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Foreword

BCI

Thank you for your interest in the Organizational Resilience: Perspectives from the Industry report. Whether you are an experienced resilience professional or new to the subject, I am confident the report will feed your curiosity and provide practical insights.

I’ve been discussing the concept of Organizational Resilience with colleagues in Australia and around the world since 2009. Much of the last decade was taken up trying to define what Organizational Resilience is and agree how it relates to the various contributing disciplines including business continuity management. Thankfully that debate was largely settled through the publication of ISO 22316: Societal Security – Guidelines for organizational resilience (2017) and the BCI’s Position Statement on OR (2016).

The discussion has now moved on to consider how organizations can best implement the OR concepts to realise the promised benefits while addressing the inevitable practical challenges along the way. Put another way; the organizational resilience focus has shifted away from the ‘what’ towards the ‘how’. With this in mind, this report forms part of the BCI’s continuing contribution to the development of organizational resilience learning and understanding. We thank Sungard for their enthusiastic support that enabled the BCI to produce this report.

The Organizational Resilience: Perspectives from the Industry Report captures the responses from contributors from around the world, both BCI members and non-members, and makes use of survey results and comments provided through several detailed interviews with industry practitioners. This has ensured that the report provides practical suggestions to accompany the analytical insights.

The report shines a light on the success factors that organizations have discovered on their OR journeys as well as acknowledging some of the challenges they have encountered. Many of the findings reinforce the importance of people and culture in developing effective resilience capabilities – successful organizations understand that resilience is people-focused.

Stepping through the report, it becomes apparent that resilience is a balancing act between multiple elements within organizations. Each organization must find its own stable position. So, I hope that you find the Organizational Resilience: Perspectives from the Industry Report provides beneficial information and insights that you can put to good use in your organization’s resilience journey.

Tim Janes
Hon FBCI
Chair of the BCI
Foreword
Sungard Availability Services

I am honoured to be asked to write a foreword for this new and important research on organizational perspectives on resilience. Organizations are complex socioeconomic structures often utterly dependent on technology for both their internal functioning and external interaction. They are therefore often full of contradictions and different perspectives which provide the departure points of debate creating a crucible for innovation and growth. Different perspectives are therefore generally a good thing and the sign of a healthy vibrant organization as, in the modern, fast-paced world, complacency and group think are perhaps the fastest way to go out of business.

However, different perspective must eventually be worked out and consensus and/or compromise reached for the innovation and growth to be realised. This can take time but unfortunately, during a disruption such as a flood, fire, power outage or cyber-attack, time is of a premium.

This research looks at the range of commonly held perspectives on resilience in an organization to determine if they are currently helping or hindering its ability to respond in a positive manner to the disruptive risks they face – and the findings are quite startling. Resilience at the organizational level is, and always has been, about being able to absorb and adapt in a changing environment. However, over the past two decades the corporate risk landscape has changed from being relatively stable and punctuated with a few short sharp discontinuities associated with events such as severe weather, power outages and IT failures where the impact on the organization can be largely anticipated and plans put in place to deal with the consequences, to one that is characterised by complexity, uncertainty and risks with adversaries. The ability to successfully manage uncertainty is therefore now key to competitive advantage and one that is discussed in Board Rooms right across the globe.

This research finds that whilst it is overwhelmingly recognised that management of anticipated risks with tools such as Business Continuity, Disaster Recovery and formal Risk Management processes provide the foundation that allows the Leadership and Management of the organization the bandwidth to deal with unanticipated risks and uncertainty, a schism appears to be appearing that could threaten the role of Business Continuity within organizational resilience. The research finds that rather than recognising their foundational role and embracing uncertainty many Business Continuity professionals are uncomfortable with the uncertainty that developments such as disruptive technology, ageing infrastructure and new ways of working brings.

The second startling finding is that whilst 87.3% of respondents cite Crisis Leadership and management as key, very few organizations are investing in developing the skills and behaviours such as situational awareness, decision making under stress and action-orientated leadership that are necessary for leaders in an organization to navigate uncertainty and steer their organizations out the other side stronger and more competitive than when they went in.

Clearly, the organizational resilience crucible is red hot as the dual facets of “absorb” and “adapt” struggle to find the optimal balance in a changing world. The point is not to distinguish the fire but to harness it for the good of the organization. This important research shines a light on how to achieve this.

Dr Sandra Bell
Head of Resilience Consulting
Sungard Availability Services
Executive Summary
Organizations are preparing for disruption, but are they ready to thrive?

**ORGANIZATIONS ARE PREPARED FOR ANTICIPATED RISKS, BUT AS THE RISK LANDSCAPE GROWS INCREASINGLY COMPLEX, THEY MUST BE ABLE TO HANDLE THE UNKNOWNS**

Traditionally, the risk landscape has been stable, and this is reflected by business continuity values; an organization being able to deliver its products and services at a predefined rate relies on its external environment allowing it to do so. More than half (51.3%) indicate that ‘anticipating disruption and having tried and tested plans, processes and recovery strategies’ comes closest to their understanding of organizational resilience. However, business processes must be able to adapt to any sort of disruption for an organization to be truly resilient.

**DEPARTMENTAL ROLES MUST BE CLEARLY COMMUNICATED WITHIN CORPORATE RESILIENCE STRATEGY**

Resilience may be perceived differently within the same organization as business units/departments will focus on the tasks that make their own services resilient. This makes the definition of each business unit/department’s resilience objectives within the overall corporate resilience strategy all the more important. For an organization to thrive during disruption, employees at all levels should be working toward the same resilience goals.

