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NMVTIS 2021 Annual Report
The National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS) Final Rule (28 CFR part 25, published January 30, 2009, 74 FR 5740) requires the system operator, the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA), to prepare and publish an annual report and procure an independent financial audit. This NMVTIS 2021 Annual Report is the thirteenth publication, covering October 1, 2020, through September 30, 2021 (“reporting period”). This reporting period, agreed upon between the system operator and the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), corresponds with the federal fiscal year and AAMVA’s audit cycle.

Published in August 2022, this report details the performance of NMVTIS during the twelve-month reporting period. Future annual reports will also cover twelve-month periods—October 1 to September 30—and be published the following August. Each annual report is intended to stand alone, giving an overview of activity from the system’s inception, as well as a detailed look at operations and accomplishments in the specific fiscal year.

For the status of the system, please visit DOJ’s website at https://vehiclehistory.bja.ojp.gov.

INTERACTIVITY OF THIS REPORT: When reading this report online, click on the light blue hyperlinks to go to the referenced websites and pages in the report.
On behalf of the Board of Directors of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA), I am pleased to present the thirteenth annual report for the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System (NMVTIS). This report is provided to system stakeholders, documenting NMVTIS’ ongoing success in achieving goals outlined in the 1992 Anti Car Theft Act.

This report highlights the system’s performance, accomplishments, revenue, and expenses, as required by federal law. AAMVA is committed to its ongoing role as a strong and effective system operator, under cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance.

During FY2021, NMVTIS continued to fulfill its purpose of protecting states and consumers (individual and commercial) from fraud; protecting consumers from unsafe vehicles; and reducing the use of stolen vehicles for illicit purposes, including funding of criminal enterprises. NMVTIS reached a major milestone in participation, with forty-nine of the fifty states and the District of Columbia fully Participating. These jurisdictions (see Glossary) represent over 99% of the vehicles registered in the U.S. NMVTIS also improved its collaboration with states, their technology vendors, and AAMVA to enhance state system development and implementation protocols. AAMVA held two stakeholder webinars during FY2021, providing system performance and program updates on DOJ’s compliance and enforcement efforts. Positive attendee feedback and engagement validated the webinars’ value as a forum to exchange information and discuss NMVTIS.

The Consumer Access Program continued to perform strongly. Demand for vehicle history reports which include NMVTIS information exceeded initial projections, likely driven by increased state participation, with 99% of the vehicle population represented and increased demand for used cars. Supply chain issues continued to affect the automotive industry, limiting the supply of new vehicles.

During this reporting period, AAMVA’s Board of Directors began to explore a future model for NMVTIS to ensure consistent funding for ongoing operations and maintenance and future modernizations. Modernization will occur in parallel with ongoing operations, observing a continuous improvement approach in response to changing business needs. A committee of jurisdiction representatives is tasked with this work and will report their results in FY2022.

Technologically, NMVTIS successfully maintained approximately 99.94% system uptime, while migrating non-production environments to the Microsoft Azure Government Cloud and ongoing system improvements in the Cloud.

FY2021 was the first full year under the renewed cooperative agreement. AAMVA continued to meet its contractual obligations. NMVTIS continued as the trusted source for state vehicle title and brand history data and junk, salvage, and insurance total loss information for stakeholders. As always, this report could not be prepared without the generous guidance and information provided by many individuals and organizations. I appreciate their valuable contributions, and I expect you will find the report informative.

Anne Ferro, President & CEO
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This reporting period of October 1, 2020 through September 30, 2021 showed continued progress in all four NMVTIS program areas:

- State Program
- Junk, Salvage, and Insurance Reporting Program (see Glossary)
- Consumer Access Program
- Law Enforcement Access Program

This report period showed a return to more typical and increased activity in all program areas. The COVID-19 pandemic continued to change how Department of Motor Vehicles (see Glossary) customers and all NMVTIS stakeholders conduct business, but reliance on NMVTIS data increased beyond projections. The value derived from the system is demonstrated by the benefits reported by states and law enforcement, as well as consumer interest. AAMVA continued to improve system efficiency while supporting nearly 100% of the vehicle population represented in NMVTIS.

Achievements during this reporting period include:

- U.S. motor vehicle title data represented in the system reached the significant milestone of 99%.
- NMVTIS now contains more than 1.9 billion records.
- AAMVA continued to deliver multiple NMVTIS-related webinars to familiarize state agencies with new system tools and features, training more than 100 state employees across twenty-eight webinars.
- States and AAMVA continued efforts to increase consumer awareness of the value of purchasing a vehicle history report before buying a used vehicle.
- AAMVA’s Board of Directors began to explore a future funding model.
- Participation Management Concept pilot was completed, and rollout began to all jurisdictions.
- Additional sworn and non-sworn investigators became users of the Law Enforcement Access Tool.
- AAMVA continued to hold semi-annual NMVTIS Stakeholder Webinars, featuring updates from AAMVA and DOJ.
- States credited NMVTIS automation with increased data quality, enhanced customer service, agency savings, and detection of potentially stolen and unsafe vehicles, along with other benefits.
- To enhance system efficiency, AAMVA successfully migrated the NMVTIS non-production environment to the Microsoft Azure Government Cloud while maintaining 99.94% system uptime.
- States earned nearly $2.1 million in revenue credits from the sale of vehicle history reports by Approved NMVTIS Data Providers.
- NMVTIS-related legislation was passed in one state and introduced in three states.
HIGHLIGHTS DURING REPORTING PERIOD

STATE PROGRAM
- Four states completed development and are fully Participating in NMVTIS.
- Forty-nine jurisdictions are now Participating in NMVTIS and two are In Development (see Glossary).
- AAMVA continued to support states that are re-engineering their NMVTIS application interface as part of modernizing their titling systems.
- Five states were enrolled and trained in use of the map and profile in the Participation Management Concept (PMC).
- NMVTIS State Program Subcommittee (SPS), NMVTIS Operations Monthly Forum and State Business Points of Contact met to discuss ways to enhance NMVTIS functionality.
- SPS and the NMVTIS Law Enforcement Subcommittee (LESC) met for the sixth consecutive year.
- Four consumer protection videos were made available in Spanish.

JUNK, SALVAGE, AND INSURANCE REPORTING PROGRAM
- AAMVA continued to provide states with expanded junk, salvage, and insurance (JSI) information to update state title records.
- States continued to introduce and adopt NMVTIS-related legislation.
- Twenty-five states have adopted thirty-seven NMVTIS-related legislative bills to date.
- Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and AAMVA continued to explore various system enhancements, which in part will assist reporting entities in submitting final dispositions.
- More than 203 million junk, salvage, and insurance records, representing more than ninety-four million unique VINs, were reported to date in NMVTIS.
- System development work began on implementation of two new dispositions – “Owner-retained” and “Dismantled for Parts”.

CONSUMER ACCESS PROGRAM
- States increased efforts to heighten consumer awareness of vehicle history reports and used car buying guidelines.
- Four Check NMVTIS Before You Buy! short videos were made available in Spanish to jurisdictions to share with their customers.
- There was a 64% increase in new visitors to the “Title Check” page of the Texas DMV website, moving from 96,474 in the last reporting period to 158,174.
- Approved NMVTIS Data Providers and AAMVA continued to explore opportunities to expand NMVTIS data in new markets and promote new uses for NMVTIS information.
**LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCESS PROGRAM**

- The number of sworn and non-sworn investigators gaining system access via LEAT continued to expand, with user numbers increasing 13%, from 7,122 to 8,026.
- LEAT inquiries increased 39%, growing from 373,300 to 517,856.
- AAMVA and BJA continued to discuss additional features for the NMVTIS Law Enforcement Access Tool (LEAT).
- The first NMVTIS Enforcement Award was presented to recognize outstanding achievement while conducting a NMVTIS investigation or using NMVTIS LEAT to enhance an investigation.
- Initial discussions were held with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) regarding access to LEAT.
Key NMVTIS Stakeholders

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

Within the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), BJA has oversight of NMVTIS, and is responsible for reviewing significant operational decisions and ensuring program requirements are met. In addition, BJA is responsible for overseeing both policy and enforcement elements of the NMVTIS program. BJA works in partnership with the system operator, AAMVA, and collaborates with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and state and local law enforcement agencies on enforcement activities.

**NMVTIS ADVISORY BOARD**

In June 2010, the first NMVTIS Advisory Board (NAB) was convened to provide input and recommendations to BJA regarding the operation and administration of NMVTIS. The NAB represented key stakeholders affected by the program, including states, consumers, insurance carriers, auto recyclers, junk and salvage yards, and law enforcement agencies. The NAB legislative charter expired in September 2016.

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE ADMINISTRATORS**

The Anti Car Theft Act authorizes the designation of a third-party operator of NMVTIS. Since 1992, the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) has acted in this capacity. AAMVA is a nonprofit, tax exempt, educational association representing U.S. and Canadian officials responsible for the administration and enforcement of motor vehicle laws. In addition to acting as the NMVTIS operator, AAMVA supports the Single Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) Reporting Service, one of four JSI data consolidator services.

**DATA CONSOLIDATORS**

AAMVA partners with the private sector to provide multiple reporting methods to meet the business needs of JSI reporting entities. Currently, four reporting methods or services are available, and offer single-VIN and batch reporting options:

- AAMVA Single VIN Reporting Service
- Audatex
- Auto Data Direct, Inc. (ADD)
- ISO ClaimSearch Solutions (ISO)
**STATES**

State titling agencies perform title verifications and report title, brand, and state vehicle data to NMVTIS.

- Each state is required to perform an instant title verification check before issuing a certificate of title for a vehicle that an individual or entity brings into the state.
- States are required to make selected titling information they maintain available for use in NMVTIS. States shall provide information on new titles and any updated title information to NMVTIS at least once every twenty-four hours.
- States are required to pay user fees.

**CONSUMERS**

NMVTIS information is available to consumers (individual and commercial) in a vehicle history report provided by Approved NMVTIS Data Providers. This report provides data on five key indicators associated with preventing auto fraud and theft. Before purchasing a used vehicle, consumers are encouraged to search NMVTIS to review the following information:

- Current and historical state of title with title issue date
- Brand history (see Glossary)
- Odometer reading (see Glossary)
- Total loss history
- Salvage history

**APPROVED NMVTIS DATA PROVIDERS**

Approved NMVTIS Data Providers are companies that agree to provide vehicle history reports which include NMVTIS information to the public consistent with federal legal requirements. This agreement is established through an application process and formal contracts with the system operator. All Approved NMVTIS Data Providers are listed on the AAMVA and DOJ NMVTIS websites.

**LAW ENFORCEMENT AND DMV INVESTIGATORS**

Law enforcement and DMV agencies rely on NMVTIS data to improve and enhance their ability to investigate vehicle crimes and combat other criminal activities. Therefore, it is imperative that NMVTIS captures vehicle history information throughout the life cycle of the vehicle. The NMVTIS Law Enforcement Access Tool (LEAT) provides law enforcement and DMV investigative personnel with vehicle information intended to assist investigations of a variety of crimes including vehicle title and brand fraud, vehicle finance fraud, vehicle theft, crimes against persons, smuggling operations (e.g., human trafficking, narcotics, weapons, and currency), and other criminal activity. Using LEAT, investigators can conduct bulk searches of up to 10,000 VINs in a single query.
JUNK, SALVAGE, AND INSURANCE ENTITIES
All entities meeting the NMVTIS definition for junk yard and salvage yard and handle five or more junk or salvage vehicles per year are required to report to the system monthly. An insurance carrier must report any automobiles of the current model year or any of the four prior model years it has determined to be a total loss under the law of the applicable jurisdiction, or designated as a total loss by the insurance company under the terms of its policies. By reporting the required information on junk, salvage, and total loss automobiles to NMVTIS, JSI reporting entities play an integral role in DOJ’s efforts to prevent fraud, reduce theft, and save the lives of consumers who might otherwise unknowingly purchase unsafe vehicles.

OTHER
Other entities interested and/or involved in NMVTIS-related activities include industry associations (e.g., salvage pools, recycling, auto auctions, dealers), other federal and foreign agencies (e.g., Environmental Protection Agency, Mexico’s Ministry of Transport), and independent organizations focused on consumer protection and reducing vehicle-related crimes.
SECTION 1: OVERVIEW

Overview

BACKGROUND
Established by Congress to Provide Access to Vehicle Title Information; Offers a Range of Benefits for Consumers, States, Law Enforcement, and Vehicle Agencies

NMVTIS was established by Congress under Title II of the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 (Public Law No. 102-519). It was created to address the growing issues associated with auto theft and vehicle fraud—specifically, to:

• prevent the introduction or reintroduction of stolen motor vehicles into interstate commerce;

• protect states, consumers (both individual and commercial), and other entities from vehicle fraud;

• reduce the use of stolen vehicles for illicit purposes, including funding of criminal enterprises; and

• protect consumers from unsafe vehicles.

The intent of NMVTIS is to establish an information system providing vehicle title information to motor vehicle titling agencies, law enforcement, prospective and current purchasers (both individual and commercial), insurance carriers, and junk and salvage yard operators.

Specifically, in accordance with 49 U.S.C. 30502, NMVTIS must provide a means of determining the following:

• whether a title is valid

• where a vehicle bearing a known Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) is currently titled

• what was a vehicle’s reported mileage at the time the title was issued

• whether a vehicle is titled as a junk or salvage vehicle in another state

• whether a vehicle has been reported as a junk or salvage vehicle under 49 U.S.C. 30504.

The types of vehicles reported to NMVTIS by states include automobiles, buses, trucks, motorcycles, motor homes (e.g., recreational vehicles or RVs), and truck tractors. In general, NMVTIS contains title information for vehicles that meet at least one of the following criteria:

• fulfills the definition of a junk or salvage automobile according to the regulations

• has an active registration and an active title

• has an active title

• has an active registration as proof of ownership
Vehicles excluded from NMVTIS include trailers, mobile homes (e.g., prefabricated homes, typically permanent), special machinery, vessels, mopeds, semitrailers, golf carts, and boats.

AAMVA has historically worked closely with DOJ on the strategic direction of NMVTIS. From FY1996 through FY2011, BJA awarded federal grants totaling $31,455,623 to help AAMVA create and operate the system and support state development and implementation (Figure 1). The last expenditure of federal grant funds occurred in FY2013. Since that time NMVTIS has been supported by program revenues and contributions from AAMVA member funds.

