RESEARCH EXAMPLE | V2 | NOVEMBER 15, 2026

A corrected income figure is not yet a reconsidered credit decision

Kerry Thornhill
contestability.ai
WEB contestability.ai

What this example tests

A competent human reviewer resolves an income-conversion objection without giving the borrower a calculation extract. The lending decision remains open. The example distinguishes legal protections, usable inquiry, and a proposed review process.

The legal starting point

In the covered automated-processing situation, French Consumer Code Article L312-16(VIII) provides for explanation, human intervention, expressing a view, and requesting reconsideration of both the creditworthiness assessment and the lending decision. Subsections I-II require careful assessment using relevant and accurate financial information. These protections are not NIC additions. The relevant version takes effect November 20, 2026; existing credit contracts generally remain under earlier provisions. [1]

The case stipulates a covered new consumer-credit application on November 23. Human sign-off does not by itself settle whether VIII applies: its wording is not confined to solely automated decisions. The account here identifies the provisions relevant to the example, rather than every obligation governing a lender.

NIC's contribution

NIC asks what informational work makes the rights usable in this dispute: can Camille, directly or with assistance, investigate the income objection, assess the lender's answer, and pursue a remaining disagreement about its effect on the decision? Personal recomputation, agreement, and approval are not conditions of success.

A usable conversation can substitute for an extract. Reliable fresh assessment may answer the live objection without reconstructing every historical processing step. A separate audit of repeated defects could require more history and its own justification. [2]

The notice, record, access route, and internal target are proposed implementations. The fictional demonstration supplies no empirical validation.

The case: four weeks entered as a month

Camille applies for a €5,000 unsecured consumer loan on November 23. Net pay is a stable €600 per paid week, with 52 paid weeks per year. A payroll extract covers four consecutive weeks ending November 22 and totals €2,400. The lender's stated rule converts this stable weekly income to an annual average divided by 12.

One agent retrieves the extract, another maps its total into the monthly-income field without conversion, and a third recommends refusal. A loan officer checks the total against the payroll record and releases the refusal, without checking the period. These are stipulated case facts, not evidence of legally sufficient review.

Item	Original assessment	Corrected assessment
Four-week source total	€2,400	€2,400
Average monthly income	€2,400	€2,600
Existing monthly commitments	€2,200	€2,200
Proposed monthly payment	€300	€300
Simplified residual	-€100	€100

Conversion under the stated rule: €2,400 × 13 ÷ 12 = €2,600. The illustrative rule flags a negative residual for refusal. Correcting the conversion removes that particular ground. It does not by itself establish entitlement to credit or resolve whether the timing of receipts and payments is manageable. The 13/12 convention assumes 52 paid weeks; it is not a universal rule for irregular income or actual calendar-month cash flow.

A fresh assessment reaches the live decision

Camille uses the initial notice's reply channel to say that the income appears understated and points to the payroll record already supplied. No agent name, technical diagnosis, or duplicate upload is required.

On November 24, Elise, the assigned reviewer and decision owner, reads the payroll period and applicable rule and recomputes the assessment from those records. She does not need to reconstruct every agent's historical execution. She checks the recorded figures used for the original refusal, confirms the mismatch, and replaces the monthly-income value with €2,600.

Elise then opens the live decision record and verifies the new amount and €100 residual. She marks the original negative-residual ground withdrawn and the refusal reopened. This is an observed action within the fiction, not merely a promise to correct a field. Camille receives the explanation and can challenge it through the same channel.

The competent reviewer route succeeds

Camille: “The €2,400 covers four weeks. Your notice calls it monthly income. Can someone check that and reconsider the refusal?”

Elise: “Yes. I checked the payroll period and our stable-income rule. We used the four-week total as monthly income. Under that rule, €2,400 becomes €2,600 in average monthly income. I have corrected the assessment, checked that the lending record uses it, and withdrawn the negative-residual ground. The application is reopened.”

Camille: “So €2,600 is an average over the year, not a claim that I receive that amount in every calendar month?”

Elise: “Correct. Your weekly receipts can fall differently across calendar months. You can question the income, expenses, or rule I have described. We still need to assess the timing of your pay and fixed payments against the proposed loan-payment date. I have not identified another ground for refusing the application.”

Camille: “That answers my concern about the understated income. Please tell me the result of that timing check and the reasons for the lending decision.”

Camille identifies the issue, obtains an evidence-responsive answer, checks a material qualification, and secures correction of the assessment and withdrawal of the stated refusal ground. No calculation extract or technical log is furnished. The reviewer supplies the relevant informational work through a conversation, followed by the interim response on the next page. Acceptance here is a stipulated case event; the route would remain available if Camille disagreed.

The unresolved ending

Income objection substantiated. Original refusal ground withdrawn. Lending decision pending. These are three separate statuses.

Elise remains responsible for the reopened decision. The outstanding inquiry concerns the timing of weekly income, fixed commitments, and the proposed repayment date. She will use the existing application information and ask Camille to clarify anything genuinely missing. This is an inquiry to complete, not an established new defect or a substitute reason for refusal.

The proposed process sets an internal target of November 26 to communicate the decision and its grounds, or explain specifically what remains unresolved and the next step. This is a case commitment, not a claimed statutory deadline. The story ends before that update. It establishes resolution of the income objection and reopening of the decision, not completed reconsideration, approval, or a justified retained refusal.

Borrower notices at two different stages

1. Initial refusal: November 23

Automated processing contributed to our creditworthiness assessment and refusal of your application. The assessment recorded monthly income of €2,400, using your payroll extract ending November 22. It compared that amount with recorded monthly commitments of €2,200 and a proposed loan payment of €300. The resulting negative residual of €100 supplied the stated reason for refusal. A loan officer checked the source total and released the decision.