**ORGANIZATIONS COULD FURTHER EMBRACE AGILE OPERATIONS**

Although more than half (50.2%) of organizations recognise that agile, yet robust, operations are one of the most important factors of their organization’s resilience, more than four in ten (43.4%) describe their direct manager’s management style in an emergency/crisis as ‘command and control’. Furthermore, only just over three fifths (61.9%) state that their KPIs are dynamic during an incident/crisis.

**STRONG LEADERSHIP IS A PILLAR OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE BUT MUST BE EMBEDDED AT ALL LEVELS**

ISO 22316 refers to leadership as a key attribute that shapes organizational resilience. However, less than a quarter (22.2%) say that decisions can be made by any employee with expertise in the area, rather than a member of management. Less than one in ten (7%) state that their organization offers executive coaching, and no respondents claimed to use stress tests to develop employees’ leadership skills.

**NOT ALL ORGANIZATIONS GO BEYOND STANDARD RISK MANAGEMENT DESPITE RISKS BEING INCREASINGLY DYNAMIC**

Most organizations monitor risk at some level but as uncertainty grows, organizations are increasingly finding it necessary to go above and beyond standard practice. Of those whose organizations monitor risks, internal risk assessments are the most common method of monitoring (78.6%), but by going beyond that to monitoring near misses and learning from incidents that disrupted to similar organizations, organizations can enhance organizational learning and increase resilience.
DO ORGANIZATIONS THINK THEY ARE PREPARED TO THRIVE DESPITE RISKS THAT COULD DISRUPT OPERATIONS?

- 56.9% Strongly agree
- 20.0% Somewhat agree
- 10.8% Neither agree nor disagree
- 9.2% Somewhat disagree
- 3.1% Strongly disagree

HOW DOES AN ORGANIZATION ENSURE ITS RESILIENCE?

- 9.0% By ensuring that the systems, processes and suppliers that support the business are reliable
- 19.2% By ensuring that the people in the organization are able to cope with change and disruption
- 51.3% By anticipating disruption and having tried and tested plans, processes and recovery strategies
- 5.1% By having a positive culture whereby, in times of stress, everyone pulls together toward a common goal
- 1.3% Don’t know
- 14.1% Other (please specify)

TOP FIVE ORGANIZATIONAL FUNCTIONS IMPORTANT TO THE FOUNDATION OF A RESILIENT ORGANIZATION

- Business continuity: 87.3%
- Crisis leadership and management: 87.3%
- IT disaster recovery: 73.4%
- Risk management: 72.2%
- Information security: 57.0%
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TOP THREE FACTORS IMPORTANT TO ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business continuity, crisis leadership and management</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong leadership</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust, yet agile, operations</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ORGANIZATIONS’ METHODS OF RISK MONITORING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My organization carries out risk assessments across business-critical processes</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization creates a risk radar to map potential risks</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization monitors incidents that happen to organizations similar to ours</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEADERSHIP DURING A CRISIS/EMERGENCY

- Command and control – my manager leads from the front, checks on us and controls actions: 43.4%
- Innovative – my manager leads from the side, trusts and delegates actions: 21.1%
- Consultative – my manager asks for our input but makes the final decision: 25.0%
- Chaotic – my manager cedes all control to staff without a plan in place: 3.9%
- I don’t know: 1.3%
- Other (please specify): 5.3%

MY ORGANIZATION ASKS “HOW EFFECTIVE IS THIS PROCESS?” NOT JUST “IS THERE A PROCESS IN PLACE?”

- Strongly agree: 41.5%
- Somewhat agree: 29.2%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 4.6%
- Somewhat disagree: 10.8%
- Strongly disagree: 1.5%
- I don’t know: 12.3%
Organizational perspective on resilience
Organizational Perspective on Resilience

- Organizations have got the anticipated risks covered (as defined by business continuity) so have a plan in place, but it’s the unknowns that pose a challenge
- Traditionally stable risk landscape is evolving as uncertainty grows
- Business continuity plans are crucial to resilience, because a resilient organization will adapt them to the situation when required

All organizations face disruption, but not all survive; only the most resilient go on to prosper. The established definition of organizational resilience is set out by ISO 22316 as “the ability of an organization to absorb and adapt in a changing environment to enable it to deliver its objectives and to survive and prosper.” This definition dominates current discussion regarding organizational resilience, and is widely accepted - but do organizations’ daily operations align with the standard?

In practice, it seems that organizations are taking a more defensive, process-based approach to resilience. Traditionally, the risk landscape has been stable, and this is reflected by business continuity values; an organization being able to deliver its products and services at a predefined rate relies on its external environment allowing it to do so. More than half (51.3%) indicate that ‘anticipating disruption and having tried and tested plans, processes and recovery strategies’ comes closest to their understanding of organizational resilience. This suggests that organizations are able to manage anticipated risks with plans and processes, though it is worth noting that these business processes must be able to adapt to any sort of disruption for an organization to be truly resilient. Encouragingly, nearly a fifth (19.2%) define organizational resilience as ‘ensuring people in the organization are able to cope with change and disruption’. Given that many organizations have mastered plans and processes behind management of anticipated disruption, it is positive that organizations are now beginning to focus on leadership and cultural aspects of resilience.

While organizations must be able to absorb and adapt in a changing environment in order to thrive and not merely survive a period of uncertainty, there will always be a critical need for plans and process. Plans and process are relied upon during anticipated disruptions and without them, organizations would have nothing to adapt during an unanticipated disruption. Respondents indicated that the business continuity function combined with crisis leadership/management are the lynchpins to enabling this environment to thrive from a functional perspective. Business continuity (87.3%), crisis leadership and management (87.3%), IT disaster recovery (73.4%) and/or risk management (72.2%) are the top five organizational functions that provide the foundation of a resilient organization.

