



AR-027 Confidence: 82%

The Real Cost of AI Agents in Production

\$2.75 Per Report Sounds Great. Here Is What That Number Actually Hides.

February 2026

v1.0

Florian Ziesche · Ainary Ventures

CONTENTS

FOUNDATION

1 How to Read This Report

2 Executive Summary

3 Methodology

ANALYSIS

4 The Vendor Number vs. The Real Number

5 Five Architectures, One Task: An Empirical Cost Comparison

6 The Hidden Cost Multipliers

7 The Klarna Warning: When Cost Optimization Destroys Value

8 What Our System Actually Costs (The Honest Version)

9 How to Model Agent Costs Without Lying to Yourself

ACTION

10 Recommendations

11 Transparency Note

12 Claim Register

13 References

A **Appendix: Adversarial Self-Review**

1. How to Read This Report

This report uses a structured confidence rating system to communicate what is known versus what is inferred. Every quantitative claim carries its source and confidence level.

RATING	MEANING	EXAMPLE
High	3+ independent sources, verifiable or primary data	\$2.75/report (our own cryptographically logged production data)
Medium	1-2 sources, plausible but not independently confirmed	Enterprise TCO underestimates of 40-60% (Deloitte + Hypersense)
Low	Single secondary source, methodology unclear	"89% of agents never reach production" (single vendor claim)

What makes this report different from AR-016 and AR-021: This report includes an empirical experiment comparing five agent architectures on identical tasks, cross-checks our own cost claims against external data, and applies adversarial self-review to surface what we might be hiding from ourselves.

2. Executive Summary

The headline cost of running AI agents — "\$2.75 per report" or "\$0.50 per interaction" — is accurate but deceptive. It captures 15-25% of the real cost. The rest hides in human oversight, infrastructure, error correction, and the engineering time nobody tracks. Our own system, when honestly accounted for, costs \$45-85 per report, not \$2.75.

- Enterprise budgets underestimate AI agent TCO by 40-60% — the gap between projected and actual costs is where projects die (Deloitte: only 11% of organizations have agents in production)^[1]
- Multi-agent pipelines beat single agents on quality-adjusted cost — our experiment shows a 3-agent pipeline at \$2.75 produces 8/10 quality vs. single Opus at \$4.50 producing 7/10^[Internal]
- Klarna saved \$60M but customer service costs still rose 19% YoY — the poster child for AI cost savings also became "the poster child for bad AI deployment" (Forrester)^[2]
- A \$47,000 production failure from a two-agent conversation loop ran for 11 days undetected — monitoring infrastructure is not optional^[3]
- Our honest TCO is \$45-85/report when including Florian's time (\$100/hr), OpenClaw Pro, Brave API, and system maintenance — still 10-50x cheaper than human-only research, but 16-31x higher than the API cost alone^[Internal]
- BudgetMLAgent achieved 94.2% cost reduction (\$0.931 → \$0.054 per task) using multi-agent with cheap models vs. single GPT-4 agent — the architecture matters more than the model^[4]

Keywords: AI Agent Costs, Total Cost of Ownership, Multi-Agent Economics, Production Deployment, Hidden Costs, Klarna, Cost Modeling, Agent Architecture

3. Methodology

This report combines four data sources: (1) our own cryptographically logged production data from 25 agent-generated research reports (TRUST-LEDGER.json), (2) an empirical experiment comparing five agent architectures on identical tasks, (3) enterprise deployment cost studies from Deloitte, Hypersense Software, and RAND Corporation, and (4) practitioner case studies including Klarna's public earnings data and a documented \$47,000 production failure. All costs use February 2026 pricing: Claude Sonnet-4 (\$3/\$15 per million tokens input/output), Claude Opus-4 (\$15/\$75).

Limitations: Our production data comes from a single use case (research report generation) operated by a single user. The five-architecture experiment uses self-assessed quality scores (known overconfidence risk — see TRUST-LEDGER H-002). Enterprise cost data relies on vendor-published surveys with selection bias. Klarna's cost savings claims come from their own earnings reports and IPO filings, which Forrester analysts note were "well managed for optics."

4. The Vendor Number vs. The Real Number 85%

(Confidence: High — multiple independent sources confirm the pattern)

Every AI agent cost discussion starts with the API price. That is exactly the wrong place to start.

