



Charge anomalies — 18 north-sector lines, 4 rules run over 24 months

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

Document issued on 24/09/2026

Charge-payer file reconciled against the lift log · 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 — households, addresses, names and amounts invented for the demonstration. **None of these 18 lines went out on an invoice:** they came out of the file and went into the checking queue. **The four rules below are written and already run over 24 months of log — they are waiting for a signature, not for a study.**

The 10 lines of income not billed — €612.00

Line	Address and household (fictional)	Finding	Standing charge	Lifts beyond the allowance	Not billed
N-04	12 rue du Pressoir, Marnaville — Rachid Belmokhtar	Bin lifted 9 times, no active contract at the address	€74.00	9 × €2.40 = €21.60	€95.60

Line	Address and household (fictional)	Finding	Standing charge	Lifts beyond the allowance	Not billed
N-07	3 impasse des Aulnes, Marnaville — Solène Vaugirard	Contract closed in 2024, occupier present, 8 lifts	€74.00	€19.20	€93.20
N-11	27 route de Belveau, Chanteroy — Ismaël Kervadec	Property recorded as vacant, 11 lifts	€74.00	€26.40	€100.40
N-15	8 allée des Charmilles, Chanteroy — Léonie Assouline	Contract in the name of a departed owner, 7 lifts	€74.00	€16.80	€90.80
N-19	41 rue Basse, Vaux-le-Sec — Tanguy Mirebeau	Address absent from the charge-payer file, 6 lifts	€74.00	€14.40	€88.40
N-23	2 chemin du Lavoir, Vaux-le-Sec — Fadila Nourissier	Undeclared subdivision of a property, 10 lifts	€74.00	€24.00	€98.00
N-26	16 rue des Tilleuls, Marnaville — Gaspard Ollivry	Contract entered two months late — <i>standing charge already billed</i>	—	€12.00	€12.00
N-31	9 place de l'Église, Sombreval — Anaïs Trémorin	Unreadable chip, 4 lifts recorded at the flat rate	—	€9.60	€9.60
N-34	5 rue du Moulin, Sombreval — Youssef Barranquilla	Chip unreadable since March, 5 lifts	—	€12.00	€12.00

Line	Address and household (fictional)	Finding	Standing charge	Lifts beyond the allowance	Not billed
N-38	21 lotissement des Genêts, Chanteroy — Hélène Peyrichoux	Chip torn off, 5 lifts	—	€12.00	€12.00
Total	10 lines	6 standing charges + 70 lifts	€444.00	€168.00	€612.00

The 8 lines billed wrongly or to the wrong payer — €966.00

Line	Address and household (fictional)	Finding	Standing charge	Lifts counted wrongly	Billed wrongly
N-02	14 rue de la Poterne, Marnaville — communal bin, Les Cordeliers building	Communal bin chip duplicated on the bin at no. 16 — 78 lifts counted twice	—	78 × €2.40 = €187.20	€187.20
N-09	5 rue Neuve, Chanteroy — communal bin, Résidence du Parc	Same identifier as the bin at no. 7 — 72 lifts	—	€172.80	€172.80
N-13	30 avenue de la Gare, Marnaville — Fournil du Vallon bakery (assimilated trade waste)	Chip identical to the neighbouring restaurant's — 41 lifts	—	€98.40	€98.40
N-17	12 zone du Pré-Long, Vaux-le-Sec — Kervella garage	38 lifts counted twice	—	€91.20	€91.20

Line	Address and household (fictional)	Finding	Standing charge	Lifts counted wrongly	Billed wrongly
N-21	4 rue du Commerce, Sombreval — Le Panier de Sombreval store	35 lifts counted twice	—	€84.00	€84.00
N-28	18 rue des Écoles, Chanteroy — Marguerite Delacourt, left on 14 April	Half-year standing charge + 16 lifts by the new occupier	€74.00	€38.40	€112.40
N-33	7 hameau de Fontenailles, Vaux-le-Sec — Bastien Ravoire, left on 2 May	Standing charge + 15 lifts by the new occupier	€74.00	€36.00	€110.00
N-36	25 rue Haute, Sombreval — Clémence Ithurbide, left on 21 March	Standing charge + 15 lifts by the new occupier	€74.00	€36.00	€110.00
Total	8 lines	3 standing charges + 310 lifts	€222.00	€744.00	€966.00

