

Operating System Evaluation Framework

A scoring frame for operators comparing platforms — built on governance capability and evidence class rather than feature counts.

Evaluation framework • September 8, 2026

Status as of September 8, 2026. SeniorCRE® has no completed operator pilot and no operator production deployment. Capability statements in this document carry an explicit maturity label: BUILT means shipped in main and exercised in SeniorCRE-operated validation environments with synthetic data, not available to users and not in production; FRAMEWORK means the data model and surfaces exist but the behaviour a reader might assume from the name is not enforced; ROADMAP means not built.

No named third-party system is connected in operator production. Any third-party name that appears is used nominatively to describe the system category an operator already runs, never to assert an integration.

Figures labelled illustrative are worked examples on stated assumptions, not measured results, not benchmarks, and not forecasts. Nothing in this document is a warranty, a delivery date, a clinical or regulatory fitness statement, or investment advice.

What this framework scores

Feature counts do not separate platforms; governance capability does. Score each candidate on the four governing capabilities, then score the evidence behind each answer. A capability with no evidence class is scored as not demonstrated.

The governing question: which number governs?

Ask five leaders in the same operating company what occupancy was last Tuesday and you will often get five defensible answers. The census system counts a resident from move-in. Billing counts from the first billable day. The clinical record counts from the first documented assessment. The pipeline counts a signed agreement. The board deck counts whatever was pasted into it. Each system is internally correct.

The failure is not bad data. It is unassigned authority. Nobody has declared, in writing and in the system, which definition governs a decision, which source may state the number, what happens when sources disagree, and how the answer can be traced afterwards.

Not every disagreement is bad data. Two systems can both be right under different definitions. Three categories are worth separating: a definition conflict, where the same word is measured differently; a timing conflict, where systems are correct as of different moments; and a defect, where one system is simply wrong. Only the third is a data-quality problem. The first two are governance problems, and they do not resolve by buying another integration.

The four capability dimensions

- Definition — can the operator store, version, and own the meaning of a figure inside the product?
- Authority — can the operator declare which system may state a figure, for which period, by which role?
- Reconciliation — are tolerance, tie-break, escalation, and override justification configurable and recorded?
- Lineage — can a reported figure be traced to source rows in the product, by a successor, without a rebuild?

The evidence ladder

- Production for named customers, with a reference an operator can call.
- Shipped and demonstrable, but not production-proven for this use.
- Exercised only in vendor-controlled environments, often with synthetic data.
- Described in materials but not built.

Scoring rules that keep the exercise honest

- A named integration counts only at production-for-named-customers level. Otherwise it scores as framework.
- An outcome figure counts only when published with formula, sources, date, and limits.
 - A safety control counts only where it is enforced, not where it is displayed.
 - Coexistence counts: whether the platform requires replacement of a system already in place, or governs above it by operator choice.

Where SeniorCRE lands on its own framework

Governance capability BUILT and exercised in SeniorCRE-operated validation environments with synthetic data; third-party ingestion FRAMEWORK with nothing connected in operator production; medication safety enforcement ROADMAP; evidence level: vendor-controlled environments. No completed operator pilot and no operator production deployment as of September 8, 2026. Any operator applying this framework should score SeniorCRE accordingly.

Definition. Authority. Reconciliation. Lineage.

Those four are what make data governable. A definition says what the number means. Source authority says which system may state it. Reconciliation says what happens when systems disagree. Lineage says how the number can be traced back through every hand it passed through.

Govern first. Replace only by choice. Operators can govern the systems they retain or assign selected system-of-record functions to SeniorCRE. The operator chooses the architecture.

When systems disagree, the operator governs.

SeniorCRE is a registered trademark of SeniorCRE, LLC. Operator Authority Chain™ is a trademark of SeniorCRE, LLC. This document is informational. It is not an offer, a warranty, a service commitment, a clinical or regulatory fitness statement, or investment advice.

<https://seniorcre.com> • [Request an Executive Briefing](#)