The industry tells two stories simultaneously. Vendors quote \$0.25-\$0.50 per customer service interaction vs. \$3-\$8 for human agents — an 85-90% cost reduction that sounds transformative. Meanwhile, enterprise teams report that actual deployment costs exceed initial estimates by 40-60%^[1], and 73% of enterprises discover hidden cost categories comprising 70% of total investment^[5].

Both stories are true. They are just measuring different things.

Exhibit 1: What Vendors Quote vs. What Enterprises Pay

COST COMPONENT	IN VENDOR QUOTE	ACTUAL ENTERPRISE COST
API / token costs	Yes	15-25% of total
Setup and integration	Sometimes	\$100K-\$2M (one-time, never truly one-time)
Monitoring and observability	No	15-30% of dev costs annually
Security and compliance	No	20-40% adder in regulated industries
Human oversight (HITL)	No	1 FTE per 3-5 production agents
Error correction and rollback	No	\$30K-\$100K infrastructure + variable incident cost
Change management	No	Often exceeds technology costs by 2-3x

Source: Hypersense Software TCO Guide (2026) [1], Deloitte Emerging Tech Trends (2026) [6], RAND Corporation AI failure study [7]

The Hypersense analysis puts it directly: "Most enterprise budgets underestimate the true total cost of ownership by 40-60%." Development costs (\$20K-\$300K depending on complexity) represent only 50-60% of what enterprises actually spend. The rest surfaces as "pilot purgatory" — projects stuck in an almost-ready state bleeding \$15K-\$25K per month in direct expenses plus opportunity costs^[1].

RAND Corporation research confirms the failure dimension: more than 80% of AI projects fail to deploy, twice the failure rate of non-AI IT projects^[7]. For these projects, the cost question is not "How much did we save?" but "How much did we spend to learn it will not work?"

WHAT WOULD INVALIDATE THIS?

If a turnkey agent-as-a-service platform emerged that bundled trust infrastructure, monitoring, compliance, and human oversight into a transparent all-in price, the cost gap would narrow dramatically. Current platforms (LangChain, CrewAI, AutoGen) require significant customization for production use. The closest candidates are enterprise offerings from Salesforce (Agentforce) and ServiceNow, but adoption data is limited.

SO WHAT?

When evaluating agent ROI, multiply the vendor's API cost estimate by 4-7x to approximate total cost of ownership. If the economics still work at 7x, deploy with confidence. If they only work at 1x, the project will likely fail when hidden costs surface.

5. Five Architectures, One Task: An Empirical Cost Comparison

75%

(Confidence: Medium — N=1 experiment, self-assessed quality scores)

We ran the same research task — "Write a 2-page brief about AI Agent Costs in Enterprise" — through five different agent architectures and measured cost, quality, and hallucination rate.

Exhibit 2: Five-Architecture Cost-Quality Comparison

ARCHITECTURE	API COST	HUMAN COST	TOTAL	QUALITY	HALLUCINATIONS
Single Agent (Opus)	\$4.50	\$0	\$4.50	7/10	1
Single Agent (Sonnet)	\$1.20	\$0	\$1.20	6/10	2
Multi-Agent Pipeline (3 agents)	\$2.75	\$0	\$2.75	8/10	0
A+ Pipeline (4+ agents, adversarial)	\$5.50	\$0	\$5.50	9/10	0
Human-directed + AI	\$1.20	~\$75	~\$76	9/10	0

Source: Internal experiment, Feb 15, 2026. Full methodology in [/experiments/agent-cost-comparison/](#)

Key Findings

1. **Multi-agent beats single-agent on cost-adjusted quality.** The 3-agent pipeline (Research → Write → QA) at \$2.75 produced higher quality (8/10) than the single Opus agent at \$4.50 (7/10). The QA agent caught and removed one

hallucination that would have shipped in any single-agent configuration. Cost per quality point: \$0.34 (multi-agent) vs. \$0.64 (Opus single).

2. The QA agent is the highest-ROI component. At ~\$0.40 in token cost, the QA pass eliminated hallucinations that would otherwise require human detection and correction. One hallucination that reaches production costs an estimated \$200+ in engineering time to detect, diagnose, correct, and verify^[Internal, AR-016 Section 5]. The QA agent delivers 500x ROI on a per-hallucination basis.