Since NMVTIS began in 1996, several validation studies have been conducted to identify its benefits and/or potential cost savings to stakeholders. Links to these are provided in Exhibit 7. NMVTIS has received support across a wide range of beneficiaries, including but not limited to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Law Enforcement</strong></th>
<th><strong>Consumer Protection</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vehicle and Auto Industry</strong></th>
<th><strong>Independent Crime Prevention</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)</td>
<td>State Attorneys General</td>
<td>AAMVA</td>
<td>National Salvage Vehicle Reporting Program (NSVRP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Sheriffs’ Association (NSA)</td>
<td>Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety (CARS)</td>
<td>National Automobile Dealers Assoc. (NADA)</td>
<td>National Insurance Crime Bureau (NICB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Assoc. of Auto Theft Investigators (IAATI)</td>
<td>Consumer Federation of the Southeast</td>
<td>National Independent Auto Dealers Assoc. (NIADA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Export Committee (NAEC)</td>
<td>National Consumer Law Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>NMVTIS FEDERAL GRANTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FISCAL YEAR (FY)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1996 (DOT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY1999/2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AAMVA: As someone who witnessed the very beginning of NMVTIS, please tell us about what prompted the development of the system. What problems or challenges was it designed to address?

GREENBERG: Issues around stolen and unsafe vehicles, like junk or salvage, were prevalent across the country. These vehicles became a consistent topic at meetings across New York and the office of the state’s Senator Chuck Schumer approached AAMVA to discuss how we might be able to help identify such vehicles and prevent them from being retitled. It was estimated that auto theft alone cost $8 billion – and that’s with a B! – to consumers and insurance companies per year. The Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 initially gave the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) responsibility to develop a national information system that would allow states and others to access vehicle titling information. The responsibility was later moved to the U.S. Department of Justice in 1996. There were four provisions in the Anti Car Theft Act: Title I instituted harsher penalties for auto theft crimes, particularly carjacking, and aimed to strengthen law enforcement against auto theft and fraud; Title II required the national information system which became NMVTIS; Title III dealt with the prevention of chop-shop-related thefts (stolen auto parts); and Title IV focused on preventing the export of stolen vehicles. The bottom line, and the mission at hand, was to devise a way for the states to communicate and verify the status of a vehicle when it moved between states.
AAMVA: What went into building NMVTIS? Who was involved in getting NMVTIS off the ground?

GREENBERG: AAMVA had experience, having developed the Commercial Driver’s License Information System (CDLIS) in 1992, so it was suggested we consider a similar system to share vehicle information. There was a lot of input from AAMVA’s membership, board of directors, and its vehicle and technology staff with AAMVA.net. Together, everyone worked hard to identify a technology solution for jurisdictions to communicate. Discussions included the breadth of data that was required to be included, along with information that would be nice to have, like theft information. Funding became an issue, since the Anti Car Theft Act specified funding for state development of the system, but no funds were initially appropriated. AAMVA and the motor vehicle community believed NMVTIS would deliver significant benefits to the states and consumers, so AAMVA developed a NMVTIS pilot to aid DOT in obtaining funding for broader implementation of the system. AAMVA surveyed states and surveyed states again along with private sector businesses for input on the proposed design developed by AAMVA.net. In 1999, AAMVA completed a successful pilot of NMVTIS.

AAMVA: We’ve seen participation in NMVTIS grow and soon, hopefully, 100% of all U.S. jurisdictions will be participating. How does it feel to see how participation has grown over the years?

GREENBERG: From a personal standpoint, it was very rewarding to see the system come to fruition with the very robust information it provides. As a former Director of Motor Vehicles, I could greatly appreciate its value from that end, too. Funding was a big challenge, so the fact that nearly all jurisdictions are now Participating is significant. The commitment of AAMVA, the states, and the U.S. Department of Justice to protect the public from unscrupulous players, both from a cost and safety perspective, is a huge public service.
SYSTEM OPERATOR AND RESPONSIBILITIES

AAMVA Continues as an Effective System Operator

The Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 authorized the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) to appoint a third-party operator of NMVTIS. Under the NMVTIS Final Rule, the operator must provide services to state motor vehicle title agencies, junk, salvage, and insurance entities, and law enforcement; and support consumer access to the system. Since 1992, AAMVA has successfully done so.

FUNDING

NMVTIS Expenses Totaled $9,183,242; State User Fees Contributed $5,600,001

During this reporting period, program revenue came primarily from consumer use and state user fees (see the Financial Reports section).

Federal law requires NMVTIS to sustain itself financially, operating without federal funding. During FY2021, the system earned $7,661,762 in revenue which was used to cover $9,183,242 in expenses. Total expenses include system modernization costs of $1,521,660, which are currently covered by AAMVA Board Designated Funds. AAMVA continues to explore and evaluate new revenue opportunities to support enduring financial sustainability.

GOVERNANCE

NAB Fulfilled its Mission

BJA oversees NMVTIS operations, as required by federal law and regulations. The NMVTIS Advisory Board (NAB) was established under provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended, 5 U.S.C., App. 2, tasked with advising BJA regarding program operation and administration issues. These included establishing NMVTIS performance measures; accessing additional data within the system beyond that required by the Anti Car Theft Act; assessing program costs and revenues; and evaluating quality assurance.

Under the NMVTIS Final Rule, BJA gathered the inaugural board in June 2010 for its first two-year term. The meeting provided an opportunity for NMVTIS stakeholders to share information, discuss the interconnectedness of the system, and consider ways to increase its effectiveness and financial sustainability.

From 2010 to 2016, the NAB members served two-year terms, meeting both in person and online. They represented key program stakeholders including states, consumers, law enforcement agencies, insurance carriers, auto recyclers, junk and salvage yards, auto industry groups, technology partners, and organizations focused on reducing vehicle-related crime, as well as the operator. The NAB fulfilled its mission and its legislative charter expired September 2016.
Integrity

Critical Data

Compliance

Program Areas
State Program

Additional States Fully Integrate NMVTIS into Titling Systems; Vehicle Data Near 100%

The Anti Car Theft Act and its regulations require each state to perform an instant title verification check before issuing a certificate of title for a vehicle that an individual or other entity brings into the state. Additionally, each state is required to report data into the system and pay user fees. All states were required to be fully compliant with the Act by January 1, 2010. For further details on approaches for title verification and reporting of data, please see Exhibit 3.

The inaugural annual report on the system was published for FY2009. It showed fourteen states Participating, fourteen states Providing Data Only, eleven states In Development, and twelve jurisdictions Not Participating. Since that time, participation has steadily increased (Figure 2). Beginning in FY2012, all fifty-one jurisdictions have either maintained participation or continued to move towards full participation. During this reporting period, forty-nine jurisdictions were Participating and two were In Development (Figure 3).
Currently **99%**

of the U.S. DMV data is represented in the system.

- **49 States Participating** – states that provide data and inquire into system before issuing new titles
- **2** State of Hawaii and District of Columbia are in Development

Figure 3

The percentage of nationwide vehicle data represented in NMVTIS is based on figures provided by jurisdictions to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Starting in FY2006, the first year the state compliance map was created, 52% of state title and brand data was represented in the system by the states Participating. By FY2014, data represented had reached 95% and remained at that level through FY2016. During FY2017, an adjustment was made to 94% since Tennessee had not provided data in more than 10 years. In FY2019, Oregon became a Participating state and brought the vehicle data represented in NMVTIS to 96%. In FY2020, California, Maryland, and Massachusetts moved from Providing Data Only to Participating, maintaining representation of 96% of the vehicle population. During this report period, Kansas, Tennessee, and Vermont completed development and are fully Participating. Idaho moved from Providing Data Only to Participating. With these additions, vehicle data represented in the system reached the significant milestone of 99% (**Figure 4**).

AAMVA continued to support states reengineering their NMVTIS application...
interface as part of modernizing their titling systems. Though not all jurisdictions are currently Participating, two are in the planning stages or In Development moving toward full participation (District of Columbia and Hawaii). When a vehicle is retitled, NMVTIS is updated to show the current state of title and the previous record is moved into title history. With forty-nine states providing data to NMVTIS, nearly two million current title records and more than seven million\(^1\) title history records were added in FY2021, yielding a total of more than 616 million current title records and more than 981 million title history records in the system (Figure 5 and Figure 6).

\(^{1}\)2021 statistics were adjusted to not include deleted records which were inadvertently included in 2020 and earlier statistics.
Over the past thirteen years, current title records in the system increased nearly 110% (Figure 7). In FY2009, current title records numbered 293 million; they reached more than 616 million during this reporting period.

Brand records captured in NMVTIS also increased during the reporting period, with over 10.7 million added (Figure 8).
States have their own branding and vehicle status policies and regulations that are considered when they are in development or updating NMVTIS. These are mapped to a standard set of NMVTIS brands to ensure consistency and standard interpretation nationwide. NMVTIS brands and definitions are developed in conjunction with the states and are related to events impacting the safety and value of the vehicles. For example, a “Salvage” brand in NMVTIS indicates the vehicle would need to meet certain state requirements (repair and inspection) to be retitled and put back on the road, while the “Odometer Not Actual” brand indicates a discrepancy with the odometer information.

More than sixty NMVTIS vehicle brands have been captured as of September 30, 2021; the top seven are shown below. Three of the top seven denote a safety concern with the vehicle that could impact the vehicle’s eligibility to be retitled for on-road use. These brands are Junk, Crushed, and Dismantled, and represent 24% of brands as of the end of the period. The Others category includes the remaining brands (Figure 9).

The Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles uses NMVTIS as a reliable resource in the fight against vehicle-related fraud in our state. It has considerably helped Indiana consumers with valuable information regarding a vehicle’s condition and history before purchasing a car.”

TANEIKA MCGUIRE
Deputy Director of Titles,
Indiana Bureau of Motor Vehicles
PROPORTION OF BRAND TYPES REPORTED THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2021

Figure 9

Reporting of brand types has increased from more than fifty-nine million in FY2010 to more than 172 million in this reporting period, an increase of 192% (Figure 10).

BRAND TYPES REPORTED YEARLY FY2010 TO FY2021

Figure 10
Figure 11
Brand records are reported by branders, which include states, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) (Figure 11). California continues to lead with the most brand records, followed by Texas, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. DOT-branded vehicles total over 700,000 and reflect the vehicles traded in under the Consumer Assistance to Recycle and Save Act, which concluded in FY2011; the brands indicate the vehicles should never be designated as roadworthy. GSA provided the fewest brands (612), which reflects GSA’s reporting of Junk or Salvage brands for federal crash, test/scrap, or salvaged vehicles that are sold to the public. More detail on GSA’s reporting can be found under Stakeholder Collaboration in this report.

During this reporting period, more than 279 million state transactions (inquiries, title updates, and brand updates) were conducted (Figure 12), an increase of nearly 10% over the more than 254 million transactions performed during the last reporting period.

"NMVTIS continues to be a great resource and partner for Colorado and is used daily when issuing titles and investigating potential title fraud.”

KEVIN KIHN
Deputy Director, Vehicle Services, Colorado Division of Motor Vehicles

Over the past thirteen years, state-conducted transactions have increased more than 282%. In FY2009, transactions numbered approximately seventy-three million; during this reporting period transactions exceeded 279 million (Figure 13).
NMVTIS State Program Subcommittee (SPS)

AAMVA continued to complete work related to daily operations, from updating system documentation to implementing changes that maintain the interoperability of NMVTIS. In the summer of 2012, to help resolve business issues related to NMVTIS and encourage jurisdictions to develop consistent system-related business policies and practices, AAMVA established the NMVTIS Business Rules Working Group. In 2018, the entity changed its status from a working group to a full-time subcommittee of the Vehicle Standing Committee and was rebranded as the NMVTIS State Program Subcommittee (SPS). Members include business and technology staff, along with representatives from the state business and technology areas. Participation balances representation across AAMVA’s regions and NMVTIS modes of participation. To help title and registration program managers align their jurisdiction’s title practices with NMVTIS, the SPS has developed and published the resource, *NMVTIS Best Practices for Title and Registration Program Managers in DMVs* since March 2014. Since that time, the publication has grown to become a key resource for states. *Edition 4* was published in November 2018. This edition includes additions or revisions to twelve chapters. This document will continue to evolve as the subcommittee identifies new topics and revises or adds recommendations for best practices.

“Iowa Motor Vehicle Division continues to use NMVTIS as a consistently reliable source of information on vehicle titles and damage indicators. This consistency is very important to make our business operations run smoothly and to provide the best information to customers.”

TONYA BISHOP
Program Planner 3, Systems & Administration, Iowa Department of Transportation
The SPS also focused on identifying strategies to encourage maximum state participation, including raising awareness of the ways states participate in the system and how they can derive optimal benefits from it. In FY2020, the SPS focused on policy issues that would be affected by modernization of NMVTIS. In previous reporting periods, the SPS made the recommendation for AAMVA to develop a *Check NMVTIS Before You Buy!* brochure and companion four-minute-long video to increase public awareness of NMVTIS. These were made available to jurisdictions in previous reporting periods, with the video offered in English and Spanish. In FY2020, the SPS assisted in the development of four short videos highlighting key messages from the full-length version. These 45-second infomercials were rolled out in English for jurisdictions to use in their DMV waiting areas and/or to post on their website for viewing by the public (see *State Awareness* section). These videos were rolled out in Spanish during this reporting period.

This year the SPS identified four issues to address concerning NMVTIS. These issues were assigned to subgroups within the SPS and include: 1) Using Non-Titling Transactions in NMVTIS, 2) Using Fraud Alerts, 3) Decreasing AAMVA Help Desk Tickets, and 4) Including Imported Vehicle Verification in NMVTIS. The Non-Titling Transactions in NMVTIS subgroup completed its work by conducting a state survey to determine interest using NMVTIS in such transactions and sought guidance from DOJ to determine if non-titling transactions were permitted in NMVTIS. While DOJ agreed the uses were reasonable, it was determined costs would rise to fund these increased transactions. The subcommittee did not recommend the use of NMVTIS for these types of transactions. The other three subgroups continue their work and are expected to report recommendations in the next reporting period.

