institutions, consulting firms, government agencies, and executive teams worldwide.

Keywords: Organizational maturity, capability maturity, AI-native enterprise, organizational intelligence infrastructure, complexity management, decision maturity, institutional continuity, Forzi.

CONTENTS

In this publication.

PART I — FOUNDATIONS

01 Why This Framework Now 11

02 The Case for a New Framework 15

03 Foundational Principles of UOCMF 21

04 Intellectual Lineage 27

PART II — THE SEVEN STAGES

05 Stage 1 — Foundation 35

06 Stage 2 — Validation 39

07 Stage 3 — Repeatability 43

08 Stage 4 — Operational Excellence 47

09 Stage 5 — Institutional Scale 51

10 Stage 6 — Strategic Influence 55

11 Stage 7 — Institutional Continuity 59

PART III — THE MEASUREMENT ARCHITECTURE

12 The Seven Capability Dimensions 65

13 Regression Architecture 71

14 Adaptive Rendering 75

PART IV — APPLICATION AND REFERENCES

15 Application in Practice 81

16 Citation and Further Reading 85

PART ONE

I

Foundations.

"Every organization is a machine for managing complexity. When complexity outgrows the machine, the machine must evolve or perish."

CHAPTER ONE

Why this framework now.

> *The world's most influential frameworks for understanding organizational maturity — Greiner's growth model, Adizes's corporate lifecycles, Churchill and Lewis's five stages of small business — were developed for a world in which organizations were defined by revenue, headcount, and industry category. That world no longer exists.*

Between 1972 and 2020, the frameworks that shaped how leaders, consultants, and academics understood organizational maturity were built for a specific era. It was an era of predictable industry structures, human-executed work, gradual technology adoption, and organizational forms that could be reliably measured by size, sector, and time. Those frameworks earned their durability by describing that world accurately.

That world has ended. Between 2020 and 2026, three shifts have made every existing lifecycle framework structurally insufficient. Artificial intelligence has moved from tool to workforce. Complexity has grown faster than any prior period in institutional history. And the distinction between commercial, mission-driven, and governmental organizations —

always a clean framework simplification — has collapsed under the reality that all three types of institution now operate in the same intelligence-mediated economy.

The Universal Organizational Capability Maturity Framework was developed in response to these shifts. It is offered here as a framework that measures what organizations can actually *do*, rather than what they happen to *be*. It applies universally across archetype, industry, and geography. And it explicitly integrates the evolution of work itself — from human-performed to AI-augmented to institutionally adaptive — as a first-class dimension of organizational maturity.

◆ ◆ ◆

Who this publication is for

UOCMF is written for four audiences.

Academic institutions may cite UOCMF in research on organizational maturity, capability development, and AI-native enterprise. The framework is grounded in the intellectual traditions of the Capability Maturity Model, the Viable System Model, and the institution-building disciplines developed at Harvard Business School, the Kennedy School of Government, and comparable programs worldwide. It is written to be defensible in that literature.

Consulting firms may reference UOCMF in maturity assessments, transformation engagements, and strategic advisory work. The framework's structure — seven stages, seven capability dimensions per stage, continuous scoring, regression architecture — is designed to be operationalized by any firm capable of running a maturity engagement.

Government agencies and multilateral institutions may adopt UOCMF as a framework for institutional capacity assessment, particularly in contexts of national development, public sector transformation, and cross-border institutional benchmarking. The framework's explicit archetype adaptation makes it usable in developed and developing contexts alike.

Executive teams may use UOCMF as a diagnostic and planning framework for their own organizations. It is the operating framework of Forzi, the organizational intelligence infrastructure platform, and any leader who has used Forzi has already experienced UOCMF in practice.

THE PUBLICATION'S AMBITION

UOCMF is offered as a common language for organizational maturity in the AI-native era — a language that professors, consultants, ministers, and CEOs can share without translation loss.

CHAPTER TWO

The case for a new framework.

> *If existing frameworks were sufficient, this publication would not exist. Understanding what they cannot describe — and why — is the foundation for what UOCMF adds.*

Three limitations of prior lifecycle frameworks have become impossible to ignore in the AI-native era. Each limitation, once seen clearly, explains why the frameworks that served organizational leaders for five decades now require a successor.

The size-and-event problem

Every prior lifecycle framework — Adizes, Greiner, Churchill and Lewis, Verne Harnish — anchors stage identification in observable events (first customer, first hire, first funding round) and observable size (number of employees, revenue tier, market share). This was a reasonable simplification when organizations were bounded by geography and industry.

The AI-native era violates this anchor. OpenAI reached institutional influence with roughly seven hundred employees. NVIDIA reached trillion-dollar market capitalization while operating with fewer than thirty thousand employees. The Vatican, one of history's most durable institutions, has operated for two thousand years without any of the size markers a lifecycle framework would use. Singapore's civil service reached global exemplar status while classified structurally as a government agency.

