

AI & Internal Investigations

Connect information
to investigate more effectively.

Explained connections.
Questions that move the investigation forward.

SEPTEMBER 2026

A LucenOne publication

OPENING

9:20 a.m. The evidence is there. The connection comes into focus.

A disputed payment was made the previous day at 4:30 p.m. The investigator has the transaction record, several internal exchanges and a first interview. The documents refer to “approval”, “validation” and “preparation”. Read separately, each appears clear enough. Read together, they still do not explain how the money was able to leave.

During the interview, a manager says that she gave her approval that morning. She immediately clarifies that it related to preparing the file and that payment remained subject to verification of the bank details. An email sent at 2:10 p.m. keeps that condition in place. The assistance brings the two passages together while preserving their purpose and conditions. They do not describe a change of mind about the same authorisation: they distinguish what could be prepared from what could be executed.

The comparison sharpens the question: was permission to prepare understood, passed on or used as permission to pay? The investigator no longer searches broadly for “who gave approval”. She can examine the path by which the instruction travelled, the expected control and the authority of the people involved, without forcing a single meaning onto the same word.

This fictional scene illustrates an essential contribution artificial intelligence can make to an internal investigation. Its value is not limited to summarising documents. It can make the relationships between them visible enough for the professional to work more effectively: locating a statement, comparing two accounts, retrieving a condition, or framing the check that will move understanding forward.

The substance of the case has not changed. What changes is the way it can be navigated, connected and discussed. Information that once required rereading several sources becomes available at the point where it matters. An overly broad question can be broken into useful investigative steps. A new item of evidence can then be linked to the points it informs, without forcing the whole team to start reading again from the beginning.

The professional does not disappear from this process. Their role changes: they assess the connections, choose the investigative steps, hear the people involved and take responsibility for the conclusions within their mandate. The assistance gives them more precise support. It does not replace professional authority with a technical ability to generate answers.

Useful assistance does more than save reading time. It frees attention for what actually needs to be understood.

This paper develops that ambition: moving from scattered evidence to a connected reading of the case, turning relationships into investigative steps, allowing the analysis to evolve and passing on an understanding whose sources remain accessible. Safeguards give this contribution a framework that can be used throughout the investigation.

The situations described are fictional. They illustrate possible uses and reasoning; they are neither an account of LucenOne operating in a real case nor a measure of product performance.

CONTENTS

From connected evidence to a deeper investigation

01 Build a connected view of the case	4
Move from sources to questions while preserving context and versions.	
02 Surface the connections that matter	7
Compare the right objects, explain the links and turn gaps into questions that can be investigated.	
03 Turn connections into investigative steps	9
Prepare checks and interviews with a clear purpose.	
04 Keep the analysis alive	12
Integrate new material and identify exactly what changes.	
05 Pass on an understanding that can be verified	14
Prepare reporting, review and case handover.	
06 Give AI assistance the right scope	16
Connect use cases, authorised sources, powers and responsibilities.	
07 Establish the value of the work produced	18
Assess gains, coverage and the conditions for justified trust.	
Conclusion	21
Notes and references	22

CHAPTER 01

Build a connected view of the case

The first gain is not another summary. It is the ability to move from a question to the information that sheds light on it, then back to the case without losing the relationships between the two.

The problem often lies between the documents

An invoice, an email and an interview do not describe the same part of a transaction. The invoice shows what is being requested. The email may set out a condition for payment. The interview explains what a person believed they had authorised. Filing them under three separate headings helps document management. On its own, it does not reconstruct how the process moved from request to execution.

In the 4:30 p.m. payment, the question cuts across the sources. It concerns a relationship: was approval given for one stage used to move into another? That relationship may not be stated in any single document. It has to be built by comparing content, purpose and timing. This is precisely where assistance can add depth to the work: bringing together what the organisation of the files had kept apart.

A useful connection does not depend on the professional being unaware of any of the evidence. They may have read the items on different days and for different questions. Bringing them back together at the right moment mobilises knowledge that had become dispersed. The benefit lies as much in continuity as in search speed.

This perspective changes what is asked of the tool. “Summarise the case” may provide a first orientation. “Connect the preparation instructions, the conditions for payment and the record of execution” defines a more useful working space. The question leaves room for different outcomes while making clear which relationship needs to be examined.

Retrieve a passage and understand the role it plays

Retrieval used alongside text generation makes it possible to draw on a document collection while producing an answer. Lewis and co-authors notably explored this combination in their work on retrieval-augmented generation. Their research illustrates a technical principle; the experiments are neither a test of an investigation platform nor a guarantee of completeness. [1]

For investigators, the question is more practical: can information be retrieved because of the problem it helps illuminate, rather than only because of the words it contains? An instruction to “keep the hold in place” may be relevant when looking for the conditions under which a payment could be authorised. A purchase-order number may connect messages that do not all name the supplier. A temporary role may explain why someone appears in the process without being part of the usual workflow.

Useful retrieval combines these clues while preserving what distinguishes them. An invoice and a payment may show the same amount without referring to the same transaction. Two companies may have similar names. A document may mention an old reference by way of example. The nature of the link therefore needs to be visible: a matching identifier, a possible match that still needs confirmation, or simply a lead.

That care is not caution at the expense of efficiency. It prevents the professional from having to redo the comparison from scratch. If the assistance highlights the shared reference, amount, date and version difference, the user has reasons for accepting or rejecting the connection. A set of explained results is more usable than a ranking that looks relevant without showing why.

