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What is State to State?
What is State to State?

CDLIS

CDL
What is State to State?

- Designed and developed by the States, for the States.
- Allows a State to determine if an applicant has a DL or ID card in another State.
- Provides functionality for States to achieve the goal of “One Driver - One License” for all drivers.
- Allows all States to enforce their own laws, rules, regulations and policies regarding multiple credentials.

Regarding Real ID
- Participating in S2S does not require a State to participate in REAL ID.
- But S2S does help a state comply with Real ID requirements if it chooses to.
Technical capabilities are very similar
  - Same infrastructure and transactions

Governance is very different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDL</th>
<th>State to State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal requirements</td>
<td>State based requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory for all states</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMCSA monitors compliance</td>
<td>State-based compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why participate in State to State?
Benefits of Participation

- Improved Integrity of US-Issued Credentials
- Compliance with State Laws
- Detection and Deterrence of Identity Theft
- Detection and Deterrence of Benefits Fraud
- Reduced Costs for Complying with Interstate Compacts
- Improved Highway Safety
- Improved Homeland Security
How does State to State work?
For all Participants:

1. Only one Driver License
2. Only one Real ID credential

Additional State-specific, State-applied Restriction:
3. Not allowed to hold a credential (Driver License or Identification Card) in another state
SPEXS (State Pointer Exchange Service)

---

Satisfies both CDLIS and S2S functionality

---

All pointers are SPEXS pointers

---

Composed of CDLIS pointers and Non-CDLIS pointers

---

CDLIS-only states only see CDLIS pointers

---

S2S states see everything
### Pointer Index File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>CDLIS</th>
<th>S2S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial SSN</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Type</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real ID Indicator</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDLIS Record Indicator</td>
<td>♦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDLIS-only States</td>
<td>S2S Participating States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to use Application ‘02’</td>
<td>Use Application ‘37’ for all CDLIS and S2S activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to use AMIE Messaging Protocol</td>
<td>Have the option to implement all CDLIS and S2S activities using Web Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Authenticate documents
2. Enter information
3. Perform Internal State Verifications
4. Perform External Checks
   - SSOLV      - EVVE
   - VLS/SAVE   - US Passport
   - PDPS
5. Query SPEXS (CDLIS + S2S)
Use Case 1: Base license issuance with S2S, customer surrenders OOS credential


Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration
Use Case 1: Base license issuance with S2S, customer surrenders OOS credential

Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration

Customer Service Rep

Customer

Authenticate Documents

Enter information

Perform intra-state verification

Perform external checks (SSOLV, VLS/SAVE, PDPS, EVVE, US Passport)

Perform CDLIS and S2S Checks via SPEXS

Safe Drivers · Safe Vehicles · Secure Identities · Saving Lives
Use Case 1: Base license issuance with S2S, customer surrenders OOS credential

Wisconsin DRIVER’S LICENSE
• Capture and Mark Wisconsin Credential
• Issue Maryland Credential
• Perform CSOR via SPEXS

Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration

• History is captured electronically
• Wisconsin is notified electronically
Use Case 2: Base license issuance with S2S, customer does not surrender OOS credential

Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration
Use Case 2: Base license issuance with S2S, customer does not surrender OOS credential

Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration

Customer Service Rep

Customer

Authenticate Documents

Enter information

Perform Intra-state verification

Perform external checks (SSOLV, VLS/SAVE, PDPS, EVVE, US Passport)

Perform CDLIS and S2S Checks via SPEXS

Safe Drivers · Safe Vehicles · Secure Identities · Saving Lives
Use Case 2: Base license issuance with S2S, customer does not surrender OOS credential

Customer Service Rep

We see that you currently hold a DL in Wisconsin.

It will be cancelled if we issue you a Maryland DL.

Do you want us to proceed?

Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration

Perform CDLIS and S2S Checks via SPEXS
Use Case 2: Base license issuance with S2S, customer does **not** surrender OOS credential

Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration

Customer

Customer Service Rep

We see that you currently hold a DL in Wisconsin.

It will be cancelled if we issue you a Maryland DL.

Do you want us to proceed?