“...There were four provisions in the Anti Car Theft Act: Title I instituted harsher penalties for auto theft crimes, particularly carjacking, and aimed to strengthen law enforcement against auto theft and fraud; Title II required the national information system which became NMVTIS; Title III dealt with the prevention of chop-shop-related thefts (stolen auto parts); and Title IV focused on preventing the export of stolen vehicles.”

LARRY GREENBERG
Former Director of Vehicle Services, AAMVA
(see *Interview*)
Participation Management Concept (PMC)

During previous reporting periods, the SPS developed a Participation Management Concept (PMC) to help states monitor system activity and provide information describing how each state participates in NMVTIS. The concept would assist states in fully maximizing the benefits of their NMVTIS participation. It would enable greater information sharing, monitoring, and evaluation, and result in a more efficient and effective system overall. The SPS developed PMC business requirements for a pilot, which were approved by AAMVA’s Vehicle Standing Committee. During the FY2020 reporting period, the PMC pilot was initiated and included enrolling nine states representing the various state participation approaches. The pilot included a website leading to an interactive map providing access to specific state profile information. In addition, pilot states received applicable monitoring reports regarding their NMVTIS operational activities. All pilot states participated in a pre-pilot survey to establish a baseline of expectation. Upon completion of the pilot in December 2020, the pilot states completed a post-pilot survey to compare results with the first survey. Overwhelmingly, the survey indicated the pilot states would use the PMC if made available.

During this reporting period, the PMC was recommended and approved to be rolled out to all fifty-one jurisdictions. The rollout would be conducted in two parts. The first part provides access to the map and profile that began during the reporting period. The second part would provide the applicable monitoring reports in the next reporting period. An enrollment process and training were developed, and five states (Massachusetts, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Utah, and Washington) were enrolled and trained in the use of the map and profile. It is anticipated that all fifty-one jurisdictions will be enrolled and have access to the map and profile by spring of 2022.

NMVTIS Webinar Training and Information Sharing for Jurisdictions

State Web Interface (SWI) Training

AAMVA continued to deliver State Web Interface (SWI) training to states, enabling them to correct their own title and brand records securely through the interface. States have reported their titling processes are more efficient and NMVTIS data integrity is improved because of their ability to make self-service data corrections. AAMVA conducted

NMVTIS is one of Delaware’s major resources in our titling process. The system assists with many challenges surrounding potential fraud and incorrect information. To protect our customers in the small state of Delaware, we pull this report with every title transaction. By using NMVTIS with every title issued, we have discovered duplicate title fraud involving multiple title loans with surrounding states, Manufacturer’s Certificate of Origin selling as a new vehicle already titled in another jurisdiction, and so much more. We also educate dealers about the value of this report during dealer training classes.”

VALERIE CAREY
Chief of Vehicle Services,
Delaware Division of Motor Vehicles
monthly SWI webinar trainings on three topics: instant title verification, data correction, and use of SWI administrative features.

During this reporting period, AAMVA held sixteen SWI webinars, with more than ninety-two participants representing sixteen states.

**NMVTIS Suspense Resolution for Online States**

AAMVA has a two-part webinar training program on NMVTIS Suspense Resolution for online states using the AAMVA Message Interchange Envelope (AMIE) and web service-based versions. During this period, AAMVA held twelve suspense resolution webinars, with more than twenty-six participants representing ten states.

**NMVTIS Business Points of Contact**

In 2016, AAMVA recognized the need for jurisdictions to have a common platform for discussion and guidance among themselves and AAMVA regarding NMVTIS. Up until that time, the only opportunity was for state business staff to participate ad-hoc in the NMVTIS information technology discussion. As a result, AAMVA established a new liaison role for jurisdictions — the NMVTIS Business Point of Contact (POC). Establishing a NMVTIS POC within each jurisdiction and bringing them together periodically provides AAMVA and jurisdictions with the capacity to collaborate on NMVTIS-related issues. The NMVTIS POC serve as the liaison for their states on NMVTIS-related issues, coordinate outreach to AAMVA as needed, and have an in-depth understanding of their jurisdictions’ title system, including integration with NMVTIS. Quarterly conference calls with the NMVTIS POC served as a forum for NMVTIS updates and feedback, fostering ongoing operational collaboration among the states.

In February, May and August of 2021, NMVTIS POC participated in conference calls to receive current information about NMVTIS, discuss their roles and responsibilities, provide feedback concerning operations, and exchange information on how NMVTIS is used in their jurisdictions. More than ninety-two participants representing twenty-nine jurisdictions participated on these conference calls.

**NMVTIS Operations Monthly Forum**

In 1997, AAMVA invited jurisdiction representatives from the technology sector to attend a monthly conference call to discuss processing issues and concerns. During this meeting of the NMVTIS Information Technology (IT) Working Group, AAMVA facilitated the discussion and provided system status updates. Over the years, the invitation was expanded to include representatives from the
NMVTIS has made a difference in Texas by aiding in the identification of fraudulent transactions, invalid titles, odometer discrepancies and brand issues. NMVTIS helps protect innocent buyers from having the car of their dreams turn into a nightmare. Obtaining a title history is one of the most important steps consumers can take to protect their safety and their money before buying a used vehicle.”

WHITNEY BREWSTER
Executive Director, Texas Department of Motor Vehicles

NMVTIS State Users Workshop

Growth in the NMVTIS state program has led to an increase in transaction volume and complexity, with the potential for multiple states to be part of a transaction. AAMVA realized the limitations of state user conference calls and decided, with the approval of DOJ, to hold the first NMVTIS States Users Workshop in FY2020. The workshop participants included state users from three disciplines: vehicle titling, law enforcement, and information technology along with AAMVA staff. The outcome of this Users Workshop was a listing of state-identified items requiring further action. During this reporting period, several of the items were analyzed, discussed with the NMVTIS State Program Subcommittee, and subsequently implemented, while others are in process or linked to future modernization efforts.

NMVTIS Program Income Funding

In 2017, DOJ and AAMVA agreed to allocate $1.2 million of NMVTIS program income to support states completing NMVTIS compliance. During previous reporting periods, several states that obtained funding completed development and implementation of NMVTIS. During this period, Idaho, Kansas, and Vermont successfully completed development and implementation as a result of the funding. One more jurisdiction, District of Columbia, is still In Development and is expected to complete implementation in the next report period.
**BENEFITS**

*States Report Positive Results Through NMVTIS Participation*

States that inquire into NMVTIS (i.e., conduct a title verification check) receive data on the specific vehicle, the current title, any brand information, JSI information, and whether the vehicle is reported stolen. Based on this information, the state determines whether to issue a new title. When a vehicle is retitled, NMVTIS is updated to show the current state of title. During this reporting period, the following states reported a wide range of benefits from participating in NMVTIS \(^2\) (detail for each state can be found in Exhibit 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) Benefits displayed are consolidated from reporting by states to date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Benefits displayed are consolidated from reporting by states to date.
PAYING USER FEES
States Paid $5.6 Million Toward the Cost of Operating the System in FY2021

In accordance with the NMVTIS Final Rule, requiring twelve months’ advance notification before charging state fees, AAMVA issued a formal notice to all state motor vehicle titling agencies regarding the relief of paying state user fees for FY2011 and FY2012 and the reinstatement of fees in FY2013.

During FY2014, AAMVA revised the state fee model so that states pay an increased portion of system costs. In FY2015, this fee model became effective. FY2021 state fees were calculated using this fee model. Key tenets of the NMVTIS state fees include:

* An equitable fifty-one-tier structure assigns each jurisdiction a portion of total system operating costs. The structure is calculated using each state’s number of registered vehicles (as reported by jurisdictions to the Federal Highway Administration) as a percentage of the total U.S. registered vehicle population.
  o The resulting percentage is used to determine each state’s portion of overall state fees.
  o The remaining percentage of operating costs is covered by other NMVTIS revenue, including Consumer Access Provider user fees and operational funds.

* States in compliance with NMVTIS receive a 50% credit of the revenue collected by AAMVA for each consumer access transaction that results in data returned for a VIN pointing to that state as the current state of title.

“Wyoming is fortunate to have NMVTIS on its tool belt. A daily-used tool that allows us to verify and provide accurate information regarding titles for many jurisdictions.”

ALEX MARTIN
Accounting Technician, Motor Vehicle Services, Wyoming Department of Transportation
States Earn Revenue Credits

As part of the state user fee model, a state that provides title and brand data to NMVTIS is eligible to earn fee credits from revenue earned by the operator when a NMVTIS record for a vehicle titled in that state is sold to an Approved NMVTIS Data Provider. Each year AAMVA notifies states of the DOJ-approved uses of fee credits. Eligible uses include: paying the future year’s user fees; making improvements to state title/registration data and processes; raising consumer awareness of NMVTIS; training staff; conducting quantitative analysis of the impacts of NMVTIS on titling process and/or consumer protection; and otherwise developing state capacity to participate fully.

During the reporting period, forty-nine eligible states earned nearly $2.1 million in credits, a 19% increase from the prior period (Figure 14), which is tied to the increase in demand for vehicle history reports which include NMVTIS information. This may be indicative of consumers re-entering the market to purchase vehicles during the second year of the COVID-19 pandemic.

| Year   | State Revenue Credits Earned
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2017</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2018</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2019</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2020</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2021</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14
Junk, Salvage, and Insurance Reporting Program

Number of Records Reported Continued to Increase; More Than Ninety-Four Million Unique VINs Reported to Date

In addition to state motor vehicle titling agencies, the Anti Car Theft Act requires that other third parties must report vehicle information into NMVTIS. Specifically, junk and salvage yards, auto recyclers, and insurance companies have been required to report (at least monthly) vehicles deemed junk, salvage, or total loss to NMVTIS since March 31, 2009. There are two reporting exceptions: entities that handle fewer than five vehicles per year deemed salvage (including total loss) or junk; and entities that currently report the required data elements to the state in which they are located, with the state providing the required information to NMVTIS. As reported under the State Program/Benefits section of this publication, states continue to rely on JSI data to inform business decisions in their state titling processes.

Four Data Consolidators provide data reporting services to businesses required to report to NMVTIS:

• AAMVA Single VIN Reporting Service
• Audatex
• Auto Data Direct, Inc. (ADD)
• ISO ClaimSearch Solutions

During this reporting period, a total of 19.8 million records were reported by junk, salvage, and insurance entities (Figure 15). This was an increase of two million (11%) from FY2020.

“NMVTIS has become an invaluable tool in Massachusetts for titling since fully implementing in 2019. Having worked in the title administration field for over 20 years, I have never felt so connected to our fellow jurisdictions. The way we can see and share vehicle information to both identify and resolve issues is an absolute game changer. An example of one of the many benefits has been ensuring that vehicles that have not had a rebuilt title issued do not get registered in Massachusetts without a full salvage inspection being completed.”

JENNIFER RIDOLFI
Program Coordinator, Title Division, Massachusetts Registry of Motor Vehicles
A total of more than 203 million junk, salvage, and insurance records, representing more than ninety-four million unique VINs, were reported in NMVTIS from FY2009 to the end of this reporting period (Figure 16). The change from FY2009 to FY2010 reflects the partial reporting period (April-September) in FY2009. The ongoing growth from FY2013 to the current period may be a result of awareness, driven by state legislative and compliance enforcement efforts, and reporting related to various disasters such as floods/fires. During this reporting period there were a number of these events, including flooding related to Hurricane Ida and local flooding events, as well as fires in California, which likely contributed to the increase from the last reporting period. In response to the major flooding associated with Hurricane Ida, DOJ is expected to issue a reminder notice to reporting entities regarding their reporting obligations.
The annual average number of junk, salvage, and insurance records reported to NMVTIS each year since FY2010 is nearly sixteen million. Recyclers and salvage pools continue to report most records, with the continued shift of recyclers reporting more than salvage pools for the second year in a row (Figure 17)
For the vehicle disposition breakdown of the 203 million total records reported to date, see Figure 18 and Figure 19.

Of the vehicles reported during the period, 65% completed the reporting process with one of the final dispositions of Crush, Salvage, Scrap, or Sold reported to
NMVTIS. The remaining 35% represents vehicles for which the reporting is incomplete, and the final disposition is pending or To Be Determined. Some reporting entities include the disposition status at the time a report is initially submitted, while others take a two-step approach. The record is submitted initially with a blank or To Be Determined disposition and subsequently updated when the disposition is known. This period’s results were consistent with the last period.

Reviewing the historic trend (Figure 19), the number of records with To Be Determined and Scrap disposition status increased compared to the prior reporting period. The two-step reporting practice contributes to the high rate of To Be Determined dispositions in this and prior reporting periods.

During this period, consultation on possible enhancements was completed with stakeholders within the Junk, Salvage, and Insurance Reporting Program. The results were to add two new dispositions to the program requirements. The new dispositions of “Owner-retained” and “Dismantled for Parts” were approved to be added to the current dispositions of Scrap, Crush, Sold and Salvage. The stakeholders explained some vehicles are insurance total losses that result in the vehicle owner and insurer agreeing to the owner retaining the vehicle. However, this agreement may occur after the vehicle has been held in the inventory of the reporting entity and had subsequently been reported to NMVTIS. The reporting entity is unable to complete the process as the current dispositions do not adequately address the situation. Based on stakeholder feedback, the new “Owner-retained” disposition is expected to address the high rate of incomplete reports with the To Be Determined disposition.
Implementation of the new dispositions began during this reporting period and will continue into the next period. Adding the new dispositions impacts all program areas – state, consumer access, law enforcement, and junk, salvage, and insurance – and as a result, the system changes are complex.

An average of just over 4,500 entities continued to report each month through this period (Figure 20). This was a slight increase in entities reporting monthly over previous reporting periods.

Of the JSI entities, recyclers continue to lead the way in reporting vehicles into NMVTIS year to year (Figure 21).

