



Scope — what the agent does, and what extends it

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

Document issued on 24/09/2026

62 % of the dispute tomorrow · 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. **This document says what the orchestrated agent does not do well**, and which offer to turn to instead — because a scope announced too broadly is paid for on the first real file.

Sequence, process, platform: three different things

Object	Definition	Distinguishing sign	Offer
Sequence	A series of actions in the same order, inside one team	It looks the same every day	Orchestrated agent
Process	A chain of steps crossing several departments, each waiting on a decision from the one before	The path changes with the amount or the case	Process automation

Object	Definition	Distinguishing sign	Offer
Shared foundation for several agents	Access rights, a single log, shared supervision	Two agents to connect side by side	Agent platform

The client dispute, broken down

Step of the dispute	Nature	Share of time spent	Who takes it on
Building the claim file	Repetitive	27 %	Orchestrated agent
Gathering the evidence from the trace	Repetitive	21 %	Orchestrated agent
Preparing the credit note as a draft	Repetitive	14 %	Orchestrated agent
Sub-total available right now	—	62 % of the quarter's 41 disputes	—
Commercial arbitration	Decision	18 %	Management
Signed credit note, legal follow-up	Multi-department process	20 %	Process automation

Pointing to the neighbouring offer is not ducking the question: a team-level agent holding a file across several departments and several weeks would do it badly, and the company would find that out on a real dispute. **The breakdown above allows the decision to be taken on a figure rather than on a promise.**

The case of the second agent

Situation	Without a shared foundation	With an agent platform
-----------	-----------------------------	------------------------

Two agents connected to the same tools	Two logs to reconcile by hand	One single log
Access rights	Two matrices to maintain in parallel	One matrix, one review
Supervision	Two morning records	One record, one recipient

Two agents without a shared foundation cost more than the second agent

itself. That is the moment to ask the question, not after connection: a rights matrix is designed, it cannot be retrofitted.

For the owner to set

Decision on the three dispute sequences, and date: _____

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.