

# Crisis Decision Report

## A batch of our hot sauce shipped with undeclared peanuts. We

PRESAGA RESEARCH CANADA · Confidential · October 19, 2026

Issue an immediate transparent holding statement and activate a dedicated allergy support line within the next 24 hours

CONTENTS

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| The Call .....                      | 2 |
| Operating Reality .....             | 2 |
| Who's Reacting .....                | 2 |
| What's Spreading .....              | 3 |
| Recommended Response .....          | 3 |
| What to Avoid .....                 | 4 |
| Exposure .....                      | 4 |
| Where the Committee Disagrees ..... | 5 |
| What Would Change Our Call .....    | 6 |
| Evidence & Confidence .....         | 6 |
| The situation we were given .....   | 7 |

## The Call

---

A batch of hot sauce was shipped with undeclared peanuts; the company has notified the CFIA and begun a recall, and two grocery chains and a local newspaper are already seeking answers. The risk to peanut-allergic consumers is high and public demand for concrete details is escalating – the most urgent action is to release a brief holding statement today that acknowledges the recall, explains that batch numbers, store locations and a timeline are being verified, and provides a temporary contact line for affected customers. The alternative – remaining silent or waiting for full details before speaking – would allow misinformation to spread and could expose consumers to severe reactions.

## Operating Reality

---

What is known:

- A hot-sauce batch shipped with undeclared peanuts.
- The CFIA was notified this morning.
- A recall of the affected lot has been started.
- Two grocery chains have asked questions.
- A local newspaper has called for comment.

What remains uncertain:

- Specific batch numbers, store locations, and a detailed recall timeline have not been confirmed.
- Whether a 24/7 allergy hotline can be launched today is unclear.

What is being assumed (audience expectations):

- Stakeholders expect the company to disclose batch identifiers, store locations and a clear timeline.
- Consumers anticipate a dedicated hotline for allergy-related inquiries.

## Who's Reacting

---

The primary reacting groups are:

- **Peanut-allergic consumers** – expressing urgent fear and a need for exact recall details. “I just heard the hot sauce batch had undeclared peanuts! As someone with a peanut allergy, this is terrifying. Please confirm the recall, tell us which stores, and ensure this never happens again.” (a modelled consumer)

- **Grocery chains** – seeking concrete information to manage inventory and liability. “We’re pulling the hot sauce from our stores after a recall for undeclared peanuts. If you have it, stop using it and return it for a refund. Your safety is our priority.” (a modelled retailer representative)
- **Local media** – pressing for transparency and timely updates. “Thanks for the heads-up. For our readers we’ll need to know exactly how many jars are affected, which stores are involved, and when the recall will be completed.” (a modelled journalist) These groups are the most critical to address because they directly influence public safety perception and retailer partnership continuity.

## What's Spreading

---

The narrative gaining traction includes:

- **Missing details** – many posts note that the current recall communication lacks batch numbers, store locations, and a concrete timeline.
- **No allergy hotline** – consumers are voicing concern that there is no 24/7 support channel.
- **Resource constraints** – some voices suggest the company may lack legal and communications capacity to craft a full statement today. If these gaps persist, the risk of continued consumption by allergic individuals and heightened regulatory scrutiny will increase.

## Recommended Response

---

**Strategy:** Issue an interim holding statement now, followed by a rapid rollout of a dedicated allergy support line.

### **Holding statement (to be released within the next 4 hours):**

- Acknowledge the recall and confirm that the CFIA has been notified.
- State that batch numbers, affected store locations, and a recall timeline are being verified and will be shared as soon as possible.
- Provide a temporary contact line (e.g., a dedicated email address or phone number) for immediate consumer questions.
- Designate the Chief Communications Officer as the spokesperson; distribute via the company website, press release, and direct retailer channels.

### **Support line (to be operational within 24 hours):**

- Activate a 24/7 allergy hotline using existing call-center capacity.
- Staff the line with trained personnel to handle allergy-related inquiries.

- Announce the hotline in the holding statement and on all retailer communications.

### Execution timeline:

- Draft and approve the holding statement – within 2 hours.
- Publish the statement and notify retailers – within 4 hours.
- Launch the hotline – within 24 hours.

This approach directly addresses the audience’s primary expectations while buying time to verify the missing details.

## What to Avoid

---

Do not:

- Provide batch numbers, store locations, or a recall timeline that have not been verified – inaccurate specifics will damage credibility.
- Promise a full recall timeline before the information is confirmed.
- Suggest that the company lacks concern for allergic consumers; language that downplays the severity will fuel anger.
- Remain silent on the need for a dedicated allergy hotline; omission will be interpreted as indifference.
- Use legal jargon that obscures the core message of safety and transparency.

