Level 1

BCM Maturity Assessment Report – Establishing a BCMS

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Management Commitment** | 1 | BCM Steering Committee noted but no formal meeting cadence or functioning structure. | Initial awareness of need for oversight. | No formalised meeting schedule, documentation or functioning governance. | Absence of meeting records and active leadership. | Formalise and operationalise the BCM Steering Committee with scheduled meetings, roles, and documented decisions. |
| **BCM Policy** | 1 | BCM Policy mentioned but not formally approved or implemented. | Recognition of the need for policy. | No governance enforcement or formal endorsement of the BCM Policy. | Lack of an approved and communicated BCM Policy. | Develop, approve, and communicate the BCM Policy across the institution. |
| **Governance Structure** | 1 | TOR exists but not aligned to functioning structures; appointment letters not available. | TOR in draft or early stage. | No formal appointments, unclear roles and responsibilities. | Informal structure, undocumented responsibilities. | Finalise and communicate the governance framework; issue appointment letters and train committee members. |
| **BCM Charter** | 1 | No documented or approved BCM Charter available. | Initial intent acknowledged. | No strategic direction or governance intent documented. | Lack of a guiding BCM Charter. | Draft and formally approve a BCM Charter to articulate the organisation's BCM intent and scope. |
| **BCM Manager/Coordinator** | 1 | Coordinator role recognised but no formal appointment or defined responsibilities. | A point of contact may exist informally. | Role not clearly documented, limited accountability. | No formal BCM leadership structure. | Appoint a dedicated BCM Coordinator and define their responsibilities in line with the BCM programme. |
| **BCM Teams** | 1 | No formal team structures or appointment letters exist for ERT, CMT, or Disaster Recovery teams. | Acknowledgement of team concepts. | Lack of clarity on team composition, roles, and readiness. | No operational response teams in place. | Formally establish and appoint BCM teams with training and documented responsibilities. |
| **BCM Champions** | 1 | No formal champions assigned per business unit. | Concept recognised. | No BCM liaison or ownership at the business unit level. | Decentralised BCM awareness and ownership. | Identify and appoint BCM Champions across units and provide role-specific training. |
| **Business Continuity Plan** | 1 | BCP not yet approved or fully developed. | Intention to create a plan exists. | Lack of risk analysis, recovery strategies, and tested plans. | No formalised BCP to guide continuity during disruptions. | Develop, approve, and test a comprehensive BCP, covering all critical functions. |
| **BCM Budget** | 1 | BCM funding not yet prioritised; no specific allocation available. | Budget considerations are emerging. | No financial support for programme activities. | Lack of resourcing to implement BCM effectively. | Allocate a dedicated BCM budget to fund policy development, training, testing, and implementation. |
| **BCM Programme Work Plan** | 1 | No structured implementation plan available. | Acknowledgement that planning is necessary. | Activities are ad hoc with no timelines or accountability. | Absence of a phased implementation roadmap. | Develop a BCM Programme Work Plan with clear milestones, owners, and timelines. |

**Overall Summary**

* **Current Maturity Level**: **1 – Initial**
* **Overall Observations**: There is an understanding of BCM’s importance, but minimal implementation has occurred. Activities are not formally structured or documented.
* **Strengths**: Stakeholders are aware of BCM elements, and groundwork (like draft documents or discussions) may exist.
* **Weaknesses**: Lack of formalisation, appointment, documentation, and strategic direction.
* **Gaps**: Missing policies, governance structures, trained teams, and continuity planning tools.
* **Recommendations**:
  + Establish and empower a BCM Steering Committee.
  + Develop, approve, and communicate BCM foundational documents (Policy, Charter, Plans).
  + Formally appoint key roles (Coordinator, Teams, Champions).
  + Create a structured BCM Work Plan aligned with organisational priorities.
  + Allocate funding and training to ensure sustained BCM development and implementation.