Building on the foundation of business continuity, those interviewed indicate that the most important factors in terms of incubating a resilient environment within their organization are business continuity, crisis leadership and management (57.0%), strong leadership (53.2%) and/or robust, yet agile, operations (50.6%). As before, business continuity and leadership are perceived to be the cornerstones of resilience. The inclusion of robust yet agile operations suggests that it is recognised that in order to be resilient, organizations must be able to respond to change in an uncertain environment quickly – as is established by ISO 22316. In addition to agile operations, of the one in ten (12.7%) who specified answers outside of the answer list, just under a third (30.0%) stipulated innovation and creativity as an important factor to organizational resilience.

“Which of the below comes closest to your understanding of the term ‘organizational resilience’? ISO 22316 definition; the ability of an organization to absorb and adapt in a changing environment to enable it to deliver its objectives and to survive and prosper, where the changing environment can be either sudden or gradual and enhancing resilience is a strategic resilience goal.”

- By ensuring that the systems, processes and suppliers that support the business are reliable: 9.0%
- By ensuring that the people in the organization are able to cope with change and disruption: 19.2%
- By anticipating disruption and having tried and tested plans, processes and recovery strategies: 51.3%
- By having a positive culture whereby, in times of stress, everyone pulls together toward a common goal: 5.1%
- Don’t know: 1.3%
- Other (please specify): 14.1%

Figure 1. Understanding of the term ‘organizational resilience’, in %
What are the top five organizational functions you consider important to the foundation of a resilient organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crisis leadership and management</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business continuity</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT disaster recovery</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information security</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency communications</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High availability services</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical security</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong HR presence</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press releases</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Top five organizational functions considered important to the foundation of a resilient organization, in %
Please choose your top three factors in terms of importance to your organization’s resilience?

- Business continuity, crisis leadership and management: 57.0%
- Strong leadership: 53.2%
- Robust, yet agile, operations: 50.6%
- Effective communications and knowledge sharing: 40.5%
- Positive culture: 32.9%
- IT service continuity: 25.3%
- Effective partnerships and relationships: 24.1%
- Employee engagement: 17.7%

Figure 3. Top three factors in terms of importance to organizations’ resilience, in %
RESILIENCE ROADBLOCKS: BARRIERS TO PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATION

- Over half (59.0%) report that perspectives on organizational resilience vary from department to department
- More than a third (37.1%) believe that alignment of actions during a crisis could be improved
- Organizational resilience should be championed by top level management

Organizational resilience can be interpreted differently within the same organization, highlighting that departments with different expertise approach resilience differently. Perspectives on organizational resilience do not always align when compared across departments; less than a quarter (23.1%) report that there is no variation between departments, while more than half (59.0%) state that it varies to some extent. More than one in ten (14.1%) say that it varies significantly, and a similar proportion (11.5%) have not been made aware of other departments’ perspectives. Silos across organizations and are expected as different departments must focus on making their own services resilient. Although silos do allow efficiency by specialisation, to be resilient, organizations must be able to adapt. Thus, each department have a responsibility to both their own services and to the organization as a whole. It is this responsibility that needs to be defined, as well as a common corporate objective.

Encouragingly, organizations are becoming aware of these cross-departmental differences and are looking at ways to promote a more cohesive corporate strategy. For example, one organization is carrying out a policy review of its global business continuity and IT disaster recovery policy. By changing terminology within the current policies to reflect the wording of business resilience drivers and philosophies, the organization aims to influence functions throughout the organization and change daily conversation. Changing conversations within organizations is an established method to slowly influence organizational culture and day to day activities of employees.2

“We have a joined up view of what we think resilience means, but what we don’t yet have is a joined up view of how we will go about implementing it.”

(Business continuity professional, Financial services)

---

How does your department’s perspective on your organization’s resilience vary if compared to other departments within your organization?

- 23.1% It does not vary
- 44.9% It varies somewhat
- 14.1% It varies significantly
- 11.5% I have never been made aware of other departments’ perspectives on our organization’s resilience goals
- 6.4% I don’t know

Figure 4. Variation of departmental perspective on their organization’s resilience when compared to other departments within their organizations, in %
As further evidence that organizations are promoting a more cohesive resilience strategy, more than half (57.1%) of those surveyed prefer that the actions of everyone in their organization are aligned when managing risks that have the potential to disrupt the organization, more than a third (37.7%) agree that alignment could be better. One risk management professional describes an IT disaster recovery test that was scheduled for the weekend, due to lack of awareness that some operating sites run all day, every day. Their interception prevented disruption of business activity, highlighting why nearly nine in ten (87.3%) perceive business continuity to be the bedrock of organizational resilience, not least because it supports correct implementation of strategy.

One way that organizations can improve alignment is to carry out organization-wide awareness building: one organization we spoke to does this by conducting an exercise with all staff during Business Continuity Awareness Week to allow employees to remind themselves of their individual responsibilities in ensuring total organizational resilience. Meanwhile, a business continuity professional in the financial services sector reports that conducting exercises has the added benefit of helping achieve executive buy-in, a crucial element of embedding resilience and raising organization-wide awareness.

When managing risks that have the potential to disrupt the organization, do you prefer that the actions of everyone in your organization are aligned?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree, but alignment could be better</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree, alignment could be much improved</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree, my department’s actions go against my organization’s resilience strategy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Preference on alignment of actions when managing risks that have the potential to disrupt the organization, in %
HOW THE BUSINESS CONTINUITY FUNCTION CAN POSITION THEMSELVES IN RELATION TO EXTERNAL BUSINESS UNITS?

