



Priority calculation — consolidation portal,

DEMO-CVE-F01

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

Document issued on 24/09/2026

Score 98 out of 100, recomposable line by line · 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. Illustrative score produced by the demonstration policy *demo-policy-1.0*. It illustrates an engine configurable by the customer; **it is not a security assessment and not a recommended policy**. Your weights, thresholds and rules would replace its own.

The factors, their value, their contribution

Factor	Value used	Maximum contribution	Points obtained
Normalised technical severity	9.2 / 10	20	18.4
Known exploitation	yes	25	25.0
Exposure	1.0	15	15.0

Factor	Value used	Maximum contribution	Points obtained
Asset or service criticality	1.0	15	15.0
Exploitation probability	0.91	10	9.1
Business impact	1.0	10	10.0
Safety impact	0	10	0.0
Trusted fix available	yes	5	5.0
End-of-support asset	no	10	0.0
Verified compensating controls	none	−20	0.0
Raw score			97.5
Final score	rounded to the nearest unit, halves up, bounded 0–100		98

Where the displayed priority comes from

Origin	Identifier	Effect
Score threshold	immediate_review ≥ 85	98 clears the threshold → immediate review
Policy rule	PR-KEV-001	Confirmed match and known exploitation → floor of « immediate review »

Both apply, and the higher wins. Here they agree — but the rule alone would have sufficed: **a vulnerability declared exploited on an exposed, critical asset is raised even when another metric is missing.** A rule can RAISE a priority; it never lowers it silently, it does not touch the score, and it shows its identifier.

A comparison that explains the ordering: the treasury hub scores **54**. The 44-point gap rests on two factors and two only — **no known exploitation (0 instead of 25)** and **an exposure of 0.4 thanks to your segmentation (6 instead of 15)**. The rest is identical. Your group's context produces the ordering, not the vendor's rating.

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.