BCM Maturity Assessment Report – Embracing Business Continuity

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Management Commitment** | 1 | Committee exists in theory; meetings are irregular or poorly documented. | Recognition of the need for oversight. | Irregular BCM Steering Committee engagement. | Lack of active oversight, leadership accountability, and documented governance. | Reactivate the BCM Steering Committee with scheduled, minuted meetings and formalised oversight responsibilities. |
| **BCM Awareness & Induction** | 1 | Minimal awareness campaign conducted; not structured or repeated. | Initial BCM awareness attempts have been made. | Awareness not embedded into organisational culture. | No integration with employee onboarding, lack of structured campaigns. | Launch structured and recurring BCM awareness campaigns; integrate BCM into HR induction processes. |
| **Competence and Skills** | 1 | Limited or ad hoc training provided; no tracking of effectiveness. | Early recognition of training needs. | No formal training programme or post-training evaluations. | No documented training plans, no evaluation mechanisms. | Develop a formal BCM training programme with feedback loops, role-based modules, and evaluation methods. |
| **Training Effectiveness** | 1 | No documented evidence showing that BCM training is assessed or tracked. | Some training may have occurred. | Effectiveness of training is not measured or reviewed. | Absence of post-training assessments or feedback mechanisms. | Conduct post-training evaluations, collect feedback, and measure knowledge retention for continuous improvement. |
| **Training & Awareness Budget** | 1 | No specific budget is allocated to BCM training and awareness initiatives. | Budget need is acknowledged. | Training and awareness activities are unfunded and therefore sporadic. | No earmarked budget for ongoing BCM capacity development. | Allocate a dedicated BCM training and awareness budget annually to support structured learning and engagement programmes. |

**Overall Summary**

* **Overall Maturity Level**: **1 – Initial (Partially Compliant: 01–39%)**
* **Observations**:
  + Stakeholders are aware of BCM, but current practices are reactive, inconsistent, and under-resourced.
  + Governance structures exist on paper but are not active or effective.
  + BCM awareness and training efforts are informal, lacking structure and evaluation.
* **Strengths**:
  + Initial efforts have been made to introduce awareness.
  + Stakeholders recognise the importance of business continuity.
* **Weaknesses**:
  + No structured or consistent approach to training, awareness, and governance.
  + Absence of measurement tools for training effectiveness.
  + Lack of budget and operational support.
* **Gaps**:
  + Formal governance and oversight.
  + Continuous and measurable awareness and training programmes.
  + Integration of BCM into onboarding and institutional learning.
* **Key Recommendations**:
  + **Governance**: Reestablish a functioning BCM Steering Committee with regular meetings and formal documentation.
  + **Awareness**: Implement a recurring BCM awareness programme supported by communications, campaigns, and leadership endorsement.
  + **Training**: Develop role-specific BCM training plans with post-training assessments.
  + **Evaluation**: Monitor and report the effectiveness of awareness and training initiatives using surveys and assessments.
  + **Budgeting**: Secure an annual budget to support all BCM training and awareness activities.

BCM Maturity Assessment Report – Analysis

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Business Impact Analysis (BIA)** | 1 | Critical business activities have not been clearly identified or formally documented through a BIA process. | Initial recognition of need to identify critical activities. | Lack of formal BIA process, no documented list of critical activities. | No detailed analysis or prioritisation of business functions based on impact. | Initiate a formal BIA process involving key stakeholders to identify and prioritise critical activities. |
| **Detailed Impact Analysis** | 1 | No detailed impact analysis performed or documented for business functions. | Awareness of impact analysis importance exists. | Absence of formal impact evaluation over time and across functions. | No baseline impact data or reports to guide recovery planning. | Conduct detailed impact analyses with timelines to understand potential disruption effects on business functions. |
| **Recovery Objectives (RTOs, RPOs)** | 1 | Recovery Time Objectives and Recovery Point Objectives have not been established or documented. | Recognition of the need for recovery targets. | No formal documented RTOs or RPOs for critical activities. | Undefined recovery expectations hinder recovery strategy development. | Define, document, and communicate RTOs and RPOs aligned to business priorities and risk appetite. |
| **Risk Assessment** | 1 | BCM-related risks have not been formally assessed or documented in a risk assessment report. | Awareness that BCM risks exist. | Lack of detailed, BCM-specific risk identification, analysis, and reporting. | No formal BCM risk register or mitigation plans. | Conduct a comprehensive BCM risk assessment to identify, evaluate, and prioritise risks impacting continuity and recovery. |

