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WELCOME

With the Winter Olympics in full swing, an economist friend shared with me that Curling, yes Curling, is his favorite sport. He then cited that Curling is a game of strategy, tactics and skill. Success depends on your team’s ability to execute, the skills of your competition, conditions of the ice (environment), keeping track of the score, and who has the “last-stone advantage” (the hammer). This sounds like the mortgage business. Before this, I just considered us analogous to snowboarders where you are a bit crazy to even participate!

In terms of strategy, STRATMOR Group takes great pride in our commitment to staying informed of industry trends and providing insightful thought leadership to our clients. That said, it’s not news that demographics show an aging population with trillions of dollars of untapped equity, or that approximately 10,000 baby boomers a day turn 62, thus becoming eligible for a reverse mortgage.

What is news is our In-Focus piece on reverse mortgages by STRATMOR Senior Partner Jim Cameron. In this article, Jim looks at the reverse mortgage line of business, primarily with an eye towards the potential opportunity reverse mortgages present for lenders currently focused on forward mortgages. With the forward mortgage industry outlook calling for relatively flat-growth, lenders are considering options to maintain profitability, including new products, services and distribution channels. Among these options, reverse mortgage is receiving renewed attention.

In Mortgage Metrics Matter, using data from our Technology Insight Survey program, Senior Partner Nicole Yung analyzes lender use of CRM systems that are native to their LOS versus third-party systems. Given the growing competitive importance of providing a superior borrower experience, CRM systems have become a much more significant component of a mortgage technology strategy. Especially as lenders move to a Digital Mortgage strategy, the CRM system becomes critical.

Finally, our Speaking Borrower Satisfaction section has been renamed The Borrower Experience. Kicking off the renamed section, Senior Partner Dr. Matt Lind uses MortgageSAT data to take a deeper look at the importance of closing when expected. You may be surprised at how different the results are between loans originated Retail versus Consumer Direct and what this might suggest for operating practices and policies.

Happy Curling!

Lisa Springer, CEO
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MOVING FORWARD IN REVERSE

By Jim Cameron

A few weeks ago, I got a Dear John letter from my bank. My home equity line of credit will soon reach the end of its “draw period” and will begin to enter the “repayment period” in which I will have to make monthly payments until the maturity date.

My first reaction was to just ignore the letter — if I need money I will just go to my bank or another financial institution and would have no problem qualifying for a new line of credit. I am in my mid-50s (okay, I just turned 57 but I am rounding down) and I am still in the workforce, make a reasonable amount of income and have some financial assets.

But what if I were one of the millions of seniors who are on a limited fixed income, have no significant financial assets and whose home equity line draw period is about to end? What choices do they have?

Enter one possibility: a reverse mortgage structured as a revolving line of credit.

Reverse mortgages have been around for almost 30 years. And, while the reverse lending market is a fraction of the forward market, how many more reverse units might be originated if more forward lenders recognized that their customers might really benefit from a reverse? Why aren’t more lenders going forward — in reverse?

What is a Reverse Mortgage?
The reverse mortgage product allows homeowners over age 62 to access a portion of their home equity in a lump sum at closing, monthly cash payments or a revolving line of credit with growing availability.

In his best-selling book, Understanding Reverse, Dan Hultquist, Director of Learning and Development at ReverseVision (the leading loan origination system for reverse mortgage lenders), defines a reverse mortgage as, “Any loan, secured by a home, where repayment is deferred until a later date, generally when the home sells.”
Most reverse mortgages originated in the U.S. are the FHA-insured Home Equity Conversion Mortgage or “HECM.” Unlike a traditional forward mortgage, reverse loan balances will grow as borrowers take out cash and receive monthly payments, unless the borrower is also making payments on their mortgage.

Who are these senior homeowners who might benefit from a reverse mortgage? Hultquist describes senior homeowners who might benefit as:

- **Those in need.** Seniors who are “house rich and cash poor.” These homeowners may need cash for certain things like medical expenses or in-home care.

- **Those maintaining a lifestyle.** Seniors who need cash for home upgrades, travel, a new vehicle, etc.

