

# Recommendations for Statewide Operational Recovery Planning



*Presented by the*  
**Operational Recovery Planning Workgroup**  
*May 2006*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD .....	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
GOALS .....	3
GOAL 2 - POLICY & GUIDELINE CLARIFICATIONS .....	6
S.A.M. 4843 AND 4843.1 .....	6
OPERATIONAL RECOVERY PLAN DOCUMENTATION OUTLINE .....	10
GOAL 3 - EXECUTIVE AWARENESS TRAINING .....	13
BACKGROUND .....	13
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	13
GOAL 4 - PEER REVIEW OF OPERATIONAL RECOVERY PLANS .....	14
BACKGROUND .....	14
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	14
<i>Form a Peer Review Committee/Panel for ORPs.....</i>	14
<i>Revised Function.....</i>	14
<i>Peer Review Committee - Model 1 .....</i>	15
<i>Peer Review Committee - Model 2 .....</i>	16
KEYS TO SUCCESS .....	16
ISSUES .....	16
GOAL 5 - STATEWIDE CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS/ CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT PLANNING .....	18
BACKGROUND .....	18
ISSUES .....	18
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	18
GOAL 6 - MULTI-AGENCY RECOVERY COORDINATION .....	21
ISSUES .....	21
RECOMMENDATION .....	21
<i>State Recovery Coordination Planning Model .....</i>	22
GOAL 7 - STATE AGENCY MUTUAL ASSISTANCE IN SUPPORT OF CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS .....	23
WHAT IS MUTUAL ASSISTANCE? .....	23
WHY CONSIDER MUTUAL ASSISTANCE? .....	23
WHAT DOES A MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT LOOK LIKE? .....	24
OPERATIONAL RECOVERY PLANNING WORKGROUP .....	25
ATTACHMENT 1 - SAMPLE MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT .....	27
ATTACHMENT 2 - PROJECT CHARTER.....	30

## FOREWORD

This document was prepared by the State Operational Recovery Planning Workgroup (ORP Workgroup), which convened in May 2005. The ORP Workgroup was established in the *California State Information Technology Strategic Plan* and has oversight by the Information Technology Council Security Committee.

The purpose of this document is to present the development of policy changes and conceptual program recommendations surrounding the continuity of critical state operations. With the exception of the recommended policy changes to State Administration Manual (S.A.M.) 4843 and 4843.1 (an existing policy), all recommendations are conceptual for further policy or guideline development by the State. The ORP Workgroup is available to provide the services necessary for further development of the recommendations. The ORP Workgroup agreed that detailed development was not feasible until such time that the concepts were approved by the appropriate authority.

Questions regarding the content of this document may be directed to one or more of the following.

### Project Manager

John Lane,  
Chief Information Officer  
California Department of Conservation  
& Chair, Information Technology Council Security Committee  
(916) 445-0692, [john.lane@conservation.ca.gov](mailto:john.lane@conservation.ca.gov)

### Content Advisors

Rebecca Harrigan, CBCP\*  
Operational Recovery Planner  
California Department of Managed Health Care  
(916) 322-6718, [bharrigan@dmhc.ca.gov](mailto:bharrigan@dmhc.ca.gov)

Tom Jones  
Deputy Director, Infrastructure Services Division  
Legislative Counsel Data Center  
(916) 341-8890, [tom.jones@lc.ca.gov](mailto:tom.jones@lc.ca.gov)

Pamela Wagner, CBCP\*  
Business Continuity Planner  
California Department of Technology Services  
(916) 464-4527, [pam.wagner@dts.ca.gov](mailto:pam.wagner@dts.ca.gov)

Dean Izett, CBCP\*  
Operational Recovery Planner  
California Department of Technology Services  
(916) 739-7874, [dean.izett@dts.ca.gov](mailto:dean.izett@dts.ca.gov)

Ryan Dulin  
Information Technology Security Manager  
California Department of Finance  
(916) 445-5239, [security@dof.ca.gov](mailto:security@dof.ca.gov)

\*Certified Business Continuity Professional

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Operational Recovery Planning Workgroup was established to review current State Operational Recovery Plan (ORP) strategy and make recommendations to improve ORP effectiveness and consistency within the context of higher-level Continuity of Government Operations Planning.

The Operational Recovery Planning Workgroup (ORP Workgroup) was comprised of a team of experienced operational recovery practitioners and professionals certified in business continuity and/or information security within State service. In addition, the ORP Workgroup invited participation by a professional business continuity leader representing private industry.

### GOALS

Seven goals were established for the ORP Workgroup by the Information Technology Council Security Committee resulting in a number of recommendations and products as summarized below.

***Goal 1 - Develop an approach to ORP that meets current state requirements and the needs of the departments.***

The adoption and implementation of the recommendations and products developed by the ORP Workgroup sets forth the framework and tools to improve disaster preparedness planning efforts and assist State departments in developing viable ORPs. A high-level implementation plan is presented at the conclusion of this section to guide the initial roll-out and sustain the program.

***Goal 2 - Recommend changes or clarifications to S.A.M. (State Administrative Manual) and SIMM (Statewide Information Management Manual) that would help improve the value of ORPs.***

Recommendations for revised S.A.M. and SIMM policies and procedures are included as a product of the ORP Workgroup. The proposed requirements add three additional components for operational recovery planning documentation and move all requirements from S.A.M. to SIMM. These initial products will require further development of an evaluation tool and practical guidelines for developing ORPs after adoption at the executive level. The subsequent development effort will require a substantial time commitment from the advisors and the designated control agency. Further development is not recommended until vetting and final revisions are completed.

