

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.

Which AI platform should we commit to for production?

FROM Anika Veymont, CEO, CairnLattice Systems B.V. <anika.veymont@cairnlattice.example>
TO IQ256 | iq256.com/contact
DATE 25 September 2025, 09:14 CEST

Hello IQ256,

Our temporary AI agreement ends in 11 weeks. Product wants the best benchmark, Security wants the strongest controls, Finance wants AlbalInference's price, and Engineering wants to avoid another migration.

Please recommend one production architecture for our 9 October board. We will pay more when it protects the business, but do not want complexity we do not need.

Use an AI-only Deep Fusion AI without human expert interviews. The fictional attachments contain aggregate evaluation results and contract requirements only; no raw support conversations or customer-identifiable records. The updated edition adds actual external guidance checked in September 2026, separately from this 2025 scenario. Thank you, Anika

ATTACHMENTS (3)

- AI_Platform_Renewal_Brief.pdf

CairnLattice Systems B.V. | Board decision 9 October 2025

01
- Provider_Evaluation.xlsx

Fictional benchmark dated 22 September 2025 | 1,200 imagined tasks

02
- Enterprise_Requirements_and_Risk_Log.docx

Contract controls and remaining gaps

03

AI platform renewal

CairnLattice Systems B.V. | Board decision 9 October 2025

Fictional inputs. Benchmarks, interviews and voices are invented.

<div>DECISION</div> <div>Choose one production route for the next 18-24 months. Migration must finish before the temporary agreement ends.</div>		
<div>EUR 5.8M</div> <div>ARR</div> <div>116 customers</div>	<div>EUR 3.54M</div> <div>Restricted ARR</div> <div>61% of total</div>	<div>17 months</div> <div>Runway</div> <div>Current plan</div>

CairnLattice is a 67-person European customer-support software company. AI drafts replies, summarizes threads, classifies urgency, and suggests knowledge articles. A user confirms every customer-facing response.

Four routes

Route	Why it attracts support	Critical concern
AlbaInference	Best quality, fastest, cheapest	Global operations staff may access incident metadata
SilicaOrchard Compute	Strong EU controls and auditability	Higher price and 24-month term
PineCircuit	Two-provider resilience	More subprocessors, cost, and internal staff
Self-host	Maximum direct control	Creates a platform function CairnLattice does not have

Hard gates

Dimension	Required
Blind quality	At least 86/100
p95 response time	2.8 seconds or faster
Availability	At least 99.9%
Restricted workspaces	EU-only, zero retention, controlled support access
Annual all-in run rate	At most EUR 240k
Migration	Complete within 10 weeks
Ongoing internal team	At most 1.0 FTE

Customer exposure

- 19 restricted-workspace customers generate EUR 3.54M ARR.
- Six qualified opportunities worth EUR 1.20M require the same controls.
- Three renewals worth EUR 740k occur in the next six months.
- The product team can fund one migration, not two parallel migrations.

Known unknowns

- SilicaOrchard Compute offered 24 months; CairnLattice wants 18.
- AlbalInference says support access is rare but will not make it approval-only.
- PineCircuit has not completed the subprocessor review.
- The self-host estimate excludes a second reliability engineer.

Assignment scope

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.
Requested output	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.

Provider_Evaluation.xlsx

Provider evaluation

Fictional benchmark dated 22 September 2025 | 1,200 imagined tasks

Fictional inputs. Benchmarks, interviews and voices are invented.

Metric	AlbaInference	SilicaOrchard Compute	PineCircuit	Self-host
Blind quality / 100	91	88	90	82
Restricted-case recall	94%	92%	93%	85%
Unsupported claim rate	2.8%	3.4%	3.1%	6.9%
p95 latency	1.8 s	2.4 s	2.2 s	3.1 s
Availability	99.9%	99.95%	99.9%	Internal target
Annual all-in	EUR 128k	EUR 194k	EUR 267k	EUR 438k
Ongoing internal FTE	0.4	0.6	1.5	3.0
Migration	6 weeks	8 weeks	14 weeks	22 weeks

Illustrative evaluation method - not performed

- 1,200 tasks from 12 customers with company and supplier names removed.
- Double-scored by Product and Support Operations.
- Quality combines factual use, policy compliance, structure, and calibration.
- Current monthly volume is 5.4B input and 1.4B output tokens across 2.7M requests.
- Annual cost includes 35% headroom and loaded internal operations; migration is excluded.

Enterprise requirements and risk log

Contract controls and remaining gaps

Fictional inputs. Benchmarks, interviews and voices are invented.

Requirement	AlbaInference	SilicaOrchard Compute	PineCircuit	Self-host
EU-only inference	Pass	Pass	Pass, review pending	Pass
Zero retention	Pass	Pass	Supplier statements	Pass
Approval before support access	Fail	Pass	Mixed	Pass
Support-access audit log	Partial	Pass	Mixed	Pass
30-day subprocessor notice	Partial	Pass	Pending	Internal
Deletion certificate	Pass	Pass	Mixed	Internal

Risk notes

- Restricted contracts do not permit unapproved global support access to incident metadata.
- Incident metadata may expose prompts, customer identifiers, or ticket fragments even when inference stays in the EU.
- PineCircuit increases the processor chain from one to three.
- Self-hosting transfers availability, incident response, patching, and capacity planning to CairnLattice.
- SilicaOrchard Compute passes the controls but includes a 24-month minimum and broad price-escalation clause.