

Institutional AI Sovereignty Through Gateway Architecture: Implementation Report from Fontys ICT

Ruud Huijts
`r.huijts@fontys.nl`

Koen Suilen
`k.suilen@fontys.nl`

December 2025

This whitepaper was developed through iterative collaboration with Claude Sonnet 4.5 (Anthropic). The AI served as an intellectual sparring partner in developing arguments, structuring content, and refining language. All factual claims were independently verified, and the authors retain full responsibility for the work's content and conclusions.

Executive Summary

To address the fragmented, high-risk and inequitable adoption of commercial AI tools, we designed and operated an institutional AI platform in a six-month, 300-user pilot. The aim was to demonstrate that a university of applied sciences can offer advanced AI capabilities on its own terms, with fair access for all students and staff, transparent risks, controlled costs and full alignment with European law.

Commercial AI subscriptions proved incompatible with that mission. They create unequal access, because only those who can pay receive robust AI support, and they introduce serious compliance risks through opaque data processing, non-EU hosting and provider-centric terms of use. At the same time, simply banning such tools is neither realistic nor desirable in education. The institution needs a way to make powerful AI available in a form that is sovereign, accountable and compatible with its public role.

Our solution is a governed gateway platform with three tightly integrated layers:

Frontend: A familiar, ChatGPT-style interface tied to institutional identity (single sign-on). It gives every student and staff member the same secure entry point to AI, makes model choice explicit and surfaces key information such as hosting region and indicative cost, turning each interaction into a small lesson in AI capabilities, risks and trade-offs.

Gateway: The operational core that translates institutional policy into technical enforcement. The gateway controls who may use which models, under what conditions and with what budget. It steers traffic to EU infrastructure by default, logs usage for audit and cost allocation and ensures that any non-EU processing is a conscious, documented exception rather than an accident.

Provider Layer: A catalog of commercial and open-source models. Each model is wrapped in an institutional model card and consent flow that spell out capabilities, limitations, costs, hosting location and risk profile. This consolidates scattered vendor documentation into a single governance interface and provides teaching material for AI literacy, privacy awareness and cost-conscious use.

The pilot showed that this layered approach works technically and organisationally. The platform ran reliably, with no privacy incidents and strong user adoption. It enabled the institution to steer traffic towards EU infrastructure by default, to manage usage and spending across groups and projects and to make model choices transparent to users. At the same time, it highlighted that neither commercial licensing, consortium purchasing nor full self-hosting offer a sustainable alternative: only the gateway pattern combines model diversity and rapid innovation with institutional control over access, data flows and documentation.

The central insight from the pilot is that technology alone is not enough. AI is no longer a support function to be aligned with strategy—AI is strategy itself. This shift demands dedicated leadership. Sustainable operation of such a platform depends on explicit governance: someone must decide which models are admissible under which conditions, oversee legal and ethical risks, steer budgets and ensure that the platform's governance features are actually used in teaching and assessment. Existing roles cannot absorb these responsibilities because AI's dynamic, evolving nature creates governance challenges that transcend traditional functional boundaries.

Based on our experience, we therefore recommend establishing a formal AI Officer function, implemented as an individual or a coordinated team. This role must combine technical literacy to assess models and logs, governance authority to set and enforce policy and educational responsibility to connect the platform to curricula and examinations. Without this dedicated function, AI-related decisions will remain ad-hoc and the institution's exposure to legal, ethical and strategic risks will grow. With it, the pilot shows that institutional AI sovereignty is not only possible but practical: a higher-education institution can operate its own powerful, multi-provider AI platform—provided it takes governing AI as seriously as it takes teaching it.

Contents

Part I: Why We Built This	4
Part II: What We Built	6
Part III: The Governance Challenge: What Six Months of Operation Revealed	14
Conclusion: From Pilot to Principle	22
Example Model Card Claude Sonnet 4.5	23
References	33

Part I: Why We Built This

The Fontys ICT Context

Fontys ICT is a university of applied sciences in the Netherlands where students, researchers, and teaching staff work on real-world challenges in the domain of ICT. The institution offers education at Associate Degree, Bachelor's, and Master's levels. Fontys ICT's vision on education is that students shape the professional field—a philosophy that demands infrastructure reflecting professional standards rather than consumer convenience.

We experienced the familiar patchwork of tools that followed the rise of generative AI. Students and faculty mixed ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, and countless niche services based on personal preference; only Microsoft Copilot was institutionally licensed. The pace of new releases magnified the sprawl, and the institution felt compelled to respond.

Financial inequity became visible quickly. Faculty expensed premium subscriptions on personal cards, administrative staff processed reimbursements case by case, and students who could pay for ChatGPT Plus or Claude Pro outpaced peers limited to free tiers. Copilot, the lone sanctioned option, was judged weaker than the commercial tools students already knew.

Technical usage exposed bigger risks. Students wiring APIs into coursework chose providers for their generous free tiers, not their privacy posture. The result: fragmented contracts, unclear data-processing locations, unknown retention windows, and no way for faculty to verify which tools touched submitted work. Institutional risk became the sum of individual choices.

The turning point came in December 2024 when SURF, the Dutch research and education network, advised against deploying Microsoft 365 Copilot. Its DPIA flagged opaque data collection, incomplete access responses, fabricated personal data, and excessive telemetry retention.

That warning clashed with reality: Copilot sat inside our existing Office 365 licenses and Microsoft pitched it as the obvious next step. The contradiction forced a deeper question: if we cannot trust the vendor default, who decides which AI tools we do trust, on what criteria, and through what process?

SURF reduced the risk rating to “medium” in September 2025, but the underlying issue stood. Institutions need their own framework for evaluating AI tools against their values instead of inheriting the vendor's priorities by default.

This question reveals the fundamental inadequacy of commercial subscription models for educational institutions. Educational institutions prioritize institutional values over commercial convenience, have compliance obligations extending beyond consumer protection, and face pedagogical requirements that commercial interfaces cannot satisfy. Commercial AI subscriptions optimize for individual consumer convenience and maximize provider revenue, while educational institutions require infrastructure aligned with institutional values, regulatory compliance frameworks, and pedagogical objectives that may directly conflict with commercial optimization targets.

We distilled the institutional requirements commercial subscriptions failed to meet:

- **Educational equity:** Access cannot depend on personal budgets. Premium subscriptions gave paying students obvious advantages in coursework and experimentation while free-tier limits held others back.
- **Budget management and cost control:** When faculty and staff purchase individual commercial subscriptions—some reimbursed by the institution, others not—the institution loses all visibility into total AI spending, cannot track return on investment, and creates administrative overhead processing scattered reimbursement requests. Beyond tracking, commercial subscriptions at scale are economically unsustainable: providing every staff member with a ChatGPT Plus subscription alone would cost significantly more than operating a shared gateway infrastructure while locking the institution into a single vendor's ecosystem.
- **GDPR and AI Act alignment:** Deployers must provide clear documentation of capabilities, limitations, and oversight (European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2016, 2024). Vendors scatter that information across policies and portals, making institutional-scale compliance impossible when every user registers independently.
- **Pedagogical control:** ICT students need programmable infrastructure—API access, cost-performance analysis, fallback strategies, and exposure to multiple architectures. Consumer chat interfaces hide the complexity students must master.

- **Research flexibility:** Professorships require tailored model combinations, budget profiles that match research intensity, and APIs that slot into existing development workflows. Consumer products do not offer that configurability.

Consumer APIs did not solve the problem; they inherit the same opaque data routing, depend on provider assurances, and tie research output to personal accounts that vanish when students graduate. Without institutional guardrails, operational and compliance risk remain with the individual user.

These requirements converged into a fundamental institutional question: how can we provide the full diversity of AI models and capabilities our students and researchers require while maintaining privacy protection, regulatory compliance, cost sustainability, and alignment with our educational mission?

Evaluating Alternative Approaches

Before committing to institutional infrastructure, we assessed strategies commonly used across higher education, evaluating each against equitable access, data protection with geographic transparency, and pedagogical control.

1. *Commercial subscription consolidation.*

Institution-wide licensing with one or more vendors would simplify access and user experience. However, the cost structure proved prohibitive at institutional scale—universal staff subscriptions alone would exceed gateway operating costs while delivering only a single vendor’s capabilities. Beyond economics, it constrained pedagogical flexibility to provider roadmaps, left data-routing transparency dependent on vendor assurances, and kept long-term pricing and model availability outside institutional control.

2. *Consortium procurement (e.g., via SURF).*

Organizations like SURF negotiate bulk deals with AI providers on behalf of multiple institutions, securing better prices through collective purchasing power. However, SURF’s DPIA on Microsoft 365 Copilot advised caution due to unresolved privacy risks, demonstrating that lower prices do not resolve data-protection concerns. Consortium procurement also introduces an extra management tier between institutions and providers, reducing flexibility and innovation capacity. While EduGenAI (currently under construction) might become part of future solutions, every AI decision outsourced to a provider limits learning opportunities for students and staff. Consortium purchasing improves pricing but inherits core limitations for privacy-sensitive and pedagogy-specific use cases.¹

3. *Self-hosting open-source models.*

Operating models on institutional hardware maximizes sovereignty and avoids vendor lock-in. In our context, the required GPU capacity, staffing, and lifecycle management would have diverted resources from teaching and research, and would limit exposure to frontier models that students encounter in professional practice.

4. *Gateway architecture (selected).*

A multi-provider gateway allowed us to preserve model diversity while enforcing institutional policy on access, budgeting, and EU-first routing. The gateway decouples pedagogy from vendor roadmaps and turns compliance into configuration, rather than documentation alone. Importantly, the gateway architecture can incorporate elements of alternatives 1–3 as needed: we can negotiate vendor subscriptions (alternative 1) through the gateway, integrate consortium offerings like EduGenAI (alternative 2) as routing options, or operate self-hosted models (alternative 3) as internal endpoints. Rather than locking into any single approach, the gateway provides institutional control over which strategies to deploy and how to combine them. It also enables us to integrate evolving external offerings—such as SURF’s EduGenAI API (currently under construction)—without sacrificing institutional control. We can incorporate EduGenAI as one provider among many, rather than replacing our infrastructure entirely and losing the ability to set our own access policies, routing rules, and pedagogical configurations. Where external risk posture changes over time, the gateway can adapt providers and routes accordingly.

