© JUN 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 8 Issue 12 | ISSN: 2456-8880

Contextual Aware Wired Robotic Process Automation Agentic Ai System: Tenseai Caw-Rp1 Model

AYUSH MAURYA
RecoilLife Private Limited

Abstract- The Contextual Aware Wired Robotic Process Automation (CAW-RPA) agentic AI system, embodied in the TenseAI CAW-RP1 model, fuses deterministic RPA "doer" capabilities with AI "thinker" functions—namely NLP, ML, and LLMs—to create an autonomous, context-sensitive workflow engine. CAW-RP1 interprets user intent via an LLM/NLP front end, formulates multi-step plans with a reinforcement-learning agent, and executes tasks through RPA bots. A closed-loop feedback mechanism enables continual learning and adaptation. In tests on 100 representative tasks, CAW-RP1 achieved a 98% accuracy rate, 90% task-completion rate, 60% error-recovery rate, and 90% output-quality rating. We compare CAW-RP1 against traditional rule-based RPA and cognitive RPA, highlighting its superior flexibility, autonomy, and ability to handle unstructured data. Finally, we outline future enhancements—multi-agent grouping, advanced learning strategies, and governance features—that will drive the next generation of agentic automation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Robotic Process Automation (RPA) has gained widespread adoption for automating repetitive, rule-based digital tasks, such as data entry and invoice processing, by mimicking human interactions with user interfaces (Lawton). Traditional RPA systems, however, are inherently brittle: any change to the underlying application or process can require manual script updates (Pizurica). To transcend these limitations, the automation community has increasingly incorporated AI techniques—natural language processing (NLP), machine learning (ML), and large language models (LLMs)—leading to the emergence of "cognitive RPA" (Hefnawy). Yet even cognitive RPA largely follows scripted pipelines, lacking genuine autonomy and contextual awareness.

The TenseAI CAW-RP1 model represents a paradigm shift: an agentic automation system that combines RPA's reliable "doing" with AI's adaptive "thinking." CAW-RP1 leverages an LLM/NLP layer to interpret user commands in natural language, a reinforcement-learning agent to plan and schedule subtasks, and RPA bots to execute each action. Crucially, CAW-RP1 includes a closed-loop feedback mechanism that continuously refines its decision policy. This hybrid architecture extends automation to workflows that involve both structured and unstructured data, dynamic decision points, and evolving business rules.

II. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

RPA in its original form excels at automating high-volume, routine processes by replaying recorded user actions or using rule-based scripts ("What is Agentic AI?"). While RPA delivers rapid ROI for well-defined tasks, it cannot handle unstructured inputs—such as free-text emails, scanned documents, or conversational queries—or adapt autonomously to changes in context or environment (Pizurica). Cognitive RPA addresses some of these shortcomings by adding AI components: optical character recognition (OCR) for image-based text extraction, ML classifiers for decision support, and NLP for text parsing (Lawton). Even so, cognitive RPA workflows remain largely static, with limited self-improvement beyond occasional model retraining.

Agentic AI takes the next step, embedding autonomous reasoning and planning within automation. Blueprint describes agentic systems as capable of "perceiving, reasoning, and acting autonomously," using ML and NLP to navigate complex, unpredictable scenarios (Shimmerman). Context awareness—maintaining memory of past interactions, preferences, and process state—enables decisions that go beyond fixed rules. CAW-RP1 is motivated by the need for automation that is both reliable (courtesy of RPA) and adaptive (courtesy of AI), capable of end-to-end process handling with minimal human intervention.

III. SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

Figure 1 illustrates the CAW-RP1 architecture. Incoming user commands or event triggers first reach the NLP/LLM module, which interprets intent, extracts entities, and consults contextual memory (e.g., prior interactions, user profile). The structured output—goal, parameters, and context—is fed to the AI planning agent, implemented via reinforcement learning. The agent dynamically decomposes the goal into an ordered sequence of subtasks (e.g., "download invoices," "extract fields," "enter data into ERP"), optimizing for success probability and efficiency. The resulting action plan is dispatched to the RPA execution engine, where software bots carry out GUI interactions or API calls to fulfill each subtask. Execution outcomes and any exceptions are logged and sent back to the planning agent, closing the feedback loop and enabling continuous policy refinement (Pizurica; Hefnawy).

Figure 1. CAW-RP1 System Architecture.

This hybrid pipeline ensures that CAW-RP1 can handle complex workflows involving both structured (databases, APIs) and unstructured (text, image) inputs. The RL agent's adaptability addresses RPA's brittleness, re-planning on the fly when errors occur or when context shifts.

Core Technologies

1. RPA Engine

Serves as the deterministic backbone, executing user-interface actions or API calls with high reliability. Ideal for structured tasks, it guarantees precise interaction with enterprise systems (UiPath).

2. NLP & LLM

Provides natural language understanding and generation. By leveraging a pre-trained LLM (e.g., GPT-4), CAW-RP1 can parse free-form user requests, extract key parameters, and answer clarifying questions—bridging the gap between human intent and machine execution (Auxiliobits).

3. Machine Learning (Reinforcement Learning)

Drives the planning agent, which learns optimal action sequences through trial and error. Reward signals derive from task success, completion speed, and minimal errors. The RL framework allows CAW-RP1 to improve over time, handling novel situations without explicit reprogramming (Pizurica).

4. Deep Learning

Powers OCR, computer vision, and speech recognition modules to process scanned documents, screenshots, or voice commands. These perceptual components feed structured data into the planning agent, enabling end-to-end automation for tasks previously infeasible for rule-based systems (Lawton).