A case map that distinguishes different kinds of links

Imagine a case map connecting a supplier, an invoice, two managers and a bank transfer. Proximity gives an initial overview. But the lines need meaning: one marks a recipient, another a signature, a third a statement about an authorisation. Without that precision, the diagram gathers names rather than explaining an operation.

A relationship reported by a person is not the same kind of relationship as one recorded in a business application. Both may matter. Keeping them together, with their provenance, shows where the investigation is already documented and where it still needs to verify. The map becomes an aid to reading and to choosing investigative steps, not a visual suggestion of culpability based on the density of connections.

The most connected person is not necessarily the person who contributed most to the event. A coordinator may appear everywhere because they receive the updates. The person who approved an exception may be mentioned only once. Assistance adds depth when it helps distinguish documentary circulation from the authority that was actually exercised.

Preserve the context that gives information its meaning

A useful unit of reading is not always a single sentence. In an interview, it may include the question, the answer and the clarification that follows. In a table, it may require the heading, the row and the note that limits how a rule applies. In a contract, a clause may need to be read together with its amendment.

Return to the morning approval. Keeping the condition about bank-detail verification does more than make the quotation longer. It identifies what the approval was actually for. A good presentation therefore shows the relevant passage with enough context to understand its scope. The reader should not have to rediscover, every time the file is opened, the qualification that changes the meaning of the extract.

Version matters as much as surrounding text. A procedure in force today may explain the current process without describing the process on the date being investigated. Assistance can keep both readings in view: the rule that governed the event and the rule the organisation adopted later. Comparing them may reveal an improvement, but it does not retrospectively alter the requirements that applied at the earlier date.

Read across formats without flattening what each one contributes

In a fictional investigation into maintenance work, a report says that equipment was “approved”. A photograph shows the condition of a safety guard. An interview recording adds a qualification: the approval concerned a test under a temporary configuration. An email, meanwhile, refers to returning the equipment to service. The need is not for four separate summaries; it is to understand whether the sources refer to the same configuration and the same phase.

Assistance can bring together the relevant passages, time markers and visible characteristics to make that comparison easier. But each format keeps its own role. The photograph shows a state of affairs

within the limits of its frame; the interview records what a person says; the email documents an instruction. Their contributions become complementary when the connection respects those differences.

The question then becomes more precise: was the equipment returned to service under the conditions examined during the test? That question could not be answered by matching the word “approved” alone. It emerges from comparing the configurations, times and objects described. It directs a documentary or technical check instead of immediately attributing fault to the person who signed the report.

This is where multi-format analysis creates value: it makes a relationship between heterogeneous information open to examination. It does not require turning a photograph into testimony, a transcript into an original, or a visual resemblance into certain identification. The investigator can still return to the image, the audio passage or the document whenever that source provides the necessary precision.

An understanding that remains accessible without constant rereading

The value of this organisation becomes clear when the team returns to the case. An investigator picking the matter up after a few days can ask what supports the distinction between preparing and paying. A useful answer does not merely repeat the latest summary sentence. It points to the relevant material, the questions still open and the checks already carried out.

Being able to navigate through the reasoning reduces dependence on one person’s memory. It also allows a newly authorised colleague to contribute sooner, without receiving an interpretation detached from its support. The case becomes transferable while it is still being investigated, not only when the report is written.

A connected case does not replace the evidence with a story. It lets the team move between the emerging account and the evidence that supports it.

That kind of reading prepares the next gain. Once the information has been brought together, it is not enough to note that two items look similar or different. The investigation needs to show what their relationship contributes to the question being examined.

CHAPTER 02

Surface the connections that matter

A connection has value when it clarifies what is understood and what still needs to be checked. Its relevance comes from what it adds to the case, not from the number of links the system can produce.

Compare the objects before comparing the words

The disputed payment brings together several verbs that sound as though they belong to the same family: prepare, check, approve, release and execute. In a well-defined process, they may correspond to different powers and different operations. In everyday messages, people may compress them into “that’s fine” or “approved”.

Assistance can help retrieve how those words were used and what they referred to. Agreement on an amount is not yet agreement on the beneficiary account. Authorising a purchase does not identify who

authorised the bank transfer. Breaking the process down in this way gives the investigator comparable objects instead of an apparent conflict between isolated phrases.

The following table extends the fictional scenario. It does not rank people; it makes visible three relationships that the investigation needs to preserve.

Three items, three contributions to the same question

Connected item	What it contributes	What still needs to be examined
Interview: approval to prepare, subject to bank-detail verification	Clarifies the scope the manager gives to her approval.	The content of the instruction that was actually passed on.
2:10 p.m. email: condition on payment maintained	Documents a restriction expressed before execution.	Its recipients and how it was taken into account in the workflow.
Payment record at 4:30 p.m.	Locates an executed transaction, according to the meaning of the recorded event.	The control and authorisation to which that execution was linked.

The comparison opens a more precise line of work than the original question, “was there approval?”. It shows that several approvals may coexist without having the same scope. That clarification does not minimise the disputed payment. It helps identify the point at which a condition was met, bypassed, misunderstood or simply left unresolved.

Distinguish an incompatibility from an open question

A contradiction can become decisive when it concerns the same object in the same situation. If someone states that they sent a document before a particular time and a reliable record places the sending afterwards, the discrepancy deserves examination. But the team must first establish that it is the same document, the same channel and that the timestamps are being interpreted on the same basis.

