

EXECUTIVE DIAGNOSTIC REPORT SPECIMEN

Entry Friction Diagnostic

Crescent Health Network - fictional GCC healthcare organisation

PREPARED FOR	Illustrative Executive Steering Group	PREPARED BY	Dr Phillip Welsh, Stratum Human Systems
PRIORITY COHORT	20 international clinical, allied-health and technical hires	EVIDENCE BASE	Synthetic: 12 interviews, 11 documents, 2 process walks
DIAGNOSTIC WINDOW	Illustrative 10-business-day review	CLASSIFICATION	Public specimen - no client data

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION

Complete five repair-first actions within 30 days, then proceed to a governed Pathway 90 founding pilot only if manager capacity, buddy readiness, confidentiality, referral and measurement gates are green.

SYSTEM	SUPPORT	SELF
process, role and decision conditions	manager, HR and network access	sensemaking and adaptive action

This specimen shows the shape of a decision-quality report. Ratings describe fictional organisational conditions; they are not individual scores, validated measures or benchmarks.

01 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Executive decision summary

Repair first; then run a bounded pilot with explicit evidence gates.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Decision field	Illustrative conclusion
Trigger	Crescent Health Network is preparing to receive 20 internationally recruited professionals for a service expansion. Leaders want a reliable first-90-day system before the cohort arrives.
Material condition	Recruitment completes, but ownership fragments between accepted offer and day 10. Newcomers and receiving managers carry the resulting coordination and interpretation work.
Highest-priority friction	Day-one access and pre-arrival ownership are ad hoc; role legitimacy and informal decision routes are not made explicit.
Recommendation	Close five repair-first actions; configure contribution charters, manager checkpoints and a governed buddy route; then make a conditional pilot decision.
Do not proceed if	Manager time, buddy capacity, n=7 reporting, confidential coaching separation, serious-wellbeing referral or baseline ownership remains unresolved.
Decision requested	Approve the 30-day repair portfolio and authorise pilot configuration subject to the five readiness gates on page 13.

Repair-first priorities

1. Name one end-to-end owner from accepted offer through day 10 and publish the escalation path.
2. Introduce a day-minus-3 readiness control for access, equipment, roster, licence status and manager availability.
3. Complete a role-specific contribution charter and decision-right discussion by day 10.
4. Select, brief and back up buddies; route HR and manager issues out of the buddy relationship.
5. Define six measures, owners and follow-up points before the cohort starts.

Evidence position: this recommendation applies an emergent method. It does not demonstrate that the proposed actions improve retention, productivity, patient outcomes or financial return.

02 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Scope, method and evidence quality

A fictional worked example using synthetic information.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Evidence stream	Synthetic coverage	Illustrative limitation
Documents	11 current-state items across recruitment, pre-arrival, onboarding, roles and probation.	Use was not independently observed for every team.
Process walk-through	Accepted offer to arrival; day-one readiness to day-10 manager handover.	One site pathway only.
Interviews	1 executive, 2 HR/recruitment, 3 managers, 4 recent newcomers and 2 buddy/host-national colleagues.	Purposive role coverage; not prevalence or representation.
Operational data	Illustrative hiring plan and direct recruitment/mobilisation cost inputs.	Synthetic data; no validated early-exit or outcome comparison.
Pulse	Not administered in the specimen.	No participant experience score is inferred.

Method

- Conditions were examined across System, Support and Self, with evidence quality and claim boundaries overlaid.
- Organisational conditions were rated 0 absent, 1 ad hoc, 2 defined but inconsistent, 3 reliable, or N/A where evidence was insufficient/out of scope.
- Evidence confidence was assigned high, medium or low. No overall score or individual ranking was calculated.
- Each material issue was assigned one primary accountability class and a matching owner role.

Synthetic evidence-quality summary

Quality dimension	Illustrative assessment
Source diversity	Good role coverage across four evidence streams.
Operational definitions	Partial; day-one readiness and contribution milestones require formal definitions.
Outcome follow-up	Not available; day 180/365 feasibility must be agreed before pilot.

Quality dimension	Illustrative assessment
Confidence in priority findings	High for access and buddy absence; medium for authority and contribution-milestone conditions.