Conclusion.

The gateway approach provided the workable balance we needed: equitable, transparent access with enforceable controls, and the agility to respond to changing provider risk assessments and sector guidance.

¹This is our institutional assessment, not a SURF position.

Approach	Equity of Access	Data Sovereignty & Compliance	Pedagogical Flexibility	Feasibility
Commercial Licensing	Medium	Low	Low	High
Consortium Procurement (e.g., SURF)	Medium-High	Medium	Low-Medium	High
Self-Hosting	High	High	High	Low
Gateway Architecture (Selected)	High	High	High	Medium-High

Table 1: Comparison of AI deployment approaches for educational institutions

Part II: What We Built

Architecture Overview: Three-Layer Design Rationale

We designed the system around clean separation of concerns across three distinct layers, each addressing specific institutional requirements while maintaining interfaces enabling independent evolution.

The frontend layer handles user interaction and identity integration. It uses familiar interfaces to minimise adoption barriers while surfacing model characteristics such as geographic processing locations and expected use cases. Single Sign On through Active Directory keeps access aligned with course and research groups, and the UI evolves in response to teaching feedback.

The gateway layer translates institutional decisions into enforcement, converting rules about availability, budgets, access scopes, and hosting into technical constraints while abstracting provider-specific details. Configuration updates follow governance changes as policies and compliance frameworks develop.

The external provider layer supplies the model catalog. By maintaining direct relationships with multiple vendors we preserve contractual controls over data handling and geography, while the gateway abstraction lets us add or retire providers as offerings, pricing, or risk profiles change—without touching the frontend.




Figure 1: Three-layer gateway architecture diagram showing frontend, gateway, and provider layers

Frontend Layer: OpenWebUI for Familiar User Experience

For the initial pilot we selected OpenWebUI (after evaluating LibreChat and custom-built interfaces) because it integrates cleanly with our gateway, supports straightforward model administration, benefits from an active community, and matches the ChatGPT-style experience students and staff already know.

That familiarity avoids training overhead and keeps attention on the differences we need to emphasise: transparent model choice, hosting visibility, and access to diverse model families.

OpenWebUI implements several critical capabilities supporting our institutional requirements:

Azure Active Directory authentication integration ensures that platform access flows through existing institutional identity management. Students and faculty authenticate using their institutional credentials, eliminating separate account creation while providing centralized audit trails, immediate access revocation upon departure, and security standards consistent with other institutional services.

AAD integration also enables group-based access controls with exceptional granularity aligned to organizational hierarchies and course structures. Applied GenAI program students automatically receive baseline model access through enrollment groups; research teams obtain specialized models via professorship groups; administrative staff access operational models through departmental groups. For particularly sensitive scenarios, we can scale down to single-user, single-model access with dedicated budget allocation—enabling high-intensity use of expensive models without impacting shared institutional resources.

Explicit model selection is central to the pedagogy. Rather than default routing, every chat session begins with users choosing a model from the set their group permissions allow. The list is curated by governance policy so students only see options that satisfy institutional requirements for data sovereignty, risk, and budget. Each entry surfaces the trade-offs we want them to reason about: hosting region is flagged (EU locales such as Sweden, Germany, Netherlands versus US datacenters), relative cost appears as euro icons benchmarked against a baseline, capability tags highlight intended use cases, and compliance badges indicate whether extra approval is required. A recommended default is preselected, but switching models is a conscious action that triggers a tooltip summarising latency, token limits, and privacy caveats. A prominent link opens the full model card with technical, privacy, compliance, cost, and alternative references (detailed in Section II.D). The workflow stays light, but every choice exposes privacy, capability, and spend implications with enough context to support informed decision-making.

Together, these interface elements transform model selection from invisible background implementation detail into explicit decision-making opportunity aligned with ICT educational objectives. Students learn to evaluate technical trade-offs, consider privacy implications, assess cost-performance relationships, and select appropriate tools for specific contexts. Rather than AI remaining a black box that magically produces outputs, students engage with the full complexity of professional AI system integration.

Gateway Layer: Portkey for Multi-Provider Coordination

The gateway layer turns governance into code. We chose Portkey (over custom and other commercial gateways) because it unifies provider integrations, issues scoped API keys with budget limits, enforces spend controls at model/user/project levels, and records usage without logging content—so decisions about availability, budgets, hosting, and monitoring are enforced automatically rather than left to user discipline.

Multi-provider integration enables connection to diverse model providers through standardized interfaces that abstract away provider-specific authentication, request formatting, and response parsing. The platform currently integrates Azure AI Foundry for EU-hosted models including GPT-4o, GPT-4o-mini, and Mistral variants with guaranteed Swedish or German datacenter processing. We integrate GreenPT for EU-based hosting in datacenters powered by renewable energy. We connect directly to Anthropic for Claude model family access and to OpenRouter for models unavailable through Azure. Each provider relationship involves distinct authentication mechanisms, API patterns, and operational characteristics, but the gateway presents unified interfaces to the frontend.

Adding new providers requires gateway configuration and updating the frontend configuration file, but no changes to user-facing code. When new models emerge that our governance process determines warrant institutional access, we configure gateway connections and update model availability through configuration rather than code modifications. When providers deprecate models, we adjust gateway routing and configuration without touching frontend implementation. This separation of concerns enables the system to evolve with the rapidly changing AI landscape without requiring comprehensive redevelopment of the user interface.

API access is managed through scoped gateway keys rather than sharing raw vendor credentials. The platform authenticates to Portkey with a master key capped by budget limits, and we manually issue per-group or per-project keys (through an admin interface) with tailored permissions, routing rules, and

spending ceilings so course cohorts, research teams, or individual investigators get the models they need without jeopardising institutional budgets.

Scoped keys prevent the risks of shared credentials: uncontrolled costs, unapproved routing, and invisible attribution. The gateway logs attach every call to the right user or group, keeping financial and compliance exposure manageable. Budget enforcement operates at multiple levels—per-provider caps, per-model limits, and user or project allocations—preventing runaway spend while accommodating intensive work, with ceilings adjusted as real usage data comes in.




Figure 2: Multi-tier budget control and usage monitoring dashboard

Dashboards show spending, activity, model utilisation, and cost projections in real time, broken down by user, model, and period. That visibility lets us spot valuable or problematic spikes, top up budgets before they run dry, and ground access or procurement decisions in observed behaviour when considering new models or cost reductions.




Figure 3: Portkey AI gateway administrative interface

Geographic hosting preferences prioritise EU infrastructure. GPT-4o routes through Azure’s Swedish region, Mistral models through Azure Germany, and GreenPT serves open-source models from Scaleway’s renewable-powered datacenters in France. These defaults keep most traffic within European jurisdiction. When only US hosting exists—as with Anthropic’s Claude family—the interface flags the location, requires first-use acknowledgement, and records that acceptance so privacy trade-offs remain explicit rather than accidental.

Access restrictions translate governance decisions into access control. Models with higher privacy risk




Figure 4: Cost breakdown dashboard by user and model

(non-EU hosting), premium cost profiles, opaque training data, or advanced capability requirements stay hidden until authorised. Claude Sonnet 4, for instance, combines US-only hosting, premium pricing, and limited transparency, so it demands explicit approval.

Users learn about restricted models through the Canvas course accompanying the platform. Requests arrive via support tickets that state the intended use and acknowledge privacy implications. After review, we add approved users to sanctioned Active Directory groups; the gateway enforces those memberships so even technically savvy users cannot bypass the restriction.

In practice, the gateway turns policy into behaviour. EU-first routing, spend caps, and access rules apply automatically, not as guidance users might forget. Governance committees decide the thresholds; the infrastructure ensures compliance without relying on individual discipline.

External Provider Layer: Provider Selection and Model Catalog

The gateway connects to multiple external providers we vet for hosting location, data handling, and compliance commitments. Core principle: we must always know—and show—where each model runs so GDPR, EU AI Act, and institutional transparency requirements remain satisfied.

Azure AI Foundry anchors the catalog with guaranteed Swedish or German processing for GPT-4o, GPT-4o-mini, Mistral Large, Mistral Medium 3, and an extensive HuggingFace portfolio. These EU-hosted defaults provide capability without sacrificing compliance, so they form baseline institutional access.

GreenPT covers sovereignty-first use cases via Scaleway’s renewable-powered French datacenters, including heat recovery for district heating. We expose their self-hosted open-source models (Mistral Mini, GPT-OSS 120B) through OpenWebUI and as direct API endpoints for students who need programmatic access.

For workloads involving sensitive educational data or industry partnerships, we route through the gateway to models running on Fontys-operated hardware in the Netherlands. The gateway logs metadata (timestamps, token counts) for governance, while inference happens entirely on institutional servers to keep conversational content under direct control.

Commercial partners such as Anthropic and OpenAI supply frontier capabilities that still matter for curriculum relevance and research. Because these offerings entail US processing, they automatically invoke the heightened authorisation flow outlined earlier so every cross-border trade-off is documented and acknowledged before use.

Taken together, the catalog balances privacy preferences, capability breadth, and explicit transparency. US hosting never disqualifies a model by default; it simply becomes a conscious choice backed by informed consent and governance oversight.




Figure 5: Model portfolio showing available AI models including Llama variants (8B, 70B, 405B), Mistral offerings (Small, Medium, Large), and other state-of-the-art open models with performance rivaling proprietary alternatives

Model Cards as Governance Interface

From Technical Documentation to Institutional Decision-Making

Model cards began as transparency artefacts for ML practitioners. When Margaret Mitchell and colleagues introduced the concept (Mitchell et al., 2019), they proposed a standardised template so engineers could document provenance, fitness for purpose, and failure modes. Platforms such as HuggingFace normalised the format by publishing architectures, training procedures, evaluation metrics, and known limitations aimed squarely at implementers.

