



SeniorCRE®

Operating Infrastructure for Senior Housing & Care

EXECUTIVE WHITE PAPER • REFERENCE ARCHITECTURE

Beyond Epic and Oracle

*Why healthcare's next infrastructure layer must establish
coherence before intelligence*

From integrated electronic records and AI-connected information to the Operator-Controlled Operating Record — a proposed architecture for senior housing & care, stated as falsifiable propositions with a deployment test and a measurement framework.

PUBLISHED

October 14, 2026

PREPARED FOR

Operators · Institutional owners · CIOs, CTOs
& architects · Capital partners

PUBLISHER

HavenCo, Inc.

CONTENTS

—	Executive summary	3
01	Two visions of healthcare software	4
02	Epic: integration and its boundary	5
03	Oracle: connectivity, longitudinal data and the limit of inference	5
04	Data, coherence and authority are different things.....	6
05	A seven-layer reference architecture	7
06	The Operator Authority Chain	8
07	Four senior housing & care operating scenarios	9
08	Two deployment roads.....	10
09	Objections, tested	11
10	Pilot design and measurable proof	12
11	Commercial and competitive implications	13
12	Conclusion: a proposition to test	14
A	Minimum governing-decision data contract.....	15
B	Evidence boundary	15
R	References and further reading	16

EVIDENCE STANDARD

This paper is an architectural thesis and a proposed operating model. As of October 2026, the SeniorCRE Operator-Controlled Operating Record is designed but has not yet been implemented in an operator community. No SeniorCRE capability or outcome described here is represented as production-validated. Every proposition is written so that a live operator deployment can confirm or refute it.

AT A GLANCE Three questions every consequential operating decision must answer

Question	What answers it today	What is still missing
Access	Integrated suites, interoperability, longitudinal records	Nothing — information can move
Interpretation	Normalization, analytics, AI models	A record of which definition applies to which use
Authority	Usually an email, a spreadsheet or a meeting	A durable, inspectable decision: which value governs, on what evidence, by whom, for how long

Integration and connectivity solve access. Neither one settles authority.

The future of healthcare software is usually framed as a contest between two strong strategies. Epic has built a durable business on integration: one application environment, common workflows and deep adoption across health systems. Oracle Health pursues reach: longitudinal patient information, AI-enhanced workflows and connections across more of the healthcare economy.^[1]

Both strategies solve real problems, and both organizations have capabilities well beyond this simplified comparison. Yet neither application integration nor information connectivity answers a separate institutional question: **when legitimate systems present different values, which value is authorized to govern a particular operational decision — on what evidence, by whom, and for how long?** That is the distinction among access to information, interpretation of information and authority over a decision.

This paper proposes a third architectural emphasis: the **Operator-Controlled Operating Record**. Its purpose is not to displace the electronic health record, general ledger, scheduling platform or CRM by default. Its purpose is to preserve their source assertions, detect materially conflicting interpretations and produce a traceable decision about what governs a defined operational purpose. Intelligence then consumes that governing context rather than manufacturing authority from model confidence. In short: *coherence before intelligence*.

Senior housing & care is an especially demanding test. A resident's changing care level crosses clinical assessment, staffing, billing authorization, compliance, occupancy and property-level earnings. A correct clinical record does not guarantee coherent enterprise action, and fixing a reporting discrepancy is not the same as earning revenue or improving care.

THE CENTRAL THESIS

An organization can have integrated applications, interoperable records, sophisticated AI and robust auditing — and still lack a single authorized answer for a specific cross-system operating decision. The Operator-Controlled Operating Record closes that gap without erasing disagreement or silently replacing source records.

What this paper commits to

Proposes — a seven-layer reference architecture and an Operator Authority Chain that make governing decisions first-class, inspectable records.

Tests — four operating scenarios, a narrow first-operator pilot design and seven proof categories with acceptance criteria.

Separates — detection, governance, execution and financial outcome, each with its own metric, never summed into one claim.

Does not claim — production performance, realized NOI, clinical readiness, autonomous-agent safety, or that any incumbent lacks comparable functionality.