What these organizations share is not size, revenue, or category. What they share is *capability maturity*. UOCMF measures that capability directly.

The archetype-fragmentation problem

Prior lifecycle frameworks were developed for a single archetype. Greiner and Adizes describe commercial enterprises. Bridgespan and Susan Kenny Stevens describe nonprofits. Barber's Deliverology and Moore's Creating Public Value describe governments. Each framework works well within its archetype but fails when compared across archetypes.

The AI-native era eliminates that fragmentation. A modern nonprofit like the Gates Foundation operates with the capital allocation discipline of a Fortune 500 enterprise. A modern government like Singapore's operates with the strategic clarity of an elite consulting firm. A modern commercial en-

terprise like Patagonia operates with the mission-driven governance of a nongovernmental organization. Existing frameworks cannot describe these organizations coherently.

UOCMF resolves this by defining stages that are archetype-agnostic. The stages describe capability. The rendering of each stage — the language, key performance indicators, and success signals — adapts to the archetype automatically.

The work-evolution problem

No existing lifecycle framework accounts for the reality that work itself is evolving. Human-performed work is being progressively augmented, and in specific domains progressively replaced, by artificial intelligence. This is not a marginal change. It is the most fundamental shift in the nature of organizational work since the industrial revolution.

UOCMF addresses this explicitly. Every stage names the state of work evolution appropriate to that stage — from human work at Stage 1 to self-improving organizational system at Stage 7. This turns the framework into a map of both organizational maturity and work-evolution maturity simultaneously.

> "*Existing frameworks were built for a world where organizations were defined by size, sector, and archetype. UOCMF was built for a world where they are defined by capability.*"

The complexity foundation UOCMF makes explicit

Ross Ashby's Law of Requisite Variety, articulated in 1956, states that only variety can absorb variety. Stafford Beer built on this in the Viable System Model to describe how organizations must develop internal capability equal to the complexity of their environment. Cynefin and complex adaptive systems theory extend the principle further.

The insight running through all of this work is that organizations do not grow. Complexity grows. Organizations either develop the capability to absorb rising complexity or they fail. UOCMF is the first lifecycle framework to make this principle its explicit foundation.

Every stage transition in UOCMF is triggered by rising complexity. Stage 4 emerges because coordinating simultaneous engagements exceeds what a founder can manage alone. Stage 6 emerges because portfolio decisions exceed what single-market strategy can handle. Stage 7 emerges be-

cause generational continuity exceeds what any single leadership team can carry. The stages are, in effect, the levels of complexity the organization has learned to absorb.

THE FOUNDATIONAL CLAIM

UOCMF is not another lifecycle framework. It is a capability maturity framework grounded in complexity science, applied through AI-native infrastructure, and rendered adaptively across every organizational archetype in every geography.

CHAPTER THREE

Foundational principles of UOCMF.

> *Before defining the seven stages, three principles must be internalized. Every disagreement about UOCMF that has ever surfaced has come from misunderstanding one of these three principles.*

These principles are not decorative. They are the load-bearing structure of the entire framework. Every subsequent chapter of this publication rests upon them.

Principle One — Capability, not event

A stage is defined by the capability the organization has developed. Not by the event that provoked development. Not by the artifact produced along the way. A Stage 3 organization has developed the capability to predict its performance within meaningful accuracy and to reproduce delivery without founder heroics. Whether this was proved by ten paying customers, three grant-funded programs, or two successful policy pilots is a rendering detail. The capability itself is the same across all three.

This principle allows UOCMF to apply universally. A research laboratory that produces breakthrough papers instead of paying customers still passes through Stage 3 the moment its research productivity becomes predictable and reproducible. A monastic order that produces spiritual formation instead of measurable revenue still passes through Stage 3 the moment its formation practices are transmissible across novices.

Principle Two — Complexity is the driver

Stages exist because complexity grows. Every stage transition is provoked by the organization encountering complexity it cannot absorb with its current capability. Stage 1 is the complexity of clarifying what the organization is. Stage 2 is the complexity of validating whether it works. Stage 3 is the complexity of making it repeatable. Stage 4 is the complexity of coordinating simultaneous engagements. Stage 5 is the complexity of operating institutionally. Stage 6 is the complexity of operating across multiple markets, sectors, or mandates. Stage 7 is the complexity of persisting across generations.

An organization that never encounters rising complexity — a lifestyle practice, a small durable trade — may operate excellently at Stage 3 for decades without ever needing to advance. This is not failure. It is calibration. UOCMF measures capability. It does not prescribe ambition.

Principle Three — Maturity is multidimensional

Organizations do not advance uniformly. A Fortune 500 enterprise may operate at Stage 6 in Leadership, Stage 5 in Governance, Stage 4 in Technology, and Stage 3 in Intelligence simultaneously. A young African technology startup may operate at Stage 5 in Technology alongside Stage 2 in Governance and Stage 1 in Finance. The single-stage designation is an approximation. The multidimensional profile is the truth.

