



What the agent does on its own, and what is logged

LINDBERGH FORMATION — 16 rue de Maillé, 91310 Montlhéry, France · Companies register (RCS) Evry 817 946 114

Document issued on 24/09/2026

Settings adopted by the personal tax office · fictional document

Fictional document — demonstration example

This document is produced by the Blue Lemon Agent website to illustrate what an AI agent hands to its users. The companies, matters, amounts and people in it are invented. It has no legal, accounting or commercial value.

Fictional document, produced for the demonstration. **Three unprompted actions, not one more, each named, each withdrawable with a word and each reversible in both directions. Everything else waits on a request from the office.**

The three unprompted actions

Action	Rhythm	Recipient	Withdrawal	Measured effect
Matching the office's 52 standard answers against the texts and the published guidance	Every night	The office, in the morning	One word, immediate effect	Substantive corrections 1.7 % → 0.4 %

Action	Rhythm	Recipient	Withdrawal	Measured effect
One-page record of the letters and answers sent the previous day; weekly record on Monday	Every morning, every Monday	The office alone — nothing is sent outside	One word	Time to answer a message 9 days → 1 day
Flagging a question on the rise, before it fills the switchboard	When the threshold set by the office is crossed	The head of office and the deputy	One word	Declaration of property holdings: ×3 in three weeks, 1,240 contacts — answer, front-desk notice and message to the 4,800 households concerned written and waiting

Every action works in both directions. A standard answer the office withdraws leaves the answers served at the same hour: the agent never serves information the office has decided to withdraw. A flagging threshold can be raised as easily as it is lowered, and the daily record can be switched off with nothing else changing.

Who decides what

Act	Who decides	Basis	What the agent hands over, ready
-----	-------------	-------	----------------------------------

Computing the tax and putting it into collection	The DGFIP applications and the officer who validates them	Article 22 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 — right not to be subject to a decision producing legal effects based solely on automated processing	Nothing: the AI agent plays no part in it
Time to pay, discretionary remission	The collecting accountant	Delegation decision in force	Request processed, supporting documents checked, payment plan built on the declared capacity, decision drafted in the office's own template
Decision on an individual file	The case officer	Office organisation	File assembled, breakdown set out, missing documents already requested
Bringing a reference answer into force	The head of office	Office organisation	Written, sourced, dated version, replaced line alongside — 5 minutes of validation
Sending a reminder outside the mandate	An officer of the collection unit	Article 1 of the mandate	Draft letter written and sourced
Signing the answer to a claim	The officer named in the delegation	Articles R*196-2 and R*198-10 of the French book of tax procedures for the deadlines	Reasoned draft, deadlines set from the date the claim was presented

The activity indicator, if the directorate asks for one

Granularity proposed	What it shows	What it lets you decide
By question	Where the flow concentrates, which reference answers carry the office	Where to put the effort next quarter
By channel	Where the public turns up, and at what hours	Which hours to open, which channel to reinforce
By time slot	When the load falls, week by week	Staffing the rota over the six peak weeks
By reminder file	Deadlines met, files opened and settled	Sizing the collection unit for the next due date

The agent produces an indicator per officer if the office asks for it — the decision belongs to the office. And it says why it proposes another granularity, mechanically and not morally: the day « answers per officer » becomes a tracked figure, it becomes a target; people answer fast rather than right, the difficult file is transferred instead of handled, and the indicator stops measuring the service to measure the reaction to the indicator. The record by question shows what the office gives back to the taxpayer, it can be presented in a meeting without naming anyone, and it actually decides something. One constant exception, and it is not really one: whoever signs is named — a signature is not a counter.

The four conditions drafted, should an individual indicator be adopted

Condition	Text	State
Prior information of the officers	Articles 12 and 13 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Note drafted, ready to circulate
Written purpose and proportionality of the measure	Article 5(1)(b) and (c) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Drafted

Condition	Text	State
Bounded retention period	Article 5(1)(e) of Regulation (EU) 2016/679	Drafted
Consultation of the staff representative body	Referral to the social administration committee	Draft referral written

Indicator granularity adopted by the directorate: _____

Threshold for flagging a question on the rise, settled by the office: _____

Unprompted actions kept, suspended or withdrawn at the review: _____

Scope of this document: the service operated by Blue Lemon Agent. For an agent deployed at your premises, the applicable location is that of the architecture set out in the quotation and verified before commissioning; local execution is announced only for the configuration explicitly described and accepted in the quotation; the applicable isolation depends on the deployment mode set out in the quotation, no dedicated isolation being presumed; the encryption mechanisms in transit and at rest, their components and key management are those documented for the architecture chosen; roles and permissions are configured and accepted for the identities and systems actually connected; the events logged, their content, their retention period and who may access them are defined for the deployment chosen.