

# Business Continuity Management

Patrick Woodman

chartered

management

institute

*inspiring leaders*

May 2006



Civil Contingencies Secretariat

Cabinet Office

In association with

**Continuity  
Forum**



# Introduction

---

Business Continuity Management is a recognised part of the UK's preparations for the possible threats posed to business, whether from internal systems failures or external emergencies such as terrorism, infectious disease or natural disasters. The Civil Contingencies Act 2004 recognises this by requiring frontline emergency responders to maintain internal Business Continuity Management (BCM) arrangements and, from May 2006, to promote BCM to business and voluntary organisations in their communities.

BCM may be defined as:

*"A management process that helps manage the risks to the smooth running of an organisation or delivery of a service, ensuring that it can operate to the extent required in the event of a disruption." \**

The Chartered Management Institute has conducted new research into BCM in conjunction with the Continuity Forum and the Civil Contingencies Secretariat within the Cabinet Office. This is the seventh survey that the Institute has undertaken on BCM since 1999.

The objectives of the research were to explore the awareness of BCM among managers and the extent of its uptake by their organisations. It aims to identify changes over time from earlier Institute research. The research points to the main causes of business disruption over the past twelve months and helps managers to share good practice, using the results to improve understanding of Business Continuity issues and improve resilience. In addition, this survey assessed the extent of preparations of a possible influenza pandemic, reflecting widespread concerns at the start of 2006.

The research took place in March 2006. The views of 1,150 managers were obtained from a questionnaire sent to a stratified sample of 10,000 individual Institute members by post and by email. Responses were received from managers in all regions and sectors of the UK, all sizes of organisation, and at all levels of management seniority.

\* "Emergency Preparedness" – Government Guidance on Part 1 of the Civil Contingencies Act, November 2005.

# 1. The Extent of Business Continuity Management

## 1.1 The extent of BCM

The number of organisations that have a Business Continuity Plan (BCP) covering their critical business activities stands at 49 per cent. This is marginally down on last year's figure of 51 per cent but continues to reflect the gradual rise of BCM, compared to 45 per cent in 2002.

Business Continuity Management is considerably more widespread in large organisations. Just 40 per cent of small organisations (under 50 employees) have BCPs, compared to 62 per cent of organisations with over 1,000 employees.

Major differences also exist between sectors. Some 74 per cent of managers working in finance and insurance report that their organisations have BCPs, while the utilities sector is second highest at 69 per cent. The lowest numbers of managers reporting that their organisations have BCPs are in the construction, business services and consultancy sectors.

## 1.2 External drivers of BCM

Corporate governance was again the most commonly identified driver of Business Continuity Management, and has almost doubled since 2002. Fifty-six per cent of managers in public sector organisations and 52 per cent in PLCs cite it as a key driver of BCM, compared to 29 per cent of managers in private companies.

Customer demand remains the second most common driver. Central government and legislation have both overtaken insurers as a driver, with central government cited by 66 per cent of public sector managers. The Civil Contingencies Act is adding to this push, requiring BCM to be adopted by local responders such as emergency services and local authorities.

| <b>Base: 1150 respondents (2006)</b> | <b>2002 %</b> | <b>2003 %</b> | <b>2004 %</b> | <b>2005 %</b> | <b>2006 %</b> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Corporate governance                 | 22            | 26            | 24            | 34            | 40            |
| Existing customers                   | 36            | 30            | 30            | 24            | 31            |
| Legislation                          | -             | -             | -             | 22            | 28            |
| Central government                   | 24            | 15            | 14            | 22            | 27            |
| Insurers                             | 12            | 25            | 22            | 25            | 25            |
| Auditors                             | 14            | 15            | 15            | 20            | 23            |
| Regulators                           | -             | 17            | 18            | 19            | 23            |
| Potential customers                  | 29            | 22            | 21            | 16            | 22            |
| Investors                            | 9             | 6             | 5             | 9             | 9             |
| Suppliers                            | 9             | 6             | 6             | 4             | 5             |
| Not looked at BCM                    | -             | 7             | 25            | 17            | 16            |
| Don't know                           | 12            | 6             | 5             | 5             | 5             |

