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Day One: October 7, 2010

Welcome Remarks and Introductions

Note: All presentations made at this meeting are available upon request. Please contact Alissa Huntoon, DFO.

Ms. Alissa Huntoon, DFO, called the meeting to order at approximately 8:38 a.m., announced that the meeting would be recorded, thanked the members for their willingness to serve on the NMVTIS Advisory Board, and introduced Mr. James Burch, Acting Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA).

Mr. Burch welcomed the participants and said it was very encouraging to see so many industries and stakeholders present. He said there had been great progress since the Board’s inception. He noted that, as NMVTIS impacts many different communities, BJA knew there had to be some way of making sure they all had a voice at the table as the system moved forward. While an advisory board was not required by Congress, BJA believed it was necessary to ensure that NMVTIS filled
its congressional mandate. He said he was happy to see the breadth and scope of participation at the meeting.

Chair, Greg Terp welcomed all participants, BJA staff, and Board members to the meeting. He noted that at the first Board meeting, members realized they needed to focus on educating themselves, and based on that he wanted to continue to focus on education in order to transmit good advice back to BJA.

Ms. Huntoon asked for feedback on the minutes of the prior meeting. One small correction was noted by Mr. Brown, and the minutes were approved. She reviewed the agenda and thanked participants for responding to her call for agenda suggestions.

Ms. Cameron made housekeeping announcements.

**NMVTIS Status Updates**

Mr. Schuster told the group that AAMVA had been operating the system, making enhancements, and getting new states to join. He noted that overall it had been a good year for NMVTIS. He then called on Ms. Cameron to provide the operational update.

**State Programs**

Ms. Cameron described AAMVA’s activities since the last meeting. She provided the members with a detailed operational update on third party reporting, state programs, and consumer access (see presentation for details).

**Consumer Access Providers**

*Auto Data Direct, Inc. (ADD)*

Mr. Taylor gave an update on his company’s activities relative to the Prospective Purchaser Inquiry (PPI), which he said continues to see slow growth. He noted that they have a bifurcated system with one system for consumers and another for corporate customers (see presentation for details).

*CARCO Group, Inc.*

Mr. Owens said their most significant undertaking had been fine-tuning the website and working on applications for the iPhone and iPad to improve consumer reach. He said the NMVTIS data remained consistent with that reported at the June 2010 meeting and that their statistics were quite similar to Auto Data Direct’s. He also noted that his company was working to bring insurance carriers into the fold, adding that CARCO has conducted an actuarial study that shows insurance carriers would benefit from using the NMVTIS data. He further indicated that they have been discussing participation with carriers and believe this would be a key way to generate revenue for the system.

*MobileTrac*

Ms. Huntoon announced that MobileTrac was invited to serve on the Advisory Board as a new NMVTIS Technology Partner. They were invited to participate in this meeting but were unable to attend due to the short notice.

**Data Consolidators**

*ADD*

ADD has been very active in marketing, attending close to 30 conventions in 2010 and letting law enforcement agencies and other entities know that these resources are available.
Mr. Taylor also reported on new developments in their vehicle upload service. They have implemented webinar training that he called hugely successful. ADD supported the Cash for Clunkers vehicle (C4C) program in 2009 and 2010.

**Insurance Services Office (ISO)**
Mr. Giknis said that ISO’s core group is insurance companies but that they also have good representation from salvage pools and a fairly large number of recyclers (see presentation for details). He provided details regarding the breakdown of entity types using their services. He also noted that they have seen an increase in the number of recyclers since the June meeting.

**Autadex**
Mr. Terp next asked Mr. Suberlak to report, and Mr. Suberlak said that although Autadex recently came on board as a data consolidator, they were still very actively pursuing business. He reported that they had made significant investments and enhancements, such as tighter product integration, and that they have over 300,000 recyclers using the system. He indicated that they have implemented an enhanced web capability in terms of reporting and vehicle history checking, and have added a number of other clients in the salvage pool and insurance arenas.

Mr. Suberlak thanked DOJ for pursuing enforcement, saying he believes enforcement, including the recent letter, has resulted in a significantly increased interest in their services.

**NMVTIS Law Enforcement Tool**

Mr. David Lewis, BJA, said there are currently 446 law enforcement users of the law enforcement access tool. He said they are working with the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Criminal Justice Information Services Division (CJIS) in making NCIC and Interpol stolen vehicle information accessible in the law enforcement federated search. It has also been proposed to make limited stolen vehicle information available to a consumer who is purchasing a NMVTIS vehicle history report. However, FBI CJIS has stated that the States need to be polled to determine their willingness to share such information with the public.

