

A Recovery Claim That Needs a Decision

Public sample | The 30-Day Enterprise SaaS Takeover Kit v1.1.1 | Gniewko Bodora

The supplier says it has backups. The business says the platform must recover in eight hours. Both statements can be true while your recovery capability remains unknown. A useful takeover turns this uncertainty into an evidence request and a decision.

First day action

Confirm who owns the business process and who can authorise a recovery test. Ask for the latest test covering your tenant, data and failure scenario. Record the source, date, scope and limitation. If no test is available, keep the recovery assessment Unknown and give the request an owner and latest useful date.

A fictional example

Aster HR holds 2,400 worker records. E07 records RTO 8 hours and RPO 24 hours as business requirements. E08 contains a vendor backup statement but no tenant restore result. E13 demonstrates a four-hour manual intake fallback. That fallback does not demonstrate that the HRIS can be restored.

What we know	What it supports	What it does not prove
E07 Business requirements	The target the business needs.	Achieved recovery time or data-loss interval.
E08 Backup statement	A supplier claim to investigate.	Tenant-level restore completeness.
E13 Manual fallback exercise	A limited continuity option.	Restoration of the service or all records.

Why severe consequences need a separate decision

The illustrative assessment retains likelihood 2 and impact 5, giving a score of 10. The four-hour manual fallback does not establish that tenant restoration is more likely to succeed. Severe consequences require the scenario's escalation route regardless of the score. Ratings are provisional judgement, not measured probabilities.

The decision and the operating boundary

D04 Fund a scoped restore exercise

Options are to fund a capped EUR 4,000 exercise, request equivalent vendor-funded proof or direct additional containment. The recommendation is to fund the exercise while retaining the limited fallback. Relying on the backup statement alone is rejected as insufficient evidence. The decision belongs to the Executive Risk Sponsor, not the incoming Product Owner.

At Day 30, 1 December 2026, the decision remains Pending, due 4 December. Eight person-days in the next plan are conditional on that approval, an available supplier slot and an approved test environment. The executive page shows the unknown rather than painting the domain Green.

What could change the decision

An observed vendor test matching the required scenario could remove the need for a separate exercise. A quote above the cap needs another funding decision. A reduced business tolerance may require stronger containment. Neither a confident supplier email nor a sponsor's acknowledgement of the baseline constitutes risk acceptance.

Apply it

Write one recovery scenario for your platform. Identify the requirements, evidence already available, remaining unknowns and authorised decision holder. Then state the smallest next action that could change the decision. This is the same evidence → risk → decision → backlog chain used throughout the full kit.

Source basis: NIST CSF 2.0 PR.DS-11 supports creating, protecting, maintaining and testing backups. It does not prescribe this case, the EUR 4,000 budget, the scoring scale or the takeover schedule. All case details are fictional and are not projects of the author or his employers.

[NIST CSF 2.0 primary source](#)

Product information

This public sample may be shared unchanged with attribution. The full kit includes the playbook, editable templates, six workbooks, matching filled files and the complete decision walkthrough. It provides a working method, not guaranteed control or a compliance certification.