

=====

Tenant: synthetic-governance-sample ? SYNTHETIC ? not a live customer
As of: 2026-08-08T12:00:00.000Z
Window: 30 days
Engine: 1.0.0
Clinicians: 12

1. What fires

Accountable justification asks the ordering clinician for one free-text clinical justification on a low-appropriateness advanced-imaging order (CT, MR, PET, or NM) at order-sign, without blocking the signature.

2. Fire-rate ceilings

Per clinician per rolling day: 4 [modeled]

The interruption budget. ARKA asks for justification only on low-appropriateness advanced-imaging orders, so the honest unit of burden is prompts per clinician per working day, not a share of all orders. Four accountable-justification prompts in a day sits well under published alert-fatigue thresholds and below the volume a busy orderer already sees from safety alerts. On breach: suppress the card and record 'ceiling-day'.

Per clinician per rolling 30 days: 40 [modeled]

A secondary guardrail at ten times the daily ceiling. It prevents a single high-volume cohort or a bad month from exhausting clinicians even when the daily cap is respected most days. On breach: suppress and raise a governance alert ('ceiling-30d').

Organisation share of eligible advanced-imaging orders: 8.0% [modeled]

A hard organisational stop. If AJ would fire on more than 8 % of eligible advanced-imaging orders org-wide over a rolling 30 days, something is wrong with the engine threshold or the indication cohort ? not with the clinicians. On breach: tighten the score gate to ? 2 and raise a governance event ('ceiling-org-share'), rather than silently accepting an 8 %+ interrupt rate.

3. Measured fire rate (this period)

Per-clinician median: 1 [measured]
Per-clinician p95: 1 [measured]
Per-clinician max: 1 [measured]
Org share: 6.0% [measured]
Fired / eligible: 12 / 200 [measured]
Suppressed (day): 0 [measured]
Suppressed (30d): 0 [measured]
Suppressed (org): 0 [measured]

4. Response and completion

Response share (prominent): 100.0% [measured]
Median added interaction: 8000 ms [measured]
p95 added interaction: 8000 ms [measured]
Server contribution p95: 0 ms [measured] (budget 800 ms)
Interaction p95 vs budget: 8000 ms [measured] (budget 10000 ms)

5. Mechanism status

State: ACTIVE ? written share 100.0% [measured] ? lane l1
Accountable justification: ACTIVE ? verified chart writes for clinician responses meet the mechanism floor; the published effect may be expected for this deployment.

6. Commitments (firewall.json forbidden[])

- storing, logging, transmitting to a third party, or reading justification text
- joining justification text or its hash to any performance measure, peer packet, ledger cell, incentive computation or clinician-level aggregate
- blocking, delaying or conditioning an order signature
- requiring a minimum length, a structured taxonomy, or a selection in place of free text
- firing above the published ceilings
- raising a fire-rate ceiling in exchange for a commercial concession
- claiming an effect for a deployment where the record write is unavailable

6b. What we will never do (docs/NEVER_DO.json)

Generated from the three firewalls ? /governance/never-do.

- [contractual] No leaderboard, no rank, no bottom-N.

Objection: You will put me on a leaderboard or shame the bottom quartile.

lint: CHECK-I3-RANK in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts

- [contractual] No personally attributed dollar figure in a clinician-facing artefact.

Objection: You will put a dollar amount next to my name.

type: PeerPacket has no dollar field (lib/tcoc/peer/packet-types.ts); CHECK-I4-DOLLARS in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts

- [contractual] Justification text is never used for discipline, credentialing, or compensation.

Objection: Anything I type will be used against me in HR, credentialing, or bonus.

lint: CHECK-I10-JUSTIF in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts; CHECK-J5-JOIN / CHECK-J5-BRIDGE in scripts/lint-aj-firewall.ts; aj_ schema forbid

- [contractual] ARKA can auto-approve; it can never auto-deny.

Objection: The computer will deny my patient's scan.

runtime-guard: evaluateReviewerAuthorization in lib/ins/reviewer-queue.ts; lint: never-deny

(CHECK-ND-1?CHECK-ND-8); lib/arka-ip/never-deny.ts; IRE decision-surface test

External precedent ? CMS WISER Model ? California SB 1120: when coverage is denied, a human clinician with relevant expertise must be involved ? this is not our policy alone; it is the direction of federal model design.