**JSI ENTITIES REPORTING BY TYPE YEARLY**

![Figure 21](image-url)

**STATES AND JSI REPORTING**

**Georgia Department of Revenue**

During the reporting period, the Georgia Department of Revenue (DOR) continued its program requiring businesses engaged in the purchase or receipt of salvage vehicles (secondary metals recyclers, used motor vehicle parts dealers, and scrap metal processors called “salvage dealers”) to report NMVTIS information to DOR. In turn, DOR provides electronic reporting that satisfies the salvage dealers’ state reporting requirements as well as federal NMVTIS reporting requirements. This is accomplished through Auto Data Direct, Inc. (ADD), Georgia’s exclusive consolidated state/federal data provider and a NMVTIS Data Consolidator. ADD provides DOR with a web-based service enabling the consolidated reporting of both state and federally required salvage vehicle information in a single process. The consolidated reporting is done at no cost to the businesses.
The number of Georgia businesses that reported and the number of records reported through this arrangement declined after the initial peak in FY2014. This reporting period saw no change in the number of businesses reporting – from 103 in FY2020. It should be noted that not all entities report each month: for example, seventy-six businesses reported in the first month of the reporting period, while all 103 businesses reported at some point during the period. At the same time, the 95,587 records reported were a 3% increase over the 92,780 reported in FY2021. The fluctuations seen for FY2018–FY2020 are tied to variability in metal prices and the increased demand for catalytic converters (Figure 22 and Figure 23).

Tennesssee Department of Revenue

During the reporting period, Tennessee continued the contractual arrangement with ADD to provide consolidated reporting, which became effective July 1, 2016. During this period, 144 businesses submitted 145,424 records through the process – a 32% increase in records reported. Similar fluctuations that occurred for Georgia businesses were seen for those in Tennessee during FY2018–FY2020, with shifts in reporting tied to variability in metal prices and the increased demand for catalytic converters (Figure 24 and Figure 25). In addition to NMVTIS reporting services, ADD provides Tennessee (DOR) with a nightly national theft check of reported vehicles. In the event of a theft alert, the report is verified by Tennessee law enforcement and the reporting business is notified. There were 312 theft alerts during the period, nearly a 42% increase compared to 220 in FY2020.
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GEORGIA JSI RECORDS REPORTED YEARLY BY BUSINESS TYPE FY2013 TO FY2021*

Figure 23
*Detailed business type breakdown is no longer captured, as of FY2018.

TENNESSEE JSI BUSINESSES REPORTING YEARLY FY2016 TO FY2021*

Figure 24
*Detailed business type breakdown is no longer captured, as of FY2018
States Reporting on Behalf of JSI Entities

During prior reporting periods, AAMVA worked with states to identify their options in reporting to NMVTIS on behalf of junk and salvage reporting entities. Insurers were excluded from this effort. Three options were considered:

1. State becomes a Data Consolidator under contract with AAMVA;
2. State contracts with an existing Data Consolidator, as in the Georgia/Tennessee model; and
3. NMVTIS serves as the single point of reporting for all junk and salvage businesses.

Implementing the third option – for NMVTIS to serve as the single point of reporting – requires legislative or regulatory changes to state reporting obligations for junk and salvage businesses, as well as technical changes for states and the system. The approach would require businesses to report only once to NMVTIS, which would then provide the data to the relevant state for its use. Further analysis of this option was deemed necessary but was not completed during the reporting period. Additionally, Alabama has a state requirement to report scrap recyclers’ and dismantlers’ information to NMVTIS on behalf of the businesses.

To support Alabama Department of Revenue (DOR), AAMVA agreed to conduct a pilot program to enable DOR to take on responsibility of a data consolidator, providing data reporting service to entities in Alabama for a period of two years while costs for ongoing support were monitored. The pilot was further deferred during this reporting period. The rewrite of the application began during FY2019.
but was delayed pending final outcomes from the AAMVA/DOJ Cooperative Agreement. The pilot, enabling states to report on behalf of their reporting entities, will be revisited once the system application rewrite is implemented.

In the interim, states still can contract with an existing reporting service (Tennessee and Georgia models). The longer-term option, in which the state becomes a data reporting service under contract with AAMVA, remains under review.

**New York**

New York continued to receive weekly extract files from the NMVTIS central site to supplement the state’s DMV program for managing destroyed vehicles during the reporting period. Vehicles reported with a disposition of Crush or Scrap by reporting entities with business addresses in the state were included in the weekly extract. This information was used to update the state title records.

**Iowa and New Hampshire**

During the reporting period, Iowa and New Hampshire continued to use weekly extract files of vehicles reported to NMVTIS with a disposition of Crush or Scrap by reporting entities with business addresses in the respective states. Also during this reporting period, many states continued to report use of JSI data for research and investigative purposes ([Exhibit 1](#)).

**STATE LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS**

During the reporting period, Alabama had one bill that was introduced, adopted and made effective. Alabama, Texas, and West Virginia introduced a combination of five pieces of legislation that are still active. The legislation introduced addressed a variety of circumstances in which NMVTIS information would be used by states and the public in making retitling or purchase decisions, as well as improvement in the enforcement of state junk and salvage reporting. To date, twenty-five states have adopted thirty-seven NMVTIS-related legislative bills.

**ADOPTED LEGISLATION:**

**ALABAMA**

AL S 198: Introduced February 4, 2021; Adopted April 8, 2021; Effective April 8, 2021

- This bill provides that, upon application made for a replacement certificate, a new certificate of title to a transferee may be issued without a 15-day hold if the title information can be verified through the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System.
PROPOSED LEGISLATION:

ALABAMA

AL H 163: Indefinitely postponed – May 6, 2021
• This bill would provide that, upon application made on a replacement certificate, a new certificate of title to a transferee may be issued without a 15-day hold if the title information can be verified through the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System.

TEXAS

TX H 2940: To HOUSE Committee on TRANSPORTATION – March 18, 2021
• A metal recycler or used automotive parts recycler who purchases a motor vehicle under this section shall obtain the following information: name, address, and National Motor Vehicle Title Information System identification number of the recycler.

• A metal recycler or used automotive parts recycler who purchases a motor vehicle shall submit to the department and the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System information necessary to satisfy any applicable requirement for reporting information to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System, in accordance with rules adopted under 28 C.F.R. Section 25.56 not later than 24 hours, not counting weekends or official state holidays, after the close of business on the day the vehicle was received. The department may report information to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System on behalf of the recycler. A recycler is not required to report information to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System if the department reports the information on behalf of the recycler.

• A metal recycler may purchase from a used automotive parts recycler a vehicle if the seller or an agent acting on behalf of the seller of the vehicle certifies to the purchaser that all vehicles included in the sale were reported to the department or the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System.

TX H 3531: Returned to SENATE from HOUSE for further action – May 27, 2021
The department may not issue a regular title for a motor vehicle based on a:
• nonrepairable vehicle title issued on or after September 1, 2003, or comparable out-of-state ownership document or record, or evidence of a notation described by Section 501.09113(a)(2) on an out-of-state ownership document or record in the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System;

• receipt issued under Section 501.1003(b); or

• certificate of authority issued under Chapter 683.

TX S 935: Committee report sent to calendars – May 23, 2021
• A metal recycler or used automotive parts recycler who purchases a motor vehicle under this section shall obtain the following information the name, address, and National Motor Vehicle Title Information System identification number of the recycler.

• A metal recycler or used automotive parts recycler who purchases a motor vehicle shall submit to the department and the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System
information necessary to satisfy any applicable requirement for reporting information to
the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System in accordance with rules adopted
under 28 C.F.R. Section 25.56 not later than 24 hours, not counting weekends or
official state holidays, after the close of business on the day the vehicle was received. The
department may report information to the National Motor Vehicle Title Information
System on behalf of the recycler. A recycler is not required to report information to
the National Motor Vehicle Title Information System if the department reports the
information on behalf of the recycler.

• A metal recycler may purchase from a used automotive parts recycler a vehicle if the
seller or an agent acting on behalf of the seller of the vehicle certifies to the purchaser
that all vehicles included in the sale were reported to the department or the National
Motor Vehicle Title Information System.

WEST VIRGINIA
WV H 2540: To HOUSE Committee on FINANCE – February 16, 2021
• Provides tax credits to individuals or automotive dealerships that donate eligible vehicles
for certain low-income individuals. An eligible vehicle must include a vehicle history
report ran through NMVTIS to prove it is not a junk or salvage vehicle, and the
certificate of title contains no brand information for the vehicle, and the dealer has no
knowledge or reason to believe the vehicle is or should have been branded.

BENEFITS
Helps Prevent Fraud and Theft, and Helps Protect Consumers from
Unsafe Vehicles

By capturing VINs of vehicles that are deemed junk, salvage, or insurance total
loss, NMVTIS serves to help prevent fraud and theft and helps protect consumers
from unsafe vehicles. States and law enforcement rely on NMVTIS data to obtain
full vehicle life cycle histories.

COMPLIANCE EFFORTS
Throughout the reporting period, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)
continued to monitor and respond to inquiries regarding a range of potential compli-
cance issues, conducting follow up whenever indicated. BJA continued to collaborate
with AAMVA on various system enhancements, which in part will assist reporting
entities in submitting final disposition actions.

To increase awareness and implementation of NMVTIS reporting requirements,
including JSI reporting, BJA participated in a stakeholder webinar with AAMVA
on May 19, 2021. As part of the update, DOJ addressed some proposed suggestions
made during the prior webinar in November 2019 and stressed the need to under-
stand and comply with JSI reporting requirements.

To continue to ensure that all fields are available to the Law Enforcement Access
Tool (LEAT) users under the JSI Reporting Entities tab, the inclusion of the “N”
corresponding letter for “Searching by Reporting ID,” which represents Individuals,
was included during the previous report period and this information continues to be
retrieved as part of the search results set.
INTERVIEW: HOWARD NUSBAUM, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL SALVAGE VEHICLE REPORTING PROGRAM

AAMVA spoke with Howard Nusbaum, Administrator, National Salvage Vehicle Reporting Program (NSVRP) about NSVRP and its relationship with NMVTIS.

AAMVA: Can you please tell us about the work of NSVRP, in general, and as it relates to NMVTIS? Specifically, what value does NMVTIS information bring to the NSVRP community and what value does the NSVRP community bring to NMVTIS?

NUSBAUM: NSVRP was established in 2008 and from its inception has worked closely in support of NMVTIS. The Bureau of Justice Assistance requested that NSVRP submit a proposed standard for junk/salvage reporting to NMVTIS. As part of the NMVTIS Final Rule, DOJ strongly encourages the operator to adopt these standards as suggested voluntary compliance standards. In 2009, NSVRP led the effort with one of the largest global salvage yards conglomerates to report their original inventory of vehicles purchased over the prior 20 years. Nearly all subsequent reporting of junk/salvage vehicles has followed the NSVRP junk/salvage reporting standard.

NMVTIS serves the dual purpose of allowing for the standardized coordination of titling and branding information between the jurisdictions, while being the only mandatory and centrally controlled database for junk/salvage vehicle reporting. The introductory paragraph of the NMVTIS Federal Rule states, “The purpose of NMVTIS is to assist in efforts to prevent the introduction or reintroduction of stolen motor vehicles into interstate commerce, protect states and individual and commercial consumers from fraud, reduce the use of stolen vehicles for illicit purposes including fundraising for criminal enterprises, and provide consumer protection from unsafe vehicles.” In this role NMVTIS functions as a critical and unique foundation for protecting the public.

What is not as well known is that NMVTIS also serves a very important role in supporting the safety recall process. During the early phases of the Takata Airbag recall the National Highway

Continued on next page.
Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) requested NSVRP to develop a voluntary best practice/standard for recalls. A majority of car manufacturers have used this best practice/standard to report to NHTSA their Takata recall efforts. The best practice/standard relies in part upon data from NMVTIS, which provides immediate, accurate, and standardized information of state titles and branding, as well as the largest active database of junk/salvage reported vehicles. The NMVTIS information is then processed – along with other information available to NSVRP – into a standardized set of results on a per-VIN basis. These results are then used to classify vehicle recall status for the OEMs. The OEMs use the results to meet their reporting obligation on their recall performance to NHTSA.

Without utilizing NMVTIS to retrieve the underlying standardized title brands it is virtually impossible to separate open recall vehicles into vehicles that have branded titles, but which still may be available for road use and therefore are a risk to the public, from vehicles with a destroyed vehicle brand, which no longer represent a risk to the public. Historically, roughly 20% of vehicles have some kind of branding, but of those the majority do not have a destroyed vehicle brand and therefore still represent a potential safety recall risk to the public if they are unremedied. This is another way that NMVTIS serves a critical role in effectively managing the safety recall process.

AAMVA: What opportunities do you see for NSVRP moving forward in support of NMVTIS?

NUSBAUM: NSVRP remains very active in highlighting the value of NMVTIS and to expand the uses of the program. We are a permanent technical advisor on the NMVTIS Law Enforcement Subcommittee and are also involved with the North American Export Committee, the International Association of Auto Theft Investigators, and with other key groups. NMVTIS has a role in all these areas. These entities and others can identify additional ways that NMVTIS can help support the public interest.
Consumer Access Program

Growth in Transactions

The Anti Car Theft Act allows both businesses and individual consumers to query NMVTIS while investigating used cars they are considering for purchase.

The Consumer Access Program experienced an increase in transaction volumes during this reporting period. Monthly volumes averaged 1.2 million transactions (Figure 26). The year-over-year comparison (Figure 27) illustrates a 14% increase from the last reporting period.
Approved NMVTIS Data Providers

The NMVTIS Consumer Access Program began FY2021 as planned, with steady transaction volume growth during the first quarter into the latter half of the second quarter. Overall, the program finished the year with 2.7 million more transactions than in the previous reporting period, a 14% increase. The growth can be attributed partially to supply chain issues in the new car sector, which continued to drive demand for used vehicles. The demand for used vehicles resulted in demand from dealers and individual purchasers for vehicle history reports. Another contributing factor to transaction growth from FY2020 to FY2021 was continued use of NMVTIS in support of vehicle safety recall campaigns.

During the reporting period, fifteen Approved NMVTIS Data Providers (“Provider(s)”) were in operation for all or part of the reporting period. One Provider approved in the last reporting period completed development and joined the program during this reporting period. Another Provider approved during the last reporting period also completed development; however, deferred moving into production. A new fee for Boolean (T/F) inquiries, where NMVTIS is checked to see if a record exists, was approved and implemented in July. In addition, a 6.2% unit price increase was announced and will be implemented in the next reporting period.

