Means-test and billing discrepancies — 4 rules written, tested 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

Reconciliation of the means-test file, the attendance records and the changes of circumstance declared · 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. **No rule goes live without the early years coordinator's signature**, and that is precisely what makes it defensible against a family disputing its invoice.

The 26 discrepancies of the last half-year, in detail

Nature of the discrepancy	Number	Effect on the invoice	Amount	What the family would have seen
Means-test figure not updated after a declared change of circumstance	**10**	Rate calculated on the old figure	**€214.80 billed wrongly**	An invoice too high after a job loss

Nature of the discrepancy	Number	Effect on the invoice	Amount	What the family would have seen
Attendance hours recorded twice across two rooms	**7**	Hours billed twice	**€186.40 billed wrongly**	A total matching no planning sheet
Absence deduction not applied despite the certificate on file	**5**	Absence billed	**€147.50 billed wrongly**	A justified absence billed anyway
Invoice issued after the recorded leaving date	**4**	Contract closed, invoice issued	**—**	An invoice after the child had left
Booked hours not billed for want of an up-to-date contract	**included above**	Income not billed	**€291.50 not billed**	Nothing — and that is the problem
Total	**26**	—	**€291.50 / €548.70**	—

The amount is not the main subject, and it is better said plainly to the council: €583.00 and €1,097.40 over a year is not what decides a project. **What decides is that each of those 52 lines is a complaint waiting to happen**: a letter, a phone call, an appointment, an adjustment — and a parent leaving with the belief that the service got it wrong about their child. **52 complaints that never arrive are worth, in case-officer time, more than double the amounts at stake.**

The 4 control rules, written and run over 24 months of billing

Rule	Wording, in the language of your operating rules	Alerts over 24 months	Confirmed	Confirmation rate
A	An invoice calculated on a means-test figure whose update date predates the last recorded change of circumstance	**48**	**45**	**93.7%**

Rule	Wording, in the language of your operating rules	Alerts over 24 months	Confirmed	Confirmation rate
B	The same attendance hour recorded in two rooms, in the same time slot	**26**	**24**	**92.3%**
C	An invoice issued after the leaving date recorded on the contract	**16**	**16**	**100%**
D	An invoice calculated at the floor rate when no means-test figure has been looked up for twelve months	**22**	**19**	**86.4%**
Total	—	**112**	**104**	**92.9%**

What the four rules let through, and you should know it before you sign: 104 of the 113 discrepancies found over the period are covered — 92.0%. The remaining 9 come down to situations no rule will see: a contract changed verbally and never entered, shared custody whose split is written down nowhere. Those are fixed at data entry, not by a control — **and I bring them to you individually rather than folding them into a rate. Rule D is the one worth most to families:** an invoice at the floor rate for want of a means-test figure means **19 families who would have had a lower rate had they filed the document** — here the control works for them, not against them.

Rule B — why it is the tightened version that is put to you

Drafting	Alerts over 24 months	Confirmed	Confirmation rate	Families looked at for nothing
First drafting — any attendance recorded twice in a day	71	24	33.8%	**47**
Tightened version — the same time slot	**26**	**24**	**92.3%**	**2**

Drafting	Alerts over 24 months	Confirmed	Confirmation rate	Families looked at for nothing
Difference	**−45**	**all 24 true cases kept**	**+58.5 points**	**45 families spared**

The order of going live I recommend, and the arithmetic behind it

Order	Rule	Why this one first	Review load in the first run
1	**C**	100% confirmed — no review time wasted	4 alerts, 1 h 00
2	**A**	The largest volume of rate billed wrongly	24 alerts, 6 h 00
3	**B**	Tightened version, immediate effect on double recording	13 alerts, 3 h 15
4	**D**	Works for families: a missing means-test figure means a rate too high	11 alerts, 2 h 45
All four in the same month	—	**Advised against, and here is why**	**56 alerts, about 14 h in the middle of panel preparation**

> **The withdrawal threshold, written in advance: a rule that falls below 80% confirmation in a run has families reviewed for nothing.** In that case I warn you in the run concerned, **with the tightened version already written and already run over the history**. **And withdrawal is as simple as going live: a rule stops on a word, instantly, and the lines it had set aside go back into billing with the reason and the date of the withdrawal.** Nothing is blocked permanently, nothing disappears.

Rules brought into service — C ☐ A ☐ B ☐ D ☐ — settled by the early years coordinator, on: ______

Confirmation threshold below which the rule is reviewed: ______ % (proposed: 80%)

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.

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.