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## Mortgage Risk Analysis Framework

- Competing risk approach
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## Status Transition Approach
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## Incorporate Path Memory



## Data

- FHA loans originated between 1996-2012
- Quarterly loan performance panel observations
- Avoided sensor problem
- Incorporate local market economic condition
- Capture prior modification and cure history
- Two sets of multinomial logistic regression
- C_D, C_CX, C_PRE, C_SR, C_C
- D_CXS, D_CXM, D_PRE, D_CLM, D_D


## Choice Based Sample

- $10 \%$ of good loans; $100 \%$ of bad loans
- $10 \%$ of quarters before ever-default; $100 \%$ of quarters after $1^{\text {st }}$ default.

|  | Sample <br> Observations | Total Original <br> Observations | Sample Rate |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C to C | $20,024,231$ | $158,984,465$ | $13 \%$ |
| C to CX | 186,815 | 186,815 | $100 \%$ |
| C to D | $2,550,952$ | $2,586,844$ | $99 \%$ |
| C to PRE | 584,758 | $3,756,763$ | $16 \%$ |
| C to SR | 201,556 | $1,741,915$ | $12 \%$ |
| D to PRE | 159,939 | 159,939 | $100 \%$ |
| D to CLM | 658,541 | 694,433 | $95 \%$ |
| D to CX_M | 324,789 | 324,789 | $100 \%$ |
| D to CX_S | 747,035 | 747,035 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | $25,438,616$ | $169,182,998$ | $15 \%$ |
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## Modification as Loss Mitigation

- As an alternative way to enable refinance
- Otherwise constrained by LTV or DTI to qualify for refinance loan
- To avoid realizing default loss on book
- Hope house price recovery will bailout default loss
- Policy objectives
- Help borrowers keep their homes
- Avoid massive default wave bring banking system down
- Reduce number of REO sales on market, which could exacerbate housing market deterioration


## Research Issues with Modification

- Which loans benefits from modification the most?
- To minimize potential default loss = eventual PD x LGD
-What type of modifications to offer?
- Forbearance, Rate Reduction, Term extension, Principal forgiveness
- What's the re-default risk of modified mortgages?
- OCC reports 5 -year re-default rate $\approx 70 \%$
- What are the main risk drivers after modification
- What's the LGD of modified mortgages?
- Higher LGD due to more deterioration in physical condition and longer expenses


## Current to Delinquent Transition (PD)

| Variable | Name | Values | current_default |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of living units | liv_units_34 | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | 0.0789 |
| Downpayment assistant types | dpa_govt | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | 0.1726 |
|  | dpa_nonprof | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | 0.3402 |
|  | dpa_relative | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | 0.1097 |
| Relative loan size | loansize | linear function |  | 0.0007 |
| LTV | ltv100 | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | -0.0290 |
|  | ltv95 | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | 0.0720 |
| Spread at origination | sato1 | Spline function | 0 | -0.0596 |
|  | sato2 |  | >0 | 0.3891 |
| Credit score | credit_score1 | Spline function | 600 | -0.0025 |
|  | credit_score2 |  | 660 | -0.0094 |
|  | credit_score3 |  | >660 | -0.0128 |
| Missing credit score | credit_score_000 | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | -0.1338 |
| No credit score returned | credit_score_999 | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | -0.6088 |
| FHA credit score indicator | fha_score | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | -0.1757 |
| Front-end Ratio | ratio_tmp_tei1 | Spline function | 28 | 0.0296 |
|  | ratio_tmp_tei2 |  | >28 | 0.0095 |
| Missing front-end ratio | dti000 | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | -0.0691 |

