

## **BS25999 Users' Workshop**

Wednesday 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2010

Leeds Civic Centre

### **Introduction**

Collaboration between the Business Continuity Institute (BCI), the British Standards Institution (BSI) and the Civil Contingencies Secretariat (CCS) of the UK Cabinet Office has enabled the development of a series of free-to-attend workshops devoted to meeting the needs of organisations currently pursuing an interest in the deployment of the British Standard for Business Continuity: BS25999. The purpose of these workshops is

1. To disseminate information relating to the clarification, deployment and effective use of BS25999 and related guidance documents.
2. To provide the means by which individuals with a professional interest in BS25999 can network with like-minded persons for the exchange of relevant knowledge, ideas and experience.
3. To develop a two-way communications channel between the BS25999 user community and the BSI Technical Committee responsible for BS25999 (BCM/1).
4. To deliver points 1 to 3 above at minimal cost to the maximum number of individual members of the user community by engagement with, and use of, existing groups and channels ... whilst maintaining appropriate levels of independence and technical quality.

The Workshop held on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2010 in Leeds was the second in the series (the first being held in London in September 2009). The BCI, BSI and CCS are especially grateful to Leeds City Council for their generous support in providing meeting facilities within the Civic Centre to accommodate the 90 participants that attended this event.

The format of the Workshop was a mix of presentations and group discussions, with delegates seated in table-groups, each with a facilitator most of whom were members of BCM/1.

This Report is a consolidation of the table-group discussions, via the facilitators, and is divided into three sections:

1. Comments prompted by the presentations.
2. Feedback from the separate discussion exercises within each table-group.
3. General feedback from the delegates and facilitators.

### **Disclaimer**

Please note that the ideas and advice summarised in the following pages are those of the participants in the Workshop and do not necessarily reflect the views of any of the sponsoring organisations. The organisers and sponsors of this Workshop cannot accept responsibility for any decisions made as a result of reading this Report and would always recommend that professional advice is sought before undertaking the development of a business continuity management system.

## Section 1 – Comments prompted by the Presentations

The Workshop was built around four presentations, all of which can be downloaded from the BCI Workshops website at [www.thebci.org/workshopresources.html](http://www.thebci.org/workshopresources.html).

### 1.1 Case Study – Eddie Hill MBCI, Head of Business Continuity, Shop Direct Group

Eddie's case study provided a detailed review of the journey that Home Delivery Network (part of the Shop Direct Group) is following with BS25999. Having recently achieved certification Eddie highlighted that whilst this is an important milestone it must be seen as another step on a journey of continuous improvement.

Delegates were asked to reflect on the lessons to be taken from Eddie's presentation and to consider two questions in particular. The following points are taken from the Facilitators' reports of the discussions amongst the delegates.

#### What are the benefits of adopting BS 25999?

- Provides a structured approach to BCM, providing a common framework and toolset.
- Systematic approach to BCM built around a recognised a management systems approach that drives continual improvement.
- Enables the creation of a common template for BCM and BCPs (Business Continuity Plans) when applied across multi site organisations.
- It was apparent that identifying the scope early in the process and planning the appropriate resource is the key to success. The clarity of processes, reporting structure and expectation of top management support within BS25999 ensures that the strategy is tailored to the needs of the organisation.
- Assists in building an effective crisis management response.
- A useful benchmarking tool that is recognised by all key stakeholders within the organisation; and assurance to internal management that a robust BCMS is in place.
- BS25999 provides consistency and is seen as best practice. The principles of the standard can be adopted by any or all organisations and is measurable.
- Certification confirms the robustness of BCM programme.
- BS25999 provided the ability to maintain the business competitive edge and enhance reputation.
- The case study demonstrated competitive advantage: a better chance of securing business with a big client than peers without BS25999. Although the point was made that a first priority must be to ensure that normal product / service delivery is as good as the competition.
- However, some delegates found the idea of competitive advantage harder to carry over to their own organisations. For example, does a retail bank or a hospital get more customers because it has BS25999? But, supply chain pressure is an emerging driver and a firm supplying the public sector was looking at BS25999 to meet public sector procurement requirements. Lack of certification is not yet a show-stopper for procurement, more a 'nice to have' ... but some delegates questioned for how long?
- Financial services sector firms were pursuing BCM which was aligned to BS25999 but were driven, first and foremost, by FSA regulatory requirements. Again, some struggled to see benefit of

certification unless the firm was in business-to-business supplier relationship with a larger financial services sector firms where certification may offer some level of reassurance to customers.

