

## **Complaint**

Mr W has complained that Zopa Limited ("Zopa") unfairly arranged an unaffordable loan for him. He says proper affordability checks would have shown the repayments to be high and more than he could afford.

## **Background**

Zopa operated the electronic system in relation to lending which led to Mr W being provided with a loan in February 2016. The loan was for £8,000.00, had an APR of 16.86% and a 36-month term. This meant that the total amount repayable of £10,458.11, which included interest, fees and charges of £2,458.11, was due to be repaid in 36 monthly instalments of just over £290.

Mr W's complaint was reviewed by one of our investigators. She thought that Zopa ought to have seen that Mr W wasn't in a position to repay this loan at the time it arranged it. So she upheld Mr W's complaint. Zopa disagreed with our investigator's view. As Zopa disagreed, the complaint was passed to an ombudsman for a final decision.

## **My findings**

I've considered all the available evidence and arguments to decide what's fair and reasonable in the circumstances of this complaint.

I have read and considered all the evidence and arguments available to me from the outset, in order to decide what is, in my opinion, fair and reasonable in all the circumstances of the case.

We've set out our general approach to complaints about unaffordable/irresponsible lending - including the key rules, guidance and good industry practice - on our website. And I've referred to this when deciding Mr W's complaint.

Having carefully thought about everything, I think that there are two overarching questions that I need to answer in order to fairly and reasonably decide Mr W's complaint. These two questions are:

These two overarching questions are:

- Did Zopa complete reasonable and proportionate checks to satisfy itself that Mr W would be able to meet his obligations under the P2P agreement in a sustainable way?
  - If so, did it make a fair decision?
  - If not, would those checks have shown that Mr W would've been able to do so?
- Did Zopa act unfairly or unreasonably in some other way?

If I determine that Zopa didn't act fairly and reasonably in its dealings with Mr W and that he has lost out as a result, I will go on to consider what is fair compensation.

*Did Zopa complete reasonable and proportionate checks to satisfy itself that Mr W would be able to meet his obligations under the P2P agreement in a sustainable way?*

The rules, regulations and good industry practice in place when Zopa brought about this P2P agreement with Mr W required it to carry out a proportionate assessment of whether he could afford to make his repayments. This assessment is sometimes referred to as an "affordability assessment" or "affordability check".

The checks had to be "borrower" focused – so Zopa had to think about whether repaying the loan sustainably would cause difficulties or adverse consequences *for Mr W*. In practice this meant that Zopa had to ensure that making the payments to the loan wouldn't cause Mr W undue difficulty or adverse consequences. In other words, it wasn't enough for Zopa to simply think about the likelihood of Mr W making payments, it had to consider the impact of loan repayments on Mr W.

Checks also had to be "proportionate" to the specific circumstances of the application. In general, what constitutes a proportionate affordability check will be dependent upon a number of factors including – but not limited to – the particular circumstances of the consumer (e.g. their financial history, current situation and outlook, and any indications of vulnerability or financial difficulty) and the amount / type / cost of credit they are seeking. Even for the same customer, a proportionate check could look different for different applications.

In light of this, I think that a reasonable and proportionate check ought generally to have been *more* thorough:

- the *lower* a customer's income (reflecting that it could be more difficult to make any loan repayments to a given loan amount from a lower level of income);
- the *higher* the amount due to be repaid (reflecting that it could be more difficult to meet a higher repayment from a particular level of income);
- the *longer* the term of the loan (reflecting the fact that the total cost of the credit is likely to be greater and the customer is required to make payments for an extended period); and
- the *greater* the number and frequency of loans, and the longer the period of time during which a customer has been given loans (reflecting the risk that repeated refinancing may signal that the borrowing had become, or was becoming, unsustainable).

There may also be other factors which could influence how detailed a proportionate check should've been for a given application – including (but not limited to) any indications of borrower vulnerability and any foreseeable changes in future circumstances.

I've carefully thought about all of the relevant factors in this case.

*Were Zopa's checks reasonable and proportionate?*

Zopa has said that it completed an income and expenditure assessment with Mr W before arranging this loan. It also obtained copies of payslips as and carried out a credit check to

work out what Mr W's existing credit commitments were too. However, I'm mindful that any credit check carried out is likely to have shown that Mr W had a significant amount of existing debt and that he was paying a significant amount in overdraft fees because he was overdrawn.

Given any information obtained is likely to have shown the extent of Mr W's existing indebtedness, I would have expected Zopa to have taken further steps to verify Mr W's expenditure to ensure he had the necessary funds to repay the loan it was arranging. After all Mr W's indebtedness didn't tally with someone who had the level of disposable income Zopa's checks appeared to suggest.