UOCMF measures seven capability dimensions independently: Leadership, Strategy, Execution, Finance, Technology, Intelligence, and Governance. Each is scored on the same one-to-seven scale as the composite stage. The composite stage is the weighted average of the seven dimensions, with weightings adjusted for organizational archetype, industry, and geography.

"*An organization is not one stage. An organization is a profile of seven dimensional maturities that produce a composite stage.*"

The intelligence layer that unites the principles

Prior frameworks treat intelligence as an implicit consequence of stage advancement. Better systems, more data, and sharper decisions emerge as organizations mature. UOCMF treats intelligence as an explicit primary capability. Every stage names the type of organizational intelligence maturing at that stage.

Stage 1 develops Leader Intelligence. Stage 2 develops Market Intelligence. Stage 3 develops Operational Intelligence. Stage 4 develops Management Intelligence. Stage 5 develops Organizational Intelligence. Stage 6 develops Strategic Intelligence. Stage 7 develops Institutional Intelligence.

This intelligence progression is not decoration. It is the mechanism by which organizations absorb rising complexity. An organization cannot operate at Stage 5 without Organizational Intelligence — coordinated intelligence spanning the whole institution. It cannot operate at Stage 7

without Institutional Intelligence — intelligence that persists across leadership generations. Each stage's characteristic intelligence type is what makes that stage's capability possible.

THE THREE PRINCIPLES

Stages are defined by capability. Complexity is the driver of stage transitions. Maturity is multidimensional. Every application of UOCMF that ignores any of these three principles produces a distorted diagnosis.

CHAPTER FOUR

Intellectual lineage.

> *UOCMF synthesizes and applies the most durable organizational thinking of the past century. Naming the traditions from which it draws is a matter of intellectual honesty and a matter of practical defensibility.*

Every framework of consequence stands on the shoulders of prior work. What follows is the intellectual lineage that supports UOCMF, organized by the tradition from which each contribution flows.

Capability maturity foundations

The concept of measuring organizational maturity by capability rather than by size, event, or output originated in Watts Humphrey's Capability Maturity Model, developed at the Software Engineering Institute at Carnegie Mellon University beginning in 1988. Humphrey's insight — that organizations exist at identifiable levels of capability that can be measured, benchmarked, and advanced through targeted intervention — has become the foundation of every serious

maturity framework since, including CMMI, ISO 9004, McKinsey Wave, Gartner IT Score, and Deloitte's Human Capital Trends.

UOCMF extends this tradition beyond its original software-engineering domain and applies it universally to organizations of every archetype.

Complexity foundations

The principle that organizations must develop internal variety equal to the complexity of their environment was articulated by W. Ross Ashby in 1956 as the Law of Requisite Variety. Stafford Beer built on this in the Viable System Model to describe the internal structures organizations require to remain viable at increasing scales of operation. Dave Snowden's Cynefin framework, developed in the 2000s, distinguished the operational disciplines appropriate to different complexity contexts.

UOCMF is the first lifecycle framework to make complexity absorption its explicit foundational mechanism.

Lifecycle foundations

The specific stages of UOCMF draw from the lifecycle thinking of Ichak Adizes (*Corporate Lifecycles*, 1988), Larry Greiner (*Evolution and Revolution as Organizations Grow*, Harvard Business Review 1972 and 1998), Neil Churchill

and Virginia Lewis (*The Five Stages of Small Business Growth*, Harvard Business Review 1983), and Verne Harnish (*Scaling Up*, 2014). Each of these frameworks contributed insight about the transitions organizations navigate as they mature.

UOCMF integrates and reconceives their contributions in capability-centric terms.

Strategy and decision foundations

The disciplines of executive decision-making that inform each UOCMF stage draw from Peter Drucker's five decades of management writing, Herbert Simon's decision theory work on bounded rationality, Michael Porter's competitive strategy, Ram Charan's execution and CEO succession research, and Clayton Christensen's innovation theory. Together they establish that organizational maturity is measured most reliably in the quality of decisions the organization can make.

Institution-building foundations

The Stage 6 and Stage 7 disciplines of UOCMF — the transition from operational excellence to institutional influence to institutional continuity — draw from Jim Collins (*Good to Great*, *Built to Last*, *How the Mighty Fall*), Warren Buffett

and Charlie Munger on compounding across generations, and Peter Senge's work on learning organizations in *The Fifth Discipline*.

Mission-driven foundations

The mission-driven rendering of UOCMF draws from Peter Drucker's *Managing the Nonprofit Organization*, Jim Collins's *Good to Great and the Social Sectors*, the lifecycle research of the Bridgespan Group, Susan Kenny Stevens's *Nonprofit Lifecycles*, and the operational disciplines developed by mega-church and multi-site movements over the past three decades.

Government and public administration foundations

The government rendering of UOCMF draws from Mark Moore's *Creating Public Value*, Michael Barber's Deliverology framework used to transform government under Blair and adopted subsequently in Ontario, Punjab, and Maryland, the New Public Management movement of the 1980s and 1990s, and specific institutional wisdom from Singapore's civil service transformation, Rwanda's post-1994 institution building, and Estonia's e-government leadership.