In discussion-based interviews conducted by the BCI, positioning business continuity as key to resilience was recognised both as crucial to embedding organizational resilience and as difficult to achieve. We have collated the highlights from these interviews from those who have been successful in achieving this crucial buy in:

1. **SHOW THE BENEFIT OF BUSINESS CONTINUITY**

   One of the hard things is lack of information and lack of knowledge – top level management have to make decisions at a high level. The business continuity function have a lot of the information. Thanks to business continuity process, the business continuity function people have the map that is needed to navigate the organization and provide any missing information.

2. **BE FOCUSED AND CONCISE**

   As is well known, top level management are often time poor, so it is important to maximise a small amount of time and focus on what you want to achieve. Executives don’t want to know everything that you know, but they do want to hear what they need to know.

3. **ALIGN RESILIENCE WITH STRATEGY**

   Articulate plans in terms of how they fit with the organization’s overall strategy, highlighting how resilience will help the organization continue to achieve these goals while effectively managing uncertainty.

4. **TAKE A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH**

   Enable conversations about what is important to the organization that can be documented and form the basis of further plans. Although you might not be able to knock on the CEO’s door and ask for five minutes, you can talk to people who do have that access.

5. **BE VISIBLE**

   Avoid hiding behind a desk or emails. Getting out on the ‘shop floor’ helps keep observations relevant and up to date, which will help when it comes to aligning plans with the organization’s overall strategy.
3 Leadership and culture
LEADERSHIP AND CULTURE

- Management style during a crisis/emergency is most likely to be by “command and control” (43.4%)
- Although strong leadership is crucial to organizational resilience, less than one in ten (7.9%) have access to executive coaching within their organization
- None of the organizations we interviewed use stress tests to develop leadership skills

The Australian Government’s 2016 Organisational Resilience Good Business Guide warns that while an innovative culture has a positive effect on organizational performance, a ‘control’ culture can have a negative impact on organizational performance. More than two fifths (43.4%) state that the management style of their direct manager is that of command and control during a crisis. A lesser proportion (25.0%) say that it is consultative, and fewer still believe that it is innovative (21.1%). A worrying minority (4.0%) admit that their manager’s style is chaotic during an emergency, despite nearly nine in ten (87.3%) having previously named crisis leadership and management as one of the top two organizational functions that form the foundation of organizational resilience. In addition, ISO 22316 refers to effective and empowered leadership as a key attribute of organizational resilience, this indicates that some organizations must work towards achieving this at all management levels in order to align with the standard.

During an emergency or crisis, how would you describe the management style of your direct manager?

![Diagram showing management styles during an emergency or crisis](image)

- **Command and control** (43.4%): my manager leads from the front, checks on us and controls actions
- **Consultative** (25.0%): my manager asks for our input but makes the final decision
- **Innovative** (21.1%): my manager leads from the side, trusts and delegates actions
- **Chaotic** (3.9%): my manager cedes all control to staff without a plan in place
- **I don’t know** (1.3%)
- **Other (please specify)** (5.3%)
Despite more than half (53.2%) having previously named leadership as being important in terms of their organization’s resilience, less than one in ten (7.9%) say that their organization has executive coaching in place to develop staff leadership skills. One business continuity professional from the financial services sector referred to a power outage incident where people who were expected to step up to help manage the situation, did not do so. While this suggests a lack of understanding of individual roles within the business continuity plan, it also highlights why strong leadership and decision making skills must be embedded throughout an organization in order to achieve total organizational resilience.

“If I talk to a person, team, a department, operation or site, they see their responsibilities as ending at the department door/site gate.”

(Risk management professional, Manufacturing)

When considering strategies that their organization has in place to develop leadership skills, respondents name tailored development plans (26.3%), situational awareness training (23.7%) or mentoring programmes (18.4%) as strategies currently in place. Crucially, none of those surveyed report that their organization performs stress tests to develop leadership skills. Stress tests are an established way for organizations to optimise their risk management and increase resilience by testing relationships and identifying organizational vulnerabilities in a safe environment. In addition, just over one in ten (10.5%) do not know what strategies their organization has in place to develop leadership, suggesting that organizations could improve communication of these strategies to their employees.

4 Organizations’ management of uncertainty
Organizations’ Management of Uncertainty

- No blame culture is likely to be promoted but not enforced
- Organizations monitor risks that can be anticipated with formal risk management processes, but must also monitor uncertainty
- Risk management as a discipline is key to organizational resilience
- Without monitoring uncertainty, organizations may miss opportunities to catch disruption early on

Establishing a no blame culture can enhance organizational learning, thereby increasing resilience.⁵ Although some organizations promote a no blame culture, the reality for many is that it is not enforced. Only a third (33.3%) report that their organization both promotes and enforces a no blame culture. In contrast, nearly half (48.7%) of those surveyed state that although a no blame culture is promoted by their organization, it is not enforced. At a sectoral level, this is most reported by banking and financial services (63.6%). A business continuity professional working in the financial services sector reports “at least two specific incidents where someone has done something wrong, not out of malice or ineptitude, but making a decision and enacting an approach that under pressure went wrong and they got fired.” Enforcing a no blame culture allows organizations to identify gaps in processes or knowledge that may later lead to disruptive incidents. If organizations could then address these gaps, these learnings could be used to increase overall resilience.

Many organizations that promote and enforce a no blame culture do so by encouraging reporting. A risk management professional from the manufacturing sector confirms that their organization encourages “reporting of insolence, injuries, things that go wrong and customer complaints so that we can put in place corrective actions and prevent things from happening again in the future.” In fact, within that particular organization, not reporting or hiding an incident would be considered gross misconduct.