As Zopa proceeded with approving this loan without taking further steps to verify Mr W's expenditure, I'm satisfied that the checks Zopa carried out before arranging this loan weren't reasonable and proportionate.

*Would reasonable and proportionate checks have indicated to Zopa that Mr W would have been unable to repay this loan?*

As reasonable and proportionate checks weren't carried out before this loan was provided, I can't say for sure what they would've shown. So I need to decide whether it is more likely than not that proportionate checks would have told Zopa that Mr W would've been unable to sustainably repay this loan.

Mr W has now provided us with evidence of his financial circumstances at the time he applied for this loan. Of course, I accept different checks might show different things. And just because something shows up in the information Mr W has provided, it doesn't mean it would've shown up in any checks Zopa might've carried out.

But in the absence of anything else from Zopa showing what this information would have shown, I think it's perfectly fair, reasonable and proportionate to place considerable weight on what Mr W's bank statements say as an indication of what his financial circumstances were more likely than not to have been at the time. To be clear, I've not looked at Mr W's bank statements because I think that Zopa ought to have obtained them before arranging this loan for him. And I'm certainly not saying that bank statements always need to be obtained before a loan is provided. I've simply consulted Mr W's bank statements here because they were readily available at this stage and they contain the information I now need to reconstruct the proportionate check Zopa should have but failed to carry out.

It's also important to note that Zopa was required to establish whether Mr W could sustainably make his loan repayments – not just whether the loan payments were technically affordable on a strict pounds and pence calculation. I say this because Zopa has said that the loan was affordable because Mr W did make his payments and he managed to repay his loan.

Of course, the loan payments being affordable on a strict pounds and pence basis might be an indication that a consumer could sustainably make the repayments. But it doesn't automatically follow that this is the case. And as a borrower shouldn't have to borrow further in order to make their payments, it follows that a lender should realise, or it ought fairly and reasonably to realise, that a borrower won't be able to sustainably make their repayments if it is on notice that they are unlikely to be able to make their repayments without borrowing further.

I've carefully considered the information available in light of all of this.

Having done so, it's clear Mr W was struggling under the weight of his existing debts and a significant proportion of his income was going to repaying existing creditors. Furthermore, while there's some suggestion the purpose of this loan might have been debt consolidation there is no indication of which debts Mr W was going to consolidate. And it's unclear to me how or what was going to be consolidated and more crucially how this was going to improve Mr W's financial position. Indeed, the information I've seen suggests the opposite happened and that Mr W in fact ended up taking out a string of payday loans and that is what led to him making the payments to his Zopa loan.

Given all of this, it is apparent to me that Mr W was unlikely to have been able to repay these loans without borrowing further or experiencing financial difficulty.

Bearing all of this in mind, I'm satisfied that reasonable and proportionate checks would more likely than not have demonstrated that Mr W was unlikely to have been able to make the repayments to this loan without borrowing further and/or suffering undue difficulty. And, in these circumstances, I find that reasonable and proportionate checks would more likely than not have alerted Zopa to the fact that Mr W would not be able to sustainably make the repayments to this loan.

*Did Zopa act unfairly or unreasonably towards Mr W in some other way?*

I've carefully thought about everything provided. Having done so, I've not seen anything here that leads me to conclude Zopa acted unfairly or unreasonably towards Mr W in some other way.

So I find that Zopa didn't act unfairly or unreasonably towards Mr W in some other way.

*Did Mr W lose out as a result of Zopa unfairly and unreasonably bringing about his loan?*

I think that this loan had the effect of unfairly increasing Mr W's indebtedness as it led to her to being given additional credit he couldn't afford to repay. The monthly payments, which also included interest and charges took up a portion of Mr W's income at a time where he was already struggling. And as I've mentioned, the information I've seen clearly shows that Mr W resorted to taking out payday loans to try and keep up with the repayments on this loan.

So I find that Mr W did suffer significant adverse consequences and as a result lost out because Zopa unfairly arranged this loan.

**Fair compensation – what Zopa needs to do to put things right for Mr W**

Having considered everything, I think it is fair and reasonable for Zopa to put things right for Mr W in the following way:

- refund all the interest, fees and charges Mr W paid on his loan;
- add interest at 8% per year simple on any refunded interest, fees, and charges from the date they were paid by Mr W to the date of settlement†;
- remove any adverse information recorded on Mr W's credit file as a result of this loan.

† HM Revenue & Customs requires Zopa to take off tax from this interest. Zopa must give Mr W a certificate showing how much tax it has taken off if he asks for one.

**My final decision**

For the reasons I've explained, I'm upholding Mr W's complaint. Zopa Limited should put things right for Mr W in the way I've set out above.

Under the rules of the Financial Ombudsman Service, I'm required to ask Mr W to accept or reject my decision before 13 June 2022.

Jeshen Narayanan  
**Ombudsman**