

01 / Situation & scope

From site meeting notes to tracked actions.

Architects / Luxembourg

These cases show how we would apply our method to different professional situations. Business profiles, countries, timelines and gains are illustrative assumptions. They do not describe completed client engagements.

A 10-person practice manages several sites. Decisions, photos and notes arrive through different channels and actions are copied manually.

Simulated schedule	7 weeks
Support planned in the scenario	8 consulting days
Assumed internal commitment	4 person-days

Consulting days are spread across the schedule and do not mean full-time attendance. Internal days are additional. Scope and a quote must be agreed for a real engagement.

Proposed audit scope

Preparing minutes and tracking actions, without technical, structural or planning approval.

What we would examine

20 redacted meeting records, project naming conventions, responsibilities and action history.

02 / Process & decisions

The process, department by department

Operations & production

Simulated starting point	Copy actions after meetings
Proposed process	Draft action register per site
Human approval	Project architect

Administration

Simulated starting point	Scattered versions of minutes
Proposed process	Central approved version and history
Human approval	Project coordinator

Client relations

Simulated starting point	Manually assemble client updates
Proposed process	Decision summary for approval
Human approval	Client lead

The approach to compare

AI-assisted conversion of notes into decisions and actions. Compare with a standard minutes template; synchronise approved actions only.

What stays with the professional

The architect approves minutes, responsibilities and deadlines. AI does not calculate structures or certify project compliance.

03 / Timeline & deliverables

From audit to an independent team

A simulated engagement timeline, with a decision and deliverable at every stage. Rollout depends on test results.

Week 1 | 2 consulting days - Observe & measure

20 redacted meeting records, project naming conventions, responsibilities and action history.

Proposed deliverable : Process map, baseline measurement and issue register.

Week 2 | 1 consulting days - Scope & decide

Compare simplification, existing features and AI. Define scope, access, full costs and stop criteria before building.

Proposed deliverable : Audit report, priority matrix and test protocol.

Weeks 3-4 | 2 consulting days - Prototype

AI-assisted conversion of notes into decisions and actions. Compare with a standard minutes template; synchronise approved actions only.

Proposed deliverable : Limited prototype, test set and approval workflow.

Weeks 5-6 | 2 consulting days - Test & decide

No invented action or responsibility; all corrections remain traceable before distribution.

Proposed deliverable : Comparative assessment: proceed, adjust or stop.

Week 7 | 1 consulting days - Train & hand over

Train users on routine and exceptional cases. Appoint an owner and document the manual fallback. If testing fails, hand over findings and a correction plan.

Proposed deliverable : Usage guide, team workshop and 30-day follow-up plan.

During the 30 days after an approved pilot: review metrics weekly, examine exceptions and decide whether to maintain, correct or expand the scope. This follow-up period is outside the scenario schedule and consulting days.

04 / Simulated gains & measurement

Simulated net time saving

18 h / month

Spend less time reformatting notes and more time coordinating contributors.

Assumed monthly volume	60 meeting records
Baseline time per unit	50 min
Target time, including human review	30 min
Monthly monitoring and maintenance	2 h

$60 \times (50 - 30) \div 60 - 2 = 18 \text{ h / month}$

If only half the volume benefits from the process, with the same monthly monitoring: 8 h / month

This calculation is a simulation, not a client measurement. Target time includes corrections and review. Time released is not a demonstrated cash saving; it depends on actual volume and adoption.

How we would verify the result

Compare both methods on a set separate from preparation examples. Measure total time, corrections, critical errors and actual use. Keep difficult cases in the assessment; suspend if quality or confidentiality deteriorates.

Professional acceptance criterion : No invented action or responsibility; all corrections remain traceable before distribution.

Cost advice, data preparation, integration, licences, training and maintenance before committing. Price, return on investment and revenue effects must be established for each engagement.

Before a pilot, define permitted data, access and any supplier reuse. Country-specific and professional rules must be checked for the real engagement.

Background reference: CNIL, using a generative AI system.

Explore this for our organisation - ORCHESTRATEUR.AI