

SOLUTION SCENARIO / AS OF 2026-10-02

A recovery plan proven by a usable restore

A successful job is the beginning. Usable recovery is the proof.

ILLUSTRATIVE / PROPOSED SELECTIONS / MODELED FINANCIAL RESULTS

This example uses its own size and budget; figures are illustrative, not customer results or quotes.

Scenario and intended outcome

ENVIRONMENT

Illustrative 20-user nonprofit with one important file-based workload and limited operator capacity.

OBJECTIVE

Create a rehearsed recovery procedure with explicit custody, safe destinations and measurable business usability.

SCOPE

Backup and recovery of the selected file workload. Databases and SaaS require their own supported application-consistent methods.

MODEL BOUNDARY

One file-based backup/recovery component. Storage and operating service are included as hypothetical allowances.

A repeatable selection method

START WITH THE REQUIREMENT

Map the business workflow, data classification, integrations, scale, recovery objectives, operator skills and support hours. Treat eligibility, security and mandatory features as pass/fail gates before scoring price.

COMPARE SUITABLE CANDIDATES

For candidates that pass the gates, score functional fit 30%, operational maintainability 25%, integration and data portability 20%, three-year total cost 15%, and supplier/support resilience 10%. These are proposed weights, not completed vendor test results.

PROVE THE CHOICE

Run a representative pilot, negative tests and recovery exercise. Price hosting, retention, patching, engineering, support, training and exit. A lower license bill wins only when the complete solution meets the requirement.

Proposed selections and alternatives

Illustrative options for evaluation; selection does not represent a completed vendor test or an actual quote.

FIRST, PASS THE GATES

Map the business workflow, data classification, integrations, scale, recovery objectives, operator skills and support hours. Treat eligibility, security and mandatory features as pass/fail gates before scoring price.

PROPOSED SCORING WEIGHTS AFTER THE PASS/FAIL GATES

For candidates that pass the gates, score functional fit 30%, operational maintainability 25%, integration and data portability 20%, three-year total cost 15%, and supplier/support resilience 10%. These are proposed weights, not completed vendor test results.

PROPOSED DIRECTION	ALTERNATIVE TO TEST
Proposed: restic for a suitable file workload Evaluate the open-source backup tool on the selected platform and destination; test data integrity and retrieval.	Choose a commercial application-aware backup product where restore requirements, workload support or available operators make it a better fit.
PROPOSED DIRECTION	ALTERNATIVE TO TEST
Proposed: separately protected storage and custody Budget storage, retention and recovery access; test isolation and immutability only if the chosen storage/policy actually supports them.	Encryption is not immutability. Confirm protected deletion, key recovery, account separation and provider terms rather than infer them from the backup tool.
PROPOSED DIRECTION	ALTERNATIVE TO TEST
Proposed: a documented restore rehearsal Use a safe destination, named owner and realistic workflow. Re-protect recovered data and verify cleanup.	A managed recovery service is justified if the customer cannot staff the rehearsal and event-time responsibilities.

PROOF BEFORE CHOICE

Run a representative pilot, negative tests and recovery exercise. Price hosting, retention, patching, engineering, support, training and exit. A lower license bill wins only when the complete solution meets the requirement.

Architecture flow and delivery path

The sequence below follows the supplied scenario flow and implementation stages.

Architecture flow

01**Approved workload -> backup**

The owner confirms the dataset and protection objective; an authorized operator schedules and monitors the backup.

02**Backup -> protected destination**

Retention, storage access and key custody follow the approved recovery boundary.

03**Destination -> usable workflow**

A safe restore demonstrates file integrity and the business task; observed time and unresolved gaps are recorded.

Implementation stages

01 Choose recovery objectives	Identify critical data, dependencies, permitted loss and recovery time; do not promise a target before rehearsal.
02 Build and pilot	Configure the scoped file backup and storage, isolate custody and test failure notification.
03 Rehearse recovery	Restore to the authorized destination, confirm user usability and document elapsed time and limits.
04 Train and sustain	Train backup operators; schedule restore exercises, retention checks, key recovery and corrective actions.