- **Those seeking financial planning flexibility.** For example, seniors who may want to monetize a portion of their home equity to supplement retirement income or senior homeowners who have other investments that are not liquid that they may not want to sell (e.g. a building, stock holdings with large potential capital gains, an investment portfolio that experienced recent large declines in value, etc.).

One of the key attributes of a reverse mortgage is that the borrower never has to make a payment unless they want to; however, there may be good reasons for senior borrowers to make payments. What happens if the loan balance grows to a level that exceeds the value of the home and the borrower dies or moves out? This is where the FHA insurance comes into play.

**Understanding the FHA Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund**
Reverse mortgage borrowers pay an Initial Mortgage Insurance Premium (IMIP) and ongoing MIPs into the FHA’s Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund. If there is a loss on the ultimate sale of the property, the loss is covered by the FHA fund with no recourse to the borrower, the borrower’s estate or heirs. This FHA fund experienced major losses during the recession, mortgage meltdown and aftermath as the economy tanked and real estate values declined. As a result, HUD has enacted a series of changes to the HECM program since 2010 to ensure that the program remains viable and is adequately priced for the risk.

The most recent changes to the HECM program were effective October 2, 2017 and included the following:

- Increased the initial MIP to two percent from .5 percent for borrowers who take more than 60 percent of loan proceeds upfront.

- Decreased the annual MIP from 1.25 percent to .5 percent of the outstanding loan balance.
Lowered the interest rate floor from five percent to three percent. By lowering this rate, lenders will have to offer lower interest rates, thereby increasing the amount of money that a senior will be able to borrow.

Reduced the principal limit factor (PLF) tables which govern the maximum amounts available for a given age. This reduces the amounts that can be borrowed, which will reduce the risk that loans will be “upside down” when the borrower dies or moves out, resulting in losses to FHA’s MMI fund.

So Where is the Reverse Mortgage Industry Now?

While many would agree that the recent rule changes will help to ensure the long-term viability of the HECM product, the reverse lending industry is in an uncomfortable place in the first quarter of 2018. Applications and counseling requests are down more than expected for this time of year. Given the reduction in the interest rate floor, it is reasonable to expect that gain on sale margins will decline, but just how far, who knows. The reduction in unit volume and the resultant excess capacity is driving up the cost to originate reverse mortgages in the short run.

Hmmm ... lower volumes, higher costs and lower margins — sounds a lot like the traditional forward mortgage business right now.

The Forward Mortgage Lending Environment

Chart 1 summarizes actual and forecasted industry volumes and interest rates since 2007.
Average 30-year fixed interest rates have declined steadily (in fits and starts) from 6.5 percent in 2007 to 3.6 percent in 2016. Average rates increased to 4.0 percent in 2017 and are trending much higher in the first quarter of 2018 with rates approaching the 4.50 percent range. Could this be the long-predicted inflection point in which rates begin a steady upward climb? It sure seems like it as the MBA is predicting average rates to increase to 5.6 percent by 2020.

With rate-term refinance transactions on the wane and purchase production constrained by a lack of supply, the MBA is predicting overall industry production to decline to $1.6 trillion in 2018 with only modest volume increases in 2019 and 2020.

What does this mean for the traditional forward market? As volumes decline, mortgage bankers are facing the age-old challenge of higher origination costs and compressed margins. As is typical in a down market, traditional forward lenders are looking for opportunities to improve profitability and gain market share. This may include expanding into new channels such as Consumer Direct or into new products such as non-QM, construction, renovation and, last but not least, reverse mortgages.

**Overview of the Forward vs. Reverse Market**

Chart 2 reflects the relative sizes of the traditional forward and reverse mortgage market based on five-year average unit volumes from 2012 to 2016.
While the reverse mortgage lending volume is only a fraction of the traditional forward market, this could be an opportunity. Both the forward and reverse market are heavily concentrated at the top with the top 20 percent of forward lenders originating 91 percent of total volume, while the top 20 percent of reverse lenders originated 81 percent as shown in Chart 3.

**Chart 3**

**Origination Decile Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decile</th>
<th>Forward (HMDA)</th>
<th>Reverse (Top 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 10%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% - 20%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% - 30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% - 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% - 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% - 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% - 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% - 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RMI Top 100 Nov 2017 & HMDA 2016

But while the forward market represents an even mix between bank and independent lenders, the reverse market is dominated by Independents as shown in Chart 4.