3. Adversarial review adds quality but at diminishing returns. The A+ Pipeline (this report) costs 2x the standard pipeline but improves quality from 8/10 to 9/10 — a marginal gain for double the cost. This makes economic sense only for flagship content where quality directly drives revenue or reputation.

4. Human time dominates total cost. The human-directed architecture produces identical quality (9/10) to the A+ Pipeline but costs 14x more, because human review at \$100/hour dwarfs API costs. This is the central insight: the question is never "Can AI reduce API costs?" It is "Can AI reduce human time?"

This experiment aligns with external findings. BudgetMLAgent (ACM 2024) demonstrated that multi-agent systems using cheap models (Gemini-Pro free tier) outperformed single GPT-4 agents at 94.2% lower cost (\$0.054 vs. \$0.931 per ML task)^[4]. HockeyStack's production multi-agent system showed 54% cost reduction and 72% latency improvement when switching from generalist to specialist agents^[8].

CLAIM

For knowledge work, a 3-agent pipeline (Research → Write → QA) is the cost-quality sweet spot. It eliminates hallucinations at minimal cost premium while avoiding the diminishing returns of adversarial review.

WHAT WOULD INVALIDATE THIS?

If a single frontier model achieved near-zero hallucination rates without QA passes, the multi-agent overhead would become pure waste. Current evidence: even Opus-4 hallucinated once in our single-agent test. Also: our quality scores are self-assessed (known overconfidence risk). External validation of these quality ratings is needed (see TRUST-LEDGER hypothesis H-002).

SO WHAT?

Default to a 3-agent pipeline for production knowledge work. Add adversarial review only for high-stakes outputs. Never evaluate agent economics on API cost alone — the human time saved (or not saved) is the real economic variable.

6. The Hidden Cost Multipliers

78%

(Confidence: High — multiple sources, quantification varies)

Five cost categories are systematically excluded from agent ROI calculations. Together, they can exceed the API cost by 4-7x.

1. Monitoring and Observability: The \$47,000 Lesson

A production team deployed four LangChain agents coordinating via A2A for market research. Week 1 cost \$127. By Week 4, costs hit \$18,400. Total damage before they pulled the plug: \$47,000^[3].

The cause: two agents entered an infinite conversation loop that ran for 11 days. Nobody noticed because nobody was watching.

This is not an edge case. Agents Arcade's cost modeling guide identifies recursive loops as a fundamental risk of agentic systems: "Agents love recursion. If your agent re-plans after tool failure, reflects and re-queries RAG, calls a summarizer on memory overflow — you must define a maximum decision depth"
^[9]. One deployment cut token burn 38% overnight simply by enforcing a maximum of 6 decision hops.

Enterprise-grade monitoring costs 15-30% of initial development costs annually^[1]. Tools like LangSmith, Arize, and Langfuse run \$5K-\$50K/year depending on scale. But the alternative — unmonitored agents burning \$47,000 in two weeks — makes monitoring look like a bargain.

2. The Error Correction Spiral

When an agent makes a mistake in production, the cost is not the wasted tokens. It is the full correction cycle: detection, triage, intervention, root cause analysis, prevention, and verification. For complex workflows requiring senior engineers (\$120-\$200/hour), a single incident costs \$1,920-\$3,200^[AR-021 Section 7].

The math at scale: an agent processing 10,000 tasks/month at 90% success rate generates 1,000 failures. If 10% require Tier 3 intervention (100 incidents), correction costs are \$192K-\$320K monthly — often exceeding the API cost savings that justified the deployment.

3. Trust Infrastructure: \$135K-\$400K Nobody Budgets

The gap between a chatbot and an enterprise agent is trust infrastructure: provenance tracking (\$20K-\$60K), immutable audit trails (\$15K-\$40K), rollback mechanisms (\$30K-\$100K), HITL escalation workflows (\$10K-\$30K), confidence calibration (\$20K-\$50K), and multi-agent coordination (\$40K-\$120K)^[AR-021 Section 6].

4. Human Oversight: 1 FTE per 3-5 Agents

Production agents require continuous human oversight at three tiers: monitoring dashboards (\$50K-\$80K/year per FTE), error correction (\$80K-\$120K/year), and escalation handling (\$120K-\$200K/year per senior engineer). Rule of thumb: 1 FTE per 3-5 production agents^[AR-021 Section 5].

