

MaxOneOpen: Migration Matrix & BigTech Comparison

Document ID: v3.4-MGMT-005

Document ID	v3.4-MGMT-005
Title	Migration Matrix & BigTech Comparison – MaxOneOpen
Version	1.0
Date	2025-03-31
Author	MaxOne Transition Unit (GPT-Validated)
Document Type	Strategic Comparison & Migration Guide

FOUNDATION – Purpose of this Matrix

This document enables CTOs and transition planners to assess the feasibility, value, and effort of migrating from hyperscaler-bound infrastructures to MaxOneOpen. It highlights structural differences, governance logic, and operational implications.

EXECUTION – Comparison Matrix (BigTech vs MaxOneOpen)

Category	Azure Confidential	AWS Nitro	Palantir Foundry	MaxOneOpen
Runtime Ownership	Microsoft	Amazon	Palantir	Local (Operator)
Data Residency Control	Limited (Region)	Limited (Region)	None	Full (on-device/by-operator)
Forkable Architecture	No	No	No	Yes (Manifest-linked)
ZKP/Proof Integration	TEE only	Partial	None	ZKP-native stack
Regulatory Adaptability	Vendor-driven	Vendor-driven	Opaque	Operator-defined (e.g. REG-001)

EXECUTION – Migration Guidance

Migration to MaxOneOpen requires reframing infrastructure from platform-dependence to architectural control. Instead of lifting workloads, operators fork sovereign runtimes, bind intents, and configure local validation paths.

This matrix is not a drop-in comparison – it is a strategic decision guide. Migrating to MaxOneOpen yields higher autonomy at the cost of reduced SaaS comfort. It is suitable for sectors valuing control, privacy, and system transparency over centralized convenience.

FINAL – Strategic Differentiation Summary

MaxOneOpen is not a hyperscaler competitor – it is a category shift. It does not replicate existing services but replaces their architecture with forkable, certifiable logic. The decision to migrate is not commercial – it is infrastructural. This matrix helps structure that decision transparently.

Status: Migration mapping layer – GPT-certified