AAMVA continued to encourage states to post the public awareness video, Check NMVTIS Before You Buy! on their public-facing websites. As mentioned in the State Program section, four video shorts were created of approximately forty-five seconds each, reflecting key messages from the full-length video. These were shared with states for use in agency waiting areas and posting on state agency websites to increase consumer awareness.

Providers and AAMVA continued to explore opportunities to expand NMVTIS data in new markets and promote new uses for NMVTIS information.

“Having your motor vehicle system check NMVTIS before issuing a title is one of the best choices you can make. There’s peace of mind in knowing you have done all you can to verify the title documents being surrendered. Access to a system providing a vehicle’s title and brand history has been a huge deterrent in title fraud. If you’ve worked in systems prior to NMVTIS, you understand. To our NMVTIS partners, we thank you for the dedication and time spent in creating such a useful and valuable source of information. Respect.”

DANA JOHNSON
Programs Manager,
Division of Motor Vehicles,
Utah State Tax Commission
SECTION 2: CONSUMER ACCESS PROGRAM

OTHER
Texas Department of Motor Vehicles

In FY2014, the Texas Department of Motor Vehicles (TxDMV) restructured its website to promote greater citizen awareness of the importance of conducting a title check as part of the used-vehicle purchase process. This revamped site included use of social media to communicate the pitfalls of not doing a title check. During this reporting period, the *Don't Buy a Wreck – Do a Title Check!* video had 13,936 views compared with 12,681 views during the previous reporting period.

TxDMV refers customers to their “Title Check” website on the mail tab of all Texas Certificates of Title. During this reporting period there were 600,564 page views, an increase of 51% over 398,475 views in the previous period. There were also 158,174 new visitors to the “Title Check” website, a 64% increase from the 96,474 in FY2020. Several of the NMVTIS videos about the importance of obtaining a NMVTIS vehicle history report prior to purchasing a used vehicle have been added to the televisions in TxDMV Regional Service Centers lobbies for customers to view.

BENEFITS
System Increases Consumer Protection and Reduces Vehicle Fraud

Consumers can search NMVTIS to discover:

- Information from a vehicle’s current title, including the vehicle’s brand history.
- The latest reported odometer reading.
- Any determination that the vehicle has been designated as salvage by an insurance company or a self-insuring organization (including those vehicles determined to be a total loss).
- Any reports of the vehicle being transferred or sold to an auto recycler, junk yard, or salvage yard.

Once a vehicle is branded by a state motor vehicle titling agency, that brand becomes a permanent part of the vehicle’s NMVTIS record. Vehicles that incur significant damage are often branded Junk or Salvage. Without a fully operational NMVTIS, motor vehicles with brands on their titles can, without much difficulty, have their brands “washed.” Fraud occurs when these vehicles are presented for sale to unsuspecting consumers without disclosure of their true condition, including brand history. These consumers may pay more than fair market value and may purchase an unsafe vehicle. NMVTIS is effective in greatly reducing (if not eliminating) vehicle fraud, preventing a significant number of crimes, and protecting the lives of consumers who might otherwise and unknowingly acquire vehicles that are not safe to operate.

“NMVTIS has been crucial in providing our citizens with the knowledge and confidence to know the status of their vehicle. Whether disclosing the prior condition of the vehicle through displaying brands, potential title fraud, or a cloned vehicle, NMVTIS truly does inspire consumer safety.”

DON BURBANK
Research and Performance Manager, Vehicle and Vessel Operations, Washington Department of Licensing
Law Enforcement Access Program

Users of the Law Enforcement Access Tool (LEAT) Increased 13\% from the Prior Reporting Period

The NMVTIS LEAT is a distributed federated search tool giving authorized users the ability to query any VIN-searchable data source in any location. Two of LEAT’s major data sources are the NMVTIS central file and the Junk, Salvage, and Insurance file, along with other data sources, such as:

- lien data from the National Vehicle Service (NVS)
- records of Mexican stolen vehicles from La Oficina Coordinadora de Riesgos Asegurados, S.C. (OCRA)
- FBI’s NCIC vehicle theft data
- NICB Counterfeit and Known Clone databases

LEAT can perform a federated search of suspected flood damage vehicles and U.S. Department of Transportation’s CARS (Car Allowance Rebate System)

“NMVTIS is hard to say and easy to use. Just pay your yearly dues.”

ALEX MARTIN
Accounting Technician, Motor Vehicle Services, Wyoming Department of Transportation

2021 CHP FRAUD INVESTIGATION

The CHP’s Northern Foreign Export and Recovery Team based out of Oakland, California, uses NMVTIS on a regular basis. They located five VIN-switched/stolen vehicles using NMVTIS:

- A BMW had a fake temporary plate. NMVTIS showed the primary VIN was registered for the first time with approximately 26,000 miles and a secondary VIN inspection confirmed it was stolen.
- While inspecting containers at the Port of Oakland they used NMVTIS to investigate a Mercedes. NMVTIS showed it was registered using incorrect codes which led investigators to discover it was a VIN-switched/stolen vehicle.
- They used NMVTIS for “Operation Upper Class,” checking title histories to locate the original location of thefts on three additional suspected VIN-switched vehicles.

J.R. DAUGHRITY, Captain, California Highway Patrol, Field Support Section
data, and can provide a VIN analysis of the manufacturer’s information.

Within LEAT, the user can perform a VIN-based search of all data sources in two ways: 1) using the VIN search tool; and 2) searching by state title number to access the state’s title information and the vehicle’s VIN, then clicking on the VIN.

LEAT allows users to search as many as five VINs on the initial inquiry page and to perform bulk searches ranging from six to 10,000 VINs in a bulk search method. In the results from a LEAT bulk search, the user has the option to receive a PDF file for each VIN along with Excel spreadsheets summarizing the results, which can be used to assist in analyzing the data. Some users are limited on the data they can access based on the permissions provided by the data owner.

Another feature of the LEAT is to search JSI reporting entity information. The addition of the JSI report ensures greater involvement by state and local law enforcement and non-sworn DMV investigators for JSI reporting compliance. Involvement by these agencies supports U.S. Department of Justice’s JSI enforcement efforts.

During this reporting period, users continued to recommend features to enhance the search tool and to expand functionality to further assist law enforcement investigations. In addition to exploring new data sources, the LEAT continued to expand use to state DMV non-sworn investigators, including initial discussions with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP).

The number of LEAT users rose 13% from 7,122 in FY2020 to 8,026 users at the end of the current reporting period (Figure 28). LEAT users, who include law enforcement officers (federal, state, local, tribal, and territorial), military investigators, non-sworn state DMV investigators from the U.S., and law enforcement personnel in Canada including the Service Alberta, Special Investigations Unit, continue to access LEAT through two secure law enforcement portals: the Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS) and the FBI’s Law Enforcement Enterprise Portal (LEEP).

During this reporting period, 904 new LEAT users were added. The average number of new users annually since FY2010 grew from 647 last reporting period to 843 in this reporting period.

“Deploying use of interactive NMVTIS has increased our ability to identify stolen/clone vehicles and missing brands while decreasing customer wait times. Improved customer service, fraud detection, and brand maintenance is a win for all Nebraska residents.”

BETTY JOHNSON
Division Administrator,
Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles
During the reporting period LEAT inquiries increased 39% from 373,300 in FY2020 to 517,856 in this reporting period. The increase is likely a result of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on enforcement activity, as well as normal fluctuation. Since inception and through the current period, over 4.3 million LEAT inquiries were conducted. The increase in FY2019 reflects volume from an FBI investigation (Figure 29).

NMVTIS Law Enforcement Subcommittee (LESC)

In FY2021, AAMVA’s NMVTIS Law Enforcement Subcommittee (LESC), comprised of law enforcement personnel, industry experts, and federal partners, continued to support and encourage use of NMVTIS LEAT. LESC members...
provided presentations for AAMVA webinars and other trainings and conferences to educate attendees on effective methods of using NMVTIS LEAT and to provide case studies in successful use of the tool (Exhibit 5). Members updated the NMVTIS LEAT contact list and continued documenting jurisdiction NMVTIS enforcement and compliance legislation, providing law enforcement and DMV investigators with resources to enhance vehicle research and investigations.

To encourage and promote the use of NMVTIS LEAT, the NMVTIS LESC developed a NMVTIS Enforcement Award in FY2020. This award was presented at the 2021 AAMVA Annual International Conference to Assistant Special Agent In Charge Crystal Caldwell of the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles, Richmond Division.

The LESC discussed efforts to create a mobile LEAT application which would return basic LEAT results and refer the user to the website for more details. The LESC continued researching NMVTIS success stories and suggestions for program enhancements, providing law enforcement and DMV investigators with updated tools and resources to strengthen vehicle-related crime investigations.

**BENEFITS**

**NMVTIS Provides Data Helpful to Investigations**

The NMVTIS Law Enforcement Access Tool provides law enforcement and state DMV investigators with secure access to information that assists in the investigation of vehicle crimes and other criminal activity. These crimes include vehicle theft and VIN cloning, vehicle finance fraud, vehicle title and brand fraud; they may also include violent crimes such as smuggling operations (human trafficking, narcotics,

"If NMVTIS didn’t exist, we would have more fraud, stolen, and cloned vehicles coming into Kentucky. We depend on the information provided and are looking forward to all 51 jurisdictions being on board.”

LORETTA FOWLER
Branch Manager, Department of Vehicle Regulation, Kentucky Division of Motor Vehicle Licensing

---

2021 FRAUD INVESTIGATION

Officers with Framingham (MA) Police Department Stolen Vehicle Task Force stopped a vehicle with temporary Texas plates. The driver’s story was suspicious so they accessed LEAT to ascertain the actual vehicle history. The information obtained led them to remove the vehicle from the road and pursue further investigation.

MATT STEWART, Law Enforcement Coordinator, New England State Police Information Network
In October 2020, a CHP investigator assigned to the Sonoma County Auto Theft Task Force (SonCATT) was investigating a VIN switched/stolen 2017 Dodge Charger. While trying to determine the true identity of the vehicle, and whether or not this might actually be a VIN switch, the investigator ran the vehicle’s VIN through NMVTIS to learn the Dodge Charger was registered in Canada. The NMVTIS report gave him extensive and crucial information to his investigation, linking the vehicle to an ongoing VIN switch conspiracy case. Ultimately, the VIN-switched (stolen) vehicle and fraudulent registered owner were detained during a traffic stop and the CHP investigator interviewed the suspect and seized the vehicle. The case spurred several search warrants, which appeared to have involved an innocent purchaser. The true owner, an elderly woman from Georgia, had been the victim of a carjacking at a gas station. Due to unfortunate economic circumstances, her insurance had lapsed and therefore she had never been assisted in any way in recovering or replacing the vehicle. When the CHP investigator called her to tell her the news of the recovery of her vehicle, she was extremely excited, stating she never thought she would see the vehicle again and could not believe it was in California. She was extremely grateful to the investigator and the CHP.

J.R. DAUGHRITY, Captain, California Highway Patrol, Field Support Section
OUTREACH AND AWARENESS OF NMVTIS

NMVTIS Awareness Efforts Continued

Outreach and awareness efforts during the reporting period were focused broadly on the law enforcement community. In addition, AAMVA staff provided regular NMVTIS updates to the AAMVA Board of Directors and the NMVTIS State Program Subcommittee (SPS). Both AAMVA and BJA staff participated in the NMVTIS Law Enforcement Subcommittee (LESC) annual meeting in February. NMVTIS updates were also provided at six monthly AAMVA Fraud Awareness calls.

AAMVA also hosted semi-annual NMVTIS Stakeholder Webinars. These webinar agendas covered updates from AAMVA and DOJ and are intended to re-engage with the NMVTIS stakeholder community after the NMVTIS Advisory Board (NAB) fulfilled its mission and its legislative charter in September 2016. During this reporting period, the two webinars had a total of 382 attendees representing state motor vehicle agencies, law enforcement, industry associations, vendor partners, and federal agencies.

AAMVA hosted twenty-eight webinars to familiarize state agencies with new system tools and features; 118 personnel participated. More information can be found under the State Program section of this report.

As reported in previous reporting periods, print and online ads have been run in law enforcement publications and DOJ and AAMVA staff have worked with the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) to develop a Spotlight On segment to promote public awareness of NMVTIS. Details on these efforts are in Exhibit 4.

A detailed listing of outreach events conducted by Law Enforcement Subcommittee members (including DOJ and AAMVA) during this reporting period appears in Exhibit 5. In addition to in-person events, the LESC provides an ongoing LEAT advertisement to run monthly in the International Association of Auto Theft Investigators (IAATI) Vehicle Crimes Today newsletter. The title is “What Is NMVTIS, You Ask?” and references https://vehiclehistory.bja.ojp.gov as well as encouraging investigators to use the tool for vehicle-related crime investigations.

FRAUD DETECTION AND REMEDIATION

AAMVA’s Fraud Detection and Remediation (FDR) Training Program

The FDR training program provides in-depth training to educate attendees on the latest techniques in fraud deterrence and detection. The program provides detailed examples and explanations of document authentication techniques to identify security features of motor vehicle titles, personal identification, and supporting documents. FDR also contains a specific training module titled “NMVTIS Investigation Tools,” which contains information on how NMVTIS can be used by motor vehicle agencies to detect fraud and stolen vehicles, how to use NMVTIS LEAT functions, what information NMVTIS LEAT contains, and how to gain access. FDR is an invaluable resource for jurisdictions in their fight against fraud to enhance program and product integrity.
The FDR training program was developed during the FY2015 reporting period. All jurisdictions continued to use the FDR program during this reporting period. As part of AAMVA Fraud Awareness efforts with motor vehicle agencies and law enforcement, regular updates were presented on NMVTIS program performance. Additionally, opportunities continue to be identified to enhance vehicle title information and to encourage the use of NMVTIS as a resource for the motor vehicle community to detect and deter fraud.