The five duplicate chips account on their own for €633.60 out of €966.00. That is no accident: **a duplicate almost always sits on a heavily lifted bin** — a communal building bin or an assimilated trade bin, emptied several times a week. **That is exactly why rule B was written first, and why it tightens on the interval rather than on the day** (see below). **A chip duplicated on a household bin costs a few euros; on a building bin it costs a full half-year to two households at once.**

The four control rules, written in the language of your by-law, run over 24 months

Rule	What it says	Alerts / 24 months	Confirmed on examination	Confirmed share	What it lets through
A	A chip read when no contract is active at the address on the day of the lift	412	389	94.4%	23 contracts entered late — fixed at data entry
B	The same chip read twice less than two hours apart, on two different rounds	196	183	93.3%	13 bins emptied after a round incident
C	A standing charge billed to a payer whose departure the service has recorded	148	148	100%	—
D	A lift recorded with no readable bin identifier	68	61	89.7%	7 new bins not yet paired to a contract
All four together	—	824	781	94.8%	43 alerts examined for nothing out of 824

Rule D exists because the first three were letting something through, and you needed to know it before signing. 68 lifts had been recorded at the flat rate for want of a readable chip: none of rules A, B or C saw them, since there was

no contract in default, no double reading and no recorded departure. **Rule D was written for that hole, then run over the same 24 months before being put to you. A rule proposed to you without measuring what it misses is not a rule, it is a hunch.**

Rule B: what the measurement changed between the first drafting and the one put to you

Drafting	Alerts / 24 months	Confirmed	Confirmed share	Households examined for nothing
First — <i>the same chip read twice on the same day</i>	341	183	53.7%	158
Tightened — <i>less than two hours apart, on two different rounds</i>	196	183	93.3%	13
Difference	-145	0 — all 183 genuine cases kept	+39.7 points	-145 households spared

It is the tightened version that is put to you, not the first. The difference fits in one sentence: **the first drafting made you examine 158 households to confirm 183; the second makes you examine 13 to confirm the same 183. No genuine case was lost.** The same measuring work will be redone on every rule, campaign after campaign: **a rule that drops below 80% confirmation is making you examine households for nothing, and the tightened version is brought to you from the campaign concerned, already run over the history.**

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

Campaign	Rule switched on	Expected alerts (backlog included)	Examination at 10 min a line	Expected confirmed share
1st	C — 100% confirmation, no time wasted	90	15 h	100%
2nd	+ A — the largest volume of unbilled income	168	28 h	94.4%
3rd	+ B — tightened version	82	13 h 40	93.3%
4th	+ D — the hole left by the first three	38	6 h 20	89.7%
All four on the same day	A + B + C + D	378	63 h, mid-campaign	94.8%

I advise against switching all four rules on the same day, and I cost it: 378 alerts on the first campaign, i.e. around 63 hours of examination for your 6 case officers — at the precise moment they are preparing the billing. One rule per campaign is 15 hours the first time, and you keep control of what you look at. The first campaign picks up the backlog — anomalies that have lain undisturbed for several half-years; the following campaigns settle around 206 alerts, which is the real pace of 824 alerts across the four campaigns of 24 months. This is a recommendation, not a condition: if you want all four straight away, they are ready.

Withdrawal is as simple as go-live. A rule stops with a word, within the second, and the lines it had put into checking go back into billing with the reason and the date of the withdrawal. Nothing is blocked for good, nothing

disappears, nothing is lost. And bringing a rule into force stays with the service: a rule goes live only once approved by the head of the waste service — **which is precisely what makes it defensible against a resident who disputes their invoice.**

Rules adopted and go-live order settled by the head of the waste service, on: _____

Confirmation threshold below which a rule is tightened or withdrawn — proposed at 80% — set at: _____

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.