Resilience By Default™ Commentary on "Enterprise Continuity Commitment: Do We Really Have a Problem?"

Hi Dmitri, this is a strong, data-driven article that cuts through a lot of the folklore around "***Leadership Commitment***." You have articulated something the industry often misses: BCM does not appear by accident. Its very existence implies a baseline level of ***^Executive initiation, Governance, Budget, Policy, and Compliance alignment.***

Where I would extend the conversation, from a **Resilience By Default™** perspective, is in how we interpret that commitment in 2026, especially now that ***Resilience has moved from "Best Practice" to Regulatory Obligation.***

1. Commitment vs Ownership: The Modern Regulatory Distinction.

You correctly show that ***Leadership Commitment*** exists at the initiation stage.
But modern Regulations, FCA/PRA, DORA, NIS2, CER, MAS, APRA, have shifted the requirement from commitment to Ownership.

Commitment can be delegated.
Ownership cannot.
This is the Critical Gap.

A signed Policy, a budget line, or a Governance structure demonstrates commitment.
But none of these demonstrate ***Executive Ownership of Resilience Outcomes,*** which is now explicitly required across every major regulatory regime.

This is why your point resonates: Practitioners often feel a lack of commitment because what they actually need is ***Ownership, active, ongoing, Evidenced Engagement.***

2. BCM and EM Are Not the Same. And Their Drivers Are Fundamentally Different.

Your article blends BCM and EM in a way that is analytically useful, but the drivers diverge:

- **BCM** historically existed because Customers, Auditors, and Regulators expected it. ***Even today, many organisations do the bare minimum, as seen in DORA readiness gaps across Europe.***
- **Emergency Management** exists because Governments ***must protect Life Safety and Essential Services.***

As I mentioned earlier: if Politicians could avoid spending on EM, many would. Preparedness is rarely a top public demand.

This difference matters because it shapes leadership behaviour.
BCM is a Business Decision.
EM is a Civic Obligation.

The commitment signals, incentives, and consequences are not the same.

3. ISO and NIST Are "Point-in-Time". Not Assurance Frameworks.

You highlight ISO 22301 and NFPA 1660 well.
But the industry must confront a hard truth:

- **Point-In-Time Certification** does not equal Resilience.
- **Annual Audits** prove that something existed on a specific date.
  They do not prove Capability, Readiness, or Recoverability today.
- ***In a Digital, Real-time Operating Environment, Point-in-Time Frameworks are increasingly misaligned with Continuous Risk, Continuous Change, and Continuous Dependency Fragility.***

This is why* Resilience By Default™ *emphasises Continuous Monitoring, Continuous Assurance, and Continuous Evidence, not annual compliance theatre.

4. Leadership Commitment Exists, But It Is Not the Problem.

Your data is compelling:*"If a BCM program exists at all, leadership commitment must exist at least at a baseline level."* ***This is true, and important.***

But the* Resilience By Default™ *interpretation is slightly different:

- ***The problem is not commitment.***
- ***The problem is design.***
  - ***Most BCM Programmes are designed for Compliance, not Capability.***
  - ***They are built around documents, not Operational Reality.***
  - ***They validate artefacts, not Resilience.***

When Resilience is designed well, Service aligned, Dependency mapped, Tested under stress, and Evidenced, Leadership Commitment becomes visible because Leaders can see and Trust the Capability.

When Resilience is designed poorly, commitment appears absent because Leaders cannot see value.

5. Efficiency vs Resilience: The Structural Conflict.

Your economic framing is excellent.
"Efficiency is rewarded immediately.
Resilience is rewarded only after failure."

This is why BCM exists at all. It compensates for structural underinvestment in Resilience.

But this is also why Ownership matters more than commitment.

Commitment supports Efficiency.
Ownership supports Resilience.

Regulators have now forced the shift.

6. Practitioners Carry the Operational Burden: And Always Have.

Your closing section is powerful and absolutely correct: *"Leadership creates the program. Practitioners keep the organization alive."*

This is the uncomfortable truth of the Profession.

BCM Practitioners:

- ***Translate Policy into Operational Reality.***
- ***Maintain readiness when leadership is focused elsewhere.***
- ***Carry the organisation through disruptions leadership cannot predict.***
- ***Preserve institutional memory across turnover and crises.***

This is why* Resilience By Default™ *emphasises Capability Assurance. Not artefact assurance.
Practitioners need Evidence, Tooling, and Authority. Not more slogans about commitment.

7. Resilience By Default™ Summary:

Your article is factually strong and well-argued.
Where I would extend the discussion is here:

- Leadership commitment exists. ***But Commitment is not Ownership.***
- BCM and EM have different drivers and cannot be justified the same way.
- ISO/NIST are Point-In-Time Frameworks and ***increasingly insufficient.***
- ***Modern Regulations require Continuous Assurance***, not annual compliance.
- **<u>The real issue is design, not commitment.</u>**
- ***Practitioners carry the burden because Resilience is structurally undervalued.***

This is exactly the conversation the industry needs, especially as Regulators tighten expectations and Boards realise that Resilience is not a technical discipline but a Leadership Responsibility.