



Where Val d'Ancenoy's topics, notes and deliberations live

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

Document issued on 24/09/2026

Hosting, role-based access, record of processing activities, traceability · 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. **It is written to be handed as it stands to your data protection officer**: every line is verifiable against a configuration or a log, none rests on a statement of intent. **The list of what an authority monitors is itself strategic information: it is the first thing to protect.**

Where the agent runs — two architectures, one consequence

Architecture	What leaves the agglomeration's network	Exposure to the Cloud Act and FISA 702	When to choose it
Local inference, on a machine in the agglomeration	Nothing. No flow leaves the network.	Reduced to the minimum — no flow leaves the network	When the authority has a server room and wants total isolation

Architecture	What leaves the agglomeration's network	Exposure to the Cloud Act and FISA 702	When to choose it
Dedicated, isolated resource hosted in France, under French law	Nothing leaves the territory or the European Union	Reduced by the architecture; location alone is not enough, and the exposure is documented for the configuration chosen	The common case — operation and updates handled by us
Pooling between authorities	Not practised. Your monitoring scope feeds no other environment.	—	—
Options by level of requirement	SecNumCloud, and HDS for a health scope	—	A single architecture for GDPR and for reducing extraterritorial exposure

The agent's access, source by source — what is open and what is not

Source	Agent's access	Documentation service's access	What that rules out in practice
Document management system — notes, guides, procedures, resolutions	Read-only	Read and write	No collection document can be amended, deleted or overwritten by the agent

Source	Agent's access	Documentation service's access	What that rules out in practice
The service's own catalogue	Read-only	Read and write	The agent marks « to check »; it rewrites nothing itself
The 41 public official sources	Read-only	Read	—
Buyer profile — procurement exercises in preparation	Read-only, limited to subject, estimated value and timetable	Read	Companies' tender submissions and bids are not open
Residents' files and named planning applications	No access	Not applicable	Regulatory monitoring has no use for them: they are not open at all
Individual staff files	No access	Not applicable	Including for HR monitoring, which bears on texts, not on people
Intranet — bulletin opening statistics	Read-only, aggregated	Read	No individual reading record: the measurement covers the issue, not the subscriber
Service mailbox	Sends drafts to the documentation service only	Read and write	The agent cannot write to any department or member municipality

The principle behind this table is article 5.1.c GDPR: only data necessary to the purpose pursued is exposed. Regulatory monitoring bears on texts; it needs no

resident's file and no staff file to work. **Every access right in the table above is withdrawn with a word, and the withdrawal takes effect within the second** — no restart, no intervention, no delay. **And the agent plugs into what exists: no migration, no re-cataloguing, no change of tool imposed on the service.**

The service's record of processing activities, already written

Processing	Purpose	Legal basis	Data processed	Retention set by the authority
Regulatory and documentary monitoring	Informing services of applicable developments	Public interest task — art. 6.1.e GDPR	Public texts, monitored topics, internal documents — no resident data	Retention period of the document collection
Documentary search requests	Serving departments and member municipalities	Public interest task — art. 6.1.e	Requester, subject of the request, scope retained, items served	2 years after closure
Targeted alerts and acknowledgements	Establishing that the recipient service was informed	Public interest task — art. 6.1.e	Recipient service, named officer, date sent, date acknowledged	Retention period of the circulated note
Bulletin readership statistics	Measuring the reach of circulation	Public interest task — art. 6.1.e	Aggregates per issue — no individual record	3 years
Read and production log	Tracing who read what, and where each note comes from	Security obligation — art. 32 GDPR	Timestamp, role, reason, object consulted	3 years

The periods above are those the authority has set in its own record, on a date the record carries. They are not presented as a rule of law: the law sets principles — necessity, minimisation, storage limitation —, the authority derives periods from them and owns them. **A thirty-minute annual review with your data protection officer brings you the list of access rights that served no purpose over the year and the retention periods that have run out. You decide what to close and what to erase; the agent brings the list rather than waiting to be asked.**

What you produce the day a circulated note contains an error

Record	What it establishes	Where it is taken from	Time to produce
1 — The note itself	Every statement with the link to its official source, the version of the text as at the date of writing, and the text's three dates — publication, entry into force, deadline to act	Archived bulletin or alert, official sources	Immediate
2 — Who signed	Name of the public official who read and circulated it, date and time. Over the year: 48 bulletins, 48 signatures; 96 alerts, 96 signatures; 0 circulations without a signature.	Circulation log	Immediate
3 — What each person knew, and when	The artificial intelligence disclosure made in the first sentence of every exchange, and the option to ask for a public official — 74 asked, 74 got one	Disclosure and hand-over log	Immediate

Record	What it establishes	Where it is taken from	Time to produce
4 — The reissue, if the note was wrong	The corrected version, dated, sent to the same recipients with a statement of what changed — and the earlier version kept exactly as it was circulated, because a service may have acted on it. 3 reissues over the year, all out the same day.	Note version history	Immediate
5 — A member of staff's access file, on request	Their search requests, their acknowledgements, the reads made of their file and their stated reason — right of access under article 15 GDPR	All the sources above	One minute — the usual difficulty is assembling the records; they are already assembled

The artificial intelligence disclosure is not a configuration option. Article 50(1) of the EU AI Act has required, since 2 August 2026, that anyone interacting with an AI system be informed, except where this is obvious. It is built into the welcome message, on every channel open to departments and member municipalities. **And it is logged: it is that trace that makes it demonstrable, not the statement.**

Architecture retained — local inference or isolated resource hosted in France — settled on: _____

Date of the annual review with the data protection officer: _____