- The level of initial and ongoing investment highlighted by the case study was perceived as high and hard to justify without a sound business case, especially in the current economic climate. The business case for certification may be the more compelling if it offers the possibility of securing additional business rather than adding to costs in exchange for protecting existing business against very low likelihood, albeit high impact, disasters.

### **Why is certification important?**

- Helps with embedding the discipline of BCM by setting an internal goal; assists in aligning corporate objectives within staff objectives.
- Helps to raise BCM awareness at all levels and demonstrates to clients and other key stakeholders that a robust Business Continuity Management System (BCMS) is in place.
- Whilst some organisations (in particular public sector) may not see the case for BS 25999 certification at this time, they are considering pushing the requirement to key suppliers of critical services. This raises a question of credibility as a supplier ... clearly there is merit in certification as a demonstration to clients and suppliers that BCM is of high importance.
- Many organisations saw “alignment” to the Standard as more achievable in the short-term, for a variety of reasons, but recognised that this may simply be part of a step-by-step approach to certification.
- There may be an equal or greater requirement for ISO27001 as it relates to information security and has some reference to Business Continuity.
- Certification is unlikely to be taken up unless demanded by law or regulation, although the number of organisations pursuing certification would seem to contradict this view!
- If the ROI was not enough to justify going for certification (rather than alignment) then perhaps there are other factors to be considered, such as workforce motivation where a significant number of employees have been involved in the BCMS development and implementation process?
- International firms were not sure of the value of BS25999 certification for overseas operations and were minded to wait for ISO22301 as potentially more relevant and valuable. [The Workshop highlighted that BS25999 is now accepted by many non-UK administrations.]

## **1.2 Technical Briefing – Hilary Estall AMBCI, Director, Perpetual Solutions Ltd**

Developing an effective Business Impact Analysis (BIA) is central to a successful BCMS. In her presentation Hilary explained the requirements of BS25999 in respect of the BIA process.

Workshop participants were invited to reflect on Hilary’s presentation and identify the key lessons that they had identified and to summarise this by proposing “advice” to someone developing a BIA. The following points are taken from the Facilitators’ reports of the discussions amongst the delegates.

### **Key points from Hilary’s presentation.**

- Important to choose or develop an approach to developing the BIA method that suits the organisation and resource availability. Unlikely to be effective to blindly copy an approach used elsewhere. The organization should spend time planning how the BIA will be developed.

- Better understanding of the MTPD (Maximum Tolerable Period of Disruption) is required for our outsourced products and services.
- Time spent on the BIA process is time well invested.
- Important to identify impact over time; and link to recovery. The importance of the time frames used for the RTOs (Recovery Time Objectives) and MTPD
- Plan for the unexpected: especially critical services that may not be critical at the time of assessment.
- Look at activities beyond the key / critical ones as these may become critical during a disruption.
- Important to ensure that documented evidence is provided to demonstrate decision-making processes.
- Developing the BIA will involve a wide range of staff and stakeholders, at all levels.
- Sharing findings with top management: to better understand their key requirements; and to ensure that they are fully bought-in to the BC programme and the processes.
- Try looking at the BIA from an audit point of view, rather than as an involved practitioner.
- The BIA process, and the outputs, is a good means to articulate that you understand the business.
- An unresolved question is the relationship with the Scope and the desirable level of complexity, particularly where outsource partners are to be included in the analysis.