***Goal 3 - Develop a strategy for raising the importance of operational recovery planning at the executive management level through effective awareness training and marketing.***

Recommendations for a comprehensive Executive Awareness Program are included as a product of the ORP Workgroup. The recommendations include joint efforts by the State CIO, State ISO, and OES to advance Continuity of Government/Continuity of Operations (COOP/COG) and ORP issues, including comprehensive efforts to raise executive-level awareness of such issues.

***Goal 4 - Identify a mechanism for peer review of plans to ensure the plans are viable.***

The framework for a Peer Review process is included as a product of the ORP Workgroup. Two process models are presented that include training for State departments as well as a first-level evaluation of plans prior to submission to the designated control agency.

***Goal 5 - Publish recommendations on how the state could develop a Continuity of Operations/Continuity of Government (COOP/COG) planning program.***

A white paper regarding current efforts and recommendations for a Statewide COOP/COG planning program is included as a product of the ORP Workgroup. The ORP Workgroup is aware of a COOP/COG planning pilot program currently being conducted jointly by the Governor's Office of Emergency Services and the California Military Department that is scheduled for completion in early 2006. The ORP Workgroup anticipates that before any final program decisions are made on this matter, the recommendations stated herein would be given consideration.

***Goal 6 - Develop recommendations on how the state can set priorities to mitigate the effects of large-scale emergencies affecting multiple State agencies.***

A white paper titled *Multi-Agency Recovery Coordination* outlining existing problems, recommendations and an event planning model is included as a product of the ORP Workgroup. The purpose of the plan would be to enable an orderly, coordinated, and timely recovery from a wide scale disaster that may effect the operations and delivery of services for a number of state agencies. Such a plan would enable the state to prioritize recovery strategies and resources, and coordinate recovery operations and the sharing of resources between different departments and other public and private entities.

***Goal 7 - Publish a manual on how departments can establish "Mutual Assistance Programs" among state agencies.***

A memorandum of understanding is a recommended process for establishing mutual assistance among state agencies in support of their individual recovery plans. This product may be included in the practical guidelines for development of operational recovery plans in the recommended subsequent effort (see Goal 2).

This document represents the recommendations of experienced business continuity planners. These recommendations advocate an increase in the awareness and preparedness of state agencies and departments and propose a proactive effort by state leaders in ensuring state requirements, strategic planning, and review standards are practiced.

## GOAL 2 – POLICY & GUIDELINE CLARIFICATIONS

### S.A.M. 4843 AND 4843.1

The ORP Workgroup recommends the further development and updating of State policy and guidelines for Operational Recovery Plans (ORPs). There are two areas of concern:

First, it is important for State policy to officially reflect the importance of ORPs in the greater context of Continuity of Operations/Continuity of Government (COOP/COG) plans. It is generally accepted in the public and private sector that a comprehensive COOP/COG planning program is essential for a viable recovery plan. These programs incorporate emergency response, Business Resumption Plans (resumption of critical business processes) and the Operational Recovery Plan (recovery of critical applications that support the critical business processes) and ensure that each component plan works in conjunction with the others. Pursuant to Executive Order S-04-06, COOP/COG plans will be coordinated through the Office of Emergency Services (OES), and the ORP workgroup wants to ensure that the critical nature of ORPs are seen in the broader context of COOP/COG planning.

Second, the ORP Workgroup added three vital components to the current SIMM 140 Guidelines, in order to render the operational recovery plans more viable. Each of the added components was developed based on industry best practices. In the ensuing months, the workgroup plans to further develop SIMM 140 with ORP templates to facilitate agencies in ORP development.

Following is the proposed policy language for S.A.M. 4843, 4843.1, and a component guideline modifying SIMM 140.

#### **4843 OPERATIONAL RECOVERY PLANNING**

(Proposed 06/06)

Operational recovery planning provides for the continuity of computing operations in support of critical business functions, minimizes decision-making during an incident, produces the greatest benefit from the remaining limited resources and achieves a systematic and orderly migration toward the resumption of all computing services within an agency. It is essential that critical IT services and critical applications be restored as soon as possible.

It is significant to recognize that no operational recovery program is ever complete. All operational recovery planning is based upon available knowledge and assumptions, and must be adapted to changing circumstances and changing business needs, as appropriate. Procedures, resources, and strategies must be adapted as often as necessary in order to recover critical applications. Recovery strategies must be developed to anticipate risks including loss of utility (hardware, software, power, telecommunications, etc.), loss of access to the facility, loss of facility, and personnel.

The operational recovery planning process supports necessary preparation to design and document procedures to recover critical operations in the event of an outage. Agencies should consider the results of the agency risk analysis process, identify and evaluate alternative recovery strategies, and prepare a cost benefit analysis when developing the department Operational Recovery Plan. See SAM Section 4842.1. Each agency's process should culminate in a viable and fully documented Operational Recovery Plan. See SAM Section 4843.1 and SIMM Section 65.

To provide for recoverability of new systems, all agencies must include operational recovery considerations and costs in Feasibility Study Reports. See SAM Section 4819.35 and SIMM Section 20.