**Chart 4**

**Market Share Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Segment</th>
<th>Independents</th>
<th>Banks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reverse (Top 100)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward (HMDA)</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RMI Top 100 Nov 2017 & HMDA 2016

Why aren’t there more banks offering reverse? Not so long ago, large banks like Wells Fargo and Bank of America dominated the sector. But in the aftermath of the recession and mortgage meltdown, large banks exited reverse due to concerns about reputation risk, the need to focus on the larger issues around mortgage foreclosures, and the onslaught of new rules flowing from the Dodd Frank Act. At that time, banks were generally “playing defense” when it came to mortgage production and servicing and their main goal was to hunker down and stabilize. As banks exited reverse, independent mortgage bankers filled the void. While banks appear to have some natural advantages such as liquidity, capital, and large customer bases (potential for lower marketing costs), they don’t appear to be returning to the reverse market any time soon.
The Opportunity — Borrowers More Than 62-Years-Old

When sizing the industry opportunity for the reverse mortgage market, there are two common approaches. The first approach is to size the market from the “Top down.” The second is to use a “Bottom up” approach.

In the “Top down” approach, the focus is on the number of seniors with a large amount of equity in their home who may need to tap into that equity for reasons of need, lifestyle or financial planning. There is plenty of market data that shows the incredible amount of home equity held by seniors and the fact that there is a large and growing population of seniors who have not saved enough for retirement. For example, according to a study conducted by the Urban Institute, there are 3.3 million seniors over 65 who have $773 billion in home equity and who would benefit from tapping into it. If just one percent per year of these seniors acquired a reverse mortgage, it would add 33,000 reverse loans per year or 60 percent to the current five-year reverse loan origination average of roughly 55,000 loans.

Sizing the reverse mortgage using the “Bottom up” approach attempts to estimate the number of traditional forward loans originated in which a reverse mortgage may have been the better choice or at least should have been taken into consideration. It is this approach STRATMOR has taken to estimate the reverse mortgage market opportunity using studying data gleaned from our MortgageSAT Borrower Satisfaction program. MortgageSAT is a data-driven survey designed to measure every step of the borrower experience including origination, processing, underwriting and closing. To date, we have received more than 250,000 completed surveys. Of the 250,000 surveys received, approximately 45,000 were from borrowers over 62, which represented approximately 18 percent of respondents.

If we apply the 18 percent factor to an average of seven million forward units originated annually, this would result in an estimated 1,260,000 units originated industrywide for borrowers over 62. A 10 percent capture rate would result in 126,000 reverse mortgage transactions, 70,000 more than the current industry average. This “Bottom up” approach does not consider the opportunity from homeowners over 62 who have significant equity in their home and little or no mortgage debt.

Of these 45,000 loans originated for borrowers over age 62, 87 percent were secured by primary residences and thus eligible for a reverse mortgage.
Fifty-one percent of the loans were for purchase transactions, which begs the question: How many of these borrowers should have considered a HECM for purchase? Based on our data, cash out refines typically represent about 15 percent of total refinance transactions. How many of these cash out refinance customers should have considered a HECM? Were they asked?

**STRATMOR Group’s 2018 Reverse Lending Survey**

In preparation for a recent conference on reverse mortgages, STRATMOR conducted a survey on the reverse lending business. We asked lenders to classify themselves into one of three categories:

- **Category 1**: Don’t originate reverse mortgages — explore the primary reasons for not offering reverse
- **Category 2**: Don’t originate reverse but plan to — understand the general timeframe for getting up and running
- **Category 3**: Currently originate reverse — questions about reverse volumes, channel mix, product mix, functional matrix overlap, origination information and capital markets model (e.g. sell, issue HMBS, hold in portfolio).

We received responses from 120 lenders, roughly one-third were banks and two-thirds were independents.

**Survey Respondents — Bank vs Independent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>35%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Respondents</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>65%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Respondents</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: STRATMOR 2018 Reverse Lending Survey © STRATMOR Group, 2018

The survey respondents had the following key characteristics:

- **C-Level** — The respondents were primarily C-level executives plus reverse and capital markets executives.
- **Retail Focus** — About two-thirds of the traditional forward volume of the respondents was Retail, with the rest of the volume spread across Consumer Direct, Broker/Wholesale and Correspondent.
- **Production Volume Distribution** — The survey respondents were spread fairly-evenly across production volume segments, as there were just as many with annual volume over $10 billion as under $500 million.