AI-native evolution foundations

The work-evolution layer of UOCMF draws from Reid Hoffman's *Blitzscaling*, Kai-Fu Lee's *AI Superpowers*, the MIT Sloan Center for Information Systems Research work on digital operating models, and recent institutional and technical work on agentic organizational architecture emerging from Anthropic, DeepMind, and OpenAI.

THE FRAMEWORK'S FOUNDATION

UOCMF is a synthesis, not an invention. Every principle in this framework has intellectual predecessors of exceptional standing. What UOCMF adds is coherent integration, capability centering, universal archetype application, and AI-native operationalization.

PART TWO

II

The Seven Stages.

"Each stage names a specific capability the organization has developed to absorb a specific level of complexity. Advance requires new capability; regression signals capability loss."

STAGE ONE

01

Foundation.

The organization has articulated its reason for existing with defensible precision.

CAPABILITY THE ORGANIZATION HAS DEVELOPED

The founder or leader can name the problem the organization solves, the constituency it serves, and the differentiating conviction that justifies its existence. This clarity is not marketing polish. It is a defensible answer to three questions: what problem, for whom, why us. Without this capability, no further advancement is possible.

COMPLEXITY BEING MANAGED

Zero external complexity. All internal. The organization is one person or a small founding team wrestling with clarity. The complexity of Stage 1 is entirely conceptual — the complexity of deciding what to build and for whom.

INTELLIGENCE TYPE

Leader Intelligence

DECISION MATURITY

Founder decides from personal conviction

WORK EVOLUTION

Human work with consumer software

PRIMARY CHALLENGE

Clarity

ADVANCEMENT SIGNALS

- First externally validated commitment — paying customer, funded program, or approved mandate
- Core offer, program, or policy tested at least once in real conditions with observable outcomes
- Leader can articulate — in one clear sentence — what is solved, for whom, and why us

RENDERING ACROSS ARCHETYPES

In commercial enterprises, Foundation is proved by a first paying customer. In mission-driven organizations, Foundation is proved by a first funded program or confirmed beneficiary. In government institutions, Foundation is proved by a first approved budget and pilot mandate. The capability is identical. The rendering adapts.

STAGE TWO

02

Validation.

The organization has proven its value proposition can be delivered and will be accepted.

CAPABILITY THE ORGANIZATION HAS DEVELOPED

The organization has proven the model works — even if not yet repeatably. Value is being delivered. The constituency is engaging. Feedback loops between organization and audience are functioning. The founder is no longer working from hypothesis alone; observation is beginning to inform decisions.

COMPLEXITY BEING MANAGED

Emerging external complexity from a small number of engagements. Internal complexity beginning as the founding team grows past a single person.

INTELLIGENCE TYPE
Market Intelligence

DECISION MATURITY
Evidence begins informing decisions

WORK EVOLUTION

Human work with software and early automation

PRIMARY CHALLENGE

Reliability

ADVANCEMENT SIGNALS

- Value delivery stable across at least three consecutive delivery cycles
- Second and third engagements acquired through repeatable rather than one-off means
- Primary acquisition, funding, or support channel identified and documented

STAGE THREE

03

Repeatability.

The organization can predict its near-term performance and reproduce delivery without founder heroics.

CAPABILITY THE ORGANIZATION HAS DEVELOPED

The organization can predict its performance within twenty percent accuracy over meaningful time horizons. Delivery is documented in standard operating procedures actively followed by team members. At least one team member independently manages engagements or programs without daily founder input. The organization has become predictable to itself.

COMPLEXITY BEING MANAGED

Meaningful external complexity from multiple simultaneous engagements. Internal complexity from a growing team requiring coordination and clarity of role.

INTELLIGENCE TYPE

Operational Intelligence

DECISION MATURITY

Processes inform decisions

WORK EVOLUTION

Human plus automation plus basic AI assistance

PRIMARY CHALLENGE

Repeatability

ADVANCEMENT SIGNALS

- Performance predictable within twenty percent for at least six consecutive months
- Three or more standard operating procedures actively followed for critical delivery processes
- At least one team member independently manages an engagement without daily founder input

STAGE FOUR

04

Operational Excellence.

The organization delivers consistently across many simultaneous engagements without founder heroics.

CAPABILITY THE ORGANIZATION HAS DEVELOPED

Teams operate with defined authority within clear boundaries. Sixty percent or more of operational decisions are made without founder involvement. Core workflows are documented and followed consistently across all teams. A defined operating cadence — weekly, biweekly, monthly, and quarterly reviews — is followed reliably.

COMPLEXITY BEING MANAGED

High external complexity from many simultaneous engagements. High internal complexity from coordinating a team of five to fifty, or department-scale equivalent in government. The organization is absorbing complexity that a founder alone could no longer manage.