03 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

System-Support-Self heatmap

A profile of fictional organisational conditions - no composite score.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Layer	Condition	Rating	Confidence	Illustrative interpretation
System	Pre-arrival ownership	1	Medium	Responsibility shifts across recruitment, licensing and the receiving team.
System	Day-one readiness	1	High	Access and equipment exceptions recur and rely on workarounds.
System	Role and decision clarity	2	High	Formal role is clear; informal authority and consultation routes are not.
System	Contribution/knowledge transfer	1	Medium	No shared day-10 or day-90 milestone architecture.
Support	Manager access	2	Medium	Check-ins occur, but cadence varies by manager.
Support	Buddy/cultural bridge	0	High	No selected, briefed or bounded buddy route exists.
Support	HR access and trust	1	Medium	Newcomers rely on personal contacts to route repeated queries.
Support	Informal network access	1	Medium	Critical stakeholders are identified after problems arise.
Support	Host-national relationships	2	Low	Positive examples exist, but no designed reciprocal pathway is evidenced.
Self	Sensemaking support	1	Medium	No structured opportunity to test interpretations before reacting.
Self	Help-seeking and boundaries	1	Low	Routes are not consistently understood; no individual capability inference.
Self	Adaptive confidence support	2	Low	Some manager support is described; no validated participant measure used.

Rating key: 0 absent; 1 ad hoc; 2 defined/inconsistent; 3 reliable; N/A insufficient basis/out of scope. Confidence is source quality and triangulation, not statistical certainty.

PRIORITY PATTERN

The fictional profile shows the strongest immediate exposure at the System-Support interface: access, ownership, buddy boundaries and informal decision routes. Individual adaptation support should not precede these repairs.

04 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Adaptation-burden map

Move work to the owner best able to change the condition.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Observed friction	Current burden carrier	Primary accountability	Transfer / repair action
Licensing status changes are communicated inconsistently.	Newcomer repeatedly chases multiple contacts.	HR-process failure	One status owner; weekly update; single exception route.
System access is incomplete on day 1.	Newcomer and manager create workarounds.	HR-process failure	Day-minus-3 readiness review with IT/HR exception owner.
Formal role exists; informal approval path is unclear.	Newcomer maps authority through trial and error.	Organisational decision	Contribution charter plus stakeholder/decision map by day 10.
Practical questions move to personal expatriate contacts.	Informal colleagues act as an unofficial help desk.	HR-process failure	Named HR route and service window; publish unresolved-query escalation.
Manager check-ins depend on personal availability.	Newcomer waits or escalates informally.	Manager action	Protected day 1/10/30/60/90 manager cadence with deputy.
Unfamiliar interaction is interpreted without a safe sounding board.	Newcomer carries interpretive/emotional work alone.	Newcomer adaptation	Bounded buddy and reflective support after structural routes are clear.
National counterpart relationship is not designed.	Individual managers improvise knowledge transfer.	Organisational decision	Define reciprocal contribution/knowledge-transfer commitment.

Executive reading: five of seven illustrative burdens belong primarily to HR, managers or organisational decision-makers. The proposed response is receiving-system repair plus bounded participant support - not resilience training.

05 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Accepted-offer-to-day-90 journey

The fictional current state and the required control at each stage.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Stage	Current-state friction	Required control	Owner
Accepted offer	No single owner explains what happens next or how exceptions are escalated.	Named end-to-end owner and realistic role/organisation preview.	International recruitment lead
Pre-arrival	Licensing/document updates depend on individual follow-up.	Status cadence, document owner and exception route.	Credentialing/HR owner
Day minus 3	Readiness is assumed rather than verified.	Access, equipment, roster, ID, licence and manager checklist.	Receiving manager + HR operations
Days 1-10	Role induction occurs; decision rights and informal authority remain implicit.	Contribution charter and six critical stakeholder introductions.	Receiving manager
Days 11-30	Repeated issues move through informal networks.	HR service route, buddy boundary and weekly closure review.	HR process owner
Days 31-60	Network development and feedback vary by manager.	Manager review, cross-functional friction workshop and milestone check.	Receiving manager
Days 61-90	Probation review is not connected to agreed contribution and knowledge transfer.	Contribution review, sustainment plan and day-180 follow-up commitment.	Manager + programme owner

Design principle

Support changes across the first 90 days. Practical ownership and day-one readiness come first; role legitimacy, network access and reflective support follow; consolidation connects contribution, knowledge transfer and follow-up. A one-day induction cannot carry this architecture.

Control point: the contribution charter is a role-alignment tool, not a performance rating. It records priorities, decision rights, critical relationships, early milestones, support and escalation.

06 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Priority findings 1-2

Worked synthetic findings using the controlled format.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Finding 1: Ownership fragments after accepted offer

OBSERVED CONDITION

No single role owns communication, status and exception closure from accepted offer through day 10.