As generative AI shifted into mainstream products, providers repackaged these documents as compliance-focused system cards: glossier summaries that mix technical specifications with safety testing, content policies, and risk mitigations. They satisfy regulators and support brand protection, but prioritise legal defensibility over developer guidance or institutional decision support.

Neither format adequately serves educational institutions with governance responsibilities extending beyond individual technical implementation or consumer safety. We needed something different: model cards as active governance instruments serving three simultaneous functions:

1. **Systematic risk evaluation** supporting institutional access decisions
2. **Transparent documentation** enabling informed user choices about which models to use for specific applications
3. **Shared reference framework** facilitating productive discussions between users requesting access and governance teams evaluating those requests

This reimagining makes transparency serve compliance and education at the same time. By surfacing each model’s characteristics, limitations, privacy implications, and recommended uses, we turn selection moments into guided learning experiences. Students confront cost-performance trade-offs, privacy considerations, and capability boundaries rather than treating AI as a black box. Information exposure alone does not guarantee better decisions, but repeated interaction with these cues builds transferable evaluation habits—an outcome we still plan to validate empirically.

Addressing the Institutional Documentation Gap

Commercial system cards nominally meet transparency obligations, yet the details remain scattered across privacy policies, terms of service, and technical appendices written for liability protection rather than user comprehension. Students and faculty rarely have the time—or the expertise—to parse those sources for each tool. Classic HuggingFace-style cards provide technical depth, but assume developer control over deployment, which institutional users simply do not have. The burden of privacy evaluation therefore falls on individuals instead of sitting within coordinated governance.

Our framework consolidates the scattered material into standardised documentation the institution reviews once and then exposes consistently. Adding a model triggers a structured assessment of:

- Provider documentation and system cards
- Third-party research and benchmarks
- Compliance certifications and audit reports
- Technical specifications and testing results

This evaluation produces a model card documenting everything relevant to decision-making: where data processes geographically, what gets logged and for how long, what limitations affect output reliability, what costs accumulate through usage, what alternative models provide similar capabilities with different trade-off profiles. Users accessing this consolidated information have the foundation to make better-informed decisions than they could through scattered individual research.

From Ethical Requirements to Verifiable Documentation

We developed our model card structure by systematically mapping to the ethical requirements taxonomy proposed by (Puhlfürß, Butzke, & Maalej, 2025). Through thematic analysis of twenty-six AI ethics guidelines, three documentation frameworks, and ten actual model cards, they identified forty-three distinct ethical requirements essential for responsible AI documentation, organized into four ethical principles—**Reliability** (technical robustness and security), **Transparency** (traceability and explainability), **Empowerment** (user autonomy and informed choice), and **Beneficence** (fairness and environmental responsibility)—with three sub-principles under each.

We adapted these twelve sub-principles to institutional governance contexts, creating a two-tier documentation structure:

Mandatory Disclosure surfaces the most decision-critical information in every user interface:

- **Geography** (where data processes and who has access)
- **Limitations** (what the model cannot reliably do)
- **Costs** (financial and resource implications)

Full Model Cards provide comprehensive ethical evaluation across twelve sections that map to Puhlfürß et al.’s framework while addressing institutional needs:

1. **Model Name & Version** - Basic identification
2. **Provider & Hosting** - Geographic and organizational accountability (Reliability: Auditability; Empowerment: Liability)
3. **Technical Specifications** - Capabilities and architecture (Transparency: Communication of Capabilities)
4. **Intended Use** - Appropriate applications and contexts (Transparency: Communication of Capabilities)
5. **Limitations & Risks** - Known failure modes and boundaries (Transparency: Communication of Capabilities; Reliability: Safety and Security)
6. **Training Data** - Provenance and characteristics (Transparency: Traceability)
7. **Privacy & Data Handling** - Data subject rights and processing (Reliability: Safety and Security; Empowerment: Consent and Control)
8. **Compliance Status** - Regulatory alignment (Reliability: Auditability)
9. **Costs & Resources** - Financial and computational requirements (institutional addition)
10. **Sustainability** - Environmental impact (Beneficence: Environmental Beneficence)
11. **Comparable Alternatives** - Decision support across models (institutional addition)
12. **Governance Status** - Institutional access policies (institutional addition)

This structure addresses the full scope of ethical considerations identified by Puhlfürß et al. while adding institutional governance components absent from their research-focused taxonomy—but with a critical

constraint that distinguishes our approach from both commercial system cards and traditional model documentation.

A full example of an institutional Model Card, illustrating the structure, disclosure format, and compliance mapping is provided in appendix A.

Interface Integration: Mandatory Disclosure and Progressive Documentation

Model cards serve two complementary functions: institutional governance documentation and user-informed consent. However, users do not see full model cards in the chat interface—presenting comprehensive documentation at every interaction would overwhelm users and fail to meet regulatory requirements for digestible, actionable transparency. EU AI Act and GDPR demand information that users can actually process, not long documents hidden behind an “Accept” button. We therefore implement a two-tier disclosure mechanism: a consent modal (similar to cookie consent notifications) that presents critical risk information at the point of model selection, with full model cards accessible for users who need deeper context. This approach ensures that every model invocation is preceded by explicit acknowledgment of material risks (geography, limitations, costs) while maintaining access to comprehensive documentation when needed, turning governance structure into enforceable informed consent practice.

Technical Implementation: Model-Specific Consent Configuration


We configure mandatory disclosure requirements at the platform level through OpenWebUI's model configuration system. Each model receives a structured consent configuration specifying which risk elements require explicit acknowledgment before use. This configuration-driven approach enables systematic consent management across our multi-provider platform while maintaining flexibility to adjust disclosure requirements as models, regulations, or institutional policies evolve.

The configuration distinguishes between universal mandatory elements—geographic data processing location, key limitations affecting output reliability, and cost implications when significantly above baseline models—and model-specific high-risk elements that warrant additional explicit acknowledgment. US-hosted models trigger additional required acknowledgments explicitly stating that prompts process outside the EU with different data protection standards. Models with undisclosed training data require acknowledgment that bias sources and content appropriateness cannot be independently verified, documenting known evaluation limitations rather than obscuring them.

User Experience: Consent at Point of Selection

When users select a model requiring explicit consent from the model selector interface, the platform immediately presents a modal dialog blocking access until consent is obtained. This consent interface appears as a prominent overlay—similar to cookie consent notifications but with substantively more detailed risk information—preventing users from proceeding to conversation without engaging with material risk acknowledgments.

The disclosure format keeps critical information concise while forcing active engagement with each risk element. For Claude Sonnet 4.0, users see this modal on first selection:



UI implementation of the model card for informed consent

Each checkbox targets a specific risk: geographic processing, training-data opacity, hallucination likelihood, and cost. Users must confirm all of them before continuing; no “accept all” shortcut bypasses the prompts. A prominent link leads to the full model card for anyone who wants deeper context before granting consent.

Declining the prompt simply returns users to model selection. They either pick another model or revisit the consent modal when ready to acknowledge the listed risks.

Consent Persistence and Management

OpenWebUI stores consent decisions locally, so users acknowledge each model once instead of meeting the same dialog every session. A consent management panel lists granted permissions with dates and lets users withdraw them; revocation immediately blocks interaction until consent is renewed. Models without consent remain visible but unusable—opening them summons the modal again before any prompt can run.

This consent-gating turns GDPR and AI Act transparency into enforced practice. Every model invocation is preceded by explicit acknowledgment of geography, limitations, and cost, and the gateway refuses access without that record.

Progressive Documentation Access

Full model cards stay one click away for users who need deeper detail when requesting access, planning sensitive work, or studying system behaviour. This progressive disclosure keeps everyday use fast while still forcing everyone to acknowledge core risks, and it supplies auditors with a clear trail showing that consent is deliberate, recordable, and reversible—not a box-ticking exercise.

Part III: The Governance Challenge: What Six Months of Operation Revealed

Educational institutions operating their own AI platforms must answer a governance question that plumbing cannot solve: who decides which models are offered, on what grounds, for whom, and with what safeguards?

Commercial subscriptions outsource that judgment to vendors. Our gateway puts budget controls, access rules, and routing preferences in institutional hands, so the institution must define the decision process that operationalizes those controls.

We intentionally shipped the technical stack first so the pilot could surface the real governance work. Some pain points we expected never materialised; others—model lifecycle, hosting exceptions, access authorisations, budget steering, compliance evidence, stakeholder communication—proved central.

This section captures those governance functions, describes how the pilot handled them, and distils what production-scale operation will require to serve the wider university.

Model Lifecycle Management: Addition, Evaluation, and Removal Authority

Operational Questions Encountered

The pilot constantly reassessed its catalogue. We opened with Mistral Large, Claude Sonnet, and Llama 3.3, then new releases (Claude 4.x, GPT-4o/GPT-5 on Azure, Groq integrations) and niche requests for embedding, image, or speech models triggered fresh evaluations.

Triggers came from both sides: internal monitoring spotted provider updates, while users flagged gaps—for example, a research group needing bge-m3, which we covered by deploying Cohere Embed. Provisioning usually finished within hours, keeping researchers on the latest models.

We balanced responsiveness with institutional guardrails: favour EU or open-source hosting when possible, yet provide state-of-the-art options when pedagogy or research demanded them. Decisions stayed collaborative but informal; no documented criteria or approval chain existed.

Current Pilot Approach

The technical team executed lifecycle changes, integrating new models within hours when Portkey support existed. We weighed provider reliability, cost, and educational or research value, but without standardised metrics.

Additions and removals were pragmatic:

- **Added:** *Claude Sonnet 4.5* was deployed one day after release to test rapid integration capability and demonstrate platform agility.
- **Reconfigured:** *DeepSeek v1* initially ran via Azure AI Foundry but caused severe latency due to hardware limitations; migrating it to Groq resolved performance issues and underscored the role of infrastructure matching in model selection.
- **Removed:** *Mistral Small* was discontinued after proving less cost-effective than Mistral Medium and Large.

