



# LPS Attorney Roundtable

## Meeting Notes

The LPS Attorney Roundtable held an in-person conference on **Monday, October 20<sup>th</sup> at the Moscone Convention Center in San Francisco**. The attorney members of the Roundtable include the following firms:

**Aronowitz & Ford [CO]**  
**Baxter & Schwartz [TX]**  
**Bendett and McHugh [CT]**  
**Daniel C. Consuegra [FL]**  
**Millsap & Singer [MO]**  
**Nielson & Sherry [KY]**  
**Shapiro & Swertfeger [GA]**  
**Wilson and Associates [AR]**

**The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 18<sup>th</sup> at the MBA National Mortgage Servicing Conference & Expo in Tampa, FL.** If you have any comments or items of concern you would like added to the agenda for discussion, please contact any member of the Attorney Roundtable who you are comfortable reaching out to, or contact LPS Attorney Relations at [AttyFeedback@FNFS.net](mailto:AttyFeedback@FNFS.net).



## Attorney Roundtable Meeting Monday, October 20, 2008

### TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

#### 1) DIS (Data Integration Services)

(Matt Rogina)

**OVERVIEW:** LPS currently has a Data Integration Service (DIS) that assists with automation between attorney case management systems and LPS Desktop. This is available at no cost to firms and there is currently a dedicated team in the Jacksonville, FL office that works with firms to get any mapping set up. There are many different aspects of DIS that may be used, each providing additional value. LPS has data that can identify the amount of manual entries that are double-entered by attorney associates and how much time could be saved by using DIS. Firms who are interested in using DIS may contact [DISSupport@fis-lps.com](mailto:DISSupport@fis-lps.com).

Matt Rogina asked the Roundtable firms whether or not they are using DIS. Matt advised that an announcement will be sent out regarding the ways DIS can assist firms with productivity, which would yield cost savings.

- Jennifer Wilson-Harvey has sent Matt an email with questions regarding DIS. Matt advised that he received her email and that the DIS staff is coming out with documentation, which will be sent to LPS firms, regarding ways to make DIS easier to understand for individuals who may not be IT savvy.

**DELIVERABLE:** An announcement regarding DIS will be sent out to LPS firms via Network Update.

#### 2) Borrower Contact Processes Feedback

(Matt Rogina)

**OVERVIEW:** Currently, there are 12 LPS Servicers that are using the Borrower Contact Process. Bill Newland advised that as more and more clients are starting to pay close attention to loss mitigation efforts, firms should do the same.

- Stacey Aronowitz stated that the process is working smoothly on her firm's end, for those clients who are using the process as this time.
- Jennifer Wilson-Harvey asked that the Borrower Contact Announcement be sent out to the firms again.

**DELIVERABLE:** Lindsey Lesch re-sent the Borrower Contact Announcement out to the Roundtable firms. This item is closed.

#### 3) Uploading of Documents

(Aronowitz & Ford)

**OVERVIEW:** The firm suggested making it possible to upload documents related to a process within that process. For example, it is not possible to upload a title claim letter while in the title claim process. Currently, documents must be added under the foreclosure process and then the firm completes the "title claim letter uploaded" event. The firm would like to be able to add the document related to that event within a DDF tied to that event.

- James Richards advised that this feature is part of the upgrade to the title processes that is currently in testing. For example, in the new initial title process, on the first step, the firm will browse in the title worksheet within the DDF, similar to how it is currently done for signature required. The ETA for this change is tentatively the end of Q4 2008.



#### 4) Submitting excess fee requests for FNMA and FHLMC files

(Millsap & Singer)

**OVERVIEW:** In a start over state, there is another fee when a second foreclosure is processed. Servicers are asking firms to file excess fee requests for the restarts. However, in a BK setting, the guidelines in a start over state do not require excess fee requests. In a loss mitigation setting, the guidelines require that the servicer collect the fees for the first (cancelled sale) as part of the loss mitigation so no excess fee request is necessary. Excess fee requests are not allowed for title defects that are an origination error. The firm requested for rules to be put into the system that trigger on a new referral, to determine whether an excess fee request is necessary, as under the servicing guidelines, excess fee requests are only necessary under limited circumstances. This topic applies to all restart states where a 2<sup>nd</sup> fee is allowed.