For organizations who are looking to implement a no blame culture, it can begin with changes to language used to discuss incidents. In 2017, the NHS conducted practice focus groups on the topic of ‘Just culture’ with participants from organizations that staff reported treated staff involved in an error, near miss or incident fairly. One behaviour that supported the successful implementation of a no blame culture was language; they were not setting up “investigations” but “conversations”, not “taking a statement” but “getting their views”.⁶

“I’d love to say that we have a no blame culture and that our people always look forward. But I think things going wrong always stays in others’ memories.”

(Risk management professional, Manufacturing)

---


Does your organization promote and enforce a no blame culture when a mistake happens?

- **33.3%** Yes, it is promoted and enforced
- **48.7%** Somewhat, a no blame culture is promoted but not enforced
- **11.5%** No, a no blame culture is not promoted or enforced
- **6.4%** I don’t know

**Figure 8. Organizations’ promotion and enforcement of a no blame culture when a mistake happens, in %**

**Figure 8B. Organizations’ promotion and enforcement of a no blame culture when a mistake happens by company size, in %**
ANTICIPATING DISRUPTION: ORGANIZATIONS MUST MANAGE ENVIRONMENT OF UNCERTAINTY

Risk management (72.2%) is one of the top five organizational functions that comprise the foundation of a resilient organization, and the majority (90.8%) of those surveyed state that their organization monitors potential risks to business operations and strategic aims. Organizations monitor risk by carrying out risk assessments across business-critical processes (78.6%) which may be seen as standard risk management practice. Yet fewer state that their organization monitors risk by creating a risk radar to monitor potential risks (51.4%) and/or monitoring incidents that happen to organizations similar to their own (42.9%). This suggests that although some organizations recognise that in order to anticipate and prepare for disruption they must go beyond standard risk management, others could improve how their organization anticipates and prepares for uncertainty. As creating a risk radar will most likely require involvement from various departments, its creation can help prevent inter-departmental silos occurring. In follow-up interviews conducted by the BCI, one risk management professional from the third sector mentioned that their risk radar is “a human process and very people-driven.” By having individual conversations with those in the executive leadership team, shared opinions on uncertainty and risks can be documented and any that are not can be further discussed when the group meet collectively.

Less than half of respondents (42.9%) state that their organization goes beyond standard risk management to monitor incidents that happen to organizations similar to their own, suggesting that over half of organizations could potentially overlook risks not encountered before. One risk management professional from the manufacturing sector explains how sharing learnings from a disruptive incident another organization faced raised awareness of potential risk, highlighting how taking a less siloed approach to risk management can increase resilience: “We had a short circuit recorded in a battery charger. It was just a minor thing, nothing went wrong afterward. However, I shared the example of another organization’s warehouse burning down and the team realised that it could have been more serious.”

Learning from other organizations’ incidents also keeps organizations aware of the threats their own organization might face. An operations management professional from the IT sector reports that they actively learn from issues which affect customers:

“The bad guys are incredibly clever and slick and they spend their lives focusing on trying to get in, so my Head of IT always says “You run to stand still.” You’re constantly improving, if only to stand still to stay as you are.”

(Risk management professional, Charity/Not for profit)
Although organizations may not have access to first-hand customer experiences, discussion-based interviews conducted by the BCI indicate that members attend BCI forum events and other networking events to stay abreast of any threats or new developments that may influence their organization. Additionally, some organizations make use of reports such as the BCI Horizon Scan or business networking tools such as LinkedIn to track trends and raise awareness of new threats or industry developments.

**If yes, how does your organization carry it out? Please select as many as apply**

- My organization carries out risk assessments across business-critical processes: 78.6%
- My organization creates a risk radar to map potential risks: 51.4%
- My organization monitors incidents that happen to organizations similar to ours: 42.9%
- Other (please specify): 4.3%

**Figure 9. How organizations monitor potential risks to business operations and strategic aims, in %**
Encouragingly, just over eight in ten (80.3%) indicate that their organization currently reports or plans to report on operational near misses. However, not all organizations go beyond conventional risk management by reporting on near misses: just under two in ten (19.7%) report that their organization does not have a process in place for reporting on near misses. One organization in the manufacturing sector that monitors near misses reported to us that there are more than 100,000 a year. The reported near misses are used as improvement opportunities and acting on the data also offers an opportunity for silos to be broken down as the incidents occur across the organization.

An organization that the BCI spoke to in the IT sector revealed that their organization is planning to introduce reporting on near misses in the next six months, but that the difficult part is defining what is a near miss and what is not. To tackle this, the organization is planning to start with a wide definition of what is categorised as a near miss, and will narrow the definition as the organization learns.

**Does your organization have a process for reporting on operational near misses, or is it planning to introduce one in the future? Please do not consider a ‘near miss’ to apply to health and safety issues, but to mean an incident that could have disrupted business activity and/or performance but was avoided/did not occur as assumed.**

- **59.2%** Yes, my organization has a process in place for reporting on near misses
- **14.5%** Yes, my organization is in the process of introducing reporting on near misses
- **6.6%** No, but my organization is planning to introduce a process for reporting on near misses in the future
- **14.5%** No, my organization does not have a process in place for reporting on near misses
- **5.3%** No, there is no process for reporting on near misses and no plans to introduce this
- **0.0%** I don’t know

*Figure 10. Organizations’ processes for reporting on operational near misses, in %*
COORDINATING REMOTE WORKERS POSES A CHALLENGE TO ORGANIZATIONS

Encouragingly, most organizations have a reporting structure which enables top level management to have visibility of the daily operations of frontline staff. Nearly half (48.4%) of staff regularly report to line managers who report to top level management, whilst 14.1% of respondents report that top management regularly reach out directly to frontline staff. However, there were some slightly concerning figures raised in the findings: over a third of respondents (37.5%) indicated that reporting to top level management only happens if an incident has occurred, whilst a 10.9% claim that top level management were totally unaware of the daily operations of frontline staff.