Two visions of healthcare software

Judy Faulkner’s Epic and Larry Ellison’s Oracle represent distinct orientations toward enterprise healthcare technology. In Becker’s Hospital Review’s October 9, 2026 account, Epic’s founder emphasizes the consistency and usability of internally integrated software, while Oracle’s leadership describes longitudinal data and automation reaching beyond provider-centric EHR workflows into the broader ecosystem. Both invest heavily in AI.^[1]

The contrast is concrete. Epic has grown without acquisitions, declines to sell its suite piecemeal, and draws its longitudinal data from its own customer base: its Cosmos database spans roughly 320 million deidentified patients. Oracle, which entered the market through its 2022 Cerner acquisition, describes the EHR as a starting point. It aims to automate adjacent domains including payers, medical devices and regulators, and to consolidate a patient’s history across EHRs and providers. Becker’s notes that the market has so far favored Epic’s approach.^[1]

Neither position should be reduced to a caricature — “Epic does not interoperate” or “Oracle does not govern data.” Epic’s health information exchange, research, analytics, workflow and AI capabilities are substantial. Oracle’s clinical applications and broader enterprise technology include extensive administrative, identity, security and governance tooling. The distinction examined here is one of **organizing principle and proof obligation**, not the absence of ordinary enterprise features.

EXHIBIT 1 U.S. acute-care hospital EHR market share, year-end 2025 (share of hospitals)

Epic		43.7%
Oracle Health		21.9%
Meditech		14.7%
TruBridge		7.6%
Altera Digital Health		2.9%
All others		9.2%

Source: KLAS Research, U.S. acute care EHR market share report (May 14, 2026), as summarized by Becker’s Hospital Review and Fierce Healthcare.^{[2][7][8]} By share of beds, Epic held 56.9% and Oracle Health 20.4%. These are hospital figures. They are not senior housing & care market shares and are not evidence of SeniorCRE’s addressable market or competitive win rate.

The scale is the point. Two well-funded strategies dominate the hospital market, and each has an answer to fragmentation. The question this paper asks is what both answers leave open once a decision spans more than one system.

Epic: integration and its boundary

Integration delivers real benefits. Standardized terminology, a coordinated user experience, common workflows and consistent permissions reduce the cost of complex multi-vendor environments. Epic's commercial success shows how much large health systems value that coordination. A coherent application suite can embed authoritative values for many within-system workflows.

The boundary appears when a decision spans independent legal entities, vendors, time periods, systems or definitions. A finance platform may hold a revenue-recognition view of occupancy, an EHR a clinical census, and a scheduling system a staff-to-resident coverage assumption. All three may be correct, because they answer different questions. Forcing one replicated number across applications can produce apparent consistency at the expense of meaning.

Replacing every source application is therefore neither necessary nor sufficient for enterprise coherence. An integrated vendor can build cross-domain authority rules — and should be assessed on those rules, their transparency and portability, and their behavior when conflicts are unresolved. The critique is narrow: **integration should not be mistaken for a complete decision-authority model.**

The test is not whether every application displays an identical number. It is whether the enterprise can show the definition, scope, effective time, decision owner, authorizing rule, exceptions and downstream effects behind each operationally consequential value.

Oracle: connectivity, longitudinal data and the limit of inference

Oracle's vision responds to fragmentation at larger scale. A longitudinal record can carry relevant patient information across institutions and technologies — valuable for clinical continuity and for the inputs available to clinicians and automated systems. Oracle also pursues AI-assisted documentation and revenue-cycle activity, among other functions.^[1]

But collecting a broader set of assertions does not decide which assertion governs. **Provenance** identifies where a record came from. **Reconciliation** compares assertions. **Machine learning** estimates which is more plausible. None of them grants organizational authority. Authority is conferred by policy, delegation, legal responsibility, professional scope, and an accountable human or an expressly authorized rule.

The distinction matters most when an AI system could trigger downstream action. A model may infer that a resident has moved into a higher care category; that inference must not itself authorize a billing change, a staff reassignment or a clinical order. Each of those actions has different prerequisites and a different accountable owner.

Fairness requires saying that Oracle could implement an explicit authority layer, just as Epic could. The architectural question is whether governing decisions across independent sources are treated as **first-class records** whose evidence, scope, authorization and reversal remain inspectable regardless of the source-system vendor.

SECTION 04

Data, coherence and authority are different things

Each capability below answers a legitimate question. Each also stops short of the next. The Operator-Controlled Operating Record occupies the one row that answers “which value governs this use” — and it, too, has a stated limit.

