

## SECTOR COMMENT

7 September 2016

Rate this Research >>

### Analyst Contacts

Ola Hannoun-Costa 212-553-1456  
*VP-Senior Analyst*  
 ola.hannouncosta@moody's.com

Diana P Moreno 212-553-7102  
*AVP-Analyst*  
 diana.moreno@moody's.com

Yehudah Forster 212-553-7995  
*Senior Vice President*  
 yehudah.forster@moody's.com

### CLIENT SERVICES

Americas 1-212-553-1653

Asia Pacific 852-3551-3077

Japan 81-3-5408-4100

EMEA 44-20-7772-5454

RMBS and Marketplace Lending – US

# Mortgage Regulations and Industry Practices Will Limit Added Risk in Marketplace Lender RMBS

## Executive Summary

The mortgage industry's current regulatory and securitization framework would reduce additional risks posed to potential residential mortgage-backed securities (RMBS) issued by marketplace lenders.

- » As we have noted regarding consumer, student and small business loans originated by these lenders, new risks arise from their lack of historical performance and untested lending approaches.
- » However, robust mortgage lending laws and regulations, as well as government and institutional supervision, provide strong checks on minimum mortgage loan credit quality for new entrants including marketplace lenders.
- » In addition, strong RMBS industry practices, such as third-party due diligence checks, promote transparency and consistency and help to identify credit problems prior to securitization. The RMBS market also contains experienced securitization counterparties, such as mortgage servicers, trustees and custodians, which will support RMBS quality.

Although we do not currently rate any RMBS from marketplace lenders, we expect future issuance of such deals.

## Marketplace lenders have newly developed operations with limited performance history

New to the mortgage industry, marketplace lenders' innovative methods and untested lending approaches increase the uncertainty in the quality and future performance of the mortgage loans they originate relative to traditional mortgage collateral from seasoned originators. While marketplace lenders may develop new, proprietary technologies to increase efficiency and transparency in loan origination, they may lack the operational robustness to ensure the production quality of the mortgage loans. Given their inexperience with an economic down cycle, marketplace lenders' business models have not been stress tested. As such, marketplace lenders face the challenge of building strong credit management operations that monitor and test their underwriting practices and product offerings.

## Mortgage regulatory framework supports new entrants' loan credit quality

Recent mortgage lending laws and regulations, the equivalent of which are not currently present for non-mortgage consumer lending,<sup>1</sup> provide some checks on mortgage loan credit quality for new entrants in the mortgage space such as marketplace lenders. Federal consumer protection laws and government and institutional supervision guard against systemically poor lending practices. Complying with these rules and getting licensed in many states require new mortgage market entrants to make significant capital and knowledge investments.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's (CFPB) Ability-to-Repay/Qualified Mortgage (ATR/QM) rule, effective January 2014, holds mortgage lenders liable for making loans to borrowers who don't have the reasonable ability to repay them. It requires lenders to consider the borrower's income or assets and employment status against the mortgage loan payment and other obligations of the borrower, and to verify income, assets and employment status using reliable third-party documentation. While increased technological savvy, such as allowing borrowers to upload W-2 forms and other documents or utilizing algorithms to pre-qualify borrowers based on a FICO score and stated income and/or assets may improve process efficiencies, they do not change the rule's fundamental requirements. Underwriters will still need to make a reasonable determination that the borrower has the ability to repay the loan, and the information on which the underwriter bases the decision must be verified via third-party documentation by the time the loan funds. Non-mortgage consumer loans are susceptible to looser underwriting criteria and unverified borrower information because an equivalent rule for that asset class does not exist.

The TILA-RESPA Integrated Disclosure (TRID) rule, effective October 2015, requires lenders to deliver comprehensive disclosures to the borrower reducing the likelihood that borrowers will take out loans that they can't afford due to increased transparency. TRID requires lenders to provide a loan estimate and closing disclosure to borrowers that make the terms of the mortgage loan clear, simple and consistent.