- **Lower Forward Volume** — The 42 survey respondents offering reverse tended to be smaller than the 72 lenders who do not.

Smaller independent lenders may be more inclined to offer reverse as they seek to gain competitive advantage in the marketplace by leveraging their more nimble, entrepreneurial culture, especially when compared to banks.
The respondent breakdown between banks and independents is shown in Chart 8.

Like the market share data shown in Chart 4 on page 7, the overwhelming majority of survey respondents offering reverse were independent mortgage bankers.

![Chart 8](image)

The 2017 reverse unit volume of survey respondents is shown by channel in Chart 9.

![Chart 9](image)

The respondents reflect a roughly even split between Retail/Consumer Direct and the Wholesale channels in 2017.
The reverse volume mix by product type and purpose is shown in Chart 10. Table 11 summarizes our views on the key drivers of future volumes by loan category.

### Chart 10

**Reverse Volume by Mix Type**

- **HECM for Purchase (H4P)**: 15%
  - Growth in US purchase market despite supply challenges
  - Market penetration — more awareness from referral sources
  - Cost reductions — initial MIP decline from 2.5% to 2.0%; Annual MIP reduced from 1.25% to .50%
  - Builder business — Certificate of Occupancy not needed for FHA case #
  - Lower Principal Limit Factors (PLFs)
  - Financial Assessment requirements — more cash to close
- **HECM to HECM Refinance (H2P)**: 29%
  - Lower PLFs
  - Home Price Appreciation
  - Bona fide advantage needed — some apps won’t pass the tests; yet a positive for consumer and industry in the long run
- **General**: 55%
  - Market penetration — more awareness from referral sources
  - Upfront costs have increased for many borrowers; IMIP increase for “low draw” borrowers;
- **Proprietary**: 15%
  - Lower HECM PLFs — creates an opportunity for the private market to expand; while proprietary PLFs are still lower, they are typically applied to larger loan balances

---

**Table 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Overall Trend</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HECM for Purchase (H4P)</td>
<td>⇐</td>
<td>• Growth in US purchase market despite supply challenges</td>
<td>• Lower PLFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Market penetration — more awareness from referral sources</td>
<td>• Home Price Appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost reductions — initial MIP decline from 2.5% to 2.0%; Annual MIP reduced from 1.25% to .50%</td>
<td>• Bona fide advantage needed — some apps won’t pass the tests; yet a positive for consumer and industry in the long run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Builder business — Certificate of Occupancy not needed for FHA case #</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower Principal Limit Factors (PLFs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial Assessment requirements — more cash to close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HECM to HECM Refi (H2P)</td>
<td>⇑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>⇐</td>
<td>• Market penetration — more awareness from referral sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Upfront costs have increased for many borrowers; IMIP increase for “low draw” borrowers;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>⇑</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lower HECM PLFs — creates an opportunity for the private market to expand; while proprietary PLFs are still lower, they are typically applied to larger loan balances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: STRATMOR 2018 Reverse Lending Survey © STRATMOR Group, 2018
One key area of the survey focused on which functional areas are dedicated for reverse lending only or are shared with the forward lending side. Our findings are summarized in Table 12.

### Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Area</th>
<th>Dedicated for Reverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales / Application</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training / Onboarding</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwriting</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing / Lead Generation</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insuring</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Marketing</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Closing</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly, our survey results indicate that front end processes are more likely to be dedicated for the reverse channel. As we move toward the back end of the mortgage process, reverse functions are more likely to be shared with the forward lending side of the business. Given the cost and margin pressures being experienced on both traditional forward and reverse lending, combining functions where it makes sense will be a key area of focus.

