



CabinetOffice

**Government Response to the Public
Consultation on the Revised Guidance on**

**Business Continuity Management under
the Civil Contingencies Act 2004**

Introduction

1. *Emergency Preparedness* is the statutory guidance relating to Part I of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 and its supporting regulations. As part of the Civil Contingencies Act Enhancement Programme (CCAEP), the guidance is being updated to introduce greater clarity and to reflect new practices and arrangements. These changes are aimed at better supporting responders to fulfil their duties under the Act.
2. This chapter has been updated to bring it in line with the industry standard BS25999, which is recognised as national best practice.
3. The changes have been based upon views expressed by Category 1 responders and other stakeholders.
4. Chapter 6 has not been designed as a step-by-step guide but provides a framework for the design, implementation and maintenance of Category 1 responders “business continuity management promotion systems”.
5. The consultation, which ran from Wednesday 6th July to Tuesday 27th September 2011, was announced on the CCS Gateway and made available on the Cabinet Office UK resilience website and the National Resilience website. The maximum number of respondents who answered any question regarding BCM within the consultation was 61, this is out of a total of 86.
6. As illustrated by the below table (Table 1), 61 separate organisations responded to the questions on *Chapter 6 Business Continuity Management*.

Table 1: Organisations which responded to the consultation by CCA category

CCA Category	Class	Number
Category 1 responders	Environment Agency	1
	Fire and Rescue Services	8
	Local Authority	20
	NHS	4
	Police Forces	2
Category 2 responders	Transport organisations	2
	Utilities	7
Voluntary Sector		2
Individual		2
Government Department		0
Other	Associations	4
	Regulators	0
	Local Resilience Forums	9

The detailed list of organisations is shown in Annex A.

Table 2: Responses to the Consultation

No.	Question	Yes % (Number)	No % (Number)	No opinion/Don't Know % (Number)
1	Is the revised guidance sufficiently clear to allow responders to fulfil their own business continuity duties?	83.6 (51)	8.2 (5)	8.2 (5)
2	Do you consider that aligning the chapter guidance to the British Standard (25999) is helpful?	78.7 (48)	11.5 (7)	9.9 (4)
3	Do you think the additional information on exercising and testing will be helpful in encouraging more organisations to look at this area?	71.7 (43)	5.0 (3)	23.3 (14)
4	Is there anything further that you would like to see in the chapter, in particular in relation to raising awareness of BCM?	18.6 (11)	64.4 (38)	17.0 (10)

Summary

- 84 per cent of respondents indicated that the revised guidance was sufficiently clear to allow responders to fulfil their own business continuity duties.
- The alignment of the chapter guidance to the British Standard (25999) was seen as helpful by 79 per cent of respondents.
- 72 per cent of respondents thought the additional information on exercising and testing will be helpful in encouraging more organisations to look at this area.
- Finally 64 per cent of respondents indicated that there was nothing further that they would like to see in the chapter.

Detailed Responses

Q - Is the revised guidance sufficiently clear to allow responders to fulfil their own business continuity duties?

- The majority of respondents stated that the revised guidance was sufficiently clear, and one responder went further and stated that it was now clear to those who have responsibility in Category 1 and 2 organisations but are not experts in the field.
- One responder stated that the chapter was clear, concise and broken down into appropriate levels of subsections, and the diagrams help to reinforce and simplify the text.

- A concern was raised that the chapter was too detailed, with the majority of information being available through other sources. This information has been provided within the chapter on the basis that not all responders will have easy access to all the information needed and the chapter provides responders with a starting point.
- One respondent commented that the main focus of the document is on the responsibilities of Category 1 responders. While the document does acknowledge the importance of the supply chain, they would have liked to see a greater emphasis on this, and particularly the responsibilities of Category 2 responders under the Act. They believed that, at present, this continued to pose a problem to BCM planners and materially impacted on the ability of the public sector to meet the needs of communities. This may be an issue that can be explored in the forthcoming Good Practice Sharing discussion forum on the National Resilience Extranet.

Q - Do you consider that aligning the chapter guidance to the British Standard (25999) is helpful?

- There were mixed views expressed as to whether the alignment of the chapter guidance to the British Standard would be helpful.
- One respondent felt the standard may be too prescriptive and over-complicated, and another response indicated that the wording was open to interpretation as to how much effort the LA put into it.
- A number of respondents raised the concern that the possible introduction of two international standards on Business Continuity (ISO 22301 and ISO 22313) will make some of the information in the guidance obsolete or incomplete. Responders should note that publication of these two standards has not been agreed. However, the early indication is that, if published, they will not be substantively different from the British Standard BS25999, parts 1 and 2. Therefore, alignment with the British Standards will not only provide a good basis for BCM but at this stage, also appear to align with forthcoming international standards.
- However the remaining comments were positive; one respondent stated that referencing BS25999 within the statutory guidance will encourage organisations to use the standard and using the framework will enable organisations to effectively create and implement a BCMS.
- Respondents sought reassurance that certification was not, and would not become, mandatory. The industry standard BS25999, is recognised as national best practice. By following the guidance provided in the chapter, responders will be able to align their BCM arrangements to BS25999. Certification is not necessary to fulfil obligations in this regard but may be considered by some organisations.

