Level 2

Establishing a BCMS

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Management Commitment** | 2 | BCM Steering Committee exists with formal ToR and meetings held, but processes are still informal and inconsistent | Committee formally established; meetings documented | Meetings may lack consistent follow-up and effectiveness | Lack of formalized processes for ensuring continuous engagement and accountability | Formalize BCM Steering Committee processes, enhance meeting structure, and introduce follow-up mechanisms |
| **BCM Policy** | 2 | Approved BCM Policy is in place but implementation and awareness are limited | Policy documented and approved | Limited communication and enforcement across the organization | Need for awareness programs and regular policy reviews | Conduct BCM policy awareness sessions; establish regular policy review and update cycles |
| **Governance Structure** | 2 | Roles and responsibilities are defined, committee members appointed, and meetings recorded | Clear roles and appointments; records maintained | Governance is not fully embedded across all levels | Strengthen accountability and integration of governance roles | Expand governance structure to include cross-functional roles and increase role clarity |
| **BCM Charter** | 2 | BCM Charter documented and approved but not actively referenced or integrated | Charter formalized | Low usage and integration into daily BCM activities | Need to promote the BCM Charter as a guiding document | Increase communication and training on the BCM Charter importance and usage |
| **BCM Manager/Coordinator** | 2 | BCM Manager/Coordinator appointed with defined roles but limited authority or resources | Formal appointment and role clarity | Limited empowerment and resource allocation | Empower BCM Coordinator with authority and resources | Provide BCM Coordinator with sufficient authority and dedicated resources to perform effectively |
| **BCM Teams** | 2 | Teams (Business Continuity, Emergency Response, Crisis Management, Disaster Recovery) established and appointed | Teams formally appointed | Limited coordination and training among teams | Enhance inter-team communication and joint exercises | Schedule regular joint training and simulation exercises to improve coordination |
| **BCM Champions** | 2 | Champions appointed in each business unit but engagement is sporadic | Champions identified | Champions lack consistent involvement and support | Increase BCM Champion engagement and support | Develop BCM Champion training and engagement programs |
| **Business Continuity Plan (BCP)** | 2 | Approved BCP exists but is not fully tested or updated regularly | Plan developed and approved | Testing and updates are inconsistent | Establish regular BCP testing and update schedule | Implement regular BCP testing, maintenance, and continuous improvement cycles |
| **BCM Budget** | 2 | Budget allocated for BCM activities but may be insufficient or not clearly tracked | Budget provision in place | Budget adequacy and tracking issues | Improve budget planning and monitoring | Review and adjust budget allocations to ensure adequate funding; implement budget tracking |
| **BCM Programme Work Plan** | 2 | Work Plan exists but execution and monitoring are inconsistent | Work Plan documented | Execution lacks rigor and progress tracking | Strengthen work plan management and progress monitoring | Establish clear milestones, responsibilities, and regular progress reviews |

**Summary:**  
The organization demonstrates foundational BCM structures and processes (maturity level 2 - Repeatable), with formal appointments, policies, and plans documented. However, these are not consistently applied or embedded throughout the organization. There is a need for stronger governance, enhanced communication, regular testing, and empowerment of roles.

Embracing Business Continuity

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Management Commitment** | 2 | BCM Steering Committee meetings are held and documented, but governance activities are informal | Formal committee meetings and documentation in place | Governance lacks full formalization and active oversight | Need for stronger formal governance and clearer accountability | Strengthen BCM Steering Committee governance with formalized charters and regular performance reviews |
| **BCM Awareness & Induction** | 2 | BCM awareness campaigns conducted; awareness included in induction but with limited reach | Awareness campaigns and induction inclusion implemented | Awareness efforts are inconsistent and coverage across employees is incomplete | Improve consistency and coverage of BCM awareness and induction programs | Expand BCM awareness campaigns, embed BCM more firmly into all employee induction and onboarding processes |
| **Competence and Skills** | 2 | Key role players received BCM training; evidence of training effectiveness exists but limited | Training records maintained; initial effectiveness measured | Training depth, frequency, and post-training follow-up are insufficient | Enhance ongoing training and evaluation mechanisms | Develop continuous BCM training programs with assessments and refresher sessions |
| **Training & Awareness Budget** | 2 | Budget allocated for BCM training and awareness but may be limited or inconsistently applied | Budget provision secured for BCM training activities | Budget tracking and adequacy not fully monitored or optimized | Improve budget allocation and monitoring processes | Regularly review and adjust BCM training budget; ensure transparency and alignment with program needs |

**Summary:**  
The organization shows repeatable practices in embracing business continuity, including formal committee meetings, initial awareness campaigns, training efforts, and budget allocation. However, the implementation is inconsistent, and programs lack full formalization, continuous improvement, and comprehensive coverage.

