

Document Relay

From a scanned invoice to an approved record in another system.

Fictional invoices · Recorded 2026-10-09 · CPU execution

The screenshot shows the 'Document Relay' web application interface. At the top, there's a header with the 'QUARKEON LABS' logo and a 'LOCAL DEMONSTRATION' button. Below the header, a navigation bar indicates the current step: '01 / INPUT'. The main content area is divided into two panels. The left panel, titled 'Choose an input', shows a 'Demonstration case' dropdown set to 'Clear invoice - ready for review'. Below this is a preview of a scanned invoice and a 'Run analysis' button. The right panel, titled 'Inspect the evidence', shows the results of the analysis. It includes a 'Workflow state' of 'pending review', an 'OCR word confidence' of '95.4 / 100', and 'Validation flags' of '0'. A preview of the 'DEMO / PURCHASE INVOICE' is shown, with fields for 'Invoice number: QK-2026-001', 'Supplier: Demo Precision Components', 'Date: 2026-09-30', 'Currency: EUR', 'Net: 100.00', 'Tax: 21.00', and 'Total: 121.00'. At the bottom, there are input fields for 'invoice number', 'supplier', and 'date', with values 'QK-2026-001', 'Demo Precision Components', and '2026-09-30' respectively.

The problem

Extracting fields does not complete an administrative process: data needs review, delivery, traceability and failure recovery.

What the demo does

Tesseract reads the image, rules validate the fields and a person corrects and approves. HTTP delivery reaches a separate SQLite-backed service with idempotency keys, a receipt and retries that preserve approved work.

Recorded evidence

Check	Recorded result
Fields correctly extracted before review	81 of 84
HTTP delivery and recovery checks	8 of 8

Data and method

12 generated invoice scans with clear, rotated and blurred variants, including one arithmetic mismatch. Eight real HTTP integration checks against a separate SQLite-backed ledger.

Limits that matter

Same bounded invoice layout. No general invoice-parser accuracy claim. OCR missed punctuation in some invoice numbers; every document requires human review. The receiving ledger is a demonstration system, not a customer ERP or bank.

What we could build with you

A document workflow connected to the destination API, with review, traceability, deduplication and agreed maintenance.

What we would agree first

Layouts and fields, human review, duplicate rules, destination API, retention, credentials and recovery.

Evidence and contact

Video, complete evaluation and bilingual case: <https://quarkeon-website.pages.dev/en/projects/document-relay/>

Discuss a scoped pilot: <https://www.upwork.com/agencies/2108116767018789544>

Independent demonstration, not customer work. Metrics apply only to the described inputs and checks. Photos, data and model provenance are recorded in the private application repository; public data retains its original license.