INTELLIGENCE TYPE

Management Intelligence

DECISION MATURITY

Teams decide within delegated authority

WORK EVOLUTION

Human work augmented by AI assistance

PRIMARY CHALLENGE

Leadership Bottleneck

ADVANCEMENT SIGNALS

- Sixty percent or more of operational decisions made without founder involvement
- Core workflows documented and followed consistently across all teams
- Defined operating cadence followed reliably

STAGE FIVE

05

Institutional Scale.

The organization operates as an institution. Multiple leaders manage distinct portfolios. Culture persists without founder presence.

CAPABILITY THE ORGANIZATION HAS DEVELOPED

Multiple leaders manage distinct portfolios independently. Governance functions with real oversight authority — not ceremonial. Culture persists institutionally. The founder or leader can be absent for thirty consecutive days with no material operational degradation.

COMPLEXITY BEING MANAGED

Institutional-level complexity across multiple portfolios or divisions. Coordination challenges span teams, functions, and geographies. The organization must now operate coherently at a scale that no single leader could personally supervise.

INTELLIGENCE TYPE

Organizational Intelligence

DECISION MATURITY

Systems decide routinely; leaders decide exceptions

WORK EVOLUTION

Human plus AI workforce in coordination

PRIMARY CHALLENGE

Consistent Excellence at Scale

ADVANCEMENT SIGNALS

- Founder or leader can be absent thirty consecutive days with no material operational degradation
- Complete senior leadership team operating with defined authority and accountability
- Governance structure functioning with real oversight authority — not ceremonial

STAGE SIX

06

Strategic Influence.

The organization is recognized as a shaper of its category, sector, or society.

CAPABILITY THE ORGANIZATION HAS DEVELOPED

The organization influences beyond its direct customers, beneficiaries, or stakeholders. Its brand, framework, or model is referenced by others. Its performance no longer depends on any single leader, including the founder. Succession is formalized and rehearsed for the top three leadership positions.

COMPLEXITY BEING MANAGED

Portfolio-level complexity across multiple markets, sectors, geographies, or mandates. Strategic complexity from partnership networks and category-defining decisions. The organization is now shaping the environment it operates in, not merely responding to it.

INTELLIGENCE TYPE

Strategic Intelligence

DECISION MATURITY

Portfolio optimization drives decisions

WORK EVOLUTION

AI-managed operations across many domains

PRIMARY CHALLENGE

Portfolio Coherence

ADVANCEMENT SIGNALS

- Organization recognized as an institution — influence extends beyond direct constituencies
- Performance does not depend on any single leader, including the founder
- Succession planning formalized and rehearsed for top three leadership positions

STAGE SEVEN

07

Institutional Continuity.

The organization has become permanent. It survives leadership transitions and renews itself across generations.

CAPABILITY THE ORGANIZATION HAS DEVELOPED

The organization anticipates and adapts to disruption before it arrives. Culture, governance, and innovation pipeline function independently of any single leader. Multiple successful leadership succession events have been executed without operational disruption. Institutional adaptation to disruption has been demonstrated across at least one major industry, market, or regulatory shift.

COMPLEXITY BEING MANAGED

Multigenerational and cross-domain complexity. The organization manages renewal across decades, leadership transitions, industry disruptions, and generational cultural shifts. This is complexity of a kind no shorter-lived organization ever encounters.

INTELLIGENCE TYPE

Institutional Intelligence

DECISION MATURITY

Governance evolves decisions across generations

WORK EVOLUTION

Self-improving organizational system

PRIMARY CHALLENGE

Institutional Permanence

CONTINUOUS SIGNALS (STAGE 7 IS MAINTAINED, NOT ACHIEVED)

- Multiple successful leadership succession events executed without operational disruption
- Innovation pipeline consistently producing new growth vectors
- Culture demonstrably persists across leadership generations
- Institutional adaptation to disruption demonstrated across at least one major shift

THE SEVEN STAGES IN SUMMARY

Foundation. Validation. Repeatability. Operational Excellence. Institutional Scale. Strategic Influence. Institutional Continuity. These are the seven capability stages every organization — commercial, mission-driven, or governmental — passes through as its capacity to absorb complexity matures.

PART THREE

III

The Measurement Architecture.

"A framework that cannot be measured cannot be applied. UOCMF measures organizational maturity across seven capability dimensions, continuously, per archetype and geography."

CHAPTER TWELVE

The seven capability dimensions.

> *Every organization's composite stage in UOCMF is the weighted average of seven capability dimensions measured independently. This is what makes UOCMF diagnostic rather than descriptive.*

Each dimension is measured on the same one-to-seven scale as the composite stage, where dimension score one corresponds to Stage 1 capability in that dimension, dimension score seven corresponds to Stage 7 capability, and intermediate values reflect partial maturity.