Our stated method for stable weekly pay uses an annual average divided by 12. An income figure or period handled incorrectly can affect the assessment and decision. An annual average also does not show the timing of every receipt or payment.

You may request human intervention, express your view, and ask us to reconsider both the assessment and the refusal. Reply through this application channel or request an assisted conversation with the review team. You can refer to records already supplied. You do not need to identify an internal agent or establish the cause of a suspected error before asking us to examine it.

2. Interim review response: November 24

Your income objection is substantiated. The €2,400 payroll total covers four weeks. Our assessment used it as monthly income without applying the stable-income rule. The corrected average monthly income is €2,600, and the simplified residual is €100. I checked that the reopened lending record uses those corrected figures. The negative-residual ground for the original refusal is withdrawn.

Your application is reopened, with the lending decision pending. The remaining inquiry is how the timing of your weekly pay and fixed commitments fits the proposed repayment date. No new refusal ground has been established. I am responsible for completing this review. By our internal target of November 26, I will communicate the decision and its grounds, or identify the specific unresolved issue and next step.

You may question this account, point to further evidence, or ask for assistance through the same channel. Your request to reconsider the lending decision remains open. Elise, assigned reviewer and decision owner.

Status and implementation boundaries

The first notice exposes the recorded amount, method, and decision ground without retrospectively announcing a diagnosed error. The second reports findings made during review. These are case-specific English extracts, not a complete operational notice. The review channel and date are proposed arrangements; production contacts and remaining applicable content would need to be supplied. Neither notice is a technical calculation extract.

Internal review record: November 24

Case and owner. Camille's November 23 new consumer-credit application. Elise is the assigned reviewer and decision owner. She can inspect the relevant records, correct the assessment, withdraw the original ground, and decide the reopened application after completing the remaining inquiry.

Original ground preserved. Refusal based on a -€100 residual, calculated using €2,400 as monthly income. The original assessment and notice remain identifiable as superseded records; the case does not prescribe a universal retention period.

Borrower's objection. Income is understated because the supplied amount covers four weeks. Camille requests human intervention and reconsideration of both the assessment and refusal. The request was admitted without requiring a technical diagnosis or another copy of the same payroll record.

Evidence and operation. Elise examined the payroll total and period, the applicable stable-income rule, the recorded original figures and refusal ground, and the existing commitment/payment amounts. She freshly computed the monthly average from the payroll evidence. She did not reconstruct every historical agent execution or supply an external calculation extract.

Finding and correction. The source amount is correct; its use as monthly income conflicts with the stipulated conversion rule. Corrected monthly average: €2,600. Corrected simplified residual: €100. Elise read back these amounts from the live lending record and marked the original negative-residual ground withdrawn.

Borrower's investigative opportunity. Elise explained the finding, answered Camille's question about annual average versus calendar-month receipts, and left the account open to further challenge. Camille stated that the explanation answered the income concern and requested the timing-check result and final decision reasons. This records the fictional exchange, not a general usability result.

Three statuses. Income objection: substantiated and resolved in the dialogue. Original refusal ground: withdrawn. Lending decision: reopened and pending. A correction must not automatically mark the whole review complete.

Outstanding inquiry. Assess payment timing using the existing income and commitment schedule; identify any genuinely missing information and seek clarification. No adverse timing finding or other refusal ground has yet been established.

Next step and follow-through. Elise owns the November 26 internal update target. Record the completed inquiry, actual decision and grounds, communication to Camille, and any remaining disagreement. If the review is still incomplete, identify the issue and next step. Do not reuse the superseded -€100 ground or label an unspecified “other ground” an explanation.

Status at the ending. Interim response sent within the fiction; final lending disposition not recorded. The form, checkpoints, and internal target are implementation proposals. The cited provision does not prescribe this exact record.

What the successful route establishes

The successful reviewer route defeats the extract's claimed necessity in this dispute. Fresh recomputation also shows that reconstructing every historical agent step is unnecessary here. Evidence about income, the rule, and the decision's grounds still matters.

A comparison that can defeat the proposal

Define the task before choosing records: can the borrower, with permitted assistance, obtain an intelligible, evidence-responsive resolution of the income objection and pursue a remaining disagreement about its effect on the decision? Define realistic limits of time, cost, language, access, and assistance independently of the preferred implementation.

Direct route. Supply a dated calculation extract and effective review channel. Test use, rather than scoring possession as success.

Mediated route. Supply an accessible reviewer who examines evidence, explains findings, accepts challenge, and acts. Permit different records or fresh computation. Test this fictional success with participants.

Thin assurance. Supply a reason label, source total, and “human reviewed” statement. Keep the borrower's records available. Neither failure nor legal compliance is assumed.

Correction without a usable account. Correct the amount but offer no adequate explanation. Record practical improvement separately from investigative capability and the unresolved explanation question.

Hold common starting information constant. Introduce the diagnosed period error only when the relevant route discloses or discovers it. A successful substitute defeats an artifact's necessity; an adequate route that omits a candidate operation defeats that operation's necessity. Assess participant capability, institutional response, and implemented effects separately. The unresolved lending decision remains an incomplete institutional outcome.

Sources

[1] French Consumer Code, Article L312-16, I-II and VIII, with commencement note, official November 20, 2026 version, rechecked November 15. English paraphrase; new covered application stipulated.

[2] Kerry Thornhill, From Notice to Contestable Grounds: Necessary Informational Conditions for Algorithmic Contestability, research framework. See also the filed ICO response for the earlier credit scenario.

Notes

All people, amounts, dates, rules, and case events are fictional. The exchanges demonstrate stipulated success, not empirical validation. Version 2 incorporates Kerry's requested revisions. Earlier draft and substantive review are preserved. Prepared with assistance from OpenAI/Codex.