Not every useful relationship is a contradiction. A conditional authorisation and a later payment may be entirely consistent if the condition was satisfied in between. If there is not yet a record of that check, the correct outcome is an open question, not an incompatibility already established.

This distinction saves high-quality investigative time. It avoids asking a person to resolve a paradox that may not exist and focuses the next check on the missing element. A tool that distinguishes these relationships helps the professional turn a list of discrepancies into a plan for understanding.

The priority of a connection then depends on its effect on the analysis. A difference of five minutes may determine whether an instruction was available before an operation. A difference of several days may be immaterial if it concerns later formatting that had no effect on the decision. The visible size of a discrepancy is not the same as its materiality.

Reconstruct the path of the information

Another contribution is to distinguish people who observed an event from people who later received an account of it. In a fictional investigation into a meeting, three interviews repeat the same phrase. One interviewee was present. The other two read that person's written account. Semantic matching retrieves all three passages; analysis of how each person came to know the information clarifies the relationship between them.

That reconstruction does not make the latter two interviews irrelevant. They may explain how an interpretation spread and what effects it later produced. They do not, however, provide two additional observations of the words spoken in the meeting. Assistance makes the comparison more useful when it also connects the lineage of the account.

The same logic applies to copied or reused documents. Rather than deleting duplicates indiscriminately, it may be useful to group material from the same origin while preserving the way it was transmitted. Identical content is not new evidence of the original event. Its circulation may nevertheless document what another person was told or shown.

Give a quotation a working purpose

A source link becomes useful when it takes the investigator to the passage needed to assess a proposition. Its mere presence is not enough. The user should be able to see why the passage was selected and which part of the reasoning it supports. A comparison supported by two references should make it possible to compare what each contributes, not simply open two files.

The ALCE work by Gao and co-authors distinguishes, among other things, answer correctness from citation quality in the tasks they evaluate. That research distinction is useful here: well-written text and well-supported text are not the same thing and should not be assessed in the same way. It is not a ranking of investigation tools. [2]

In our scenario, a usable presentation makes the link explicit: the statement about preparation and the email about the control concern different stages, and the relationship between those stages still has to be established. The explanation is understandable to the user and verifiable in the evidence. The user does not need to understand the model's internal workings.

In its principles for explainable AI, NIST distinguishes the provision of an explanation, its meaningfulness, its accuracy in reflecting the process, and knowledge limits. For the investigator, documentary review remains essential: a readable explanation of a connection is not direct observation of the model's internal mechanisms. [3]

An absence can become a well-framed check

When none of the material within the reviewed scope documents the lifting of a condition, assistance can help define exactly what is missing. Is it a written approval, a check carried out in another application, or an explanation of an emergency route? Those possibilities do not justify inventing a validation. They help prepare searches that could establish it or assess the significance of its absence.

An investigative step framed in this way is more useful than a blank in a chronology. It distinguishes what was searched for, what was not found and why the next check might add something. The case moves forward because the gap becomes localised and actionable.

This is one of the most demanding contributions of assistance: not producing more alerts about differences, but helping identify which differences change the understanding and which should become a new working question.

CHAPTER 03

Turn connections into investigative steps

Useful analysis should lead to a justified action. It should show what would be worth looking for, from whom and for what purpose, without turning a suggestion into an automatic decision.

From a point to clarify to the right check

After the 9:20 a.m. comparison, “interview the manager” would be a possible next step, but it is still too vague. Is the purpose to clarify the scope of her approval, identify who was expected to perform the control, or understand an exception? The useful documents and people will differ according to the question.

Assistance can organise lines of enquiry around the contribution expected from each one. The manager’s interview can clarify what she asked for. The workflow log can document what was recorded. Reviewing the recipients can show how the instruction circulated. An authorisation rule can help identify who was permitted to act, without proving that the person actually did so.

This differs materially from an automatically generated task list. A plan is not “complete” simply because it contains interviews, searches and a timeline. It becomes justified when each step responds to a missing piece of information, allows for more than one possible outcome and makes clear what each outcome would change.

Look for what distinguishes competing mechanisms

Several mechanisms remain possible in the payment scenario. The condition may have been lifted through another workflow. It may not have been passed on. A preparation status may have been understood as permission to execute. An exception may have been used outside its intended scope. Some of these mechanisms may also have combined.

Progress requires more than finding material that makes each explanation conceivable. A workflow export might show which event allowed the process to move to execution. A processing note might specify which control was actually performed. The version of the procedure in force at the time might show whether the cited exception applied to that particular condition.

Assistance adds value here by making investigative steps comparable: what information could each one provide, and which explanation would that information help assess more effectively? The professional remains responsible for legality, proportionality, timing and order. But the logic of the plan can be discussed before the work is undertaken.

From the question to a usable result

Question to investigate	Targeted check	Possible effect on the next steps
Which condition remained outstanding?	Compare the instructions with the applicable version of the procedure.	Distinguish a bank-detail check from commercial approval.
How was the payment released?	Examine the release event and the rule that authorises it.	Identify a normal route, an exception or a process that needs explanation.
What had the person who acted understood?	Obtain their account, then review the relevant material with them.	Clarify their knowledge, interpretation and the instructions they received.

No row in the table promises a conclusion. It simply makes visible why a particular step may be useful. An incomplete archive, an ambiguous rule or an answer that shifts the question are not anomalies to be removed from the plan: they shape what needs to happen next.

Prepare an interview around what the person can actually know

The contribution to an interview begins before the questions are drafted. Assistance can bring together material connected with the person's role: instructions received, documents used, previous statements and recorded interventions. This positions the person's opportunity to observe. It avoids asking them, indiscriminately, to explain the entire case.