### Chart 13

**Average LOs by Type**

- Avg LOs (Rev + Fwd): 285
- Avg Authorized for Reverse: 68
- # LOs originated Reverse: 28
- # LOs exclusive Reverse: 18
- # LOs originated 1 Reverse + Forward: 11

STRATMOR 2018 Reverse Lending Survey © STRATMOR Group, 2018
Chart 13 shows that survey respondents offering reverse had an average of 285 total loan officers, including both forward and reverse. Of that total, only 68 loan officers were authorized to originate reverse. Of the 68 LOs authorized to do reverse, only 28 (41 percent) actually originated a reverse loan. Of the 28 LOs who originated at least one reverse loan, 18 (64 percent) were dedicated to reverse. Of the 28 LOs who originated reverse, 11 (36 percent) originated at least one reverse loan and one forward loan during the year. The key point here is that only a small percentage of originators actually originate reverse, both as a percentage of total LOs and as a percentage of those authorized to originate reverse. Why is that? To what extent is this due to structural issues versus originator personality types or “hard wiring”?

As shown in Chart 14, most forward loan officers refer reverse loans to specialists and receive an incentive for doing so.

**Chart 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do forward originators refer loans to a Reverse Specialist?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do forward originators receive financial incentive for the referral?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How productive are Loan Officers by quintile? STRATMOR summarized 2016 volume by quintile for forward loan officers from our annual Originator Census Survey database containing approximately 20,000 retail loan officers. We obtained data on reverse loan officer closings from the ReverseVision origination system for 2016. Table 15 summarizes the results.

**Chart 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of LO Productivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Monthly Production (Units) per FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% to 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41% to 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61% to 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                | 3.9     | 0.6     |

STRATMOR 2018 Reverse Lending Survey © STRATMOR Group, 2018
Production is heavily weighted to the top two quintiles for both forward and reverse. As expected, productivity per forward LO far exceeds productivity for reverse LOs. Common hypotheses offered for this include:

- Longer sales cycle required to educate the borrower on the benefits of a reverse mortgage including required counseling.
- Lack of a “forcing function” or sense of urgency on the part of borrowers
- Lower pull through percentage.

We asked survey respondents to indicate their secondary market strategy as summarized in Chart 16.

**Chart 16**

*Secondary Market Outlets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Avg Reverse Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brokered out to Wholesale Lender</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sold to Correspondent Lenders / Investors</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issued Ginnie Mae HMBS</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 42 survey respondents offering reverse either brokered out the loans, sold them to correspondents or issued HMBS.

- **Brokered Out** — 47 percent of the volume of respondents, they tend to be small originators (only 185 units)
- **Sold to Correspondents** — 45 percent, they tend to be larger lenders with average volume of 1,083 units
- **Issued HMBS** — 8.5 percent, this is the domain of larger lenders with average unit volume over 7000.
Is the Industry Still Listening to Cassette Tapes?
Of the 72 respondents not currently offering reverse, we asked them for their primary reasons for not offering the product. A score of one indicated that the respondent was not concerned about the item and a score of ten indicated that they were highly concerned. The results are summarized in Table 17.

While the scores tended to cluster in the seven to ten range, the results indicated that concerns about reputation risk ranked highest, followed closely by concerns about being a distraction and a lack of expertise in house. A smaller number of lenders were concerned that the reverse product would not be profitable. Not surprisingly, reputation risk was more of a concern for banks than independents.

The reasons noted for not offering reverse mortgages appear to be influenced as much by a lack of understanding of the current reverse mortgage environment as they are by actual experience with reverse. It’s time to toss that old cassette tape deck and break out a new media player to hear the latest:

- **Reputation Risk** — There have been many changes in the last several years, including caps on origination fees, bona fide advantage rules, financial assessment / LESAs, reduction of interest rate floor, and common-sense regulation, which is good for borrowers and the industry in the long run.
- **Profitability** — While current market is challenging for both forward and reverse, there is a lot of room for improvement in efficiency and cost reduction. We have been through cycles before, and combining functions with forward where it makes sense will be a big help.
- **Too Complex** — While the front end of the sales cycle is different and requires different skills (vs. forward), at some point, a loan is a loan. Reverse is not so much more complex as it is unfamiliar to forward lenders and consumers.
- **Distraction from Forward** — Shrinking forward margins will cause more lenders to move into reverse as expansion into new products is a common reaction to declining margins. What may seem to be a distraction for some may be an opportunity for others.
Think in Reverse
As we move through the first quarter of 2018, there are clearly challenges in both the traditional forward and reverse mortgage markets. Margins are compressed in both sectors, and lenders are looking to crack the code on leveraging both the forward and reverse sales force and to optimizing marketing expenditures. As in all down markets, forward and reverse lenders have a renewed focus on operational efficiency and are carefully examining the need to combine functions where it makes sense.