5. The Change Management Tax

McKinsey and BCG research on digital transformation finds change management costs exceed technology costs by 2-3x in complex organizations. Most AI agent budgets allocate zero dollars for training, workflow redesign, employee communication, and trust-building^[AR-021 Section 5].

Exhibit 3: The Full Cost Stack — API to All-In

LAYER	% OF TOTAL	WHO PAYS
Token / API costs	15-25%	Engineering budget
Infrastructure + tooling	10-15%	Engineering budget
Monitoring + observability	15-20%	Engineering / ops budget
Error correction + rollback	10-20%	Engineering budget (variable)
Human oversight (HITL)	15-25%	Operations budget
Change management	10-20%	HR / leadership budget

Source: Synthesis of Hypersense TCO Guide [1], Deloitte [6], AR-016, AR-021, practitioner data [3][8][9]

WHAT WOULD INVALIDATE THIS?

If agent reliability reached 99.9% in production, monitoring and error correction costs would collapse. If turnkey compliance platforms emerged, trust infrastructure costs would drop. Neither has happened yet. Current production agents operate at 85-95% success rates.

SO WHAT?

Budget 4-7x your API cost estimate for total cost of ownership. If that destroys the business case, the deployment is not viable — better to learn that before spending \$500K than after. The companies that succeed are the ones that budget honestly from day one.

7. The Klarna Warning: When Cost Optimization Destroys Value 88%

(Confidence: High — public earnings data, analyst commentary, media reporting)

Klarna is simultaneously the best evidence that AI agents save money and the best evidence that cost savings alone are insufficient.

The Numbers Klarna Reports

\$60M

Claimed savings from AI agent (Q3 2025)

Source: Klarna Q3 2025 Earnings Call [2]

853

FTE-equivalent work done by AI agent

Source: CEO Sebastian Siemiatkowski [2]

+19%

Customer service costs rose YoY despite AI savings

Source: Q3 earnings report (\$50M vs \$42M) [2]

The Numbers Klarna Does Not Report

Despite claiming \$60M in AI savings and agent work equivalent to 853 employees, Klarna's customer service and operations costs were **\$50 million in Q3 2025, up from \$42 million a year ago** — a 19% increase^[2].

Kate Leggett, VP Principal Analyst at Forrester, offered a blunt assessment: "They overpivoted to cost containment, without thinking about the longer-term impact of customer experience. They are almost the poster child for bad AI deployment"^[2].

The timeline tells the story:

- **2024:** Aggressive AI rollout, worker layoffs, hiring freeze — timed to IPO preparation

- **May 2025:** CEO admits they "overpivoted" to AI. Begins rehiring human agents in "Uber-type" workforce model
- **Q1 2025:** Claims "no drop in consumer satisfaction" — contradicted by customer complaints about generic answers
- **Q3 2025:** Customer service costs still rising despite \$60M in claimed savings

Leggett notes: "With their IPO, I wonder how much of this cost savings was having their optics well managed for them going public"^[2].

What Klarna Actually Proves

Klarna proves three things simultaneously:

1. **AI agents can handle high-volume, simple queries at massive scale.** Two-thirds of all customer inquiries handled, 82% faster response times, 25% fewer repeat issues. For FAQ-level interactions, the economics are unambiguous.
2. **Cost savings without trust infrastructure eventually backfire.** Customers complained about generic, unable-to-handle-nuance answers. The institutional knowledge of laid-off workers was lost.
3. **Claimed savings and actual cost reductions are different numbers.** "\$60M saved" and "costs up 19% YoY" can both be true when the baseline grows (114M active users, up 32%). But it means the savings number is misleading without context.

CLAIM

Klarna's AI deployment achieved genuine cost avoidance (handling growth without proportional headcount) but not the cost reduction their headlines suggest. Customer service costs rose 19% YoY despite \$60M in claimed AI savings.

WHAT WOULD INVALIDATE THIS?

If Klarna's full cost accounting showed that without AI, customer service costs would have risen 60-80% given their user growth (32% YoY), then the \$60M savings claim is accurate as cost avoidance. We do not have access to their counterfactual model.

SO WHAT?

Demand counterfactual analysis in any AI cost savings claim. "We saved \$X" means nothing without "compared to what?" Klarna's experience shows that even legitimate savings can coexist with rising costs and degrading quality — a warning for any enterprise pursuing AI-driven cost reduction.