As might be expected due to the agile nature of smaller organizations, more than a third (35.7%) of SMEs report that top-level management regularly reaches out directly to frontline staff for reports on daily operations, also not a single respondent indicated that top level management were unaware of the daily operations of frontline staff. Conversely, exactly half (50.0%) of respondents from large organizations have top level management that is unaware of how frontline staff view daily operations and only 12.0% have frontline staff regularly report to top-level management either directly or through line managers. The effects of not engaging with frontline staff are already well documented: a 2017 Gallup survey indicated that better engagement with frontline staff leads to a 41% decrease in absenteeism, a 17% increase in productivity, a 24% decrease in staff turnover and a 21% increase in profitability – all aspects which make a tangible difference to the resilience of an organization.

One SME in the information technology sector is meeting the challenge that remote working poses to a resilient workplace culture by ensuring that all staff report directly to top level management. As the organization grows, it is striving to keep the start-up feel of face-to-face contact by implementing monthly catch ups with a member of top-level management, which can also be conducted with staff working remotely. These catch ups are made a priority; top level management keep an afternoon free in their calendar to dedicate to frontline staff, and endeavour to always honour any slots booked.

“Out of hours support teams are not based in the same building as me. So it’s not as easy as me walking around and walking the floor and saying, ‘how is everybody doing today?”

(Operations Manager, Information Technology)

**How do frontline staff report to top level management about daily operations in your organization? Please select as many as apply**

- Frontline staff regularly report to line managers who in turn report to top level management: 48.4%
- Frontline staff regularly report to line managers who only report to top level management if an incident has occurred: 37.5%
- Top level management regularly reach out directly to frontline staff for reports on daily operations: 14.1%
- Top level management are unaware about how frontline staff view daily operations: 10.9%
- Other (please specify): 4.7%

*Figure 11. How frontline staff report to top level management about daily operations, in %*
Preparing staff for disruption is crucial to organizational resilience. Nearly all (95.3%) organizations report that they use different methods to ensure staff are prepared for a potentially disruptive incident and other threats. Organizations use a variety of methods to prepare staff, with the most common being continuous staff education and training on business continuity and disaster recovery arrangements (42.6%). This is followed by scenario exercising (16.4%), ensuring staff are equipped with action-oriented decision-making skills and feel empowered to act when appropriate (14.8%), and running tabletop exercises (8.2%). Encouragingly, 70.0% of the 11.5% of respondents who answered “other” to this question said they use all the options available to prepare their staff for disruptive incidents.

Does your organization use any method/s to ensure that its staff are prepared for a potentially disruptive incident and other threats?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous staff education and training</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario exercising</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring staff are equipped with skills</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running tabletop exercises</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All options available</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Whether organizations use any method/s to ensure that its staff are prepared for a potentially disruptive incident and other threats, in %
 Organizations were asked to report the proportion of their staff involved in different methods of preparations for business activity disrupting incidents. Ensuring risk awareness, continuous education and training and encouraging socialising are the most popular methods of training. Techniques such as interdepartmental wargaming, scenario rehearsals and tabletop exercising are less popular, but the fact that these techniques are still employed by over 30% of organizations demonstrates an acceptance of the effectiveness of more practical exercising.

Despite agile operations previously being named as an important factor to organizational resilience, only just over one in ten (14.8%) report that ensuring staff are equipped with action oriented decision-making skills and empowered to act when appropriate. In addition, more than a third (35.4%) state that this method of preparation only involves up to 25% of the organization, and nearly a quarter (24.6%) say that it only involves top level management.
Wargaming gives the opportunity for organizations to learn both how other organizations and their own teams respond to disruption. More than half (56.9%) of those surveyed report that wargaming occurs across their organization, although it tends to be limited to top level management (15.4%) or only involve up to 25% of the organization (27.7%). A business continuity professional from the financial services sector reports that wargames within the organization are based on “the most likely risks and threats, combined with horizon scanning. [Those organizing the workshop] develop what the risk would look like as a scenario in terms of any different impact across different areas, replication or regulatory, financial technology and so on, and this feeds into the wargames.”

![Figure 14. Proportion of organizations’ staff involved in preparation for business activity disrupting incidents, in %](image-url)

What proportion of your organization’s staff are involved in the below preparation for business activity disrupting incidents in your organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tabletop exercises</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario rehearsal</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging socialising between members of staff</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wargaming across departments</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring staff are risk aware</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring staff are equipped with action-oriented decision making skills</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous staff education and training</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAINTENANCE AND EVALUATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE

- SMEs more likely to agree that there is enough dedicated staff to ensure their organization’s resilience than large organizations
- Large organizations lag behind SMEs when it comes to questioning the effectiveness of a process
- Not all organizations conduct meaningful evaluations of resilience processes

Nearly two thirds (66.2%) of organizations agree to some extent that they have enough dedicated staff to ensure the resilience of the organization. Conversely, more than a quarter (27.7%) of organizations disagree to some extent that there is enough dedicated staff to ensure the resilience of the organization.

Large organizations are more likely not to have enough dedicated staff to ensure the resilience of the organization. More than eight in ten (85.7%) SMEs agree that there is enough dedicated staff to ensure resilience, compared to a smaller proportion (60.8%) of large organizations. A business continuity professional from a large organization in the financial services sector reports that not having enough dedicated staff means that progress is “lamentably slow”, and that more resource would mean achieving more, faster. Large organizations cannot rely on strength in numbers but should deploy dedicated staff to prevent delaying progress as well as to ensure organizational resilience.

