Consumption anomalies — 4 rules over 24 months, 214 missing notices

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

Document issued on 24/09/2026

59,600 readings and the smart metering log run against the article L. 2224-12-4 III bis threshold · 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 — customers, volumes and amounts invented for the demonstration. **The four rules below are written and already run over 24 months of readings — they are waiting for a signature, not for a study. A rule is judged not on what it catches, but on what it catches WRONGLY and on what it lets through: both columns are here.**

The four rules, written in the language of your service by-law

Rule	What it says	Alerts / 24 months	Confirmed	Confirmed share	What it lets through

A	**Consumption for the period exceeds double the average of the last three periods — the very threshold of article L. 2224-12-4 III bis**	**1,042**	**986**	**94.6%**	56 genuine, explicable rises — pool, extra occupant, watering
B	**The reading is lower than the previous index**	**318**	**297**	**93.4%**	21 meters replaced without the index being carried over
C	**Zero consumption over two consecutive periods while the contract is active**	**274**	**251**	**91.6%**	23 second homes genuinely unoccupied
D — on the 6,258 smart meters	**A non-zero night flow for seven consecutive nights**	**386**	**371**	**96.1%**	**Sees nothing on the 8,642 manually read meters**
All four together	—	**2,020**	**1,905**	**94.3%**	**115 customers examined for nothing out of 2,020**

Rule D is the only one that sees the leak BEFORE the reading, and that is what sets it apart. A, B and C correct an invoice; **D stops it existing.** A non-zero night flow for seven consecutive nights on a domestic meter has practically no explanation other than a leak — **and 371 confirmations out of 386 alerts show it. That is why it is proposed first, even though rule A carries the statutory threshold.**

LINDBERGH FORMATION — a simplified joint-stock company with share capital of €250,000 · Registered office: 16 rue de Maillé, 91310 Montlhéry, France · Companies register (RCS) Evry 817 946 114 · SIRET 817 946 114 00029 · VAT FR 60 817 946 114 · "Blue Lemon Agent" trade mark · Training-provider registration no. 119 108 635 91 (Île-de-France prefect — this registration does not amount to State approval) · Qualiopi certified, no. 03896, for the "training actions" category · contact@bluelemonagent.ai · dpo@bluelemonagent.ai · Hosted in France.

What rule D has gained, and what it will not gain

Measure	Value	Basis of calculation
Leaks seen before the reading, over 24 months	**371**	Smart metering log, rule D
Average lead over detection at the reading	**118 days**	Gap between the 7th night and the date of the next reading
Volume that did not go into the ground	**21,889 m³**	371 × 118 days × 0.50 m³/day of average observed leak flow
Valued at the production and distribution cost	**€18,386.76**	21,889 m³ × €0.84/m³, 2025 annual report
Effect on network yield (P104.3)	**+ 0.4 of a point — 78.4% would become 78.8%**	10,944 m³/year removed from 490,320 m³ of losses
What this does NOT fix	**490,320 m³ of losses remain on the network, not past the meter**	**No billing rule will go and find them — that is a pipe renewal question**

> **The honest figure is the one on the last line, and it does not flatter rule D. 0.4 of a point of yield is not what will lift your indicator in front of the water agency. What rule D really gives you is 371 customers who did not receive a three-figure invoice** — and, incidentally, 371 complaints that never reached the switchboard. **Selling 0.4 of a point of yield as a result would have you deciding on the wrong number.**

Extending smart metering, costed — an open question, not an answer

Scope	Meters	Rule D alerts / 24 months	What remains to be measured
Smart-metered fleet today	**6,258 — 42%**	**386**	—
Manually read fleet	8,642 — 58%	0	**Leaks there are seen at the reading, up to six months later**
Whole fleet, same rule	**14,900 — 100%**	**919**	**386 ÷ 42%**
The protocol proposed	—	—	**Compare, at the next campaign, the average value of leak files among smart-metered customers and among the rest. That gap is what will say whether replacing the meters pays for itself — and the agent does not promise it.**

The 214 notices that were not sent — and what they cost

Item	Value	Basis
Leak-past-the-meter files for the year	640	Complaint log
Customers who received no notice within the meaning of III bis	**214 — 33.4%**	Reconciliation of the letter log and the readings
Volume above double the average, across those 214 files	**22,500 m³**	An average of 105.1 m³ per file
Valued at the drinking water variable rate	**€38,700.00**	22,500 m³ × €1.72/m³, resolution of 11/12/2025

Item	Value	Basis
Recoverable share	**€0.00**	**« Failing the information […], the customer is not liable for payment of the share of consumption exceeding double the average consumption » — art. L. 2224-12-4 III bis**
Sanitation share and water agency levies on those volumes	Handled file by file	Article 21 of the service by-law — a contractual regime, distinct from III bis

Those 214 files are not a dispute: they are extinguished debts. The text requires neither fault nor negligence — **it is enough that the notice was not given.** And the notice must go out **« as soon as the service observes »** the abnormal increase, **and at the latest when the invoice based on the reading is sent. That is a deadline only processing at the point of reading can meet: twelve days of average lead time, as today, is already too late on part of the files.**

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

Drafting	Alerts / 24 months	Confirmed	Confirmed share	Customers examined for nothing
First — *zero consumption over one period*	742	251	33.8%	**491**
Tightened — *zero consumption over two consecutive periods*	**274**	**251**	**91.6%**	**23**
Difference	**− 468**	**0 — all 251 genuine cases kept**	**+ 57.8 points**	**− 468 customers spared**

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

Campaign	Rule switched on	Expected alerts (backlog included)	Examination at 15 min a line	Expected confirmed share
1st	**D — the only one that sees the leak before the reading**	**116**	**29 h**	**96.1%**
2nd	+ A — the statutory threshold, the one that triggers the notice	268	67 h	94.6%
3rd	+ B — reversed index	118	29 h 30	93.4%
4th	+ C — tightened version	102	25 h 30	91.6%
All four on the same day, across the 6 rounds	**A + B + C + D**	**604**	**151 h, mid-campaign**	**94.3%**
All four, on reading round no. 2 alone	**A + B + C + D**	**129**	**32 h 15**	**94.3%**

> **Withdrawal is as simple as go-live — with one exception that is not the agent's. 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. But the article L. 2224-12-4 III bis notice goes out as soon as consumption exceeds double the average, even with rule A switched off. That is not a safeguard the agent imposes on itself: it is the condition on which the service keeps the right to bill the excess share. A rule that drops below 85% confirmation is flagged from the campaign concerned, with the tightened version already written and already run over the history.

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

Confirmation threshold below which a rule is tightened or withdrawn — proposed at 85% — 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.