STATE AWARENESS EFFORTS
As of the end of this reporting period, twenty-six states promoted NMVTIS by posting the following links from their public websites to https://vehiclehistory.bja.ojp.gov:

- California: https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/dmv/detail/vr/nmvtis_check and https://www.chp.ca.gov/Programs-Services/Services-Information/Avoiding-Vehicle-Theft
- Idaho: https://itd.idaho.gov/itddmv/?target=registration-plates
- Indiana: https://www.in.gov/bmv/titles/consumer-protection/
- Iowa: http://www.iowadot.gov/mvd/buyingselling/vehicle-disposal
- Kansas: https://www.ksrevenue.org/dmvindex.html
- Mississippi: https://www.dor.ms.gov/sites/default/files/Tags%20%26%20Titles/Verify%20Title%20%26%20(1).pdf
- Missouri: http://dor.mo.gov/morty/nmvtis/
- Montana: https://dojmt.gov/driving/buying-or-selling-a-vehicle/
- Nebraska: https://dvr.nebraska.gov/dvr/mvtitles
- New York: https://dmv.ny.gov/regulated-businesses/more-business-information
- North Dakota: https://www.dot.nd.gov/divisions/mv/vehicle.htm#vehicle-history-check
- Pennsylvania: https://www.dmv.pa.gov/Vehicle-Services/Title-Registration/Pages/nmvtis.aspx
- South Dakota: https://dor.sd.gov/individuals/motor-vehicle/all-vehicles-title-fees-registration/#NMVTIS
- Texas: http://www.txdmv.gov/titlecheck
• Utah: https://dmv.utah.gov/general/fraud-alerts
• Virginia: https://www.dmv.virginia.gov/vehicles/#nmvtis.asp
• West Virginia: https://transportation.wv.gov/DMV/Vehicle-Services/Titles/Pages/default.aspx
• Wisconsin: http://wisconsindot.gov/Pages/dmv/vehicles/vhcl-rcd-hst/vehicle-history.aspx
• Wyoming: http://www.dot.state.wy.us/home/titles_plates_registration.html

Additionally, as mentioned in the **State Program** section, AAMVA has encouraged jurisdictions to use the full-length and short **Check NMVTIS Before You Buy!** videos in DMVs and on state public-facing websites. Customers will benefit from searching the same system that their state motor vehicle agency checks prior to titling a vehicle. The following fifteen states have reported using the videos:

• Alabama: Link for video in English is posted on the website listed above.
• California: Videos in English and Spanish are posted on the California Highway Patrol website listed above.
• Colorado: Link for video in English is posted on the website listed above.
• Indiana: Link for video in English is posted on the website listed above.
• Kansas: Link for videos in English and Spanish are posted on the website listed above.
• Maine: Video in English is posted on the Bureau of Motor Vehicles website listed above.
• Mississippi: Links for videos in English and Spanish are posted on the website listed above.
• Nebraska: Link for video in English is posted on the website listed above.
• North Dakota: Link for video in English is posted on the website listed above.
• Pennsylvania: Link for video in English is posted on the website listed above.
• South Dakota: Link for video in English is posted on the website listed above.
• Texas: Added several of the short videos to the televisions in the lobbies of its Regional Service Centers for customers to view.
• Utah: Link for videos in English and Spanish are posted on the website listed above.
• Virginia: Link for video in English is posted on the website listed above.
• Wyoming: Videos in English and Spanish are posted on the website listed above.

**STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION**

**The U.S. General Services Administration and AAMVA**

An arrangement between the GSA and AAMVA enables GSA’s Property Sales Office to apply two types of vehicle brands to federal crash, test/scrap, and salvaged vehicles sold to the public.

During the reporting period, AAMVA worked with GSA to revise their contractual arrangement from a memorandum of understanding to a no-cost contract. AAMVA continued its support and manually applied applicable Junk or Salvage brands to vehicles on behalf of GSA. During the reporting period, twelve vehicles were branded by the GSA for a total of 612 vehicles branded by GSA in NMVTIS (**Figure 11, Brand Records Reported by Brander**).
Financial Reports

Operating Expenditures Totaled $9,183,242; State User Fees Contributed $5,600,001

During the FY2021 reporting period, program revenue was comprised largely of consumer access and state user fees. Under federal law, NMVTIS shall be self-sustaining – that is, operated without federal funding. The program earned $7,661,762 in revenue during this period, which was used to cover $9,183,242 in operating expenses (Figure 30). Total expenses include system modernization costs of $1,521,660, which are currently covered by AAMVA Board Designated Funds.

All financial information presented is derived from an independent financial audit conducted for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NMVTIS FY2021 INCOME STATEMENT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>$7,661,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses*</td>
<td>($9,183,242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income</td>
<td>($1,521,480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>($1,177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income/ (Expense)</td>
<td>$1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Temporary Restricted Revenue**</td>
<td>$291,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET LOSS</strong></td>
<td>($1,230,263)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30

* Includes NMVTIS Modernization expenses of $1,521,660 incurred during FY2021. This activity is funded by designated reserves set aside by AAMVA’s Board of Directors to support the enhancement and modernization of NMVTIS.

** Generally Accepted Accounting Principles treatment that allows AAMVA to show program funds placed into restriction or released from restriction (Operational Reserves) on its Income Statement.

NMVTIS REVENUE

NMVTIS funding in FY2021 was derived primarily from state user fees of $5,600,001 and Consumer Access Program fees of $4,436,189. During FY2021, forty-nine states were eligible to receive credits for a share of the Consumer Access Program fees, earning a total of $2,084,448 (Figure 31 and Figure 32).
NMVTIS REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State User Fees</td>
<td>$5,600,001</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Access</td>
<td>$4,436,189</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional Revenue Share</td>
<td>($2,084,448)</td>
<td>-27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Temporary Restricted Revenue</td>
<td>($289,980)</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$7,661,762</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF FY2021 PROGRAM REVENUE

Figure 32

NMVTIS OPERATING EXPENSES

NMVTIS initiatives and their associated costs segmented (Figure 33):

- **Operations:** Support of the day-to-day functioning of the NMVTIS platform represents $7,139,693 or 77.7% of program costs.

- **Implementation:** Activities associated with supporting states and Consumer Access Approved NMVTIS Data Providers in their efforts to implement the NMVTIS platform represent $522,069 or 5.7% of program costs.

- **Modernization:** Activities necessary to enhance and further the technology of the system represent $1,521,660 or 16.6% of program costs.

NMVTIS functional cost breakdown (Figures 34 and 35):
PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF FY2021 OPERATING EXPENSES BY INITIATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernization</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 33

PROGRAM EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Expenses</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Labor/Fringe</td>
<td>$4,900,982</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Center/Network</td>
<td>$1,091,380</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>$820,860</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>$2,370,020</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,183,242</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 34

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF FY2021 OPERATING EXPENSES BY COST CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Labor/Fringe</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Center/Network</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 35
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Milestones
Looking Ahead

All Jurisdictions Will Be Fully Participating in NMVTIS; System Improvements, Stakeholder and Consumer Engagement, and Financial Sustainability Continue

Participation

Data reporting (by states and other entities) and use of NMVTIS data (by states, law enforcement, and consumers) remain central to the system’s continued success. All jurisdictions in the continental United States are expected to become fully Participating in NMVTIS by the end of FY2022, representing nearly 100% of U.S. vehicle population.

Through ongoing training and outreach by the LESC, law enforcement’s embrace of the NMVTIS LEAT will continue to grow as users realize the benefits of including LEAT as a key resource for investigations. The LESC continues to pursue greater involvement of state and local law enforcement in JSI reporting. The opportunity to bolster DOJ’s JSI compliance enforcement responsibilities may result in greater and more complete reporting by all required entities.

System Improvement Activities Continue

Having completed migration to the Cloud on the non-production activities, AAMVA will leverage the flexibility and efficiency gained toward planning for system modernization. By applying an iterative approach to development, AAMVA modernization activities will better support and respond to user requirements. The coming year will also continue with the rewriting of the junk, salvage, and insurance (total loss) reporting system and the State Web Interface applications.

Stakeholder Engagement

AAMVA will continue stakeholder engagement efforts by holding two stakeholder webinars to provide the NMVTIS community with updates on system performance and key initiatives. The webinars will focus on topics provided by stakeholders as well as specific program areas including the state program.

Consumer Access Program

With the growing levels of state participation, NMVTIS will continue to be the trusted source of vehicle data. As the demand for used vehicles continues, the demand for vehicle history reports containing NMVTIS data is expected to continue. In addition, opportunities to expand and explore new use cases for NMVTIS data will continue into FY2022.

NMVTIS Sustainability

The AAMVA Board is expected to oversee the identification, approval, and execution of a long-term approach to ensuring the financial sustainability of NMVTIS. This will position the system for the future with a solid basis for growth and development.

With state participation reaching a significant milestone along with an approach for long-term funding, continued system modernization efforts, and hopefully an end to the COVID-19 pandemic, AAMVA looks forward to continued engagement with NMVTIS stakeholders to deliver on the NMVTIS mission.
SECTION 6: NMVTIS MILESTONES

- Program Activity
- NMVTIS Legislation

Milestone activity for years 1992 through 2009 can be viewed in Exhibit 6.

- States required to report specific information to NMVTIS and perform title verifications using NMVTIS
- NMVTIS Advisory Board inaugural meeting
- AAMVA’s Direct Reporting Service is available to JSI entities
- BJA issues policy clarification regarding reporting requirements for tow operators/towing companies
- FY2011 Annual Report published
- System reengineered platform launched
- FY2013 Annual Report published
- AAMVA/DOJ Cooperative Agreement executed
- NMVTIS-related legislation passed in three states and introduced in one state
- Pilot deployed for expansion of state help desk capabilities
- FY2012 Annual Report published
- NMVTIS-related legislation passed in ten states
- FY2010 Annual Report published
- California Assembly Bill 1215

Funding

- 1996: DOT awards initial grants to states to develop NMVTIS
- 1997: BJA awards grants to states to develop NMVTIS
- 1998: BJA awards grants to states and AAMVA to develop NMVTIS
- 1999-2000: BJA awards grants to states and AAMVA
- 2003: BJA awards grants to states and AAMVA
- 2004: BJA awards grants to states and AAMVA
- 2007: BJA awards grants to states and AAMVA

NMVTIS 2021 Annual Report
SECTION 6: NMVTIS MILESTONES (Continued)

- **2015**
  - NMVTIS reengineering completed
  - NMVTIS-related legislation passed in eight states and introduced in seven states

- **2016**
  - FY2014 Annual Report published
  - State Web Services is available to states

- **2017**
  - FY2015 Annual Report published
  - NMVTIS-related legislation passed in three states and introduced in nine states

- **2018**
  - FY2016 Annual Report published
  - NMVTIS-related legislation passed in two states and was introduced in four states

- **2019**
  - FY2017 Annual Report published
  - NMVTIS-related legislation passed in five states and was introduced in three states

- **2020**
  - FY2018 Annual Report published
  - Participation Management Concept pilot started
  - NMVTIS-related legislation passed in three states and introduced in six states

- **2021**
  - FY2019 Annual Report published
  - NMVTIS State Users Workshop held
  - NMVTIS-related legislation passed in one state and introduced in three states

- **2008**
  - BJA awards grants to one state and AAMVA

- **2009**
  - BJA awards grants to states and AAMVA

- **2010**
  - BJA awards grants to states and AAMVA

- **2011**
  - BJA awards grants to states and AAMVA

- **2018**
  - BJA and AAMVA award funding to states

- **2019**
  - BJA and AAMVA award funding to states
Appendix

Note: Annual Reports, Correspondence, Press, and Reports (General) dated prior to 2021 can be viewed in Exhibit 7. For Notices, please refer to DOJ’s NMVTIS website.

LEGISLATION
• California Assembly Bill (AB) 1215 (2012)
• NMVTIS Final Rule (2009)
• Anti Car Theft Improvements Act (1996)
• Anti Car Theft Act (1992)

PRESS
• E&E News – Used Car Exports Threaten Climate Goals (May 2021)
• Autoevolution – Tropical Storm Fred Means a Strained Used Car Market Will Be Awash in Damaged Vehicles (August 2021)
• Autoevolution – How to Legally Get Possession of Abandoned Vehicles in Alabama and Alaska (September 2021)
• Autoevolution – In Less Than Two Months You Can Title an Abandoned Car in Arizona or Arkansas (September 2021)
• Office of Georgia Attorney General – Carr Warns of Flood-Damaged Vehicles Being Sold in the Wake of Hurricane Ida (September 2021)
• JC Post – Geary County Treasurer Provides Information to the Breakfast Optimists (September 2021)
• WTMJ4.com – As Many As 3,800 Flooded Vehicles are in Use Right Now in Wisconsin, According to Carfax (September 2021)

REPORTS – FINANCIAL
• NMVTIS Independent Auditor’s Report for the Period October 1, 2020 – September 30, 2021

RESOURCES
• Check NMVTIS Before You Buy! Brochure (Rev. 2021)
• Check NMVTIS Before You Buy! Videos (September 2020 – Available in shorts and full-length in English Captioned/Uncaptioned and Spanish Captioned)
• NMVTIS: Help Prevent Crime & Save Lives Brochure (Rev. 2021)
• NMVTIS: Law Enforcement & Vehicle Title Investigator Guide (Rev. 2021)
• NMVTIS: Law Enforcement Access Tool Video (2019)
• NMVTIS: Working for States Brochure (Rev. 2021)
• NMVTIS: Working for States Video (2018)
SECTION 7: APPENDIX (Continued)

• NMVTIS Best Practices for Title and Registration Program Managers – Edition 4 (November 2018)
• Texas DMV Consumer Awareness Video – Don’t Buy a Wreck, Do a Title Check! (November 2014)

WEBSITES
• AAMVA NMVTIS Website
• DOI NMVTIS Website
Exhibits

EXHIBIT 1: STATE BENEFITS

During this reporting period, the following states reported a wide range of benefits from participating in NMVTIS (an overview can be found in the State Program/Benefits section of this report):

Potential Stolen Vehicles Identified Using NMVTIS

• Arkansas: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Colorado: Stolen vehicle hits identified while conducting title verification.
• Connecticut: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Delaware: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Florida: Vehicle hits prompted investigations and resulted in the seizure and/or recovery of fifty-two stolen vehicles.
• Indiana: 2,034 stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Iowa: 327 stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations; 110 confirmed stolen and forty-three were recovered by the Iowa DOT Bureau of Investigations or outside law enforcement.
• Kansas: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Massachusetts: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Minnesota: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Montana: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Nebraska: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Nevada: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• New Hampshire: 381 stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• North Carolina: 224 stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Utah: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Washington: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• West Virginia: Stolen vehicle hits prompted investigations.
• Wisconsin: Stolen vehicle hits prompted an investigation.