To lenders who are thinking about going into reverse, here’s the good news:

- Reverse is a mortgage product that can benefit senior borrowers.
- Concerns of the past are being mitigated through regulation and improved practices.
- Compelling demographics will continue to create opportunities for lenders that can execute well in the go forward market.
TECHNOLOGY INSIGHT SURVEY

SELECT RESULTS FROM THE 2017 TECHNOLOGY INSIGHT SURVEY

STRATMOR’s 2017 Technology Insight Survey (TIS) captures and consolidates incisive information provided by more than 200 lenders about Commercial-off-the-shelf (“COTS”) and proprietary Loan Origination Systems (LOS) and the scope of available functionality they provide.

The 2017 TIS Report covers the following topics in addition to detailed lender feedback on 12 unique Loan Origination systems including satisfaction, user experience and a functionality assessment:

- LOS Market Share
- Overall Satisfaction
- User Experience
- Implementation Experience
- Expenditures
- Required Resources

The 2017 Report also includes information on other mortgage technologies that work with an LOS throughout the process, such as:

- Lead Management/CRM
- Document Preparation
- Point of Sale
- Pricing Engine Software
- Fee Engines
- Closing Collaboration Software

SELECT RESULTS

CRM systems are gaining more and more attention from lenders with an increasing focus on customer experience. Lenders are actively seeking out tools and technologies that can help its sales force stay in contact with customers. Further, the longer life cycle of purchase loans gives greater importance to managing the customer contact and experience throughout the sales process.
The following are select results from the 2017 Technology Survey

**Do lenders use the CRMs that are native to their LOS?**

According to the 2017 STRATMOR Technology Insight Report, the majority of lenders (84 percent) use a third-party CRM solution. Roughly one-third of the lenders indicate that though their LOS includes CRM capabilities, they have chosen to use an ancillary system.

To better understand which systems were offering CRMs that lenders use, we analyzed the results of this question by LOS. However, we did not find a clear pattern of LOS with strong CRMs that are used consistently by lenders versus LOS without CRM capabilities. For more than one system, we found that there were significant numbers of lenders who indicated that the LOS did offer CRM along with lenders who indicated that a CRM is not available. Further, no single LOS had more than 30 percent of lender users indicate that they use the native CRM capabilities.

This indicates that LOS vendors (as of 2017) have not been effective at creating and/or publicizing their native CRM capabilities. As lenders push for tools to help manage and enhance the customer experience, they will continue to seek out tools and technology solutions. Unless LOS vendors further develop their CRMs and evangelize their CRM’s capabilities to their clients, this space will be dominated by third party solutions.

Unless LOS vendors further develop their CRMs and evangelize their CRM’s capabilities to their clients, this space will be dominated by third party solutions.
What third-party CRMs are lenders using to help manage customer contact?

SalesForce and Velocify rank at the top of the list for third-party CRMs. Both are more likely to be used both by large and mid-size lenders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>All Lenders</th>
<th>Large Lenders (over $2B)</th>
<th>Mid-Size / Small Lenders (under $2B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SalesForce</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velocify</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top of Mind</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Returns</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top of Mind and Mortgage Returns rank third and fifth overall but have a larger market share with the mid-size lenders.

Interestingly, proprietary systems rate fourth as systems in use, and these home-grown systems have a larger market share at mid-size lenders than at large lenders. In the LOS space, it is the largest of the large lenders who build and maintain proprietary systems. For CRMs, it appears that lenders of all sizes see the need for these tools and have dedicated resources to build custom solutions.

PARTICIPATE IN THE 2017 TECHNOLOGY INSIGHT SURVEY

Find out more about the 2017 Technology Insight Survey, including how to purchase the full report here.

If you participated in the survey and do not have the participant code, contact us at technologyinsight@stratmorgroup.com.
OVERVIEW

Every lender wants their borrower to be delighted with their mortgage experience. So why do some borrowers love their mortgage experience and others say they’ll never work with that lender again (and do say this to anyone who’ll listen...)?