Mr. Lewis also indicated that BJA is working with AAMVA to update the junk and salvage data set provided to law enforcement. In addition, they are exploring other data sets that are VIN-based and that can easily be integrated into a federated search. They continue to receive expressions of interest from law enforcement entities in obtaining more information.

Mr. Terp confirmed that stolen vehicle data is indeed important to the states.

**NMVTIS Enforcement**

Mr. Todd Brighton, BJA, reported on DOJ’s enforcement’s efforts regarding NMVTIS reporting requirements by reporting entities (definition of reporting entities under the NMVTIS regulation is found [here](#)). He reached out to the Automotive Recyclers Association, American Salvage Pool Association, Institute of Scrap Recycling, and National Insurance Crime Bureau in July and, sent the groups a letter from DOJ that they agreed to pass on to the field. BJA also direct mailed approximately 20,000 letters to junk and salvage yards in August, and in October were working to send insurance carriers a similar enforcement letter. Mr. Brighton has conducted onsite visits to reporting entities and has coordinated with the Department of Transportation (DOT) and others. Mr. Brighton told the data consolidators present that it would be very valuable to offer a printout capability, to enable entities to have documentation or receipt of vehicle information reported. He also noted that some entities that use an inventory management system confuse such a system with reporting to NMVTIS.

Mr. Brighton has been following up with reporting entities based on incoming emails and
questions that come into NMVTIS.gov email address. He emphasized that their current enforcement efforts are focused on assisting entities with reporting and educating the field on federal reporting requirements.

Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Used Buyers Guide

Ms. Huntoon stated that she contacted the FTC regarding their used buyer’s guide and they had no update to offer at this time.

Questions and Answers on the Presentations

Ms. Wiener asked if there were a further breakdown of the 816 recyclers reporting, and Mr. Giknis said there was not.

Ms. Fitzgerald asked why Illinois was not yet participating in the system, and Ms. Cameron said AAMVA had not heard from the state recently but that Illinois has had fundamental objections to the NMVTIS program. She said she knew there was activity in Illinois but that the state had not reached out to AAMVA formally. Ms. Huntoon stated that DOJ could not speak for the state of Illinois and the question is best asked of the state directly.

Ms. Huntoon added that DOJ had made recent grant awards to six states to support NMVTIS implementation and that one of those was Illinois. The others were Kansas, Washington, DC, Colorado, Georgia, and Oregon. Mr. Nusbaum said he had discussions last year with Illinois’ Attorney General and Secretary of State’s offices and was told that if the state was awarded a grant, they intended to implement NMVTIS.

Mr. Wilson asked if BJA had a sense of insurance company reporting. Mr. Terp and Ms. Huntoon explained that the Board would not be discussing specific enforcement activities because of the possibility of active or upcoming investigations. Mr. Terp emphasized that the important fact is that there are enforcement activities underway, with additional efforts planned.

Ms. Grim emphasized the importance of entering correct VIN numbers and asked if there have been improvements in the VIN packages so they could identify when an invalid VIN is entered. Mr. Owens said they use a decoder for the VIN but also had to accept VINs that do not follow the normal 17-digit pattern because of older cars that do not have it. He said that they tell customers if a particular VIN will not decode, but that ultimately they must allow customers to submit the number they want as there are legitimate non-standard VINs within NMVTIS.

Mr. Giknis was asked about the trend in reporting, and he said that reporting is increasing significantly, particularly with the method that allows automatic reporting.

Ms. Huntoon clarified her previous comments regarding enforcement, indicating that as they move forward they will make information available once it is complete.

Mr. March asked for a copy of the enforcement letter, indicating he had heard about its effectiveness.

Mr. Sullivan said it might be a good idea to have the insurance industry on the Board. Mr. Terp noted that this was an ongoing process and that the recommendation would be taken into consideration.

In closing the discussion, Mr. Terp reiterated the importance of having accurate data in NMVTIS.

Break
NMVTIS Operator System Costs

Mr. Terp said one of the goals of the Board is to explore ways to make the system self-sustaining, and therefore the Board needs a better understanding of the total costs. He asked Mr. Schuster to present the NMVTIS operator system costs.

Mr. Schuster said AAMVA is very appreciative of DOJ’s assistance through the grant funding, which has been a great help. The funding has allowed AAMVA to continue its good work on system operation and implementation.

Ms. Cameron gave the NMVTIS Financial Overview, which entailed a presentation on the FY’09 grant award expenditure as well as the year-end projection, including a carryover amount. She described some of the activities that occurred during the period (see slide for details).