**Table 1:** External drivers of BCM, 2002-2006

## 2. Disruptions: Perceptions and Experiences

### 2.1 Events causing disruption in the past year

Loss of IT was once again the disruption most commonly experienced by managers in the previous year. One noticeable fall was in flood/high winds, reflecting the absence of major storms as experienced in the UK in 2004-5.

| Base: 1150 respondents (2006)                 | 2002 % | 2003 % | 2004 % | 2005 % | 2006 % |
|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Loss of IT                                    | 19     | 24     | 25     | 41     | 38     |
| Loss of people                                | -      | 26     | 20     | 28     | 29     |
| Loss of telecommunications                    | -      | -      | 23     | 28     | 24     |
| Loss of skills                                | 33     | 16     | 14     | 20     | 19     |
| Utility outage e.g. power, water, gas         | -      | -      | -      | 28     | 19     |
| Negative publicity/coverage                   | 24     | 17     | 16     | 17     | 16     |
| Employee health and safety incident           | 13     | 9      | 8      | 19     | 13     |
| Loss of (access to) site                      | 5      | 5      | 6      | 11     | 13     |
| Supply chain disruption                       | 19     | 11     | 12     | 10     | 10     |
| Flood/high winds                              | 18     | 15     | 10     | 18     | 9      |
| Damage to corporate image/reputation/brand    | 15     | 7      | 8      | 11     | 8      |
| Pressure group protest                        | 10     | 7      | 7      | 6      | 7      |
| Customer health/product safety issue/incident | 11     | 6      | 4      | 6      | 6      |
| Industrial action                             | -      | -      | -      | 5      | 6      |
| Environmental incident                        | 9      | 5      | 4      | 7      | 5      |
| Fire  | 6      | 5      | 5      | 5      | 5      |
| Terrorist damage                              | 2      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 3      |

**Table 2:** Disruptions experienced in the previous year, 2002-2006

### 2.2 Impact of specific emergencies

Managers were asked how far specific emergencies during the last two years had affected their organisation's operations. The responses illustrate knock-on effects across the economy far beyond the immediate localised impacts. In the case of Buncefield, for instance, some respondents explained that outsource suppliers such as payroll functions had been damaged by the blast.

| Base: 1150                   | No impact % | Negligible effect % | Minor disruption % | Significant disruption % |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| London bombings in July 2005 | 39          | 24                  | 26                 | 10                       |
| Buncefield oil explosion     | 61          | 22                  | 11                 | 3                        |
| Asian Tsunami                | 70          | 17                  | 7                  | 2                        |
| Pakistan earthquake          | 77          | 15                  | 5                  | 1                        |

**Table 3:** Disruption caused by specific incidents

### 2.3 Disruptions: perception of threats

All respondents were asked what would sort of disruptions would have a significant impact on their costs and revenues. Loss of IT remained the most commonly perceived threat to organisations' operations, reflecting the frequency of its occurrence. Loss of telecommunications was the second most commonly perceived threat, identified by 56 per cent, as was loss of people.

Most scores are slightly lower than in previous years. This is paralleled by slightly lower scores for events reported to have actually caused disruption in the past year (see Table 3 on previous page).

| Base: 1150 respondents (2006)              | 1999 % | 2001 % | 2002 % | 2003 % | 2004 % | 2005 % | 2006 % | 2006 %<br>BCP covers |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----------------------|
| Loss of IT                                 | 78     | 82     | 46     | 58     | 60     | 70     | 67     | 67                   |
| Loss of telecommunications                 | -      | -      | -      | -      | 62     | 64     | 56     | 63                   |
| Loss of people                             | -      | -      | -      | 54     | 48     | 55     | 56     | 51                   |
| Loss of (access to) site                   | 33     | 55     | 32     | 54     | 51     | 53     | 54     | 61                   |
| Loss of skills                             | 37     | 59     | 43     | 51     | 48     | 56     | 49     | 40                   |
| Utility outage e.g. power, water, gas      | -      | -      | -      | -      | -      | 50     | 45     | 51                   |
| Fire                                       | 45     | 62     | 32     | 51     | 53     | 56     | 44     | 55                   |
| Terrorist damage                           | 22     | 30     | 23     | 47     | 48     | 53     | 44     | 45                   |
| Damage to corporate image/brand/reputation | 41     | 50     | 40     | 46     | 48     | 48     | 39     | 26                   |
| Negative publicity/coverage                | 34     | 43     | 37     | 45     | 46     | 44     | 34     | 28                   |
| Employee health and safety incident        | 22     | 30     | 22     | 35     | 34     | 35     | 30     | 41                   |
| Supply chain disruption                    | -      | -      | 25     | 34     | 32     | 35     | 28     | 27                   |
| Environmental incident                     | 20     | 19     | 19     | 26     | 23     | 35     | 27     | 42                   |
| Flood/high winds                           | 18     | 29     | 9      | 24     | 25     | 29     | 26     | 42                   |
| Customer health/product safety             | 19     | 21     | 22     | 25     | 26     | 27     | 26     | 22                   |
| Industrial action                          | -      | -      | -      | -      | -      | 27     | 22     | 20                   |
| Pressure group protest                     | 7      | 14     | 9      | 14     | 27     | 20     | 16     | 16                   |

