

01 / Situation & scope

Organise incoming work to focus on exceptions.

Judicial officers / 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 14-person practice receives a large flow of correspondence and documents. File allocation and incomplete requests consume administrative time.

Simulated schedule	9 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

Administrative triage and incoming-file preparation, without automated instruments, service or enforcement decisions.

What we would examine

100 redacted letters with correct allocation, ambiguous cases and a reassignment log.

02 / Process & decisions

The process, department by department

Administration

Simulated starting point	Manual sorting and file matching
Proposed process	Suggested classification with source document
Human approval	Administrative caseworker

Operations & production

Simulated starting point	Exceptions buried in the general queue
Proposed process	Review queue for incomplete or ambiguous items
Human approval	Responsible judicial officer

Finance & accounting

Simulated starting point	Manually locate payment evidence
Proposed process	Suggested reconciliation without moving funds
Human approval	Accounting lead

The approach to compare

Assisted classification and suggested file matching after deterministic reference checks. Ambiguous items stay in a review queue.

What stays with the professional

The judicial officer retains legal assessment, deadline checks and decisions affecting parties. No letter or instrument is sent without approval.

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 redacted letters with correct allocation, ambiguous cases and a reassignment log.

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

Week 2 | 1.5 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 3-6 | 3 consulting days - Prototype

Assisted classification and suggested file matching after deterministic reference checks. Ambiguous items stay in a review queue.

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

Weeks 7-8 | 2.5 consulting days - Test & decide

No incorrect file match accepted; every ambiguous identifier triggers manual review.

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

Week 9 | 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

Reduce triage time and make incomplete files immediately visible.

Assumed monthly volume	300 incoming documents
Baseline time per unit	12 min
Target time, including human review	8 min
Monthly monitoring and maintenance	2 h

$300 \times (12 - 8) \div 60 - 2 = 18 \text{ h / month}$

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 incorrect file match accepted; every ambiguous identifier triggers manual review.

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