The decision to proceed with issuance or not is made by the customer

Perform CDLIS and S2S Checks via SPEXS
Go-Live Process

Required at State go-live
- Update all CDLIS pointers
- Add pointers for all Real ID compliant credentials issued to date

Optional (decision made by each State)
- Add pointers for all DLs issued to date or follow a ‘day forward’ approach
- Add pointers for all ID cards issued to date or follow a ‘day forward’ approach

What current Production States have chosen to do
- Add pointers for all DLs and all IDs (Real ID compliant and Customary) for pilot evaluation and best practices
State to State Pilot Project Status
# S2S Timeline

## S2S Timeline – Key Milestones and Dates
(as of 5/4/2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task / Deliverable</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot Operations and Eval’n Period Start Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>03/03/2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Certification Environment Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>03/03/2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production Environment Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>07/06/2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wisconsin Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>08/10/2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Dakota Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>11/16/2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maryland Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>01/31/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indiana Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>02/21/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iowa Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>05/21/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arkansas Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>06/04/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wyoming Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>09/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S2S In Person Meeting (Atlanta, GA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>09/26/2016 – 09/28/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nebraska Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>10/15/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arizona Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>10/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alaska Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>10/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mississippi Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>10/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Dakota Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>10/29/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idaho Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>11/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>11/2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delaware Target Go-Live</strong></td>
<td><strong>01/2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot Operations and Eval’n Period End Date</strong></td>
<td><strong>03/03/2017</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Funding Sources

- One Pilot slot still available
  - Currently working with multiple interested States, but until committed the slot remains open for any State

- Whether Pilot or post-Pilot implementation
  - NHTSA 405c Grant vehicle
    - Implementation Costs (VA)
    - Duplicate Resolution Costs
  - DHS Grants
    - Implementation Costs (ID)
Monthly training available to all states

Month of May cycle in progress; next cycle starts on June 20, 2016

For more information, go to http://www.aamva.org/systems-training/
System availability remains excellent

Transaction response times continue to meet requirements
Pointer Counts

- CDLIS pointers
- Non-CDLIS pointers


15,014,989

5,000,000 10,000,000 15,000,000 20,000,000 25,000,000 30,000,000 35,000,000

CDLIS pointers Non-CDLIS pointers

4,346,715 4,944,666 9,548,118 15,144,557

15,022,697 15,122,896 15,205,402 15,211,650 14,470,109 14,518,667

Safe Drivers · Safe Vehicles · Secure Identities · Saving Lives
Benefits Realized to Date
(Anticipated and Unanticipated)
Increased visibility into credentials issued
- Identification of multiple credentials issued to the same customer across State lines
- Identification of duplicate records within a given State

Proactively, prevented 7k+ new duplicates

Reactively, detected 47K+ existing duplicates
Benefits Realized to Date

- Identification of several cases of potential fraud
- Automation of manual processes, and improvement of existing processes and systems
- Reallocation of resources to focus on customer support, combined CDLIS and S2S help desk, and potential duplicate resolution
- Immediate gains through collaboration with other pilot states
States are now aware of duplicates that already existed, both within and outside of CDLIS.

States are actively identifying improvements in processes, communications, research and resolution.

- Focus on proper resolution, setting the bar high, yet realizing that not all states have the tool set to achieve everything.

- The objectives are to:
  - Detect and deter fraud
  - Minimize the impact on citizens that have done nothing wrong
  - Minimize resource requirements needed to resolve duplicates

AAMVA and States have identified several potential enhancements that will provide significant bang for the buck for current and future State participants.
Next Steps for the Program

- Support Remaining Pilot State Implementations
- Conduct Pilot Evaluation and Compile Best Practices for use by future S2S States
- Transition Long Term Governance and Implement Fee Model
- Support Ongoing Communication with all Stakeholders
- Introduce CDLIS-only States to the Benefits of S2S
For More Information

Contact:

Nancy Carlson - ncarlson@clerussolutions.com
Loffie Jordaan - ljordaan@aamva.org
Governance Activities
Governance Activities

- Long-Term Governance Approach
- S2S Financial Model and User Fees
- DIVS Executive Committee Approval
- Communication to States
Decision Regarding Long Term Governance

- Long term Governance will be provided by an organization representing the states participating in S2S.