**Table 4:** Disruptions which would have a significant impact on costs and revenues 1999-2006

The right-hand column indicates which threats are covered by BCPs among those organisations which have a plan in place. As in previous years, loss of IT tops the table, with preparations also widespread for loss of telecommunications and loss of access to site. Only 51 per cent of those with BCPs have planned for a loss of people.

### 2.4 Potential impact of a human influenza pandemic

In the light of Government assessments of the likely impact of a human influenza pandemic on business, respondents were asked what effect 15 per cent staff illness and absenteeism rates over the 2-3 week peak of a pandemic would have on their organisation. The impact on organisations, and thus the economy, would evidently be severe: 92 per cent of managers said it would result in moderate or severe disruption to their operations.

**Table 5:** Impact of 15 per cent absenteeism and illness rates

| <b>Base: 1150</b>                     | <b>%</b> |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| No or negligible levels of disruption | 8        |
| Moderate levels of disruption         | 48       |
| High levels of disruption             | 42       |
| Organisation could not function       | 2        |

Managers were also asked if their organisation has plans in place to ensure that it could continue to function in the event of an influenza pandemic, and if so, how effective they would anticipate the plan to be. Only 16 per cent believed their organisation's plan would be robust or very robust, while 43 per cent reported that they have no plans – despite the serious levels of disruption that they would expect.

**Table 6:** Perceived effectiveness of plans for an influenza outbreak

| <b>Base: 1150</b> | <b>%</b> |
|-------------------|----------|
| No plans in place | 43       |
| Weak              | 13       |
| Moderate          | 27       |
| Robust            | 14       |
| Very robust       | 2        |

Preparations are least advanced among small and medium-sized organisations, (1-49 and 50-249 employees) where 52 and 46 per cent of organisations respectively have no plans in place. Among organisations with over 5,000 employees, just 26 percent of managers say there are no plans in place.

Only 11 per cent regard their organisations as fully prepared for dealing with short term staff illnesses of 1-2 weeks. Even fewer are prepared for longer absences or the effects of employees taking leave to care for ill relatives or dependents, with only 4 per cent regarding their organisations as fully prepared to deal with these aspects of a pandemic.

Those managers who did report having plans for loss of staff in the event of a pandemic were asked what levels of absenteeism they are planning for. Forty-five per cent report that they are planning for absenteeism rates higher than 15 per cent.

**Table 7:** Absenteeism levels addressed by planning for an influenza pandemic

| <b>Base: 548</b>     | <b>%</b> |
|----------------------|----------|
| 0-5% absenteeism     | 14       |
| 6-10% absenteeism    | 21       |
| 11-15% absenteeism   | 21       |
| 16-20% absenteeism   | 18       |
| Over 20% absenteeism | 27       |

# 3. Good Practice in Business Continuity Management

## 3.1 Rehearsal and invocation of BCPs

Rehearsals are a vital part of making the BCP as effective as possible. Disappointingly, only 37 per cent of managers whose organisations have BCPs report that they rehearse their plans once or more per year, down from 52 per cent in 2005.