8. What Our System Actually Costs (The Honest Version)

90%

(Confidence: High — our own data, honestly calculated)

We claim "\$2.75 per report" in AR-016. That number is accurate and deeply misleading. Here is what our system actually costs.

The \$2.75 Number: What It Includes

The \$2.75 average per report captures: API token costs for research, writing, and QA phases across our multi-agent pipeline using Claude Sonnet-4. It is logged cryptographically in our TRUST-LEDGER with hash chains, runtime measurements, and model identifiers. The number is real.

The \$2.75 Number: What It Excludes

Exhibit 4: Our Honest Total Cost of Ownership

COST CATEGORY	PER REPORT	MONTHLY (EST. 20 REPORTS)	NOTES
API tokens (Sonnet/Opus)	\$2.75	\$55	Measured, logged in TRUST-LEDGER
OpenClaw Pro subscription	~\$1.50	\$30	\$30/month amortized over ~20 reports
Brave Search API	~\$0.50	\$10	~\$10/month for research queries
Florian's review time (30 min avg)	\$50	\$1,000	At \$100/hr loaded cost
System maintenance (prompts, templates, debugging)	~\$15	\$300	~3 hrs/month at \$100/hr
Initial system design (amortized)	~\$10	\$200	~\$5,000 over first 6 months
Honest Total	\$45-85	\$900-\$1,700	Range depends on review intensity

Source: Internal cost tracking + honest accounting of human time. Feb 2026.

The honest total cost per report is **\$45-85**, not \$2.75. The API cost is 3-6% of the real cost. The dominant cost is Florian's time reviewing, editing, and directing the system.

Is This Still Good Economics?

Yes — decisively. A comparable research report from a human analyst costs \$800-\$2,400 (8-16 hours at \$100-\$150/hour). At \$45-85 per report, our system delivers:

- **9-53x cost reduction** vs. human-only research

- **10x speed improvement** (50 minutes vs. 8+ hours)
- **Consistent quality** across reports (QA scores 79-92, avg 85.3)

The economics are excellent. But they are not 181x ROI. They are 9-18x ROI — still exceptional, but a fundamentally different story than "\$2.75 per report."

What Would Make The \$2.75 Number Honest?

The \$2.75 becomes the honest number only when:

1. Florian's review time drops to zero (full autonomous trust)
2. System maintenance is negligible (fully mature infrastructure)
3. Setup costs are fully amortized (>500 reports)

We are not there. We may never be there for high-stakes research content. And that is the point: the marginal API cost is real but insufficient for understanding the economics of production agent systems.

CLAIM

Our honest TCO is \$45-85 per report, not \$2.75. This is still 9-53x cheaper than human-only research — but it is a different story than the API cost headline suggests.

WHAT WOULD INVALIDATE THIS?

If Florian's review time is valued at \$0 (hobby project, not commercial), the cost drops to \$15-30 per report. If system maturity eliminates the need for human review entirely, it approaches the \$2.75 marginal cost. Both scenarios reduce the honest cost but do not eliminate the gap between API cost and TCO.

SO WHAT?

When someone quotes you "\$X per AI-generated output," ask: "Does that include human review time, infrastructure, maintenance, and amortized setup?" The answer is almost always no. The API cost is the floor, not the ceiling. Budget accordingly.

9. How to Model Agent Costs Without Lying to Yourself

80%

(Confidence: High — practitioner-validated approach)

Think in workflows, not requests. Think in decision loops, not API calls. Think in total human time, not just machine time.

The Five-Layer Cost Model

Agents Arcade's production cost modeling framework identifies five layers that must be modeled independently^[9]:

1. **Token Consumption Layer:** LLM input/output tokens across every loop. Not per-request — per workflow. A single user request may trigger 8-15 internal calls (planning, tool calls, follow-ups, reflection, synthesis, retrieval).
2. **Tooling Layer:** Vector DB queries, API calls, function execution. Each tool call has its own cost profile.
3. **State Layer:** Memory storage, caching, session persistence. Grows with usage.
4. **Compute Layer:** Hosting, autoscaling, cold starts. Bursty agent traffic creates spikes.
5. **Observability Layer:** Logging, tracing, metrics retention. Required for production, often forgotten in budgets.

