

Minimal deployment gates

- Gate 1 - scope parity: documented proof that leadership cohorts using the same meeting substrate are not categorically exempt.
- Gate 2 - notice and consultation: worker-facing notice plus worker/representative consultation completed before pilot start.
- Gate 3 - access discipline: reason-coded drill-down, user-visible logs, and exception-path approval logic in place.
- Gate 4 - challenge workflow: transcript error, attribution error, context dispute, and disposition appeal paths defined with SLA.
- Gate 5 - misuse sanctions: repurposing outputs for performance or silent investigative browsing is prohibited and sanctionable.
- Gate 6 - pause / rollback rule: if governance breaches, selective exclusion, or trust breakdown exceed threshold, deployment pauses.

7. Paste-ready wording for Kashi materials

Short positioning block

Kashi assumes that institutional misuse is possible, including by leadership. The system is therefore designed to resist selective deployment, executive carve-outs, silent drill-down, and asymmetrical visibility between the institution and the individual affected. Executives may receive broader aggregate visibility, but they do not receive deeper raw visibility than the affected individual absent a formally justified investigator path.

Governance-page / deck paragraph

A governance product that works only under good-faith leadership is not robust enough for the environments where it is most needed. Kashi is built on the assumption that institutions may sometimes want accountability optics without full accountability substance. The system therefore uses anti-capture controls: no downward-only deployment, no executive carve-outs, worker-visible access logging, independent escalation routes, and periodic review of whether the system itself is being used selectively or performatively.

Shorter lines worth reusing

- Broader aggregate visibility is not the same thing as deeper investigative power.
- If a cohort is in scope to be governed by the system, leadership interacting within that same meeting substrate must also be in scope.
- Every drill-down leaves a worker-visible trace.
- Kashi is designed to resist accountability theater, not merely to document risk.

8. Claim discipline

Safe to say	Better if softened	Do not say
Kashi is designed to resist selective deployment, executive carve-outs, and silent drill-down.	Kashi is not an employee-monitoring tool.	Kashi guarantees that leadership cannot misuse the system.
Executives may see broader aggregate patterns, but not deeper raw context absent a justified path.	Kashi solves retaliation risk.	Kashi makes the institution fully independent from itself.

Kashi includes worker-visible access logs and challengeable representations.	Kashi eliminates politics from workplace accountability.	A CEO dashboard by itself proves accountability.
--	--	--

9. Source register

Internal Kashi materials

- [K1] Kashi — Progress & Project Overview (2026-04-21).
- [K2] Transparency That Drives Institutional Accountability — current meeting-governance concept note.

External sources used for this memo

- [S1] U.S. Department of Justice, Evaluation of Corporate Compliance Programs (updated 2024). Used for consistency-across-levels and independence logic.
- [S2] Transparency International, Internal Whistleblowing Systems (2022). Used for impartial follow-up, direct board access, appeal routes, and regular independent review.
- [S3] NIST, AI Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0, 2023). Used for impacted-person feedback, governance structures, and independent assessment logic.
- [S4] OECD, Algorithmic Management in the Workplace (2025). Used for worker consultation, resistance, explainability, and accountability concerns in workplace algorithm deployment.
- [S5] European Commission, Navigating the AI Act FAQ (2026). Used for worker/representative information duties and explanation logic in workplace deployment contexts.
- [S6] ICO, employment guidance on consent / monitoring in worker contexts. Used for the proposition that consent is weak where power imbalance is real.

Note: this memo is a project-use research synthesis, not formal legal advice. Its purpose is to strengthen product and rollout design before counsel review, not to replace jurisdiction-specific legal analysis.