

## **Detailed Use Case Description: Form One User Suggestion Rejection Feedback Loop**

### **Use Case**

Form One is an AI-powered report assistance capability that helps officers complete structured fields in web-based forms using body-worn camera transcripts, officer dictation, and other available structured inputs. Officers remain in control: suggestions are never auto-submitted, and officers can accept, edit, or ignore them while completing the report.

This use case is intended to help Axon understand, in a privacy-preserving way, how well Form One's field-level suggestions are performing when users complete reports. To improve suggestion quality, the system may use multiple AI models tailored to different field types. For each form field that an officer ultimately enters, the system evaluates whether the AI suggestion matched and, when it did not, classifies the primary failure mode using a small set of durable categories: wrong selection, hallucination, or missed context. It also records a coarse entity type for the field value, such as person, location, date/time, or identifier. The final artifact is a table of pseudonymized, field-level outcomes captured from eligible customer tenants. Raw form content and source transcripts are not stored in this feedback artifact.

### **June 8, 2026 Addendum**

As of June 8, 2026, Axon proposes replacing the pseudonymized Field ID previously described in this use case with a normalized field name. The normalized field name is generated through an LLM-based normalization process that removes agency names, officer names, email addresses, agency-specific identifiers, jurisdiction-specific identifiers, and other potentially identifying information prior to export. This change is intended to improve field-level error analysis while maintaining privacy protections.

### **June 24, 2026 Addendum**

As of June 24, 2026, Axon proposes evaluating Form One extraction quality for customers using Axon RMS. For eligible customers, Form One-generated field predictions may be compared against the final values entered into corresponding Axon RMS forms. The purpose of this comparison is to measure extraction performance and identify recurring extraction failure modes.

The comparison is performed within the Customer Cloud and is intended solely for product quality evaluation. The resulting outputs are limited to field-level error classifications and aggregate extraction quality metrics. No transcript content, form content, or field values are exported as part of this evaluation process.

### **Customer Benefit**

This use case helps Axon improve Form One by showing where AI-generated field suggestions are working well and where they are falling short. Because the exported data captures error category and entity type at the field level, Axon can analyze recurring patterns by field type and

workflow without storing report content. That supports product improvement in suggestion quality while preserving officer control over final form submission.

### **June 8, 2026 Addendum**

As of June 8, 2026, Axon proposes exporting normalized field names in place of pseudonymized Field IDs. This enables more actionable field-level analytics by allowing recurring error patterns to be analyzed across semantically equivalent fields while continuing to avoid storage of report content, field values, transcripts, or other identifying information.

### **June 24, 2026 Addendum**

This capability enables Axon to understand how accurately Form One extracts information from transcripts and where extraction failures occur. By analyzing recurring extraction error patterns across form fields, Axon can improve extraction quality, reduce common failure modes, and increase the usefulness of Form One suggestions while preserving customer privacy.

### **Data Accessed**

For eligible use of this feature, Axon may access information about each submitted form and the outcome for each evaluated field. The exported data model consists of a pseudonymized Organization ID, pseudonymized User ID, pseudonymized Form ID, pseudonymized Field ID, Entity Type, Error Category, and Date. No raw form content, transcripts, dictation, or field values are extracted, and only categorical outcomes are exported.

### **June 8, 2026 Addendum**

As of June 8, 2026, Axon proposes modifying the exported data model to include a normalized field name rather than a pseudonymized Field ID. The normalized field name is generated through an LLM-based normalization process that removes or generalizes potentially identifying information contained within field names prior to export.

### **June 24, 2026 Addendum**

For customers using Axon RMS, Axon may access:

- Form One-generated field predictions.
- The corresponding completed Axon RMS form fields used for comparison.
- Associated field metadata required to perform extraction quality evaluation.

These data sources are used solely to determine whether a predicted value matched the final form value and to classify extraction errors. Transcript content, completed form values, and report content are not exported as part of the evaluation artifact.

## **How Axon Uses the Data**

Axon uses this information to understand how users interact with AI-generated field suggestions in Form One and to measure where the system fails to produce the right suggestion. For each field where the suggestion did not match the officer-entered value, the system classifies the failure as wrong selection, hallucination, or missed context, and pairs that with a coarse entity type. Axon personnel can then review aggregated patterns in these field-level outcomes to improve extraction quality, reduce recurring error modes, and prioritize product improvements. This use case is for product improvement and analytics only and does not change production behavior or the user experience. These insights may be used to evaluate and improve multiple AI models tailored to different field types.

## **June 8, 2026 Addendum**

As of June 8, 2026, Axon proposes using normalized field names to support field-level analytics and aggregation. Normalized field names allow Axon personnel to identify recurring error patterns across similar fields while avoiding retention of raw field names that may contain agency-specific or other identifying information.

## **June 24, 2026 Addendum**

Axon uses this information to evaluate extraction performance and identify recurring extraction failure modes. For each evaluated field, the system may classify the outcome into one of several extraction error categories, including hallucination, cross-field contamination, field semantic misinterpretation, over-included content, under-included content, or incorrect value.

Axon personnel review aggregate patterns and metrics derived from these classifications to improve extraction quality and evaluate extraction models. This process is intended for analytics and product improvement purposes only.

## **Privacy-Preserving Technique**

The privacy protection here comes from minimizing what is exported. The exported artifact contains only pseudonymized identifiers and categorical labels such as entity type and error category. It does not include raw form values, report content, transcripts, dictation text, names, emails, phone numbers, dates of birth, addresses, case numbers, plates, VINs, badge numbers, unit IDs, or other identifying tokens. Axon achieves this by using a Large Language Model (“LLM”) inside the Customer Cloud which classifies the reason for a user rejecting a Form One Suggestion, without a human ever seeing the raw form content. Multiple AI models may be used within the Customer Cloud to support these classifications, without exposing raw content externally.

