

---

W H I T E P A P E R

# DEPLAW

*Orchestrated Legal Automation.*

---

AI Agents in Legal Advisory:

## Orchestrated, Not Autonomous.

AI can massively accelerate legal work. But only when deployed in a controlled manner — not as an independent decision-maker, but as a precise tool within a clear process. This whitepaper explains the difference — and why it is strategically relevant for CEOs and COOs.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 01** The Promise of Autonomous AI — and Its Price
- 02** The Core Problem: Same Case, Different Outcome
- 03** The Fallacy: More Intelligence = Less Control
- 04** Autonomous vs. Orchestrated — a Direct Comparison
- 05** AI as Instrument, Not as Conductor
- 06** What Orchestrated AI Concretely Delivers
- 07** Process Standards as a Foundation for Control
- 08** What This Means for CEOs and COOs
- 09** The Next Step

FOR CEOs AND COOS

# Agentic AI: Tempting, but irresponsible?

AI is increasingly being used in legal processes. The latest development: so-called “agentic AI” — systems designed to independently complete tasks, make decisions, and pursue goals without a human approving every step.

This sounds like maximum efficiency gains. But in legal practice, independently acting systems hit a hard limit: in law, it must always be clear who decided what and why. Legal processes are chains of accountability — and those must not disappear inside software.

## Four questions autonomous AI cannot answer

### 1. Who made the decision?

Autonomous systems blur the chain of accountability between action and decision-maker.

### 2. On what basis?

When a system decides based on probabilities rather than clear rules, there is no traceable rationale — for internal reviews or for courts.

### 3. At what point in time?

In law, the timing of an action is critical. Legal proceedings have deadlines and dependencies.

### 4. With what alternatives?

Legal work is risk management. Assessments must be based on clear criteria — not statistical probabilities that may change from case to case.

## R I S K

# Same case, different outcome — an untenable risk.

The core problem with autonomous AI in law: it does not deliver the same result every time. Autonomous systems adapt their behavior situationally and work with probabilities instead of fixed rules.

**In concrete terms: the same set of facts may be processed differently today than yesterday — without anyone knowing why. In law, this is not progress. It is a risk no organization should knowingly take.**

## 1. Predictable processes are mandatory

Legal processes need workflows that function the same way every time. When a document arrives, it must be clear what happens next — not “approximately,” but exactly.

## 2. Predictable escalation paths

When a case deviates from the norm, there must be a clear escalation path — not one the AI invents on its own.

## 3. Clear boundary between human and machine

At which points does the AI decide, at which does a human? This must be defined in advance — not left to chance.

*“The more intelligent the system, the clearer the framework must be. Because what is technically possible creates the responsibility to clearly define what is operationally intended.”*

— Tim Platner, CEO, Legal Data Technology GmbH

## GOVERNANCE

# It is not intelligence that decides — but the rules of the game.

A common misconception: “The better the AI, the less we need to worry about processes.” In practice, the opposite is true. Without clearly defined workflows, you are hoping the AI will figure it out — effectively surrendering control.

The decisive question is not how smart the AI is — but whether it operates within a clear framework. The best AI results come not from giving AI more freedom, but from better rules.

**Autonomous systems make decisions that cannot be traced from the outside. For management, this means: you bear responsibility for outcomes you cannot explain. This is neither regulatory defensible nor commercially prudent.**

## What this means for management

✗ **No audit trail**

When AI decides autonomously, there is no way to prove afterward why it decided that way. Regulatory documentation requirements are systematically violated.

✗ **No process control**

When AI determines when and how a step is executed, management effectively loses control over operations.

✗ **No liability management**

When an error occurs, there is no traceable chain of reasoning. Yet liability rests entirely with you — not with the AI.

## COMPARISON

## Two approaches, one goal.

The alternative is not to forgo AI — but to embed it within an orchestrated framework.

Autonomous Systems	Orchestrated Systems
Nobody can explain why the AI decided that way	Every step is traceable and auditable
AI acts without defined boundaries	Clear boundaries: what the AI may do, what humans decide
Decisions disappear into a black box	Every single step is fully documented
Unclear who is responsible for what	Clear responsibilities and approval processes
High liability risks	Enterprise-ready and compliance-compliant
AI acts independently and uncontrolled	AI works as a precise tool within fixed rules
Becomes a problem as compliance requirements grow	Scales seamlessly with compliance requirements

## THE PRINCIPLE

# Orchestration, not autonomy.

The solution is not less AI — but AI with clear rules. Think of it like an orchestra: the musicians (AI agents) are highly talented, but they play from a score (the workflow) and under the direction of a conductor (the process control).

