

Management Capability Assessment Report

Bayside Council BCP Capability Assessment Report

NB Based on publicly available information.

Created:
08/04/2026

Last Modified:
08/04/2026

Total Domains: 7
Overall Maturity: 21.4%

Capability Maturity Heatmap

Filled cell = current maturity level | T = target level

Domain	N Absent	P Ad hoc	L Defined	F Operational	Evidence Strength
BCM Program & Governance				T	Mixed
Business Impact Analysis & Risk Assessment			T		Weak
BCM Strategies & Solutions			T		Weak
BCM Plans & Procedures			T		Mixed
Exercising, Testing & Maintenance			T		Weak
Culture, Training & Awareness			T		Weak
Performance Evaluation & Continuous Improvement			T		Weak

● N Absent
 ● P Ad hoc
 ● L Defined
 ● F Operational

Assessment Summary

Assessment Statistics

Total Domains	7
Overall Maturity	21.4%
Completion	In Progress

Maturity Distribution

N		14% (1)
P		86% (6)
L		0% (0)
F		0% (0)

Domain Overview

Current: P Ad hoc

Target: F Operational

Informal, inconsistent, person-dependent

Evidence Questions

#	Question	Answer	Evidence Notes
E1	Does a formally approved BCM policy, scope, roles, responsibilities, and governance structure exist?	YES	<p>The BCM policy provides clear evidence of a formal framework and governance basis. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Approved BCM policy stating objectives, scope, and principles. * Documented roles, responsibilities, and authorities for BCM (incl. executive sponsor and owner). * Defined governance structure (e.g., steering committee, risk/BCM forum) with ToR and meeting cadence. * BCM included in organisational policy hierarchy and referenced in key management system documents.
E2	Do governance bodies actively oversee BCM (e.g., approve priorities, resolve issues, allocate resources)?	NO	<p>Committee oversight exists, but recurring records of approvals, funding decisions, and issue resolution were not found publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Governance body meeting records showing BCM on the agenda, decisions, and follow-up actions (priorities, risk acceptance, funding). * Documented approval of BCM plans, strategies, and key assumptions by governance. * Evidence of resource allocation decisions for BCM (budget lines, FTE, tools). * Escalation and issue-resolution records demonstrating governance intervention on BCM issues.
E3	Is BCM governance integrated into enterprise risk, strategy, assurance, and management review cycles?	NO	<p>BCM links to risk and assurance are visible, but broader integration into strategy and management review is not clearly evidenced publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * BCM explicitly integrated into ERM, strategy, and investment processes (e.g., BCM inputs in risk registers and business cases). * BCM status incorporated into management review, board reporting, and audit/assurance programs. * BCM accountabilities in executive scorecards or KPIs, and reflected in performance discussions. * Demonstrated use of BCM insights in strategic decisions (e.g., site selection, outsourcing, IT transformation).

Business Impact Analysis & Risk Assessment

Current: P Ad hoc

Target: L Defined

Informal, inconsistent, person-dependent

Evidence Questions

#	Question	Answer	Evidence Notes
E1	Does a defined organisational methodology exist for conducting BIA and continuity risk assessments?	YES	Method intent is evident, but a full public methodology, templates, and review schedule were not found. Necessary and sufficient evidence: * Documented BIA and continuity risk assessment methodology, including impact dimensions, scoring, RTO/RPO definitions, and approval. * Standard templates and tools for BIAs and risk assessments. * Defined scope and criteria for critical activities, applications, sites, and third parties. * Assigned responsibilities and schedule for conducting and reviewing BIAs/assessments.
E2	Are impact assessments, RTOs, RPOs, and risk ratings logical, evidence-based, and decision-useful?	NO	No completed BIA or continuity risk assessment was found publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence: * Completed BIAs for in-scope business units showing clear impact rationales, quantified impacts, and traceable RTO/RPO decisions. * Risk assessments with documented causes, scenarios, likelihood, and controls leading to coherent risk ratings. * Evidence that BIA and risk outputs are used in strategy choice (e.g., mapping RTOs to DR tiers, staffing, alternate sites). * Sign-off by accountable business owners and challenge/validation by BCM or risk specialists.
E3	Are BIA and risk outputs kept current and used to drive strategy, investment, and prioritisation?	NO	No current living register or evidence of BIA-driven prioritisation was found publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence: * BIA and risk data maintained in a living register or system with defined review triggers (e.g., annual plus change-driven updates). * Evidence that updated BIA/risk outputs directly drive investment, prioritisation, and project decisions. * Linkage between BIA/risk results and other disciplines (IT DR planning, vendor risk, crisis scenarios, insurance). * Regular reporting of BIA and risk metrics/trends to governance and inclusion in audit and assurance scopes.