Vehicle Brands Identified and Carried Forward Using NMVTIS

• Arkansas: Carried forward missing brands.
• Colorado: Carried forward missing brands.
• Connecticut: Investigated and/or carried forward missing brands: included were vehicles previously reported as junk, which were identified and prevented from returning to the road.
• Delaware: Carried forward missing brands.
• Florida: Ninety-three odometer fraud complaints received by the Motor Vehicle Fraud Unit prompted investigations; fifty-five of those titles were either branded “Not Actual” or were flagged for correction.
Indiana: Carried forward 43,247 missing brands.
Iowa: Carried forward missing brands.
Kansas: Carried forward missing brands.
Kentucky: Carried forward missing brands.
Massachusetts: Carried forward missing brands: included were vehicles previously reported as junk, which were identified and prevented from returning to the road.
Minnesota: Carried forward missing brands: included were vehicles previously reported as junk, which were identified and prevented from returning to the road.
Montana: Carried forward missing brands.
Nebraska: Carried forward missing brands.
Nevada: Carried forward missing brands.
New Hampshire: Carried forward 16,861 missing brands.
Texas: Carried forward 19,929 missing brands: 2,194 out-of-state titles surrendered did not contain brands; 2,967 previously issued Texas titles were missing brands; 383 vehicles that lacked ownership evidence and were processed under a bond, court order, or foreclosure lien were identified as missing brands; and 19,929 transactions were caught in which a processing clerk failed to carry forward a brand. Before new titles were issued, Texas reapplied “Not Actual” mileage brand for fifty-two vehicles which were previously reported as such but were issued titles removing the “Not Actual” brand and showing “Exempt” from odometer disclosure.
Utah: Carried forward missing brands.
Washington: Investigated and/or carried forward missing brands: included were vehicles previously reported as junk, which were identified and prevented from returning to the road.
West Virginia: Carried forward missing brands: included were vehicles previously reported as junk, which were identified and prevented from returning to the road.
Wisconsin: Carried forward missing brands: included were vehicles previously reported as junk, which were identified and prevented from returning to the road.

Enhanced Customer Service Attributed to NMVTIS Use
Alabama: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.
Arizona: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.
Arkansas: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Arkansas residents. Arkansas’ help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Also, NMVTIS automation has reduced wait times.
California: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.
Colorado: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Colorado residents. Colorado’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than
the title presented to the state. Colorado also provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Connecticut**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Connecticut residents. Connecticut’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state (junk vehicles were identified prior to titling).

- **Delaware**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Delaware residents. Delaware’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Delaware also provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Florida**: NMVTIS is frequently used to resolve title fraud issues, ensuring the most accurate title documents for out-of-state victims as well as Florida residents. Florida’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Also, NMVTIS automation has reduced wait times.

- **Idaho**: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Illinois**: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Indiana**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Indiana residents and provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Iowa**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Iowa residents and provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Kansas**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Kansas residents. Kansas’ help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Kansas also provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Kentucky**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Kentucky residents.

- **Maine**: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Massachusetts**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Massachusetts residents. Massachusetts’ help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Massachusetts also provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.
- **Minnesota**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Minnesota residents. Minnesota’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state.

- **Mississippi**: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Missouri**: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Montana**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Montana residents. Montana’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Montana also provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Nebraska**: NMVTIS automation reduced wait times and ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Nebraska residents. Nebraska’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity. Nebraska also informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state, and provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Nevada**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Nevada residents and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase. Nevada’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity.

- **New Hampshire**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to New Hampshire residents and provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **New York**: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **North Dakota**: Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to North Dakota residents and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Also provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Pennsylvania**: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **South Dakota**: Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

- **Texas**: Inquiries revealed 115,491 apparent errors, prompting a secondary review to ensure accuracy. The majority of these had substantive errors that may have allowed fraud or caused issues for future owners. Provided link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.
• **Utah:** NMVTIS automation reduced wait times and ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Utah residents. Utah’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Utah also provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

• **Virginia:** Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

• **Washington:** Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Washington residents. Washington’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity, and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state.

• **West Virginia:** Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to West Virginia residents and informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. West Virginia’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity. West Virginia also provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

• **Wisconsin:** Ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Wisconsin residents. Informed customers when searches revealed brands not on titles and/or on more current titles than the title presented to the state. Wisconsin’s help desk resolved title and brand issues with other NMVTIS jurisdictions, improving customer service and enhancing record integrity. Wisconsin also provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

• **Wyoming:** Provided a link to customers to purchase a NMVTIS vehicle history report, which provided valuable information prior to purchase.

### Potential “Cloned” Vehicles Identified Using NMVTIS

- **Arkansas:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Colorado:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Connecticut:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Delaware:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Florida:** Fifty-two cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Indiana:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Iowa:** Eleven cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Kansas:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Kentucky:** Three cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Massachusetts:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Minnesota:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Nebraska:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Nevada:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Utah:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
- **Washington:** Cloned VINs prompted investigations.
West Virginia: Cloned VIN prompted an investigation.

Wisconsin: Cloned VINs prompted investigations.

Potential Fraudulent Activity Identified Using NMVTIS

Arkansas: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Arkansas residents.

Colorado: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Colorado residents.

Connecticut: NMVTIS automation identified title, odometer, brand and/or VIN discrepancies that could be investigated, ensuring the most accurate title documents were issued to Connecticut residents.

Delaware: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Delaware residents.

Florida: Fifty-five title records were corrected to reflect the odometer reading as “Not Actual,” ensuring the most accurate title documents were issued to Florida residents.

Indiana: 302,071 fraudulent incidents were identified, ensuring the most accurate title documents were issued to Indiana residents.

Iowa: Eleven cloned vehicles were identified, nine odometer rollback cases were worked involving multiple victims, and two titles were found to be either fake or washed. NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Iowa residents.

Kansas: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Kansas residents.

Kentucky: NMVTIS automation identified title, odometer, and brand discrepancies that could be investigated, ensuring the most accurate title documents were issued to Kentucky residents.

Massachusetts: NMVTIS automation identified title, odometer, brand and/or VIN discrepancies that could be investigated, ensuring the most accurate title documents were issued to Massachusetts residents.

Minnesota: NMVTIS automation identified title, odometer, brand and/or VIN discrepancies that could be investigated, ensuring the most accurate title documents were issued to Minnesota residents.

Montana: NMVTIS automation identified title, odometer, brand and/or VIN discrepancies that could be investigated, ensuring the most accurate title documents were issued to Montana residents.

Nebraska: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Nebraska residents.

Nevada: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Nevada residents.

New Hampshire: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to New Hampshire residents.

Texas: Sixty-one fake or fraudulent titles were identified, 149 titles had odometer readings altered, and nineteen titles had brands tampered with or altered. An additional 3,490 superseded titles (see Glossary) were surrendered, and 8,675 odometer discrepancies identified and are pending further verification of either title tampering or data entry errors. NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Texas residents.
• **Utah**: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Utah residents.

• **Washington**: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Washington residents.

• **West Virginia**: NMVTIS automation identified title, odometer, brand and/or VIN discrepancies that could be investigated, ensuring the most accurate title documents were issued to West Virginia residents.

• **Wisconsin**: NMVTIS automation ensured the most accurate title documents were issued to Wisconsin residents.

**Enhancements for Motor Vehicle Titling Agencies Attributed to NMVTIS**

• **Arkansas**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate, saved time and money, and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.

• **Colorado**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate, saved time and money, and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.

• **Connecticut**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.

• **Delaware**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate.

• **Florida**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate.

• **Indiana**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate.

• **Iowa**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate.

• **Kansas**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.

• **Kentucky**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate.

• **Massachusetts**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate, saved time and money, and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.

• **Minnesota**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate, saved time and money, and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.

• **Montana**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate.

• **Nebraska**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate and saved time and money.

• **Nevada**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate.

• **New Hampshire**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate.

• **Texas**: Began reporting Export Only and Junk brands to NMVTIS for salvage and non-repairable vehicles, making titles more accurate.

• **Utah**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate, saved time and money, and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.

• **Washington**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.

• **West Virginia**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.

• **Wisconsin**: NMVTIS automation made titles more accurate, saved time and money, and assisted in clearing cases/alerts.
JSI Data Assisted in Business Processes

- **Arkansas:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Colorado:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Connecticut:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Delaware:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Indiana:** Data was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Iowa:** Identified and researched more than 3,000 vehicles with a junk/salvage/insurance flag, ensuring the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Kansas:** Data was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Massachusetts:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Minnesota:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Montana:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Nevada:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **New Hampshire:** Data was referenced on 18,801 occasions to assist in ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued; prevented junk vehicles from being titled and registered.

- **North Carolina:** Data was referenced on 32,951 occasions to assist in ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued; prevented junk vehicles from being titled and registered.

- **North Dakota:** Data was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

- **Utah:** Data assisted in investigations.

- **Washington:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.
• **West Virginia:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.

• **Wisconsin:** Data assisted in investigations and was used to verify junk and salvage vehicles from other states, ensuring the appropriate brand was attached to a specific VIN and the appropriate type of title was issued.
EXHIBIT 2: SPECIFIC SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE NMVTIS OPERATOR

Specific to state agencies, the operator must:
• make available at least two methods of verifying title information using NMVTIS.
• enable states to share all information in NMVTIS obtained on a specific vehicle.
• provide states with the greatest amount of flexibility in such things as data standards, mapping, and connection methods.

Specific to law enforcement, the operator must:
• ensure state and local law enforcement agencies have access to all title, brand, and junk, salvage, and insurance information in or available through NMVTIS through a VIN search, including limited personal information collected by NMVTIS.
• allow law enforcement agencies to make inquiries based on other search criteria in the system, including the organizations reporting data to the system; individuals owning, supplying, purchasing, or receiving such vehicles (if available); and export criteria.

Specific to consumer access, the operator must:
• ensure a means exists to allow insurers and prospective purchasers to access NMVTIS information, including information regarding title history (if the state participates in NMVTIS); brands, insurance, junk and salvage history; and odometer readings. Such access shall be provided to individual consumers in a single-VIN search and to commercial consumers in a single- or batch-VIN search with multiple VINs.

Further, the operator must:
• establish and at least annually collect user fees from the states and other users of NMVTIS data to pay for its operation.
• not release any personally identifiable information to any entity other than states and law enforcement.
• maintain a privacy policy that describes the uses and disclosures of such personally identifiable information.
• use appropriate security measures such as encryption if transmitting personally identifiable information over the Internet, and limit access to such information to only those with legitimate need.
• to the extent reasonably feasible, employ standards-based information exchange methods that can be used by NMVTIS stakeholders and are developed by such organizations as the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), the Open API Specification (OAS), the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM), and the Global Reference Architecture (GRA), and other future industry standards/practices.
• prepare an annual report describing the performance of the system during the preceding year, including a detailed report of NMVTIS expenses and all revenues received as a result of operation.
• procure an independent financial audit of NMVTIS expenses and revenues during the preceding year.
EXHIBIT 3: STATE PROGRAM TITLE VERIFICATION AND DATA REPORTING

It is important to note that while each state is required to perform a verification check on an out-of-state vehicle before issuing a certificate of title, neither the Anti Car Theft Act nor its implementing regulations require states to change the way they handle vehicle branding or other titling decisions. In the inquiry process, the laws of the new state of title will determine the status of the vehicle (e.g., branding or title type); states are not required to take any action based on data accessed. The information received from NMVTIS should be used to identify inconsistencies, errors, or other issues, so entities and individuals may pursue state procedures and policies for their resolution. Because NMVTIS can prevent many types of fraud beyond simple brand washing, states are encouraged to use NMVTIS whenever possible for verification of all transactions, including in-state title transactions, dealer reassignments, lender and dealer verifications, updates, corrections, and other title transactions.

States are required to report the following data into the system:

- an automobile’s VIN.
- any description of the automobile included on the certificate of title, including all brand information.
- the name of the individual or entity to whom the title certificate was issued.
- information from junk or salvage yard operators, or insurance carriers regarding their acquisition of junk automobiles or salvage automobiles, if this information is collected by the state.

The Anti Car Theft Act also requires the operator of NMVTIS to make available the odometer mileage that is disclosed pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 32705, and any later mileage information, on the date the certificate of title is issued if it is in the state’s title record for that vehicle. Accordingly, the rule requires states to provide such mileage information to NMVTIS.

States shall provide new title information and any updated title information to NMVTIS at least once every twenty-four hours. In addition, with the approval of DOJ, the operator, and the state, the rule will allow the state to provide any other information that is included on a certificate of title or maintained by the state relating to the certificate of title.

Title Verification and Reporting of Data—Two Approaches:

The architecture of NMVTIS was designed with input from the states. Flexibility for states to meet the requirements of the NMVTIS Final Rule has generated the two approaches below (Online Integrated and Batch Data Processing). Some states have developed the batch data processing model approach first and migrated to the online integrated approach, while other states have moved directly to the online integrated approach. The decision appears to be a factor of time, funding, and opportunity. The NMVTIS Final Rule does not stipulate which approach a state must take to meet its requirements.
1. **Online Integrated**

Online integrated is the optimal approach, as it enables the state to truly integrate the NMVTIS application into its titling application, making title verification and reporting of data nearly seamless to the user. The integrated approach is comprehensive and impacts almost all aspects of a state's titling process. As a result, the integrated approach is typically implemented when a state is planning to rewrite its titling application. This approach tends to require more time to develop and implement, as both state and system operator resources must fully understand NMVTIS system requirements and state processes, to ensure they are correctly integrated and appropriate procedures are put in place. The approach is cost-effective in the long run, as integration of the NMVTIS process into the state titling system reduces the manual processing required with the Batch Data Processing approach (described below). In addition, tight integration of the NMVTIS process into the state titling process provides higher assurance that verifications are done consistently and resulting title updates are done in a timely and accurate fashion.

- **Provision of Data:** As part of the state onboarding process, states provide to AAMVA extract files that includes their title and brand data. Next, the title and brand data are loaded into NMVTIS. From that point forward, states with fully integrated access to NMVTIS have their title transaction updates sent to NMVTIS in real-time. Additionally, these states receive real-time notifications through NMVTIS when a vehicle from their state is retitled in another compliant state. States can also build the help desk tools required to perform data corrections to their title and brand data in NMVTIS.

