01 / Situation & scope

Connect every analysis to verifiable sources.

Tax advisers / 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.

Eight staff search internal precedents and collect documents before preparing a brief. Versions and tax periods sometimes become mixed.

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

Factual preparation of a brief within a defined tax scope, without automated regime selection or advice.

What we would examine

20 redacted briefs, sources labelled by country and period, and questions with known answers.

02 / Process & decisions

The process, department by department

Professional practice

Simulated starting point	Manually search precedents
Proposed process	Source passages labelled by date and country
Human approval	Senior tax adviser

Administration

Simulated starting point	Difficult document version tracking
Proposed process	Document index and missing-information list
Human approval	File manager

Finance & accounting

Simulated starting point	Fragmented preparation of data tables
Proposed process	Extracted data linked to supporting documents
Human approval	Engagement reviewer

The approach to compare

Search an authorised, dated corpus with citations and abstention when sources are missing. Explicitly test period and jurisdiction confusion.

What stays with the professional

The adviser checks source currency, the client’s circumstances and every conclusion. No automated filing, final tax calculation or advice.

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 briefs, sources labelled by country and period, and questions with known 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 an authorised, dated corpus with citations and abstention when sources are missing. Explicitly test period and jurisdiction confusion.

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

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

Every reference must be retrievable for the correct country and period; unsupported answers must be withheld.

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

Free time to analyse client-specific issues and discuss options.

Assumed monthly volume	72 brief preparations
Baseline time per unit	60 min
Target time, including human review	35 min
Monthly monitoring and maintenance	3 h

72 × (60 − 35) ÷ 60 − 3 = 27 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 : Every reference must be retrievable for the correct country and period; unsupported answers must be withheld.

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