DIMENSION	WHAT IT MEASURES
Leadership	The maturity of leadership capacity, distribution, and succession planning across the organization
Strategy	The maturity of strategic thinking, planning, prioritization, and portfolio allocation
Execution	The maturity of operational delivery, quality control, and consistency across engagements
Finance	The maturity of financial discipline, forecasting, capital allocation, and unit economics
Technology	The maturity of technology architecture, adoption, integration, and AI-native operations
Intelligence	The maturity of decision infrastructure, data flow, organizational learning, and institutional memory
Governance	The maturity of oversight, accountability, board or council function, and institutional discipline

Why seven dimensions

Seven is not an arbitrary choice. It is the smallest set of dimensions that captures every axis of organizational capability without redundant coverage. Fewer dimensions produce blind spots. More dimensions produce measurement fatigue and cognitive load without proportional diagnostic value.

Every dimension is independent — an organization may operate at Stage 6 in Leadership and simultaneously at Stage 3 in Technology. Every dimension is measurable — capability signals per stage are specified in enough detail to support assessment. Every dimension matters — no organization can be genuinely mature without capability in all seven.

"*An organization is not one stage. It is a profile of seven dimensional maturities producing a composite stage.*"

The weighting mechanism

Different archetypes and industries prioritize different dimensions. Government institutions weight Governance more heavily than commercial enterprises. AI-native technology firms weight Technology and Intelligence more heavily than

traditional service firms. Mission-driven organizations weight Leadership and Governance more heavily than Finance and Strategy.

UOCMF weightings are configurable per archetype (commercial, mission-driven, governmental), per industry (technology, financial services, manufacturing, healthcare, education, faith community, government agency, and comparable categories), and per geography (North America, Sub-Saharan Africa, East Asia, Latin America, Europe, and comparable regions). Default weightings are established through empirical analysis of organizations at each stage in each archetype-industry-geography combination.

The composite stage is calculated by taking the weighted average of the seven dimensional scores, rounded to one decimal place. An organization may therefore be classified as Stage 4.6 — meaning it operates predominantly at Stage 4 with meaningful capability progressing into Stage 5.

THE MEASUREMENT DISCIPLINE

Composite stage classification is useful for narrative. Dimensional profile is useful for diagnosis. Every UOCMF application should surface both.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

Regression architecture.

> *Organizations do not advance monotonically. UOCMF is the first lifecycle framework to make regression a first-class concept and to prescribe continuous regression monitoring as core practice.*

Every serious framework of organizational maturity must account for the reality that capability can be lost as well as gained. UOCMF makes this explicit and operationalizes it.

Why regression matters

Toyota regressed operationally after Taiichi Ohno's active influence ended. Apple regressed strategically during John Sculley's tenure and again during the early years after Steve Jobs's return before recovery took hold. Nokia regressed catastrophically from Stage 7 to Stage 4 between 2007 and 2013. General Electric regressed from Stage 7 to Stage 5 during Jeffrey Immelt's tenure. Boeing regressed on quality dimension from Stage 6 to Stage 3 during the 2015 through 2019 period.

Regression is the norm, not the exception. Every organization that has ever operated at Stage 5 or above has experienced regression in one or more dimensions. The organizations that survived and renewed were those that detected regression early and intervened. The organizations that failed were those that treated regression as a marketing problem rather than a capability problem.

The regression risk score

UOCMF calculates a continuous Regression Risk Score for every organization on every capability dimension. The score reflects the probability of dimensional decline in the current period based on observed signals.

Common regression triggers monitored by UOCMF include: founder returning as decision bottleneck after Stage 4; over-expansion collapsing operational excellence; governance decay after leadership transition; technology debt overwhelming operational capacity; cultural erosion after acquisition or rapid growth; financial discipline breakdown during growth surges; strategic drift from portfolio incoherence; and institutional adaptation failure during market or regulatory disruption.

When regression is detected, UOCMF surfaces the specific dimension in decline, the trigger identified, the historical dimensional score, the current dimensional score, and the recommended intervention. This is what turns UOCMF from a descriptive framework into a predictive operating discipline.

◆ ◆ ◆

The multigenerational implication

Stage 7 organizations — those that have achieved institutional continuity — do not maintain that state passively. They maintain it through active monitoring of regression signals and active intervention when signals emerge. This is what Jim Collins observed in *How the Mighty Fall* and what Peter Senge described in the discipline of learning organizations.

UOCMF operationalizes this insight. Every Stage 7 organization operating on Forzi receives continuous regression monitoring across all seven dimensions. Signals of decline trigger executive-level alerts calibrated to the severity and dimension of decline. This creates institutional adaptive capacity that no prior generation of leadership ever had access to.

THE REGRESSION DISCIPLINE

Advance is not permanent. Regression is normal. Continuous monitoring is the difference between organizations that renew and organizations that decay.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

Adaptive rendering.

> *UOCMF is universal in principle. Its rendering is contextual by necessity. A Nigerian federal ministry at Stage 4 shares the capability profile of a Silicon Valley technology company at Stage 4, but the operational manifestation of that capability differs materially.*

UOCMF resolves this through archetype and geographic adaptation. The framework's structure — seven stages, seven capability dimensions, regression architecture — is invariant. Its language, key performance indicators, and success signals adapt automatically to the organization's context.

