



American Association of
Motor Vehicle Administrators

MEETING Agenda and Notes NMVTIS Business Rules Working Group

Date of Meeting: September 17 - 18, 2012

Prepared By: Kitty Kramer and Cathie Curtis

Location: AAMVA, Arlington, VA Board Room - 4th Floor

Agenda -September 17th

8:30 – 9:00 Continental Breakfast

9:00 Welcome and Introductions – Working Group Chair, Kitty Kramer

Greetings -

Neil Schuster, President/CEO, AAMVA

Patrice Aasmo, Vice President, AAMVA

Housekeeping Items - Cathie Curtis, Director of Vehicle Programs, AAMVA

9:15 Review of Agenda - Kitty

9:15 – 10:00 Background on Prioritized Issues – Charlie Katz, AAMVA

10:00 - 10:15 Break

10:15 - 11:00 Assign Subgroups, explain assignments – Kitty

11:00 - 12:00 Subgroups meet

12:00 – 1:00 Lunch - on site

1:00 - 2:15 Subgroups continue to meet

2:15 - 2:30 Break

2:30 - 4:00 Subgroups continue to meet

4:00 - 4:30 Full Working Group convenes in the Boardroom for wrap-up - Kitty

4:30 Adjourn for the day - dinner on your own or as a group

Agenda - September 18th

8:30 - 9:00	Continental Breakfast;
9:00 - 10:30	Full group hears recommendations and rationale from Subgroups A and B - Kitty
10:30 - 10:45	Break
10:45 – 11:45	Full group hears recommendations and rationale from Subgroups C - Kitty
12:00 – 1:00	Working Lunch – Wrap-up, Next steps - Kitty
1:00	Adjourn – Safe Travels!

1. Meeting Overview

The purpose of this meeting is to begin to develop recommendations for resolving the Top 10 prioritized NMVTIS business related issues.

2. Attendance at Meeting

<i>Name</i>	<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>Invited</i>	<i>Attended</i>
Kitty Kramer, Chair	California	Yes	Yes
Anita Wasko	Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes
Priscilla Vaughan	New Hampshire	Yes	Yes
Valerie Bowman	Vermont	Yes	Yes
Scott Clapper	Delaware	Yes	Yes
Karen Dudenhoeffer	Missouri	Yes	Yes
Shannon Dickson	Indiana	Yes	Yes
Shannon Degrazio	Wyoming	Yes	Yes
Ted Imfeld	Navada	Yes	Yes
Mike Gamble	Alabama	Yes	Yes
Yolanda Fleming	Virginia	Yes	Yes

Sharon Madison	South Carolina	Yes	Yes
Andrew Frey	Iowa	Yes	Yes
Tina Hargis	Iowa	Yes	No
Cynthia Grant	Illinois	Yes	Yes
Kim Bright	U.S. Department of Justice	Yes	No
Neil Schuster	AAMVA	Yes	Yes
Patrice Aasmo	AAMVA	Yes	Yes
Vivienne Cameron	AAMVA	Yes	Yes
Cathie Curtis	AAMVA	Yes	Yes
Mekala Joy	AAMVA	Yes	Yes
Susan Creighton	AAMVA	Yes	Yes
Abhi Kapil	AAMVA	Yes	Yes
Charlie Katz	AAMVA	Yes	Yes

3. Meeting Notes, Decisions, Issues

Meeting Summary 9/17/12

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Kitty Kramer welcomed the group and members introduced themselves. Neil Schuster welcomed the group and reinforced his support for NMVTIS, the work that needs to be done by the working group and thanked the members for their time.

Patrice Aasmo welcomed the group and explained NMVTIS in general and provided some background information. She also explained the process for obtaining feedback from the jurisdictions and how it has evolved. She discussed the NMVTIS IT and Law Enforcement working groups and discussed the relationship between all of the working groups. She also explained that recommendations made by this working group will need to be vetted through appropriate channels. This could include the vehicle standing committee or other appropriate committees depending on the recommendations. If recommendations are made that would result in NMVTIS system modifications, it will require going through the established change control process.

Vivienne Cameron welcomed the group and explained the role of the consumer access service providers and data consolidators. She reinforced that NMVTIS has grown substantially and explained that increasing the general public's access to NMVTIS data, is the ultimate goal in consumer protection. She also established that all working groups that participate have a good working knowledge of NMVTIS.

Kitty reviewed the agenda and then asked Charlie Katz to provide some background information on the issues the Working Group (WG) will be addressing.

II. Background on Prioritized Issues

Charlie provided some background and history on each of the top ten issues the WG will be considering.

Issue #3 Duplicate Titles - There have been occasions where a state has issued a duplicate title after another state has issued a title. A business process or practice should be developed to eliminate or at least reduce the chances of this happening.

Background - Vehicles and titles move from one state to another. In this situation, the state that first issued a title, issues a duplicate, most likely because the owner requests it. This state is completely unaware that another state has issued a title on this vehicle, prior to the issuance of the duplicate. The duplicate title becomes the title of record. States are not required to check NMVTIS before issuing a duplicate. In this circumstance, what do the states need to do to correct the situation? What does NMVTIS do to correct the situation? How can it be prevented in the future?

Issue #4 Brand Modifications - How and under what circumstances should a state change, add or remove a brand after another state has issued a title? How and when should the current state of title be informed of the brand change?