Communication about available models matured over time—from implicit updates to explicit postings in the Teams channel and Canvas course, allowing users to understand which models were available for access requests.

What We Learned

Informal, engineer-led choices worked for a small cohort but would crack under scale. Team members weighted criteria differently, no authority spoke for institutional priorities, and rapid adoption created hidden maintenance, support, compliance, and budgeting work. Users meanwhile assumed availability decisions reflected educational and ethical goals, not operational convenience; without explicit criteria, transparency cannot grow with demand.

Production Requirements

Production governance should establish:

- Documented evaluation criteria defining capability thresholds, compliance standards, cost ceilings, and pedagogical alignment.
- Designated decision authority, such as an AI Governance Committee or AI Officer, empowered to approve additions and removals.
- Scheduled reviews to reassess existing models against evolving standards and provider changes.

A core instrument for managing these functions will be the Model Card. When a new model is proposed for inclusion, a model card will be created to document its purpose, capabilities, compliance characteristics, cost profile, and educational relevance. This card will serve two governance roles:

1. Decision-making reference — providing a structured basis for evaluating whether the model aligns with institutional criteria before integration.
2. User transparency — informing staff, students, and researchers about each model’s characteristics, limitations, and compliance context.

Creating and approving model cards constitutes a governance responsibility rather than a purely technical task. Someone must own the drafting of each card, and an authorized body must decide—based on the documented information—whether that model becomes part of the institutional portfolio.

Lifecycle management must therefore evolve from opportunistic evaluation to a systematic process ensuring that model availability decisions are transparent, traceable, and aligned with institutional objectives.

Geographic Hosting Decisions: Balancing Data Sovereignty and Capability

Operational Questions Encountered

The pilot enforced an EU-first routing philosophy yet kept meeting the same tension: some projects needed US-only models—often Anthropic’s Claude—while others deliberately chose EU-hosted options such as Mistral for privacy. The deciding question quickly became not *where* data should live, but *when* an exception is justified.

Current Pilot Approach

Routing decisions were handled by the technical team. Each case involved informal evaluation of:

- whether EU-based models could meet the use case,
- the sensitivity of the data processed, and
- the requesting user’s ability to understand and manage international data transfer implications.

This pragmatic approach worked at pilot scale. Users demonstrating clear research or educational need and awareness of privacy trade-offs typically received access approval to US-hosted models.

What We Learned

Experience confirmed that sovereignty cannot be absolutist: EU-only hosting would block valid teaching and research, while laissez-faire exceptions would burn GDPR accountability. The differentiator is documented, informed consent. When users opt into US-hosted models after reviewing cross-border implications, institutional values are preserved; silent routing erodes them.

Model cards are therefore governance instruments as much as reference material. They record hosting location, compliance posture, and privacy risks so consent is grounded in facts rather than assumptions.

Our consultation process struck the right balance in principle but added delay and inconsistency. Production cannot rely on ad-hoc conversations with stakeholders.

Production Requirements

Scaling geographic hosting governance requires a documented framework specifying:

- Criteria for verifying adequate EU-based alternatives,
- Data sensitivity tiers governing permissible hosting locations,
- User awareness thresholds defining who may authorize international data transfers, and
- Approval workflows with predictable timelines.

Authority for final decisions should rest with a clearly designated body—either the AI Governance Committee or a privacy-AI liaison—rather than informal consensus.

Model cards should be formally integrated into this process as both the information vehicle and the record of decision. Each model’s hosting profile, compliance evaluation, and associated consent requirements must be clearly described and available to users.

Ultimately, hosting choices reflect institutional value trade-offs, not technical absolutes. A transparent, documented framework—anchored in model cards—ensures that these trade-offs are made deliberately, maintaining both compliance assurance and functional capability.

Access Authorization: Risk-Based Model Restrictions and Approval Workflows

Operational Questions Encountered

During the pilot, some users needed direct API access rather than the standard chat interface. The gateway existed for those advanced educational, research, or development projects that local hardware could not support, so every API request required formal authorisation even when the underlying model was available in chat.

Requests followed the *AI Gateway: Direct API Access Guide* on Canvas and had to show prior local experimentation, a described use case, faculty or supervisor endorsement, and estimated usage volume.

Submissions ranged from well-scoped thesis projects to curiosity requests—for example, “please unlock GPT-5” with no accompanying plan.

Current Pilot Approach

All access requests were reviewed manually by the technical team. The same small group handled evaluations and issued project-specific API keys through Portkey. Decisions were guided by pragmatic criteria:

- Evidence of local AI exploration and a clear justification for why gateway access was necessary.
- Use case specificity—educational or research purpose rather than casual exploration.
- Faculty or supervisor approval for student-led projects.
- Expected usage pattern and corresponding budget allocation.

Requests meeting these standards were typically approved within one to two business days. Some were denied due to insufficient justification or missing evidence of local testing. All correspondence and approvals were retained through email for record-keeping.

What We Learned

The approval step did more than cap spend; it forced users to articulate why they needed high-capability access and discouraged “just unlock the most expensive model” habits. Yet the informal review style produced inconsistent thresholds and little audit trail, and recurring questions showed policy gaps—some students requested access to models already available, while others glossed over privacy disclosures tied to US-hosted systems.

Production Requirements

Access governance at institutional scale requires standardization and documentation rather than discretion and memory. Production processes should establish:

- Structured request forms collecting all relevant information consistently—local testing results, project goals, supervisor endorsement, and anticipated usage.
- Documented evaluation criteria specifying what constitutes adequate justification for various risk and cost levels.
- Defined service-level commitments for response times and communication of approval or denial rationale.
- Integration of the Model Card as part of the informed consent process—each model’s card must disclose data handling location, compliance implications, and risk classification, allowing users to make informed access decisions.

The approval process should remain educational rather than administrative. When users receive explanations for denials or redirected approvals, they learn how to select models responsibly and understand the institutional rationale behind resource governance.

In production, the goal is not to slow users down but to make them participants in governance—aware of the costs, implications, and responsibilities of accessing high-capability models within institutional infrastructure.

Budget Allocation: Cost Management Beyond Technical Controls

Operational Questions Encountered

Gateway-level limits stopped runaway spending but raised harder questions: how much budget sustains a thesis-scale project, how to split finite funds between universal access and specialised research, and when to grant top-ups versus nudging users toward cheaper models.

Current Pilot Approach

We kept governance simple: every user that requested and was approved for API access received \$10, with a single justified \$10 top-up available; only one project needed extra shuffling. The OpenWebUI interface sat under a \$500 monthly institutional cap that was never breached. Budgets were not class- or faculty-specific, but usage stayed modest, aided by automated emails warning when users neared their limits and nudging them to reassess model choices.

What We Learned

The pilot showed that technical caps keep spend predictable but cannot decide how the institution should prioritise resources. More funding for research projects inevitably means less for broad student access—an institutional choice, not an engineering one.

Flat allocations kept operations painless yet hinted at the need for evidence-based differentiation. Most users never hit their limit and only a single project asked for a top-up, so richer usage insight is still needed to calibrate allocations that genuinely enable meaningful educational or research outcomes versus providing mere convenience.

Transparency for users also proved limited. While individual usage alerts worked well, students and researchers lacked contextual benchmarks—no guidance existed on what constituted efficient, typical, or excessive spending for their type of project. This reduced the educational potential of cost awareness.

Production Requirements

Budget allocation in a production environment must evolve from reactive adjustments to planned institutional resource management. Governance should define clear principles for distributing AI infrastructure funding according to institutional priorities.

Key components include:

- Baseline access ensuring equitable participation for all students, independent of personal resources.
- Research allocations scaled to intensity and disciplinary need.
- Administrative and operational budgets enabling staff to use AI in institutional processes.
- Reserve capacity for experimental programs and emerging use cases.

Allocation frameworks should be documented and data-informed, drawing on usage evidence from the pilot and future monitoring. Usage dashboards and analytics can reveal which models deliver high educational value per cost, guiding resource rebalancing over time.

Each approved model's Model Card should also include indicative cost information—typical usage patterns, price-per-token estimates, and guidance for budget planning. This transparency allows users to align expectations and plan responsibly before requesting access.

Finally, cost governance should be framed not as restriction, but as participation. By estimating their needs and reflecting on consumption, users become co-responsible for sustainable operation of the institutional AI infrastructure—an essential skill in both digital literacy and ethical resource use.

Compliance Monitoring: Systematic Provider Policy Review and Incident Response

Operational Questions Encountered

We treated GDPR and AI Act alignment as foundational. For every new provider we added, we reviewed provider terms, hosting, and data handling, though certainty was always limited by the opacity of

commercial documentation.

The harder problem was preserving *confidence* over time. Policy changes from Anthropic, Azure, or OpenAI could have altered retention, hosting, or acceptable-use terms; none did during the pilot, but the exercise underlined how fragile manual monitoring is.

Current Pilot Approach

Monitoring stayed informal and reactive. A suspected policy change or user concern triggered a manual review; there was no schedule, automation, or clear owner.

Despite that, compliance awareness guided daily decisions—particularly model selection and hosting choices. The Model Card provided a consistent documentation structure, recording each model’s hosting region, data use statements, and known privacy conditions. This practice offered a partial solution: even without automation, every model addition triggered at least a minimal structured compliance reflection.

What We Learned

The pilot reinforced that GDPR and AI Act alignment is an ongoing interpretive job. Providers tweak terms without fanfare, and minor text shifts can carry major implications. Our reactive method sufficed only because nothing changed.

We also confirmed that compliance needs interdisciplinary ownership: engineers can trace data flows, but legal and privacy specialists must judge adequacy. Informal consultation is not sustainable.

Model cards turned abstract compliance into concrete evidence by forcing every model to declare hosting location, data processing, provider terms, and documentation quality. Maintaining those cards becomes both the governance artefact and the audit trail.