- Two options being explored
  - Committee within AAMVA
  - Subsidiary of AAMVA

- Will be formed in 2016 so that governance can be transitioned by March 2017.
Fee Model Objectives

- Do not penalize early adopters
- Keep the per state fee equitable by size (i.e. population) of state
- Provide incentives for states to join
- Consider the benefit that could be provided by obtaining a subsidy from outside DIVS. Any subsidy should have defined beginning and end dates.
Features of Fee Model

- Meets the Fee Model Objectives
- Keeps fees in line with the 2013 Fee Model
- Based on 14 states on board by March 2017 and four states being added each year thereafter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Annual Per State Fee</th>
<th>Annual Per Driver Fee</th>
<th>On-Time Implementation Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$27,166</td>
<td>$0.0720</td>
<td>$93,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$29,651</td>
<td>$0.0720</td>
<td>$96,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$32,885</td>
<td>$0.0720</td>
<td>$99,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$35,893</td>
<td>$0.0720</td>
<td>$101,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$39,202</td>
<td>$0.0720</td>
<td>$104,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0.0720</td>
<td>$107,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0.0720</td>
<td>$110,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0.0720</td>
<td>$113,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Does not show a deficit, if participation goals are met
5/6/2016: DIVS Annual Meeting – BOD & S2S Pilot States will discuss options for long term governance.

May 2016: DIVS Governance Working Group to complete recommendations per pilot state feedback.

June 2016: DIVS Executive Committee

August 2016: AAMVA Board of Directors

Sept 2016-Feb 2017: Transition Governance to AAMVA

March 2017: AAMVA Governance and Fee Collection
Level of Effort for State Implementations
Wisconsin Level of Effort

Context:
- 302,000 CDLIS pointers
- 4.3M Non-CDLIS pointers
- In 13 months, nearly 20,000 customers have moved between WI and the other pilot states

Investment:
- IT resource commitment for WI is estimated to be 5000-6000 hours.
- Six IT resources are currently allocated to the project.
- Other states may see a lesser commitment;
  - Considering differences in state applications, business processes and volume of activity
  - As best practices are being identified and shared as part of the pilot effort.
North Dakota Level of Effort

Context:
- 72,000 CDLIS pointers
- 575,000 Non-CDLIS pointers

IT Investment:
- Core business and IT team comprised from CDLIS group
- 1 main programmer (with backup during structure testing)
- 1 main business sme
- Total 3 month effort
- Approximately 150 hours on the business side and 500 hours on the coding / testing side
Context:
- 224,000 CDLIS pointers
- 4.6M Non-CDLIS pointers

IT Investment:
- Core business and IT team comprised from CDLIS group
- Original implementation of web services. As we got further in the development effort, realized too many risks to meet deadline.
- Made decision to move to UNI development April 2015, estimated hours 6000-7000.
- New implementation goal January 2016
- Lessons learned by early adopters will be helpful to subsequent jurisdictions.
Context:
- 352,096 CDLIS pointers
- 4.8M Non-CDLIS pointers

IT Investment:
- Four IT resources allocated
- Estimate total 5000-6000 hours
Lessons Learned and Best Practices
Lessons Learned

Implementation
- Planning
- Requirements Review
- Business Impact Assessment
- Development
- Testing
- Go Live Preparations
- Training and Communications

Post Go Live
- Front Office Operations
- Back Office Operations
- Potential Duplicate Resolution
Implementation

- Planning
  - Executive leadership / governance support is critical
  - Allocating and dedicating resources to the project
  - Utilizing CDLIS resources to minimize learning curve
  - Establishing a charter and communications plan
  - Recurring team meetings at all levels (weekly, monthly, key milestones)
  - Allocating sufficient time for each task within the plan
Implementation
  o Requirements Review
    • Fully understanding the requirements as they relate to pointer maintenance.
    • Multiple pointer concept over current CDLIS.
  o Business Impact Assessment
    • Thorough business impact assessment is critical
    • Use case review and decision tree spanning full product line
  o Development
    • Use of staff already familiar with CDLIS and State environment
Implementation

- Testing
  - Establishing a second test environment to allow old CDLIS and S2S to be tested in parallel.
  - Include peer state testing as part of your casual testing.
  - Include PDPS interaction.
  - Test state-side processes and flows in addition to interaction with the service.
  - Allow ample time for structure testing and related data set-up.
Implementation
  Go Live Preparations
    • Determine what will be loaded at go-live vs. day forward vs. not at all

    • Run the Data Quality Verification Process (CD31) 1+ times to make existing CDLIS data as clean as possible

    • Perform the Dry Run Bulk Load Process (CD34) 1+ times, and well in advance of go-live. Use the output to;
      • correct errors,
      • investigate and correct potential duplicates prior to go-live, and
      • anticipate level of effort / resources needed to resolve potential duplicates after go-live.
Implementation
  o Training and Communications
    • Training front end staff is critical to a smooth transition after go-live.
    • Communicating to citizens

Post Go Live
  o Front Office Operations
    • Communications with the Customer
    • Decision Tree and Issuance Decisions
  o Back Office Operations
    • Data Quality Verification Process (CD31)
Post Go Live

- Potential Duplicate Resolution
  - Best practices being developed by production states and pilot WG.
  - Goal of finding balance between due diligence needed to fight fraud but also to minimize the number of state resources.