**Based on your experience and what you have learnt today, what advice would you give to someone developing a BIA with a view to meeting the requirements of BS25999?**

- Keep the BIA in perspective: too much detail and the results will be unwieldy and the task never completed. But ensure sufficient time to enable robust implementation of the BIA process.
- Make it work for your organisation: the BIA must be tailored to your needs. Keep it simple and use BS25999:2 as a checklist. Do not over complicate the process and ensure sufficient time is spent at the planning stage.
- Ensure there is a clear method of measuring impact to ensure consistency across the organisation.
- Make sure you understand the BIA yourself. This may be particularly true where you have used an external consultant to develop and populate the BIA.
- Important to identify correct and appropriate representatives within the organisation who understand the process. It will need to be discussed at the lowest level; and at the highest level.
- Ensure that there is a champion at executive level to get buy in throughout the organisation.
- Develop clear instructions on how to complete a BIA. Ask straightforward questions and avoid jargon.
- Mapping internal dependencies and “knock-on” effects is very important in a BIA. There is a balance to be drawn between accuracy and simplicity.
- When looking at your supply-chain you need to understand where you fit in your suppliers priorities in the event of a disruption.
- Recognise that it may be naïve to believe that a customer (often small) can put BCM demands on a supplier (often very large). Supplier/customer relationships can be complex and perhaps BS25999 is not sufficiently detailed in this area.

- Who decides priorities in an organisation? Decisions will need to be made based upon the outputs from the BIA and so ensure that senior management are fully conversant with the BIA processes.

### **1.3 Review of BCM/1 Development Programmes – Robin Gaddum MBCI, Senior Managing Consultant, IBM, and Wayne Harrop MBCI, Centre for Disaster Management, University of Coventry**

The session and presenters were introduced by David Adamson, the BSI Committee Manager for BS25999. The purpose of these two presentations was to explain some of the continuing work of BCM/1, the Technical Committee for BS25999.

Robin provided an overview of BS25777 which is a code of practice for ICT Continuity associated with, and building upon, BS25999 part 1.

PD25888, which addresses Business Recovery, is still in development but, again, builds upon BS25999 and provides more detailed guidance in this specific area.

Delegates, working in their table-groups, were asked to consider a number of questions relating to the presentations given by Robin and Wayne and the facilitators provided the following summaries:

#### **What, for you, were the key points from Robin's presentation on BS25777?**

- Explaining the standard
- Providing further information around Recovery Point Objectives
- It's a guidance document, but still useful.
- Awareness of the existence of the document and what it covered. It's good that there is a discipline for technical workers which may help those concerned to work more closely with the non technical side of a business. It needs to be used in conjunction with BS 25999.

#### **What, for you, were the key points from Wayne's presentation on PD25888?**

- Find out about the document and its links with BS25999.
- Recognition of the role of a Recovery Management Team.
- Situation Assessments.
- Generally, people were unaware of this document or what it covered.

#### **Why, specifically, might these additional guidance documents be important for you?**

- They will help me during development of a BCM programme.
- Provide us with recovery guidance, best practice etc.
- They will be useful to assist in the BC process and to help others not conversant with BC planning or who need assistance with it.

### **1.4 Case study - Andy Mason MBCI, Head of Business Continuity, PricewaterhouseCoopers**

The final presentation of the Workshop brought discussions full circle from the opening case study with many of the challenges being similar, but in a very different type of organisation. Once again the point

was made that certification to BS25999 is an important goal, but still just a milestone on a continuing journey.

As before, the facilitators provided feedback from the table-group discussions:

**How did this case study add to, or reinforce, what you have learnt throughout the day?**

- Reinforced the need to see if certification is right for the organisation or whether “alignment” to the standard would be a better option. Reinforced that you must make the standard work for your business and not the other way round.
- Brought home that the organisation must fully evaluate the benefits before committing time and resource to becoming certified to BS 25999.
- National level of resilience across all organisations is a positive regarding the standard and maintaining standards across the UK.
- Raising BC awareness across a big organisation with the use of an e-learning package.
- Focusing on the positive outcomes rather than thinking it is extra administration for administration's sake.
- The standard is measurable and scalable.
- Business constraints are mostly financial in terms of justifying certification.
- Good small hints and tips from different standards.
- Interesting to see the process from beginning to end and the amount of resource required.
- Read the Standard word for word!