Besides ATR/QM and TRID, mortgage lenders must comply with a plethora of other consumer lending regulations designed to ensure safer mortgage loans, such as the Truth in Lending Act (TILA), the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (RESPA), and the Home Ownership and Equity Protection Act (HOEPA).

Mortgage lenders are also subject to oversight from various government agencies, such as the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, the CFPB, and regulators in the states where they are licensed. They are also subject to supervision from government sponsored entities (GSEs) Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac if the lenders are approved sellers, as well as supervision from institutions, such as banks and insurance companies that invest in their loans. Such supervision typically consists of regular audits and feedback. In addition, if the lenders are GSE-approved sellers, the lenders must comply with each agency's respective eligibility standards and seller guides, which require standardized underwriting and origination practices.

## Industry standards will help maintain marketplace lender RMBS credit quality

Strong RMBS industry practices and a mature market consisting of experienced securitization counterparties will support credit quality of RMBS issued by marketplace lenders. Some of these industry practices include comprehensive pre-securitization loan due diligence which provide checks on marketplace lenders' collateral quality, appraisal quality improvements, and representation and warranty (R&W) frameworks that give originators skin in the game.

This publication does not announce a credit rating action. For any credit ratings referenced in this publication, please see the ratings tab on the issuer/entity page on [www.moody's.com](http://www.moody's.com) for the most updated credit rating action information and rating history.

Post-crisis RMBS transactions generally use independent third-party review firms to perform pre-securitization due diligence reviews of the mortgage loans selected for securitization, providing transparency and a check on the data quality of the mortgage loans. The scope of due diligence review consists of credit, property valuation, data integrity and regulatory compliance. In re-underwriting the mortgage loans, due diligence firms assess whether the mortgage loans conform to the lender's underwriting guidelines and evaluate evidence of the borrower's willingness and ability to repay the mortgage loan. The due diligence firms also review appraisals to assess whether the appraised values were reasonably supported. Lastly, the due diligence firms test the mortgage loans for regulatory compliance. To date, most post-crisis transactions have had this diligence check on either 100% of the mortgage loans or a significant statistical sample.

RMBS appraisal quality benefits from the Uniform Collateral Data Portal (UCDP) initiated by the GSEs in 2012. Under the UCDP, lenders must electronically submit all appraisals using the UCDP portal in a format that standardizes fields and definitions. This electronic collection of appraisal information gives the GSEs a large database from which they can compare characteristics of different appraisals to identify faulty information and poor appraisers, and detect appraisal fraud. Even though the UCDP applies mostly to GSE loans, it also benefits loans going into private-label RMBS because the tighter GSE quality control on appraisers, who value homes securing both conforming and non-conforming loans, have improved overall appraisal standards.

Recent RMBS transactions also benefit from R&W frameworks that have mechanisms to put defective loans back to their originators. Typically, these frameworks include a provision for an independent reviewer to check any loan that becomes seriously delinquent to see if it breached its R&Ws. Such R&W frameworks will discourage rogue origination practices because they will hold marketplace lenders responsible for buying back loans that don't meet the R&Ws.

We expect marketplace lenders to use many of the same transaction counterparties that traditional RMBS issuers use, such as servicers, custodians and trustees. These experienced counterparties have the knowledge and experience to service mortgage loans for new entrants through the business cycle. Their practices, data requirements and roles and responsibilities have evolved through the financial crisis with various regulatory and industry group guidance and regulations.

## Moody's Related Research

- » [Understand the Risks of Marketplace Lending Securitizations, 4 May 2015.](#)
- » [2016 Outlook – Marketplace Lending Platforms Will Continue to Evolve, Expand Loan Types, 7 December 2015.](#)

To access any of these reports, click on the entry above. Note that these references are current as of the date of publication of this report and that more recent reports may be available. All research may not be available to all clients.

## Endnotes

- 1 On 2 June 2016, the CFPB proposed regulations that target payday, vehicle title, and certain high-cost installment loans. These proposed regulations, among other rules, would require lenders to reasonably determine that the consumer has the ability to repay the loan.