To improve the likelihood for the full recovery of key business functions, Operational Recovery Plans should be developed as part of a complete business continuity program.

#### **4843.1 AGENCY OPERATIONAL RECOVERY PLAN**

(Proposed 6/06)

Each state agency (including each state data center) must maintain an Operational Recovery Plan (ORP) identifying the computer applications that are critical to agency operations, the information assets that are necessary for those applications, and the agency's plans for resuming operations following an unplanned disruption of those applications.

Each agency must have policy that requires periodic testing of its Operational Recovery Plan. Testing policy should include the type of test(s), time interval as to when the test(s) will be performed and how the test(s) will be conducted. Examples of testing may include tabletop exercises, data recovery testing, and/or actual recovery from an unplanned outage or failure. Each agency must keep its Operational Recovery Plan up-to-date and must provide annual documentation as to its status. The annual requirements are:

1. Each agency must file a copy of its Operational Recovery Plan with the Department of Finance in accordance with the Operational Recovery Plan Quarterly Reporting Schedule (SIMM Section 05).
2. If the agency employs the services of a state data center, it must also provide the data center with a copy of its plan.
3. An Operational Recovery Plan Certification (SIMM Section 70) may be filed in place of a full ORP if both of the following conditions exist:
  - a. A full plan was submitted the previous year and is on file with Finance; and
  - b. No changes are needed to the current plan.
4. Each agency Operational Recovery Plan must cover, at a minimum, ten topic areas which are listed and described in the Operational Recovery Plan Documentation Outline (SIMM

Section 65). In addition, if the Operational Recovery Plan does not follow the SIMM 65 format, a cover sheet must be included to indicate where information on each topic area can be found.

It is important to adapt the detailed content of each plan section to suit the needs of the individual agency.

---

---

**State of California**  
**Department of Finance**  
**Operational Recovery Plan**  
**Documentation Outline**

May 2006

---

---

## OPERATIONAL RECOVERY PLAN DOCUMENTATION OUTLINE

**The following ten items describe the minimum requirements that an agency must include as components of its Operational Recovery Plan (ORP). An ORP is one portion of the agency's overall Continuity of Operations and Continuity of Government (COOP/COG) program.**

### MINIMUM ORP REQUIREMENTS

#### **1.0 AGENCY ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION**

- 1.1 An executive summary that serves as a guide to the structure of the plan, the procedures for updating (plan maintenance) and distributing the plan, and a description of the agency's test and awareness programs.
- 1.2 A description of the agency's mission, including the organizational, managerial and technical environments. This section should include organization charts, business functions, and a description of the agency's information technology environment.
- 1.3 A communication strategy noting information flow, decision making, and interrelationship among agency core resources for response, recovery and resumption.

#### **2.0 CRITICAL BUSINESS FUNCTIONS/APPLICATIONS**

- 2.1 A description of critical business functions and their supporting applications, a designation of maximum acceptable outage (MAO) timeframes for each application, and the recovery priorities.
- 2.2 This section should include a chart that lists the critical business functions, the supporting applications, designation of maximum acceptable outages for the applications and the recovery priorities.
- 2.3 The agency may also include information on the approach used to determine the recovery priorities (e.g., a business impact assessment or planning committee meeting).

#### **3.0 RECOVERY STRATEGY**

- 3.1 A description of the portions of the plan that will be implemented based on various levels of incident severity, for example, minor interruption of service, total service failure or loss of facility. Recovery strategies should be built to accommodate a worst case scenario, loss of service and facility. It is not expected that an agency's plans include catastrophic or regional disasters unless responding to such events is part of the agency's mission.
- 3.2 A description of the recovery strategy that supports the agency's critical application priorities, including identification and evaluation of alternative recovery strategies. Will

the agency sustain critical business functions manually until the applications are recovered? Does the agency contract with an outside source for recovery services? Will the agency's information technology infrastructure be rebuilt at another location? Will a hot or cold site be used?

- 3.3 Alternate recovery sites should be detailed within the plan that includes location, contact numbers and the type of facilities/equipment that will be available.

#### **4.0 BACKUP AND OFFSITE STORAGE PROCEDURES**

- 4.1 Backup and retention schedules and procedures are critical to the recovery of an agency's applications and data.
- 4.2 The detailed procedures should include software and data file back-up and retention schedules, off-site storage details, and appropriate contact and authority designation for personnel to retrieve media.

#### **5.0 OPERATIONAL RECOVERY PROCEDURES**

- 5.1 This section systematically details the operational procedures that will allow recovery to be achieved in a timely and orderly way.
- 5.2 Detailed recovery procedures (including manual processes) that support the agency's recovery strategy and provide for the recovery of critical applications within the established maximum acceptable outage time frames. Included would be the process for recovering the critical data-processing activities, application and data recovery, and the process for suspending non-critical activities and any relocation to an interim (back-up) processing site.
- 5.3 The procedures should be detailed enough so that another trained information technology professional would be able to recover the agency's infrastructure should those with primary responsibility be unavailable during the recovery process. Include a high-level network diagram that includes all critical applications.

#### **6.0 DATA CENTER SERVICES**

- 6.1 For agencies using the services of a data center, a description of data center services that will be provided during recovery must be documented.
- 6.2 Include information on any interagency agreements, memorandums of understanding or contracts.
- 6.3 If specific coordination of efforts with the data center is critical to the agency's recovery, those procedures should be included within Section 5 above.