Q - Do you think the additional information on exercising and testing will be helpful in encouraging more organisations to look at this area?

- The majority of responders (72 per cent) indicated that the additional information would be helpful in encouraging more organisations to look at Business Continuity Management.
- It was felt that the chapter emphasised the importance of exercising and testing however the guidance remains flexible.
- The emphasis given to exercising plans and highlighting that they cannot be validated until exercised was welcomed.
- One response stated that it would be useful to include additional information on setting objectives for exercising and testing. However, as this chapter is designed to be a flexible framework for creating BCPs, providing information on setting up objectives would be too prescriptive.
- A respondent highlighted that the BSI committee that developed BS 25999, had developed additional guidance on 'exercising and testing' in the form of PD 25666. This guidance has been referenced in this chapter.
- One respondent thought the new proposals were predicated on the assumption that almost all LRF members would have reasonably comprehensive business planning arrangements in place to support exercising and testing, but felt that this was not always the case. Another felt that information sharing between responders was not as good as it should be and that this could be a block on progress in this area.

Q - Is there anything further that you would like to see in the chapter, in particular in relation to raising awareness of BCM?

- The majority of responses indicated that there was nothing further that they wanted to see in the chapter relating to raising awareness of BCM.
- Two respondents felt that engagement of senior management, as well as an emphasis on BCM being an integral part of every managers role, should be strengthened. Another respondent emphasised that staff should be engaged in the development, review and testing of plans in order to raise awareness.
- One respondent stated they currently have to purchase guidance directly from the BSI and that additional guidance on how to prepare business impact analysis and BC plans would be helpful. Cabinet Office will be publishing a book in the 'dummies guide' series on BCM in late spring 2012 and this will provide advice on these topics and much more.
- The omission of Category 2s in the chapter was felt to be detrimental by one respondent, while another indicated they would like to see the Chamber of Commerce cited as official level 3 responders.
- Further use of case studies, as well as signposting to organisations where implementation had been successful, was requested. Both of these will be available on the National Resilience Extranet early in 2012.

Q - Is there anything further that you would like to see in Chapter 6?

- A number of minor factual errors were highlighted and these have been corrected.

- Other suggestions which were accepted and implemented included standardising wording such as the use of 'critical functions' instead of 'key functions', adding emphasis or clarity to specific terms such as emergency or *disruption*.
- Links to the BSI website, which offers further information on BS25999 and PD25666, has been included, as have details of the proposed new International Standards Organisation ISO 22301 and ISO 22313.

List of Respondents

Anglian Water Services Ltd
ATOC Ltd. (Association of Train Operating Companies)
Bedfordshire & Luton Local Resilience Forum (BLLRF)
Birmingham City Council
Bradford Council
Bristol Water plc
British Standards Institute
Cheshire local resilience forum
City of London Police
Cleveland Emergency Planning Unit and LRF
Continuity Forum
Cornwall Council
County Durham and Darlington Local Resilience Forum
East Staffordshire Borough Council
East Sussex Fire and Rescue Service
Emergency Planning Shared Service Rotherham and Sheffield
Emergency Planning Society - West Midlands Branch
Environment Agency
Great Ormond Street Hospital
Hampshire Fire and Rescue Service
Health Protection Agency
Heathrow Travel Care
Hereford & Worcester Fire and Rescue Service
Hertfordshire County Council
Highways Agency
Humber Emergency Planning Service (joint local authority team)
International Association of Emergency Managers (IAEM)
Lancashire County Council
Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service (LFRS)
Lancashire Resilience Forum Business Continuity Sub Group, employed by
Blackpool Council
London Borough of Barnet
London Borough of Hillingdon
London Fire Brigade
Manchester City Council
Merseyside Fire & Rescue Service
Metropolitan Police Service
National Grid
Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd
NHS Sussex
NHS Sussex (Sussex PCT Cluster)
North Yorkshire County Council Emergency Planning Unit. Also on behalf of:
NYCC Health and Adult Services and City of York Council EPU
North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service

Northumbrian Water Limited
Oxfordshire County Council
Plymouth City Council
Private individual
South Yorkshire Local Resilience Forum
Southampton City Council Emergency Planning Unit
Southern Water Services Ltd
Staffordshire Civil Contingencies Unit (CCU)
Suffolk Resilience Forum
Surrey County Council
Sussex Resilience Forum
Thurrock Council
United Utilities
Water UK
West Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service
West Yorkshire Resilience Forum
Worcestershire County Council