"Most teams only model Layer 1. That is amateur hour"^[9].

The Honest TCO Formula

```
Honest TCO = (API cost per workflow × volume)
+ infrastructure (hosting + tools + monitoring)
+ human time (review + maintenance + escalation) × hourly
rate
```

```
+ amortized setup cost / expected lifetime volume
+ failure cost (error rate × avg correction cost)
```

Example: Our System

- API: $\$2.75 \times 20 \text{ reports/month} = \55
- Infrastructure: $\$40/\text{month} (\text{OpenClaw + Brave})$
- Human time: $10 \text{ hrs/month} \times \$100/\text{hr} = \$1,000$
- Setup amortization: $\$5,000 / 500 \text{ reports} = \$10/\text{report} \times 20 = \200
- Failure cost: $5\% \text{ error rate} \times \$200 \text{ correction} \times 20 = \200
- **Monthly TCO: ~\\$1,495. Per report: ~\\$75.**

Compare this to the API-only calculation: $\$55/\text{month}$, $\$2.75/\text{report}$. The honest number is 27x higher.

SO WHAT?

Use the five-layer model before approving any agent deployment budget. Run the honest TCO formula with your real numbers. If the business case survives honest accounting, deploy with confidence. If it only works with API-only math, it will fail in production.

10. Recommendations

The economics of AI agents favor deployment — but only if you account for the full cost stack and optimize the right variables.

For Budget Planning

1. **Multiply vendor API cost estimates by 4-7x for total cost of ownership.** This accounts for monitoring, error correction, human oversight, and infrastructure. If the business case survives at 7x, it is robust.
2. **Budget 30-50% of Year 1 dev costs for annual maintenance.** Monitoring, retraining, security updates, and infrastructure changes are recurring, not one-time.
3. **Reserve 20% of budget for failure.** Error correction, rollback infrastructure, and the possibility that the project fails entirely (80%+ of AI projects do). Failing cheap is better than failing expensive.
4. **Demand counterfactual analysis in every savings claim.** "We saved \$X" means nothing without "compared to what?" — as Klarna's simultaneous \$60M savings and 19% cost increase demonstrates.

For Architecture Selection

1. **Default to 3-agent pipeline for production knowledge work.** Research → Write → QA delivers the best cost-quality ratio in our experiment. Single agents are cheaper but produce hallucinations. Adversarial review is better but at diminishing returns.
2. **Use cheap models for specialist tasks, expensive models for judgment.** HockeyStack's "Judge" pattern — small models for intermediary steps, large model for final evaluation — reduces cost 54% while improving accuracy^[8].
3. **Enforce maximum decision depth.** Cap recursive loops (6 hops max). This single control prevented \$47,000 in one documented case.
4. **Eliminate agent invocations for deterministic tasks.** Scripts beat agents for format conversion, data validation, and file operations. Our PDF generation

script saves \$0.50 and 5 minutes per report vs. an agent.

For Cost Optimization (In Order of ROI)

1. Measure baseline costs for 30 days before optimizing
2. Implement monitoring from day 1 (the \$47K lesson)
3. Progressive context loading (30-50% token reduction)
4. Model routing: cheap models for simple tasks, expensive for complex
5. Output caching for repetitive queries (40-50% reduction)
6. Prompt compression (high effort, medium return — only at scale)

11. Transparency Note

This section documents the methodology, confidence calibration, and known limitations of this report. It is provided to enable independent validation and replication.

Overall Confidence	82% — Strong on internal data and Klarna case, weaker on enterprise TCO quantification due to limited disclosure
Sources	22 total: 5 web research searches (50 results screened), 6 deep-fetched articles, 2 internal reports (AR-016, AR-021), 1 internal experiment, 1 production ledger (TRUST-LEDGER.json), multiple earnings reports and analyst commentary
Strongest Evidence	Our own production data (cryptographically logged, 25 reports), Klarna public earnings data with Forrester analyst commentary, BudgetMLAgent peer-reviewed ACM paper
Weakest Point	Five-architecture experiment is N=1 with self-assessed quality scores (known overconfidence risk). Enterprise TCO ranges are wide and based on vendor-published surveys with selection bias. "40-60% underestimate" claim from Hypersense is not peer-reviewed.
What Would Invalidate	If token costs dropped 10x, all optimization strategies become irrelevant. If agent reliability reached 99.9%, monitoring and error correction costs collapse. If our quality self-assessments are overconfident by >2 points, our cost-quality comparisons change.
Methodology	Multi-agent research pipeline (A+ variant): web search → source fetch → internal data review → experiment design → synthesis → adversarial self-review → revision → template application. All phases logged.
System Disclosure	This report was created with a multi-agent research system. Research, writing, QA, and adversarial review were performed by AI agents (Claude Opus-4 and Sonnet-4). Human direction and final review by Florian Ziesche.

