

Recovery Evidence Boundary

DEFINITION

Recovery evidence can exist without recovery claims being independently validated — proof requires an authority structurally separate from whoever produced the evidence.

FRAMEWORK FLOW

01 The Condition Recovery programs generate artifacts and declare recoverability based on internally produced evidence.	02 The Boundary No independent authority exists that validates recovery claims. Self-validation lets the evidence producer become the evidence judge.	03 Failure State Evidence Theater — artifacts exist, but no authority with standing can independently reject the conclusion.	04 Consequence Recovery claims stay operationally asserted rather than independently trusted — sovereign recovery assurance never arrives.
--	--	---	---

Failure State: Evidence Theater



THE DIAGNOSTIC SIGNAL

EVIDENCE OWNERSHIP Ask the recovery team whether their test passed. The answer is always yes — confidently, and often correctly.	VALIDATION OWNERSHIP Ask who independently confirmed the claim. The honest answer is nobody — not neglect, absence of a validating authority.
TRIGGER CONDITION The gap activates the moment someone outside the recovery team — auditor, regulator, acquirer — asks for proof rather than a summary.	REMEDIATION SHAPE Named independent reviewer, third-party reproducibility, evidence stored outside the platform being evaluated, contract-defined rejection authority — architectural, never procedural.

THE RECOVERY MATURITY PROGRESSION

01 Design	02 Execute	03 Survive Compromise	04 Survive Attack	05 Continuity	06 Evidence Boundary
--------------	---------------	--------------------------	----------------------	------------------	-------------------------

Stages 1–5 are engineering capability; Stage 6 is the first governance-legitimacy question in the progression. Distinct from execution authority (#144): an organization can have flawless recovery execution authority and zero recovery evidence validation authority at the same time — different failure modes, same incident.

ARCHITECTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

#163 Continuity Execution Boundary DEPENDENCY STRONG Evaluating whether recovery/continuity claims are independently validated presupposes continuity itself has already been established as executable and survivable, not merely asserted.	#148 Recoverability Gap RELATED MODERATE #148 establishes whether recovery capability survives adversarial compromise; #167 asks whether the claim that it did so can be independently proven, one layer above.
#144 Recovery Authority Fragmentation RELATED WEAK #144 evaluates whether the people and credentials needed to execute recovery survive the incident; #167 evaluates whether anyone independent of the executors can confirm the claim afterward.	#151 Infrastructure Evidence Gap RELATED WEAK – CROSS-PILLAR Same architectural principle, different layer: #151 is a chain-of-custody problem in Modern Infrastructure & IaC; #167 is an independent-authority problem in Data Protection.

ANCHOR /recovery-evidence-boundary/

FRAMEWORK HOME

The independent-authority condition is domain-agnostic beyond this anchor — the same failure geometry recurs anywhere self-produced evidence stands in for independently validated proof.

"Every recovery test can correctly explain its own result. Nobody can independently confirm what that result actually proves — not because anyone neglected the question, but because no one was ever assigned to answer it."