In another fictional scenario, someone in procurement knows which documents are required for a purchase but has no access to banking execution. Interview preparation should respect that boundary. The person may explain the purpose of an approval and who received their message; they do not become a witness to treasury validation simply because both stages appear in the same case file.

Suggested questions can then be linked to their purpose. "What did that status mean to you?" seeks a situated interpretation. "Which documents had you reviewed at that point?" examines the basis of the person's knowledge. "What still needed to happen before execution?" helps reconstruct the process without building an allegation of wrongdoing into the question.

This preparation does not turn the interview into a questionnaire being read aloud. It allows the professional to listen more closely to an unexpected answer because they know what the question was meant to illuminate. An unused suggestion remains a suggestion; it does not become an action performed or information obtained.

Make documents and testimony work together

A new answer may introduce a term that had not previously appeared in the searches: "We were waiting for the vendor-master team's green light, not procurement's." The value of assistance is then its ability to connect that expression with the rest of the case, including material that had already been reviewed under a different question.

The professional may decide on a new search, a document request or a later follow-up. Everything does not have to happen in real time. What matters is that the information obtained genuinely redirects the work instead of being lost between the interview note and a disconnected action list.

When a document is shown to an interviewee, the analysis should preserve the sequence in which information was obtained. A recollection given before seeing the document, a clarification made afterwards and an interpretation of the document are three different contributions. Assistance that keeps them retrievable makes the interview more usable without asking the person to validate the tool's analysis.

Recognise work that no longer needs to be repeated

Assistance can also make clear that a question has already been answered within a properly defined scope. Someone proposes a further interview to establish the date on which an instruction was sent. The file already contains the message, its recipients and a review of its origin. The remaining need may no longer be to confirm the date, but to understand how the instruction was understood and applied.

The system can compare the proposed step with checks already completed and identify the question that remains. It does not decide that an interview is unnecessary: the interview may serve other purposes or be required by specific safeguards. It helps the professional avoid confusing a new action with new information.

That economy matters in a sensitive case. Re-interviewing a person, requesting another data extraction or extending a collection exercise is not neutral for the people involved or for the timetable.

Distinguishing what is already supported from what still justifies an action can reduce unnecessary requests without lowering the standard applied to open questions.

Prioritise by the effect on the case

The fastest search is not always the most urgent. A source at risk of disappearing may need to be preserved before other steps that are more directly explanatory. A risk situation may require a parallel protective measure. The usefulness of a suggestion therefore has to be assessed together with the conditions for carrying it out, not only by its analytical interest.

Assistance can make those reasons visible: an archive to preserve, expertise to bring in, a blocking point before the next decision. The plan remains an instrument for professional choice. It should not decide by counting sources, by the order in which suggestions were generated, or through a general score assigned to people.

Assistance becomes operational when it helps explain why the next action is worth taking.

An investigation supported in this way does more than make results available faster. It organises how those results can change the team's understanding. That ability to move the analysis forward is what keeps the investigation alive.

CHAPTER 04

Keep the analysis alive

A case develops as investigative steps are carried out. Assistance creates continuity when it helps identify what each new element confirms, clarifies or changes, without pushing every question back to the same starting point.

A new item of evidence is not a new investigation

Continue the fictional scenario. The team responsible for the supplier master record sends a document showing that the bank details were checked at 3:58 p.m., before the 4:30 p.m. payment. That information was not part of the initial scope. It may answer the control question that had remained open that morning.

The team still needs to identify the document, its scope, the transaction to which it relates and the meaning of its timestamp. Once those points have been examined, it can assess what the item actually documents. The case now contains evidence locating a control before execution. That finding should not be diluted into a generic update of every summary.

Assistance has a precise role here: connect the new item to the bank-control condition, the payment timeline and the questions that depended on it. It can help distinguish what is now better supported from what remains open, particularly the authority to execute and how the people involved became aware of the control.

This development does not necessarily correct an earlier error. An analysis stating that no supporting record had been found within the scope then available may have been accurate at the time. New evidence enriches knowledge. Preserving the difference between evolution of the case and correction of an earlier account helps the team understand the work already done without rewriting its history.

Identify exactly what changes

The 3:58 p.m. record may satisfy part of the expected verification. It does not automatically resolve every authorisation question. Checking bank details, approving the amount and executing the transfer may be separate functions. Satisfying one condition does not automatically make every neighbouring act regular.

At the same time, keeping the question permanently open as though nothing had been received would be equally unsatisfactory. The professional needs an analysis that reflects the progress actually made. The question about the control can be narrowed, the request for supporting material closed, and part of the planned interview reframed.

Assistance makes this alignment easier by showing dependencies: this question arose from that absence; this action was intended to address it; this summary still refers to it. The team can see what needs review without rereading every deliverable to find each occurrence of the point that has moved.

The aim is not to update every document silently. A note already circulated should remain identifiable as a dated statement of the case at that time. The recipient may need a supplement explaining what has changed. Smooth updating and traceable communication serve different purposes and have to be coordinated.

A timeline of the event and a timeline of knowledge

The record states that a check occurred at 3:58 p.m. It is sent to the investigator the following day. The manager who was interviewed may or may not have known the result before the transfer. Those three moments cannot be collapsed into a single date labelled “control known”.