EXHIBIT 2 What each capability answers — and what it cannot do alone

Capability	Question answered	Not sufficient for
Interoperability	Can information move between systems?	Selecting the governing assertion
Normalization	Can values share syntax and definitions?	Delegating organizational authority
Provenance	Where did an assertion originate?	Determining its appropriate decision scope
Reconciliation	What disagrees, and why?	Authorizing the final operating decision
Operator-Controlled Operating Record	Which authorized value governs this use, when, and why?	Proving financial or clinical benefit on its own
Intelligence	What do the governed facts suggest?	Creating authority by confidence alone

Source: SeniorCRE reference architecture.

The Operator-Controlled Operating Record does not impose one universal truth. It may maintain distinct authorized views for clinical census, billable occupancy, payroll planning and lender reporting — and those views may legitimately differ. **Coherence is the controlled relationship among them:** visible derivation, explicit purpose, bounded authorization and reproducible history.

Governing decisions are typed and constrained. A decision made for billing does not automatically govern clinical documentation; a finance leader may not supersede a licensed clinician’s clinical judgment. Authority follows organizational roles and applicable regulation, not interface convenience. A decision that exceeds delegated scope is escalated or remains visibly unresolved.

A seven-layer reference architecture

The proposed SeniorCRE architecture places the Operator-Controlled Operating Record between evidence and intelligence. The five layers below the boundary establish what is true, what disagrees and who may decide; the two layers above it explain and act — but only within the governed context.

EXHIBIT 3 How evidence, authority and intelligence connect



1 Source systems — originals preserved, never silently overwritten

Source: SeniorCRE reference architecture. Designed; not yet implemented in an operator community. Layers 4 and 5 form the governing core. Intelligence consumes governed context; authority enters only through operator policy and delegation.

The sequence is logical, not a claim that every real-world activity runs in strict serial order. Data-quality checks, alerts and human work can occur asynchronously. The invariant is simple: **automated confidence cannot retroactively manufacture approval or erase upstream uncertainty.**

Industry standards supply complementary building blocks. HL7 FHIR Provenance records the activities and agents involved in creating or altering a resource — a valuable mechanism for source history, though not a complete organization-specific governing-decision model.^[3] The NIST AI Risk

Management Framework emphasizes ongoing governance, measurement and management of AI risk.^[4] The HTI-1 final rule addresses algorithm transparency for certified health IT.^[5] Each reinforces the need for traceability and oversight; none mandates this specific architecture.

EXHIBIT 4 Evidence required at each layer

Layer	Required evidence
7 Controlled execution	Approval, action log, acknowledgement
6 SeniorCRE Intelligence	Inputs, uncertainty, model and version

AUTHORITY NEVER FLOWS DOWN FROM MODEL CONFIDENCE	
5 Operator-Controlled Operating Record	Decision ID, rationale, effective interval
4 Operator Authority Chain	Role, delegation, scope, escalation
3 Disagreement detection	Rules, thresholds, difference record
2 Evidence and provenance	Lineage and source snapshots
1 Source systems	Source ID, field, observed and effective time

Source: SeniorCRE reference architecture. Shaded rows form the governing core.

SECTION 06

The Operator Authority Chain

The Authority Chain is a policy and evidence model, not a role-based access-control list. For every governed decision it must answer six questions:

1	What is being decided?	The decision type and the operational purpose it serves
2	For what scope?	Entity, community, resident or reporting period
3	From which sources?	Eligible sources and the definitions that apply to them
4	Decided by whom?	The authorized role or policy, and the delegation behind it
5	On what evidence?	The supporting evidence that must be present before approval
6	And then what?	What happens on approval, reversal or expiration

Each decision carries, at minimum, a unique identifier, source assertions, comparison logic, rationale, delegated decision maker, effective start and end, materiality category, workflow state, audit events and downstream acknowledgements (the full contract is in Appendix A). The operator must be able to reconstruct **what was known at the time of a decision** — not merely see the latest overwritten value.

Controls

Separation of duties where appropriate; policy versioning; conflict-of-interest and scope checks; emergency overrides with retrospective review; escalation when no authorized owner exists; and a prohibition on silently resolving high-stakes disputes by model confidence. For sensitive clinical and billing actions, human review is designed around qualified professional scope and the specific consent, documentation, contractual and regulatory obligations involved. **A governing platform must never claim legal authority the operator does not hold.**

SECTION 07

Four senior housing & care operating scenarios

Scenario A — Census and occupancy

A community's clinical census reads 91, a billing extract contains 89 accounts, and the staffing schedule assumes 92 occupied units. None of these numbers is automatically wrong.