Acceptance and operating handoff

Acceptance evidence is scoped to the illustrative component described in this brief.

Acceptance checks

01

Acceptance check 1

A selected backup produces a readable restore with verified representative contents.

02

Acceptance check 2

The business owner completes the intended workflow from the restored copy.

03

Acceptance check 3

Backup/storage failures alert the right person.

04

Acceptance check 4

Custody, cleanup and re-protection can be performed by the backup operator.

Common handoff

01

Handoff 1

Customer owns approvals and business priorities; L8DT owns only the operating tasks and access authority in the signed schedule.

02

Handoff 2

Deliver versioned configuration, asset/data-flow registers, escalation and recovery runbooks, license obligations, known gaps and an acceptance record.

03

Handoff 3

Rehearse the operator workflow and restore before acceptance. Record owners, backup owners, training attendance, support hours and supplier escalation.

04

Handoff 4

Review coverage and evidence monthly; revisit capacity and access quarterly. Define export, credential removal and retention at termination.

36-month economics

Synthetic scenario inputs and calculated model outputs. These values are not a quote or realized savings.

Monthly assumptions and setup

Input	Illustrative commercial comparator	Illustrative L8DT model
One-time setup	\$1,750	\$2,250
License / month	\$180	\$0
Infrastructure / month	\$100	\$120
Service / month	\$200	\$300
Monthly cash total	\$480	\$420
Customer effort / month	2 hours	4 hours
Customer hourly value	\$65	\$65
Customer effort value / month	\$130	\$260

Calculated totals across 36 months

36-month total	Commercial comparator	L8DT model
Cash TCO (setup + monthly cash)	\$19,030	\$17,370
Customer-effort value	\$4,680	\$9,360
Economic TCO (cash + customer effort)	\$23,710	\$26,730

Modeled comparison outputs

NET CASH AVOIDANCE +\$1,660	COST AVOIDANCE 8.72%	CASH ROI 9.56%
ECONOMIC BENEFIT -\$3,020	PRETAX PROFIT DELTA: YEAR 1 / STEADY Y1 +\$220 steady +\$720	PAYBACK 9 months
L8DT EXTRA CUSTOMER TIME / MONTH 2 hours	SENSITIVITY ADD-ON / MONTH \$90	SENSITIVITY NET CASH AVOIDANCE -\$1,580

Model definitions, boundaries and references

Use the links and source notes for review. Public destination routes are targets; deployment was not verified for this package.

Definitions: cost avoidance = net cash avoidance / commercial 36-month cash TCO; cash ROI = net cash avoidance / proposed L8DT 36-month cash TCO. Economic benefit = commercial economic TCO minus L8DT economic TCO; economic TCO adds customer effort valued at the stated hourly input. Valued time is not payroll saving. Sensitivity applies the stated additional monthly L8DT operating cost for all 36 months.

REALIZED OUTCOMES

Realized ROI: NOT PROVIDED | Realized profit: NOT PROVIDED. These are not provided as customer results.

INTERPRETATION LIMIT

Illustrative scenario only. Proposed selections, input costs and modeled values are not actual customer results, completed vendor test results, or supplier quotes.

HYPOTHETICAL PROFIT-DELTA ASSUMPTION

Year-one pretax profit delta uses the modeled recurring cash difference less any incremental setup; steady-year delta uses 12 times the recurring cash difference. The model assumes costs are recognized as operating expenses with equal revenue and other costs. Capitalization, depreciation and tax treatment can differ.

Out of scope for this model

Unscoped SaaS/database recovery, endpoints, bandwidth, extra retention, dedicated disaster-recovery infrastructure and taxes are excluded equally. No actual RTO/RPO is claimed.

WHAT TO PROVE AND PRICE

Run a representative pilot, negative tests and recovery exercise. Price hosting, retention, patching, engineering, support, training and exit. A lower license bill wins only when the complete solution meets the requirement.

Official project and product references

restic project and license

restic.net

Source data as of 2026-10-02.

Related L8DT destinations

Experience story /experience/nonprofit-recovery/	Solution detail /solutions/nonprofit-recovery/
--	---

Website: <https://www.layer8defensetechnologies.com/>