Assistance can help represent these separate timelines. It links the time of the action, the time it was recorded and the evidence about how it was communicated. That precision makes it possible to ask a question that an oversimplified timeline would hide: was the condition in fact satisfied, and did the people who acted have the information they needed in order to rely on it?

The answer does more than attribute an act. It may also illuminate how the control functioned: was the information available in the right place, at the right time and under wording that could be understood? Assistance therefore helps examine both individual conduct and the organisational conditions in which people acted.

This reasoning does not require an exact timestamp for every line. Information known “between completion of the control and the start of execution” may properly be represented as an interval. The system’s value lies in keeping useful uncertainty in the right place, not smoothing the chronology into a neat graphic.

Maintain working memory, not only an audit trail

An audit trail records what was done. Working memory helps the team understand where the case now stands. The two complement each other. An investigator opening the case the next day needs to know that a new document was added, but more importantly which question it helped address.

A handover summary can distinguish consolidated points, questions still open and next actions already decided. It should also make it possible to retrieve why a line of enquiry was set aside. Without that working memory, a team may reopen the same question repeatedly or forget the condition that justified keeping it open.

Continuity does not mean retaining every sentence of every conversation indefinitely. Some discussions are exploratory, some documents are irrelevant and some data must be deleted. Useful working memory should be limited to what is necessary for the mandate and remain compatible with applicable retention rules. The CNIL framework for professional whistleblowing schemes distinguishes purposes and retention stages; it does not propose unlimited archiving of every exchange. [6]

Put corrections in their proper place

A transcription error is not a new contribution to the case. Correcting a speaker attribution should trigger review of the propositions that depended on it. By contrast, the arrival of a new item or an explanation from a person does not, by itself, prove that the earlier analysis was defective.

That distinction helps organise the response. For a correction, the team identifies uses affected by information that should have been represented differently. For new evidence, it identifies the additional contribution. For a change in mandate, it examines a different scope. Using the same “update” button should not erase those different reasons.

A living analysis does not change everything whenever new evidence arrives. It makes visible what has good reason to change.

The practical result is a team able to continue the investigation with less reconstruction work and more attention to what new information actually contributes. That continuity naturally carries through into the quality of reporting.

CHAPTER 05

Pass on an understanding that can be verified

The report should not be the first place where the analysis becomes intelligible. Well-integrated assistance supports reporting throughout the case while preserving the link between what is said, what supports it and the recipient authorised to receive it.

Write from the work already done

A management summary, an interview brief and an investigation report do not serve exactly the same purpose. The first helps organise the next steps. The second prepares information-gathering. The third presents findings and their significance. Assistance adds more value when it uses the relationships already built in the case instead of starting again from a pile of files each time.

In our scenario, the report can draw on the instructions, the payment record, the bank-control document received later and the interviews conducted. The drafting makes visible the stages that the original vocabulary had collapsed together. The summary is not an account of an answer produced by AI; it is an account of the investigative work and of the material retained by the authorised professionals.

Within the field of anti-corruption internal investigations, the AFA-PNF guide recommends reporting the steps taken, the facts, the elements that support or dispel the suspicion, and the limits on access to information. That professional reference concerns the report; it does not validate any AI capability and does not apply indiscriminately to every procedure. [4]

A summary must preserve the relationships that matter

A good summary does not preserve every detail. It preserves the details whose removal would change the reasoning. The recipient does not always need to read every exchange about preparation of the payment. They do need to understand that this approval did not concern the same object as the authorisation to execute.

“The manager had given her approval” may be short and accurate in one sense while still being insufficient for the reader’s purpose. “She had authorised preparation; execution remained subject to separate conditions” preserves the crucial distinction. That is not a cautionary qualification added for style: it is the information needed to understand the process.

Assistance can support this condensation if the summary remains linked to the precise propositions that were examined. It then produces a shorter form of structured analysis rather than a new story reconstructed from the most frequent words. Professional review focuses on fidelity and use, not merely on elegant drafting.

What a report can say about the payment

After reviewing the additional evidence, a report might distinguish the findings as follows:

“The material reviewed distinguishes approval to prepare from authorisation to execute. The 2:10 p.m. email maintains a condition relating to the bank-detail check. The document received later records a check at 3:58 p.m. for the transaction concerned, before the 4:30 p.m. payment. It remains to establish how execution was authorised and how the relevant information reached the people who acted.”

This wording does not claim to close the investigation. It allows the recipient to see genuine progress: the relationship between the condition and the control is now better documented, while the question of authority remains separate. It avoids reducing the entire case to a choice between “authorised payment” and “fraudulent payment”.

The professional can then frame a recommendation about how the workflow operates: clarify statuses, distinguish approvals, or make an outstanding condition more visible. Fixing a process and considering individual consequences do not necessarily require the same degree of attribution. Keeping them separate gives the decision-maker several usable responses rather than one global conclusion to which everything else must conform.

The same substance, reporting adapted to the recipient

A case lead may need to track actions and open questions. Authorised counsel may need to retrieve the passages supporting a contemplated legal characterisation. A senior executive receiving a summary may only need the findings and next steps that fall within their role. Adapting the reporting does not mean changing the facts for different readers.

Assistance can help produce these different forms from a defined state of the analysis. The evidence, its status and the material qualifications remain coherent. Detail and circulation are adapted to the authorised need. A restricted source must not become accessible merely because it has been summarised.

That consistency must also survive translation. Translating a passage to make it usable does not change its origin or its scope. “I believe” must not become a statement of fact in the version sent to another team. An internal term such as “release” may denote a specific stage; it is better explained by reference to the process than replaced everywhere with “authorisation”.