#### **7.0 RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS**

- 7.1 A comprehensive list of the equipment, space, telecommunication needs, data, software, hard-copy references (forms and procedures) and personnel necessary for recovery is essential.

- 7.2 Identification of resources that will be available at an alternate site should also be documented.

## **8.0 ASSIGNMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY**

- 8.1 Distinct management and staff assignment of responsibilities must be clearly designated within the operational recovery plan. Within procedures, job titles (rather than the names of individuals) should be used to assign responsibility as it lessens maintenance on procedures as staffing changes.

## **9.0 CONTACT INFORMATION**

- 9.1 Separate contact lists should include the names of individuals, job title and contact information. If home phone numbers are included, the contact lists should be designated as confidential sections of the operational recovery plan.
- 9.2 Contact lists for vendors, other government entities, and outside resources critical to the agency's recovery process.

## **10. TESTING**

- 10.1 A description of the periodic operational recovery test(s) performed, including how the test(s) will be conducted and high level timeframes for each test. Examples of testing may include tabletop exercises, data recovery testing, forced testing (actual recovery due to an unplanned outage or failure), and/or full plan testing.

## **APPENDICES**

A variety of appendices may be attached to the plan. Many of the plan sections described above will contain static procedures, while others will contain operational information that requires continual maintenance.

Some examples of appendix topics are:

- (A) Emergency action notification information containing the names and phone numbers of the various management, staff and specialty team members;
- (B) Damage assessment or disaster classification forms intended to function as a guide to supplement/support the management decision process;
- (C) Profiles of critical applications;
- (D) Agency hardware and system software inventory; and
- (E) Any data communications network routing information necessary for providing interim processing capability and restoring full processing capacity.

## **GOAL 3 – EXECUTIVE AWARENESS TRAINING**

### **BACKGROUND**

In order for any continuity of government operations planning effort to be successful, it must have sponsorship at the executive level. Historically, and as reported by those assigned responsibility for operational recovery planning, the biggest difficulty in developing a viable plan within the state has been obtaining the necessary executive support. This is especially critical during initial planning and development efforts when resources may need to be temporarily redirected to provide valuable input to the recovery plan. During the maintenance phase, resources must be permanently allocated to sustain the plan through organizational changes and other change management issues. Executive support ensures that the operational recovery plan does not become a shelved document that merely meets a control agency's requirements, but instead becomes a living document vital to the recovery of critical business processes.

Operational recovery development efforts often fail because their sponsors have under-emphasized the prioritization of those efforts. The State of California must raise the level of executive awareness and commitment to be adequately prepared to recover from any future disasters or unplanned business interruptions. Loss of services and public confidence are risks that can be mitigated and minimized if there is a commitment and proactive approach adopted to protect the assets, mission and recoverability of critical state operations and services.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

In order to improve executive-level awareness of ORP and COOP/COG issues, the ORP Workgroup offers the following recommendations:

1. The State CIO, the State ISO, and OES work together to develop an on-going training effort to communicate ORP and COOP/COG issues and responsibilities to department directors and Agency secretaries.
2. This training effort should include presentations by an external expert in COOP/COG programs in a wide variety of executive venues (e.g. DTS Governing Board meetings, Governor's cabinet meetings, respective Agency director's meetings)
3. Executive awareness training should include a wide variety of media: expert consultant presentations, written training materials that spell out department director responsibilities, publishing key resources on the State CIO website, and Government Technology Conference training sessions.

## **GOAL 4 – PEER REVIEW OF OPERATIONAL RECOVERY PLANS**

### **BACKGROUND**

Current limited resources prevent a thorough review of operational recovery plans that are submitted to the Department of Finance as mandated in S.A.M. 4843. State training programs do not exist for operational recovery that would provide a knowledge base for those responsible for developing and maintaining these plans. The State has a very limited number of staff with extensive experience or certification in business continuity/operational recovery. The ORP Workgroup has offered recommendations to modify S.A.M. and SIMM to provide more detail and structure in the development of ORPs. If these revisions are adopted, agencies will benefit from formal training on the new requirements and assistance in modifying their current plans, if necessary.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### ***Form a Peer Review Committee/Panel for ORPs.***

Initially, the intention of this group was to provide additional resources for the annual review of the operational recovery plans. It was also thought that the results of the review would be documented and submitted to the owner of the State operational recovery program. The designated owner of the statewide operational recovery program would then issue official correspondence to the agency/department that either accepted the plan or listed necessary corrective action.

As the structure of this committee was discussed it became clear that a mentoring and training program would be vital in order to nurture an acceptable level of program knowledge for new participants. Further discussions have led to the inception of the idea that this Peer Review Committee may serve as the foundation for a State Operational Recovery Planning training program.

In addition, the agencies' perspectives were taken into consideration. Rather than simply mandating compliance, the IT Council Security Committee would like to offer an approach that will garner support and participation. In light of that, the Peer Review Committee would provide the results of the review and recommendations for improvement of the ORPs to the agency Directors and CIOs. This gives Departments the opportunity to correct, improve or receive validation of completeness of the plans prior to submission of the document to the Department of Finance.