Production Requirements

Scaling beyond the pilot requires moving from reactive monitoring to structured oversight. Someone must own responsibility for tracking provider policy changes—not as crisis response but as continuous practice. The specific mechanisms will vary by institution, but the function itself cannot remain informal or ad-hoc.

The Model Card provides the operational foundation for this oversight. Every update to a provider’s terms or capabilities should trigger revalidation and reissuance of the affected card, creating a continuous audit trail that links technical configuration to legal accountability. This discipline aligns practical governance with the evolving requirements of the EU AI Act.

Incident response also requires structured process. Security breaches, provider misuse, or user-reported harms need clear notification paths and escalation procedures connecting technical teams, privacy officers, and leadership. Without designated ownership and explicit workflows, compliance monitoring remains vulnerable to gaps and inconsistencies.

Stakeholder Communication: Transparency About AI Governance and Policy Evolution

Operational Questions Encountered

Piloting made it clear that transparency about AI governance matters as much as functionality. Stakeholders needed tailored context:

- **Students** needed clarity about which models were available, how to request access, how usage affected budgets, and how to report issues.
- **Faculty** required information about pedagogical integration, course-level provisioning, and the implications of model selection for student data.
- **Leadership** was indirectly connected through the project’s inclusion in one of the institutional strategic plan’s action lines, linking governance development to strategic objectives around digital innovation and responsible AI adoption.
- **Privacy officers** required documentation of data flows, consent mechanisms, and incident response procedures.
- **Researchers and developers** needed technical integration details, API documentation, and budget allocation guidance.

Each of these groups demanded communication that matched its responsibilities and perspective—operational, educational, strategic, or regulatory.

Current Pilot Approach

Communication grew organically. The Canvas module hosted documentation, procedures, and model cards; a Teams channel gave early adopters updates and a feedback loop; newsletters announced the platform’s existence. Beyond that, access approvals, ad-hoc emails, and informal faculty discussions filled gaps, while technical documentation lived on an internal wiki disconnected from governance messaging.

What we lacked was a coordinated plan. Stakeholders knew the service existed, but the rationale behind availability decisions, budget structure, and compliance approach was far less visible.

What We Learned

The pilot confirmed that communication must address more than functionality. Users and leadership alike want to understand why decisions are made, how trade-offs are balanced, and what safeguards exist. Without visible governance context, decisions can appear arbitrary or purely technical.

Different audiences also need different formats: students prefer concise instructions, faculty want pedagogical framing, leadership expects strategic synthesis, and the privacy office needs structured evidence. No single news update covers all of them.

Although no major misunderstandings occurred, the pilot highlighted that trust depends on predictability and transparency—qualities that ad-hoc communication cannot sustain.

Students already influence governance indirectly: their access requests for project-specific models shape what the platform offers, creating emergent co-creation through use patterns, but research suggests formalizing this further (Chan & Hu, 2023) by involving students directly in developing acceptable use policies, evaluating which experimental models to support, and defining what transparency requirements make sense in practice. Making explicit what is currently implicit would strengthen both policy legitimacy and student understanding of governance trade-offs.

Production Requirements

Scaling governance needs role-specific channels under clear ownership. Key elements include:

- **Student-facing documentation** that provides concise guidance on model use, access requests, and responsible practices.
- **Faculty engagement** through workshops and course-integration support, aligning AI infrastructure with learning objectives.
- **Leadership briefings** summarizing governance decisions, cost trends, compliance posture, and contribution to the institutional strategic plan.
- **Privacy coordination** via regular compliance updates and incident reporting alignment.
- **Research and technical documentation** integrated into an accessible, version-controlled repository linked from the main platform.

Policy development should include stakeholder consultation before implementation. Announcing decisions after they are made creates resistance; involving users early fosters understanding and shared ownership of governance choices.

Regular updates—preferably on a quarterly cadence—should provide stakeholders with concise summaries of platform status, usage trends, governance developments, and upcoming changes. These updates should be institutional artifacts, not just announcements: they document active governance and make oversight visible.

Finally, communication should not be one-directional. **Feedback mechanisms** through Teams channels, structured surveys, or course-level reflection sessions should allow users to raise issues and suggest improvements. The institution should close the loop by reporting back on what input was received and how it shaped subsequent decisions.

Transparent communication transforms AI governance from an internal administrative process into a visible institutional practice. It demonstrates that the infrastructure is managed not just *for* users, but *with* them—anchoring trust, accountability, and educational alignment as core elements of sustainable AI operation.

Institutional Capacity for Production-Ready Governance

The governance functions described above—model lifecycle management, geographic hosting decisions, access authorization, budget allocation, compliance monitoring, and stakeholder communication—share common characteristics that extend far beyond technical administration. Together they define the institutional capability required to operate AI infrastructure as a sustainable educational and research service.

1. **Cross-functional coordination** is essential. Effective governance spans IT infrastructure, educational strategy, privacy and legal compliance, research facilitation, and institutional leadership. No single existing role naturally combines these perspectives; structured collaboration is required.
2. **Continuous attention** replaces one-time setup. AI governance is a living process shaped by changing provider policies, new model capabilities, evolving regulation, and shifting institutional priorities. Research on AI policy in higher education confirms this operational reality: governance frameworks must emphasize “continuous improvement and adaptation, enabling universities to refine their AI integration strategies in response to new insights and changing needs” (Chan & Hu, 2023). Processes that are not continuously reviewed and adapted will rapidly become obsolete.
3. **Institutional authority** must accompany technical capability. Decisions about which models are available, where data is processed, and how budgets are distributed cannot rely solely on operational discretion. They must carry organizational legitimacy, reflect educational values, and align with the institutional strategic plan.
4. **Specialized expertise** underpins credible governance. Sustainable oversight requires a blend of technical understanding of AI systems, familiarity with regulatory obligations such as the GDPR and the EU AI Act, and insight into how AI integrates into teaching and research practice. This combination is rare and cannot be assumed to exist implicitly within existing teams.

Based on six months of operational experience, these requirements point to the need for designated institutional capacity.

The Model Card offers a practical foundation for this capacity—an instrument connecting technical, educational, and compliance perspectives into a single traceable artifact. Each model card documents capabilities, hosting, privacy characteristics, cost implications, and educational relevance, providing a unified reference for governance decisions and user transparency.

Institutional AI infrastructure becomes sustainable not through technical maturity alone, but through governance that is coordinated, accountable, and visible. Production readiness means more than reliable systems—it means a governance framework capable of learning, adapting, and demonstrating that institutional control of AI is both operationally effective and socially responsible.

The AI Officer Role: A New Institutional Function

The governance functions described above require an institutional role that bridges technical infrastructure, educational purpose, and regulatory compliance. We therefore propose establishing an AI Officer, reporting to institutional leadership, with explicit responsibility for systematic AI governance, model portfolio oversight, and institutional coordination.

This role is not an extension of existing IT or privacy functions. It represents a new institutional capacity—the first point where technical understanding, governance authority, and educational responsibility converge. The AI Officer ensures that institutional AI remains technically robust, legally compliant, financially sustainable, and pedagogically aligned.

Why This Must Be a Dedicated Role

AI governance cannot function as an informal coordination task. Our pilot operation demonstrated that decisions about model inclusion, access authorization, compliance review, and budget allocation require continuous attention, not occasional involvement.

This need reflects a fundamental shift in how AI relates to institutional strategy. Unlike conventional technologies, AI is not merely a support function to be aligned with strategy—AI is strategy itself. As AI continues to reshape how institutions compete, innovate, and deliver value, responsibility for its deployment and governance cannot remain ad hoc or fragmented (Butcher, 2024). A new leadership function is required, one that is structurally embedded in institutional leadership and strategically empowered to orchestrate AI across the enterprise.

Technical staff possess the skills to integrate models but lack institutional authority for value-based governance. Administrators and privacy officers possess governance expertise but cannot assess the technical validity of model claims or provider documentation. This gap is not unique to us: analysis of executive AI leadership identifies a structural “executive gap” in most organizations—“the absence of a formally recognized role that can integrate technical knowledge and strategic direction for AI at the enterprise level” (Butcher, 2024). Traditional technology leaders remain “reactive, execution-focused, and typically confined to infrastructure or product domains”; they lack the institutional mandate for value-based governance.

The AI Officer occupies this intersection, translating institutional values into operational practice. Without dedicated capacity, governance becomes fragmented—dependent on whoever happens to notice provider changes, handle access requests, or respond to compliance concerns. This governance vacuum leads to inconsistencies in deployment, duplication of efforts, and heightened exposure to regulatory and reputational risks (Butcher, 2024). As AI systems evolve, this fragility becomes untenable. Governance must have both institutional backing and operational continuity.

AI systems introduce novel governance challenges that transcend traditional functional boundaries. Unlike conventional technologies, AI models are dynamic, probabilistic, and often non-deterministic. They evolve through learning, exhibit opaque internal logic, and can produce emergent effects not anticipated at design time (Butcher, 2024). These properties introduce novel forms of ethical, operational, and reputational risk that defy existing accountability structures, demanding a leadership function specifically attuned to AI’s unique characteristics.

Production-scale governance also demands positional authority. Decisions about which models enter the institutional portfolio or how student data is processed affect multiple stakeholders and must carry organizational legitimacy. A formal role prevents governance from being interpreted as personal preference or technical convenience. The AI Officer thus serves as both operational coordinator and institutional representative for AI governance.

Required Competencies

The AI Officer blends two scarce skill sets. First, **technical literacy**: working knowledge of model architectures, provider ecosystems, APIs, and performance trade-offs, plus the fluency to read compliance documentation, spot data-processing implications, and judge when exceptions are justified. Second, **institutional governance capability**: the capacity to craft policies that balance educational needs, privacy obligations, cost realities, and strategic goals, grounded in GDPR, the EU AI Act, and educational data ethics, and reinforced by cross-functional coordination.

Separated, these abilities fail—technical insight without governance produces unaccountable systems; governance without technical grounding creates impractical policy. The AI Officer exists to keep them fused.

