VEOTEQ
INTELLIGENT AUTOMATION

# AI Value Sprint Executive Report

Prepared for Alder & Finch Architects

SAMPLE · FICTIONAL COMPANY

This sample shows the structure and depth of a VEOTEQ AI Value Sprint report. The company, people, systems, and numbers are fictional and illustrative. They are not a client result.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

# Start with AI-assisted submittal review

Alder & Finch Architects is an 85-person architecture firm with three studios. Project teams spend a large share of their week reviewing contractor submittals against specifications, and resubmissions are delaying construction administration.

| 140 | 2.6 h | 18% | 6.5 days |
|---|---|---|---|
| submittals reviewed per month | average review effort each | returned for resubmission | average turnaround |

## Recommendation

Run an eight-week Outcome Pilot of AI-assisted submittal review on two active projects. The assistant classifies incoming submittals, extracts key data, checks them against the project specifications and firm standards, and drafts a reviewer summary. Architects approve, edit, or return every submittal; nothing is issued automatically.

## Why this first

- Highest-value opportunity identified: about 1,300 reviewer hours a year at stake (see page 5).
- Clear owner (Director of Construction Administration) and executive sponsor (Managing Principal).
- Specifications and past submittals are already digital in the document management system.
- Low-risk to start: draft-only output with architect approval on every item.

> **Decision requested:** approve the pilot scope on page 6 and nominate two pilot projects and a reviewer group by the next leadership meeting.

CURRENT PROCESS

# How submittal review works today

Mapped in workshops with construction administration staff, two project architects, and IT.

**1. Receive**
Contractor uploads to the project portal; CA coordinator logs it

**2. Route**
Coordinator finds the right reviewer by email; 0.5–1 day wait

**3. Review**
Architect compares against spec sections and standards by hand

**4. Consultants**
Engineering items forwarded and tracked in a spreadsheet

**5. Respond**
Stamped response returned; log updated manually

## Baseline measures (last 6 months)

| MEASURE | BASELINE | SOURCE |
|---|---|---|
| Submittals reviewed per month | 140 | Project portal export |
| Average review effort per submittal | 2.6 h | Timesheet sample, 60 submittals |
| Share returned for resubmission | 18% | Submittal log |
| Average turnaround | 6.5 days | Submittal log |
| Items missed in review and found later | 9 | Change order notes |

## Root causes

- Spec requirements are checked from memory or by searching long PDFs.
- Routing depends on one coordinator's inbox.
- No structured record of recurring contractor errors to learn from.

OPPORTUNITIES

# Prioritized AI opportunities

Each opportunity was scored with the process owner on value, feasibility, risk, and data readiness.

| OPPORTUNITY | VALUE | FEASIBILITY | RISK | DATA READINESS | PRIORITY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| AI-assisted submittal review | High | High | Low | Ready | **1** |
| Standards and specification assistant | High | High | Low | Partial | **2** |
| RFI drafting support | Medium | Medium | Medium | Partial | 3 |
| Project status reporting | Medium | High | Low | Scattered | 4 |
| Proposal writing assistant | Medium | Medium | Medium | Scattered | 5 |

## Not recommended now

Automated code-compliance sign-off. The risk of relying on AI for a regulated professional judgment is too high until the firm has evidence from lower-risk use cases.

> Opportunity 2 shares most of its foundation with opportunity 1, so the pilot is designed to make it a fast follow-on.

VALUE, CONTROLS, AND APPROACH

# Baseline, ROI assumptions, and controls

## ROI assumptions

| | |
|---|---|
| Review effort today | 364 h / month |
| Target reduction in review effort | 30% |
| Hours returned to architects | ~1,300 h / year |
| Loaded internal cost per hour | $95 |
| Annual benefit from time alone | ~$124,000 |

Not counted: fewer resubmissions, faster turnaround, and fewer items missed in review.

**Investment test:** the expected annual benefit must be at least three times the pilot investment, with payback inside six months.

## Control requirements

- Draft-only: the assistant never issues a response.
- Architect approves, edits, or returns every submittal.
- Access follows existing project permissions in the document system.
- Client content excluded from AI provider model training.
- Every AI suggestion and human decision is logged.
- Data stays in the firm's existing cloud region.

## Technical approach

Provider-neutral options were compared against these controls. Recommended: connect the firm's existing enterprise AI workspace to the document management system through a permission-aware integration, with a submittal-review workflow built on the Document & Quality Review accelerator. A private model option was considered and kept as a fallback if data-residency requirements tighten.

PILOT AND RECOMMENDATION

# Outcome Pilot scope and success measures

## In scope (8 weeks)

- Two active projects, one reviewer group of five architects
- Architectural submittals (Divisions 05–10)
- Classification, extraction, spec checks, draft summary
- Integration with the document system and submittal log
- Training, documentation, and acceptance evidence

## Out of scope

- Engineering consultant submittals
- Automatic issuing of responses
- Changes to the contractor portal
- Code-compliance decisions

## Success measures

| MEASURE | BASELINE | PILOT TARGET |
|---|---|---|
| Review effort per submittal | 2.6 h | 1.8 h or less |
| Returned for resubmission | 18% | 12% or less |
| Average turnaround | 6.5 days | 4.5 days or less |
| Reviewer satisfaction with drafts | n/a | 4 of 5 or higher |

## Go / no-go

Proceed to production if at least three of four targets are met with no control exceptions. Otherwise stop, or adjust scope and re-test, based on the evidence.

**Next steps:** approve scope · nominate projects and reviewers · confirm IT access path · kick off pilot.

This is a sample report. Alder & Finch Architects is a fictional company, and all names, systems, and numbers are illustrative. Your report is built from your own processes, data, and measures.