

Fictional exchange. Companies, people, operational inputs, interviews and reviews are invented. Updated 18 September 2026. Listed attachments are rendered pages in this PDF, not native downloadable files.

Recommendation: choose SilicaOrchard Compute, keep the exit easy

FROM IQ256 | iq256.com/contact
TO Anika Veymont, CEO, CairnLattice Systems B.V. <anika.veymont@cairnattice.example>
DATE 25 September 2025, 17:02 CEST

Hello Anika,

Choose SilicaOrchard Compute for production, but do not accept its contract as written. Ask for 18 months, price protection, complete export, deletion evidence, and a 60-day migration window. Build one thin portability layer that CairnLattice owns.

AlbaInference wins the benchmark and price. It loses the business decision because its operational-access clause conflicts with contracts attached to EUR 3.54M ARR. PineCircuit and self-hosting solve future problems by creating a larger problem today.

The attachments contain the comparison, contract gates and proposed 30-day execution plan. The updated edition includes an external research supplement checked on 15 September 2026. The supplier figures remain fictional inputs, and migration has not been performed.

IQ256

ATTACHMENTS (3)

 IQ256_AI_Platform_Decision_Review.pdf CairnLattice Systems B.V. Deep Fusion AI 25 September 2025	01
 Vendor_Contract_Gates.xlsx Accept, negotiate, or reject before signing	02
 Thirty_Day_Migration_Plan.pdf Migration actions and evidence checkpoints	03

AI platform decision review

CairnLattice Systems B.V. | Deep Fusion AI | 25 September 2025

Fictional worked example: scenario inputs, calculations and proposed actions.

RECOMMENDATION

Choose SilicaOrchard Compute for production. Keep the exit easy.

1. Use SilicaOrchard Compute for production customer workspaces for 18 months.
2. Ask for fixed pricing, complete export, deletion evidence, and a 60-day migration window.
3. Build one thin CairnLattice-owned portability adapter.
4. Keep AlbalInference only for public demo data if the second account costs almost nothing.
5. Do not implement PineCircuit or self-hosting now.

SilicaOrchard Compute is the only managed route that clears every current hard gate. Its EUR 66k premium over AlbalInference protects contractual compatibility for EUR 3.54M ARR. Its quality score of 88 remains above the agreed minimum of 86.

CONFIDENCE

High on the route; medium on final commercial terms because SilicaOrchard Compute has not accepted the requested 18-month term.

Evidence boundary

- Fictional inputs: benchmark, customer obligations, cost model, capacity and supplier terms in the request.
- Calculated from those inputs: cost premiums, ARR exposure and gate comparison.
- Actual external research: the dated NIST and UK government supplement strengthens evaluation and exit checks; it does not verify the fictional suppliers.
- Unknown in the scenario: final term, price cap, operational-access compliance and PineCircuit subprocessor approval.
- AI-only example: no human expert review, supplier contact, benchmark execution or production migration was conducted.

Why the choice is simpler than it looks

GOVERNING CONSTRAINT

This is not a model-quality contest. It is a production-contract decision with a minimum quality gate.

Gate	AlbaInference	SilicaOrchard Compute	PineCircuit	Self-host
Quality >= 86	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail
p95 <= 2.8 s	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail
Availability >= 99.9%	Pass	Pass	Pass	Unknown
Restricted controls	Fail	Pass	Pending/fail	Pass
Run rate <= EUR 240k	Pass	Pass	Fail	Fail
Migration <= 10 weeks	Pass	Pass	Fail	Fail
Team <= 1.0 FTE	Pass	Pass	Fail	Fail

Why the alternatives lose

- AlbaInference: its three-point quality advantage cannot repair a contractual access-control failure.
- PineCircuit: exceeds cost and staffing limits while adding subprocessors.
- Self-host: misses quality, latency, cost, staffing, and schedule together.

Retained dissent

Simulated voice: Select AlbaInference and ask 19 restricted customers for exceptions. It saves EUR 66k annually and improves visible quality.

