

Verified-fix postmortem template

A receipt-first record for what initiated an incident, what was ruled out, what changed, and whether the fix held.

Incident ID _____ _____	Postmortem owner _____ _____	Reviewers _____ _____	Status _____ _____
Severity _____ _____	Incident start _____ _____	Recovery time _____ _____	Publication date _____ _____

Incident metadata and impact

Give a future reader the minimum context needed to find the incident and understand its consequence.

Incident ID, owner, reviewers, status, severity, start, detection, mitigation, recovery, and close times _____ _____
Affected workloads, users, clusters, nodes, ranks, devices, checkpoints, and data _____ _____
Measured impact, duration, capacity lost, work lost, data integrity exposure, and customer effect _____ _____
Detection source, first alert, escalation path, and why existing controls did or did not catch it _____ _____

Evidence-backed timeline

Record event time, observation time, actor, action, result, and an immutable receipt for each material step.

First abnormal event and the last known-good event _____ _____
Detection, declaration, containment, evidence capture, hypothesis tests, remediation, recovery, and observation milestones _____ _____
Clock skew, missing logs, overwritten evidence, and any event order that remains uncertain _____ _____

Causal evidence

Initiator evidence

Identify the first causal event without promoting downstream timeouts, wrapper exceptions, or collateral rank failures.

Literal initiating signature, timestamp, host, rank, process, device, workload, and full preceding context
Telemetry, scheduler, kernel, network, storage, checkpoint, and configuration receipts aligned to the event
Why this evidence predates and causally explains the downstream symptoms
Confidence level, uncertainty boundary, and evidence that would falsify the claim

Causal chain

Trigger	Initiating condition	Downstream symptoms	Impact

Hypotheses and remediation

Rejected hypotheses

Show what plausible explanations were tested, not merely what the team eventually believed.

Hypothesis, reason it was plausible, and evidence expected if true		
Controlled comparison, fixed conditions, independent variable, result, and receipt		
Reason rejected or retained, confidence, and any untested edge case		
Hypothesis	Controlled comparison and receipt	Decision and confidence

Remediation and rollback

Describe the exact causal condition changed, the execution receipt, and the safe path back.

Change, owner, timestamp, command or revision, systems touched, approval path, and immutable receipt
Why the change addresses the initiating condition instead of suppressing the symptom
Rollback command, trigger, owner, expected recovery time, and state that cannot be rolled back
Checkpoint, data, configuration, and dependency integrity checks completed before recovery

Observation and recurrence

Observation window

Define in advance what must stay healthy, for how long, at what production shape, and with which stop condition.

Start, end, workload shape, node and rank set, input, checkpoint, versions, traffic or job volume, and baseline 			
Original signature, initiating warning, throughput, loss, GPU health, network, storage, and checkpoint signals monitored 			
Pass threshold, failure threshold, stop condition, and reason the window is long enough to cover expected recurrence 			

Window start 	Window end 	Production shape 	Pass or fail
--	--	--	--

Recurrence record

Count every repeat of the initiating event and separate a clean interval from missing observation.

Recurrence count before remediation, during the control, and during the observation window
For each recurrence: time, workload, rank, node, device, signature, context, and receipt
Missing telemetry, blind spots, excluded intervals, and whether zero means observed zero or unknown

Outcome and follow-up

Verified outcome

Close with a bounded claim whose evidence, population, interval, and remaining uncertainty are explicit.

Claim: the initiating condition changed, the matched control passed, and the original signature did or did not recur

Exact population, workload shape, versions, observation duration, sample count, and receipts supporting the claim

What this outcome does not prove, remaining risk, rollback readiness, and the next verification date

Follow-up actions

Turn learning into owned, testable work instead of a list of intentions.

Action, category, priority, owner, tracking ID, deadline, status, and acceptance test

Prevention, detection, mitigation, evidence retention, runbook, and training improvements

Verification command or dashboard, expected result, rollback trigger, and closure receipt

Action item register

Action and tracking ID	Owner and due date	Acceptance test and closure receipt

Review and publication checklist

[]	The language is factual and blameless, and every causal or outcome claim links to evidence.
[]	The initiating event is separated from downstream symptoms and collateral failures.
[]	Rejected hypotheses include the control that ruled each one out.
[]	The remediation names the causal condition changed and includes a rollback path.
[]	The observation window, recurrence count, population, blind spots, and remaining uncertainty are explicit.
[]	Every follow-up action has one owner, a deadline, an acceptance test, and a closure receipt.

Postmortem owner signoff _____	Technical reviewer signoff _____	Follow-up owner signoff _____
--	--	---

Official sources

[Google SRE Workbook: Postmortem Culture](https://sre.google/workbook/postmortem-culture/) <https://sre.google/workbook/postmortem-culture/>

[Google SRE: Example Postmortem](https://sre.google/sre-book/example-postmortem/) <https://sre.google/sre-book/example-postmortem/>

[Google Cloud: Conduct Thorough Postmortems](https://docs.cloud.google.com/architecture/framework/reliability/conduct-postmortems) <https://docs.cloud.google.com/architecture/framework/reliability/conduct-postmortems>

A postmortem should help people learn and prevent recurrence. Use factual, blameless language and redact secrets, personal data, and customer-confidential evidence before wider sharing.

Additional notes

Redactions, sharing scope, publication receipt, and next review