© 2016 Moody's Corporation, Moody's Investors Service, Inc., Moody's Analytics, Inc. and/or their licensors and affiliates (collectively, "MOODY'S"). All rights reserved.

CREDIT RATINGS ISSUED BY MOODY'S INVESTORS SERVICE, INC. AND ITS RATINGS AFFILIATES ("MIS") ARE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ("MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS") MAY INCLUDE MOODY'S CURRENT OPINIONS OF THE RELATIVE FUTURE CREDIT RISK OF ENTITIES, CREDIT COMMITMENTS, OR DEBT OR DEBT-LIKE SECURITIES. MOODY'S DEFINES CREDIT RISK AS THE RISK THAT AN ENTITY MAY NOT MEET ITS CONTRACTUAL, FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS AS THEY COME DUE AND ANY ESTIMATED FINANCIAL LOSS IN THE EVENT OF DEFAULT. CREDIT RATINGS DO NOT ADDRESS ANY OTHER RISK, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO: LIQUIDITY RISK, MARKET VALUE RISK, OR PRICE VOLATILITY. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S OPINIONS INCLUDED IN MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT STATEMENTS OF CURRENT OR HISTORICAL FACT. MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS MAY ALSO INCLUDE QUANTITATIVE MODEL-BASED ESTIMATES OF CREDIT RISK AND RELATED OPINIONS OR COMMENTARY PUBLISHED BY MOODY'S ANALYTICS, INC. CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS DO NOT CONSTITUTE OR PROVIDE INVESTMENT OR FINANCIAL ADVICE, AND CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT AND DO NOT PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO PURCHASE, SELL, OR HOLD PARTICULAR SECURITIES. NEITHER CREDIT RATINGS NOR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS COMMENT ON THE SUITABILITY OF AN INVESTMENT FOR ANY PARTICULAR INVESTOR. MOODY'S ISSUES ITS CREDIT RATINGS AND PUBLISHES MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WITH THE EXPECTATION AND UNDERSTANDING THAT EACH INVESTOR WILL, WITH DUE CARE, MAKE ITS OWN STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EACH SECURITY THAT IS UNDER CONSIDERATION FOR PURCHASE, HOLDING, OR SALE.

MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS AND MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS ARE NOT INTENDED FOR USE BY RETAIL INVESTORS AND IT WOULD BE RECKLESS AND INAPPROPRIATE FOR RETAIL INVESTORS TO USE MOODY'S CREDIT RATINGS OR MOODY'S PUBLICATIONS WHEN MAKING AN INVESTMENT DECISION. IF IN DOUBT YOU SHOULD CONTACT YOUR FINANCIAL OR OTHER PROFESSIONAL ADVISER. ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS PROTECTED BY LAW, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, COPYRIGHT LAW, AND NONE OF SUCH INFORMATION MAY BE COPIED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED, REPACKAGED, FURTHER TRANSMITTED, TRANSFERRED, DISSEMINATED, REDISTRIBUTED OR RESOLD, OR STORED FOR SUBSEQUENT USE FOR ANY SUCH PURPOSE, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, IN ANY FORM OR MANNER OR BY ANY MEANS WHATSOEVER, BY ANY PERSON WITHOUT MOODY'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.

All information contained herein is obtained by MOODY'S from sources believed by it to be accurate and reliable. Because of the possibility of human or mechanical error as well as other factors, however, all information contained herein is provided "AS IS" without warranty of any kind. MOODY'S adopts all necessary measures so that the information it uses in assigning a credit rating is of sufficient quality and from sources MOODY'S considers to be reliable including, when appropriate, independent third-party sources. However, MOODY'S is not an auditor and cannot in every instance independently verify or validate information received in the rating process or in preparing the Moody's Publications.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability to any person or entity for any indirect, special, consequential, or incidental losses or damages whatsoever arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information, even if MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers is advised in advance of the possibility of such losses or damages, including but not limited to: (a) any loss of present or prospective profits or (b) any loss or damage arising where the relevant financial instrument is not the subject of a particular credit rating assigned by MOODY'S.