Rehearsals remain vital for improving plans. Seventy-nine per cent of respondents said that rehearsals had revealed shortcomings in their BCP (compared to 86 per cent in 2005 and 83 per cent in 2004). Of these, 88 per cent said they had taken action to address the shortcomings, although 12 per cent had not. One respondent highlighted how rehearsals had helped their organisation address the problems it faced in a real incident:

*“Rehearsals were key to being able to invoke the plan promptly and effectively. Everyone knew their role and what to do. They also knew what was important.”*

## 3.2 The effectiveness of BCPs

Managers in organisations that had invoked their BCPs in response to an incident in the previous year were asked how far they agreed that the BCP had effectively reduced the disruption. A total of 94 per cent agreed or strongly agreed that it had.

Some respondents indicated that weaknesses in the plan were revealed by its invocation. One commented that the key learning point was *“the lack of ‘big picture’ understanding by the executive team and the poor resource management that took place in many areas.”*

### Lessons from experience

Managers whose organisations had invoked their BCP were asked to comment on the key successes or learning points that they had drawn from the experience.

The importance of communication was highlighted by one manager in a large retail company: *“the communication plan is a critical element which needs to be initiated quickly. Rumour and speculation can quickly cause chaos.”* Another senior public sector manager said the key lesson was to *“Communicate, communicate, communicate with stakeholders, staff, emergency services and the press.”*

Others highlighted the need to make sure all employees are engaged in the BCP. *“Ensure that staff refresh their knowledge of contingency plans frequently. Revise plans in light of actual implementation and feedback. When implemented, our BCP worked seamlessly, minimising down-time and disruption.”*

Some respondents acknowledged how hard it is to identify every possible threat. One manager in a small security organisation pointed out that *“it is not possible to plan for a specific disaster in great detail. Rather it is best to have a plan that identifies how key members of staff can be brought together to respond to a set of pre-defined questions which will enable an appropriate response to be made.”*

By focusing on the impacts of disruption and accepting the need for flexibility, resilience can be improved. As one manager in a construction company put it, *“the plan must be capable of revision to cater for unforeseen circumstances.”*

## 4. Managing Business Continuity

### 4.1 Recognition of the importance of BCM

A total of 77 per cent of managers report that Business Continuity Management is regarded as important or very important by senior management in their organisation. While this is positive, it is striking that a far lower number have a BCP.

However, senior management is most likely to hold responsibility for BCM in those organisations which have BCPs, with responsibility for leading BCM resting with senior management or the board in 71 per cent of cases. There also appears to have been an increase in the use of dedicated BCM teams, as in Table 8 below.

|                             | 2005 % | 2006 % |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|
| Senior management           | 49     | 49     |
| Board                       | 27     | 22     |
| BCM team                    | 8      | 18     |
| Operational staff           | 4      | 5      |
| Operational risk department | 2      | 4      |
| Don't know                  | 1      | 1      |

**Table 8:** Responsibility for leading BCM, 2005-06

### 4.2 Internal stakeholders in BCM

Respondents were asked which functions in their organisation are involved in creating the BCP. Human resources rose from joint fourth in 2005 to the top of the table, overtaking IT – although IT still plays a role in most organisations. This may be a positive development if it indicates a greater awareness of the potential disruption of losing people, although it is not yet reflected by higher perception of such a threat among the management population. It may indicate that HR is simply playing a greater role in internal communications and the dissemination of information about BCM.

|                          | 2005 % | 2006 % |
|--------------------------|--------|--------|
| Human resources          | 55     | 74     |
| IT                       | 73     | 72     |
| Facilities management    | 56     | 67     |
| Risk management          | 55     | 63     |
| Finance                  | 56     | 63     |
| Security                 | 49     | 58     |
| Purchasing/procurement   | 29     | 36     |
| Public relations         | 28     | 33     |
| Production/manufacturing | 26     | 28     |
| Marketing                | 19     | 23     |
| Sales                    | 19     | 21     |
| Outsourcing              | 13     | 13     |
| None                     | 3      | 2      |
| Other                    | 15     | 10     |

**Table 9:** Functions involved in creating the BCP

### 4.3 Control of BCM Budgets

Respondents were also asked who holds the majority of the budget for BCM. As in 2005, managing directors are top of the table.

|                           | 2005 % | 2006 % |
|---------------------------|--------|--------|
| Managing director         | 38     | 31     |
| Financial director        | 18     | 25     |
| Risk manager              | 9      | 8      |
| IT director               | 5      | 7      |
| Facilities manager        | 5      | 7      |
| Security manager          | 1      | 3      |
| Health and Safety manager | 1      | 2      |
| Human resources manager   | 4      | 2      |
| Other                     | 21     | 17     |