Ms. Huntoon asked if AAMVA could provide a more detailed breakdown, and Mr. Nusbaum said he was not comfortable with the financial presentation because it did not contain enough information. He mentioned a comparable system in Europe that handles a large number of records at a significantly lower cost per year. He requested a detailed budget breakdown and an explanation of the system architecture [Note: a more detailed presentation followed the next morning. See Meeting Summary Day Two.]

Ms. Cameron indicated that more detailed information can be provided.

Ms. Cameron received questions on what constitutes “full implementation” and on what ongoing costs would be once the system is fully implemented. Mr. Guiot explained that as AAMVA completes the implementation of the system’s requirements, the ongoing system operating costs also increase. However, until all required users (States and reporting entities) are participating, AAMVA will not have a full picture of what the total operating costs will be.

NMVTIS Terminology and Vehicle Definitions

Mr. Terp asked Mr. Spiller to lead a discussion of NMVTS terminology and the related topic of a vehicle’s “life cycle.” The group discussed varying definitions of certain terms and the differences in the industry in using terminology. There was also some discussion of revising the definitions in the rule, with Ms. Weiner indicating that some of the definitions do not seem to fit their industry. Ms. Huntoon said the discussion was very helpful for purposes of the Board’s own understanding but clarified that at this time BJA has not planned to write a new rule, which would be the requirement in order to change or revise any definition contained within the existing regulation. Mr. Owens and Ms. Wiener suggested it might be useful to form a working group on life cycle terminology, and Mr. Terp said that would be considered. Board members agreed that the discussion was principally for the Board’s own use.

Mr. Terp thanked Mr. Spiller for stepping up to the task of leading the discussion.

Lunch Break

Open Discussion

Before opening the discussion of various constituencies’ use of implementation of NMVTIS, Mr. Terp said that at the last meeting a request had been made to look into the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act. Ms. Cameron stated moving forward would require convening a working group of states. Mr. Terp reiterated that it is very important to the Board to move this effort forward, thereby helping service members when they come home.
**Law Enforcement**

Mr. March outlined his organization’s (Regional Information Sharing Systems) efforts to provide law enforcement with access to NMVTIS information and that those efforts were proving to be fruitful.

**Consumers**

Mr. Dartland initiated a discussion on how best to educate and inform consumers, and others agreed it was an important area. Some suggested launching a public awareness campaign, including public service announcements (PSAs). Others thought such a campaign should be delayed because they believe there are data integrity issues within NMVTIS. One member made a comment that NMVTIS would never be absolutely perfect and that the Board should not wait too long before implementing a public awareness effort.

Mr. Brown said it would be extremely valuable if all claims data could be entered into NMVTIS. Some said that legislation might be needed for this to occur. Mr. Terp asked BJA and AAMVA to look, from the information technology (IT) side, at the possibility of having NMVTIS pop up when people did Internet searches on related subjects. Finally, Mr. Spiller asked what the possibilities were of getting the District of Columbia to join. Ms. Huntoon said DC received BJA funding to assist with NMVTIS implementation.

**States**

Ms. Judd enumerated three states’ concerns: privacy laws and sensitivities about data disclosure; states selling of bulk data; and unfunded federal mandates. Mr. Terp said that, as opposed to being just an unfunded mandate, NMVTIS affects the citizens of every state. Ms. Judd also noted that the NMVTIS system could be the platform for state to state titling or some other revenue opportunity in the future.

**Break**

**Technology Partners**

Mr. Taylor raised the issue of whether or not towing companies are required to report to NMVTIS. There was general agreement that, given the nature of the towing industry and the fact that towing companies have large numbers of abandoned vehicles in their possession, it would be appropriate for the industry to report to NMVTIS. Mr. Terp said he agreed that the towing industry was a source of significant concern and that he supports including them in the definition of who should report.

Ms. Grim said that in Virginia, towing companies sometimes try to game the system by claiming there were no plates on a vehicle, then entering an incorrect VIN. Mr. Terp said it would be desirable to have an electronic message sent to a consumer whenever any activity took place on their VIN.

Mr. Taylor raised a concern about a proposed practice in Florida regarding an electronic filing system and the impact it might have on the ability to sell data to third parties. Mr. Ford stated that the planned process in Florida does allow for dealers to have unauthorized access to certain pieces of NMVTIS. If that were to occur Florida could amend their processes as necessary. Mr. Taylor also mentioned a similar incident in Minnesota, and Ms. Cameron said AAMVA had assessed the Minnesota situation and had not found any issues from their perspective. Mr. Taylor said he believes all entities that want access to NMVTIS should have it but that they should pay for it.
Mr. March indicated the White House is actively promoting NMVTIS to the law enforcement community. He also mentioned some activity occurring at the federal level on interagency cooperation and information sharing.