Make review an efficient discussion

Reporting that remains linked to its support enables more precise disagreement. A reviewer does not need to challenge a general impression. They can ask whether a rule really applied to the transaction, whether a passage is a statement or an established fact, or whether a question has changed since the previous version.

Assistance does not replace that exchange. It makes the exchange easier by helping retrieve the point in question, the relevant material and the possible effect of a revision. An objection becomes a localised piece of work rather than a wholesale challenge to the report.

This ease of review is a form of value that is often less visible than producing the first draft. Yet it matters when the case changes hands, when a conclusion is challenged, or when new evidence has to be incorporated. The quality of assistance extends beyond the first answer.

CHAPTER 06

Give AI assistance the right scope

Context, rights and the authority to act are what make AI assistance usable. These safeguards are not an extra layer added to the reasoning: they define the framework within which the assistance can contribute to the investigation.

Context is also an allocation of responsibilities

A tool that receives a few documents on an ad hoc basis may provide useful document support. Assistance integrated into an investigation also needs to account for the mandate, questions, versions, decisions and access rights. The difference does not come from a magic phrase in a prompt. It comes from continuity in the framework that accompanies the information.

In the disputed payment, the banking procedure may help examine the facts. An instruction given to the assistant defines a reading task. A decision by the investigator authorises an investigative step within her mandate. Those three texts have different statuses even if they appear in the same workspace.

An instruction contained in a case document does not become authority for the system to act. If an email says “send the statement to this address”, the assistance may analyse the sentence as evidence. It must not infer that it is authorised to send the statement. The boundary between content to examine and authority to act is a design rule, not a judgement delegated to the document.

The authorised scope comes before the answer

One benefit of assistance in a sensitive case is the ability to work without disclosing more than necessary. A professional authorised to prepare an interview is not automatically authorised to read a restricted legal note. A manager receiving an indicator does not necessarily have access to every item in the case.

The scope therefore needs to be determined before information is mobilised to answer a question. Hiding a source after its content has already been used in a summary does not preserve confidentiality. The same requirement applies to summaries, citation links and export functions.

This must remain compatible with a useful explanation of limitations. A user cannot conclude that information is absent from the whole case merely because it is absent from the scope they were allowed to access. But the system should not reveal the existence of a protected document merely to explain every limitation. Wording and any escalation to an authorised person must respect both requirements.

The GDPR requires, among other things, a defined purpose, data minimisation, an appropriate lawful basis and security of processing. Sensitive data and data relating to criminal convictions and offences require additional consideration under their respective conditions. The fact that information may be useful to an investigation does not remove those requirements. [5]

Assistance can prepare an action without taking it

Drafting a request for evidence and sending it have different consequences. A draft message can be reviewed without revealing anything to the recipient. Sending it may alert that person to the investigation, expose a source or change how people prepare their answers. The function should not receive the same autonomy merely because the two operations sit next to each other on screen.

The same distinction applies between a proposed factual statement and its validation, between text added to a draft and a report that has actually been sent. Assistance can make an action easier to prepare while leaving the decision to the competent authority. That separation automates effort without silently transferring power.

The professional should be able to see the consequences of the proposed action: content, recipient, scope and document status. Meaningful validation requires the ability to modify or reject the proposal and enough time to do so. That is not friction for its own sake; it focuses human decision-making at the point where an action has an effect.

Govern the real use, not merely the name of the feature

A summary may help someone navigate evidence or become the basis for an adverse assessment of a person. A list may organise documents or rank employees according to an estimate of their behaviour. The apparent format therefore does not define the use or the risk.

The CNIL recommends starting from identified needs, defining authorised uses and establishing governance that brings together the relevant expertise. Its Q&A materials also distinguish deployment models and roles in data processing. These are reference points for organising use, not a certificate of compliance attached to the choice of a supplier. [7]

The AI Act likewise has to be considered by reference to the intended purpose of the system, the roles involved and the conditions of application. Certain employment-related uses appear in Annex III. The word “investigation” alone does not determine classification. Transparency obligations, prohibited practices and the high-risk regime are distinct. [8]

For this September 2026 edition, the official implementation timeline notably distinguishes transparency requirements applicable from 2 August 2026 from the application of the Annex III regime from 2 December 2027. Transitional provisions and obligations already in force still need to be considered for the particular system and use concerned. [9]

The GDPR also regulates solely automated decisions that produce legal effects or similarly significantly affect a person, subject to the conditions and exceptions in Article 22. A merely formal human intervention should not be used to disguise the reality of how the decision is made. [5]

Create the conditions for sustainable use

Useful governance identifies who defines use cases, who assesses results, who handles difficulties and who authorises changes. It also distinguishes routine processing from reuse of data for other purposes. Improving a service does not, by itself, authorise sensitive case files to be reused.

Where processing is likely to result in a high risk to the rights and freedoms of individuals, the need for a data protection impact assessment must be considered under the applicable framework. The CNIL sets

out its purpose and conditions. This work can help select concrete measures before deployment instead of merely documenting practices after they have already begun. [11]

These requirements give the team a stable framework: what information may be used, for which task and with what authority. They allow assistance to take a durable place in investigative work rather than remaining an isolated demonstration.

CHAPTER 07

Establish the value of the work produced

The value of AI shows up in the case itself: relevant passages retrieved, distinctions better preserved, sharper questions and analysis that is easier to pick up again. A convincing demonstration should make those outcomes open to examination.