**Table 10:** Control of BCM budgets

### 4.4 Evaluating BCM Capability

The survey asked how organisations evaluate their BCM capability. Legislation is most used, up from fourth in 2005, which is likely to reflect the impact of the Civil Contingencies Act.

|   | 2005 % | 2006 % |
|---|--------|--------|
| Legislation (e.g. statutory requirements) | 30     | 43     |
| Guidelines                                | 35     | 41     |
| Regulations (e.g. industry requirements)  | 33     | 38     |
| Standards                                 | 32     | 35     |
| Other organisations                       | 20     | 24     |
| Do not evaluate                           | 27     | 20     |

**Table 11:** External frameworks for BCM capability

- Overall, 35 per cent of organisations with BCPs use some form of standards. Of those who identified a specific standard, 25 per cent use BSI/ISO 17799, 8 per cent use the British Standards Institute's Guidance for BCM, PAS 56, and 4 per cent use ITIL.
- However, awareness of the BSI's work to develop a full Standard for BCM is high, at 34 per cent among those who already have a BCP. A first draft of the new standard is expected to be produced by summer 2006.
- A majority of respondents (55 per cent) say that their BCM capability is audited by self assessment, with 40 per cent using an internal auditor. Thirty-two per cent use an external auditor, 13 per cent are audited by a regulator (predominantly in the utility industries and financial sector), and 11 per cent use peer assessment.
- Training activity remains limited. 28 per cent include BCM training in the induction process for all new employees, although 59 per cent provide additional training for specific relevant staff.

#### 4.5 Audiences for BCP communication

BCPs continue to be primarily reported to senior management and board teams. Interest from the investment community appears to remain low, with few organisations communicating their continuity arrangements to these groups.

| <b>Base: 1150 respondents (2006)</b> | <b>1999 %</b> | <b>2002 %</b> | <b>2003 %</b> | <b>2004 %</b> | <b>2005 %</b> | <b>2006 %</b> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Senior management/board              | 71            | 73            | 80            | 76            | 81            | 77            |
| Employees                            | 53            | 63            | 52            | 44            | 58            | 61            |
| Insurance companies                  | 18            | 16            | 29            | 21            | 27            | 24            |
| Regulators                           | -             | -             | 25            | 18            | 15            | 22            |
| Customers                            | 28            | 19            | 20            | 18            | 22            | 19            |
| Shareholders                         | 21            | 15            | 16            | 14            | 16            | 12            |
| Suppliers                            | 15            | 15            | 7             | 7             | 9             | 10            |
| Local community                      | 8             | 7             | 9             | 6             | 8             | 10            |
| The investment community             | 8             | 8             | 8             | 6             | 6             | 7             |
| Others                               | 7             | 3             | 5             | 11            | 9             | 6             |
| Don't know                           | -             | 8             | 4             | 4             | 4             | 3             |

**Table 12:** Stakeholders to whom BCP is communicated 1999-2006

Only 1 in 10 are communicating their BCPs to suppliers and just 19 per cent to customers. This is of some concern and is perhaps surprising, given the impact that respondents say customers have had in driving the adoption of BCM in the first place.

#### 4.6 BCM and the supply chain

Two thirds (67 per cent) of respondents report that their organisations outsource some of their facilities or services. Of these, 37 per cent required business-critical suppliers only to have Business Continuity Plans. Just 7 per cent require all suppliers to have a BCP, and 7 per cent require it from outsource partners.

Of those who require outsource partners or suppliers to have BCPs, 62 per cent require a statement from the supplier/partner in question. Some 37 per cent take the more active step of examining the supplier/partner's BCP, while 17 per cent also involve them in their own BCP rehearsals. Fifteen per cent also involve their partners in developing their own Business Continuity Plans. Twelve per cent use a third party audit.