Adaptation across the three organizational archetypes

For commercial enterprises, UOCMF renders in language of customers, revenue, unit economics, competitive positioning, market share, and shareholder value. Advancement signals are calibrated to commercial performance. Governance is rendered in terms of board oversight and fiduciary discipline.

For mission-driven organizations — nonprofits, foundations, faith communities, and civil society institutions — UOCMF renders in language of beneficiaries, funders, program delivery, mission alignment, and institutional sustainability. Advancement signals are calibrated to mission fulfillment. Governance is rendered in terms of board or council oversight and stewardship discipline. For faith communities specifically, additional dimensional language is provided around congregation, formation, and spiritual leadership.

For government institutions, UOCMF renders in language of constituents, mandate, budget, program delivery, policy influence, and public value. Advancement signals are calibrated to public administration performance. Governance is rendered in terms of legislative oversight, regulatory compliance, and institutional accountability. Adaptation includes national and subnational context — federal, state, and municipal renderings differ.

Geographic adaptation

UOCMF's geographic adaptation reflects the reality that operational context varies materially across regions. Regulatory environments differ. Capital markets differ. Cultural expectations of leadership differ. Institutional traditions differ. A framework that ignores these differences produces distorted diagnosis in every context outside the one in which it was designed.

Default geographic renderings include North America, Sub-Saharan Africa, East Asia, Latin America, Europe, South Asia, and the Middle East. Within each region, further adaptation occurs at the country level based on regulatory, cultural, and institutional context. A Nigerian commercial enterprise receives a rendering distinct from a Ghanaian, Kenyan, or South African enterprise despite operating in the same broad region.

"UOCMF is universal in principle, adaptive in rendering. This is what makes it applicable to a Silicon Valley founder, a Nigerian federal minister, and a Ghanaian bishop with equal authenticity."

THE ADAPTATION DISCIPLINE

A framework that cannot adapt to context is not universal. A framework that cannot preserve its principles across contexts is not coherent. UOCMF is designed to satisfy both requirements simultaneously.

PART FOUR

IV

Application and References.

"A framework proves its worth in the application. UOCMF is offered for use by academic institutions, consulting firms, government agencies, and executive teams worldwide."

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

Application in practice.

> *UOCMF is the operating framework of Forzi, the organizational intelligence infrastructure platform. Every organization using Forzi receives continuous UOCMF assessment across all seven capability dimensions, calibrated to their archetype, industry, and geography.*

Application of UOCMF outside the Forzi platform is welcomed and encouraged. The framework is offered here for citation, reference, and application in academic research, consulting engagements, government transformation programs, and executive team planning. What follows are practical guidelines for application.

◆ ◆ ◆

Application in academic research

Researchers studying organizational maturity, capability development, complexity management, or AI-native enterprise may cite UOCMF as a framework that integrates capability maturity thinking (Humphrey, Software Engineering Insti-

tute), complexity science (Ashby, Beer), lifecycle traditions (Greiner, Adizes, Churchill and Lewis), and institution-building disciplines (Drucker, Collins, Charan). Full citation guidelines follow in the References section of this publication.

Empirical research on UOCMF stages and dimensions is welcomed. Forzi maintains an anonymized dataset of organizational capability profiles across archetypes and geographies that may be made available to serious researchers by request through forzi.ai.

Application in consulting engagements

Consulting firms may apply UOCMF as a diagnostic framework in maturity assessments, transformation engagements, and strategic advisory work. The framework's structure — seven stages, seven dimensions, continuous scoring, regression monitoring — is designed to be operationalized by any firm capable of running a maturity engagement. Firms may develop proprietary scoring methodologies within the UOCMF framework and are encouraged to publish their findings for the benefit of the field.

Application in government transformation

Government agencies and multilateral institutions may adopt UOCMF as a framework for institutional capacity assessment, particularly in contexts of national development, public sector transformation, and cross-border institutional benchmarking. The framework's explicit archetype and geographic adaptation makes it usable in developed and developing contexts alike.

National development agencies, multilateral donors, and cross-country institutional benchmarking programs may find particular value in UOCMF's ability to compare institutional maturity across geographies without requiring culturally inappropriate normalization.

Application in executive team planning

Executive teams may use UOCMF as a diagnostic and planning framework for their own organizations. The most productive application is annual: assess capability profile at year start, identify highest-priority dimensional advancement targets, execute against those targets, and reassess at year end. Over three to five years of disciplined application, organizations frequently observe measurable advancement across multiple dimensions.

THE OPEN INVITATION

UOCMF is offered as a framework for the field. Its intellectual value increases with citation, application, and refinement by others. Every serious application strengthens the framework.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

Citation and further reading.

