

03 - HREVN AI Documentation Review File

Structured case file for documentary review and subsequent legal work.

Client	DemoChatBot Ltd.
System	DemoChatBot Assistant
Date	2026-05-02T08:45:12+00:00
Version	intake-bridge-v0.1
Status	Documentary review in progress
Legal note	Preliminary document / not legal advice

Preliminary document · Not legal advice

1. Case identification

Reviewed company	DemoChatBot Ltd.
Internal case reference	demochatbot-chatbot-intake-en-001
Reviewed system	DemoChatBot Assistant
Reference scenario	demochatbot-chatbot-intake-en-001
Generation date	2026-05-02T08:45:12+00:00

2. Documentary review summary

Current case status: Under correction. Applicable legal framework: EU AI Act · transparency, provider review and operational control. The file cannot move toward a closure decision until documentary gaps and pending review blockers are reinforced.

Commercial chatbot with transparency and operational-control gaps

The chatbot is already operating in a real use case, but documentary implementation is still partial across transparency, operational control and evidence.

3. Blocker diagnosis

Case progress is currently constrained by a combination of transparency, privacy and operational-control gaps. While these points remain open, review cannot rely on a sufficiently solid documentary basis.

Finding 'The AI-interaction notice remains partial' remains open.

The AI-interaction notice remains partial	Finding 'The AI-interaction notice remains partial' remains open.
There is still no sufficient basis for chatbot data categories or privacy	Finding 'There is still no sufficient basis for chatbot data categories or privacy' remains open.
Conversation traceability or retention remains unclear	Finding 'Conversation traceability or retention remains unclear' remains open.
No formal human-escalation procedure is documented	Finding 'No formal human-escalation procedure is documented' remains open.

4. Area-by-area documentary review

This section separates what the company declares from what can already be considered sufficiently supported for review based on the evidence currently available. This is where HREVN's main transformation happens.

AI-interaction notice	
Declared by the company	The company declares that some visible notice exists in the interface.
Evidence provided	A partial notice exists, but there is not yet consistency across channels or conversation moments.
HREVN assessment	The AI-interaction notice remains partial and is not enough for a strong documentary posture.
Status	Pending
Required action	Complete the notice copy, visibility and deployment criterion.

Data and privacy	
Declared by the company	The company declares collection of contact and commercial-need data.
Evidence provided	A declared basis exists, but privacy and data categories remain incomplete for review.
HREVN assessment	There is still no sufficient documentary basis on privacy, processed data or access to conversations.
Status	Blocking
Required action	Document data categories, privacy notice and conversation-access workflow.

Human escalation and review	
Declared by the company	The company declares manual handoff to sales or support when the chatbot cannot resolve the enquiry.
Evidence provided	Human escalation is described informally, without a sufficiently formal procedure.
HREVN assessment	There is still no formal human-escalation procedure or sensitive-response review procedure.
Status	Blocking
Required action	Formalise human intervention, thresholds and periodic review.

Provider and usage limits	
Declared by the company	The company declares an external provider and basic setup notes.
Evidence provided	Provider documentation remains partial for strong review.
HREVN assessment	There is still no sufficient basis on provider instructions, usage limits or training-data handling.
Status	Pending
Required action	Collect provider instructions, limits and processing terms.

Traceability and incidents	
Declared by the company	The company declares basic conversation retention and internal follow-up.
Evidence provided	An initial basis exists, but fully sustained traceability and incident handling are still missing.
HREVN assessment	Conversation traceability or retention remains unclear and the incident register is not yet sufficiently mature.
Status	Pending
Required action	Define retention, operational samples and a formal incident register.

5. Control metrics

Open findings	8
Open objections	0
Documented evidence items	5

Assignment posture	Formal ownership is already assigned at intake stage.
---------------------------	---

6. Recommended action plan

The recommended path must combine administrative unblocking and technical continuity. It is not only about correcting the file: first we need a formal record of who is accountable, on what basis and toward which next decision.

Step	Action	Rationale
1	Complete the visible AI-interaction notice.	User-facing transparency remains partial in this version of the case.
2	Formalise the human-escalation path.	Operational control should not rely only on informal practices from the sales or support team.
3	Document data categories and privacy handling.	A clearer documentary basis is needed on collected data, notice and conversation handling.
4	Review provider controls, usage limits and training terms.	Review still depends on a partial basis of provider instructions and limits.
5	Define sensitive-response review and incident handling.	Conversation traceability and incident logging should be operationally sustained.
6	Generate a new file version.	Once transparency, operational control and provider basis are reinforced, a new version should be issued for review.

Next internal step: update remediation

This file supports preliminary documentary review and human review. It does not replace legal judgment.

7. Scope statement

This file is not a legal certification or a declaration of compliance. It summarises the documentary posture of the case from the declared information and supporting evidence, and is intended to support later human review.

This document forms part of an HREVN demonstration generated from a reduced intake form and a limited subset of the legal matrix applicable to the EU AI Act. It is meant to show the documentary workflow and does not amount to a full review based on the complete set of questions, checks and legal provisions that a real file would require. A full review needs broader information and will usually produce a longer document.