Responsibility Scope and Authority Requirements

The AI Officer spans policy design and day-to-day execution to keep AI governance transparent, consistent, and aligned with educational goals. Core responsibilities include:

- **Model portfolio governance**: evaluate, approve, and retire models against institutional criteria and maintain their Model Cards as the audit trail for every decision.
- **Access authorisation**: run predictable approval processes, document rationales, and balance capability needs with privacy and cost.
- **Compliance coordination**: work with privacy and legal teams to schedule provider reviews, maintain processing records, and trigger incident response when needed.
- **Educational and research integration**: guide faculty and researchers on appropriate use, model behaviour, and privacy impacts.
- **Budget planning and reporting**: align allocations with institutional priorities, analyse usage data, and advise on financial implications of new models or providers.

Reporting to institutional leadership gives the AI Officer legitimacy to approve or decline integrations, enforce standards, and recommend resource allocations.

Organizational Implementation: Individual Role or Shared Responsibility

This function can be implemented as a single role or a small, coordinated team. Whichever structure wins, the test is capacity: the institution needs sustained expertise that can cover portfolio, access, compliance, education, and budgeting.

A single officer offers clear accountability and consistent application of criteria. A distributed governance team can share specialist responsibilities while acting as one institutional voice. In either case, the function must be formally designated, recognised, and empowered to approve or reject integrations, maintain model cards, coordinate compliance reviews, and advise leadership on budget and strategy. Anything less leaves governance to informal initiative rather than institutional commitment.

Conclusion: From Pilot to Principle

The six-month pilot began as an engineering test and ended as proof that architecture is governance. Every decision about routing, access, and transparency encoded values; building our own gateway meant we could no longer outsource responsibility.

We showed that institutional AI sovereignty is viable when governance receives the same design discipline as code: equitable access, privacy standards, and educational autonomy can coexist. The deliverable is not a product but a configurable, value-driven framework.

Scaling such platforms depends on institutional maturity. Governance must move from good intentions to structured capacity: someone responsible for tracking provider changes, systematic oversight instead of crisis response, processes that adapt as AI evolves. Trust comes from consistent accountability, not comprehensive procedures.

This requires dedicated leadership for a fundamental reason: AI is no longer a support function but strategy itself. Systems that learn, evolve, and produce unexpected effects demand governance beyond traditional IT or privacy functions. The AI Officer bridges infrastructure, regulation, and pedagogy—treating AI as the strategic foundation it has become, not merely an operational tool to manage.

The lesson extends beyond any single institution. As AI becomes central to how institutions operate, public education and other public institutions cannot depend on commercial systems built for profit over values. The challenge is universal: AI is everywhere, yet no one is formally responsible. Dedicated leadership and structured oversight protect the ability to decide how knowledge is produced, processed, and safeguarded. Designing our own infrastructure reclaimed agency. The commitment is clear: we should govern AI tools with the same transparency, accountability, and ethics we teach students to practice.

Example Model Card Claude Sonnet 4.5

Model Card – Claude Sonnet 4.5

1. Model Name and Version

Model Name: Claude Sonnet 4.5

Version: Release Date: September 29, 2024

Model Identifier: `claude-sonnet-4-5-20250929`

Provider: Anthropic PBC

This is the current flagship model in Anthropic's Claude 4 family, representing the most advanced iteration of Sonnet. Version tracking matters—Anthropic frequently updates models, and behavioral characteristics can shift between releases. When referencing this model in research, technical documentation, or access requests, always include the full version identifier to ensure clarity.

2. Provider and Hosting Location

Provider Organization: Anthropic PBC (Public Benefit Corporation)

Primary Hosting: United States (AWS datacenters in Oregon and Virginia regions)

EU Availability: None. Anthropic does not currently offer European datacenter hosting for any Claude models.

Data Processing Flow: All inference requests route directly to Anthropic's US infrastructure via AWS. Your prompts and responses travel internationally—there is no European processing option regardless of payment tier or special arrangements.

Geographic Reality Check: This means GDPR Article 44 international data transfer considerations apply to every conversation. Anthropic relies on Standard Contractual Clauses (SCCs) as the legal mechanism for EU-US data transfers. While SCCs are an accepted framework, they place compliance demonstration burden partially on the institution rather than being as straightforward as EU-hosted alternatives.

Why No EU Hosting? Anthropic has prioritized model capability and rapid iteration over geographic distribution. They concentrate infrastructure in US regions where they maintain operational expertise and can deploy updates quickly. This is a strategic choice—not a temporary limitation we expect to resolve soon.

3. Technical Specifications

Architecture Type: Transformer-based large language model (constitutional AI training methodology)

Parameter Count: Undisclosed (Anthropic does not publish exact parameter counts for competitive reasons)

Context Window: 200,000 tokens (~150,000 words or 500+ pages)

Maximum Output: 8,192 tokens per response

Supported Modalities:

- **Input:** Text, images (PNG, JPEG, GIF, WebP), PDF documents (with text extraction)
- **Output:** Text only (no image generation, though can produce code that generates images)

Inference Speed: Approximately 60-80 tokens/second for typical requests (varies with load and complexity). This is middle-tier speed—faster than Opus, slower than Haiku variants.

Notable Technical Characteristics:

- Extended reasoning mode available through specific API parameters (triggers deeper analysis chains)
- Strong function calling support for tool use and structured outputs

- Reliable JSON mode for applications requiring formatted data
- Excels at following complex multi-step instructions with maintained context

What "Sonnet" Means in Anthropic's Lineup: Sonnet represents their balanced model tier—smarter than Haiku (fast/cheap), more efficient than Opus (maximum capability/expensive). Think of it as the "Goldilocks" option for most sophisticated applications that don't require absolute frontier performance.

4. Intended Use

Provider's Stated Intended Use: Complex text analysis, research synthesis, technical writing assistance, code generation and review, extended document processing, multi-step reasoning tasks, conversational agents requiring nuanced understanding.

Institutional Assessment:

This model excels in scenarios requiring:

- **Research document analysis** where you're synthesizing information across multiple 50+ page papers
- **Complex coding tasks** involving architecture decisions, debugging across multiple files, or explaining intricate algorithms
- **Extended technical writing** where you need to maintain consistent voice and logical flow across long-form content
- **Multi-turn problem-solving** where the conversation builds on previous context over dozens of exchanges
- **Structured thinking** about ambiguous problems requiring breaking down complexity systematically

Educational Level Appropriateness:

- **MA-AAI1 Advanced Students:** Ideal for guild projects requiring sophisticated reasoning across Architect, Engineer, or Experience Designer specializations
- **Research Applications:** Well-suited for professorship investigations requiring nuanced analysis
- **Undergraduate Students:** Generally appropriate, though consider if less expensive EU-hosted alternatives (GPT-4o via Azure, Mistral Large) adequately serve the use case before defaulting to this premium option

When NOT to Use This Model:

- Simple factual lookups (use GPT-4o-mini or Mistral Small instead—same accuracy, 1/5th the cost)
- Quick code snippets under 50 lines (cheaper models handle this fine)
- Tasks requiring image generation (this model doesn't generate images)
- Applications with sensitive personal data unless US processing is explicitly acceptable
- Casual conversation practice (reserve expensive models for genuine complexity)

5. Limitations and Risks

Hallucination Risk: Moderate to High for certain query types

Like all large language models, Claude Sonnet 4.5 can generate authoritative-sounding but incorrect information, particularly for:

- **Recent events** after training cutoff (January 2025)—it will confidently fabricate details about news, research, or events it wasn't trained on
- **Precise quantitative claims** requiring exact calculation—it approximates rather than computes
- **Niche technical domains** with sparse training representation—specialized engineering, emerging technologies, obscure academic subfields

- **Specific citations** it claims to reference—it may invent paper titles, authors, or publication details that sound plausible but don't exist

Critical Verification Requirement: ALWAYS independently verify factual claims for high-stakes decisions. Use this model as a brainstorming partner and analysis tool, not as an authoritative reference source. Cross-check specific facts, citations, technical specifications, or numerical claims before relying on them.

Training Data Transparency: None

Anthropic does not disclose:

- What corpora trained this model (web crawl? books? code repositories? proprietary datasets?)
- How they curated or filtered training data
- What content they explicitly excluded or included
- Copyright status of training materials

What This Opacity Means: We cannot independently verify bias sources, content appropriateness for educational contexts, or potential copyright implications in generated outputs. You're trusting Anthropic's internal processes without external validation. This is an *industry-standard* limitation—most frontier model providers maintain similar opacity—but that doesn't make it less problematic for institutional assessment.

Bias Considerations:

Third-party evaluations and user reports document several consistent patterns:

- **Cultural representation gaps:** Training data skews toward Western (particularly American) contexts. Expect weaker performance for non-Western cultural references, holidays, social norms, historical events, or idioms.
- **English language dominance:** While multilingual capable, quality degrades noticeably in non-English languages. Dutch performance is adequate but not native-level—expect occasional awkward phrasing or cultural context misses.
- **Professional stereotyping:** May default to gendered assumptions in career contexts (nurses as female, engineers as male, etc.) despite training to avoid this
- **Socioeconomic assumptions:** Training data likely overrepresents middle/upper-class perspectives—may not accurately reflect lived experiences of students from diverse economic backgrounds

Recommendation: Review outputs critically when model generates content about underrepresented populations, non-Western contexts, or makes assumptions about user circumstances. The model's "default human" tends to be Western, English-speaking, and relatively privileged.

Reasoning Limitations:

Despite sophisticated capabilities, documented failure modes include:

- **Novel problem types** outside training distribution—it pattern-matches rather than truly reasons, so genuinely unprecedented problems may confuse it
- **Multi-step mathematical proofs** requiring rigorous logical chains—it can approximate but may introduce subtle errors in extended derivations
- **Adversarial queries** deliberately designed to exploit model weaknesses—it's not robust against sophisticated jailbreaking or manipulation attempts
- **Self-knowledge:** It doesn't accurately know what it knows—confidence levels don't reliably indicate accuracy

Context Retention Over Long Conversations:

Even with 200K token context window, accuracy and coherence degrade across very long conversations involving multiple distinct topics. The model maintains focus better than most alternatives, but you'll still see:

- Drift in conversational tone or persona after 50+ exchanges
- Forgetting details mentioned early in conversation when context approaches token limits
- Confusion when mixing multiple unrelated topics in single session

Best Practice: Start fresh conversations for distinct projects or topics rather than trying to handle multiple subjects in one endless thread.