Current: P Ad hoc

Target: L Defined

Informal, inconsistent, person-dependent

Evidence Questions

#	Question	Answer	Evidence Notes
E1	Does a defined organisational approach exist for developing continuity and recovery strategies?	YES	<p>The policy points to recovery strategies, but no standalone organisational approach was located publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Documented organisational approach for selecting continuity/recovery strategies (e.g., tiers, patterns, cost-benefit criteria). * Defined decision criteria linking strategies to RTO/RPO, risk appetite, and dependencies (people, facilities, IT, suppliers). * Standard templates for documenting strategy options, assumptions, and decisions. * Roles and approvals for endorsing BCM strategies.
E2	Do strategies realistically meet agreed RTOs/RPOs within known constraints (people, facilities, suppliers, IT)?	NO	<p>No strategy validation, feasibility evidence, or stakeholder sign-off was found publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Strategy documents demonstrating realistic solutions mapped to agreed RTOs/RPOs and constraints. * Technical and operational validation that strategies are feasible (e.g., DR design, capacity assessments, alternate site readiness). * Evidence of trade-off analysis and cost-benefit justification for chosen strategies. * Sign-off from affected stakeholders (IT, facilities, HR, suppliers, operations) confirming capability and responsibilities.
E3	Are strategies aligned with risk appetite, budgets, IT DR, suppliers, and broader resilience planning?	NO	<p>No public evidence showed alignment to budgets, IT DR architecture, supplier arrangements, or resilience programmes. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Clear alignment of BCM strategies with risk appetite, budgets, IT DR architecture roadmaps, and supplier contracts/SLAs. * Integration of BCM strategies with broader resilience initiatives (e.g., cyber, supply chain, safety, crisis management). * Periodic review of strategies tied to architecture, sourcing, and capital planning cycles. * Evidence that major change programs routinely consider and update BCM strategies as part of their process.

Current: P Ad hoc

Target: L Defined

Informal, inconsistent, person-dependent

Evidence Questions

#	Question	Answer	Evidence Notes
E1	Does a defined organisational framework exist for developing and maintaining BCM plans and procedures?	YES	<p>The policy and emergency management planning material show a framework exists. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Documented organisational framework for plan types (crisis, business recovery, IT DR, site emergency, etc.) and their relationships. * Standard templates, style guides, and minimum content requirements for BCM plans. * Defined ownership, maintenance responsibilities, and review cycles for each plan. * Formal approval process for plans.
E2	Are plans clear, actionable, role-based, and usable under realistic time pressure?	NO	<p>The local emergency plan supports partial evidence, but no service-level BCPs were found publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Plans that are concise, role-based, and action-oriented with clear triggers, decision points, and checklists. * Inclusion of dependencies, workarounds, communication matrices, and contact lists verified as current. * Evidence from exercises or incidents that plans could be followed under time pressure and enabled timely recovery. * Feedback from users indicating plan usability and clarity, and resulting improvements.
E3	Are plans current, accessible, referenced in contracts and procedures, and actually used in incidents or exercises?	NO	<p>Some plans are publicly accessible, but use evidence, update triggers, and cross-document integration were not demonstrated publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Plans stored in accessible locations (including offline/alternate access) and referenced in operational procedures and contracts. * Demonstrated use of plans during real incidents or exercises (logs, debriefs, post-incident reports). * Integration with other documentation sets (SOPs, IT runbooks, HR procedures, vendor playbooks). * Routine plan updates triggered by organisational changes, system updates, or lessons learned, with version control.

