

01 / Situation & scope

Reply faster with reliable information.

Retail businesses / 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.

An 11-person retailer answers the same questions in-store and online. Product information and return policies are spread across several sources.

Simulated schedule	8 weeks
Support planned in the scenario	10 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

Drafting answers to routine questions, without autonomous refunds or stock promises.

What we would examine

100 anonymised requests, an up-to-date catalogue, approved policies and reference answers.

02 / Process & decisions

The process, department by department

Client relations

Simulated starting point	Repeatedly search for the same information
Proposed process	Source-linked draft reviewed before replying
Human approval	Customer adviser

Purchasing & inventory

Simulated starting point	Ask several colleagues about availability
Proposed process	Check current stock or escalate
Human approval	Store manager

Finance & accounting

Simulated starting point	Misdirected refund requests
Proposed process	Classify and route to the approver
Human approval	Administrative manager

The approach to compare

Search and drafting assistant using the catalogue and approved policies. Compare with reply templates; retrieve current stock through a controlled connection.

What stays with the professional

The adviser checks prices, stock, commitments and the final reply. Sensitive complaints and exceptions go directly to a manager.

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

100 anonymised requests, an up-to-date catalogue, approved policies and reference answers.

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

Search and drafting assistant using the catalogue and approved policies. Compare with reply templates; retrieve current stock through a controlled connection.

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

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

No invented price, stock or commitment; withhold the answer if required information is unavailable.

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

27 h / month

Give staff more time for advice and complex requests.

Assumed monthly volume	600 draft replies
Baseline time per unit	7 min
Target time, including human review	4 min
Monthly monitoring and maintenance	3 h

$600 \times (7 - 4) \div 60 - 3 = 27 \text{ h / month}$

If only half the volume benefits from the process, with the same monthly monitoring: 12 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 price, stock or commitment; withhold the answer if required information is unavailable.

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