Cross-Reference	AR-016 claims \$2.75/report and 181x ROI. AR-021 claims 3-7x cost overrun and \$150-\$300 all-in cost. This report reconciles: \$2.75 = API cost only; \$45-85 = honest TCO; 9-53x = honest ROI range. AR-016's 181x is API-only ROI.
Conflicts of Interest	We are reporting on the economics of a system we built and operate. Self-interest biases toward favorable economics. The honest TCO section (Section 8) is the corrective.

12. Claim Register

#	CLAIM	VALUE	SOURCE	CONFIDENCE
1	Enterprise budgets underestimate AI agent TCO	40-60%	Hypersense Software TCO Guide 2026	Medium (vendor)
2	Organizations with agents in production	11%	Deloitte Emerging Tech Trends 2026	High (n=large survey)
3	AI projects that fail to deploy	>80%	RAND Corporation	High (peer-reviewed)
4	Klarna AI agent savings claimed	\$60M	Klarna Q3 2025 Earnings Call	High (public filing)
5	Klarna CS costs YoY change	+19% (\$42M→\$50M)	Klarna Q3 2025 Earnings Report	High (public filing)
6	Multi-agent cost reduction vs single GPT-4	94.2%	BudgetMLAgent, ACM 2024	High (peer-reviewed)
7	HockeyStack specialist agent cost reduction	54%	HockeyStack production data	Medium (practitioner)
8	Production agent loop cost	\$47,000	TowardsAI practitioner report	Medium (single case)
9	Our average API cost per report	\$2.75	TRUST-LEDGER.json (25 reports)	High (internal, logged)
10	Our honest TCO per report	\$45-85	Internal cost analysis	High (internal, calculated)
11	Hidden costs comprise 70% of	70%	AgentMode AI CFO Guide	Low (single vendor claim)

total AI investment				
12	Monitoring costs as % of dev costs	15-30%	Hypersense + Deloitte	Medium (2 sources)

Top 5 Claims — Invalidated If:

- **Claim 1:** Invalidated if enterprise-grade turnkey platforms reduce integration overhead to near-zero
- **Claim 4-5:** Invalidated if Klarna releases counterfactual model showing costs would have risen 60%+ without AI
- **Claim 6:** Invalidated if frontier single-agent models achieve equivalent quality at similar cost to multi-agent
- **Claim 9-10:** Invalidated if external review scores our reports significantly lower than internal QA (H-002)
- **Claim 8:** Low replicability — single practitioner anecdote, may be exaggerated for content virality

13. References

- [1] Hypersense Software. (2026). "The Hidden Costs of AI Agent Development: A Complete TCO Guide for 2026." <https://hypersense-software.com/blog/2026/01/12/hidden-costs-ai-agent-development/>
- [2] Customer Experience Dive. (2025). "Klarna says its AI agent is doing the work of 853 employees." <https://www.customerexperiencedive.com/news/klarna-says-ai-agent-work-853-employees/805987/>
- [3] Kusireddy, T. (2025). "We Spent \$47,000 Running AI Agents in Production." Towards AI. <https://pub.towardsai.net/we-spent-47-000-running-ai-agents-in-production>
- [4] BudgetMLAgent. (2024). "A Cost-Effective LLM Multi-Agent system for Automating Machine Learning Tasks." ACM AIMLSystems. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.07464>
- [5] AgentMode AI. (2025). "The Hidden Costs of Agentic AI: A CFO's Guide to True TCO and ROI Modeling." <https://agentmodeai.com/the-hidden-costs-of-agnostic-ai/>
- [6] Deloitte. (2026). "Emerging Technology Trends: Agentic AI Strategy." <https://www.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/technology-management/tech-trends/2026/agnostic-ai-strategy.html>
- [7] RAND Corporation. (2024). "Factors That Influence the Success or Failure of AI Projects." RR-A2680-1.
- [8] HockeyStack. (2025). "Optimizing Latency and Cost in Multi-Agent Systems." <https://www.hockeystack.com/applied-ai/optimizing-latency-and-cost-in-multi-agent-systems>
- [9] Agents Arcade. (2026). "Cost Modeling for Agentic Systems Before You Go to Production." <https://agentsarcade.com/blog/cost-modeling-agnosticic-systems-production>
- [10] KPMG. (2026). "AI at Scale: How 2025 Set the Stage for Agent-Driven Enterprise Reinvention." <https://kpmg.com/us/en/media/news/q4-ai-pulse.html>
- [11] Ainary Research. (2026). "The Agent Economics Report." AR-016.
- [12] Ainary Research. (2026). "AI Agent Economics — The Real ROI Nobody Talks About." AR-021.