![Figure 15. Organizations' amount of dedicated staff to ensure the resilience of the organization, in %](image)

- **15.4%** Strongly agree
- **50.8%** Somewhat agree, but the level of resource could be increased
- **6.2%** Neither agree nor disagree
- **24.6%** Disagree somewhat, there is little resource provided
- **3.1%** Strongly disagree, there is no resource provided
- **0.0%** I don’t know
More than half (51.3%) of those surveyed felt that their understanding of ‘organizational resilience’ came closest to ‘anticipating disruption and having tried and tested plans, processes and recovery strategies’. It is therefore encouraging that seven in ten (70.8%) agree that their organization asks how effective a resilience process or capability is rather than just ticking the box to show they have one in place. However, more than one in ten (15.4%) disagree, while a similar proportion (13.8%) are unsure or unaware of how resilience processes or capabilities are evaluated. The Good Practice Guidelines (GPG) 2018 advise that evaluating the effectiveness of a process is vital to its success, as it determines whether the process is current, accurate and serves its purpose effectively.

SMEs are better than large organizations at questioning whether processes are effective. All of those surveyed from SMEs report that their organization questions the effectiveness of a process, while less than two-thirds (62.7%) of those from large organizations say the same. A business continuity professional from an SME in the financial services sector reports that the BC programme is evaluated by an external auditor every three years. Comparatively, a risk management professional from a large organization in the manufacturing sector reports that although internal audits are performed, outside of health and safety audits, most do not go into anything in depth.

**Do you agree with the statement, ‘When deciding on processes and capabilities to enhance resilience, my organization asks ‘how effective is this process’ and not just ‘do we have a process in place’?**

- **Strongly agree**: 29.2%
- **Somewhat agree**: 41.5%
- **Neither agree nor disagree**: 12.3%
- **Somewhat disagree**: 10.8%
- **Strongly disagree**: 4.6%
- **I don’t know**: 1.5%

**Figure 16. Agreement with the statement “When deciding on processes and capabilities to enhance resilience, my organization asks ‘how effective is this process’ and not just ‘do we have a process in place’, in %**
Thriving despite risks that could disrupt operations or threaten the strategic aims of the organization is the essence of organizational resilience. It means that an organization has gone beyond surviving disruptions and is able to learn and grow from the negative experience. Organizations appear to be positive that they are adequately prepared to thrive despite risks, with more than three quarters (76.9%) strongly or somewhat agreeing that their organization is adequately prepared to thrive despite risk.

**Do you agree that your organization is adequately prepared to thrive despite risks that could disrupt operations or threaten the strategic aims of the business?**

- **20.0%** Strongly agree
- **56.9%** Somewhat agree
- **10.8%** Neither agree nor disagree
- **9.2%** Somewhat disagree
- **3.1%** Strongly disagree

*Figure 17. Whether organizations are adequately prepared to thrive despite risks that could disrupt operations or threaten the strategic aims of the business, in %*
Organizations’ response to disruption
AGILE RESPONSE: ORGANIZATIONS COULD INCREASE FLEXIBILITY OF DISRUPTION RESPONSES

- Decision making during a crisis often rests with management, not employees with specific expertise
- Only just over six in ten (61.9%) report dynamic KPIs during a crisis
- Even less (43.6%) organizations adapt and review current training plans after an incident

Despite strong leadership (53.2%) and agile, yet robust, operations (50.6%) being recognised as two of the most important factors to organizational resilience, decision making authority during operational disruption usually falls to a member of management rather than an employee with expertise relating to the issue. More than three quarters (77.8%) of those surveyed state that decisions fall to a management role, while under a quarter (22.2%) take the more agile approach and allow decisions to be made by a trusted employee if it falls within their expertise. This is less the case for SMEs; nearly half (46.2%) report that any member of staff can make the decision if it is within their expertise.

When the business suffers an operational disruption, which of the below best describes decision making authority within your organization?

- 39.7% Decisions are only made by top level management
- 38.1% Decisions are made by middle management
- 22.2% Decisions can be made by any member of staff if it falls within their expertise
- 0.0% I don’t know

Figure 18. Decision making authority within organizations during an operational disruption, in %
More than six in ten (61.9%) report that Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are deemed dynamic and flexible during a disruptive situation: over a third (38.1%) claim that their KPIs are dynamic and would reflect the response priorities during an incident, whilst 23.8% report that their KPIs change to reflect Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery procedures. However, a significant minority of respondents (14.3%) report that their KPIs do not change during a business disrupting incident and, conversely, 15.9% claim that KPIs become irrelevant during a business disrupting incident suggesting an environment that goes beyond that of even agile. Interestingly, respondents from the professional services industry are more likely to adapt their KPIs according to the situation with only 6.3% reporting that they remain unchanged, while more than two in ten (21.1%) of professionals from banking and finance report that they remain unchanged. This may be because banking and finance industries have tighter compliance regulations.9

“Depends on the crisis, but you have to remember, what is a major crisis for perhaps a small part of the organization, everyone else has got business as usual… Unless you’re a single site and it burns down, I guess your KPI might change.”

(Risk management professional, Manufacturing)

When analyzing organizations’ response to an incident, over 90.3% of respondents state that their organization reports on the incident to internal and external stakeholders. Whilst this high percentage is to be applauded, the 9.7% who do not report is a significant, and slightly concerning, minority. It is encouraging that a full incident debrief is carried out by 83.9% of respondents, with a similar number (82.3%) actively updating response plans to reflect on lessons learnt. Some organizations go a step further and seek to evaluate the performance of contractors and suppliers (43.6%) and analyse and adapt current training plans after an incident occurs – both symptomatic of adopting an agile strategy to resilience.

