

01 / Situation & scope

Complete files before the critical stages.

Notaries / France

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 18-person practice repeatedly follows up for documents. Name and version inconsistencies are discovered late.

Simulated schedule	9 weeks
Support planned in the scenario	10 consulting days
Assumed internal commitment	6 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 completeness for one file type, without automated authentication or legal validation.

What we would examine

25 redacted files, a practice-approved document checklist and follow-up history.

02 / Process & decisions

The process, department by department

Administration

Simulated starting point	Track documents in multiple lists
Proposed process	One checklist with statuses and sources
Human approval	Practice administrator

Professional practice

Simulated starting point	Discover discrepancies late
Proposed process	Flag inconsistencies before file review
Human approval	Notary

Client relations

Simulated starting point	Write each follow-up individually
Proposed process	Draft follow-up for approval
Human approval	File manager

The approach to compare

Field extraction and rule checks against an approved checklist. AI suggests matches; discrepancies are held for review.

What stays with the professional

The notary and staff assess documents and approve the file. Deeds, identity checks and statutory deadlines are not delegated to autonomous decisions.

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

25 redacted files, a practice-approved document checklist and follow-up history.

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

Field extraction and rule checks against an approved checklist. AI suggests matches; discrepancies are held for review.

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

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

Every missing mandatory item remains blocking; each extracted value links to its source document.

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

Fewer scattered follow-ups and clearer visibility of files needing preparation.

Assumed monthly volume	40 file checks
Baseline time per unit	75 min
Target time, including human review	45 min
Monthly monitoring and maintenance	2 h

$40 \times (75 - 45) \div 60 - 2 = 18 \text{ h / month}$

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 : Every missing mandatory item remains blocking; each extracted value links to its source document.

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