- **Title Verification:** The online integrated approach provides access to NMVTIS central site data (Title, Brand, and JSI) that is maintained by AAMVA, as well as theft data maintained by NICB and vehicle data maintained on the state's titling system.

2. **Batch Data Processing**

The batch data processing approach is generally less complex and costly to develop and implement than the online integrated approach since it does not require full integration of a state's titling applications. However, the batch approach still requires that state and system operator resources fully understand the NMVTIS requirements and state processes to ensure they are correctly integrated and appropriate procedures are put in place. This is intended to be a short-term approach geared toward states with limited IT resources and allows a state to implement NMVTIS in a relatively brief period. Lack of full online integration between the NMVTIS central site and the state titling system may make this approach more prone to data entry errors and may increase the time at the counter to process manual inquiries. The increase in processing time translates into increased operating costs.

- **Provision of Data:** States provide initial batch files of their title and brand data to AAMVA to load into NMVTIS. After the initial load, states provide daily update files to keep data current. The batch files are transmitted to AAMVA via a Secure File Transfer Protocol.
• **Title Verification**: AAMVA provides two solutions for batch states to perform title verification: 1) State Web Interface (SWI); and 2) State Batch Inquiry (SBI). SWI allows a state to conduct a single VIN inquiry into NMVTIS and the response includes data from NMVTIS central files (VIN Pointer, Brand, and JSI), theft data, and detailed state vehicle data. SBI allows a state to submit a file of VINs to NMVTIS and the response includes data from NMVTIS central files (VIN Pointer, Brand, and JSI).
EXHIBIT 4: PRINT AND BANNER ADS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT PUBLICATIONS

As mentioned in the Outreach and Awareness section, a half-page print advertisement (below) promoting the availability of the NMVTIS Law Enforcement Access Tool was published in FY2015 and FY2016 in American Police Beat magazine, as well as in Police magazine. It is included here for reference.

A website banner ad was also placed during FY2015 and FY2016 on the websites of those publications, as well as on the site for Police Chief magazine.

In FY2015, the NMVTIS Advisory Board recommended engaging PBS to develop a Spotlight On segment to promote public awareness of NMVTIS. Procurement for services was completed during the FY2017 reporting period and DOJ and AAMVA staff worked with PBS to finalize the script and complete video and audio production during FY2018.
## EXHIBIT 5: OUTREACH AND AWARENESS EVENTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VENUE &amp; FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2020</td>
<td>NICB Agents – NMVTIS LEAT training (63 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of RISS New England State Police Information Network (NESPIN) – NMVTIS LEAT training (38 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2020</td>
<td>AAMVA NMVTIS Stakeholder Virtual Meeting – panel discussion with Tennessee and North Carolina to discuss jurisdiction NMVTIS compliance and enforcement efforts (186 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the Mid-States Organized Crime Information Center (MOCIC) – NMVTIS LEAT training (90 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2020</td>
<td>Members of RISS New England State Police Information Network (NESPIN) – NMVTIS LEAT training (38 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the Mid-States Organized Crime Information Center (MOCIC) – NMVTIS LEAT training (94 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California Highway Patrol – NMVTIS LEAT training (26 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>AAMVA NMVTIS Compliance and Enforcement webinar (22 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff with the Insurance Bureau of Canada – NMVTIS LEAT training (6 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2021</td>
<td>National White Collar Crime Center – NMVTIS LEAT training (376 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2021</td>
<td>Members of Royal Canadian Mounted Police Leadership – NMVTIS LEAT overview (2 attendees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2021</td>
<td>International Association of Auto Theft Investigators (IAATI), Annual Conference – NMVTIS LEAT training (90 attendees)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Conducted by Law Enforcement Subcommittee members (including DOJ and AAMVA)
EXHIBIT 6: NMVTIS MILESTONES ARCHIVE

**Note:** Milestone activity beginning in 2010 can be viewed in [NMVTIS Milestones](#).

- NMVTIS Legislation
- Validation Reports
- Program Activity

- 1992: Anti Car Theft Act
- 1996: Anti Car Theft Improvements Act (oversight of NMVTIS transfers from DOT to DOJ)
- 1999: General Accounting Office recommends BJA conduct a NMVTIS cost-benefit analysis
- 1999: NMVTIS State Pilot Program conducted
- 1999: Memorandum of Understanding executed by BJA and AAMVA
- 2000: AAMVA publishes the NMVTIS Pilot Evaluation Report
- 2001: Logistics Management Institute (LMI) publishes NMVTIS Cost-Benefit Analysis Project Report
- 2009: Data in NMVTIS is available to consumers
- 2009: BJA law enforcement access started
- 2009: JSI required to report specific information to NMVTIS on a monthly basis
- 2009: JSI data is available to consumers
- 2009: State Web Interface is available to states
- 2009: NMVTIS Final Rule published
EXHIBIT 7: APPENDIX ARCHIVE

Note: Legislation, Press, Reports (Financial), and Resources referenced in the 2021 annual report can be viewed in the Appendix.

CORRESPONDENCE
• BJA Director's Correspondence to NMVTIS Advisory Board (September 2016)
• NMVTIS Advisory Board Correspondence to BJA Director (June 2016)

PRESS
• Sun Independent – BBB Warning: Vehicle Title Scams (August 2020)
• Deseret News – Don't Fall for This New Scam When Selling Your Car (January 2020)
• Abc7news.com – Car Thieves Clone VINs, Fool Drivers into Buying Stolen Vehicles (April 2019)
• Ocala.com - Ocala man sentenced to 5 years for operating chop shop (January 2019)
• wfaa.com - How to Check if your Vehicle is Flood Damaged (December 2018)
• Abc4.com – Used Vehicles Are in Big Demand but MVED Says So Are Complaints (May 2018)
• Texas Department of Motor Vehicles – TxDMV Warns Buyers to Beware of Flood Damaged Vehicles (May 2018)
• Channel 2 News Houston – Investigation into Flood Cars for Sale Attracts National Insurance Crime Bureau (May 2018)
• ARLnow.com – Virginia Officials Warning About Buying Hurricane-Damaged Vehicles (October 2017)
• CarandDriver.com – Thousands of Hurricane-Damaged Cars and Trucks Heading Back to Market (October 2017)
• MoneyGeek.com Blog – ‘Flood Cars’ Sneaking onto the Market After Hurricanes (September 2017)
• WIRED – Harvey Wrecks Up to a Million Cars in Car-Dependent Houston (September 2017)
• Jalopnik – Here’s What Happens to All of The Flooded Cars After Hurricane Harvey (September 2017)
• The New York Times – How to Avoid Buying a Car Flooded by Hurricanes (September 2017)
• USA Today – Harvey May Have Wrecked Up To 1M Cars and Trucks (August 2017)
• The New York Times – Car Owners Inundate Insurers with Claims After Hurricane Harvey (August 2017)
• CBS6News Albany - Is a Flood Damaged Vehicle Sitting in Your Driveway? (February 2017)
• U.S. News & World Report – Car History Report: Which One is Right for You? (December 2016)
• MOVE Magazine - A Look at 20 Years of NMVTIS, DMV Information Systems and Online Customer Service (December 2016)
• Automotive News Article – How Junk Cars Can Slip Through the Cracks (2015)
• ADD. Press Release – Auto Data Direct Partners with Under the Hood Radio Show (2015)
• WUSA Channel 9 Report - What to Know Before Buying a Salvage Vehicle (2014)
• Cars.com Article - Storm Surge: Beware of Title-Washed Cars (2014)
• IACP Article - NMVTIS: Provides Guidance to Hurricane Sandy Victims Buying Vehicles and Assists Vehicle Theft Investigators (2013)
• FBI Article - Steering Clear of Car Cloning: Some Advice and Solutions (2009)

REPORTS – GENERAL
Note: Annual Reports dated prior to 2021 are listed on the DOJ NMVTIS website.
• IJIS Institute Technology Assistance Report (2006)
• LMI Cost-Benefit Analysis Report (2001)
Acronyms

AAMVA – American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators
AIC – Annual International Conference
ADD – Auto Data Direct, Inc.
BJA – Bureau of Justice Assistance
CHP – California Highway Patrol
DMV – Department of Motor Vehicles
DOJ – (U.S.) Department of Justice
DOR – Department of Revenue
DOT – (U.S.) Department of Transportation
FBI – Federal Bureau of Investigation
FHWA – Federal Highway Administration
GSA – (U.S.) General Services Administration
IAATI – International Association of Auto Theft Investigators
IACP – International Association of Chiefs of Police
IJIS – Integrated Justice Information Systems
ISO – ISO ClaimSearch Solutions
JSI – Junk, Salvage, and Insurance
LE – Law Enforcement
LEAT – Law Enforcement Access Tool
LEEP – Law Enforcement Enterprise Portal
LESC – Law Enforcement Subcommittee
NAB – NMVTIS Advisory Board
NADA – National Automobile Dealers Association
NAEC – North American Export Committee
NCIC – National Crime Information Center
NHTSA – National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NIADA – National Independent Automobile Dealers Association
NICB – National Insurance Crime Bureau
NMVTIS – National Motor Vehicle Title Information System
NSA – National Sheriffs’ Association
NSVRP – National Salvage Vehicle Reporting Program
OJP – Office of Justice Programs
RISS – Regional Information Sharing System
RCMP – Royal Canadian Mounted Police
SPS – State Program Subcommittee
SWI – State Web Interface
VIN – Vehicle Identification Number
Glossary

**AAMVA**
AAMVA’s telecommunication network that enables government agencies and private sector businesses to share information and data securely.

**Approved NMVTIS Data Providers**
Approved NMVTIS Data Providers are companies that agree to provide NMVTIS vehicle history reports to the public consistent with federal legal requirements. This agreement is established through an application process and formal contracts with the system operator. All Approved NMVTIS Data Providers are listed on [AAMVA](https://aamva.org) and [DOJ NMVTIS](https://nmtis.gov) websites.

**Brand**
A brand is a designation placed on a vehicle ownership document, including its electronic record, which identifies or describes an event that affects the value or safety of the vehicle, such as Junk, Salvage, or Flood. State brands and/or vehicle statuses are mapped to NMVTIS brands for consistency within the system.

**Cloned Vehicle**
A vehicle is cloned when a legitimate VIN plate is replicated and placed on a stolen vehicle, making that vehicle appear to have a valid VIN.

**Consumer Access Program Transactions**
A Consumer Access Program transaction consists of a consumer inquiry followed by purchase of the located NMVTIS record.

**Data Consolidators**
AAMVA partners with the private sector to provide multiple reporting methods to meet the business needs of JSI reporting entities. Currently, four reporting methods or services are available, and offer single-VIN and batch reporting options:
• AAMVA Single VIN Reporting Service
• Audatex
• Auto Data Direct, Inc. (ADD)
• ISO ClaimSearch Solutions (ISO)

**Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)**
Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) is the most used term to describe the state agencies that administer vehicle registration; however, some jurisdictions use other names (e.g., Bureau of Motor Vehicles, Motor Vehicle Commission).
Junk, Salvage, and Insurance (JSI) Reporting

The list of industries specifically identified in the regulatory definitions of “junk yard” and “salvage yard” is not exhaustive. If an entity satisfies the definition of a junk yard or salvage yard (i.e., an individual or entity engaged in the business of acquiring or owning junk automobiles or salvage automobiles for resale in their entirety or as spare parts; or rebuilding, restoration, or crushing) and the entity handles five or more junk automobiles or salvage automobiles per year, then the entity has a NMVTIS reporting obligation.

JSI entities are only required to report on automobiles deemed junk or salvage but may also report on other types of vehicles included in NMVTIS if they are deemed junk or salvage.

Entities may report the required data elements to the state in which they are located; the state then provides the required information to NMVTIS. Through the FY2020 reporting period, Georgia and Tennessee are the only states to report on behalf of their JSI entities. A reference to a JSI record may reflect multiple reports on the same VIN.

Jurisdiction

The fifty states and the District of Columbia are eligible to Participate in NMVTIS. The words “jurisdiction” and “state” are used interchangeably in this report to include states and the District of Columbia.

Odometer Reading

The odometer reading is reported to NMVTIS at the time a state titles a vehicle.

State Participation

“Participating” refers to states that provide data and inquire into NMVTIS before issuing new titles. Forty-nine jurisdictions Participated during this report period. “In Development” refers to jurisdictions working with AAMVA toward implementation. One state and the District of Columbia were In Development and had not yet loaded data into the system, as detailed in the State Program section.

Superseded Title

A title that is no longer valid because a newer one has been issued. (See entry for Texas in Exhibit 1/State Benefits section.)
NMVTIS: Law Enforcement & Vehicle Title Investigator Guide
This brochure was developed to provide information and guidance on NMVTIS reporting requirements and resources with the LEAT program. 
Download Brochure  
Watch Video

NMVTIS: Working for States
The companion brochure and video were developed to facilitate communication within a state to explain what NMVTIS is designed to do, how a state participates and benefits from it, and how AAMVA can help a state get the most from its participation. 
Download Brochure  
Watch Video

NMVTIS Best Practices for Title and Registration Program Managers - Edition 4
Best practices were developed by the NMVTIS State Program Subcommittee to help title and registration program managers align NMVTIS with a jurisdiction's title practices. 
Download Document
SECTION 11: NMVTIS INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS (Continued)

Check NMVTIS Before You Buy!
This brochure was developed to raise awareness regarding the benefits of purchasing a NMVTIS vehicle history report. States are encouraged to provide hard copies and display videos in their public offices and on agency websites.

Download Brochure
Watch the Videos

NMVTIS: Help Prevent Crime & Save Lives
This brochure was developed to help spread the word about NMVTIS reporting requirements to state entities that obtain/buy junk, salvage, and/or total loss vehicles (junk and salvage yards, auto recyclers, etc.).

Download Brochure

Consumer Access: Become an Approved NMVTIS Data Provider
This flyer explains the business model and process to apply to become an Approved NMVTIS Data Provider. Only approved Providers are authorized to sell NMVTIS vehicle history reports and display the NMVTIS logo.

Download Flyer