



Scoring check — 41 discrepancies across 3,180 applications

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

Document issued on 24/09/2026

Recalculation of the adopted scale, year just ended · 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. **The recalculation applies the scale the urban authority adopted on 18 November 2025 — it invents no line and weights none differently. Every discrepancy is presented with the line of the scale concerned and the document on file that grounds it.**

What the recalculation found

	Number	Share of the 3,180 applications	Direction of the discrepancy
Scores that agree	3,139	98.7 %	—
Discrepancies against the applicant	29	0.9 %	Points not counted although a document on file justified them

	Number	Share of the 3,180 applications	Direction of the discrepancy
Discrepancies in the applicant's favour	12	0.4 %	Points counted with no document on file
Total discrepancies	41	1.3 %	—

The five causes behind the 41 discrepancies

Cause	Discrepancies	Line of the scale	What explains it
Overcrowding not counted	14	Scale, line 6 — 12 points	The household composition had been updated after the score was entered
Waiting time rounded down to the completed month instead of the month begun	11	Scale, line 2 — 1 point per half-year	Two possible readings of the line; the one in the adopted scale is the month begun
Internal transfer not flagged	8	Scale, line 9 — 8 points	The transfer file was not attached to the application
Priority points counted with no dated document	6	Scale, line 4 — 20 points	Discrepancy in the applicant's favour — the document has since been supplied in 5 cases out of 6
Rent-to-income ratio calculated excluding charges	2	Scale, line 7 — 6 points	The estate's rent statement had changed between entry and sitting

None of these discrepancies is a fault: eleven out of forty-one come from a line of the scale that reads two ways, fourteen from a document that arrived after the score was entered. **What a systematic recalculation brings is that the discrepancy is seen**

before the sitting rather than after the appeal. Of the 23 written challenges last year, 6 bore on a score: all 6 would have been avoided.

One discrepancy in detail — application 2025-02017

Line of the scale	Points entered by hand	Points recalculated	Document on file grounding the recalculation
Line 2 — waiting time on the application	8	8	Unique number, registration date of 4 March 2023
Line 6 — overcrowding	0	12	Birth certificate of the third child, filed on 19 January 2026 — later than the score entry
Line 7 — rent-to-income ratio	6	6	2024 tax assessment notice, rent statement in force
Line 9 — internal transfer	0	0	Not applicable
Total	14	26	A 12-point discrepancy against the household

The recalculation is reproducible: the same application run again in six months gives the same total, and the arithmetic prints. That is what separates a calculation from an appraisal — and it is why the total is shown, while the ranking between three households stays with the committee, in keeping with article 22 of the General Data Protection Regulation, which gives every person the right not to be subject to a decision producing legal effects based solely on automated processing.

What is put to the board

Proposal	What it changes	Decision
----------	-----------------	----------

Systematic recalculation of the score before every sitting	Discrepancies are seen before the committee; 6 challenges out of 23 avoided	_____
Clarify line 2 of the scale — month begun or month completed	11 discrepancies disappear of their own accord	_____
State in the standing orders the display order and the right to depart from it	The committee's freedom of appraisal becomes written and enforceable	_____

Board meeting at which these three points are tabled: _____

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.