Workflow Integration

1. Input Reception: User issues a natural-language command (e.g., via chat or email).
2. Contextual Interpretation: LLM/NLP extracts intent and context.
3. Agentic Planning: RL agent decomposes the goal into subtasks and sequences them.
4. RPA Execution: Bots perform the subtasks, interacting with target applications.
5. Monitoring & Feedback: Success and exception data flow back to the agent for learning.
6. Output Delivery: Final results—reports, updated records, or notifications—are generated and delivered to the user.

This orchestration enables CAW-RP1 to manage both predictable and unpredictable process elements seamlessly (Pizurica).

IV. EVALUATION METRICS AND RESULTS

To measure CAW-RP1's effectiveness, we ran 100 representative tasks covering invoice processing, filling Excel database then save, Exploring Web and compliance checks. We defined four metrics:

Metric	Score (per 100)
Accuracy Rate	98
Task Completion Rate	90
Error Recovery	60
Output Quality	90

Table 1. CAW-RP1 Evaluation Metrics (n = 100).

The 98% accuracy reflects RPA's precision, while the 90% completion rate shows strong end-to-end reliability. Error recovery at 60% indicates room for improving exception policies and adaptive re-planning. Output quality, rated by domain experts, averaged 90/100, demonstrating that CAW-RP1 delivers business-acceptable results in most cases.

V. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Traditional RPA automates structured tasks reliably but lacks context sensitivity and adaptability (Lawton). Cognitive RPA adds AI for perception and basic decision making—OCR, NLP, ML classifiers—but workflows remain largely static (Pizurica). CAW-RP1 surpasses both by embedding an autonomous planner that can re-plan on the fly and improve via feedback. This agentic approach expands automation to dynamic, multi-stage processes and reduces human intervention for exception handling (Hefnawy).

VI. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Future TenseAI models will incorporate multi-agent architectures—specialized subagents (e.g., "data-extractor," "validator," "notifier") orchestrated by an LLM master agent—to parallelize workflows (Pizurica). Enhanced continual-learning techniques (meta-learning, few-shot adaptation) will boost error recovery. Governance features—explainable decision trails and human-in-the-loop checkpoints—will address enterprise audit requirements (Blueprint). Domain-specific fine-tuning of LLMs and tighter integration with knowledge bases will further improve contextual accuracy.

CONCLUSION

The CAW-RP1 model illustrates a powerful synthesis of RPA's deterministic reliability and AI's adaptive intelligence. By uniting an LLM/NLP layer, an RL-based planner, and an RPA execution engine in a closed-loop architecture, CAW-RP1 achieves high accuracy, robust task completion, and promising self-improvement capabilities. As the TenseAI series evolves, agentic automation will play a central role in enabling enterprises to automate complex, variable workflows with minimal human oversight.

REFERENCES

[1] Auxiliobits. "LLMs in Agentic Process Automation: Transforming Efficiency." Auxiliobits Blog, 12 May 2025, www.auxiliobits.com/blog/the-role-of-large-language-models-llms-in-agentic-process-automation/.

[2] Hefnawy, Ahmed. "RPA vs. LLM-Based Agents: A Technical Deep Dive for Automation Engineers Shifting to Multi-Agent AI." Medium, 8 Apr. 2025, medium.com/@ahmedhefnawy1811/rpa-vs-llm-based-agents-a-technical-deep-dive-for-automation-engineers-shifting-to-multi-agent-ai-21406c613e37.

[3] Lawton, George. "RPA vs. Cognitive Automation: What Are the Key Differences?" SearchCIO, TechTarget, 14 May 2021, www.techtarget.com/searchcio/feature/RPA-vs-cognitive-automation-What-are-the-key-differences.

[4] Pizurica, Veselin. "The Next-Gen (AI) RPA: The Multi-Agent Concept in Waylay." Waylay Blog, 10 Sept. 2024, www.waylay.io/articles/next-gen-ai-rpa.

[5] "RPA vs. Cognitive Automation: What Are the Key Differences?" UiPath, www.uipath.com/ai/agentic-ai.

[6] Shimmerman, Dan. "From RPA to APA: Unlocking the Next Era of Intelligent Automation." Blueprint Blog, 21 Jan. 2025, www.blueprintsys.com/blog/from-rpa-to-apa.

[7] "From RPA to APA: Unlocking the Next Era of Intelligent Automation." Blue Prism, www.blueprismtsys.com/blog/from-rpa-to-apa. Accessed 18 June 2025.

[8] Hefnawy, Ahmed. "RPA vs. LLM-Based Agents: A Technical Deep Dive for Automation Engineers Shifting to Multi-Agent AI." Medium, 2024, medium.com/@ahmedhefnawy1811/rpa-vs-llm-based-agents-a-technical-deep-dive-for-automation-engineers-shifting-to-multi-agent-ai-21406c613e37. Accessed 18 June 2025.

[9] "RPA and Agentic AI: A Transformational Shift in Automation." Blue Prism, www.blueprismtsys.com/blog/rpa-and-agentic-ai-a-transformational-shift-in-automation. Accessed 18 June 2025.

[10] "RPA vs. Cognitive Automation: What Are the Key Differences?" TechTarget, www.techtarget.com/searchcio/feature/RPA-vs-cognitive-automation-What-are-the-key-differences. Accessed 18 June 2025.

[11] "What Is Agentic AI?" UiPath, www.uipath.com/ai/agentic-ai. Accessed 18 June 2025.

[12] "The Next-Gen(AI) RPA – The Multi-Agent Concept in Waylay." Waylay, www.waylay.io/articles/next-gen-ai-rpa. Accessed 18 June 2025.

[13] "LLMs in Agentic Process Automation: Transforming Efficiency." Auxilobits, www.auxilobits.com/blog/the-role-of-large-language-models-llms-in-agentic-process-automation. Accessed 18 June 2025.