

What your examiner receives when an agent built the change.

Every exhibit here is drawn from receipts the line already wrote at the moment of the work; a person assembles them into exhibits. Nothing in this pack was reconstructed after the letter arrived.

This sample walks one change end to end: **CHG-2417**, a workers'-compensation rating update at a fictional MGA — and then **CHG-2418**, the change that was refused before anyone was asked to approve it.

SAMPLE — FIXTURE DATA. Meridian Casualty MGA, Dana Reyes, and every identifier in this document are fictional demonstration data. No customer data appears in this pack. No examiner has reviewed these exhibits; this is what we would hand one. The shape of the record is the point.

01	The operation receipt — every step the agent took, and who signed off	p. 2
02	Policy conformance detail — each gate, and the policy revision it ran against	p. 2
03	Approval record — the human name, the role, the why, verbatim	p. 3
04	The refusal — a change that failed a check, and the record it left	p. 3
05	How to verify — what to ask of any vendor who claims this	p. 4

APPEND-ONLY

The record is append-only, enforced below the application: the database refuses UPDATE and DELETE, and the role that serves the application cannot lift them. Chaining each receipt to the one before it by hash is proposed for v1 and is not built. We are not going to call this tamper-evident.

THE HUMAN GATE

No state change without a recorded approval: a person, a role, a moment, and the why in their own words. A change that fails a check never reaches that person, and no approval is requested.

FROZEN REFERENCES

Code, prompts, and context are referenced by content: the exact line that ran and the exact instruction that was given, resolvable years later, after every refactor since.

PORTABLE

Open, queryable formats that outlive any vendor. Format spec: [haltere.ai/receipt-spec](#), with the machine-readable schema published beside it.

EXHIBIT 01

The operation receipt

One governed change, as the record holds it. One lookup returns this whole row.

FIELD	VALUE ON THE RECORD
receipt	rcpt_01J9... · 2026-07-24T14:14:09Z
change	CHG-2417 PROPOSED FIELD
work order	W0-0093 · scope granted: rating.client-config.write PROPOSED FIELD
actor	program-manager · role rating:request
operation	rating.update_loss_cost
context	config@v7 · hash e41c9b... filed-rate/FR-TX-2024-118 · band 1.38-1.61
agent	claude-opus · prompt rating_change_v4@a3f9c2 the exact rendered prompt is on the record, verbatim
code	repo@b52e88 · rating/loss_cost.py#L88
checks	pass stay-in-scope · scope.yml@r14 pass core-boundary · scope.yml@r14 pass filed-rate-conformance · rates.yml@r9
approval	Dana Reyes · underwriting-operations-lead, Meridian Casualty 2026-07-24T14:13:52Z
effect	loss_cost 1.42 → 1.55 · rating_rules v7 → v8 · event rating.updated

EXHIBIT 02

Policy conformance detail

Each gate ran before any effect, and each names the policy revision it ran against. These are conformance tests in CI, not assertions in a document.

CHECK	POLICY REVISION · WHAT IT EVALUATED	RESULT
stay-in-scope	scope.yml@r14 · touched only rating_rules; nothing outside the grant	pass
core-boundary	scope.yml@r14 · no writes across the domain boundary	pass
filed-rate-conformance	rates.yml@r9 · 1.55 falls inside the filed band 1.38-1.61 on FR-TX-2024-118	pass

A value outside the band fails at this gate. No human is asked, nothing merges, and the refusal is recorded with the rule that matched. Exhibit 04 is that record.

EXHIBIT 03

Approval record

The name an examiner asks for, with the reasoning attached. Durable: it survives restarts, redeploys, and years.

FIELD	VALUE ON THE RECORD
approver	Dana Reyes
role	underwriting-operations-lead · Meridian Casualty MGA – the customer’s employee, not ours
moment	2026-07-24T14:13:52Z
the why	“loss-cost multiplier +9%, within the filed band; hazard group C unchanged”
binding	recorded in the same commit as the change it approves
integrity	append-only, enforced at the database by trigger and by role. The hash chain is proposed for v1 and is not built.

EXHIBIT 04

The refusal

Four days later, the same program, a value outside the filed band. This is the whole record of it.

FIELD	VALUE ON THE RECORD
receipt	rcpt_01JA... · 2026-07-28T17:40:02Z · CHG-2418 PROPOSED FIELD
actor	program-manager · role rating:request
agent	claude-opus · prompt rating_change_v4@a3f9c2 · proposed 1.71
checks	pass stay-in-scope · scope.yml@r14 pass core-boundary · scope.yml@r14 fail filed-rate-conformance · rates.yml@r9 – 1.71 is outside the filed band 1.38-1.61
approval	never requested – a failed check does not ask for one
effect	none. It did not merge.

A control you have only ever seen pass is a control you have not seen. The attempt is on the record with the rule that stopped it, whether or not anyone was watching — and no person was ever placed in a position to wave it through.

EXHIBIT 05

Whether you're examining us or any vendor claiming this.

The same five questions separate a record from a diary. Ask them with the vendor's documentation open and the date spoken aloud.

1 · Ask for one change, by number.

Can they produce every field on page 2 for a single change, in minutes, from a query — or does the answer require people assembling documents?

2 · Ask for the prompt.

Not a description of it: the exact rendered instruction, at its own version, as the model received it.

3 · Ask for the code that ran.

A frozen reference to the exact commit and line, not the file as it looks today.

4 · Ask what happens on failure.

A blocked change should leave a receipt too. "We would have caught it" is not evidence; a refusal on the record is. Exhibit 04 is ours.

5 · Ask who approved, and why.

A human name, with authority, with reasoning, that survives the person leaving — and an answer to whose employee that person is.

What is not in this record: systems that predate the line. Enforcement starts at what you build next, and existing systems enter the record as they move onto it. We would rather you read that here than find it on exam.

Every claim in this pack is checkable, and the format is public at haltere.ai/receipt-spec with the schema and both records above published as files. Start with the workflow you already have to build, and the examiner you answer to: haltere.ai. Inquiries are answered within one business day, by someone who can answer them.