Describe the gain before trying to quantify it

Assistance can create several kinds of value. It may reduce the time needed to retrieve information, make evidence easier to compare, help surface a question that has been overlooked, or make handover easier. Those gains may reinforce one another, but they should not be collapsed into a single productivity number.

Producing a summary quickly does not yet prove that the investigation is more effective. The question is whether the summary preserves the distinctions that matter and what it enables the team to do next. Conversely, assisted reading that brings an important question to light may create an additional investigative step. The case takes longer, but that time answers a need that had previously been poorly identified.

A relevant evaluation therefore distinguishes effort spent producing, effort spent verifying and the usefulness of the result. Value is not simply doing the same number of actions in less time. It may mean choosing better actions, recognising a limitation sooner or making independent review easier.

NIST's AI Risk Management Framework structures, among other things, governance, mapping, measurement and management of AI risks in the context of use. This voluntary framework can help organise an evaluation; it does not replace examination of a product's actual results in a particular use case. [10]

Show the relationship between a capability and its effect

For the disputed payment, a narrow contribution can be tested: does the system retrieve the passages about preparation and control, with their relevant conditions, and connect them to the correct transaction? The expected result is not a single sentence. It lies in preserving the objects being compared and enabling the professional to turn that comparison into a useful question.

A strong demonstration allows the reviewer to see the evidence, the question asked, the response and the work that follows. It specifies the scope, the version used and the conditions under which the result was obtained. Success on this case supports that observation. It does not become a guarantee that the system will make no error on every case.

The scenarios should then be broadened: approval relating to a different object, a condition stated elsewhere in a document, an interview in another language, or a document that has already been superseded. This is not an artificial attempt to make the system fail. It is a way to test the property on which the team intends to rely, rather than the fluency of one particular answer.

The same distinction applies across formats. A function evaluated successfully on text emails should not automatically be treated as equally reliable on an audio recording or a scanned document. Qualification needs to follow the information actually processed and the role it plays in the investigation.

Assess assistance by what it enables

Value sought	Useful observation	What is not enough
Access to information	The relevant passage is retrieved with the useful condition and version.	A large number of documents returned.
Connection	The link, its supporting material and the objects compared are understandable.	An unexplained similarity or score.
Progress of the investigation	A relevant check is identified and its purpose is specified.	A long task list.
Continuity	The contribution of new evidence and the points to revisit are localised.	A completely rewritten summary with no comparison.
Handover	An authorised third party can retrieve the reasons for a conclusion.	A report that is merely shorter or more elegant.

This table does not present LucenOne performance results. It offers a way of recognising observable contributions. Any measurement should be based on situations and work that have actually been examined.

Examine omissions as closely as suggestions

A visible connection is easier to evaluate than a connection the system failed to propose. Yet part of the value of assistance lies in making important material accessible, including material that qualifies the explanation the team is already considering.

To evaluate that coverage, a set of evidence can be reviewed independently to identify the passages relevant to a defined question. System results can then be compared with that reference while preserving the reference's own limits. A list produced by the system cannot, on its own, prove that nothing important was omitted.

The importance of an omission matters as much as the number of omissions. Missing a repetition of a message already considered is not equivalent to missing the only condition that changes the scope of an approval. Expert assessment therefore needs to stay tied to the question and to the role of the information, rather than relying only on an overall retrieval rate.

Likewise, an answer may use different wording while preserving the relationships correctly. Useful reproducibility does not always mean identical phrasing. It means preserving the relevant sources, objects, conditions and limitations that give the result its meaning.

Give professionals reasons to use the assistance

Adoption does not depend only on training people about limitations. It also depends on situations in which users can see the contribution: a search that used to be laborious becomes easy to resume; an interview note reconnects with its source; new evidence links to the right questions; review no longer depends entirely on the person who conducted every interview.

That trust is concrete and revisable. It is built through defined uses, examined results and genuine ability to act on the proposal. A professional may rely heavily on assistance for retrieval while reserving more intensive review for connections that support a sensitive conclusion.

Benefits do not cancel every defect. A report is not acceptable merely because it is fast if it discloses information to an unauthorised recipient. Strong average performance on documentary tasks does not justify assessment of people that has neither been evaluated nor authorised. Value depends on a set of conditions, not on a balance sheet where every strength and weakness can be traded off.

Maintain the standard as the system evolves

A new feature, a new language or a change in processing can alter what the assistance contributes. Monitoring should make clear what was evaluated and under which conditions. A result obtained on a specific version remains useful evidence; it does not remove the need to examine changes that may affect important properties.

The aim is not to prevent improvement. It is to preserve value already established while extending the service on a justified basis. An evolution may provide better context, retrieve passages that were previously hard to access, or make re-examination easier to understand. Those improvements should be demonstrated through the work they make possible.

CONCLUSION

Better-equipped investigations, better-supported judgement

Return to 9:20 a.m. The payment still has to be explained. The assistance has not named a responsible person or closed the case. It has allowed the team to read together material that the files presented separately. It preserved the distinction between preparation and execution and then helped identify the checks capable of making the workflow understandable.

The banking record received later moved part of the analysis forward. Connecting it to the existing questions made one issue narrower without making the questions of authority and information flow disappear. Interviews could be prepared more precisely. Reporting could distinguish what had become better established from what still required work.

That progression gives a more accurate measure of the value of AI in internal investigations. The professional does not simply receive more text. They gain better access to sources, relationships that are easier to examine, proposed actions whose purpose is visible, and working memory that makes the next stage easier to conduct.