**Junk, Salvage, Recyclers, Insurance, and Auto Industry**

Mr. Wilson raised questions regarding local law enforcement efforts with the junk/salvage industry and asked what work was underway to make sure people were reporting. Ms. Huntoon again stated the responsibility for enforcement falls to DOJ and that local law enforcement may become involved if there criminal activity was involved.

Mr. Terp replied that the information could still be important to local law enforcement and said it was useful to him as an auto theft investigator. He asked Board members to try to get NMVTIS on the agendas of upcoming association meetings as a way of spreading the word.

There was further discussion among Board members concerning compliance and what further efforts could be undertaken to achieve it. For example, Mr. Nusbaum mentioned the possibility of having an anonymous tip line. Ms. Wiener also said the entities that are supplying vehicles to shredders should be the ones reporting to NMVTIS, as often the shredders cannot determine the VINs given the condition of the vehicles they receive.

Ms. Huntoon said the rule requires shredders to report; however, there are clarifications regarding shredder reporting and the inability to determine VINs on the NMVTIS.gov website.

**Closing Remarks/Adjournment**

Members of the public in attendance were offered a chance to make comments to the Board and none were made. Mr. Terp stated the Board would be meeting in working groups the next day and asked members to join a group based upon where they could add the most value. The Board is beginning to form sub working groups that will focus on specific topic areas. Tomorrow they will meet for the first time and start to identify members and first steps.

Ms. Huntoon advised that AAMVA would provide a more detailed financial overview the next morning and the agenda would be adjusted accordingly.

The meeting adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

**Day Two: October 8, 2010**

**Welcome Remarks**

Mr. Terp convened the meeting at 8:35 a.m., welcomed the group back, and praised the facilities and arrangements for the conference.

Ms. Cameron provided the members with reimbursement instructions.

**NMVTIS Financial Overview**

Mr. Marc Saitta, AAMVA CFO, and Mr. Philippe Guiot, CIO, AAMVA, presented the financial overview.

Mr. Saitta presented the financials showing the breakdown of expenditures under AAMVA’s three
program categories (base operations, implementation, and enhancements) as well as the detailed project activities/expense categories within each program category. He noted that a large portion of the program’s functional costs are IT-related specifically the contract with IBM to run the system’s mainframe. He noted that most of the work is done in-house by a combination of staff and contractors. He further explained that the contract with IBM was recently re-competed and had been renewed for three years. The contract also gives AAMVA access to a back-up site in Boulder, CO.

Mr. Terp asked whether outside contractor costs would decline when the system is fully implemented. Mr. Guiot said contractor costs are related to total number of transactions. As AAMVA increases the number of states participating and adds more data into the system, the contractors’ costs also increase. The addition of data and transaction also requires more resources to deal with data quality issues.

Mr. Nusbaum asked about the system’s age and whether it would be worthwhile to modernize it in order to save costs. Mr. Guiot said it is an older system but that since 2000 any new applications have been done using newer server-based platforms. He explained that while the server-based environment has efficiencies, it also must be duplicated to provide backup. Mr. Guiot explained that the costs for labor and contractors would not change with a server-based system because AAMVA must spend significant time working with the states to ensure the data is in the correct format. Mr. Guiot described system enhancements that AAMVA had implemented in the past year.

Mr. Terp thanked Mr. Schuster for compiling this report and said it would prove important for the working groups. Mr. Schuster said AAMVA would be happy to make such a presentation at every meeting, either to the whole group or to a working group.

NMVTIS Working Groups

Ms. Huntoon explained that the Chair had the discretion to form sub-working groups. These groups will help the full advisory board with potential recommendations to BJA. Board members were provided with a sheet that listed the two working groups and their goals. They were also provided with a set of questions or items to consider for the group’s first meeting and discussion. It was not expected that Board members would answer all the questions in a day. She asked participants to consider what additional information they would need to fully explore issues in order to make informed recommendations back to the Board and eventually BJA.

Because the NMVTIS Advisory Board is subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) regulations and procedures, Ms. Huntoon said that these working groups are considered subcommittees and they report directly back to the advisory board. Further guidance about how the sub groups will be structured would be forthcoming, but since the sub groups met as part of the full advisory board meeting’s agenda, members of the public present could observe during the working group discussions, but they could not participate. In the future, if the working groups meet separate from official Advisory Board meetings, these meetings may be closed to the public.

Mr. Terp asked Mr. Van Alst to lead the working group on NMVTIS Revenue Options and Mr. March to lead the group on NMVTIS Technology Capabilities.