Element	Illustrative finding
Business consequence	International recruits and receiving managers spend time locating information and reconciling inconsistent updates; the lived experience depends on personal escalation.
Evidence	Synthetic DOC-02, DOC-04, PWO-01 and seven interview accounts. Confidence: high. One manager reported an effective local workaround, which is retained as disconfirming evidence.
Primary accountability	HR-process failure - international recruitment process owner.
Required response	Name one end-to-end owner, publish service windows and escalation, and review open exceptions weekly before arrival.
Evidence label	Emergent method / Practice hypothesis for the proposed response.
Limitation	One fictional site and one illustrative cohort; no prevalence, retention or cost attribution.

Finding 2: Day-one readiness is an assumption, not a control

OBSERVED CONDITION

Access, equipment and roster readiness have no common day-minus-3 verification and no single exception owner.

Element	Illustrative finding
Business consequence	The first days can be spent arranging basic conditions, weakening credibility and delaying the first

Element	Illustrative finding
	agreed contribution milestone.
Evidence	Synthetic PWO-02, DAT-01 and eight interview accounts. Confidence: high. Illustrative data definitions are incomplete.
Primary accountability	HR-process failure - joint HR operations/IT readiness owner.
Required response	Introduce a day-minus-3 readiness control, exception dashboard and deputy owner; include the measure in the pilot baseline.
Evidence label	Emergent method / Practice hypothesis for the proposed response.
Limitation	The report does not quantify productivity loss or claim that readiness repair will change retention.

07 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Priority findings 3-4

Expertise needs role legitimacy, not only a job description.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Finding 3: Expertise arrives before decision legitimacy

OBSERVED CONDITION

Formal accountabilities are documented, but delegated authority, consultation requirements and informal decision routes are not made explicit in the first 10 days.

Element	Illustrative finding
Business consequence	Newcomers can hesitate, over-consult or act without the local sponsorship needed for their expertise to translate into trusted contribution.
Evidence	Synthetic role documents, PWO-02, three manager and four newcomer interviews. Confidence: high. Variation by specialty remains an alternative explanation.
Primary accountability	Organisational decision - service executive, enabled by the receiving manager.
Required response	Agree a contribution charter and decision/stakeholder map by day 10; calibrate across role families before pilot launch.

Element	Illustrative finding
Evidence label	Emergent method / Practice hypothesis for the proposed response.
Limitation	Contribution legitimacy is an interpretation from bounded evidence, not a validated construct or performance measure.

Finding 4: Informal networks are performing unrecognised HR work

OBSERVED CONDITION

Newcomers route repeated practical and policy queries through personal expatriate and host-national contacts because the formal HR route is unclear or slow.

Element	Illustrative finding
Business consequence	Informal colleagues carry hidden service burden; answers vary and unresolved issues are harder to track or improve.
Evidence	Synthetic INT-03, INT-07, INT-10, INT-11 and DOC-07. Confidence: medium; no complete HR case-volume data were available.
Primary accountability	HR-process failure - employee services owner.
Required response	Publish one route, response window and escalation rule; tag repeated queries and review root causes monthly.
Evidence label	Emergent method / Practice hypothesis for the proposed response.
Limitation	Interview frequency is not evidence of prevalence; service-volume baseline is required.

08 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Priority findings 5-6

Support must be designed and bounded; contribution must be defined.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Finding 5: Buddy support is absent and unmanaged

OBSERVED CONDITION

The organisation has no defined buddy selection, briefing, contact cadence, backup arrangement or boundary with HR and management.

Element	Illustrative finding
Business consequence	Newcomers either lack a low-friction navigation route or depend on goodwill that can become inconsistent, burdensome or inappropriate.
Evidence	Synthetic DOC-08 and nine interview accounts. Confidence: high. Informal support exists but is not a governed buddy process.
Primary accountability	Manager action - programme owner and receiving manager jointly assign/brief buddies.
Required response	Select, train and back up buddies; require first contact within 72 hours; monitor role boundary and escalation quality.
Evidence label	Emergent method / Practice hypothesis for the proposed response.
Limitation	The 72-hour standard is a founding-pilot delivery target, not historical outcome evidence.

Finding 6: Contribution milestones are not defined early enough

OBSERVED CONDITION

The first meaningful contribution is discussed informally and varies by manager; no shared milestone is recorded by day 10.

Element	Illustrative finding
Business consequence	The newcomer, manager and sponsor can hold different expectations, and structural barriers appear later than necessary.
Evidence	Synthetic probation form, three manager and four newcomer interviews. Confidence: medium; role-specific calibration has not been tested.
Primary accountability	Manager action - receiving manager, with service executive calibration.
Required response	Define role-specific day-30/60/90 contribution milestones and record the first agreed milestone by day 10.
Evidence label	Emergent method / Practice hypothesis for the proposed response.
Limitation	Milestones do not measure full productivity, clinical competence or performance appraisal outcomes.