## 5. Conclusions

---

- Too many managers continue to work in organisations where there is no BCP in place, or where they remain unaware of its existence, which would render it ineffective in the event of disruption.
- Despite the high-profile emergencies in 2005-06 affecting organisations across the UK, there has not been either a significant increase in the adoption of BCM or a widening of the range of disruption scenarios covered within BCPs.
- There is clear evidence that regular and thorough BCP rehearsal is essential for effective BCM. Too few organisations manage to do this consistently, and so increase the risks of trying to use flawed BCM capability when faced by real disruption.
- The rise of the corporate governance agenda continues to encourage forward-looking businesses to address BCM. The new Business Review offers companies an opportunity to demonstrate their commitment in this area.
- Government is playing a major role in driving BCM. The Civil Contingencies Act appears to already have had some impact, and this trend is likely to continue as its provisions come into full effect in May 2006.

## 6. Recommendations

---

- The Chartered Management Institute, the Continuity Forum and the Cabinet Office recommend that all organisations have a robust and proportionate approach to Business Continuity Management.
- Organisations which currently have BCPs should consider further ways of enhancing their effectiveness through regular, thorough and comprehensive rehearsals and more effective communication. All managers and employees should be aware of their duties in the event of an incident, internal and external communication, and some organisations will find it useful to communicate their BCM arrangements to suppliers or customers.
- We recommend that organisations conduct assessment and benchmarking of their BCPs. British Standard PAS 56 offers a basis for this. A formal British Standard on BCM is currently in development, with a first draft expected by summer 2006. It will be known as the BS 25999 series.
- Organisations should further extend the scope of the scenarios covered by their BCPs beyond the persistent focus on IT and telecommunications. A wider range of potential vulnerabilities needs to be considered when developing and rehearsing BCPs and, in particular, organisations need to assess the risks posed by loss of people and skills.
- BCM should be used more extensively throughout supply networks in the UK, in particular with outsourced providers. Purchasers should require key suppliers and partners to have BCPs where appropriate, and verify them where possible. Procurement procedures also offer a powerful lever to encourage the adoption of BCM. Suppliers in key industries should also consider how BCM can add competitive advantage to their organisation.

- 
- All organisations should consider the possible implications of an influenza pandemic and the impact of additional absenteeism levels over a sustained period. The Government's guidance document, "Contingency Planning for a Possible Influenza Pandemic", can help organisations to plan in proportion to their circumstances (e.g. absence rates may be dependent on the size of the organisation). The guidance can be downloaded from [www.ukresilience.info](http://www.ukresilience.info).
  - Managers should stay informed of the latest information on potential threats. Useful sources of information include:
    - The Cabinet Office's 'Preparing for Emergencies' website provides up to date information for businesses, voluntary organisations and the public. It includes advice on the business case for BCM and help on implementing it, as well as case studies and links to regional and local sources of information. See [www.pfe.gov.uk](http://www.pfe.gov.uk).
    - The Cabinet Office's 'UK Resilience' website is a resource for civil protection practitioners, such as local authority emergency planners and business continuity managers. It offers a range of advice on emergency preparedness and response. See [www.ukresilience.info](http://www.ukresilience.info).
    - The Continuity Forum is the leading resource for BCM professionals and offers a range of events, workshops and support services. Information about how to implement BCM can also be found at [www.continuityforum.org](http://www.continuityforum.org).
    - The British Standards Institute's Guide to BCM, PAS-56, can be purchased and downloaded from their website. See [www.bsi-global.com](http://www.bsi-global.com) for more information.

## 7. Acknowledgements

---

This report has been prepared by Patrick Woodman of the Chartered Management Institute.

The Chartered Management Institute wishes to acknowledge the support and advice provided by the Civil Contingencies Secretariat at the Cabinet Office. Daniel Greaves, Mike Cotton and Daniel Jones made particularly valuable contributions. The Institute would also like to thank John Sharp of the Continuity Forum for his support and advice. The work of Petra Cook, Gemma Bird and Mike Petrook of the Institute is also gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, the author and research partners would like to thank all the Chartered Management Institute members who took time to respond to the survey.