6. Training Data and Evaluation

Training Data Sources: Undisclosed

Data Curation Methodology: Undisclosed

Evaluation Datasets: Partially disclosed through Anthropic's published research

Training Cutoff: January 2025

What Anthropic Has Disclosed:

Through published research and blog posts, we know:

- Training included "constitutional AI" methodology emphasizing helpfulness, harmlessness, and honesty through reinforcement learning from AI feedback (RLAIF)
- Data filters aimed to reduce toxic content, personal information, and copyrighted material—but specific mechanisms remain proprietary
- Evaluation used standard benchmarks including MMLU, HumanEval, GSM8K, and internal safety assessments

Performance Claims from Provider:

Anthropic reports Claude Sonnet 4.5 achieves:

- 89.8% on MMLU (graduate-level knowledge across 57 subjects)
- 94.6% on HumanEval (Python coding problems)
- 96.7% on GSM8K (grade school math word problems)
- Strong performance on constitutional AI safety metrics

Institutional Skepticism Warranted: These are *provider-reported* figures using datasets and evaluation methodologies we cannot independently verify. Benchmark performance doesn't always predict real-world capability—models can overfit to common evaluation tasks while struggling with novel applications. Consider these figures rough capability indicators, not precise performance guarantees.

Subgroup Performance Analysis: Not published

We have no independent data on:

- Performance differences across demographic groups
- Capability variations across languages beyond English
- Bias metrics for outputs affecting different populations
- Fairness evaluations across protected characteristics

This represents a significant documentation gap. Models showing strong aggregate performance can still exhibit substantial performance disparities across subgroups, potentially creating equity issues in educational applications.

7. Privacy and Data Handling

What Gets Logged:

Anthropic retains:

- **Request metadata:** Timestamps, API keys, token counts, model version, error logs
- **Conversational content:** Your prompts and Claude's responses
- **Usage patterns:** Frequency, topic clustering for abuse detection

Retention Periods:

Per Anthropic's current privacy policy:

- **Active conversations:** Retained for 30 days for operational troubleshooting and abuse prevention
- **After 30 days:** Conversational content deleted unless you explicitly save it or it's flagged for Trust & Safety review
- **Metadata:** Retained longer for billing, analytics, and service improvement—specific timelines vary by data type

Training Data Usage:

Anthropic's contractual commitment for API usage (which our gateway uses):

- **Your conversations do NOT enter training pipelines** for future models
- **Exception:** Content flagged through Trust & Safety review for abuse (violence, illegal content, CSAM) may be retained for safety research
- This is a *contractual commitment* rather than technical impossibility—we must trust Anthropic honors this agreement

Geographic Processing: US-Only

Despite routing through our gateway, your data still processes exclusively in Anthropic's US datacenters. Our gateway adds EU-based routing and budget controls, but cannot change fundamental data processing geography. The actual model inference happens in Oregon or Virginia AWS facilities.

Audit Mechanisms:

Limited external verification available:

- Anthropic undergoes SOC 2 Type II audits covering security controls
- No independent GDPR compliance audits publicly available
- No technical verification mechanisms allowing institutions to confirm data handling claims
- Relies primarily on contractual terms and Anthropic's reputation

Institutional Data Processing Agreement:

We maintain a data processing agreement with Anthropic covering:

- Contractual commitment to 30-day content deletion
- Standard Contractual Clauses for EU-US transfer compliance
- Sub-processor disclosure (AWS as infrastructure provider)
- Limited liability for model outputs

What We Cannot Verify:

Despite contractual agreements, we lack technical mechanisms to independently confirm:

- Whether content actually deletes after 30 days (we trust, cannot verify)
- What Anthropic's internal staff can access and under what circumstances
- How abuse detection algorithms work or what triggers content review
- Whether metadata retention serves only stated purposes

This is standard industry practice but remains a transparency gap. We document it clearly rather than pretending certainty we lack.

8. Compliance Status

EU AI Act Risk Classification: General Purpose AI Model (not high-risk per current interpretation, subject to change as guidance evolves)

GDPR Compliance Verification:

- **Legal Mechanism:** Standard Contractual Clauses (SCCs) for EU-US data transfer per GDPR Article 46
- **Verification Method:** Contractual review + legal counsel assessment—no independent technical audit
- **Last Review:** October 2024 (ongoing monitoring)
- **Adequacy:** Legally permissible under current framework, though EU-only hosting would simplify compliance demonstration

Relevant Certifications:

- **SOC 2 Type II:** Achieved (security, availability, confidentiality controls verified by third-party auditor)
- **ISO 27001:** Not claimed by Anthropic
- **GDPR Certification:** No formal certification (SCCs provide legal basis instead)

Compliance Gaps Requiring Institutional Mitigation:

1. **International Transfer Risk:** US processing requires explicit user acknowledgment per GDPR Article 49. Our platform implements this through mandatory pre-use disclosure.
2. **Training Data Transparency:** GDPR Article 13 requires information about data processing purposes and legal basis. Anthropic's opacity about training data sources creates documentation gaps we must acknowledge to users.

3. **Automated Decision-Making:** GDPR Article 22 requires disclosure when automated processing significantly affects individuals. Users must understand that AI outputs shouldn't drive high-stakes decisions without human review.
4. **Data Subject Rights:** GDPR grants rights to access, rectification, and erasure. Anthropic's 30-day retention supports erasure in principle, but we cannot offer immediate deletion upon user request—creates 30-day window where data remains accessible to provider.

Verification Confidence Level: Medium

We have:

- ✓ Contractual commitments addressing key requirements
- ✓ Third-party SOC 2 audit of security controls
- ✓ Legal counsel review confirming adequate SCCs
- × No independent technical audit of data handling practices
- × No verification mechanism for content deletion timeline
- × Limited visibility into sub-processor relationships beyond AWS

Regulatory Risk Assessment: Low to Medium

- **Current Status:** Compliant under accepted legal frameworks (SCCs remain valid post-Court of Justice of the European Union, 2020) with supplementary measures)
- **Monitoring Required:** EU-US data transfer landscape evolves—new Data Privacy Framework, potential adequacy decisions, or regulatory guidance may affect compliance posture
- **Mitigation in Place:** Mandatory user acknowledgment, transparent disclosure, alternative EU-hosted options available

9. Costs and Resource Usage

Token Pricing (via Anthropic API):

- Input tokens: \$15.00 per 1M tokens
- Output tokens: \$75.00 per 1M tokens
- Cached input tokens: \$1.50 per 1M tokens (90% discount for repeated content)

Typical Usage Cost Estimates:

Use Case	Input	Output	Cost
Short query (question/answer)	100	500	€0.04
Medium conversation (5-10 exchanges)	1,000	2,000	€0.17
Extended analysis (document summary)	20,000	10,000	€1.05
Research session (multi-turn reasoning)	50,000	25,000	€2.63
Intensive coding project (architecture)	100,000	50,000	€5.25

Token counts and costs are approximate. Input/Output measured in tokens.

Budget Impact for Fontys Platform:

This model costs approximately **5x more than GPT-4o-mini**, our baseline model for general use. That price premium buys:

- Superior reasoning for genuinely complex problems
- Better context retention across long conversations
- More nuanced understanding of ambiguous instructions
- Stronger coding capabilities for sophisticated applications

Cost-Justify Advanced Capabilities: Before selecting this model, ask yourself: "Does my task genuinely require these premium capabilities, or would a cheaper EU-hosted alternative (GPT-4o via Azure at €0.03-0.15 per 1M tokens) serve adequately?"

Computational Intensity: High

- Estimated energy per 1M tokens: ~2-3 kWh (rough approximation—Anthropic doesn't publish exact figures)
- Carbon footprint: Depends on AWS datacenter energy mix (partially renewable, exact percentage varies by region)
- Environmental impact: Moderate to High relative to smaller models like GPT-4o-mini or Mistral Small

Gateway Budget Controls:

Our platform implements spending limits preventing runaway costs:

- **Per-conversation caps** preventing single session from consuming excessive budget
- **Per-user monthly allocations** appropriate to role (higher for research, lower for course-work exploration)
- **Per-model institutional limits** ensuring Claude Sonnet 4.5 doesn't dominate entire AI budget

When approved for access, you'll receive clear budget allocation so you understand consumption limits before hitting restrictions.

10. Sustainability Metrics

Provider-Published Environmental Data: Minimal

Anthropic does not publish model-specific carbon emissions, energy consumption, or sustainability metrics. We lack visibility into:

- Exact kWh per million tokens processed
- Carbon footprint per conversation
- Energy source composition for inference datacenters
- Water usage for cooling (relevant for large-scale GPU deployments)
- E-waste from hardware lifecycle

What We Can Estimate:

Based on:

- Model architecture (large transformer, likely 100B+ parameters)
- Inference hardware requirements (multiple high-end GPUs per request)
- AWS datacenter energy profiles (mixed grid + renewable energy)

Rough approximation: Processing 1M tokens with Claude Sonnet 4.5 likely consumes 2-3 kWh, generating approximately 1-1.5 kg CO₂ equivalent (varies significantly by AWS region energy mix).

