ARKA
ARKA contribution ? compensation-committee one-pager
==
For the compensation committee: CFO, CMO, and a physician representative.
Zero customer data. Figures and rules from the contribution engine that feeds the pay export.

WHAT IS THIS NUMBER?

Avoided low-value studies against a locked pre-period, on the panel your organisation already attributed, at your contracted rate. ARKA measures which clinician's ordering behaviour changed. Dollars are your rate from the ledger ? there is no shipped default. If the number is wrong, the input is wrong.

HOW DO WE KNOW IT IS RIGHT?

Every figure travels with its Wilson 95% interval; a point estimate on a pay statement implies a precision the data does not support. Below a minimum panel of 30 the status is insufficient-panel, not a number ? a pay figure on twelve orders is noise. The exclusion cascade is printed on the record (considered, minus each named reason, equals eligible panel). A mandatory 14-day dispute window sits between generation and export eligibility; a figure still inside that window is provisional and cannot be emitted by any adapter. Interval includes zero. The exported figure is attenuated toward zero rather than the point estimate. A figure statistically indistinguishable from no change is not paid. How to challenge a contribution figure: a clinician files a reason, the record moves to disputed, and it stays out of the export until a resolution is appended. There is no override that exports a provisional or disputed figure. The pressure to use one arrives at payroll deadline; the type system refuses it.

WHAT COULD GO WRONG?

Small panels are noisy: the minimum panel is a floor, not a suggestion, and twelve orders will still make a committee nervous if anyone treats the interval as optional. The baseline lock is a precondition and not a formality ? a contribution figure without a locked pre-period is unrepresentable. ARKA deliberately refuses to attach peer rank to pay: peer comparison is feedback, not a pay determinant, and merging them is unsupported and indefensible in a governance meeting.

[THE 25.0 DISTINCTION]

Contribution attribution is not beneficiary attribution. The two concepts share a word and nothing else. Here is the difference, here is the linter, here is Clause 8.
Beneficiary attribution | Contribution attribution
What it answers: Which patients belong to which clinician or ACO // Which clinician's ordering behaviour changed
Who sets it: CMS programme rule, or the customer's own model // ARKA's measurement, against a locked pre-period
ARKA's posture: Read-only. Never written. Never influenced. // This is the product.
Financial effect: Determines who is at risk for a population, and the benchmark // Determines who gets credit for a measured reduction
Enforcement: CHECK-ATTR-1, the ingest allowlist, Clause 6 // CHECK-INC-* (Prompt 25.3), Clause 8
Linter: CHECK-INC-1 and CHECK-INC-2 in scripts/lint-tcoc.ts. Contract: Clause 8 in docs/arka-aj/DEPLOYMENT_AGREEMENT_CLAUSES.md. Catalog: contribution-attribution-is-not-beneficiary-attribution.

Generated from the same engine as the pay export. It cannot overstate what the module does.

- end of note -