- Consider how to reallocate resources after go live.
  - Some processes will be automated reducing the need for staff time however there will be a larger demand on the help desk to resolve potential duplicates and interact with fraud units as needed.
Specific Quotes from Current Production States
Corey Kleist, Wisconsin
Brad Schaffer, North Dakota
Chrissy Nizer, Maryland
Steve Leak, Indiana
1. (WI) Please speak to the process that you went through to implement the service and how long it took.

2. (ND, IN, MD) Regarding implementation of the service please speak to the level of effort including types of resources, number of resources and how many work hours.

3. (MD, IN) What were the most challenging tasks and other lessons learned? What advice do you have for states considering implementation of the service?
Question & Answer: Implementation and Go Live

1. (WI) Please speak to the process that you went through to implement the service and how long it took.

Corey Kleist, Wisconsin (1st Production State, August 2015):
Wisconsin started by developing a team, identifying project leads from business and IT development. We identified the business area experts, the IT developers and the testing resources that we would be using. We started the project by reviewing potential impact on our own DL/ID card issuance systems, permitted combinations of products and potential risks to the project. During the project we found a number of areas where our own issuance system was operating in ways that were inconsistent with state statute. So we were able to resolve those issues.

We looked for a way to use S2S to automate many of our manual processes, which would save us money down the road. Some of those manual processes are the things that Jay and Tom talked about earlier such as the automated notification of issuance to another state. In Wisconsin that would result in the cancellation of their credential. We automated that process using S2S and the pointer management similar to CDLIS. Additionally, we looked at driver history that has historically been transmitted on paper, through the mail and processed when people can get to it. That is now available to be transmitted electronically. It is now a much shorter time period between when a state would receive some form of notice and when they receive the actual driver history.
Question & Answer: Implementation and Go Live

1. (WI) Please speak to the process that you went through to implement the service and how long it took.

Corey Kleist, Wisconsin (1st Production State, August 2015): Continued

The development process, testing and implementation took approximately 8 months. From our program launch until implementation it took a bit longer because we spent some time focusing on the other areas of our DL and ID card issuance systems. As I mentioned, we found issues that we might not have seen if we were not looking at these combinations of products. One example, involved a WI customer with an identification card product and applying for a driver’s license. The ID card would remain valid in our system even though the state statues prohibit that combination. We able to find issues like that and to resolve them while implementing S2S. We gave a great deal of focus on keeping the efforts away from the customer facing, front counter staff and preventing the transaction from growing any longer that it was currently. Both from an employee and customer perspective. As a result, this approach did create a great deal of work for our back office staff who have additional duties such as reviewing completed Change State of Record transactions and the resolution of pointer issues. As for how it has worked out for us, it has really worked out quite well. There has been zero increase in processing time by front counter staff. They are able to immediately select the appropriate pointer (or multiples), to complete the Change State of Record transaction, and the adjudication processing takes place after the customer transaction. We have seen benefits already. We are really excited to see additional states, especially our neighbor states, coming on, so we can see the service work even better for us.
Question & Answer: Implementation and Go Live

2. (ND, IN, MD) Regarding implementation of the service please speak to the level of effort including types of resources, number of resources and how many work hours.

Brad Schaffer, North Dakota (2nd Production State, November 2015):
North Dakota is a small state so we did not have a lot of resources available to us for this project. We had one main IT programmer and a backup programmer that helped with the structured testing once we got to that phase. In all it took roughly about 3 months from the starting of coding to when we finished structured testing. We also had one business person involved part time. She spent about 150 hours over a 3.5 month time period. It took us about 500 hours for coding and testing. Like I said, we are small but we really had no problems implementing this with the small staff that we had.