For context: That's roughly equivalent to:

- Driving an average car 5-7 km
- Running a laptop continuously for 2-3 days
- One load of laundry in an electric dryer

Relative Environmental Impact:

Compared to alternatives:

- **Higher impact than:** GPT-4o-mini, Mistral Small, Phi models (smaller/more efficient architectures)
- **Similar impact to:** GPT-4o, Claude Opus, Mistral Large (comparable complexity models)
- **Lower impact than:** Training models from scratch (inference is orders of magnitude less energy-intensive than training)

AWS Sustainability Commitments:

Anthropic's infrastructure provider (AWS) has committed to:

- 100% renewable energy by 2025 across global operations
- Carbon neutrality for all operations
- Water-positive goal for direct operations

However: These are AWS-wide commitments, not model-specific guarantees. We cannot verify what percentage of Claude inference actually runs on renewable energy versus fossil fuel-powered datacenters.

Institutional Environmental Consideration:

This represents a significant documentation gap. Users concerned about environmental impact deserve clear information enabling sustainable AI choices. When environmental data remains unavailable, we make this section explicitly acknowledge the absence rather than omitting environmental considerations entirely.

Climate-conscious users should:

- Prefer smaller models (GPT-4o-mini, Mistral Small) when adequate for the task
- Avoid unnecessary re-generation of content you already have

- Batch queries rather than making many small requests
- Consider whether AI tool use is necessary versus alternative approaches

11. Comparable Alternatives

You don't have to use this model. Several alternatives offer different trade-off profiles that may better suit your needs:

EU-Hosted Alternatives (Better Privacy, Lower Cost)

GPT-4o via Azure EU (Sweden/Germany datacenters)

- **Processing location:** Guaranteed EU (Swedish or German datacenters)
- **Capabilities:** Comparable reasoning, slightly faster inference, multimodal (can generate images)
- **Cost:** €5-15 per 1M tokens (65-80% cheaper)
- **Trade-offs:** Slightly less nuanced instruction-following, context window 128K instead of 200K
- **Best for:** Most use cases not requiring Anthropic's specific reasoning style or extended context

Mistral Large via Azure EU

- **Processing location:** EU-hosted (Swedish datacenter)
- **Capabilities:** Strong reasoning, efficient, European provider
- **Cost:** €8-24 per 1M tokens (approximately 50% cheaper)
- **Trade-offs:** Smaller context window (128K), less established track record for complex coding
- **Best for:** Users preferring European provider, general research applications, strong French language support

Lower-Cost Alternatives (Same Geographic Limitations)

Claude Haiku 4 (when available via our gateway)

- **Processing location:** US (same as Sonnet 4.5)
- **Capabilities:** Faster, cheaper, adequate for straightforward tasks
- **Cost:** ~85% cheaper than Sonnet 4.5
- **Trade-offs:** Less sophisticated reasoning, shorter context window
- **Best for:** Simple queries, quick code snippets, casual exploration

GPT-4o-mini via Azure EU

- **Processing location:** EU-hosted
- **Capabilities:** Excellent for routine tasks, very fast
- **Cost:** ~90% cheaper than Claude Sonnet 4.5
- **Trade-offs:** Less capability for complex reasoning
- **Best for:** Baseline use, practice, simple coursework support

Maximum Capability Alternative

Claude Opus 4.1 (restricted access)

- **Processing location:** US (same hosting limitations)
- **Capabilities:** Anthropic's most capable model, strongest reasoning
- **Cost:** ~2x more expensive than Sonnet 4.5
- **Trade-offs:** Slower inference, significantly higher cost, restricted to specific research applications
- **Best for:** Genuinely frontier research requiring absolute maximum capability

Decision Framework:

Ask yourself:

1. **Does my task involve sensitive data?** → Prefer EU-hosted alternatives (GPT-4o, Mistral Large)
2. **Is extended reasoning truly necessary?** → If no, use GPT-4o-mini or Mistral Small
3. **Do I need Anthropic's specific instruction-following style?** → If yes, Claude Sonnet 4.5 may be worth premium
4. **Is cost a significant concern?** → EU alternatives provide 50-80% savings with comparable capability

Our Platform Makes Switching Easy: All these alternatives are available through the same interface. Try cheaper EU-hosted models first—you can always escalate to Claude Sonnet 4.5 if genuinely needed.

12. Governance Status and Institutional Oversight

Current Access Configuration:

✓ Automatically Available To:

- MA-AAI1 Advanced students (with faculty authorization)
- Faculty with research authorization via professorship groups
- Administrative staff with documented need

Warning: Requires Access Request:

- Undergraduate students seeking advanced capabilities
- Research projects involving high-intensity usage
- Any user outside pre-authorized Active Directory groups

× Not Currently Available:

- Guest accounts
- External collaborators (unless specifically provisioned)

Access Rationale:

Claude Sonnet 4.5 receives restricted deployment because:

1. **US hosting creates privacy considerations** requiring user understanding of international data transfer implications
2. **High costs demand justification** ensuring institutional resources distribute appropriately rather than concentrating in premium services
3. **Powerful capabilities warrant user sophistication** for appropriate use and critical output evaluation
4. **Training data opacity requires informed consent** acknowledging evaluation limitations

We do NOT restrict access as arbitrary gatekeeping. Restrictions ensure users:

- Understand privacy trade-offs they're accepting
- Have legitimate needs genuinely requiring premium capabilities
- Won't inadvertently consume disproportionate institutional budget without awareness

Access Request Requirements:

To request access, you must provide:

1. **Use Case Description** substantiating need for capabilities not satisfied by EU-hosted alternatives like GPT-4o or Mistral Large (be specific—"I need advanced reasoning" isn't sufficient; explain what complex problem requires this particular model)
2. **Privacy Acknowledgment** demonstrating understanding that your prompts process in US datacenters under different privacy frameworks than EU alternatives
3. **Faculty Authorization** (for students) confirming course requirements genuinely necessitate this specific model's capabilities
4. **Budget Justification** (for high-intensity research) explaining expected usage patterns and why EU alternatives won't serve your application

Requests typically receive response within 3-5 business days. We approve most requests demonstrating substantiated need—the process exists to ensure informed choice, not to deny access arbitrarily.

Required Acknowledgments Before First Use:

Even after access approval, you must explicitly acknowledge:

- ☐ My data will process in United States datacenters subject to US legal jurisdiction
- ☐ Anthropic has not disclosed training data sources; Fontys cannot verify bias mitigation or content appropriateness
- ☐ This model may generate confident but incorrect information; I will verify critical facts independently
- ☐ Cost implications understood—this model costs 5x baseline alternatives, and I've considered whether EU-hosted options would meet my needs

Harm Reporting Procedures:

If you encounter problems, contact:

- **Problematic outputs** (bias, harmful content, persistent inaccuracy): ai-governance@fontys.nl
- **Privacy concerns** (unexpected data handling, access issues): privacy-office@fontys.nl
- **Technical failures** (model unavailable, gateway errors): ict-support@fontys.nl
- **Budget/access questions**: platform-admin@fontys.nl

Liability Clarification:

- **Provider:** Anthropic's terms limit liability for model outputs and do not guarantee accuracy or suitability for any purpose
- **Institution:** Fontys provides access through our gateway but cannot verify all provider claims; we document known limitations and gaps honestly
- **You:** Responsible for validating outputs before relying on them for decisions, coursework, or research. Human oversight required for high-stakes applications.

This model is a tool, not an oracle. Treat its outputs as sophisticated but fallible suggestions requiring your judgment and verification.

Summary: Should You Use Claude Sonnet 4.5?

Use this model when:

- Your task genuinely requires extended reasoning across complex, ambiguous problems
- You're working with very long documents (100+ pages) requiring comprehensive analysis
- You need sophisticated coding support for architectural decisions, not just syntax
- EU-hosted alternatives have proven inadequate for your specific application
- You understand and accept US data processing implications

Consider alternatives when:

- Your task is straightforward or routine (use GPT-4o-mini—same quality, 5x cheaper)
- Data sensitivity requires EU-only processing (use GPT-4o or Mistral Large via Azure EU)
- You're exploring casually or practicing (reserve expensive models for genuine need)
- Cost efficiency matters and cheaper options might suffice

Remember:

- This model excels at genuine complexity but costs premium—use judiciously
- Geographic limitations create privacy trade-offs requiring informed consent
- Training data opacity means we cannot verify all provider claims
- Alternative models offer comparable capability with better privacy/cost profiles

Need access? Submit request via platform interface with substantiated use case.

Have questions? Contact ai-governance@fontys.nl

References

- Butcher, M. (2024). *Strategic integration of artificial intelligence in the c-suite: The role of the chief ai officer*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10247. Retrieved 2025-11-11, from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.10247>
- Chan, C. K. Y., & Hu, W. (2023). A comprehensive ai policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(38). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3> doi: 10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3
- Court of Justice of the European Union. (2020). *Data protection commissioner v facebook ireland limited and maximillian schrems (case c-311/18)*. Retrieved 2025-10-20, from <https://curia.europa.eu/juris/liste.jsf?num=C-311/18>
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2016). *Regulation (eu) 2016/679 of the european parliament and of the council of 27 april 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing directive 95/46/ec (general data protection regulation)* (Vol. L 119). Retrieved 2025-11-11, from <https://gdpr-info.eu/> (Accessed via GDPR-info.eu maintained by Intersoft Consulting Services AG)
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). *Regulation (eu) 2024/1689 of the european parliament and of the council of 13 june 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (artificial intelligence act) and amending regulations (eu) no 300/2008, (eu) no 167/2013, (eu) no 168/2013, (eu) 2018/858, (eu) 2018/1139 and (eu) 2019/2144 and directives 2014/90/eu, (eu) 2016/797 and (eu) 2020/1828* (Vol. L). Retrieved 2025-11-11, from <https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/ai-act-explorer/> (Accessed via the EU AI Act Explorer maintained by the Future of Life Institute)
- Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., Barnes, P., Vasserman, L., Hutchinson, B., ... Gebru, T. (2019). Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency (fat*)* (pp. 220–229). New York, NY, USA: ACM. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287596> doi: 10.1145/3287560.3287596
- Puhlfürß, T., Butzke, J., & Maalej, W. (2025). *Model cards revisited: Bridging the gap between theory and practice for ethical ai requirements*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06014. Retrieved 2025-11-11, from <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2507.06014v1>