- Vernon Singer stated that his firm has to complete numerous fee requests, but FNMA recognizes that a fee request is not necessary.
- James Richards advised that it is best to upload these request forms in every case as a security measure, as some clients have had requests denied by FNMA because the form was not provided initially.
- Bill Newland said that LPS could possibly get involved with reviewing whether a form is necessary when loans are coming out of bankruptcy.
- Per James, it would not be possible for LPS to accommodate this request for enhancement with the current data provided in the referral files LPS receives from servicers. While firms do not feel the excess fee request is always necessary, most servicers require the request be made and approval or denial of the request from FNMA be provided in all cases. LPS has recently been contacted by servicers because FNMA denied a claim for reimbursement of additional fees on a FC restart, simply because it was not requested prior to initiating the new Foreclosure. It is better for the servicers involved if the request is made even if it is ultimately denied for any of the reasons.
- Millsap and Singer will provide the verbiage being referenced from the FNMA servicing guide which leads them to believe that a fee request on a restart would not be necessary. Once received, LPS can present this to the servicers for review and hopefully receive confirmation that a fee request on a restart would not be necessary.

**DELIVERABLE:** Vernon Singer will send Bill Newland the FNMA documentation regarding fee requests.

#### 5) Title Claim Rejections

(Aronowitz & Ford)

**OVERVIEW:** When the "Results of Indemnification Request" first comes due, approximately 1 month after the claim is filed, the firm will request status and re-project two weeks. Recently, the firm says some rejections have been denied with a request for the reproject to be no more than one week. The firm requested to be able to reproject for more than one week in these cases. No loan examples have been provided yet.

- James Richards advised that the reason LPS sometimes does not allow firms to reproject out more than 2 weeks is because verification of contact is needed. James also stated that LPS is also moving float days out in the new Title Claim template, so that should take care of some of the problems associated with this issue. In the meantime, any loan examples that are provided will be reviewed with staff to identify if rejections for longer timeframes could be allowed in the cases provided.
- Stacey Aronowitz advised that she has loan examples of where her firm tried to reproject and were advised they can only reproject out one week, instead of the usual two weeks.

**DELIVERABLE:** James Richards will address this training issue with his staff and make sure that they are allowing firms to reproject out for at least 2 weeks, as that is the standard.

**DELIVERABLE:** Stacey Aronowitz will provide loan examples.



## 6) LPS Sending Intercoms about worklist items due on the same day

(Aronowitz and Ford)

**OVERVIEW:** The firm says they have received intercoms the day a task is due (prior to 4pm CT), requesting status. The firm typically does not respond to the messages and reprojects the task. When this happens, the next time, the firm says they get a "Second Request" intercom. The firm believes this is more of an LPS training issue as compared to something that needs to be adjusted. No examples have been provided.

- LPS advised that staff should not be intercoming firms regarding items that are due on the same day unless it is already past the 4pm CT cutoff time for rejections.
- Stacey Aronowitz said she would send some examples and LPS will review these to address the training issues with the staff.

**DELIVERABLE:** Stacey Aronowitz will send Lindsey Lesch loan examples of where this issue is occurring, and these will be addressed with the appropriate department.

## 7) LPS processors denying rejections instead of closing

(Aronowitz and Ford)

**OVERVIEW:** The firm has come across cases where they have reprojected an event because the necessary fee approval or documents were not yet available. In some cases, an LPS associate uploaded the fee approval or document after the rejection has been requested and denied the firm's reprojected because the needed information was now available. The firm requested that their rejections be approved in these cases, as they were valid at the time they were raised.

- LPS agrees that rejections should not be denied in this scenario, but should be closed instead. Any examples that are provided will be reviewed by the appropriate department as a training issue.

**DELIVERABLE:** Stacey Aronowitz will send James Richards loan examples of where this issue is occurring, and these will be addressed with the appropriate department.