#### ***Revised Function***

The function of this program would be to provide an independent annual review of state Operational Recovery Plans to agencies. This review will provide written recommendations for improvement to meet current state standards. Additionally, the development of a training

program will create a larger pool of experienced operational recovery planners within the State of California.

### ***Peer Review Committee - Model 1***

Each quarter, 30 to 40 ORPs are scheduled for submission. Using an evaluation form, based on the recommended revisions to S.A.M. requirements, it is estimated that the initial review of one ORP will require two hours. In order to provide a broader review, it is recommended that review teams are proposed. The volunteer peer review committee members would use the evaluation form to identify that key components exist within the ORP (2 hrs/ORP/per volunteer) and a more thorough and final review would be conducted by a core review team member (4 hrs/ORP including documentation of recommended plan improvements).

**Participants and Structure of Committee:** Six teams comprised of one core review team member and two volunteer team members.

- ***Core Review Team\**** (Six “permanent” committee members): A mix of several certified business continuity planners and State staff with two or more years of experience developing and implementing OR/BCPs.

***Time Commitment:*** Three days in the first month to train new participants and, three to four days per quarter to document recommendations

***Total Time Commitment per quarter per team member:*** Approximately seven workdays

- ***Quarterly Volunteer Team*** (Twelve “volunteer” participants each quarter)

***Time Commitment:*** Three days in the first month to receive training and two to three days per quarter to evaluate plans

***Total Time Commitment per quarter per team member:*** Approximately six workdays

\*Please note that the time estimated for the core review team members does not include the development or administration of the training program or peer review process.

### **Process for ORP Evaluations:**

Each peer review team would be assigned approximately seven or eight ORPs per quarter. Two team members would conduct separate evaluations of each ORP and submit the results to a core team member for further review.

One core review team member (working independently) would be assigned to each peer review team as the lead. The core review team member would review the evaluations and develop written recommendations that would be sent to the agency’s Director and CIO.

## **Peer Review Committee - Model 2**

Another approach may be that agencies send staff to the recommended ORP training program offered by the core review team and then structure an internal review team. The agency review team would use the same evaluation form and a process similar to *Model 1* each quarter. Agencies could also request advice or guidance from the core review team.

If an “agency based” approach is taken, the core review team could serve as an advisory committee on best practices for agencies with internal review teams and limit their first level reviews to departments/boards and commissions not governed by an umbrella agency. This approach would place more responsibility on agencies but use fewer agency resources (volunteers) than *Model 1*.

## **KEYS TO SUCCESS**

In order for the Peer Review Committee and Training Program to be successful, the following elements must be in place:

1. Adoption and publication of the revised S.A.M. and SIMM policies and guidelines.
2. Further development of the SIMM guidelines based on the revised S.A.M. language to assist departments.
3. Development of a participant training program based on revised S.A.M. and SIMM and the proposed peer review process.
4. The Peer Review Committee must become a recognized and sanctioned entity within the State’s IT community with the authority to issue these recommendations and best practices.
5. Joint sponsorship from the State CIO and DOF to promote the efforts of the Peer Review Committee and a partnership with the owner of the statewide operational recovery program to improve ORPs.
6. For long-term success, the committee would need a home and eventual permanency within State government. Ideally, the core review team would become an established “unit” within a larger department (e.g. Homeland Security or one of the data centers) with funding for PYs and a comprehensive State Operational Recovery Training Program.

## **ISSUES**

1. Departments that provide participants for the Peer Review Committee would benefit through the training received by those team members.
2. Confidentiality must be addressed for this group in regard to the contents/viability of operational recovery plans. It is recommended that a confidentiality agreement be developed for participants.

3. Consideration of on-site audits for agencies with mission critical business functions should be discussed as the State's operational recovery program is further developed.
4. The process for receiving copies of the operational recovery plans and the content/language of letters to the agencies and departments must be developed.
5. It must be determined which State entity will oversee the efforts of Peer Review Committee.
6. It is recommended that further development of the peer review process be delayed until the basic structure of the Peer Review Committee is reviewed and direction is received from the State CIO.

## **GOAL 5 – STATEWIDE CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS/ CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT PLANNING**

### **BACKGROUND**

The State of California is responsible for providing a number of critical services to the public. Disasters and other business disruptions can and do prevent the delivery of those services. Therefore, the State of California must ensure that the appropriate steps are taken for the continuation of service delivery.

Past events, both local and regional, have proven that a viable COOP/COG can help to prevent or mitigate the effects of a disruption of critical services. Conceptually, a COOP/COG Planning program encompasses emergency response, operational recovery (the recovery of critical information technology systems) and business resumption planning (the recovery of critical business processes). These plans may stand alone to meet their respective needs; however, recovery of an agency's critical services would require the planning and execution of each of those components being performed in a coordinated manner. A viable COOP/COG Planning program ensures that coordination.

The ORP Workgroup is aware of a COOP planning pilot program currently being conducted jointly by the Governor's Office of Emergency Services and the California Military Department, and that is scheduled for completion in early 2006. As stated earlier, Executive Order S-04-06 places COOP/COG planning responsibility with OES. In that process, OES is requested to give full consideration to the recommendations stated herein.