The quality of assistance therefore lies in cooperation. The system contributes to organisation and analysis; the professional exercises the judgement, mandate and choices that remain theirs. Safeguards around source, context and access are not obstacles to this gain. They are what make the contribution usable in situations where words, interpretations and decisions have consequences.

The ambition behind LucenOne

LucenOne advocates this approach to assisted investigation: make the substance of the case easier to access, connect evidence to the questions it informs, and help professionals understand what justifies the next step. Artificial intelligence creates value through the work it helps people perform, not through authority attributed to the model itself.

That ambition does not require turning every investigation into a technology demonstration, nor replacing professional analysis with a conversation with a model. It requires an environment in which information, investigative steps and conclusions can remain connected, open to examination and usable by the right people.

What an organisation can expect from such assistance is demanding: less effort lost reconstructing what has already been understood, more attention available for the questions that matter, and a stronger ability to explain the case when responsibility passes to someone else. Trust can be built on those observable contributions.

Connecting information is not only a better way to see the case. It is a way to investigate it better.

To discuss the role of AI in your investigations and a demonstration scenario tailored to your needs: lucen.one. An initial conversation does not require you to share names, evidence or confidential case information.

NOTES

References and scope

The scenarios and tables in this paper are fictional illustrations. They present professional analysis and assessment criteria; they do not report measured LucenOne performance. The sources below support the points to which they are linked, within their respective fields of application.

This paper is not legal advice on any particular situation. The cited texts retain their own conditions and implementation timelines. References were checked for this edition on 9 September 2026.

[1] Lewis et al. - Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP Tasks

NeurIPS 2020; revised arXiv version dated 12 April 2021.

Research combining parametric memory with document retrieval for language-processing tasks. Cited in Chapter 1 for the principle of grounding a response in documents, without extrapolating the experimental performance to LucenOne.

[View the publication](#)

[2] Gao, Yen, Yu and Chen - Enabling Large Language Models to Generate Text with Citations

EMNLP 2023, pp. 6465-6488.

The ALCE work distinguishes fluency, correctness and citation quality in the tasks studied. It supports Chapter 2's distinction between generated text and documentary support. It is not an evaluation of investigation platforms.

[View the paper](#)

[3] Phillips et al., NIST - Four Principles of Explainable Artificial Intelligence

NISTIR 8312, September 2021; published 29 September 2021.

Reference points on explanation, meaningfulness, accuracy and knowledge limits. Used in Chapter 2 to distinguish an examinable documentary relationship from a claim to observe the model's internal workings.

[View the report](#)

[4] AFA and PNF - Practical Guide to Anti-Corruption Internal Investigations

14 March 2023, in particular section 2.3.4, pp. 29-31.

Reference points on the report, investigative steps, facts, material that supports or dispels suspicion, and limits on access to information. Used in Chapter 5 within the anti-corruption context, without treating the guide as a universal procedure or as validation of AI.

[View the guide](#)

[5] Regulation (EU) 2016/679 - General Data Protection Regulation

27 April 2016, in particular Articles 5, 6, 9, 10, 22, 25, 28, 32 and 35.

Principles of processing, lawfulness, data protection and solely automated decision-making. Used in Chapter 6. Each provision retains its own scope and exceptions; this paper does not determine the legal position of any particular processing activity.

[View the GDPR](#)

[6] CNIL - Framework for Professional Whistleblowing Schemes

Deliberation No. 2023-064 of 6 July 2023; published in the Journal officiel on 21 July 2023, in particular section 7.

Data-protection framework for these schemes, including purposes and retention. Used in Chapter 4; it is not the complete legal regime for every internal investigation.

[View the deliberation and annex](#)

[7] CNIL - Q&A on the Use of Generative AI Systems

Initial guidance announced on 18 July 2024; page accessed 9 September 2026.

Needs, use cases, deployment, responsibilities and governance, including question 6. Used in Chapter 6. Institutional recommendations are distinguished from legal obligations that would apply identically to every use.

[View the Q&A](#)

[8] Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 on Artificial Intelligence - AI Act

13 June 2024; consolidated version of 27 July 2026 consulted on EUR-Lex.

In particular Articles 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 50, 111 and 113 and Annex III, point 4. Used in Chapter 6 to distinguish intended purposes, roles and applicable regimes. The acts published in the Official Journal remain authoritative.

[View the consolidated text](#)

[9] European Commission - Timeline for the Implementation of the EU AI Act

AI Act Service Desk; timeline accessed 9 September 2026.

Institutional reference on implementation dates, including amendments from the Digital Omnibus on AI. Used in Chapter 6 to distinguish transparency, high-risk requirements and transition periods. It supports, but does not replace, reading the legal texts.

[View the official timeline](#)

[10] NIST - Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0)

NIST AI 100-1, January 2023.

Voluntary framework for governance, mapping, measurement and management of risk. Used in Chapter 7 for the logic of contextual evaluation. The comparison method proposed in this paper is an editorial application, not a certification result.

[View the AI RMF](#)

[11] CNIL - What You Need to Know About Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs)

Institutional page accessed 9 September 2026.

Conditions and purpose of the DPIA for processing likely to result in a high risk. Used in Chapter 6. The assessment required depends on the characteristics of the processing concerned.

[View the DPIA guidance](#)

A LucenOne publication

You may share this paper in full provided its attribution and notices are retained. Its presentation must preserve its meaning and must not imply LucenOne approval that has not been given.

[lucen.one](#)