EXHIBIT 5 One community, three legitimate numbers

Source	Value	Plausible definition	Governs which decision?
Clinical census	91	Residents physically present at a point in time	Care delivery, clinical reporting
Billing extract	89	Active accounts; excludes a move-in not yet billed	Revenue forecast, invoicing
Staffing schedule	92	Occupied units plus an anticipated admission	Labor allocation for the coming period

Source: illustrative scenario. Figures are hypothetical and do not represent any operator.

A disciplined resolution first establishes definitions and effective timestamps, then names the specific decision — staffing allocation, revenue forecast or management reporting. The authorized owner approves the appropriate value and rationale. The Operator-Controlled Operating Record documents that decision while preserving all three originals. The measurable output is **reduced unexplained-exception age**, not an unsupported claim that occupancy rose.

Scenario B — Resident care level

A clinical assessment indicates increased support needs; billing has not reflected the corresponding service plan, and scheduling has not been updated. The assessment, service agreement, resident or representative communications, payer conditions and role-specific approvals may all be relevant. The system surfaces the differences and routes them to the authorized parties. **It does not independently change a resident's fees or care plan on the strength of an inference.** The economic chain must also be separated into stages, each with its own metric:

EXHIBIT 6 The evidence chain — four stages, four separate metrics

STAGE 1 Detection	STAGE 2 Governance	STAGE 3 Execution	STAGE 4 Outcome
A discrepancy is found and classified.	An authorized owner approves a correction.	The correction is implemented in the source system.	Payment is collected or cost is avoided.
Metric: exceptions detected; false positive and negative rates	Metric: decisions with role, rule and rationale; decision age	Metric: acknowledged actions; failures and reversals	Metric: finance-validated dollars against a baseline

Source: SeniorCRE measurement framework. Evidence at one stage is never reported as evidence of a later stage.

Scenario C — Labor and acuity

Scheduled coverage may rest on stale acuity assignments while the EHR holds newly documented changes. The operator must decide whether the data warrants a staffing change, weighing licensure, care obligations, available labor, resident safety and local regulation. The Operator-Controlled Operating Record can document the basis for that staffing decision without substituting analytics for a qualified professional's judgment.

Scenario D — Portfolio NOI and lender reporting

A multi-community management report may aggregate property operating statements with inconsistent accrual cutoffs and occupancy definitions. The Operator-Controlled Operating Record can preserve local ledgers, normalize comparable reporting rules, and document CFO-authorized adjustments and exclusions — improving reproducibility and timeliness. That is not evidence of higher NOI unless a separately established causal mechanism and a measured economic result exist.

SECTION 08

Two deployment roads

SeniorCRE's governing rule is **govern first; replace only by choice**. Replacement is never a condition of obtaining governance, and it is never prohibited. The operator — not SeniorCRE — chooses the road. Both roads are configurations of one category.

ROAD 1

Govern what you have

The operator keeps its clinical, finance, work-force and other incumbent platforms. Initial ingestion uses scoped exports or approved integrations. The governing layer does not need write access to demonstrate the full chain — from conflicting assertions to an authorized decision and an exportable audit record.

Material constraints: vendor access terms, data protection, interoperability limits and implementation burden. Real operator participation is essential to validation.

ROAD 2

Run on SeniorCRE

Where an operator elects SeniorCRE as the system of record for defined domains, source documentation can originate inside the platform. That does not remove the need for governing distinctions across the domains that remain elsewhere.

Boundary: Road 2 is not described as production-ready EHR or eMAR functionality without the relevant validation, safety, clinical, security and regulatory evidence. The system-of-record scope is specific and contractually explicit.

SECTION 09

Objections, tested

A thesis worth publishing should state the strongest case against it. Five objections, each answered on its merits:

-
- 01 **“Existing EHRs and enterprise master-data platforms already reconcile information.”** Frequently true. The differentiator must therefore be tested at the level of decision objects and evidence, not generic features: can an existing environment preserve contrary assertions, document policy-backed authority across vendors, support scoped effective decisions and export independent lineage — without custom consulting work?
 - 02 **“A new authority layer adds complexity and creates another source of truth.”** A serious risk. A platform that merely copies records into another database worsens fragmentation. To justify itself, the layer must distinguish governing decisions from underlying facts, minimize duplication, provide transparent APIs and exports, and relieve a demonstrable operational burden.
 - 03 **“The EHR should remain authoritative for clinical matters.”** Correct. The architecture does not displace legitimate clinical-system authority or licensed professional decision-making. It respects domain-specific scope while recording how cross-domain decisions interact.
 - 04 **“Humans become the bottleneck.”** A scalable design needs materiality thresholds, delegated policy rules, queues, service levels and constrained automation. Low-risk deterministic matching can be automated under approved rules; high-impact exceptions require appropriate approval. Success is not maximum human review — it is minimum unjustified uncertainty and minimum unaccountable execution.