Cite as: Ainary Research (2026). "The Real Cost of AI Agents in Production." AR-027.

About the Author

 FZ

Florian Ziesche

Florian Ziesche is the founder of Ainary Ventures, where AI does 80% of the research and humans do the 20% that matters. Before Ainary, he was CEO of 36ZERO Vision and advised startups and SMEs on AI strategy and due diligence. His conviction: HUMAN × AI = LEVERAGE. This report is the proof.

ainaryventures.com

Appendix A: Adversarial Self-Review

This appendix documents the adversarial review process applied to this report. Four perspectives were used to stress-test the claims, methodology, and conclusions.

As CFO: "Would I Trust These Numbers?"

Verdict: Partially. The internal production data (\$2.75 API cost, \$45-85 honest TCO) is credible because it comes with cryptographic logging and methodology transparency. The enterprise TCO ranges (40-60% underestimate, 4-7x multiplier) are directional but imprecise — they come from vendor surveys and consultant estimates, not audited financial data. A CFO would want: (a) third-party audit of our TRUST-LEDGER, (b) larger sample sizes for the five-architecture experiment, (c) Klarna's actual financial model, not earnings call quotes. **Risk rating: Medium.** Sufficient for strategic planning, insufficient for budget approval without validation.

As Vendor: "What Does This Report Hide About Our Costs?"

What we are hiding: (1) Our quality self-assessments may be overconfident — hypothesis H-002 is untested. If external reviewers score our reports 5-6/10 instead of 8-9/10, the entire cost-quality comparison collapses. (2) We do not track Florian's cognitive load or context-switching cost — the \$100/hr estimate for review time may significantly understate the true cost of staying in the loop. (3) The system requires a technically sophisticated operator (Florian). The labor market cost of hiring someone with equivalent skills to maintain this system is not \$100/hr — it is \$150-\$250/hr for a senior AI engineer. (4) We have not accounted for the opportunity cost of building this system instead of doing other work.

As Competitor: "How Do I Replicate This in a Week?"

Answer: You cannot. The \$2.75 API cost is replicable in hours. The quality is not. The quality comes from: (a) 25 reports of iterative template refinement (TEMPLATE-RULES.md), (b) a trust ledger with 10 locked decisions and 9

Kintsugi repairs, (c) a claim registry with cross-referenced sources, (d) 15+ documented hypotheses driving systematic improvement. Replicating the template is trivial. Replicating the compounded learning in the system takes months. **The real moat is not the code — it is the iteration history.**

What Cost Category Is Missing Completely?

Four categories this report does not account for:

1. **Reputation risk cost:** If an AI-generated report contains a factual error that damages Ainary's credibility, the cost is not the error correction — it is the lost trust and future revenue. Unquantified but potentially the largest cost category.
2. **Model dependency risk:** If Anthropic changes pricing, deprecates Sonnet-4, or degrades quality in an update, our entire cost model breaks. We have zero vendor diversification.
3. **Attention and cognitive overhead:** Florian's mental bandwidth for managing the system, staying current on AI developments, and making architectural decisions has a real cost that is not captured in "30 minutes review time."
4. **Data and privacy liability:** Research sources, prompt content, and generated text flow through third-party APIs. The liability exposure in regulated contexts is unquantified.



AI Strategy · Published Research · Daily Intelligence

Contact · Feedback

ainaryventures.com · florian@ainaryventures.com

© 2026 Ainary Ventures