**Overall Summary**

* **Maturity Level**: **1 – Initial (Partially Compliant: 01–39%)**
* **Observations**:  
  BCM analysis activities are in nascent stages with no formal processes, documentation, or recovery metrics in place.
* **Strengths**:  
  Initial awareness of the importance of analysis, risk, and recovery planning is evident.
* **Weaknesses**:  
  Lack of formalisation, documentation, prioritisation, and recovery criteria.
* **Gaps**:  
  No BIA process, no detailed impact or risk analysis, and absence of recovery objectives.
* **Recommendations**:
  1. Establish and implement a formal BIA process with stakeholder engagement.
  2. Perform detailed impact analyses documenting operational and financial effects over time.
  3. Define and communicate clear RTOs and RPOs for critical business functions.
  4. Conduct a BCM-focused risk assessment with documented risks and mitigation plans.

BCM Maturity Assessment Report – Solutions Design

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Business Continuity Strategy Development** | 1 | No formal business continuity strategies documented for sustaining critical activities. | Awareness of the need for continuity strategies exists. | Lack of documented strategies and alignment with critical activities. | No formal linkage to BIA or risk assessment results. | Develop and document business continuity strategies explicitly linked to BIA and risk assessment findings. |
|  | 1 | BIA and risk assessment outputs have not been used to inform strategy development. | Recognition that BIA/risk inputs are important. | Strategy formulation is disconnected from formal analysis. | Missing integration of analysis outputs into strategy. | Ensure all continuity strategies are based on formal BIA and risk assessment outcomes. |
|  | 1 | No evaluation of tactics against resource and service requirements; adequacy unknown. | Initial understanding of operational requirements. | No formal assessment of whether chosen tactics meet operational needs. | Lack of documented evaluation or validation processes. | Conduct formal evaluations of proposed strategies and tactics against resource availability and service level requirements. |
| **Solution Implementation Planning** | 1 | No funded projects exist for implementing business continuity solutions. | Concept of solution implementation is recognised. | Absence of project funding, planning, or resourcing. | No actionable project plans or budgets to operationalise strategies. | Secure funding and develop detailed project plans for implementing business continuity solutions, including resource allocation and timelines. |

**Overall Summary**

* **Maturity Level**: **1 – Initial (Partially Compliant: 01–39%)**
* **Observations**:  
  Solutions design is in its infancy with no documented strategies, no use of prior analysis to guide design, and no funded implementation plans.
* **Strengths**:  
  Stakeholders understand the importance of strategies and implementation but lack formal processes.
* **Weaknesses**:  
  No documented strategies or planning, lack of linkage to prior business impact or risk assessments, and no funding for solution rollout.
* **Gaps**:  
  Absence of documented, validated continuity strategies and implementation plans with funding.
* **Recommendations**:
  1. Develop and document formal business continuity strategies linked directly to BIA and risk assessments.
  2. Evaluate and validate strategy tactics against critical operational requirements.
  3. Create and fund detailed project plans for implementing continuity solutions.
  4. Engage stakeholders to prioritise and resource these initiatives.