## Dynamic Variables

| Variable | Name | Values | current_default |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current LTV |  | Spline function | 1 | 1.3791 |
|  | Itv_current2 |  | 1.2 | 0.8968 |
|  | ltv_current3 |  | 1.4 | 1.4451 |
|  | ltv_current4 |  | >1.4 | 0.0000 |
| House price appreciation local level | hpa2y_n | linear function |  | -0.0128 |
| Burnout factor. Prior <br> cimulative number of quarters <br> prepayment option in the | burnout1 | Spline function | 9 | 0.0007 |
|  | burnout2 |  | >9 | -0.0015 |
| Cumulative number of quarters under water | c_burnout1 | Spline function | 6 | 0.0077 |
|  | c_burnout2 |  | >6 | -0.0252 |
| Unemployment rate change in last two quarters | delta_ue1 | Spline function | 0 | 0.1183 |
|  | delta_ue2 |  | >0 | 0.1771 |
| Difference of 10 year and 1 year CMT rates | ycslope | linear function |  | 0.0280 |
| Effective GSE refinance interest rate | GSE_refi_ince_PMT1 | Spline function | 0 | 0.0082 |
|  | GSE_refi_ince_PMT2 |  | 25 | 0.0234 |
|  | GSE_refi_ince_PMT3 |  | >25 | -0.0317 |

## Modification Variables

| Variable | Name | Values | current_default |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prior loan modification | prior_mod | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | 0.1446 |
| Percentage monthly payment reduction of loan modification | mod_pay_pet_rdet1 | Spline function | 0.16 | -5.7670 |
|  | mod_pay_pet_rdct2 |  | 0.36 | 3.1272 |
|  | mod_pay_pet_rdct3 |  | >0.36 | 1.8231 |
| Missing payment reduction | mis_mod_pay_pet_rdct | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  | -0.1508 |
| Mortgage age function | age1 | Spline function | 2 | 1.4014 |
|  | age2 |  | 5 | 0.1524 |
|  | age3 |  | >5 | -0.0030 |
| Number of quarters since end of last default episode | cx_time1 | Spline function | 1 | 2.2639 |
|  | cx_time2 |  | 10 | -0.1108 |
|  | cx_time 3 |  | 25 | -0.0286 |
|  | cx_time 4 |  | >25 | -0.0041 |
| Season of year | season_fall season_spring season_summer | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ | 0.3024 <br> -0.0726 <br> 0.1606 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{X}=0 / 1$ |  |  |
| Intercept Term | contstant |  |  | -7.9545 |
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## Payment Reduction Dummy Variables
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## Implications

- If house price growth $=0$ for the next $\times$ years, the percent of re-default rate of modified loans would be

| Quarterly | 1 -Year | 2 -Year | 5 -Year | $10-$ Year |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $5 \%$ | $18.5 \%$ | $33.7 \%$ | $64.2 \%$ | $87.1 \%$ |
| $10 \%$ | $34.4 \%$ | $57.0 \%$ | $87.8 \%$ | $98.5 \%$ |
| $15 \%$ | $47.8 \%$ | $72.8 \%$ | $96.1 \%$ | $99.8 \%$ |
| $20 \%$ | $59.0 \%$ | $83.2 \%$ | $98.8 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| $25 \%$ | $68.4 \%$ | $90.0 \%$ | $99.7 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

- Optimal size of payment reduction is about 15-20\%. Further reduction leads to increase in re-default risk


## Implications

- A modified loan with no payment reduction has redefault risk similar to a never defaulted loan with 200 points lower FICO score
- Modification of $18 \%$ payment reduction reduces redefault rate similar to the magnitude of 100 points higher FICO score
- Competing risk: re-default risk increases when refinance option is deep in the money
- Credit burnout: re-default risk decreases when continue payment through a period of underwater


## Further Questions

- Why does higher payment reduction increase redefault risk?
- Implication of income shock to the family; harder to recover drastic income reduction
- Rate reduction to below market rate implies borrower cannot afford the house
- LGD of modified loan
- Correlation between payment reduction and LGD?
- Does increase in LGD in modified loan offset the reduction in eventual PD?
- Is modification a good loss mitigation policy? In a rising interest rate environment?