The borrowers’ experience is deeply impacted by the mortgage professionals the borrower interacts with throughout the origination process. Getting borrower feedback is essential to knowing what steps need to be taken to enhance, or improve, the origination process for the next borrowers.

Monthly, STRATMOR gathers borrower data through the borrower satisfaction survey program, MortgageSAT. STRATMOR analyzes the results across all participating lenders and creates the National Borrower Satisfaction Index.

Then, in each issue of Insights, we highlight the results for one of the many categories tracked and offer suggestions on using this information to improve the borrowers’ experience. This month, we look at the category of Closing When Expected.
CLOSING WHEN EXPECTED

One of the seven commandments for achieving borrower satisfaction is “Thou shalt close loans within the expected timeframe.”

Bottom line: borrowers expect their loans to close within the time frame indicated by the lender. Typically, this is the date indicated in the Loan Estimate Disclosure which, for purchase loans, is usually the date anticipated for closing on the home.

Closing a loan later than the expected date makes borrowers very unhappy and, based on MortgageSAT data, results in a 21-point drop in average satisfaction (see Chart 1). While some delays in the closing date are unavoidable, it is important to proactively manage borrower expectations.

Chart 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Closed in expected timeframe</th>
<th>93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not close in expected timeframe</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: STRATMOR MortgageSAT © STRATMOR Group, 2018
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Chart 2 illustrates LO and Overall Satisfaction scores as a function of the difference between the date when a loan actually closes and its target closing date for both Retail and Consumer Direct originations.

What the Numbers Show

The Retail Loan Officer’s relationship with the borrower may be a buffer against negative satisfaction numbers.

- The Retail LO Satisfaction score is 97 when the loan is closed more than 15 days early (the blue column). This score drops to 95 (the orange column) when the loan closing is more than 30 days late.

- Overall Satisfaction holds up relatively well in the face of a missed target date in the Retail channel, declining from a score of 92 when the closing is more than 15 days early to a score of 84 when the closing is more than 30 days late. While a score of 84 is not great, it’s not catastrophic, either.
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Compare these Retail results with the results for Consumer Direct (CD) loans:

- The CD LO scores 95 when the origination is more than 15 days early, an almost identical score to the Retail LO. But, the CD LO’s score drops to 77 if the loan closes more than 30 days late.

- Overall Satisfaction takes a terrific hit when the loan is more than 30 days late — Overall Satisfaction for CD decreases from 93 to 45. Wow! Consider the social media impact with this level of dissatisfaction.

The adverse results for CD underscores the importance of the arguably more personal relationship that Retail LOs develop with their borrowers relative to call-center LOs. In short, for the Consumer Direct LO, closing the loan when expected by the borrower is much more important.

What’s a Lender to Do?

- Keep the borrower informed. Regular communications with the borrower that include updates to changes in the closing time are essential.

- Retail LOs: attend the closing, especially if the loan closes significantly later than expected. MortgageSAT National Benchmark data indicates that the loan officer attending closing helps mitigate negative borrower perceptions caused by problems in the loan process, including closing date changes.

- CD LOs: connect with the borrower by phone pre-closing to go over closing details, and consider holding open time on your calendar to be available during the closing to answer questions from the borrower especially when the loan closes late.

1 “The Seven Commandments For Achieving Borrower Satisfaction”

MortgageSAT is the mortgage industry’s only Borrower Satisfaction measurement tool that gives lenders direct borrower feedback 24/7 and allows lenders to take a proactive approach to managing and improving the borrower’s experience from application to close. Lenders who participate in the MortgageSAT program have access to borrower satisfaction analysis from across the origination process, from region, branch, and loan officer, to back office personnel. Find out more about the MortgageSAT program and how it can help you improve your borrowers’ end-to-end experience.
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**PGR** MBA AND STRATMOR PEER GROUP ROUNDTABLES

**COMPENSATION CONNECTION**

**TECHNOLOGY INSIGHT**

**ORIGINATOR CENSUS**

**MORTGAGESAT** MEASURING THE BORROWER EXPERIENCE

**CONSUMER DIRECT WORKSHOP**

Contact us today to learn how these products and services can give you a data-driven advantage!