Level 4

ESTABLISHING A BCMS

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Management Commitment | 4 | BCM Steering Committee formally established with documented meetings held regularly and minutes. | Strong leadership engagement; formalized governance structure supports BCM oversight. | Meetings documented but may lack consistency in agenda focus or stakeholder engagement. | Opportunity to enhance meeting effectiveness and stakeholder participation. | Strengthen meeting agendas to focus on strategic BCM topics; increase engagement of wider stakeholders. |
| BCM Policy | 4 | Approved BCM Policy is in place and communicated to relevant parties. | Clear organizational commitment via documented policy. | Policy may not be reviewed frequently or communicated regularly. | Policy review cycles and communication strategies may not be fully implemented. | Establish formal periodic policy reviews; enhance awareness campaigns on BCM Policy across the org. |
| Governance Structure | 4 | Roles & responsibilities of Steering Committee clearly defined and members formally appointed. | Well-defined governance framework ensuring accountability and role clarity. | Some members may not fully understand their responsibilities or lack BCM training. | Training and onboarding for committee members could be improved. | Implement regular BCM training for committee members; develop onboarding material to clarify roles. |
| BCM Charter | 4 | Documented and approved BCM Charter guides the program. | Formal charter provides foundation for BCM activities. | Charter may be high-level without detailed operational guidance. | Charter could be expanded to include operational-level detail for teams. | Update BCM Charter to include more specific operational guidelines and success metrics. |
| BCM Manager/Coordinator | 4 | BCM Manager appointed with clearly documented roles and responsibilities. | Dedicated resource ensures BCM program coordination and accountability. | Role may be stretched without adequate support or resources. | Potential resource constraints; limited delegation. | Assess workload and resource needs; consider additional support roles or cross-training. |
| BCM Teams | 4 | Business Continuity Teams, Emergency Response, Crisis Management, Disaster Recovery Teams appointed. | Comprehensive team structure enables effective BCM execution across disciplines. | Team members might lack regular BCM training or exercises. | Lack of consistent training and practical exercises for teams. | Schedule regular training and simulation exercises for all BCM teams to maintain readiness. |
| BCM Champions | 4 | Champions appointed for each business unit supporting BCM culture. | Good penetration of BCM awareness and support across the organization. | Champions’ BCM responsibilities may be secondary to their primary roles. | Champions may have limited time or capacity to fully support BCM initiatives. | Formalize BCM Champion role with clear expectations and time allocation; provide training and recognition. |
| Business Continuity Plan (BCP) | 4 | Approved BCP exists and is accessible. | Comprehensive plans ensure readiness to respond to disruptions. | Plans may not be tested frequently or updated with lessons learned. | Testing frequency and update processes could be improved. | Conduct more frequent BCP testing; incorporate test results into plan updates for continuous improvement. |
| BCM Budget | 4 | Specific BCM budget allocated annually. | Dedicated budget supports BCM activities and resources. | Budget may not fully cover emerging risks or all BCM initiatives. | Budget review processes may be infrequent or reactive rather than proactive. | Review budget adequacy regularly; plan for emerging risks and technological needs in budget cycles. |
| BCM Programme Work Plan | 4 | Documented work plan guides BCM implementation. | Structured approach enables coordinated BCM activities. | Work plan may not fully reflect all risk scenarios or organizational changes. | Work plan updating process may lack formal review and adjustment timelines. | Establish a formal review schedule for the BCM Programme Work Plan; align with risk assessments and changes. |

**Summary:**

The organization demonstrates a **Managed (Level 4)** maturity in establishing its BCM program, indicating formal structures, documented policies, appointed roles, and allocated resources are in place. Strengths lie in clear governance and organizational commitment. However, there are opportunities to improve in areas such as regular training, plan testing, resource allocation, and continuous updates to documentation and budgets.