<https://www.cms.gov/priorities/innovation/innovation-models/wiser>

- [contractual] No hard stops, ever.

Objection: This will block me from signing when I need to order.

runtime-guard: CHECK-J1-BLOCKING / CHECK-J1-NO-BLOCK in scripts/lint-aj-firewall.ts;

order-sign-while-AJ-500 acceptance test (J1)

- [contractual] ARKA does not store justification text.

Objection: You will keep a copy of my clinical reasoning and mine it, lose it, or hand it over.

schema: CHECK-J6-NOTEXT in scripts/lint-aj-firewall.ts; npm run aj:verify-no-text; migration column allowlist

- [product] No claim of effect where the mechanism is absent.

Objection: You will claim the trial effect even when the chart write is not working at my site.

type: JustificationReceipt.recordWrite required discriminated union; CHECK-J2-RECEIPT in scripts/lint-aj-firewall.ts; MECHANISM DEGRADED below MECHANISM_FLOOR

- [contractual] No fire above the published ceilings.

Objection: You will fire so often that I ignore every alert.

runtime-guard: FIRE_CEILINGS / resolveFireCeilings / effectiveCeilingValue in

lib/aj/governor/spec.ts; CHECK-CEIL-1 / CHECK-CEIL-2; governor suppression + recorded ceiling events (J4); published on /evidence/mechanisms

- [contractual] No site may raise a fire-rate ceiling in exchange for a commercial concession.

Objection: You will trade my interruption budget for a discount or a deal term.

lint: CHECK-CEIL-1 / CHECK-CEIL-2 in lib/aj/governor/spec.ts and

scripts/lint-aj-firewall.ts; Clause 2 in docs/arka-aj/DEPLOYMENT_AGREEMENT_CLAUSES.md;

Math.min against CEILING_MAXIMA

- [contractual] We will not touch your ordering behaviour until your LEAD benchmark is closed.

Objection: You will cut imaging volume in 2026 and I will carry a lower benchmark until 2036.

lint: CHECK-LEAD-MTI in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts; Clause 5 in

docs/arka-aj/DEPLOYMENT_AGREEMENT_CLAUSES.md

- [contractual] ARKA does not compute, influence, or recommend changes to beneficiary attribution or to risk-adjustment coding. Attribution and risk scores are read-only inputs supplied by your organisation. We measure avoided utilisation against the attribution and risk model you give us, and we publish the specification of how we use them.

Objection: This is a coding product wearing a quality costume, and it will put our Shared Savings or LEAD settlement under audit.

lint: CHECK-ATTR-1 in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts and the attribution scope rule in scripts/lint-scope-boundary.ts; Clause 6 in docs/arka-aj/DEPLOYMENT_AGREEMENT_CLAUSES.md

- [contractual] ARKA measures which clinician's ordering behaviour changed against a locked pre-period, and exports that measurement. ARKA never uses, alters or influences the assignment of beneficiaries to clinicians, and never derives a contribution figure from a field that determines attribution or risk score. The two are computed from disjoint inputs and the build proves it.

Objection: They are going to use our compensation feed to reverse-engineer attribution, or to reward clinicians for coding.

lint: CHECK-INC-1 and CHECK-INC-2 in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts; the disjoint-input proof in docs/attribution-firewall.json; Clause 8 in docs/arka-aj/DEPLOYMENT_AGREEMENT_CLAUSES.md

- [contractual] Where ARKA writes a care-setting flag or a 'considered and deferred' note back to the record, it is documented as a clinical decision. ARKA never suggests, implies or enables a documentation change whose effect is to increase a risk score or a billing level.

Objection: The write-back feature is a coding-intensity tool with a clinical label on it.

lint: CHECK-ATTR-2 in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts

- [contractual] ARKA never sets, suggests, or ratchets a group utilisation target. Medical directors choose the goal; ARKA measures against it.

Objection: This is a utilisation-pressure tool dressed as quality improvement ? you will set the target and make me explain it to my board.

lint: CHECK-GOAL-1 and CHECK-GOAL-2 in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts

- [contractual] A payer-authored or utilisation-management source may inform a coverage determination and may never inform clinical appropriateness. The two field sets are disjoint and the build proves it.