09 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Contribution charter and milestones

A worked role-alignment example - not a generic productivity standard.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Charter field	Illustrative content for a senior specialist role
Role purpose	Provide specialist expertise, contribute to safe service development and transfer defined capability to the local team.
Decision rights	Can recommend pathway changes and lead review; service-level changes require clinical/service executive approval.
Critical relationships	Service executive, department chair, nursing/allied-health lead, quality, HRBP and national counterpart.
Day-10 milestone	Charter agreed; decision map confirmed; six stakeholder introductions completed/scheduled.
Day-30 milestone	Current pathway reviewed with local team; first improvement opportunity jointly defined.
Day-60 milestone	Evidence/options presented to the authorised governance forum; barriers and decisions recorded.
Day-90 milestone	Client-defined first contribution delivered or a documented, owner-assigned barrier explains why not.
Knowledge transfer	Two reciprocal learning sessions and a jointly agreed capability handover plan with the national counterpart.
Support/escalation	Manager cadence, buddy route, HR service route and clinical/ethical escalation remain distinct.

USE RESTRICTION

This charter clarifies the early operating agreement. It is not a selection instrument, clinical competency assessment, probation score or universal time-to-productivity measure.

10 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Illustrative value-at-risk scenario

Client-input sensitivity analysis - not proven savings or ROI.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

REQUIRED INTERPRETATION

The percentages below are arbitrary sensitivity assumptions used to demonstrate the method. They are not derived from the thesis, client history or Stratum effectiveness evidence.

Client input	Illustrative value	Source/limitation
Planned priority hires	20	Synthetic hiring plan for one defined cohort.
Direct recruitment/mobilisation cost per hire	US\$38,000	Synthetic client input; inclusions would require definition.
Exposed direct cost	US\$760,000	20 x US\$38,000; not a loss forecast.
Excluded	Salary, clinical output, patient outcomes, agency cover and opportunity cost	Excluded to avoid unsupported aggregation.

Scenario	Assumption	Scenario exposure	Permitted wording
Low sensitivity	5%	US\$38,000	Illustrative exposure only
Base sensitivity	10%	US\$76,000	Illustrative exposure only
High sensitivity	15%	US\$114,000	Illustrative exposure only

Formula: US\$760,000 exposed direct cost x client-selected sensitivity assumption. This is not avoidable cost, expected saving, financial benefit or attributed programme impact.

Decision use

This scenario lets the sponsor compare cohort cost exposure with the effort required to strengthen receiving-system controls. Any later economic evaluation requires a defined counterfactual, agreed outcomes, adequate follow-up, attribution controls and independent review.

11 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Repair-first action portfolio

Every structural issue has an owner, date and closure test.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Action	Primary owner	Due	Closure evidence	Status
Name end-to-end entry owner and publish service/escalation route.	International recruitment lead	Day 10	Approved owner map and communication issued.	Red
Implement day-minus-3 readiness control with exception owner.	HR operations + IT	Day 20	Two dry runs completed; exceptions closed/tracked.	Red
Approve contribution-charter and decision-map template.	Service executive	Day 20	Calibrated for two role families; managers briefed.	Amber
Select, train and back up buddies; publish boundaries.	Programme owner	Day 25	Roster, brief completion and escalation route confirmed.	Red
Define six pilot measures and data owners.	Workforce analytics lead	Day 25	Metric dictionary and baseline feasibility approved.	Amber
Confirm confidentiality, n=7 suppression and referral routes.	Privacy lead + client sponsor	Day 25	DPIA/notice/reporting route approved for pilot scope.	Red
Schedule protected manager check-ins for pilot cohort.	Receiving managers	Before arrival	Calendar evidence and deputy coverage confirmed.	Amber

PILOT GATE

Do not open participant enrolment or collect participant data until the confidentiality, referral, data-owner and reporting-threshold controls are approved.

12 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Measurement and governance baseline

Define the chain from readiness to contribution without inventing a generic productivity metric.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Measure	Definition	Cadence	Data owner	Illustrative quality
Day-one readiness	All agreed access/equipment/licensing/manager items verified by day minus 3 or exception-owned.	Each arrival	HR operations	Definition to approve
Buddy contact	Assigned/briefed buddy makes first contact within 72 hours of arrival.	Day 3/10	Programme owner	Process measure
Contribution charter	Manager and role holder agree charter by day 10.	Day 10	Receiving manager	Template to calibrate
Issue ownership	Material friction issue has class, owner, due date and status.	Weekly	Programme owner	Register available
First contribution milestone	Client-defined milestone agreed by role; progress/barrier recorded.	Days 30/60/90	Manager + role holder	No generic benchmark
Experience pulse	Approved, non-predictive cohort items with n>=7 reporting.	Baseline/30/60/90	Client data owner	Instrument pre-pilot
Follow-up	Retention/contribution context observed without attribution.	Days 180/365	Workforce analytics	Contractual access needed