Analysis

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Business Impact Analysis (BIA)** | 2 | Key critical activities identified; impact analysis performed but lacks depth and consistency | Critical activities documented; initial impact analysis done | BIA process is informal and inconsistently applied; impact analysis lacks detailed quantification | Need for standardized BIA methodology and more detailed analysis | Develop a formal, repeatable BIA process with standardized templates and consistent application |
|  |  | Recovery Time Objectives (RTOs) and Recovery Point Objectives (RPOs) are documented but not fully validated | RTOs and RPOs established | RTOs/RPOs may lack alignment with actual business needs and are rarely tested | Require validation and alignment of RTOs/RPOs with business priorities | Review and validate RTOs and RPOs regularly; integrate testing to ensure realistic recovery targets |
| **Risk Assessment** | 2 | BCM-related risk assessment performed but lacks comprehensive coverage and formal risk treatment plans | Risk assessment exists and identifies BCM risks | Risk assessment scope is limited; risk treatment and mitigation plans are not well-developed | Expand risk assessment scope and establish formal risk treatment plans | Implement a comprehensive risk management process aligned to BCM including formalized risk treatment and review |

**Summary:**

The organization has established foundational analysis activities such as BIA and risk assessment at a repeatable level. However, these processes are informal, lack consistency, and need formalization and deeper integration with business priorities. Improvements are required in standardizing the BIA process, validating recovery objectives, and expanding risk management coverage to enhance BCM effectiveness.

**Solutions Design**

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Business Continuity Strategy Development** | 2 | Business continuity strategies exist and are documented but are basic and not consistently linked to BIA and risk assessment results | Strategies identified and documented | Strategies lack strong linkage to analysis outcomes; may not fully address all critical needs | Need for systematic integration of BIA and risk assessment outcomes into strategy development | Formalize process to align strategies explicitly with BIA and risk assessment results; enhance strategy depth |
|  |  | Tactics are adopted to address resource and service requirements but evaluation is informal or incomplete | Initial tactics implemented | Tactics may not fully meet all service/resource needs; evaluation is ad hoc | Establish robust evaluation of tactics against requirements | Develop formal evaluation criteria for tactics to ensure resource and service-level adequacy |
| **Solution Implementation Planning** | 2 | Some projects exist with funding allocated for solution implementation but lack comprehensive planning and tracking | Funding and projects in place | Projects may lack clear timelines, scope, or resource allocation clarity | Improve project planning, funding oversight, and progress monitoring | Create detailed project plans with milestones, resource allocation, and regular status reporting |

**Summary:**

The organization has established foundational business continuity strategies and solution implementation planning at a repeatable level. While strategies and projects exist with some documented funding, they lack comprehensive integration with analysis results and rigorous planning or evaluation processes. Strengthening formal alignment and oversight will improve BCM solution effectiveness.

**Enabling Solutions**

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Incident Response** | 2 | Documented incident response structure exists but is basic and inconsistently applied | Incident response roles and structure documented | Incident response process lacks formal activation criteria and coordination mechanisms | Need to formalize incident response triggers and improve coordination between teams | Develop detailed incident response procedures including clear triggers and escalation paths |
| **Business Continuity Plan (BCP)** | 2 | Approved BCP exists but is infrequently reviewed and lacks regular testing | BCP documented and approved | Plan updates and testing are irregular; staff awareness of plan content is limited | Establish routine plan review and comprehensive testing schedule | Schedule regular BCP reviews, updates, and testing; conduct awareness training for all staff |
| **Emergency Response Plan (ERP)** | 2 | Emergency Response Plan is in place but is not fully integrated with other response plans | ERP documented | Limited integration with crisis and disaster recovery plans; response roles not fully defined | Improve ERP integration and clarity of roles | Align ERP with other BCM plans and clarify roles and responsibilities |
| **Disaster Recovery Plan (DRP)** | 2 | Approved DRP for IT continuity exists but lacks recent updates and testing | DRP documented and approved | Testing of DRP is sporadic; alignment with business priorities may be weak | Increase frequency of DRP testing and update cycles | Conduct regular DRP testing and review to ensure IT recovery meets business needs |
| **Crisis Management Plan (CMP)** | 2 | Crisis Management Plan documented but rarely exercised or reviewed | CMP formalized and documented | Exercises and reviews are insufficient; unclear roles and decision-making authority | Enhance CMP exercises and clarify management roles | Implement regular CMP simulations and update plan with clear authority delegation |
| **Pandemic Response Plan** | 2 | COVID-19 or similar pandemic response plan developed but not fully integrated with BCM framework | Pandemic response plan documented | Limited ongoing updates or integration into broader BCM strategy | Integrate pandemic planning into BCM and update regularly | Align pandemic response with overall BCM program; review and update plan based on lessons learned |

**Summary:**

The organization has foundational enabling solutions documented at a repeatable level, including incident response, continuity, emergency, disaster recovery, crisis management, and pandemic plans. However, these plans require formalization through integration, regular review, testing, and staff awareness to ensure operational readiness and resilience.

Validation

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Exercising and Testing** | 2 | An exercising and testing programme exists but is informal, inconsistently applied, and lacks full documentation | Basic testing and exercises are conducted | Testing frequency, scope, and documentation are irregular; limited variety of test types | Establish a formal, comprehensive testing programme covering all BCM elements | Develop a structured exercising and testing schedule with diverse test types and clear documentation practices |
| **Review and Assurance** | 2 | BCM arrangements have been reviewed through internal audits or self-assessments, but irregularly and without formal follow-up | Some review activity conducted | Reviews lack formal schedules, scope, and corrective action tracking | Implement regular, documented reviews with follow-up actions | Schedule periodic internal and external audits; formalize review processes and track remediation actions |

**Summary:**

The organization has foundational validation activities at a repeatable maturity level, with some exercising/testing and review efforts underway. However, these activities lack formal structure, consistency, and comprehensive documentation. Formalizing and expanding the scope and frequency of validation activities will enhance BCM assurance and continuous improvement.