## Exposure

---

If the response is mishandled, the following risks loom:

- **Reputational damage** – loss of consumer trust and negative media coverage.
- **Regulatory penalties** – potential fines or sanctions from the CFIA for inadequate public communication.
- **Liability for allergic reactions** – legal exposure if consumers suffer harm due to insufficient information.
- **Retail partner fallout** – grocery chains may suspend or terminate product placement.
- **Long-term brand erosion** – recurring allergen-label incidents could drive customers to competitors.

## Where the Committee Disagrees

---

Six unresolved disagreements were recorded:

1. **Affected-Party Advocate vs Evidence Auditor** – The Advocate argues that the lack of disclosed batch numbers, store locations, and timeline is a clear gap; the Auditor says no evidence exists to verify that the company can provide those details now. The Advocate would have you issue a holding statement that explicitly notes the missing specifics; the Auditor would have you refrain from mentioning them until verified.
2. **Affected-Party Advocate vs Escalation Watch** – The Advocate maintains that continued consumer calls for an independent audit justify proactive transparency; the Watch notes that posting volume alone does not diminish the need for such measures. The Advocate would have you commit to an independent audit; the Watch would have you focus on immediate consumer communication first.
3. **Adversarial Skeptic vs Evidence Auditor** – The Skeptic believes the organization's internal actions show capacity to issue a coordinated message today; the Auditor counters that critics' concerns about limited legal/PR resources mean feasibility is unproven. The Skeptic would have you proceed with the full statement now; the Auditor would have you delay until resources are confirmed.
4. **Evidence Auditor vs Escalation Watch** – The Auditor stresses the lack of internal recall documentation; the Watch points to sustained high posting volumes as a sign the conversation remains active. The Auditor would have you wait for internal documentation before expanding communication; the Watch would have you continue active public updates.
5. **Operational Realist vs Adversarial Skeptic** – The Realist says isolated recall confirmations lack the coordinated detail needed for batch identifiers and timelines; the Skeptic says existing posts already reassure consumers. The Realist would have you hold off on broader statements until comprehensive details are ready; the Skeptic would have you proceed with the current recall messaging.
6. **Proponent vs Evidence Auditor** – The Proponent notes that while batch numbers and locations are pending, distribution has been halted and retailers are removing product; the Auditor again highlights the absence of verifiable specifics. The Proponent would have you communicate that the risk is contained and details will follow; the Auditor would have you avoid any mention of specifics until they are confirmed.

## What Would Change Our Call

---

The following observations would reverse the current recommendation:

- If the organization publicly releases specific batch numbers, store locations, and a detailed recall timeline, the need for a holding statement focused on pending details would disappear.
- If a 24/7 allergy hotline is announced and operational, the urgency around establishing a temporary contact line would be resolved.
- If stakeholder posts shift from demanding details to expressing satisfaction with the current recall communication, the pressure for additional transparency would lessen.
- If evidence emerges that the CFIA was not notified or the recall was not actually initiated, the premise of compliance would be invalidated.
- If the organization provides proof of a fully staffed legal and communications team ready to issue a comprehensive statement, concerns about resource constraints would be removed.

These are plausible triggers this run's evidence does not speak to either way.

## Evidence & Confidence

---

Evidence supporting this briefing includes:

- The customer confirmed that a recall has been started and the CFIA was notified this morning.
- The simulation showed consumers repeatedly demanding batch numbers, store locations, a recall timeline, and a 24/7 allergy hotline.
- Six unresolved committee disagreements were recorded, highlighting key points of contention.
- Direct quotes from the simulated audience illustrate the urgency and expectations of allergic consumers, grocery chains, and local media.
- The audience's dominant narrative risk is the absence of concrete recall details, which could lead to severe health incidents.

Given the limited factual input and the breadth of unresolved disagreements, confidence in the recommended response is low, and the range of certainty is wide. The reader should treat this as a directional guide and monitor the listed reversal triggers closely. Named 4 things we did not know before looking anything up; 3 were decision-critical; 3 outside this module's research scope (recorded, not researched). Looked up "food-safety regulator". Resolved: none. Asked the customer: none.

## The situation we were given

---

Reproduced exactly as submitted — this is what the scrutiny examined.

### The situation you described:

A batch of our hot sauce shipped with undeclared peanuts. We told the CFIA this morning and started a recall. Two grocery chains are asking questions and a local paper called. I need to decide what we say publicly today.

---

### Methodology & Disclaimer

This report was prepared by PRISM, Presaga's reaction intelligence engine. It reflects modelled public and stakeholder reaction to the scenario provided: a simulated analysis over a generated audience, not a factual assertion about real individuals, platforms, or events.

This report is a structured simulation of how people may react — not a prediction of what will happen. Results reflect modelled discourse patterns based on the input scenario and should be used to inform strategy, not as the sole basis for decision-making. © 2026 Presaga Research Canada.