## STATUS UPDATES

### 1) Collapsing of Holds/Issues for bankruptcy and foreclosure

(Bill Newland and Chris Hymer)

**OVERVIEW:** Bill Newland advised that the USFN has created a document that outlines industry standards in an effort to eliminate duplicate hold types. After an initial review, LPS found that roughly 35% of the hold types related to foreclosure can be eliminated. LPS is also looking to see if dropdowns within hold types can be utilized.

- Jennifer Wilson-Harvey asked if the USFN recommendations were taken into consideration for this project.
- Bill Newland advised that LPS did review the USFN recommendations when reducing the number of hold types, but servicer-specific needs were also factored in, as the list of holds and issues must work with mapping set up for each client system.
- The list of proposed hold and issue types that was sent by the USNF was in an effort to create an industry-accepted list that all outsourcers would potentially adopt.
- LPS is on board with this idea and believes that the list could possibly go down to about 70 hold types. LPS is not currently aware of whether or not other outsourcers are doing the same thing.

**UPDATE:** LPS is continuing to work on the project to consolidate the list of holds and issues. The current phase of the project is to ensure the new names for the collapsed holds/issues that are created are mapped correctly to the client systems. The ETA for resolution of this is the end of November. Bill Newland advised that LPS is moving forward with this project, but follow up with Jennifer and Alberta to make sure the list of holds/issues that LPS has provided will work for the USFN.



**DELIVERABLE:** Jennifer Wilson-Harvey will ask Alberta Hultman, of the USFN, to contact James Richards regarding this issue as James was originally the one who sent the list to the USFN. Before any finalizing can be done, James will review with her.

## **2) Original document return timeframe**

**(Christine Anderson)**

Aronowitz and Ford requested a review of the timeframe in which the "original documents returned to client" step becomes due in Process Management. The task currently comes due one day after the firm is instructed to close and bill. The firm believes this is too soon for them to return documents.

**UPDATE:** Chris Anderson requested a report to show how many days, on average, the "Return original docs to the client" step has been in CO. This report has identified that the average turn-time is 5 days in CO, so based on this information; LPS will move the due date out 5 days. The ticket for this change has been completed and the information was relayed to Aronowitz and Ford. This item is resolved.

**DELIVERABLE:**

## **3) Contact information for Clients, LPS, and investors**

**(Lindsey Lesch)**

Rich Nielson would like to see if an interactive database could be created within Process Management. Also, Rich would like to have a centralized place where firms could find servicer contacts. Rich also asked for a centralized resource for public information like Loss Mit numbers. Rich would also like a single, centralized place for changing firm information.

- LPS will not be able to maintain a database with this information. However, LPS will continue to send quarterly network updates with updated servicer escalation contacts.
- LPS will also distribute information to firms on how to update their information in Process Management as soon as administrative functionality is available in the new interface.
- A ticket was also opened to enhance the form within Desktop for vendor information which will create a dropdown with a standard list of departments along with an open field for "title."

**DELIVERABLE:** Attorney Relations will continue sending out the Servicer Customer Contacts on a quarterly basis.

**DELIVERABLE:** LPS will distribute information to firms on how to update their information in Process Management as soon as administrative functionality is available in the new interface. This item is considered resolved.

## **4) Issues and Holds Dropdowns**

**(Matt Rogina)**

Firms recommended that the list of Issues and Holds to be customized based on user so that Issues or Holds that are for client or LPS use only would not be available in the dropdown for firms.

**UPDATE:** This item is scheduled for the 1.18 release, tentatively set for 12/5. Once this is completed, each issue or hold will have an availability flag that will allow the issue or hold to be raised by the client or attorney. Each issue/hold will have a yes/no flag within the admin utility as well which will be customizable by client with the proper administrative access to Process Management. Matt Rogina requested for the Roundtable firms to provide him with any possible feedback they may have, regarding this item. This item is resolved.



## 5) Stop Requests and New Referrals

(Michael Cloin)

When a stop request is issued due to restart necessary, the stop request and the new FC template/referral usually come into the workload within minutes of each other. This causes some confusion as to which FC template should be closed as there could end up being 2 active.