Chrissy Nizer, Maryland (3rd Production State, January 2016):
In Maryland we originally thought we were going to implement using web service and we had never implemented a web service application before. What we realized as we got into the process is that it probably wasn’t the best time to experiment with a new method of access the service. We decided, after several months into the effort, to go back to development using the AAMVAnet UNI/AMIE method to access the service. We felt like it would allow us to select a target implementation date that we could achieve. Overall we had a bout 5000 hours of programming that was required. We used staff that was familiar with CDLIS on both the business and the IT side. We had regular weekly meetings between the staff to ensure that everything worked smoothly through requirements, design, and testing.
Question & Answer: Implementation and Go Live

2. (ND, IN, MD) Regarding implementation of the service please speak to the level of effort including types of resources, number of resources and how many work hours.

Steve Leak, Indiana (4th Production State, February 2016):
Our experiences in Indiana are similar to what you have already heard. We ran collaborative meetings, between business and IT, twice weekly for about three months. Looking back at meeting schedules and attendees they accounted for approximately 400 hours, then there were some meetings outside of that. These included people from branch operations, technology, legal, fraud and security, communications and variety of different areas. Once we developed, what we felt was the right way for Indiana to achieve what we wanted to get from the service and statutory requirements, we then took that design to our IT team. We a dedicated project manager and 4 It developers dedicated initially, but as time went on the development work declined, we peeled off these individuals off to other projects. The IT effort was roughly 8 months long. We also use the AAMVA.net UNI/AMIE method to access the service and took right around 5000 hours to complete the programming, causal and structured testing. The overall time could have been cut back but we only had one testing environment so we had to stop testing when there were regular builds to test for production systems. Afterward we had to flip our testing environment back to S2S so that really added another 4-6 system build before we could complete the S2S operations. The time put into it was well worth it given where we landed.
Question & Answer: Implementation and Go Live

3. (MD, IN) What were the most challenging tasks and other lessons learned? What advice do you have for states considering implementation of the service?

Chrissy Nizer, Maryland (3rd Production State, January 2016):
In terms of what is important for states to think about as they consider implementing S2S is they should really think about how they want the process to work from a customer perspective. Tom walked through some scenarios of customers at the front counter and that is what I would recommend that you do as a first step in the planning process. Think about how you want to interact with the customer and how you want the process to flow. Working that through from a business side and how you want the process to work as tasks on the front end, is really helpful in terms of how you want your development to be setup on the back end. Now that pilot states have gone through that effort we have documents that may be useful to states that may be helpful when state layout those scenarios. I think that was most beneficial as we began our process.

In terms of lessons learned, they include the knowledge gained from how our current CDLIS operations are running today and what could be improved in our own environment and interdependence that each state has on each other to exchange data. We expect to see those benefits to continue to grow as additional states join S2S. When we have the ability to take the driving record for customers moving to Maryland from another participating state it is a tremendous benefit and again we expect to see the benefits grow as additional states join the S2S service.
3. (MD, IN) What were the most challenging tasks and other lessons learned? What advice do you have for states considering implementation of the service?

Steve Leak, Indiana (4th Production State, February 2016):
One of the biggest lessons learned was the classic, you don’t know what you don’t know. While you are touching every part of the transaction for verification, you would think that at the time when you are compliant with CDLIS 5.2 and having gone through all this iterations for all these years, to ultimately find little messaging errors and such. It was a surprise because you would think that all of the testing and efforts of the past that you would have less of that. That was very good. It allowed us to really understand and split a lot of hair once we started finding errors. It was a variable that you would not necessary identify outside of a project like this. So you get some residual clean up, or bonus if you will, by going through this. You identify things that are internal Indiana-to-Indiana duplicates, or where things did not occur with other states, or maybe a person came in an left the state as one name, remarried and came back in. There is a lot of interesting information, that as you come onboard S2S, you will learn. I think the most critical thing, we spent a necessary amount of time on, is identifying what are truly duplicate pairs where you have the same individual and you cannot place a lot of trust in just a few fields matching.
For the experience of the customer and to minimize the potential negative impact on customers, it is going to take good investigative work by your people, that are already experienced in this work within the CDL programs and things like that.
1. (IN, MD, ND, WI) Please speak to the benefits that you are realizing from use of the service as part of daily operating activities. Does the additional information provided by the service pose additional challenges or opportunities?
Question & Answer: Operations and Maintenance

1. (IN, MD, ND, WI) Please speak to the benefits that you are realizing from use of the service as part of daily operating activities. Does the additional information provided by the service pose additional challenges or opportunities?