**The AI never decides whether something happens — only how well the task it was assigned is executed. You determine the process.**

## Three building blocks of the principle

<b>Processes</b>	Your business processes are mapped as visual workflows — step by step. Everyone knows what comes next. Nothing happens unexpectedly.
<b>AI Agents</b>	The AI handles precisely defined tasks — e.g. reading a document and extracting the key data. Nothing more, nothing less.
<b>Orchestration</b>	DEPLAW is the central control unit. It determines when each step is executed, who is notified, and what happens in case of exceptions.

*„Der KI-Agent ist ein Werkzeug im Orchester — kein Dirigent. Die Prozesslogik liegt beim Menschen.“*

— Sebastian Adams, CTO, Legal Data Technology GmbH

## IN PRACTICE

## Concrete areas of application.

In DEPLAW, AI handles individual, clearly defined tasks within a business process. It receives a task, completes it, and passes the result to the next step. Nothing more.

<b>Document Analysis</b>	Who is suing? By when must we respond? What amount is at stake? The AI reads the document and delivers the answers in seconds.
<b>Classification</b>	Is it a lawsuit, a payment order, or an inquiry? The AI identifies the document type and automatically routes it to the correct process.
<b>Text Generation</b>	Based on the case file, the AI drafts response letters, summaries, or statements of claim — which are then reviewed by a lawyer.
<b>Quality Assurance</b>	Before a letter goes out, the AI checks: Is all information complete? Do the facts match the case file?
<b>Fact Extraction</b>	The AI reads incoming briefs, identifies the relevant facts, and transfers them in a structured manner into the digital case file.

### Three governance guarantees

✓ **No autonomous action**

No AI agent acts independently. Every AI task is part of a workflow your employees have defined. Final decisions are always made by a human.

✓ **Full auditability**

What did the AI read? What did it produce? When? Everything is fully documented — retrievable for internal reviews, audits, or in case of disputes.

✓ **Human override at any time**

Your employees can intervene at any time, review results, or make corrections. The AI makes suggestions — the final decision rests with humans.

## FOUNDATION

# Clear processes instead of invisible decisions.

DEPLAW uses an internationally established standard for process workflows (BPMN). This means: your legal workflows are mapped as visual flowcharts — understandable for lawyers, executives, and auditors alike. This creates something autonomous systems cannot offer: complete transparency.

<b>Open standard</b>	The standard is internationally recognized. Your processes belong to you — they are not tied to any single vendor.
<b>Usable without IT skills</b>	Your domain experts can create and modify processes themselves — via drag-and-drop, without programmers.
<b>Auditable</b>	Every change to a process is automatically documented: who changed what, and when? Traceable at any time.
<b>Immediately operational</b>	What you see in the diagram runs exactly that way in the system. There is no translation gap between plan and reality.
<b>Scalable</b>	Even with hundreds of different process types, you maintain oversight — and can adjust individual workflows at any time without disrupting operations.

**In short: BPMN is the shared language between your domain experts and the technology. Lawyers define the process, the platform executes it — traceably, controllably, and scalably.**

## STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

# Three decisions that need to be made now.

The question is not whether AI will be used in legal case processing. The question is how — and who retains control.

**1. KI-Strategie definieren: Orchestration statt Autonomie**

Make a deliberate choice for AI that operates within clear rules. Autonomous systems may appear simpler at first glance — in the long run, they create risks you cannot control.

**2. Processes als strategisches Asset begreifen**

If your legal workflows are not clearly documented and modeled, you lose control — no matter how good the AI is. Defined processes are the foundation of any sustainable automation.

**3. Build in compliance from the start**

Regulatory requirements are growing. Every AI decision must be traceable, documented, and correctable. Do not see this as a constraint — but as a quality differentiator that sets you apart from vendors with opaque systems.

**The future of legal tech is orchestrated**

Autonomous AI may be technologically fascinating. For legal processes, it is structurally unsuitable.

**Legal tech does not improve by having systems “act on their own,” but by optimally supporting people within clearly orchestrated processes.**

## TAKE ACTION

# What happens next?

Every collaboration starts with a conversation. We listen first — and then show you concretely how controlled AI can improve your specific processes.

## The onboarding process

<b>30 Minutes</b>	Initial contact & fit assessment — open, without sales pressure
<b>90 Minutes</b>	Individuelle Demo angepasst an Ihre Branche und Processes
<b>Follow-up</b>	Technical deep-dive — architecture, AI governance, integration
<b>Optional</b>	Joint profitability assessment — realistic, not optimistic
<b>Start</b>	Pilot project or direct start depending on your preference

## Three questions we answer in the initial meeting

- How can AI support your legal workflows — without surrendering control?
- How much of your case work can realistically be automated?
- How quickly will you see initial results — and what is a realistic timeline?

**Your contact**

Legal Data Technology GmbH

**Tim Platner, CEO**

info@legaldata.tech | 0202 25625 001

[legaldata.tech/demo](https://legaldata.tech/demo)**DEPLAW — Orchestrated Legal Automation.**

One system. All processes. Fully automated.