## Section 2 – Feedback from the separate discussion exercises within each table-group

Delegates were invited to choose the table-group that they joined for the morning sessions and the same again for the afternoon. Their choice of table-group was determined by the pre-determined “big issue” that was to be discussed at that table. Each table was hosted by a Facilitator, most of whom were drawn from the BCM/1 Technical Committee.

The following notes have been provided by the Facilitators and serve to summarise the discussions around each of the “big issues”.

For newcomers to BCM, what guidance does BS25999 provide in respect of how we should structure our plans and the level of detail needed for our organisation?

- BS 25999 provides sufficient high level guidance on the content and structure of BC and incident management plans and the level of detail required. However BS25999 is not prescriptive and does not provide specific guidance on how to apply this within your own organisation or sector.
- If the goal is to ensure that where more than one BCP exists (and in some cases many BCP's exist for large and complex organisations) then they should be integrated. At the Workshop, this was seen as an objective that no one organisation represented felt they had this sufficiently well covered. Could this be an area where further help is needed?
- Always worth looking to other similar organisations for examples of plans and then tailor them to the needs of your organisation.
- Use a common template for plans across multi-site organisations and provide help and guidance to staff at these sites re the completion of the plans. This can be written guidance, workshops, one-to-one help and advice.
- Look at what you already have in terms of DR (Disaster Recovery) plans etc. Some very good procedures and plans may already be in place.
- General view that detail should be in BCP's and IMP's (Incident Management Plans) but long term recovery plans should be kept relatively blank. An impact assessment following a major incident will establish the content of this plan. Note it was recognised that PD25888 could provide further help with this category of plan.
- Critical to establishing good and effective plans was to ensure that they were regularly exercised, updated and maintained as outlined in BS25999 and that the results of any invocations were also fed back in to the process.
- Above all plans should be kept simple and the contents should be communicated as part of the BCM education programme. Note the content of plans and the responsibilities of individuals should be well known so that in the event of a minor or major incident individuals know what they need to do.
- Overall the aim should be to establish practical, relevant plans that are embedded in the organisation and are ultimately fully integrated.

We have chosen "alignment with BS25999" rather than certification. How can we demonstrate to our stakeholders that we are no less resilient as a result?

- First, the Workshop concluded that there are different interpretations of "alignment" and "compliant" and these require clarification that might lead to a clearer understanding. There is a need for standard terminology and there was a suggestion that it would help if BCI or BSI developed a glossary, which included various definitions such as "alignment", "compliance" and "certification".
- Some public sector organisations use peer reviews which helps them identify shortcomings in their business continuity planning. However, there were challenges to this from a quality management point of view.
- Some organisations reported using their own interpretation when implementing the standard within their respective organisations but they still faced the same dilemma around certification and alignment.
- Consider "peer assessment" utilising auditor skills within the organisation.
- Establishing clarity on internal auditing processes and links with internal performance management checklist for providers, suppliers and stakeholders.

We have decided to pursue BS25999 certification. What will be our major challenges; and how can we best prepare ourselves?

- Delegates could see the value of alignment to BS25999 but foresaw particular difficulties with persuading top management to buy in to the costs of a certification and compliance programme unless there was a clear and tangible financial net benefit. So, the immediate challenges that must be faced can be summarised as follows ...
  - Quantifying the amount of effort involved to become certified;
  - Identifying the benefits to the organisation and overcoming the cost objections;
  - Maintaining momentum (and funding) after the initial implementation;
  - Fulfilling every requirement of the standard even where it appears to contradict company requirements.
- Education and awareness for the entire organisation are crucial, providing a clear understanding of what and why certification is being undertaken.
- The benefits of taking action on these challenges will be that they will focus the organisation in deciding whether certification to BS 25999 is appropriate and worthwhile ... or whether "alignment" is sufficient to meet the needs.

BS25999 (Clause 3.2.4) requires that we ensure the competency of our BCM personnel. What does this mean in terms of job descriptions, training, assessment, etc...?

- In attempting to answer this question the following must be considered ...