To the extent permitted by law, MOODY'S and its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors and suppliers disclaim liability for any direct or compensatory losses or damages caused to any person or entity, including but not limited to by any negligence (but excluding fraud, willful misconduct or any other type of liability that, for the avoidance of doubt, by law cannot be excluded) on the part of, or any contingency within or beyond the control of, MOODY'S or any of its directors, officers, employees, agents, representatives, licensors or suppliers, arising from or in connection with the information contained herein or the use of or inability to use any such information.

NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO THE ACCURACY, TIMELINESS, COMPLETENESS, MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE OF ANY SUCH RATING OR OTHER OPINION OR INFORMATION IS GIVEN OR MADE BY MOODY'S IN ANY FORM OR MANNER WHATSOEVER.

Moody's Investors Service, Inc., a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Corporation ("MCO"), hereby discloses that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by Moody's Investors Service, Inc. have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to Moody's Investors Service, Inc. for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from \$1,500 to approximately \$2,500,000. MCO and MIS also maintain policies and procedures to address the independence of MIS's ratings and rating processes. Information regarding certain affiliations that may exist between directors of MCO and rated entities, and between entities who hold ratings from MIS and have also publicly reported to the SEC an ownership interest in MCO of more than 5%, is posted annually at [www.moody's.com](http://www.moody's.com) under the heading "Investor Relations — Corporate Governance — Director and Shareholder Affiliation Policy."

Additional terms for Australia only: Any publication into Australia of this document is pursuant to the Australian Financial Services License of MOODY'S affiliate, Moody's Investors Service Pty Limited ABN 61 003 399 657 AFSL 336969 and/or Moody's Analytics Australia Pty Ltd ABN 94 105 136 972 AFSL 383569 (as applicable). This document is intended to be provided only to "wholesale clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. By continuing to access this document from within Australia, you represent to MOODY'S that you are, or are accessing the document as a representative of, a "wholesale client" and that neither you nor the entity you represent will directly or indirectly disseminate this document or its contents to "retail clients" within the meaning of section 761G of the Corporations Act 2001. MOODY'S credit rating is an opinion as to the creditworthiness of a debt obligation of the issuer, not on the equity securities of the issuer or any form of security that is available to retail investors. It would be reckless and inappropriate for retail investors to use MOODY'S credit ratings or publications when making an investment decision. If in doubt you should contact your financial or other professional adviser.

Additional terms for Japan only: Moody's Japan K.K. ("MJJK") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of Moody's Group Japan G.K., which is wholly-owned by Moody's Overseas Holdings Inc., a wholly-owned subsidiary of MCO. Moody's SF Japan K.K. ("MSFJ") is a wholly-owned credit rating agency subsidiary of MJJK. MSFJ is not a Nationally Recognized Statistical Rating Organization ("NRSRO"). Therefore, credit ratings assigned by MSFJ are Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings. Non-NRSRO Credit Ratings are assigned by an entity that is not a NRSRO and, consequently, the rated obligation will not qualify for certain types of treatment under U.S. laws. MJJK and MSFJ are credit rating agencies registered with the Japan Financial Services Agency and their registration numbers are FSA Commissioner (Ratings) No. 2 and 3 respectively.

MJJK or MSFJ (as applicable) hereby disclose that most issuers of debt securities (including corporate and municipal bonds, debentures, notes and commercial paper) and preferred stock rated by MJJK or MSFJ (as applicable) have, prior to assignment of any rating, agreed to pay to MJJK or MSFJ (as applicable) for appraisal and rating services rendered by it fees ranging from JPY200,000 to approximately JPY350,000,000.

MJJK and MSFJ also maintain policies and procedures to address Japanese regulatory requirements.

REPORT NUMBER 1037313