

01 / Situation & scope

Find the facts. Protect time for advice.

Lawyers / Belgium

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 12-person firm prepares matters from scattered documents and emails. Reconstructing the facts takes time before each meeting.

Simulated schedule	8 weeks
Support planned in the scenario	10 consulting days
Assumed internal commitment	5 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

Document preparation for recurring matters, without autonomous drafting of pleadings.

What we would examine

Sample of 20 redacted matters, timed preparation and a record of corrections.

02 / Process & decisions

The process, department by department

Professional practice

Simulated starting point	Read each document separately
Proposed process	Source-linked chronology for review
Human approval	Responsible lawyer

Administration

Simulated starting point	Scattered files and duplicate versions
Proposed process	File classification and missing-item flags
Human approval	Legal assistant

Client relations

Simulated starting point	Rushed meeting preparation
Proposed process	Approved factual brief before meetings
Human approval	Client relationship lawyer

The approach to compare

Source-linked document retrieval (RAG), followed by a draft chronology from authorised documents only. Compare with well-indexed conventional search.

What stays with the professional

The lawyer checks every fact and source. Legal analysis, strategy, deadlines and client communications remain under their control.

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

Sample of 20 redacted matters, timed preparation and a record of corrections.

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 3-5 | 3 consulting days - Prototype

Source-linked document retrieval (RAG), followed by a draft chronology from authorised documents only. Compare with well-indexed conventional search.

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

Weeks 6-7 | 2 consulting days - Test & decide

No unsourced facts; missing documents remain visible. A critical error requires correction and retesting.

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

Week 8 | 2 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

22 h / month

Reallocate preparation time to client meetings and case analysis.

Assumed monthly volume	60 matter preparations
Baseline time per unit	50 min
Target time, including human review	25 min
Monthly monitoring and maintenance	3 h

$60 \times (50 - 25) \div 60 - 3 = 22 \text{ h / month}$

If only half the volume benefits from the process, with the same monthly monitoring: 9.5 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 unsourced facts; missing documents remain visible. A critical error requires correction and retesting.

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