- What do we mean by competent and to whom does it apply? Is there a suitable measure of competence?
- BCM practitioners running the programme will need one level of skills/knowledge whereas junior team members and/or part-time BCM administrators may need a different level of competence.
- Attending a training course is clearly valuable but is not, in itself, a measure of competence.
- The BCI Grades provide a good measure of competence for BCM professionals but they are not really appropriate as measures of competence for the junior staff or part-time managers.
- Senior Managers often had no understanding of BCM but were making decisions about it and so an accepted specification of competency requirements is especially important. An example in the public sector was where budgets were re-assigned to emergency planning because of lack of understanding of differences between BCM and Emergency Planning.
- The National Occupational Standards (NOS) might be helpful.  
Visit [www.skillsforjustice-nosfinder.com/aboutnos.php](http://www.skillsforjustice-nosfinder.com/aboutnos.php) for further information.
- Cost of training courses was raised as a potential barrier, especially for the public sector given that training is potentially required at all levels. Training from the EPC (Emergency Planning College) was considered to be too emergency planning centred and BCI accredited training may not be within the budget for most public sector personnel.  
E-Learning packages might usefully be considered, for example ...  
[www.thebcicertificate.org/elearning.html](http://www.thebcicertificate.org/elearning.html)
- Most organisations did not appear to address BCM in orientation training programmes; nor were BCM requirements typically included in job descriptions or performance objectives. Strongly suggested that these may be the starting points for improving competency.

How does BS25999 meet the requirements of legislation (such as the Civil Contingencies Act (CCA)), regulators (such as the FSA) or other formal obligations (such as Health & Safety)?

- A comparison with H&S legislation suggests two distinct perspectives ...
  - First, a distinct parallel between the two in that breach of either could affect the welfare of people both in and outside the organisation.
  - Second, a view that H&S was a matter of “life and death” which therefore requires a legislative basis for enforcement; whereas business continuity is predominantly about the financial well-being of the organisation and should be a decision for the management of the organisation and not subject to legislation.
- The question of whether or not to pursue certification was dominated by the economic case to the partial exclusion of other possible motivations, such as the need for legal or regulatory compliance. Other than possible implied expectations of the CCA there appeared little appetite for extending any statutory requirements to include business continuity arrangements.
- However, following through this debate led to the realisation that if one considers the number and size of organisations that are subject to the CCA, and the requirement for them to ensure that their critical suppliers have “adequate” Business Continuity Management Systems, it is likely that pressure will be applied to these companies and in turn to their suppliers, to comply to some standard. There was a belief that this “ripple effect” could be considerable.

- The contribution of an effective BC Management System to corporate resilience – and hence to addressing issues of corporate responsibility with respect to “duty of care” – appears not to be fully understood within many organisations still thinking in terms of the much simpler BCP as the product of the development process.

For a relatively small organisation, what will be the up-front and on-going costs and resource requirements of adopting BS25999? How can we justify this investment?

- Consider first the extent to which the organisation wishes to deploy BS25999: from simple consideration of the principles, through alignment, to formal certification. However, once the organisation is truly aligned with BS25999, the step to certification should not be ‘too’ expensive if it is then expected (demanded?) by customers or regulatory bodies.
- Further considerations that underpin the question of cost include ...
  - In spite of reservations about the value of certification, most organisations were still looking at costs and the ROI of going for certification.
  - Need to be really clear about the drivers for smaller organisations: customer expectations; prestige; competitive advantage; resilience; employee motivation; ...
  - Will BS25999 ever be mandatory? Or how strong must recommended practice be to have similar influence?
  - What case can be made in order to persuade the organisation to pay for something that might be seen as intangible?
- Organisations were at many different stages in the development of their BCM programmes and there was discussion around the different types of costs that would be incurred. For example, are BCM team expenses already covered and so should we be looking only at the costs of alignment and/or certification, to BS25999.
- The major cost of certification was perceived as the fees charged by the certification body and this may be misleading if many hours of effort are required in order to comply and conform to BS25999.
- Some of the specific costs to be considered include:
  - Cost of staff's time to draw up the plan
  - Cost of developing to the selected strategy.
  - Costs for gap analysis
  - Cost of certification body to come in and audit.
  - Continuing costs to maintain certification.
  - Who are the BS25999 certification bodies? See below.
  - Reputational importance (and value) for having BCM, especially in the public sector.
  - What is the cost of NOT having BS25999?
  - Alignment may, sometimes, be of more value than certification.
  - RTO involving the holistic approach to suppliers/customers

