



The document collection — 214 outdated citations and 4 rules run across 36 months

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

Document issued on 24/09/2026

18,400 documents reconciled against the texts they cite · 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 — guides, procedures and citations invented for the demonstration. **No collection document has been amended:** the 214 are marked « to check » and the replacement paragraph is proposed to their author. **The agent marks, proposes and dates; the guide's author decides and signs.**

The 31 outdated citations inside documents that make people act

Document	Outdated citations	Pages concerned	Nature of the change	State of the proposal
Agglomeration procurement guide (44 pages)	7	7, 12, 19, 24, 31, 36, 40	4 thresholds amended, 2 article references, 1 text replaced	7 replacement paragraphs drafted

Document	Outdated citations	Pages concerned	Nature of the change	State of the proposal
« Development control and site notices » guide (38 pages)	6	9, 14, 17, 22, 29, 33	3 article references, 2 items amended, 1 decision to comment on	6 paragraphs drafted
Delegations guide (26 pages)	5	4, 11, 15, 18, 23	5 article references	5 paragraphs drafted
9 other guides	9	—	Article references and replaced texts	9 paragraphs drafted
4 service procedures	4	—	Article references	4 paragraphs drafted
Total for documents in service	31	—	—	31 paragraphs drafted, 0 documents amended

Every proposal arrives with four elements, and that is what makes it reviewable in two minutes: the page and paragraph concerned, the current wording reproduced as it stands, the text that amended it, with its official link and its publication date, and the replacement paragraph, drafted in the guide's own style. The service reads 31 paragraphs; it does not reopen 27 guides.

The four control rules, written in the language of your topic sheets, run across 36 months

Rule	What it says	Alerts / 36 months	Confirmed on examination	Share confirmed	What it lets through
------	--------------	--------------------	--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------

A	A published text whose entry into force is deferred and which has no alert addressed to a named service fifteen days beforehand	168	159	94.6%	9 topics monitored for information, with no recipient service
B	A collection document citing a text amended or repealed after it was written	214	196	91.6%	18 citations as history — entirely legitimate
C	A court decision handed down on a text that one of your guides comments on	74	74	100%	—
D	A text of immediate application touching a monitored topic	57	49	85.9%	8 texts with no bearing on the responsibilities exercised
All four together	—	513	478	93.2%	35 alerts examined for nothing out of 513

Rule D exists because the first three let through what costs the most, and you had to know it before signing. 57 texts entered into force on the very day they were published: no deferred entry, so nothing to flag fifteen days ahead.

Rule A does not see them — and they are precisely the ones that leave no catch-up margin. Two of the five texts that arrived too late last year were of that kind. Rule D was written for that hole, then run across the same 36 months before being put to you. A rule proposed without measuring what it misses is not a rule, it is a hunch.

What the four rules cover of the 514 gaps found

Nature of the gap	Found over 36 months	Covered by the 4 rules	Coverage
Impact text flagged after entry into force	182	171	94.0%
Collection document citing an outdated text	241	223	92.5%
Decision handed down on a text commented on by a guide	91	84	92.3%
Total across 36 months	514	478	93.0%
Annualised	171	159	—

The go-live schedule — one rule per quarter, and the arithmetic behind it

Quarter	Rule switched on	Expected alerts (backlog included)	Examination at 10 min a line	Expected share confirmed
1st	C — 100% confirmation, no examination time wasted	24	4 h	100%

Quarter	Rule switched on	Expected alerts (backlog included)	Examination at 10 min a line	Expected share confirmed
2nd	+ A — deferred-entry texts, the ones that leave a margin	46	7 h 40	94.6%
3rd	+ B — catching up the collection	58	9 h 40	91.6%
4th	+ D — texts of immediate application	16	2 h 40	85.9%
All four on the same day, in Q1	A + B + C + D	196	32 h 40, for a three-person service	93.2%

I advise against switching all four rules on the same day, and I cost that advice: **196 alerts in the first quarter, i.e. roughly 32 h 40 of examination for three people who already put out a bulletin every week. One rule per quarter is 4 hours the first time, and you keep control of what you look at. The first quarter picks up the backlog — citations dormant for several years; at steady state, the four rules produce 171 alerts a year, 159 of them confirmed. This is a recommendation, not a condition: if you want all four straight away, they are ready.**

The 18 historical citations are the example of what a rule must learn to stop flagging. A guide that recalls a repealed text to explain where a rule comes from is entirely right to do so. Their authors marked them « historical », with a word, with their reason and their date — and they no longer come up. A rule that flags what is fine ends up not being read at all, and that is how a control mechanism dies. Withdrawing a rule is as simple as switching it on: it stops with a word, and the documents it had marked return to their previous

state with the reason and the date of the withdrawal.

The 31 replacement paragraphs approved by their authors and settled by the head of service, on: _____

Rules retained and go-live order — confirmation threshold proposed at 80% — set on: _____

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.