## **June 8, 2026 Addendum**

As of June 8, 2026, Axon proposes applying an LLM-based field-name normalization process within the Customer Cloud before export. This process removes or generalizes potentially identifying information contained in field names, including agency names, officer names, email addresses, agency-specific identifiers, jurisdiction-specific identifiers, suspect names, witness names, and similar identifiers.

Example:

- Alpha Police Department Years of Service → Police Department Years of Service
- Gamma Police 52 Division Cross Street 2 → Police Division Cross Street 2

## **June 24, 2026 Addendum**

As of June 24, 2026, extraction quality evaluation is performed within the Customer Cloud. Any AI-generated field predictions used for evaluation remain within the customer boundary and are used solely for comparison against completed form fields.

Only derived metrics and error classifications are exported. Transcript content, report content, form values, model predictions, personally identifiable information, and other customer data are not exported. The exported artifact contains only quantitative metrics, aggregate statistics, and predefined error category labels required for extraction quality analysis.

## **Data Schema**

The extracted data is as follows:

- Organization ID: a pseudonymized identifier for the customer organization.
- User ID: a pseudonymized identifier for the user who completed the form.
- Form ID: a pseudonymized identifier for a single submitted form instance.
- Field ID: a pseudonymized identifier of the field being evaluated, such as an incident location or incident time field.
- Entity Type: a broad category describing the kind of value involved, such as person, location, date/time, identifier, vehicle, free text, or other.
- Error Category: the type of suggestion failure, limited to wrong selection, hallucination, or missed context.
- Date: the calendar date the form was submitted.

## **June 8, 2026 Addendum**

The Field ID field described above is proposed to be replaced with a Normalized Field Name field. The normalized field name preserves the semantic meaning of the field while removing potentially identifying information prior to export.

### **June 24, 2026 Addendum**

For extraction quality evaluation, the exported artifact may additionally contain:

- Extraction Error Category: A classification describing the primary extraction failure mode, such as hallucination, cross-field contamination, field semantic misinterpretation, over-included content, under-included content, or incorrect value.
- Extraction Evaluation Outcome: A categorical indicator describing whether the generated prediction matched the final form value.
- Aggregate Metric Records: Derived statistics used to measure extraction quality across fields, forms, and workflows.

No field values, predicted values, transcript content, or form content are included in these records.

### **Examples of What May Be Reviewed**

A reviewed record may show that, for a particular submitted form, the field “xyz123” (pseudonymized version of “incident\_type”) had entity type “location” and error category “missed\_context”, or that field “abc987” (pseudonymized version of “incident\_time”) was classified as a suggestion rejection because the model suggested one date but the officer entered another.

### **June 8, 2026 Addendum**

Under the proposed change, reviewed records would contain normalized field names such as “Incident Location” or “Incident Time” rather than pseudonymized Field IDs.

### **June 24, 2026 Addendum**

AI-generated field predictions used during extraction quality evaluation are not exported as part of the review artifact. The exported artifact does not retain transcript content, completed form values, generated field values, report narratives, or other customer content. Only derived error classifications, normalized field names, pseudonymized identifiers, and aggregate extraction quality metrics are retained.

### **Examples of What Is Not Retained in Original Form**

This use case is not intended to retain raw form content, source transcripts, dictation, field values, or other identifying report content in the exported review artifact. It is also not intended to retain real names, emails, phone numbers, dates of birth, addresses, case numbers, license plates, VINs, badge numbers, unit IDs, or similar identifying tokens in exported rows. The exported artifact is intentionally limited to pseudonymized identifiers plus categorical outcomes.

## **June 8, 2026 Addendum**

Original field names containing agency names, officer names, email addresses, agency-specific identifiers, jurisdiction-specific identifiers, or other potentially identifying information would not be retained in exported records. Only normalized field names would be exported.

## **Retention Period**

Axon retains only the sanitized, extracted field-level outcome data for a limited period no longer than necessary to support product improvement for this use case. The exported artifact is limited to pseudonymized identifiers and categorical labels rather than report content itself.

## **Preservation of Original Content**

This use case does not modify the customer's original records, submitted forms, source transcripts, or live product behavior. It operates in analysis mode only and is intended to support product improvement without changing production routing, model responses, or user experience. Original customer content remains unchanged.

## **Withdrawal**

Customers participating in this use case may request withdrawal. After withdrawal, Axon would stop collecting new data for this use case from that customer. Previously generated de-identified or pseudonymized derivative insights may continue to be retained where permitted and where they no longer identify the customer, user, or original report content.

## **Summary**

This use case helps Axon improve Form One by reviewing privacy-protected, field-level outcomes from eligible customer form submissions. Rather than exporting report content, the system exports only pseudonymized identifiers plus categorical information about the type of field involved and the kind of suggestion failure that occurred. That allows Axon to improve Form One's suggestion quality without storing raw form content, transcripts, dictation, or field values in the review artifact.

### **June 8, 2026 Addendum**

Under the proposed change, the exported artifact would contain pseudonymized identifiers, normalized field names, and error categories. No raw field names, field values, report content, transcripts, or dictation would be exported.

### **June 24, 2026 Addendum**

Under the proposed extraction quality evaluation workflow, Axon may compare Form One-generated field predictions against completed Axon RMS form fields within the Customer Cloud. The exported artifact remains limited to normalized field names, pseudonymized identifiers, extraction error classifications, and aggregate metrics. No transcript content, form content, field values, or model predictions are exported.