- Public vs. private - different drivers
- Find an angle and use it
- Loss avoidance; business efficiency improvements.
- How are different organisations are approaching the process?
- What experience can be gleaned from other organisations?
- What might be the benefits of taking action on each of these learning points?
  - Enhances, and gives credibility to, the BC work already been undertaken.
  - Even if we choose to “align” (rather than going for certification) there is, presumably, still a cost associated with demonstrating the completeness of our “alignment”.
  - Would we enjoy lower business interruption insurance premiums?
  - What is the “value” of staff motivation? With so many people involved in the BCM programme, the costs may be relatively modest compared to the psychological boost to performance.
  - Achieving something worthwhile and of added value to the company's reputation.
  - That, when we rewrite our plans we look to align it with the BSI standard in case there becomes a requirement to take up certification.
- A full and up-to-date list of certification bodies, accredited by UKAS, can be found on the following web-site ...  
[www.ukas.com/about-accreditation/accredited-bodies/certification-body-schedules-BCM.asp](http://www.ukas.com/about-accreditation/accredited-bodies/certification-body-schedules-BCM.asp)

We are a large and widely distributed organisation. How should we structure our BCM team(s) in order to facilitate the adoption of BS25999 throughout the organisation and with a view to applying for certification?

- First, what do we mean by a BCM team?
  - BCM is everyone's responsibility (for which awareness is a prerequisite) but with a core team driving it.
  - The scope of the BCM needs to be defined in order to define the team/s.
  - Teams in large organisations can be geographically organised, however it is possible to exclude non critical locations.
  - The team structure could be based on activities with critical activities prioritised.
  - Team inclusions may be based on staff/resource availability.
  - A lead team could be established as a pilot. A framework could then be established that could be transferred across sites.
  - There is a requirement that team members have a predefined level of BCM competency.
  - BCM implementers may or may not be the same people as those involved in incident response teams.
- What experience did the Workshop participants have in structuring BCM teams?

- Need to consider cultural differences across the range of locations.
- Locations can be in different time zones and team structure should account for that.
- BCM teams drive the programme but the business does the bulk of the work.
- Central control of documentation.
- BCM teams/structure aligned with internal regulation.
- Some have experienced budgeting issues in relation to contributions from non-participating (i.e. non critical) departments. They need to be aware of indirect benefits of the programme.
- Working groups/pilots have been used successfully.
- Need to account for cost/time spent on BCM.
- Senior management approved performance targets help focus the teams and others who are involved.
- Top management should be involved in the structure for decision making capacity and to ensure objectives are met.
- Use of actual issues/disruptions as means of selecting/training team members and as impetus for others to get involved.
- What further advice from Workshop participants?
  - Ensure that a consistent approach is adopted – avoid planning in silos.
  - The executive should sign off on all key milestones of the implementation.
  - The business owns their BCM, whilst the BCM team own the management system.
  - Include top management in the BCM structure.
  - Run a pilot then introduce the BCMS to other areas step by step, but consider culture, language, outputs that differ across sites.
  - Delegate authority where possible to local BCM teams.
  - Assess available resources at the outset and build framework around what's available (assuming budgets don't allow for additional resource).
  - Run awareness sessions to create a common level of understanding. Make sure the sessions are regular and the people/processes are visible.
  - Have a committee at the top and BC managers (may not be sole responsibility) within areas/regions, then practitioners at local level.
  - Install a robust emergency communications network. This could include a mix of e-mail, landline, and mobile communications.
  - An adaptable solution is required to accommodate different needs, but with a central framework.