-
- 05** “AI will eventually resolve all conflicts.” A model can classify, retrieve and recommend. A probability estimate is not a delegation of financial, clinical or legal authority, and explicitly defined authorization remains necessary as models improve.

SECTION 10

Pilot design and measurable proof

A credible first operator pilot uses a narrow, representative set of communities and two or three cross-domain workflows with known disagreement frequency. The operator defines its own rules and accountable roles *before* seeing any recommendation. Data ingestion and scope are documented. Initial deployment favors read-only evaluation and approval records over autonomous execution.

Baseline first

Before implementation, establish a baseline for exception rate, unresolved age, investigation time, re-work incidents and downstream corrections. Classify every disagreement as a **semantic difference, timing difference, missing information, source error or true authority conflict**. Do not reward false agreement or conceal unresolved cases.

Independent review

Independent operator reviewers assess decision accuracy, policy conformance and reversibility. The technology team assesses provenance completeness, audit reproducibility, isolation, access control, security, privacy and operational reliability. Successful cross-system workflow completion is evaluated separately from governing-value creation.

Financial outcomes, measured separately

Validated recoveries, avoided labor or administrative hours, reduced write-offs and recognized NOI improvement are each tied to a defensible baseline and attribution method. Overlapping benefits are not added together, and an identified opportunity is never equated with realized value.

EXHIBIT 7 Proof categories and illustrative acceptance criteria

Proof category	Illustrative acceptance criterion
Data integrity	Every displayed governing assertion links to a preserved source and time
Conflict detection	Pre-agreed exceptions detected, with measured false-positive and false-negative rates
Authority	Every material decision has an authorized role, rule and rationale
Lineage	An independent reviewer can reconstruct decisions and their revisions
Operator usefulness	The operator completes a designated real workflow — not a scripted demo
Security	Access, audit and PHI controls documented and tested within approved scope
Economic evidence	Any claimed savings or revenue supported by finance-approved measurement

Source: SeniorCRE pilot measurement framework. Criteria are illustrative and are finalized with each operator before deployment.

SECTION 11

Commercial and competitive implications

The category thesis is strongest as **independent operating infrastructure**, not as a claim that incumbents are incapable of governance. SeniorCRE has to win on specific, demonstrable differences: operator policy portability, multi-vendor decision lineage, low-disruption onboarding, role-specific accountability and reproducible cross-domain outputs.

The largest competitive threat may not be Epic or Oracle directly, but a well-executed governance feature from an incumbent EHR, finance vendor, interoperability provider or vertical data platform. Defensibility will rest on deeply embedded operator-approved workflows, portable policy and evidence histories, integration breadth, implementation efficiency, trust and adoption — not on the word “governance.”

The two-road model provides strategic flexibility at the cost of engineering and market complexity. SeniorCRE therefore keeps a hard line between the first governing-layer deployment and longer-term system-of-record ambitions: success in read-only governing workflows will not be extrapolated to clinical system-of-record readiness or to autonomous agent execution.

The economic opportunity across multi-community operators may be substantial, but market size, pricing power, deployment cost, gross margin and long-run retention require independent validation. Neither hospital EHR share nor architectural novelty establishes value.

Conclusion: a proposition to test

Healthcare needs integrated applications, interoperable data and advanced intelligence. They are complementary capabilities, not rival alternatives. The remaining architectural challenge is to make the authority behind consequential operating decisions **explicit, durable, purpose-bound and reviewable**.

SeniorCRE proposes that the Operator-Controlled Operating Record sit between evidence and intelligence. Source records stay visible; disagreement is preserved until it is understood; authorized operators define which value governs a decision; and downstream intelligence works inside those boundaries. “Coherence before intelligence” is both a design rule and a testable product promise.

