BRIEFING · ALEETH · 2026

The Control Gap

KPMG's 2026 Global Tech Report says the enterprise is racing into scaled AI. Its own numbers say almost no one can prove they control it. That gap is the opportunity, and the risk.

SHANE SCHRECK FOUNDER, ALEETH JUNE 2026

ALEETH.COM/PUBLICATIONS/THE-CONTROL-GAP

The headline writes itself. Enterprise AI is moving from pilots to production, and the executives running it expect that move to happen fast. That is not the part of KPMG's 2026 report worth your attention. The part worth your attention is the gap hiding inside the same numbers.

KPMG surveyed 2,500 technology executives across 27 countries and eight industries for its 2026 Global Tech Report. On the surface, the story is ambition. Half of these organizations expect to reach the top stage of AI maturity by the end of this year. Underneath, the story is exposure. Almost none of them can prove they are in control of what they are deploying.

WHAT THE NUMBERS ACTUALLY SAY

Start with the distance between where companies are and where they expect to be. Eleven percent are fully scaled today. Fifty percent expect to reach the top maturity stage within the year. That is not a forecast. That is a sprint into territory most of these organizations have never operated in.

The value is real and the proof is not. Seventy-four percent say AI is already producing business value. Only twenty-four percent can show a return across more than a handful of use cases. Fifty-five percent admit they cannot demonstrate that value to the people who fund it: stakeholders, boards, shareholders.

Eighty-eight percent are already investing in agentic AI. Ninety-two percent expect managing AI agents to become a core enterprise skill within five years. And the projects are multiplying faster than anyone can coordinate them. Thirty-two percent report too many disconnected AI efforts with no shared governance.

Read those numbers together and the picture is plain. Ambition is running years ahead of control.

THE MARKET IS SOLVING THE WRONG PROBLEM

For three years the contest has been about access. Bigger models, faster inference, cheaper tokens, more capable agents. That contest is effectively over. Access is a commodity now, and it gets cheaper every quarter.

The problem that remains is the one the KPMG numbers describe. It is not whether the enterprise can use AI. It already is. It is whether the enterprise can deploy AI at scale without losing control, fragmenting its operations, failing to prove a return, or walking into a risk it cannot see coming.

That is not a model problem. No frontier release solves it. It is a control problem, and control has to be built.

POLICY IS NOT CONTROL

Most organizations answer the control question with a document. An AI policy. A set of responsible-use principles. A committee that meets on Thursdays.

A policy is a statement of intent. It tells you what the organization meant to do. It does not tell you what the system actually did at two in the morning when no one was watching: which agent made the call, on whose authority, against which rule, and whether anyone could have stopped it.

> When the regulator calls, when the board asks, when the counterparty checks, intent is worthless. The only thing that holds is evidence.

A guardrail is a hope. A principle is an intention. Neither one produces proof. And proof is the entire job.

WHAT SCALE ACTUALLY REQUIRES

An organization that intends to run AI across the enterprise needs governance that is continuous, operational, and evidence-based. Not a one-time policy. A live system that holds while models, agents, workflows, and regulations keep moving underneath it.

In practice that means every agent is tied to an owner, an approved use case, a measurable target, a permission set, a monitoring protocol, and a rollback path. Every consequential action leaves a trail a reviewer can follow. Every claim of value is backed by a record a third party can check. Leadership receives proof in a form a board can read, not a dashboard it has to take on faith.

This is the work that lives in the gap between ambition and control. It does not happen by accident, and it does not happen with policy language. It happens with architecture.

A CATEGORY, NOT A FEATURE

The reflex is to call this AI governance and file it under compliance. That misframes it and undersells it. Compliance is a cost you pay once. What the Intelligence Age requires is infrastructure built into the way AI operates, before deployment, during operation, and after the fact.

We named the category Institutional Control Infrastructure, and we built the architecture that operationalizes it. Institutional Control Architecture is a governance standard for autonomous systems. Seven control layers any system must establish to be governed under ICA. Seven failure modes that map how agents actually break. Cryptographically signed records any third party can verify without trusting the issuer. A live governance platform, an in-environment sensor, a browser sentry, and a public registry.

It turns the questions KPMG's respondents cannot answer into artifacts they can hand to a board, a regulator, a customer, or a partner. Not a promise. A signed record.

The KPMG data points at a market that is about to learn the hard way that capability and control are different things. The companies that win the next phase will not be the ones with the best models. Everyone will have those. They will be the ones that can deploy AI at scale and prove, at any moment, that it is governed.

> In the Intelligence Age, trust will not be claimed. It will have to be proven.

That is the line ALEETH was built to hold.

ALEETH>

The Institutional Control Architecture. Court-grade attestation for autonomous systems. Mathematically signed. Independently verifiable. Forever.

Source: KPMG Global Tech Report 2026, "Leading in the Intelligence Age: Excelling today, shaping tomorrow." Publication number 140343-G, January 2026. Findings drawn from a survey of 2,500 technology leaders across 27 countries and eight industries. All statistics cited above are reported by KPMG; the interpretation is ALEETH's.

SHANE SCHRECK · FOUNDER · ALEETH

AI HAS MET ITS MATCH. TRUTH.™