### Section 3: General Feedback from the Delegates and Facilitators.

#### Alignment vs. Certification

- The two case studies gave an idea of how people have found the certification process and may strike a chord with some of those people who are currently going through the process. However, it was very interesting to see that the majority of delegates were considering aligning their BCM arrangements to the standard as opposed to going for full certification and so perhaps next time, one of the case studies could be about a company who is working to “align” themselves to BS25999.
- The question now is where do we take this User Group next? There is obviously an appetite for the subject but perhaps it needs to broaden out and acknowledge that there are several more users than just those looking for certification. This was certainly what I took away from the day and I think that there is potential to create an independent “verification” process for organisations which are looking to self assess and self certify.
- A straw poll with my groups produced an overwhelming show of hands in favour of “alignment” rather than certification. Can something be done to develop the concept of self certification but which offers some form of recognised benchmark or performance level to the outside world if/when a company wished to go public on their “alignment to BS25999” status?
- A majority of the delegates indicated that they did not feel there was a need for certification but that alignment would suffice. The question arose as to what “alignment” is and the value of alignment vs. third-party certification. Clearly the cost and impact of certification was paramount.

#### Too many standards?

- PDCA (Plan Do Check Act) model is useful in providing consistency across the management system standards; however, there are now many such standards. The correlation table of standards in Annex A (in the NHS version as well as BS25999) is helpful. While only a couple of people currently had more than one MS standard, the importance of liaising with those responsible for the ISO27001 and ISO14001 standards when preparing for audits was noted. There is a need to rationalize standards, especially amongst corporations. A useful web site can be found at:  
[www.iso.org/iso/iso\\_catalogue/management\\_standards/understand\\_the\\_basics.htm](http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_catalogue/management_standards/understand_the_basics.htm)
- The number of standards and their interrelationship was confusing and unclear to many, e.g. specification versus code of practice; BS25999's relationship to BS25777; PAS or PD. Also, are we producing too many and is there are market desire for them all?
- There are too many different standards emerging: they are unnecessary and confusing. There was some support for BS25777 but confusion about whether you could certify against it rather than BS25999 if you business was really purely IT related.

#### More on Standards

- In the same way as ISO9000 does not guarantee quality but rather demonstrates a quality management system, BS25999 does not guarantee business continuity. The standard may be much strengthened by adding a requirement for a 'capability statement', reviewed and signed off annually by top management, which describes in broad terms the continuity arrangements in place for its products and services, the level of impact the business accepts on its products and services in a major disaster, the implications for customers and the sorts of events that are not being planned for, e.g. outbreak of war, where the residual risk is accepted (and is by implication reviewed annually as part of producing this statement). This would serve to keep top management accountable, engaged and

central to reviewing whether the level of investment in continuity and residual risk remain appropriate.

- There was concern regarding the development and significance of ISO 22301. It appears that many organizations will not embrace the national standard pending the publication and review of the ISO. Would it be cheaper to certify to the ISO? What would the cost be to make a transition from one to the other? Clarification would be helpful.

**Views on BS25999; and drivers for adopting BS25999.**

- BS25999 should include everything that is needed. In particular, there was no justification seen for the Business Recovery PD. The other PD's were seen only as helpful guides and should not be promoted or sold by BSI as part of the standard itself.
- Of significance, "understanding your organization / improving efficiency" was not mentioned as a benefit to adopting BS25999. While satisfying legislation, competitive edge, assurance to suppliers, etc. were mentioned, the benefit of understanding the organization is not recognized except by those involved in certification.
- Overall, the level of BC competence and familiarity with BS25999 was much higher than the first Workshop (London, 2009). Those attending had a more specific objective rather than simply information gathering and I met only one person who said he was not familiar with the standard. Others seemed concerned that the requirements of the standard would be imposed on their organizations.
- It is naïve to believe that a customer (often small) can put BCM demands on a supplier (often very large). The nature of supplier/customer relationship is complex and BS25999 may be too simplistic.
- There was strong representation from CCA Cat1 organisations, from financial services sector firms and those in their supply chains. This may suggest that regulation and legislation are still the main drivers of interest in the standard, followed by supply chain pressures within those sectors. On this occasion, regulation, legislation and customer expectations might appear to trump the value of standards for their own sake!

end