The dissent does not win. The saving is 1.9% of protected ARR, and six pipeline opportunities require the same control. Exceptions would turn one supplier gap into 19 account negotiations.

Pay for control, not unnecessary redundancy

<div>EUR 66k</div> <div>Price premium</div> <div>vs AlbalInference</div>	<div>EUR 3.54M</div> <div>Protected ARR</div> <div>61% of total</div>	<div>EUR 194k</div> <div>Recurring run rate</div> <div>Supplied annual all-in</div>
--	---	---

Calculation: EUR 194k SilicaOrchard Compute all-in - EUR 128k AlbalInference all-in = EUR 66k premium. Both supplied values include loaded internal operations and 35% usage headroom. No separate recurring adapter cost is added.

Recommended architecture

- CairnLattice owns the provider interface, policy controls, prompts, logs, and evaluation set.
- SilicaOrchard Compute is the only production inference provider during the initial term.
- Require export of prompts, configuration, logs and evaluation results; test a critical workflow elsewhere and estimate exit time/cost. An adapter alone does not prove portability. See [2].
- Planned check: version the scenario evaluation, document data provenance and workflow coverage, and rerun representative tests before material model or prompt changes. See research supplement [1].
- Do not add a production router until the reopening threshold is met.

Sensitivity

- Treat EUR 240k as the absolute all-in recurring-cost ceiling. If the forecast exceeds it, reopen the architecture decision.
- If AlbalInference closes the access-control gap, it becomes the leading alternative.
- If SilicaOrchard Compute falls below quality 86 on the final shadow run, hold launch and reopen supplier remediation.

Risks and reversal thresholds

Risk	Early signal	Mitigation
24-month term remains	First redline returns unchanged	Board exception only with stronger price and exit terms
Live quality degrades	Score below 86 or claims above 5%	Hold cutover and inspect task segments
Migration slips	Adapter incomplete by day 15	Reduce scope to four production workflows
Cost rises	Forecast above EUR 240k	Trigger routing or self-host review
Requirement was overstated	Privacy approver accepts simple exceptions	Re-score AlbalInference

Reopen the architecture when

- The all-in recurring forecast exceeds EUR 240k; set any later routing threshold during that reopening using then-current prices and outage evidence.
- Expected annual outage exposure exceeds EUR 120k.
- Production volume reaches four times today's level.
- A self-hosted model reaches quality 88 with p95 below 2.8 seconds.
- AlbalInference accepts approval-only EU operational access with audit logs.

FINAL SENTENCE

Select SilicaOrchard Compute because it satisfies the business CairnLattice has today. Preserve the evidence and interfaces needed to choose differently later.

External research and practical checks

External sources actually checked on 15 September 2026. This supplement belongs to the updated edition, not the fictional September 2025 correspondence. All named vendors, customer figures and benchmark results remain fictional scenario inputs.

[1] Test the deployment, not just a headline score

NIST recommends documented evaluation in conditions resembling deployment, cautions against extrapolating from narrow assessments, and addresses output-source checks and evaluation-data provenance. Applied here: freeze the workflow mix, record dataset provenance and limitations, and rerun representative shadow tests after meaningful changes. The fictional score of 88 cannot itself establish production reliability.

NIST AI 600-1: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile

<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/NIST.AI.600-1.pdf>

July 2024. MEASURE 2.3 and MS-2.5-001/-003/-005; printed pages 30-31 (PDF pages 34-35).

[2] Make exit readiness testable

UK government guidance weighs service value against portability and considers the time and cost of leaving. Applied here: retain one production provider initially, document switching triggers, and test a critical workflow plus export path elsewhere. Cost the exit exercise and account for adapter maintenance; do not add a router merely to claim independence.

GDS / CDDO: Managing technical lock-in in the cloud

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/managing-technical-lock-in-in-the-cloud>

Published 17 December 2019; updated 3 September 2026. Sections: Balancing risk and opportunity; Manage your technical lock-in.

RESEARCH BOUNDARY

These sources inform the checks. They do not establish supplier compliance, validate the invented benchmark, approve a contract or guarantee a migration outcome.

