

YOUR AI ACT COMPLIANCE SNAPSHOT

Legal Intake Assistant

Based on the information supplied, RRCS identified your likely AI Act role, preliminary risk route and current compliance readiness.

ASSESSMENT DATE

August 9, 2026 8:18 pm

REPORT ID

fd2262f617ab621aab

EU AI ACT SCOPE

Likely in scope

CONFIDENCE

Medium



R · RISK

Transparency obligations with elevated review needs

General legal information and consultation booking, with limited decision support, do not clearly match an Annex III or Annex I high-risk route on these facts.

Article 53 GPAI provider obligations

R · ROLE

Likely provider and deployer

The chatbot appears to be offered under the firm's name and purpose, suggesting the firm places it on the market or puts it into service.

Article 3(3) Definition

Article 16 Provider obligations

CS · COMPLIANCE SCORE

61 / 100

The Compliance Score is calculated by AAMS, not by the AI, and only against the safeguards relevant to your use, role and risk route. Requirements that apply from a later date are listed separately and do not reduce it.

HOW THE SCORE WAS REACHED

Safeguards counted, and their weight

Only the safeguards relevant to your role and risk route are counted. Each one is weighted, so the same answers always produce the same number.

SAFEGUARD	REPORTED STATE	WEIGHT	COUNTED
AI literacy Article 4 AI literacy	In place	0.80	0.80
Responsibility and escalation Article 26 Deployer obligations	In place	1.30	1.30
Risk review process Article 9 Risk management system	Partly in place	1.35	0.68
Transparency and disclosure Article 50 Transparency obligations	In place	1.00	1.00
Human oversight Article 14 Human oversight	Not in place	1.25	0.00
System documentation Article 11 Technical documentation Annex IV Contents	Partly in place	1.25	0.63
Monitoring and incident response Article 72 Post-market monitoring Article 73 Serious incident reporting	Partly in place	1.15	0.58
Weighted total		8.10	4.98

4.98 of 8.10 weighted points = 61 / 100

A solid start with an incomplete file. The main safeguards exist, but the evidence behind them may not hold up to scrutiny. Ask us to review the documentation.

hello@aiactmadesimple.eu

Needs a deeper check: some EU countries have implemented their own compliance legislation in addition to the EU AI Act.

CURRENT GAPS

Relevant today and incomplete

Add oversight for legal-information outputs

No lawyer reviews answers before display, creating a risk of misleading or unsuitable legal information.

Article 14 Human oversight

Complete a documented risk review

The review is only partly complete and should address legal-information accuracy, user reliance and escalation.

Article 9 Risk management system

Strengthen monitoring

Monitoring is only partly in place for errors, complaints, harmful outputs and booking impacts.

Article 72 Post-market monitoring

Article 73 Serious incident reporting

EXECUTIVE SNAPSHOT

Your current position

The firm is likely both provider and deployer of an AI chatbot. No clear prohibited or high-risk route is identified, but chatbot transparency, documented risk review, lawyer oversight and monitoring need attention.

PROFESSIONAL VALIDATION

Matters raised by this assessment

These topics are selected from the information available in this snapshot. They are not a checklist, legal advice or implementation instructions.

01

Introduce lawyer oversight and escalation: Define when answers must be withheld, qualified or escalated to a lawyer.

02

Complete the risk and documentation review: Record intended purpose, limitations, testing, known risks and corrective actions.

03

Improve output and incident monitoring: Track errors, complaints and problematic answers, with a process for rapid correction.

PROFESSIONAL VALIDATION

Move from snapshot to qualified validation

We can validate the preliminary role and risk route, review the available evidence and prepare a tailored quotation for any work that may be appropriate after professional analysis.

Request validation and quotation

See all your answers to the questionnaire

system-name	Legal Intake Assistant
use-case	Our law firm's website has an AI chatbot that answers general legal questions from anonymous visitors and helps them decide whether to book a consultation with one of our lawyers. No lawyer reviews individual chatbot answers before they are shown.
eu-scope	yes
organisation-activity	built-or-commissioned
role-name-check	ours
role-purpose-check	mainly-us
people-impact	possibly
sensitive-area	other-important-decisions
decision-influence	limited-support
system-capabilities	direct-interaction
ai-interaction-notice	yes
synthetic-authenticity	no
safety-function	no
prohibited-signals	none
literacy	yes

responsibility	yes
risk-review	partly
transparency-readiness	yes
human-oversight	no
documentation	partly
monitoring	partly

Important limitation

This report is an indicative snapshot based exclusively on the answers and information supplied by the user. It does not constitute legal advice, a formal AI Act classification, a conformity assessment, certification or confirmation of compliance. The result may contain errors and should be validated by qualified professionals before it is used for legal, compliance or operational decisions.

The readiness percentage describes the reported implementation status of the controls selected by the RRCS analysis. It does not measure legal certainty and does not guarantee compliance.