BCM Maturity Assessment Report – Enabling Solutions

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Incident Response** | 1 | No documented incident response structure in place. | Awareness of the need for incident response mechanisms. | Absence of formal incident response roles, responsibilities, and processes. | No incident response framework or documentation. | Develop and approve a formal incident response structure detailing roles, responsibilities, and escalation paths. |
| **Business Continuity Plan (BCP)** | 1 | No approved or current BCP documented. | Recognition of the importance of having a BCP. | Lack of a formal, approved, and communicated Business Continuity Plan. | No formal plan to ensure continuity of critical operations during disruptions. | Develop, review, and formally approve a comprehensive Business Continuity Plan aligned with organisational needs. |
| **Emergency Response Plan (ERP)** | 1 | No Emergency Response Plan currently documented or approved. | Initial awareness of emergency planning needs. | No formal emergency response procedures or plans. | Lack of defined emergency response guidelines. | Develop and implement an Emergency Response Plan with clear procedures for managing emergencies effectively. |
| **Disaster Recovery Plan (DRP)** | 1 | No approved Disaster Recovery Plan for IT service continuity exists. | Awareness of IT disaster recovery importance. | No documented or tested Disaster Recovery Plan for IT systems and services. | IT service continuity planning absent or informal. | Develop and approve a Disaster Recovery Plan focused on IT infrastructure, ensuring backup and recovery capabilities. |
| **Crisis Management Plan (CMP)** | 1 | No Crisis Management Plan is currently in place. | Recognition that crisis management is needed. | No formal crisis management structure or documented plan. | Absence of crisis management framework and protocols. | Establish and document a Crisis Management Plan defining escalation, decision-making, and communication during crises. |
| **Pandemic Response Plan** | 1 | No documented COVID-19 or pandemic response plan exists. | Awareness of pandemic risks after recent events. | No formal pandemic or health emergency response plans. | Lack of preparedness for health-related disruptions. | Develop a pandemic response plan addressing business continuity during health crises, including remote work and health safety protocols. |

**Overall Summary**

* **Maturity Level**: **1 – Initial (Partially Compliant: 01–39%)**
* **Observations**:  
  The organisation lacks formalised, documented, and approved plans for incident, emergency, disaster recovery, crisis, and pandemic responses.
* **Strengths**:  
  Stakeholders recognise the importance of these plans and the need for structured responses.
* **Weaknesses**:  
  No documented or approved plans to guide response efforts during disruptions.
* **Gaps**:  
  Absence of formal documentation, roles, responsibilities, and tested response procedures.
* **Recommendations**:
  1. Develop and formally approve all critical response and recovery plans (Incident, BCP, ERP, DRP, CMP, Pandemic).
  2. Assign roles and responsibilities within these plans clearly.
  3. Conduct regular training and testing of the plans to ensure effectiveness.
  4. Establish a governance framework to oversee ongoing plan maintenance and updates.

**BCM Maturity Assessment Report – Validation**

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exercising and Testing** | 1 | No established or documented programme for exercising and testing BCM arrangements. | Awareness of the need for exercising and testing BCM. | Absence of formal testing schedules, scenarios, and documentation. | No structured testing programme to validate BCM plans and readiness. | Develop a formal BCM exercising and testing programme including schedules, test scenarios, roles, and documentation. |
| **Review and Assurance** | 1 | BCM arrangements have not been reviewed via internal or external audits or self-assessments recently. | Recognition that review and assurance are important. | No audit or review activities to assess BCM effectiveness or compliance. | Lack of assurance mechanisms and continuous improvement feedback. | Implement regular BCM reviews through audits, self-assessments, or external evaluations and establish reporting mechanisms for findings and corrective actions. |

**Overall Summary**

* **Maturity Level**: **1 – Initial (Partially Compliant: 01–39%)**
* **Observations**:  
  Validation processes such as exercising, testing, and auditing are not yet established or documented.
* **Strengths**:  
  Stakeholders understand the importance of BCM validation activities.
* **Weaknesses**:  
  No formal programme for BCM testing or assurance reviews.
* **Gaps**:  
  Absence of scheduled BCM exercises and independent reviews to verify effectiveness.
* **Recommendations**:
  1. Develop and implement a BCM exercising and testing programme to validate plans and readiness.
  2. Schedule regular reviews and audits (internal or external) of BCM arrangements to ensure compliance and continuous improvement.
  3. Document outcomes of tests and audits and track corrective actions until closure.