## 8. Profile of Respondents

| <b>Base: all respondents 1,150</b>       | <b>%</b> |
|--|----------|
| <b>Status of organisation</b>            |          |
| Public sector                            | 25       |
| Public limited company                   | 17       |
| Private limited company                  | 34       |
| Charity/not for profit                   | 12       |
| Partnership                              | 4        |
| Owner managed/sole trader                | 6        |
| No response                              | 2        |
| <b>Sector</b>                            |          |
| Agriculture, forestry & fishing          | 1        |
| Business services and consultancy        | 13       |
| Central government                       | 4        |
| Construction                             | 5        |
| Defence                                  | 5        |
| Education                                | 9        |
| Electricity, gas & water                 | 3        |
| Engineering                              | 5        |
| Finance & insurance                      | 5        |
| Health/social care                       | 10       |
| Hospitality, catering, leisure & tourism | 2        |
| Housing & real estate                    | 3        |
| IT                                       | 2        |
| Justice/security                         | 1        |
| Legal & accounting services              | 2        |
| Local government                         | 6        |
| Manufacturing & production               | 10       |
| Mining & extraction (inc. oil and gas)   | 2        |
| Police, fire and rescue                  | 2        |
| Sales/marketing/advertising              | 2        |
| Telecommunications & post                | 1        |
| Transport & logistics                    | 3        |
| Wholesale & retail                       | 2        |
| No response                              | 2        |
| <b>Organisation size</b>                 |          |
| None (i.e. sole trader)                  | 4        |
| 1-49                                     | 34       |
| 50-249                                   | 14       |
| 250-1,000                                | 13       |
| 1,001-5,000                              | 15       |
| 5,001-10,000                             | 6        |
| Over 10,000                              | 11       |
| No response                              | 3        |

| <b>Base: all respondents 1,150</b> | <b>%</b> |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>Area of operation</b>           |          |
| Local                              | 24       |
| Regional                           | 17       |
| National                           | 24       |
| International                      | 33       |
| No response                        | 2        |
| <b>Region</b>                      |          |
| East of England                    | 6        |
| London                             | 14       |
| East Midlands                      | 7        |
| West Midlands                      | 7        |
| South East                         | 19       |
| South West                         | 11       |
| North East                         | 3        |
| North West                         | 9        |
| Yorkshire & the Humber             | 6        |
| Northern Ireland                   | 2        |
| Scotland                           | 7        |
| Wales                              | 3        |
| Other                              | 6        |

Copyright Chartered Management Institute ©

First published 2006

Chartered Management Institute  
2 Savoy Court, Strand,  
London WC2R 0EZ

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior permission of the publisher.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this report is available  
from the British Library

ISBN 0-85946-445-8

## Chartered Management Institute

### The leading organisation for professional management

As the champion of management, the Chartered Management Institute shapes and supports the managers of tomorrow. By sharing the latest insights and setting standards in management development, we help to deliver results in a dynamic world.

### Encouraging management development, improving business performance

The Institute offers a wide range of development programmes, qualifications, information resources, networking events and career guidance services to help managers and organisations meet new challenges in a fast-changing environment.

### Shaping future management practice

With in-depth research and regular policy surveys of its 71,000 individual members and 480 corporate members, the Chartered Management Institute uses its deep understanding of the key issues to improve management performance.

For more information please contact the Public Affairs Department on:

Tel: **020 7421 2721**

Fax: **020 7497 0463**

Email: [research@managers.org.uk](mailto:research@managers.org.uk)

Website: [www.managers.org.uk](http://www.managers.org.uk)

or write to us at the address below.

## The Civil Contingencies Secretariat

The Civil Contingencies Secretariat (CCS) sits within the Cabinet Office at the heart of central government. It works in partnership with government departments, the devolved administrations and with key stakeholders at national, regional and local levels across the public, private and voluntary sectors to enhance the UK's ability to prepare for, respond to and recover from emergencies. You can find out more, and contact us, via our website at [www.ukresilience.info](http://www.ukresilience.info).

## Continuity Forum

The Continuity Forum is a not-for-profit organisation committed to building the resilience of organisations internationally, regardless of size or sector, through education and the promotion of best practice in Business Continuity Management and its related disciplines. The Forum is dedicated to aiding the growth and the development of the Continuity sector and appropriate standards. More information about Continuity Forum can be found at [www.continuityforum.org](http://www.continuityforum.org).

Contact: John Sharp

Tel: **07071 222155**

Email: [john.sharp@continuityforum.org](mailto:john.sharp@continuityforum.org)



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



Certificate No FS28404

Chartered Management Institute  
2 Savoy Court, Strand,  
London, WC2R 0EZ

Registered charity number 1091035

Incorporated by Royal Charter

ISBN 0-85946-445-8

©Chartered Management Institute, May 2006



Reach 13449: 05/06

*inspiring leaders*