- Wilson and Associates advised that they used to see this issue arise but have not in months.
- Baxter & Schwartz advised that they have an FHA and a regular non-judicial foreclosure open at the same time right now. Mary Cocheu provided a loan example and LPS will review.

**UPDATE:** LPS pulled an ad hoc report to look into the concern of multiple foreclosure processes being active at the same time on the same loan. In general, the system does not allow for multiple core processes to be opened concurrently.

**UPDATE:** With regard to restarts, a Stop FC Process must be opened when a foreclosure is closed for any reason. This must occur even in restart situations because, at times, the "new" restarted FC may not be referred to the attorney working the prior action. This is Servicer-specific and differs between business rules. The process flow is that the Stop FC Process is launched, the old FC process is closed, and the new FC referral is sent. It could be possible for a new FC Referral to go out in the time between the old FC closing and the FC Stop process being completed. We will review what exceptions allow for a change in procedure, but at this time the flow within the Desktop will remain. The Referrals team has confirmed that going forward, in the scenario of when a stop process is opened and a new referral is sent on the same day, the Referrals staff will provide the NTRID in the stop request, so that the firm can differentiate which Foreclosure must be stopped. This will prevent further confusion.

## 6) Second Mortgage Defense

(Rick Snoke)

Shapiro & Felty requested an additional foreclosure template to be added to PM/Desktop for the purpose of tracking Second Mortgage Defenses (Junior Liens) separately from regular foreclosures.

**UPDATE:** Rick Snoke has mapped out a couple of states at this time. Rick is contacting firms in each state to assist with the mapping and his goal is to have these mapped out by the end of 2008.

**DELIVERABLE:** Rick will provide updates regarding this project.

## 7) Documents uploaded in "Document Management Referral Inbox"

(Lindsey Lesch)

Aronowitz & Ford suggested LPS add an additional column in the referral inbox within Document Management that would list the document "Type" (New Referral vs. Additional Document).

**UPDATE:** The ticket for this request has been opened and is being reviewed for an ETA.

**DELIVERABLE:** When the HelpDesk ticket for this item is closed, LPS will notify Stacey Aronowitz and network firms.

## 8) Missing Documents/Information

(Jennifer Wilson and Rich Nielson)

The AFN- and USFN-designated roundtable firms have been working together to survey firms in each state to find out which documents are needed for first action in each state.

**UPDATE:** Jennifer and Rich provided the responses from the AFN and USFN. LPS has compiled the results and is comparing the responses to create a list of agreed-upon documents needed in each state for first action. The results will be used to help the LPS Document Retrieval team to put special attention on the documents on this list.



**DELIVERABLE:** Bill Newland will discuss with Scott Barnes about working with LPS Servicers regarding the required documents being sent with each referral.

**DELIVERABLE:** Drew Fuerstenberger and Bill Newland will reach out to firms regarding a few states where the responses either differed greatly between the responding firms or were not provided.

### **9) Client-Specific APR Summary Report**

**(Lindsey Lesch)**

LPS advised that guides for these reports will be sent to the Roundtable for review. Once the firm versions of these reports are finalized, the guides will be sent to the rest of the network via network update. These reports (BK and FC versions) are currently the top priority items on the APR projects list.

**DELIVERABLE:** Lindsey Lesch sent the guides for the firm version of the reports to the roundtable firms for review.

### **10) Productivity Report**

**(Lindsey Lesch)**

At the request of the Roundtable, LPS created a productivity report for firms, which outlines Process Management productivity for individual users.

**UPDATE:** This report is now available on business objects and a guide was sent out via Network Update. This item is resolved.

### **11) Action in the Name of Project**

**(Scott Walter)**

Scott Walter is currently working on a two part project to assist with missing "action in the name of" information.

**UPDATE:** This project will be rolled out for each client one at a time, as appropriate. This is currently underway for WAMU and a HelpDesk ticket has been opened for tracking. Scott Walter will provide the Roundtable with further updates during the next Roundtable meeting.

### **12) Volumes for new clients**

**(Sheryl Newman)**

Kay Schinker asked if there is a way to determine the volume a firm is going to receive after signing a fee agreement for a new client.

**UPDATE:** After review, LPS Implementations has advised that this information will not be provided to the firms, as it is not possible at this time. This item is closed.