### **ISSUES**

COOP/COG planning needs to be clearly addressed in SAM. Clear written authority and guidelines on this matter will facilitate agency implementation of such plans. This will better prepare agencies to deliver critical services following a disaster.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

In implementing a COOP/COG program for the state, the ORP Workgroup recommends that the State (via OES or another State entity):

1. Establish the COOP/COG planning program as a standard business practice for all state agencies.

2. Publish and put in place the necessary requirements and authorities for state agencies to both develop and implement COOP/COG planning programs.
3. Establish a state training program to support COOP/COG planning programs to ensure that ongoing expertise is developed within state service.

The development of this work should be done under the sponsorship of a high level executive or an executive-level steering committee, aided by staff experienced in continuity of government operations, business continuity, business resumption, operational recovery and/or emergency management planning.

It is further recommended that, in developing a COOP/COG planning program, OES incorporate the following elements and considerations:

1. A business impact analysis (BIA) to determine and prioritize critical business processes including maximum acceptable outage timeframes, which are a measure of outage tolerance.
2. An emergency response plan as currently prescribed in Government Code Section 14615.
3. An incident management plan with both internal and external communications components, as prescribed in the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS), Government Code Section 8560.
4. Business resumption plans for those business processes identified in the BIA as critical, including the documentation of resource requirements and interdependencies such as skilled staff, office equipment, technology applications and systems, communications, services, and general supplies necessary for recovery.
5. Provision for the protection of vital records and data as identified in the business resumption plans.
6. Operational recovery plans as required in S.A.M. 4843 and SIMM 140.
7. A description of the recovery strategy that supports the agency's critical business priorities.
8. Provision for annual exercise testing of all components of the COOP/COG plan.
9. The need for clear and comprehensive requirements.
10. The need for state oversight and review, including a requirement for remediation of incomplete plans.

11. A training program that would include executive awareness, continuity of government operations or business continuity industry practices, guidelines for the development of plans and a certification process for state continuity of government operations planners.
12. A review of Government Code Sections 8549 through 8549.16.
13. A review of Government Code Sections 8549.20, 8549.21, and 8549.22 which are outdated and in which mandated requirements were met July 1, 1991.
14. A review of any other statutes or mandates that may be identified during discovery.
15. Take into consideration all the findings and recommendations of the State ISO's Operational Recovery Planning Workgroup.

## **GOAL 6 – MULTI-AGENCY RECOVERY COORDINATION**

The ORP Workgroup recognizes the need for the state to develop an instrument for multi-agency recovery coordination. The purpose of the plan would be to enable an orderly, coordinated, and timely recovery to a wide scale disaster that may effect the operations and delivery of services of a number of state agencies. Such a plan would enable the state to prioritize recovery strategies and resources, and coordinate recovery operations and the sharing of resources between different departments and other public and private entities.

### **ISSUES**

In the event of a large scale disaster that affects a large portion of state operations, especially one in the downtown Sacramento area, there needs to be a plan or mechanism for the coordination, prioritization, and facilitation of state resources for the purpose of the quick recovery of critical state operations. The disruption of a large disaster affecting multiple state agencies and services would make coordination and management of recovery efforts difficult. A contingency plan is needed in advance of such a disaster.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Operational Recovery Workgroup recommends that the Office of Emergency Services form, at the Cabinet level, a State Recovery Coordination Team that would become operational in the event of a major disaster affecting multiple state agencies. The team would operate under the authority of the Governor's Office. It would differ from OES in that it would not require permanent staff or resources and would only meet to work on plans, review scenarios, update the plans, test plans, and convene in the event of a real disaster.

The State Recovery Coordination Team would be responsible for the following tasks to prepare for, and respond to, a major disaster involving multiple state agencies.

1. Select a planning team.
2. Define the issue and obtain input on best practices that apply.

3. Complete a State Recovery Coordination Plan that includes the roles and responsibilities of state officers and agencies, the activities of the State Recovery Coordination Team, and the specific methods and procedures to be followed by the team during a disaster.

### ***State Recovery Coordination Planning Model***

The following are some examples of the elements that should be considered for inclusion in a multi-agency recovery coordination plan.

1. Crisis Management as it relates to the restoration of the business functions of the state.
2. Communication interfaces with entities like the OES and first responders.
3. Coordination and prioritization of the existing state resources and staff as well as the procurement of additional resources, as appropriate.
4. Coordination with the Governor's Office and other state agencies and officials in determining the prioritization of resources.
5. Coordination of the restoration of damaged infrastructure and facilities.
6. Coordination and communication with state agencies in the recovery of the individual critical business processes and supporting applications.
7. Assisting the Governor's Office in managing such issues as executive succession, legislative requests, cost assessments, etc.
8. Provide the Governor with an information stream concerning agency and business impacts, available resources, expected timelines for resources and recoveries, as well as any additional information pertinent to the Governor's responsibilities or concerns.
9. Forward requests and recommendations to the Governor's Office regarding specific restoration and recovery issues, especially where there are competing priorities among state agencies or officials.

## GOAL 7 - STATE AGENCY MUTUAL ASSISTANCE IN SUPPORT OF CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

### WHAT IS MUTUAL ASSISTANCE?

Mutual assistance is a basic model of “neighbor helping neighbor.” Mutual assistance has three key components: membership, resources, and reciprocity. The first component, membership, requires participation in a written agreement between one or more entities. Second, the agreement identifies the availability of resources (typically “like” or “similar”) that either entity might make use of. Third, each member entity agrees to provide reciprocity with regard to those resources.