Exercising, Testing & Maintenance

Current: P Ad hoc

Target: L Defined

Informal, inconsistent, person-dependent

Evidence Questions

#	Question	Answer	Evidence Notes
E1	Does a defined organisational exercising, testing, and review program exist for BCM?	YES	<p>The policy sets annual exercise expectations, which supports programme intent. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Documented exercising/testing strategy and program with scope, objectives, frequency, and methods (table-top, simulation, technical tests). * Defined roles, responsibilities, and approval requirements for exercises and tests. * Standard templates for scenarios, plans, evaluation, and reporting. * A forward schedule or calendar of exercises and tests.
E2	Do exercises meaningfully validate assumptions, decision-making, coordination, and recovery timelines?	NO	<p>No recent exercise reports or test outputs were found publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Executed exercises that test key assumptions, decision-making, escalation, and recovery timelines against RTOs/RPOs. * Test and exercise reports capturing objectives, outcomes, issues, and quantitative/qualitative performance. * Evidence that coordination across functions, sites, and suppliers has been exercised and evaluated. * Documented comparison of actual recovery performance versus targets, with root-cause analysis where not met.
E3	Are lessons identified, tracked, and used to update BIAs, strategies, plans, and training?	NO	<p>No public lessons log, action tracker, or evidence of closure was found. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Lessons identified captured in a central log with owners, due dates, and status tracking to closure. * Evidence that lessons directly trigger updates to BIAs, strategies, plans, training, and technical configurations. * Exercises integrated into business calendars (e.g., aligned to peak periods, change freezes, regulatory cycles). * Continuous improvement themes visible over time (e.g., recurring issues reducing, maturity increasing in reports).

Current: N Absent

Target: L Defined

No evidence

Evidence Questions

#	Question	Answer	Evidence Notes
E1	Do defined BCM roles and an organisational training and awareness framework exist?	NO	No public training framework, role competency set, or awareness artefacts were found. Necessaroy and sufficient evidence: * Defined BCM roles (e.g., coordinators, plan owners, incident managers) with competency profiles. * Organisational BCM training and awareness framework, including curricula for different role types. * Training materials and awareness artifacts (e-learning, slide decks, intranet content, posters, FAQs). * Defined schedule and responsibility for delivering and maintaining training and awareness.
E2	Do people understand their responsibilities and demonstrate competence appropriate to their role?	<input type="checkbox"/>	-
E3	Is BCM awareness sustained through onboarding, refreshers, leadership messaging, and real behaviours?	<input type="checkbox"/>	-

Performance Evaluation & Continuous Improvement

Current: P Ad hoc

Target: L Defined

Informal, inconsistent, person-dependent

Evidence Questions

#	Question	Answer	Evidence Notes
E1	Do defined organisational mechanisms exist for evaluating and improving BCM performance?	YES	<p>Risk and committee oversight mechanisms exist, but a defined BCM metrics and review suite was not found publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Documented mechanisms for monitoring, measuring, and evaluating BCM (KPIs, KRIs, internal audits, management reviews). * Defined BCM metrics set (e.g., BIA coverage, test performance, plan currency, training rates). * Schedule and roles for BCM performance evaluations and reviews. * Linkage to nonconformance/corrective action processes where they exist.
E2	Do evaluations identify meaningful gaps, trends, and systemic weaknesses?	NO	<p>Governance structures support this in principle, but no BCM-specific audit report or trend analysis was found publicly. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Regular reports that identify meaningful gaps, trends, and systemic weaknesses (not just activity counts). * Internal audits or reviews with documented findings, ratings, and recommendations related to BCM. * Evidence that performance information is discussed by governance, with prioritised actions agreed. * Analysis across incidents, tests, and metrics demonstrating insight into underlying causes, not just symptoms.
E3	Are findings acted upon, tracked to closure, and reflected in management decisions and investment?	NO	<p>No public evidence showed BCM corrective actions tracked through to closure. Necessary and sufficient evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Corrective and improvement actions tracked through to closure with deadlines and accountability. * Evidence that BCM evaluation outcomes influence management decisions, investment, and risk appetite discussions. * BCM performance integrated into enterprise assurance maps and combined assurance reporting. * Demonstrated year-on-year changes in capability, reflected in metrics, external feedback, or independent maturity assessments.