In follow-up interviews conducted by the BCI, one discussion point included how organizations ensure the resiliency of staff after an incident that may impact wellbeing. One organization has implemented the following:

“We get our support team together afterwards as a team. Even just as a team follow-up for say 10 minutes, we ask how they are all feeling. We have got a one-to-one schedule for anybody that we know has taken a difficult call or who’s been involved in it, and because some of our staff work closely with some of our customers, we have a program that lets us know when a customer has invoked so that we can follow up on it.”

(Operations Manager, Information Technology)
During a disruptive incident, does your organization undertake any of the following? Please select all that apply

- Reporting to internal and external stakeholders: 90.3%
- Debriefing on the incident and actions taken: 83.9%
- Update the organization’s response plans to reflect lessons learned: 82.3%
- Evaluate the performance of contractors and suppliers: 43.6%
- Analyse and adapt current training plans: 43.6%
- Engage an independent organization to audit response strategy and processes: 17.7%
- Other (please specify): 3.2%

Figure 20. Organizations’ response after a disruptive incident, in %
Nearly half of respondents (49.2%) believe that their top-level management advocate the importance of people and culture in their organizational resilience when communicating with staff about an incident. This is particularly highlighted by respondents from SMEs (76.9%) and organizations from the professional services industry (68.8%).

The concept of “resilience” is still a new concept to many organizations and many have yet to fully define it, which explains why just over a fifth of respondents (20.6%) answer that they are unsure how resilience is defined. Just 9.5% of respondents believe that top management communicate that resilience is process orientated after a business activity disrupting incident, demonstrating a discrepancy between how resilience is achieved vs how resilience is defined. With 87.3% of respondents rating the Business Continuity function as one of the top five functions considered important to the foundation of a resilient organization, it is clear that respondents continue to rely on process to underpin practical implementation of organizational resilience despite top level management adopting a high level approach.

“So, I think that will be the biggest part of the challenge because at the end of the day, software is easy, communications is easy, it’s what we do for a living as a business, but getting, keeping that culture running, it can only work by leading it by example. So when we do have an issue, whether it is in Spain, Paris, France, London, it’s about sharing that with everybody in the whole organization, so that the people in Paris have empathy for the people in London, and vice versa, and I think that the soft skills part of resilience will become more important than the software part of it.”

(Operations Manager, Information Technology)
After a business activity disrupting incident, which comes closest to the way that top level management communicate about the incident with the staff? Please select all that apply.

- Resilience is about processes: 9.5%
- Resilience is about people and culture: 49.2%
- Resilience is best achieved through learning: 14.3%
- I don’t know: 20.6%
- Other (please specify): 6.4%

Figure 21. Top level management’s post-incident communication about disruptive incidents with staff, in %
During follow-up interviews conducted by the BCI, it became clear that respondents are aware that the risk landscape is changing toward uncertainty. Top-level management are comfortable with handling uncertainty. Business continuity and risk management professionals must therefore ensure that they embrace uncertainty or risk being left off of the future organizational resilience agenda. Though the risk landscape is developing, there is only so much that is within the organization’s control – anything outside of that must be handled in the moment. Areas of uncertainty on the horizon may also offer opportunities for development and positive change. The BCI has collated concerns that respondents revealed are on their roadmap:
1. Aging Technology Infrastructure

Members are concerned about the challenge that legacy infrastructure poses and how it threatens progress towards organizational resilience, however it may also be seen as a transformation opportunity for organizations and a chance to use new technology to approach business processes differently.

“What I’ve seen commonplace throughout certainly the financial services industry is a legacy infrastructure. This is essentially the core of most of the banking infrastructure of the UK and therefore presents an issue as you can’t swap it out easily because it’s essentially the beating heart of the organization. You’ve also got newer and more up-to-date products and services and applications changing off of the old infrastructure which makes you even more dependent on it instead of trying to wean off it.”

Business continuity professional, Financial Services

2. Disruptive Technology

Organizations are beginning to take AI and robots into account when horizon scanning. A member in the financial services sector raised a concern that as processes become more automated and outsourced, uncertainty will increase. Another member from the IT sector mentioned that Blockchain is very much on their radar as their customers are already requesting that data be sent in an encrypted format. However, not all members are early adopters; one member from the manufacturing sector mentioned that their organization is waiting for the technology to be better established before adopting.

3. Remote Working

Remote working presents a challenge to organizational resilience as distance can mean that organizations lose the “family feel”, as noted by an operations manager in the IT sector who said keeping teamwork despite workers being based remotely is high on their organizational resilience priority list.

“[What] we would like it to have is everybody working together well, when they’re spread over different time zones, different locations, and they’ve got different first languages, because a lot of what we’re talking about in terms of resilience isn’t about technology. It’s about people being able to help other team members, and teams being able to work together, and that’s tricky when we’re all working remotely.”

Operations manager, Information Technology

4. No Blame Culture

No blame cultures increase organizational resilience through encouraging reporting and enhanced learning. In addition, a no blame culture would help encourage collaboration and prevent a defensive approach. However, although organizations often promote no blame cultures, human nature means that mistakes are not soon forgotten unless the organization has a very high turnover. However, one way that an organization in the manufacturing sector supports its promotion of no blame culture is through encouraging full reporting.

“Just general mistakes? Okay, everyone makes mistakes. But deliberately covering up something is seen as very serious.”

Risk management professional, Manufacturing
6 Annex
Total number of respondents: 87
Number of sectors: 12
Number of countries: 19

Number of employees:
- 1-250: 23.0%
- 251-500: 6.9%
- 1,001 – 5,000: 24.1%
- 5,001 – 10,000: 11.5%
- 10,001 – 50,000: 24.1%
- 50,001 – 100,000: 4.6%
- More than 100,000: 5.7%
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