> *UOCMF stands on the intellectual work of scholars, practitioners, and institutions across the past century. Citing this framework requires acknowledging that tradition.*

Recommended citation

STANDARD CITATION FORMAT

Adekanla, W. (2026). *The Universal Organizational Capability Maturity Framework (UOCMF)*. Forzi Publications. Retrieved from forzi.ai

For citations of specific stages, dimensions, or applications, refer to the appropriate section of this publication and cite the relevant chapter.

◆ ◆ ◆

Further reading in intellectual lineage

CAPABILITY MATURITY FOUNDATIONS

Humphrey, W. S. (1989). *Managing the Software Process*. Addison-Wesley.

Software Engineering Institute. (2010). *CMMI for Development, Version 1.3*. Carnegie Mellon University.

International Organization for Standardization. (2018). *ISO 9004:2018 Quality management — Quality of an organization*.

COMPLEXITY FOUNDATIONS

Ashby, W. R. (1956). *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. Chapman & Hall.

Beer, S. (1972). *Brain of the Firm*. Allen Lane / Penguin Press.

Snowden, D. J. & Boone, M. E. (2007). "A Leader's Framework for Decision Making." *Harvard Business Review*, 85(11).

LIFECYCLE FOUNDATIONS

Adizes, I. (1988). *Corporate Lifecycles*. Prentice Hall.

Greiner, L. E. (1972, revised 1998). "Evolution and Revolution as Organizations Grow." *Harvard Business Review*.

Churchill, N. C. & Lewis, V. L. (1983). "The Five Stages of Small Business Growth." *Harvard Business Review*, 61(3).

Harnish, V. (2014). *Scaling Up: How a Few Companies Make It...and Why the Rest Don't*. Gazelles.

STRATEGY AND INSTITUTION-BUILDING

Drucker, P. F. (1954). *The Practice of Management*. Harper & Row.

Simon, H. A. (1947, revised 1997). *Administrative Behavior*. Free Press.

Porter, M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy*. Free Press.

Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The Innovator's Dilemma*. Harvard Business Press.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to Great*. HarperBusiness.

Collins, J. & Porras, J. (1994). *Built to Last*. HarperBusiness.

Collins, J. (2009). *How the Mighty Fall*. HarperCollins.

Charan, R. (2001). *What the CEO Wants You to Know*. Crown Business.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline*. Doubleday.

MISSION-DRIVEN AND FAITH COMMUNITY

Drucker, P. F. (1990). *Managing the Nonprofit Organization*. HarperCollins.

Collins, J. (2005). *Good to Great and the Social Sectors*. HarperCollins.

Stevens, S. K. (2001). *Nonprofit Lifecycles: Stage-Based Wisdom for Nonprofit Capacity*. Stagewise Enterprises.

The Bridgespan Group. (various). Nonprofit lifecycle research publications. Retrieved from bridgespan.org.

GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC SECTOR

Moore, M. H. (1995). *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Harvard University Press.

Barber, M. (2015). *How to Run a Government*. Penguin.

Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing Government*. Addison-Wesley.

AI-NATIVE EVOLUTION

Hoffman, R. & Yeh, C. (2018). *Blitzscaling*. Currency.

Lee, K. (2018). *AI Superpowers*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

MIT Sloan Center for Information Systems Research. (2020-2026). Research on digital operating models. Retrieved from cisr.mit.edu.

THE FRAMEWORK'S FOUNDATION

UOCMF is a synthesis. Its intellectual value derives from the traditions it integrates. Serious application requires familiarity with those traditions.

A CONCLUDING NOTE

Concluding note.

> *This publication presents UOCMF version 1.0. Subsequent versions will incorporate feedback from academic, consulting, government, and executive practitioners applying the framework in real institutional contexts worldwide.*

The framework's ambition is to serve as a common language for organizational maturity in the AI-native era — a language that professors, consultants, ministers, and CEOs can share without translation loss. Every citation, application, and critique strengthens that ambition.

UOCMF is offered here in the tradition of Watts Humphrey, W. Ross Ashby, Peter Drucker, and Jim Collins — thinkers who made their frameworks freely available to the field because they believed the field was strengthened by shared standards. The intellectual property of UOCMF rests not in the framework itself but in the operationalization of the framework through Forzi, the organizational intelligence infrastructure platform.

An open invitation to the field

Every framework of consequence becomes what its users make of it. CMMI became a global standard because the field adopted, refined, and applied it across contexts its originators never anticipated. ISO 9004 gained authority through the same process. UOCMF is offered in that spirit.

Academic researchers, consulting practitioners, government officials, and executive leaders are invited to apply UOCMF in their contexts, publish their findings, refine the framework where it needs refinement, and contribute to its evolution as a shared standard.

Contact

For inquiries related to academic collaboration, consulting application, government adoption, or executive practice, contact Forzi through **forzi.ai**. Serious inquiries from institutions, agencies, and firms will be directed to the appropriate team for substantive engagement.

◆ ◆ ◆

— Wale Adekanla

FOUNDER, FORZI · 2026