The Complete Guide to Succession Planning

Source: leapsome | **Published:** March 25, 2026 | **PMS Relevance:** PMS CORE | **Type:** Practitioner Guide | **Geography:** Global

Source URL: https://site.leapsome.com/blog/succession-planning

Executive Summary

This article addresses the organizational risk created by inadequate succession planning, arguing that most companies operate reactively rather than proactively when leadership vacancies occur. The author presents a six-step succession planning framework covering role identification, talent assessment, high-potential development, individual development plans, knowledge transfer, and ongoing plan review. Key evidence includes a claim that 70% of companies lack formal succession plans, that mismanaged transitions cost organizations $1 trillion annually, and that structured development programs reduce leadership transition failures by 30%, attributed to Center for Creative Leadership research. Real-world case studies of Albertsons and Kering/Gucci are used to illustrate planned versus reactive succession approaches. The article concludes that systematic succession planning delivers competitive advantage through bench strength, faster market adaptation, and improved talent retention. Throughout, Leapsome's platform is positioned as the enabling technology for each step of the framework, making the guide function simultaneously as a practitioner resource and a product promotion document.

Key Insights

1. 70% of companies operate without formal succession plans, despite mismanaged leadership transitions costing organizations an estimated $1 trillion annually.

2. Succession planning effectiveness requires distinguishing between current performance and future leadership potential — high performance in an execution role does not predict success in a strategic leadership role.

3. Middle management succession is identified as an underaddressed layer, with departures at that level creating cascading effects on client relationships, team morale, and revenue targets comparable to executive-level transitions.

Practical Takeaways

- Organizations can scale succession planning by company size: small companies (50–200 employees) are described as focusing on 5–8 critical roles, mid-size organizations expanding to department-level planning, and enterprises creating division-specific templates with detailed competency frameworks.

- Knowledge transfer is framed as a structured process requiring documented decision frameworks, relationship mapping, and mentoring partnerships initiated months or years before anticipated transitions — not a handover activity triggered by departure announcements.

Critical Analysis

Strengths: The article provides a coherent, sequentially structured framework that addresses succession planning across organizational levels, including the often-overlooked middle management tier. The Albertsons and Kering/Gucci case studies ground abstract concepts in observable organizational behavior. The FAQ section addresses genuine implementation barriers. Limitations: The article's primary limitation is commercial bias — Leapsome's platform is referenced as the solution in nearly every section, undermining the guide's neutrality and making it difficult to assess whether the framework reflects independent research or product capability mapping. Several statistics (e.g., $1 trillion cost of mismanaged transitions, 30% reduction in transition failures) are cited without direct attribution to specific named studies, reducing verifiability. The claim that 'more than three-quarters of HR professionals prioritize leadership development, yet only one in five organizations reports being effective at upskilling' lacks a named source. The SHRM figure (63% of organizations invest in formal mentoring programs) is attributed but not linked to a specific report or year. The article does not engage with critiques of succession planning, such as potential bias in high-potential identification or the risk of overlooking external talent. AI transformation is repeatedly invoked as a urgency driver without substantive elaboration.

Organizational Practice

The article describes organizations conducting formal succession plan reviews quarterly with annual comprehensive assessments. Practices include mapping critical roles by revenue impact and operational dependency, using skills matrices to evaluate current capabilities against future requirements, assigning cross-functional rotations and stretch assignments to high-potential employees, establishing mentoring partnerships between incumbents and identified successors prior to transitions, and integrating succession readiness data with performance management cycles. The Albertsons case illustrates a 'ready-now' succession model involving advance public announcement, SEC filing, and promotion of a candidate with nearly 40 years of internal experience. The Kering/Gucci case illustrates reactive but internally resourced succession, elevating a deputy CEO already embedded in strategic decision-making.

Strategic Implications

The article positions succession planning as increasingly time-sensitive given AI-driven role transformation and reported HR capacity constraints through 2026. The framing of succession planning as a continuous talent development process rather than a periodic administrative exercise reflects a broader trend toward integrating succession data with real-time performance and learning systems. The emphasis on middle management succession alongside executive succession suggests organizations are expanding the scope of formal succession programs beyond the C-suite. The repeated linkage of succession planning effectiveness to technology platforms indicates growing vendor interest in positioning talent software as infrastructure for leadership continuity rather than administrative tooling.

Validation Status: passed