EMBRACING BUSINESS CONTINUITY

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Management Commitment | 4 | BCM Steering Committee formally established with documented regular meetings and minutes. | Strong governance with formal oversight and accountability. | Some meetings may focus more on administration than strategic BCM development. | Limited engagement of broader stakeholders in governance activities. | Enhance meeting agendas to focus on strategic BCM issues; increase stakeholder engagement beyond core committee. |
| BCM Awareness & Induction | 4 | Awareness campaigns conducted; BCM included in employee induction processes. | Effective communication and integration of BCM awareness into new employee onboarding. | Awareness campaigns may lack regular refreshers or impact measurement. | Limited ongoing reinforcement post-induction for continuous awareness. | Implement periodic refresher awareness campaigns and measure impact through surveys or quizzes. |
| Competence and Skills | 4 | Key role players received BCM training; effectiveness tracked via assessments and feedback. | Structured training program with evidence of effectiveness and continuous improvement. | Training coverage may not include all relevant staff or tailored role-specific content. | Potential gaps in skills for less engaged or newly appointed team members. | Expand training scope and tailor content for different roles; track training uptake and effectiveness continuously. |
| Training & Awareness Budget | 4 | Budget allocated specifically for BCM training and awareness initiatives. | Dedicated financial support enables ongoing training and awareness activities. | Budget may be constrained relative to expanding needs or advanced training technologies. | Possible underfunding for advanced simulation or e-learning platforms. | Review budget adequacy annually and explore innovative, cost-effective training methods like e-learning. |

**Summary:**

The organization demonstrates a **Managed (Level 4)** maturity in embracing business continuity, showing formal governance, structured awareness programs, and allocated budgets for training. Strengths include integration of BCM into employee onboarding and continuous evaluation of training effectiveness. However, there is room to enhance ongoing engagement and broaden training scope to reach more personnel effectively.

ANALYSIS

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Business Impact Analysis (BIA) | 4 | Critical business activities identified and documented; detailed impact analysis performed. | Comprehensive understanding of business priorities and impacts supports effective BCM planning. | Some BIA reports may lack granularity or recent updates to reflect changing business environments. | Updates to BIA may not be scheduled frequently enough; limited integration with operational changes. | Establish a formal review cycle for BIA updates aligned with business changes; increase analysis detail where needed. |
| Recovery Objectives (RTOs & RPOs) | 4 | RTOs and RPOs clearly established for critical activities and documented. | Clear recovery targets provide measurable goals for BCM activities and recovery planning. | Recovery objectives may not be fully validated through testing or operational alignment. | Lack of alignment between recovery objectives and actual technical capabilities. | Conduct regular validation exercises to test and confirm RTOs/RPOs feasibility; update based on results. |
| Risk Assessment | 4 | Detailed BCM-related risk assessment performed and documented. | Strong risk awareness and structured approach to identifying BCM risks. | Risk assessment may not fully capture emerging or evolving risks such as cyber threats or supply chain issues. | Risk assessment scope may need expansion to include dynamic risk landscape. | Expand risk assessment scope regularly to include emerging risks; incorporate scenario-based risk testing. |

**Summary:**

The organization demonstrates a **Managed (Level 4)** maturity level in the Analysis focus area, indicating well-established BIA and risk assessment processes with clear recovery objectives. Strengths include comprehensive impact analysis and documented recovery targets. Opportunities exist to enhance the frequency and depth of BIA updates, validate recovery objectives regularly, and expand risk assessment to capture evolving risks.

**SOLUTIONS DESIGN**

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Business Continuity Strategy Development | 4 | Documented business continuity strategies align with sustaining critical activities. | Strategies clearly based on BIA and risk assessment results, ensuring relevant focus. | Some strategies may be high-level and lack detailed tactical plans for execution. | Tactical detail and scenario-specific adaptations may be insufficiently developed. | Develop detailed tactical plans supporting each strategy; incorporate scenario-based planning and testing. |
| Use of BIA and Risk Assessment | 4 | Strategy documentation references BIA and risk assessment outcomes as foundational inputs. | Strong alignment between analysis outputs and strategy formulation. | Possible delays in updating strategies when new BIA or risk data emerge. | Strategy update cycles may not be tightly integrated with analysis update processes. | Synchronize strategy reviews with BIA and risk assessment updates to ensure timely relevance. |
| Adequacy of Tactics | 4 | Tactics adopted generally address resource and service-level requirements for critical operations. | Adequate consideration given to resource allocation and service expectations. | Tactical evaluations may not fully consider emerging risks or operational changes. | Continuous monitoring of tactic effectiveness may be limited. | Implement periodic reviews and adjustments of tactics based on operational feedback and changing risk landscape. |
| Solution Implementation Planning | 4 | Funded projects exist for implementing agreed business continuity solutions. | Dedicated resources and funding ensure execution capability. | Project scope and timelines may lack transparency or comprehensive stakeholder communication. | Potential for resource allocation conflicts or project delays. | Improve project governance with clear milestones, stakeholder communication, and risk mitigation plans. |

**Summary:**

The organization is at a **Managed (Level 4)** maturity in Solutions Design, with documented strategies grounded in analysis outputs and funded implementation projects. Strengths include strong alignment between strategy and analysis, and funded plans for execution. To advance, more detailed tactical planning, synchronized update cycles, continuous monitoring, and improved project governance are recommended.

