

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE NMLS COMMENT PERIOD ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO COURSE RENEWAL FEES AND THE COURSE RENEWAL PROCESSING CYCLE MARCH 14, 2010 TO APRIL 14, 2010

Background

NMLS is required by the SAFE Act¹ to approve courses which will satisfy pre-licensure and continuing education requirements for state-licensed mortgage loan originators. NMLS may charge reasonable fees carrying out this obligation². The State Regulatory Registry LLC (SRR) which operates the NMLS issued a 30-day request for public comment on March 14, 2010 regarding proposed changes to fees course providers must pay to renew their NMLS-approved courses and changes to the cycle when courses must be renewed. The request for public comment and the related fee and processing schedules can be found on the NMLS Resource Center. This request is identified as 2010-1 ([See Notice on NMLS Resource Center](#)). The remainder of this report includes a summary of the comments received and the action the SRR Board of Managers took regarding the proposed changes. In addition, all of the comments received about this subject are posted to the NMLS Resource Center (See Comments Received).

Summary of Public Comments

During the comment period, March 14 – April 14, 2010, SRR received a total of 13 comments related to the proposed changes to the course renewal fees and course renewal processing cycle. Six of the comments came from NMLS approved course providers and seven comments came from individual mortgage loan originators or individuals representing mortgage brokers or bankers.

Five of the six course providers did not support the proposed change to the course renewal fee and one did not comment directly on the proposed fees. Five of the six course providers supported the proposed rolling course renewal processing cycle, while one did not comment directly on the cycle.

Three of the industry respondents did not support the proposed fee changes while four did not comment on them directly. One industry representative supported the proposed renewal processing change while six did not comment on it directly or had no comment.

In general, respondents who did not support the proposed fee changes believed that the current fee schedule should be left intact or the fees should be reduced. In general, respondents who supported the new rolling course renewal process believed that it would make their operations more efficient.

¹ The SAFE Act is Public Law 110-289 (PL 110-289) and information can be found at: <http://mortgage.nationwidelicencingsystem.org/safe>.

² SAFE Act §1510

Response of the SRR Board of Managers

At its meeting on April 16, 2010, the SRR Board of Managers approved the proposed course renewal fee and the proposed rolling course renewal process. The board made its decision after considering the public comments which were received. The board believed that it was in the best interest of SRR to more closely align course renewal fees with the amount of effort required to administer the course renewal process and to more equitably distribute renewal costs by making the fee structure vary based on the number of hours of the course being renewed. Under the previous fee structure, the cost to renew a 20 hours course was the same as the cost to renew a 1 hour course.

The board believed this new fee structure was necessary given the resources required in providing ongoing monitoring and auditing of NMLS approved courses.