The decisive next step is not a stronger claim about Epic or Oracle. It is a completed operator deployment that demonstrates evidence preservation, conflict detection, delegated authority, governing-decision lineage and controlled workflow outcomes. Only then does the architectural thesis graduate into an evidence-backed market assertion.

THE LONG VIEW

The long-term winner will not necessarily be the vendor that stores the most data or ships the most AI features. It may be the infrastructure enterprises trust to explain why a particular action was authorized — while preserving their right to use or replace the systems underneath.

Minimum governing-decision data contract

Each governing decision is an immutable record. These are the minimum fields a reviewer needs to reconstruct what was decided, by whom, on what evidence and with what effect.

EXHIBIT 8 Governing-decision record — minimum fields

Field	Meaning
decision_id	Immutable identifier for the governing decision
scope	Entity, community, person or reporting context
purpose	Operational use for which the value governs
source_assertions	Referenced original values and source versions
definitions	Metric semantics and normalization assumptions
policy_version	Approved authority and comparison policy
deciding_principal	User, role or service, and the delegation basis
rationale	Decision explanation and supporting evidence
effective_interval	Period during which the decision governs
status	Proposed, approved, rejected, superseded or expired
supersession	Pointer to reversals or replacement decisions
execution_links	Downstream action, acknowledgement and failure status
audit_trail	Timestamped changes and access events

Source: SeniorCRE reference architecture.

Evidence boundary

This paper keeps four levels of evidence apart, and labels claims accordingly:

Level	Evidence type	Status in this paper
i	Independent published facts	Epic, Oracle and relevant standards — cited to sources
ii	Proposed architecture	The SeniorCRE design described in Sections 04–10
iii	Built but unvalidated	Engineering assets that may exist but have not been proven in operator workflow
iv	Validated in live operation	None asserted

No production performance, realized NOI, causal revenue uplift, clinical readiness or autonomous-agent safety result is asserted, nor that any incumbent lacks comparable functionality.

REFERENCES

References and further reading

- [1] Giles Bruce, “Judy Faulkner and Larry Ellison: 2 very different healthcare strategies,” *Becker’s Hospital Review*, October 9, 2026. www.beckershospitalreview.com/healthcare-information-technology/ehrs/judy-faulkner-and-larry-ellison-2-very-different-healthcare-strategies/
- [2] Giles Bruce, “Hospital EHR market share leaders in 2025, by category,” *Becker’s Hospital Review*, May 18, 2026, citing KLAS Research. www.beckershospitalreview.com/healthcare-information-technology/ehrs/hospital-ehr-market-share-leaders-in-2025-by-category/
- [3] HL7, FHIR R4 Provenance Resource. hl7.org/fhir/R4/provenance.html
- [4] NIST, Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0) and related materials. www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework
- [5] Assistant Secretary for Technology Policy / ONC, HTI-1 Final Rule. healthit.gov/regulations/hti-rules/hti-1-final-rule
- [6] “How the hospital EHR market has shifted,” *Becker’s Hospital Review*, June 11, 2026. www.beckershospitalreview.com/healthcare-information-technology/ehrs/how-the-hospital-ehr-market-has-shifted/
- [7] Giles Bruce, “Epic up by 77 hospitals: 8 things to know,” *Becker’s Hospital Review*, May 14, 2026, citing KLAS Research. www.beckershospitalreview.com/healthcare-information-technology/ehrs/epic-up-by-77-hospitals-8-things-to-know/
- [8] Heather Landi, “Epic grows EHR footprint among small health systems even as overall market sales decline in 2025,” *Fierce Healthcare*, May 15, 2026. www.fiercehealthcare.com/health-tech/epic-continues-grow-ehr-market-share-it-makes-gains-small-health-systems

ABOUT SENIORCRE

SeniorCRE is developing operating infrastructure for senior housing & care, organized around an Operator-Controlled Operating Record with downstream SeniorCRE Intelligence and controlled execution. Its two-road model — Road 1, govern what you have; Road 2, run on SeniorCRE — lets the operator choose between governance across existing platforms and, where chosen and sufficiently validated, bounded system-of-record functions. SeniorCRE, LLC is a subsidiary of HavenCo, Inc., a Texas public benefit corporation.

Contact **John Hauber**, Founder & CEO · jhauber@seniorcre.com · seniorcre.com

© 2026 HavenCo, Inc. SeniorCRE[®] is a registered trademark of HavenCo, Inc. Epic, Oracle and other company names are the property of their respective owners. References to third parties do not imply endorsement or affiliation.