Ms. Judd said that in determining the system’s cost it would be important to consider any effects on DMVs as a result of any changes to the system. She cautioned that increasing the time it would take a DMV to deal with a customer would indeed be a real cost.

Mr. Terp said her point was valid. He then asked Board members to choose which working group they would like to join and directed them to meet separately to discuss their topics.
**Working Group Report Outs**
Mr. Terp thanked the working group leaders for taking on this responsibility, particularly at the last minute, and he asked them to present their findings to the group. He asked Mr. March to report the findings of his group first.

**Working Group: NMVTIS Technology Capabilities**
Mr. March expressed appreciation for the enthusiastic participation of the group’s members and said they realized they have a lot to learn. He indicated they would be focusing both on the flexibility of the system as well as the necessity to reduce its costs. Mr. March explained that in order to have a common understanding of the NMVTIS system from a technological point of view, they asked Mr. Guiot to explain in more detail the system’s current technological structure and to follow-up with an even more in-depth presentation. Mr. March for future meetings this subgroup could use his organization’s WebEx capabilities. He also acknowledged that the technical group would need to have a close relationship with the financial group.

Mr. Terp said that based on the group’s charge, he believed they were taking the right steps. He reminded Board members to copy him and Ms. Huntoon on any communications that they exchange or receive. He also noted that he was pleased to see a lot of interaction in both groups.

**Working Group: NMVTIS Revenue Options**
Mr. Van Alst thanked his group and acknowledged the group’s enthusiasm and willingness to look openly beyond their own constituencies. He reported that they discussed current revenue streams and potential revenue sources to cover the costs of operating the system, including individual user fees and the tiered structure of fees for states. They outlined potential users, such as auction houses, as well as potential barriers to the use of NMVTIS data. He explained that while profit is not allowed the group considered looking for an assessment of the system from a profit-making standpoint. In moving forward, they would like to have individual conference calls and all Board members are welcome to participate.

There was some discussion among board members regarding branding and trademark and a name that would resonate with consumers. Mr. Suberkak offered his expertise in trademark law should the Board and DOJ decide to choose a new name.

Mr. Terp asked the chairs of the working groups to estimate how much time they would need for the next meeting so that plans could be made accordingly. He also reminded the Board that Ms. Wiener would head a temporary third working group on the life cycle of a vehicle.

Ms. Huntoon stated that until further operational guidance was provided to the Board regarding FACA regulations, the working group leads should refrain from holding any meetings or conference calls.

Members of the public were given the opportunity to make comments to the Board. Mr. John Hair, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America, said he heard discussion regarding the insurance industry and the possibility of bringing more insurance representation onto the Board. He said his company would definitely be willing to participate, particularly on the working group on the life cycle of a vehicle.

**Next Steps**
**Next Meeting**
The Board discussed a mid- to late February meeting with the location to be determined. Mr. Terp proposed the following meeting for June 2011 in Washington, D.C there were no objections.
**Closing discussion**

Mr. Terp asked the Board members for their closing comments. Most participants said that it had been a very good meeting, that they had learned a lot, and that they were impressed by the dedication, professionalism, and collegiality of the group, especially considering the diversity of the stakeholders present. Many also thanked the organizers, the DFO, and the Board chair.

Additional closing comments:

Mr. Dartland said he hoped to have NMVTIS representatives on a panel at one of the consumer conferences, which are held at least three times a year.

Mr. Suberlak suggested the working groups consider setting timelines and milestones.

Ms. Fitzgerald said one of the biggest challenges the Board faces is to stay focused.

Mr. March said one thing he did not hear discussed was the number of charity car donations proliferating around the country. He said that was an area he suggested including for the next meeting.

Ms. Wiener asked Board members to email her by the end of day October 13, 2010 if they were interested in joining her working group on definitions and lifecycles.

Mr. Brown said a few Board members had been talking about branding and promoting NMVTIS and had suggestions for alternative names.

Mr. Schuster said that at some point, the Board might want to think about specific issues on which to advise DOJ. The group could also have a work plan and a timeline, he said.

Mr. Giknis said they work on the database side with many federal agencies and that none of them has an advisory board, although they could use one.

Mr. Spiller recommended that DOJ establish an antitrust policy statement and distribute it at every meeting.

Mr. Myers said it was important to remember to gather success stories and that compiling such information on the benefit to consumers would help the group in the long run.

Ms. Huntoon stated that the group is very important to BJA and that BJA needs to hear the various perspectives of Board members as they implement the system. She also asked the members to provide suggestions for speakers or topics for future meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 11:24 a.m.