### WHY CONSIDER MUTUAL ASSISTANCE?

The State Information Management Manual (SIMM) 140, *Operational Recovery Plan, Topic Guideline*, published by the Department of Finance recommends that state agencies develop recovery strategies “that may include the use of mutual aid agreements.”<sup>1</sup>

While commonplace among emergency management and first-responder agencies at the federal, state and local government levels<sup>2</sup>, mutual aid among non-first-responder state agencies has not been generally practiced. Yet, the Emergency Services Act requires that state agencies render all possible assistance upon request of the Governor or the Director of the Office of Emergency Services (OES). In doing so, state agencies must work together collaboratively.<sup>3</sup>

Typically, requests for mutual assistance at the State level would come following a regional disaster. But what happens when there is a single agency business interruption? For State agencies, a business interruption is defined as “any unplanned occurrence which causes the stoppage of the operation of any state agency in such a manner that it cannot accomplish its mission and goals.”<sup>4</sup> Advanced planning using mutual assistance agreements ensures that in the event an agency has a business interruption, another agency is ready and equipped to render some assistance.

*Example:* Agency A and Agency B have a signed mutual assistance agreement. The agreement states that if either agency must evacuate its building and activate the agency’s Emergency

---

<sup>1</sup> 15 SIMM 150, ORP Topic Outline

<sup>2</sup> California Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS) and the National Incident Management System (NIMS)

<sup>3</sup> Government Code §8596 a. and §8596 b.

<sup>4</sup> Government Code §8549.3

Operations Center (EOC), the other agency will provide adequate office or meeting room space, telephones, copiers, etc., to accommodate a given number of people. The agreement may or may not limit use of the resources to a specified interval of time (i.e., 30 days, 60 days, 6 months, etc).

## **WHAT DOES A MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT LOOK LIKE?**

A sample mutual assistance agreement is included in Attachment 1 in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). This particular sample provides for reciprocity between two actual departments<sup>5</sup> in the event one of the departments has a business interruption. Note that the agreement would be fulfilled only if *one* of the departments has a business interruption. It is assumed that if the departments had simultaneous interruptions, one would not have the resources to help the other and vice-versa.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Department of Technology Services and the Franchise Tax Board

---

## OPERATIONAL RECOVERY PLANNING WORKGROUP

<i>Project Sponsor</i>	J. Clark Kelso, State Chief Information Officer
<i>Project Manager</i>	John Lane, Chief Information Officer, CA Dept. of Conservation
<i>Team Leads</i>	Tom Jones, Deputy Director, Legislative Counsel Data Center Rebecca Harrigan, Operational Recovery Planner, Dept. of Managed Health Care
<i>Team Members</i>	Harinder Dhillon, Operational Recovery Planner, Dept. of Child Support Services Ryan Dulin, Information Technology Security Manager, Dept. of Finance Dean Izett, Operational Recovery Planner, Dept. of Technology Services Eileen Kennedy, Network Infrastructure Manager, Dept. of Technology Services Bert Pierroz, Information Technology Security, Dept. of Water Resources Teresa Soria, Operational Recovery Planner, State Controllers Office Pamela Wagner, Business Continuity Planner, Dept. of Technology Services
<i>Private Industry Participant</i>	David Locke, Disaster Recovery Manager, Blue Shield of California
<i>Advisor</i>	Debra Reiger, State Information Security Officer, Dept. of Finance

## **ATTACHMENTS**

## ATTACHMENT 1 - SAMPLE MUTUAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT

### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

- I. This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into between Agency A, hereinafter called A, and Agency B, hereinafter called B.
- II. A will provide B with an alternate emergency operations center (EOC) within 24 hours notice at (\_\_\_\_\_ enter address here \_\_\_\_\_), in the event of a business interruption.

This agreement shall be subject to the following conditions:

- B's EOC locations identified in the Continuity of Government Operations Plan, are not available and,
- B's EOC Director designates A as the assembly location when the EOC is activated.

B will provide A with an alternate emergency operations center (EOC) within 24 hours notice at (\_\_\_\_\_ enter address here \_\_\_\_\_), in the event of a business interruption.

This agreement shall be subject to the following conditions:

- A's EOC locations identified in the Continuity of Government Operations Plan, are not available and,
- A's EOC Director designates B as the assembly location when the EOC is activated.

This is a reciprocal agreement between A and B to establish an alternate EOC for the purpose of:

- Providing a "known" physical location where A or B management and key recovery staff can be located and accounted for in the event business interruption.
- Provide a temporary location for A or B management and key recovery staff to determine subsequent business recovery and resumption actions.

- III. The term of this MOU agreement shall be January 1, 2006 thru December 31, 2006 between A and B. The MOU will be updated on an annual basis. This agreement may be cancelled by either party upon 30 days advance notification.
- IV. A or B will provide the requirements identified in the MOU procedures.

Authorizations:

Name  
Director, Agency A

Name  
Director, Agency B

\_\_\_\_\_   
Date

\_\_\_\_\_   
Date

**Agency A  
Alternate Emergency Operations Center (EOC) At Agency B  
Agency A Procedures  
Updated January 1, 2006**

**PURPOSE**

This document is an attachment to the memorandum of understanding signed between Agency A and Agency B. The purpose is to detail the procedure to invoke this agreement if Agency A needs to use Agency B as an assembly location.