### 13) Attorney Reporting Project List – Top 5 Priority

Item	Description	Status
Client Specific APR Summary Report (firm view)	A report showing a firm's specific performance for each servicer, shown with three different comparisons.	End of Q4
100% Carve-out for Assignments	100% carve-out on the APR for assignments that have to be sent to the client for execution in states that require assignments for first action or for clients who require it.	End of Q4
Remove Federal Holidays from APR	The 10 Federal Holidays will be removed from firms' APR for service performance and File Referred logic.	Tentatively set for Q4
Invoicing Accuracy %	New service item displaying percentage of invoices not requiring corrections compared to state averages.	This stage has been rolled out to the APR performance reports on both Business Objects and Web Reporting.
Loss Mitigation %	New service items displaying the percentage of files in the APR period with loss mitigation activity.	This stage has been rolled out to the APR performance reports on both Business Objects and Web Reporting.
Upstate/Downstate New York	Separate Upstate and Downstate counties in NY for APR purposes (by zip codes)	This enhancement has been rolled out on both Business Objects and Web Reporting.
Compliance %	Add compliance % according to FNMA guidelines with all holds accounted as a stage on the APR report. Compliance percentage would also be separated out in the client-specific section.	This stage has been rolled out to the APR performance reports on both Business Objects and Web Reporting.

### Deliverables

Item Description	Active Tasks	Tasks Assigned to
<b>DIS (Data Integration Services)</b>	An announcement regarding DIS will be sent out to LPS firms via Network Update.	Matt Rogina
<b>Submitting excess fee requests for FNMA and FHLMC files</b>	Vernon Singer will send Bill Newland the FNMA documentation regarding fee requests.	Vernon Singer
<b>Title Claim Rejections</b>	James Richards will address this training issue with his staff and make sure that they are allowing firms to reproject out for at least 2 weeks as that is the standard.	James Richards
<b>Title Claim Rejections</b>	Stacey Aronowitz will provide loan examples.	Stacey Aronowitz
<b>LPS Sending Intercoms about worklist items due on the same day</b>	Stacey Aronowitz will send Lindsey Lesch loan examples of where this issue is occurring, and these will be addressed with the appropriate department.	Stacey Aronowitz
<b>LPS processors denying rejections instead of closing</b>	Stacey Aronowitz will send James Richards loan examples of where this issue is occurring, and these will be addressed with the appropriate department.	Stacey Aronowitz



<p><b>Collapsing of Holds/Issues for bankruptcy and foreclosure</b></p>	<p>Jennifer Wilson-Harvey will ask Alberta Hultman, of the USFN, to contact James Richards regarding this issue as James was originally the one who sent the list to the USFN. Before any finalizing can be done, James will review with her.</p>	<p>Jennifer Wilson-Harvey</p>
<p><b>Contact information for Clients, LPS, and investors</b></p>	<p>LPS will distribute information to firms on how to update their information in Process Management as soon as administrative functionality is available in the new interface.</p>	<p>LPS</p>
<p><b>Stop Requests and New Referrals</b></p>	<p>Scott Walter will provide an explanation why a stop issue and a new foreclosure are issued on the same day for restarts and also explain how this process works.</p>	<p>Scott Walter</p>
<p><b>Second Mortgage Defense</b></p>	<p>Rick will provide updates regarding this project.</p>	<p>Rick Snoke</p>
<p><b>Documents uploaded in "Document Management Referral Inbox"</b></p>	<p>When the HelpDesk ticket for this item is closed, LPS will notify Stacey Aronowitz and network firms.</p>	<p>Lindsey Lesch</p>
<p><b>Missing Documents/Information</b></p>	<p>Bill Newland will discuss with Scott Barnes about working with LPS Servicers regarding the required documents being sent with each referral.</p>	<p>Bill Newland</p>
<p><b>Missing Documents/Information</b></p>	<p>Drew Fuerstenberger and Bill Newland will reach out to firms regarding a few states where the responses either differed greatly between the responding firms or were not provided.</p>	<p>Bill Newland/Andrew Fuerstenberger</p>