Steve Leak, Indiana (4th Production State, February 2016):

It is fun when you get to see some of your expectations realized and things like the service helping us identify a lot of duplicates. It is helping states identify, perhaps because of a failure at one point. When a person comes to IN and you don’t know they have a CDLIS pointer out there because the previous state did not bring it over. Picking randomly, lets say a driver moves from MO to KY, says they don’t need their CDL anymore and gets a base DL or ID, a search isn’t made by KY so you don’t know that the CDL pointer should be brought over and by the time they get to Indiana asking for a credential, (we say we must do CDLIS pointer check on everyone), and we find it 2 or 3 states back. So there is a lot of benefit in data clean up and the pointer cleanup. You find that customers are not being forthright, when stating they don’t have credentials anywhere else and yet we find that yes they do and sometime multiples. In Indiana our laws are such that you can only hold one credential period, issued by Indiana or any multiple jurisdictions. S2S allows us to be compliant with our laws and we just know more than we used to know. The other benefit of S2S is the fraud identification. We have had instances that we have clear proof that we have been able to identify fraudulent applications before issuance occurs and they have been substantiated by our fraud and security department investigations. These benefits are real and it is rewarding to see it after all of the work that you put into it.
1. (IN, MD, ND, WI) Please speak to the benefits that you are realizing from use of the service as part of daily operating activities. Does the additional information provided by the service pose additional challenges or opportunities?

Corey Kleist, Wisconsin (1st Production State, August 2015):
I’d echo a lot of the things that Steve said, especially the comment that he made earlier, that you don’t know what you don’t know. One of the items that is available as part of S2S is the document discriminator number, which is a number that is specific to a credential issue to a customer. Wisconsin does not currently participate in other services that allow states to share photos. When a customer walks in with a credential, we are relying on our processors' ability to determine if the credential is authentic. S2S provides the additional information that we can verify against the product presented to us. It is a great fraud prevention tool.

Additionally, as I mentioned earlier about the automation that we have seen, the ability to do a pointer pull that previously had someone working off of paper that had been mailed. So we might be looking at notification of issuance from a state that took place 60 or 90 days ago and we are just getting to it now and hoping we don’t miss anything. Now that is something that we are receiving electronically in real time.
Question & Answer: Operations and Maintenance

1. (IN, MD, ND, WI) Please speak to the benefits that you are realizing from use of the service as part of daily operating activities. Does the additional information provided by the service pose additional challenges or opportunities?

Brad Schaffer, North Dakota (2nd Production State, November 2015):
We just had an interesting case just a couple days ago. I got a call from our state game and fish department. They were wondering why this certain individual could not get a residential hunting license in ND because they cross checked our records. When we did a little research, and learned that he is licensed in WI. WI pulled the pointer when they went through the S2S process and this person is still presenting his ND license for benefits in ND. Game and Fish were confused so we had to explain that we are now part of this S2S program. When they told the guy, they never heard back from him again.

He was trying to get residential fees here in ND, which are quite a bit less than non-resident fees. Once Game and Fish found out about it they were really excited couldn’t believe that we were part of this service like this. They are really looking forward to seeing other states join the service, especially neighboring states. So it is a really great thing to see, in that yeah the service is designed to prevent driver license fraud but it really goes beyond that to benefit fraud like this with Game and Fish. It will most likely reach beyond Game and Fish to help reduce fraud in other areas.
Question & Answer: Operations and Maintenance

1. (IN, MD, ND, WI) Please speak to the benefits that you are realizing from use of the service as part of daily operating activities. Does the additional information provided by the service pose additional challenges or opportunities?

Chrissy Nizer, Maryland (3rd Production State, January 2016):
I think that is a great example. The reality is that the benefits of implementing the service are yet to be seen. We are currently reaping the benefits of cleaning our own records, and records with participating pilot states, but really there are so many things in the long term that we will see. The efficiencies of electronic exchange as well the fraud prevention (front end) as opposed to what we did before in really chasing that fraud on the back end after it occurs. The highway safety benefit, because we know there are individuals pursuing credentials that cannot be licensed elsewhere. In the short time that we have been on the service, seen each of the benefits that were laid out earlier in the presentation. As states join these benefits will expand and the impact will go beyond the motor vehicle world. As Brad just articulated, it really will spread further into where DL and ID cards are used to acquire services or to get access to certain things.