

CASE STUDY · MILITARY & DEFENSE · DATA CONTROL & ENTERPRISE DATA BOUNDARY

# A defence integrator ran AI against controlled data with the boundary enforced, not promised

Clearance-scoped roles and a fail-closed boundary let controlled programme data reach a model at all — under conditions the programme office could verify.

|                                                                                 |                                |                                                                                                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Partner</b><br>Defence systems integrator · controlled programme environment | <b>Published</b><br>2026-09-30 | <b>Orcher components</b><br>Data Control Gateway, Role Identity Fabric, Immutable Audit Ledger |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

## Summary

A defence systems integrator needed AI assistance on documentation inside a controlled programme environment. Orcher enforced clearance-scoped access and a fail-closed data boundary per directive, with evidence for the programme office produced by execution itself.

|                                                            |                                                        |                                                                                                      |                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>0</b><br>controlled-data routes to unapproved endpoints | <b>100%</b><br>of directives classified before routing | <b>Approved</b><br>programme office sign-off for AI assistance<br><br>previously prohibited outright | <b>48%</b><br>reduction in documentation drafting hours |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|

## The situation

- Programme rules prohibited controlled data reaching any endpoint without a verified handling posture.
- A blanket prohibition had been the default, which meant no AI assistance at all on the programme.
- Any approved approach had to produce evidence the programme office could review without a special project.

## What Orcher enforced

- Directives are classified before routing, and the gateway fails closed when classification, clearance and endpoint posture do not agree.
- Role bindings are clearance-scoped: an agent can never see data the directing engineer could not see.
- Model selection is constrained to endpoints approved for the specific classification, with the decision recorded.
- The ledger produces per-directive evidence that the programme office reads as its standing control report.

The data

| Classification         | Approved endpoints | Directives | Refused pre-route    | Evidence produced |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Unclassified           | All approved       | 14,200     | 0                    | Per directive     |
| Controlled — general   | 2 endpoints        | 6,850      | 31                   | Per directive     |
| Controlled — programme | 1 endpoint         | 2,140      | 88                   | Per directive     |
| Restricted             | None               | 0          | 412 attempts blocked | Per attempt       |

Routing outcomes by classification over the engagement period.

Outcomes

- AI assistance exists on the programme at all, which was the binary outcome that mattered.
- The programme office reviews a standing report rather than commissioning audits.
- Blocked attempts became a training signal for engineers about what the classification rules actually mean.
- The pattern is being reviewed for a second programme with tighter constraints.

“The question was never whether the model was useful. It was whether we could prove, afterwards, exactly where the data went.”

— Programme Security Officer, defence systems integrator (partner declined attribution by name)

Read further

- Trust and standards — [dippai.com/trust](https://dippai.com/trust)
- The Data Control Gateway — [dippai.com/orcher/data-control-gateway](https://dippai.com/orcher/data-control-gateway)
- Full case study — [dippai.com/case-studies/defense-integrator-boundary-and-identity](https://dippai.com/case-studies/defense-integrator-boundary-and-identity)

**Disclosure.** Design-partner engagement, anonymised at the partner's request. Figures are measured by Orcher's own observability and ledger instrumentation over the stated period and have not been independently audited. Market figures carry their own source line.