Objection: Your clinical score is the payer's criteria with a white coat on.

lint: CHECK-APPR-1 in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts; CHECK-FW-1..3 in lint:sources / lint:coverage / lint:scope; the disjoint-input proof in docs/appropriateness-firewall.json; Clause 9 in docs/arka-aj/DEPLOYMENT_AGREEMENT_CLAUSES.md

- [contractual] Every evidence-panel decision is published, including adverse decisions.

Objection: You will bury the ratings you lowered and only publish the upgrades.

lint: CHECK-CHARTER-PUBLISH in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts;

docs/governance/EVIDENCE_PANEL_CHARTER.md publication commitment

- [contractual] The chair and any co-chair of the evidence panel are entirely free of conflict.

Objection: The panel chair works for you, or owns a piece of the company.

lint: CHECK-CHARTER-CHAIR in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts; IOM 2011 chair rule in docs/governance/EVIDENCE_PANEL_CHARTER.md

- [contractual] No ARKA surface, artefact, metric, export, contract clause or piece of marketing may reference evaluation-and-management coding, billing level, code selection or reimbursement in connection with the considered-and-deferred note ? and the build fails if one does.

Objection: The write-back is a coding-intensity tool, and you will teach my clinicians to document for level.

lint: CHECK-CF-1 in scripts/lint-coding-firewall.ts; docs/coding-firewall.json computed disjointness; Clause 10 in docs/arka-aj/DEPLOYMENT_AGREEMENT_CLAUSES.md

- [contractual] Whether a considered-and-deferred note was written may not enter the attribution ledger, the peer-comparison packet, the contribution export, or any incentive computation. The write-back module graph is unreachable from attribution, ledger and incentive, and the build proves it.

Objection: Clinicians who write the note will look better on the measure than clinicians who do not ? you built a documentation incentive by accident.

lint: CHECK-CF-2 / CHECK-CF-3 in scripts/lint-scope-boundary.ts; CHECK-CF-4 / CHECK-CF-5 in scripts/lint-coding-firewall.ts and scripts/lint-tcoc.ts; Clause 10 in docs/arka-aj/DEPLOYMENT_AGREEMENT_CLAUSES.md

- [contractual] ARKA never assigns a less favourable appropriateness rating to an order because of the care setting in which it was placed.

Objection: You will down-score my telehealth orders because you assume I cannot examine the

patient.

lint: CHECK-CS-3 in lib/aiie/care-setting.ts and scripts/lint-tcoc.ts;

docs/governance/VIRTUAL_ENCOUNTER_POSITION.md

- [contractual] ARKA never recommends an in-person evaluation in place of a study that the indication supports.

Objection: You will use 'come in for an exam' as a deflection when imaging is indicated, especially on telehealth orders.

lint: CHECK-IPE-SPEND-1 in lib/cards/ipe-spend-firewall.ts and scripts/lint-tcoc.ts;

buildInPersonEvaluationCard refuses when indicationSupportsStudy is true

Secondary finding ? Requisition quality (A.4 / Prompt 13.4)

Asking for a justification improves the clinical question the radiologist receives.

n_justified=0 ? n_matched=0 ? method=ceiling-suppressed comparator

RI-RADS delta (justified ? matched): 0 [illustrative]

Concordance delta (justified ? matched): 0 [illustrative]

Labelled illustrative until production observations back the deltas; not for homepage claim.

Every number above carries a provenance label. Small cells are suppressed at $n < 11$.

Appendix ? Schema (J6 no-text)

=====

ARKA does not store what your clinicians write. The justification is composed in your EHR, written with your clinician's own credentials, and lives in your chart. We keep a hash, a length and a timestamp, so we can tell you the mechanism was present. There is nothing for us to hand over, mine, or lose.

You can verify this. Run 'npm run aj:verify-no-text' against your own instance, or read the schema ? aj_justification_receipts has no text column, and a CI check fails the build if anyone adds one.

Migration: supabase/migrations/069_aj_core.sql

aj_justification_receipts columns include text_sha256 and char_length ? never a text, justification, narrative, comment, or body column.

Verify: npm run aj:verify-no-text ? CI fails the build if a forbidden column is added.