**CONTACTS**

Agency A shall contact the Agency B personnel listed in priority order below to invoke the MOU.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Office Phone</b>	<b>Cell / Pager</b>
	Agency B Emergency Services Officer	XXX-XXXX	XXX-XXXX
	Agency B Facilities Management	XXX-XXXX	XXX-XXXX
	Agency B Continuity Planning Office	XXX-XXXX	XXX-XXXX
	Agency B Project Planning & Support	XXX-XXXX	XXX-XXXX
	Agency B Technology Services Division	XXX-XXXX	XXX-XXXX
	Agency B Hot Site Coordinator	XXX-XXXX	XXX-XXXX
Guard on Duty	Agency B Security Command Center	XXX-XXXX	XXX-XXXX

**AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL**

The following Agency A personnel are authorized admission into the alternate emergency assembly location at Agency B.

Name	Title
	Director
	Chief Deputy Director
	Dep. Director Engineering
	Dep. Dir. Administration
	Information Sec. Officer
	Dep. Dir. Operations
	Public Information Officer
	Facilities Manager
	Telecom Manager

Name	Title
	Customer Services Mgr.
	Human Resources Mgr.
	Continuity of Ops Mgr.
	Operational Recovery
	Business Resumption
	Enterprise Operations/OR
	Health & Safety Officer
	Facilities Engineer
	Desktop Support

## REQUIREMENTS

The following resources are identified by Agency A to be provided by Agency B.

### Required Items

- Meeting Room to accommodate at least 25 people
- 12 voice communication lines and phones
- Agency B contacts, including for Agency A phone and pager numbers
- Floor plan identifying room designated
- Map displaying various routes to Agency B facility
- Parking for 20-25 Agency A staff vehicles

### Desirable Items

- Access to TV and/or radio
- Access to copier and FAX machines
- Access to printer
- Storage place for emergency documents such as:
  1. Copies of critical Agency A documents
  2. Executive and key staff contact list

## MEETING ROOM(S)

Conference Room XXXX has been selected for Agency A's alternate emergency operations center (EOC) located at Agency B. See attached maps and floor plans.

## ATTACHMENT 2 - PROJECT CHARTER

**Project Sponsor:** J. Clark Kelso  
**Project Mgr:** John Lane  
**Start Date:** May 31, 2005  
**Est. End Date:** December 2005

### Project Core Team Members

Team Member	Role
Tom Jones	Lead
Rebecca Harrigan	Lead
Harinder Dhillon	Member
Ryan Dulin	Member
Eileen Kennedy	Member
Bert Pierroz	Member
Teresa Soria	Member
Pam Wagner	Member
Dean Izett	Member
<b>CONSULTANTS</b>	
Debra Reiger (Advisor)	State ISO
Dave Locke, Blue Shield of CA	Consultant

### Project Scope Statement

Review current State Operational Recovery Plan strategy and make recommendations to improve ORP effectiveness and consistency, within the context of a higher-level Continuity of Government Operations Plan.

### Project Tradeoff Matrix

	Not Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Most Flexible
<b>Resources</b>			x
<b>Schedule</b>		x	
<b>Scope</b>	x		

**Project Budget:** None  
**Expended to Date:** None

### Project Goal

1. Develop an approach to ORP that meets current state requirements and the needs of the departments.
2. Recommend changes or clarifications to SAM and SIMM that would improve the value of ORPs.
3. Develop a strategy for raising the importance of the ORP in the eyes of

4. executive management through effective awareness training and marketing
4. Identify a mechanism for peer review of plans to ensure the plans are actually usable
5. Publish recommendations on how the state could develop a Continuity of Government Operations Planning program.
6. Develop recommendations on how the state can set priorities to mitigate the effects of large-scale emergencies affecting multiple State agencies.
7. Publish a manual on how departments can establish "Mutual Assistance Programs" among state agencies.

### Deliverables

1. Project Charter
2. Periodic Status Reports
3. ORP Policy (Goal 1)
4. ORP Development Procedures (Goal 1) - Deferred
5. ORP Handbook for Plan Review (Goal 1) - Deferred
6. S.A.M./SIMM Modification Documents (Goal 2)
7. Statewide Executive Awareness Plan (Goal 3)
8. Peer Review Guideline (Goal 4)
9. Continuity of Government Operations Planning program proposal (Goal 5)
10. Multi-Agency Recovery Coordination proposal (Goal 6)
11. Mutual Assistance Agreements Guideline (Goal 7)

### Dependencies

1. Personnel Resource - Consistent attendance and participation by all team members
2. Periodic status updates and direction
3. State IT Strategic Plan

### Benefits

1. Statewide Standards and Best Practices

### Performance Attributes

1. Recommendations approved by Sponsor.
2. Deliverables distributed to Department Heads and their management for

implementation.

3. Increase in % of departments reporting ORP to State ISO
4. State Admin Manual expanded to represent current business and technology environment
5. Increased awareness of state department's due diligence in contingency planning by applying Continuity of Government (business continuity) practices and Operational Recovery practices.
6. Communication and coordination improve amongst interdependent agencies in responding to state emergency impacting

critical services to Californians.

7. Improved fund allocation for IT contingency planning

**Issues**

1. Political influence in distribution of findings and recommendations by ORP committee.
2. State level implementation vs. funding and resource allocation