Delivery record and remaining work

This fictional assignment is complete when the agreed review and documents are delivered and checked. Its business recommendations and future execution are separate from that completion.

Agreement	Boundary in this example
Delegated work	Compare the four supplied supplier options, recommend a route, research relevant evaluation/exit guidance, and prepare contract gates and a migration plan.
Work illustrated as delivered	A supplier review, traceable calculation/gate tables, a dated external research supplement and a proposed 30-day plan. No benchmark or migration is performed.
Completion checks	Reconcile costs and hard gates; distinguish fictional inputs, calculations and real guidance; identify unresolved supplier conditions and useful next checks.
Authority retained by customer	Anika and the board retain supplier selection, customer exceptions and signature. No supplier contact, contract commitment, spend or production-data movement is authorized.
Remaining checks	Confirm final supplier terms, permitted support access, actual representative evaluation, privacy approval, export/deletion and migration proof.
Fee and timing	Illustrative scope; price and delivery agreed in the quote. Current service guide: iq256.com/what-we-do. This collection is a sample, not a package entitlement.
Business budget	The EUR 240k recurring ceiling and supplier prices are fictional customer operating budgets, not the IQ256 review fee.

Where human input is agreed, IQ256 selects, briefs, coordinates and pays contributors. IQ256 integrates the agreed work and performs baseline completion checks. Extra verification answers a specified additional concern. External information packets require explicit customer approval; no approval is needed for every internal step within the agreed mandate.

If scope, price, deadline, sharing or customer effort changes materially, agree the next course before exceeding the mandate. A recommendation may name one option while the customer retains the decision; permission to act or commit money is agreed separately.

Discuss a defined assignment

<https://iq256.com/contact>

Start with a short, non-confidential description. Initial human reply normally within 2-48 hours, distinct from the agreed delivery deadline.

SilicaOrchard Compute negotiation gates

Accept, negotiate, or reject before signing

Fictional worked example: scenario inputs, calculations and proposed actions.

Condition	Accept	Negotiate	Reject
Term	18 months	24 with board exception + stronger exit	Over 24 months
Price increase	0% in initial term	3% cap after	Uncapped
Processing	EU-only, zero retention	None	Training or cross-region
Support access	Prior approval + audit	Only an expressly permitted customer exception	Unapproved access, including emergency access with later notice
Subprocessors	30-day notice + objection	15-day notice	No notice
Export	Complete documented export	Capped assistance fee	Partial/proprietary only
Deletion	Certificate in 30 days	45 days	No certificate
Incident notice	24 hours	48 hours	Over 48 hours
Migration window	60 days	45 days	Under 45 days

DECISION RULE

Sign only when every row is Accept or an authorized customer decision-maker has explicitly permitted the specific exception. Four-hour notice after emergency access fails a prior-approval requirement. No signature if any Reject condition remains.

First 30 days

Migration actions and evidence checkpoints

Fictional worked example: scenario inputs, calculations and proposed actions.

Time	Action	Owner	Evidence
Days 1-3	Send contract redlines and security questions	CEO + Legal	Response against every gate
Days 1-5	Freeze evaluation and scoring	Product	Versioned 1,200-task suite
Days 4-8	Build provider interface and logging contract	Platform	Same app call against stub and provider
Days 7-12	Complete privacy and subprocessor review	Privacy approver	Signed decision record
Days 10-15	Run complete shadow evaluation	Product + Support	Quality >= 86; p95 <= 2.8 s
Days 16-20	Test export, deletion, failover, incident contact	Security	Timestamped evidence pack
Day 21	Final go/no-go	CEO	All hard gates green
Days 22-30	Migrate two low-risk workflows	Platform	Seven stable days

Stop conditions

- Restricted data leaves the agreed region.
- Quality remains below 86 after remediation.
- p95 exceeds 2.8 seconds in three consecutive tests.
- Recurring run rate exceeds EUR 240k.
- Any Reject contract condition remains.