ENABLING SOLUTIONS

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Incident Response | 4 | Documented incident response structure exists and is communicated. | Clear, formalized incident response framework supports timely and coordinated reactions. | Incident response roles and responsibilities may lack recent updates or practical exercises. | Potential lack of regular testing and refresher training for incident response teams. | Schedule regular incident response drills; update documentation to reflect organizational changes. |
| Business Continuity Plan (BCP) | 4 | Approved and up-to-date BCP is maintained and accessible. | Comprehensive plan covers critical business processes and recovery strategies. | Plan may not be tested frequently or incorporate latest risk insights. | Testing frequency and incorporation of lessons learned could be improved. | Conduct regular BCP testing and update plan based on outcomes and evolving risk environment. |
| Emergency Response Plan (ERP) | 4 | Emergency Response Plan is documented and integrated with overall BCM framework. | Effective ERP supports immediate response to emergencies, enhancing safety and continuity. | Coordination between ERP and other plans may need strengthening. | Integration and communication gaps between ERP and other response plans. | Enhance cross-plan coordination and conduct joint response exercises to ensure cohesive execution. |
| Disaster Recovery Plan (DRP) | 4 | Approved DRP exists to ensure IT service continuity post-incident. | Focused recovery plan minimizes IT downtime and data loss, supporting overall BCM goals. | DRP testing may be infrequent or not fully comprehensive. | Lack of regular DRP validation exercises including full disaster simulations. | Increase frequency and scope of DRP testing; include complex disaster scenarios in testing cycles. |
| Crisis Management Plan (CMP) | 4 | Crisis Management Plan documented and roles assigned. | Formal crisis management structure enhances decision-making and communication during crises. | CMP may not be regularly rehearsed or updated with recent crisis learnings. | Gaps in ongoing training and scenario-based drills for crisis management teams. | Implement regular crisis management drills and update CMP based on lessons learned and organizational changes. |
| Pandemic Response Plan | 4 | COVID-19 or equivalent pandemic response plan developed and documented. | Proactive planning for pandemics demonstrates adaptability and responsiveness to health crises. | Plan may not yet be integrated into broader BCM and continuity frameworks. | Integration and regular review of pandemic plans within overall BCM may be insufficient. | Integrate pandemic response into BCM plans; conduct periodic reviews and updates reflecting evolving health risks. |

**Summary:**

The organization maintains a **Managed (Level 4)** maturity across Enabling Solutions with formally documented plans covering incident response, business continuity, emergency response, disaster recovery, crisis management, and pandemic response. Strengths include comprehensive documentation and structured frameworks. To improve, the organization should focus on enhancing testing frequencies, cross-plan integration, and scenario-based training to ensure plans remain effective and up-to-date.

VALIDATION

| **Focus Area** | **Maturity Level** | **Observations** | **Strengths** | **Weaknesses** | **Gaps** | **Recommendations** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exercising and Testing | 4 | Established and documented programme for exercising and testing BCM arrangements is in place. | Structured testing schedule ensures BCM plans and teams are regularly evaluated and improved. | Some exercises may be limited in scope or scenario variety, focusing on common or known risks. | Limited incorporation of complex or emerging risk scenarios in test exercises. | Expand testing scenarios to include emerging risks and complex situations; increase cross-departmental involvement in exercises. |
| Review and Assurance | 4 | BCM arrangements reviewed through audits or assessments within the last 12 months. | Regular internal and external reviews provide assurance on BCM effectiveness and compliance. | Reviews may be periodic and not continuous; feedback incorporation process could be more formalized. | Lack of continuous monitoring and timely remediation tracking for audit findings. | Implement continuous monitoring mechanisms; establish formal remediation tracking and timely updates based on reviews. |

**Summary:**

The organization demonstrates a **Managed (Level 4)** maturity level in Validation, with a formal program for exercising and testing BCM plans and recent internal/external reviews. Strengths include regular assurance activities and structured test programmes. To enhance maturity, the organization should diversify testing scenarios to cover emerging risks and improve continuous monitoring and feedback integration.