

Confidential Supervisory Information
Collection Note Review

Entity Name:

Prepared by:

NMLS/License Number:

Date:

Examiners should use this template to evaluate the entity’s compliance with state specific requirements. The review should cover collector’s notes.

- I. Collection note review [#]

 - A. State specific subset..... [#]

Confidential Supervisory Information
Collection Note Review

Entity Name:

Prepared by:

NMLS/License Number:

Date:

I. Examination Procedures – Collection Note Review	
<i>To evaluate compliance with Federal and State regulations.</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1. Is there documentation or evidence of collection notices/letters being sent?	[Click&type]
2. Are the required disclosures found in the notes as evidence of having been provided? (Mini Miranda etc.)	[Click&type]
3. Are all call times between the hours of 8:00 am and 9:00 pm <u>local</u> time? (15 U.S.C. 1692c(a)(1))	[Click&type]
4. Is the call frequency limited so as not to be considered harassing? (15 U.S.C. 1692d(5))	[Click&type]
5. Is there evidence convenience fees were disclosed?	[Click&type]
6. Are recurring payments being set up or accepted? a. Are credit or debit card transactions being accepted? b. Can the determination from the notes be made as to which type of card is being accepted for payments?	[Click&type]
7. Is there evidence of third party contact? a. Is there evidence of disclosure of information? b. If contacted more than once, is the third party contact permissible? (15 U.S.C. 1692b(3)) & (15 U.S.C. 1692c(b))	[Click&type]
8. Is there any evidence of false or misleading statements? (15 U.S.C. 1692e)	[Click&type]
9. Do the notes make any reference to credit reporting? a. Does the company credit report?	[Click&type]

Confidential Supervisory Information
Collection Note Review

Entity Name:

Prepared by:

NMLS/License Number:

Date:

Collection Notes	
A. State specific subset	
<i>To determine compliance with state specific requirements relating to collection notes.</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1. Arizona (anything specific)?	[Click&type]
2. Connecticut a. Are the letters identified per CT statute? b. Convenience fees	[Click&type]
3. Idaho (anything specific)? Conv fees?	[Click&type]
4. Maine (anything specific)?	[Click&type]
5. Massachusetts (anything specific)? a. Is there evidence of soliciting post-dated payments? b. Is the call frequency found in the notes in compliance with MA statute?	[Click&type]
6. North Dakota (anything specific)?	[Click&type]
7. Wisconsin (anything specific)?	[Click&type]