Governance rhythm

Forum	Cadence	Decision
Operational issue review	Weekly during cohort	Close friction, escalate overdue structural action, monitor fidelity.
Executive evidence review	Days 30/60/90	Review aggregated experience, contribution signals, barriers and method deviations.
Follow-up review	Days 180/365	Observe retention/contribution context; decide evaluation and scale without causal overclaim.

13 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Conditional Pathway 90 pilot blueprint

Proceed only after the repair and governance gates are green.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Pilot element	Illustrative configuration
Cohort	Up to 20 internationally recruited clinical, allied-health and technical professionals in the defined service expansion.
Duration	Two-week configuration plus 12 weeks of delivery; days 180 and 365 follow-up contractually enabled.
Supports	Configured field guide, bounded buddy route, contribution charter, manager cadence, optional reflection practice, monthly coaching and issue resolution.
Reflective practice	Pause - Interpret - Reframe - Respond; emergent practice sequence, not a validated psychological technique.
Organisation role	Close structural issues, protect manager time, maintain HR response route and make decisions at the agreed governance cadence.
Evidence purpose	Assess feasibility, acceptability, fidelity and exploratory contribution signals; not effectiveness, prediction or ROI.

Founding-pilot delivery standards - targets, not results

Standard	Target	Evidence status
Buddy first contact	>=90% within 72 hours	Delivery target to test
Contribution charter	>=80% by day 10	Delivery target to test
Programme completion	>=80%	Feasibility target to test
Pulse response	>=75% at each wave	Data-completeness target to test
Structural issue ownership	100% with owner and date	Governance standard

GO/NO-GO CONDITIONS

Go only when sponsor, manager time, buddy readiness, referral, privacy, n=7 reporting, metric ownership and day-180/365 access are approved. Otherwise redesign, repair or stop.

14 | ILLUSTRATIVE REPORT

Evidence boundary, limitations and next decision

What this specimen can demonstrate - and what it cannot.

ILLUSTRATIVE - NOT CLIENT DATA

All names, counts, findings, costs, ratings and recommendations in this specimen are synthetic. They demonstrate the form of the output only and must not be interpreted as evidence of a real organisation or Stratum effectiveness.

Evidence position	Controlled statement	Boundary
Doctoral finding	The commercial proposition originates in a 35-person Qatar diagnostic cohort.	Context-specific; not representative, predictive or GCC-wide.
Bounded intervention evidence	A separate 12-person Saudi cohort received guide, buddy, reflection/mindfulness and monthly coaching supports.	No comparator, causal attribution, component isolation or generalisability.
Emergent method	Stratum translates the research into a staged diagnostic, accountability and first-90-day operating method.	The commercial method was not validated in the doctorate.
Practice hypothesis	A governed pilot can test feasibility, acceptability, fidelity and exploratory contribution signals.	Not effectiveness, retention, productivity, patient outcomes, prediction or ROI.

Specimen limitations

- Crescent Health Network is fictional; all evidence, findings, counts, costs, ratings and actions are synthetic.
- The heatmap illustrates organisational-condition reporting; it is not a validated instrument or benchmark.
- The value-at-risk scenario illustrates formula transparency; the sensitivity assumptions are arbitrary and not expected savings.
- The proposed pilot standards are targets for prospective testing, not historical performance.
- The original research boundary remains Western self-initiated expatriates in Qatar and Saudi healthcare; wider populations require context-specific piloting and fairness review.

Next executive decision

Option	Decision test	Illustrative recommendation
Repair only	Structural conditions can be corrected without a cohort support pilot.	Approve five repair actions now.
Design sprint	Journey, ownership and measures need further co-design before pilot.	Use if contribution-charter/manager architecture cannot be calibrated in 30 days.
Conditional Pathway 90 pilot	All readiness gates green; cohort, roles and evidence purpose bounded.	Approve configuration subject to gate review.
Stop / defer	Privacy, safety, sponsor authority or intended-use boundaries fail.	Mandatory where controls remain unresolved.

DECISION REQUESTED

Approve the 30-day repair portfolio. Authorise Pathway 90 configuration only after the sponsor receives written confirmation that all readiness gates are green.

Prepared by Dr Phillip Welsh | Stratum Human Systems

See the system. Find the friction. Support the person.