

Table 2– Key implications for regulatory agencies

Key implication 1

Broad reference frameworks are valuable, but they are not a plug-and-play solution. They form part of a well-established global body of regulatory knowledge, meaning agency-level RCFs build on recognised professional foundations rather than starting from scratch.

What agencies can do

Use these frameworks as a starting point and tailor them to the agency’s legislative environment, sector risks and priorities, and organisational culture. Avoid reinventing the wheel by drawing on the wider regulatory profession to guide design, consistency, and alignment.

Benefit

Ensures RCFs are fit-for-purpose while maintaining alignment with professional standards, improving consistency, credibility, and usability across the agency.

Key implication 2

Customisation enables RCFs to reflect the unique operational realities of a regulatory agency, including its legislative remit, compliance and enforcement approach, and sector-specific challenges. However, without careful design, there is a risk that RCFs become overly complex or disconnected from the broader regulatory capability system.

What agencies can do

Adopt a selective ‘less is more’ approach to designing RCFs, focusing only on capabilities that reflect the agency’s actual work. This improves usability and makes the framework easier to apply and embed in practice, while also increasing consistency, reducing cognitive load, and supporting targeted capability development. A smaller set of core capabilities helps facilitate the effective use of the RCF in practice.

Benefit

A ‘less is more’ approach enhances adoption and engagement by making core regulatory capabilities easier for staff to remember and apply; sharpens strategic focus on what truly drives regulatory success; and increases agility by enabling the RCF to evolve as priorities change.

Key implication 3

Some core elements of regulatory practice are not always explicitly captured in RCFs, meaning important aspects of regulatory work can be under-recognised or under-defined. Regulatory decision-making is a clear example. Similar gaps may exist and, as a result, RCFs may not fully reflect the reality and complexity of regulatory work.

What agencies can do

Co-design RCFs with experienced regulatory practitioners to ensure they reflect how regulatory work is done in practice. This includes identifying where critical capabilities are implicit, assumed, or spread across other areas, and making them explicit, observable, and useful for capability development.

Benefit

A more grounded, practice-informed approach strengthens the relevance and credibility of RCFs. It ensures they better reflect the realities of regulatory work, improves consistency in capability development, and supports more effective, confident and defensible regulatory practice across the agency.