Background - Brands are stored in the history. The vehicle may move between states, but the brand remains in the history. Sometimes a brand error is identified and it is determined that the brand needs to be corrected. The state that initially created the brand may not be the state that is now the state of record. The vehicle could have been titled a number of times, in a number of states since the brand was created. We need to develop a process for correcting the brand to include which state corrects it, which states are informed of the error and the correction, how and when is each state informed of the correction. Is it a manual process? Is it an automated system correction? Under what conditions should a state be allowed to make a change?

Issue #5 Correcting records with incorrect VINs - Procedures are needed for correcting a record with an incorrect VIN. Sometimes another vehicle is properly titled with that VIN and sometimes no other record contains the VIN. How should states handle these situations internally, and what should be on the central files?

Background - This is a problem for incorrect VINs and is not related to state assigned VINs. There are times when a VIN is entered incorrectly and it is a valid VIN on another vehicle properly titled in another state. This may go unnoticed until one of the vehicles is re-titled. At

that point the state of record may not match the document that is presented by the new owner. It causes confusion and sometimes hardships for the consumer as well as the state trying to resolve the problem. What should the state do to correct the error and what should be reflected in NMVTIS?

Issue #8 Handling SEW messages - Should states address specific error and warning messages from NMVTIS in a standard way? What NMVTIS processes could be improved to make states' business operations easier and more accurate?

Background - The warnings and errors are important. The states depend on each other to ensure the data is accurate. Corrections need to be addressed. Is there a way to improve the process for the states? Can the system/policy be adjusted to make sure the states act on the errors and warnings? The public, as well as law enforcement are now accessing the data which means that data integrity is increasingly more important. There was significant discussion reinforcing how important it is to have accurate data.

Follow-up - The WG members asked for stats on errors and the number of each type of errors.

Issue #10 Titling of Non-repairable vehicles. What should be the process for titling non-repairable vehicles? Some states allow it, others do not. There will be a Best Practices document released by the Unconventional Vehicles Working Group in September 2012 that states the best practice is as follows: *“Non-repairable vehicles and VIN bearing parts from non-repairable vehicles cannot be titled for operation on public roads.”*

Background - Some state statutes require vehicles to be reported “Junk” and therefore, the state brands the vehicles as “Junk.” However, they are allowed to be resold, re-titled and re-registered. Other states consider as non-repairable “Junk” vehicle and will not title and register it again. There are problems when these vehicles are issued a JUNK brand, re-titled in that state and then sold in a state that will not re-title a vehicle once it is branded Junk. There are inconsistencies in the way the states brand and title these vehicles. There needs to be some consistency in definitions, clarifications, brands and mapping.

Issue #1 Reporting Fraudulent Titles - How should states report fraudulent titles in their internal systems and what should be sent to the NMVTIS central files? Sometimes a fraudulent title can have a legitimate VIN that is on another vehicle with a legitimate title, junk certificate, export manifest, etc. and sometimes the fraudulent title is created with a VIN that is not on any other vehicle.

Background - Sometimes a vehicle is titled correctly and another vehicle has been titled fraudulently with the same VIN. How do we fix the title record to deal with the fraudulent title and not negatively impact the valid title?

Issue #2 Handling Undercover Vehicles - How should states report police “undercover vehicles” to NMVTIS to ensure that the records reflect appropriate information? It is our understanding that sometimes these vehicles may move between undercover use and non-undercover operations.

Background - Currently states are told to handle them the way it is appropriate for their state and not necessarily send NMVTIS information. However, it can be more complicated. There are times when a government owned vehicle goes back and forth between undercover and non-undercover use. Also, the vehicles are eventually sold and the new owner should have full information on the vehicle. How can NMVTIS support full disclosure to the general public and at the same time minimize risks to undercover operations.

Issue #12 Handling of Purged Theft Records - How should states (and NMVTIS) deal with reports on stolen vehicles that have been purged from NCIC but are still on NICB’s theft file? Once the state has determined that the vehicle was recovered and legitimately titled, there is no way to clear the record in the NICB system. What should states do?

Background - This is a long standing issue. It is our understanding that NICB is working with NCIC on this issue. NCIC maintains the stolen vehicle database. The jurisdiction that reports vehicle stolen should report that it is recovered but this doesn’t always happen. After 5 years the reports are dropped on NCIC. NICB keeps the stolen vehicle data beyond 5 years. There have been many discussions with NCIC and NICB on the issue, but there has never been a solution that reconciles the two databases.

Issue #19 Brand Code Descriptions - The brand descriptions came from many different sources. A few have been reviewed, but it is time to review many more of them. Are they accurate, are they sufficient?

Background – Consumers have access to NMVTIS and are now factoring in information they see in NMVTIS reports, in their vehicle purchase decisions. There is a new CA law that increases this access. Negative reports on NMVTIS must be highlighted when the CA dealer provides it to the consumer. Consumers are seeing brands and asking what they mean and also making assumptions on what they believe the brands to mean. While NMVTIS is designed to protect consumers, inaccurate interpretations of NMVTIS data can adversely impact the value of a vehicle.

Follow up - The working group asked if there are certain brand descriptions that are more pressing, or have a higher volume of inconsistencies.

Issue #21 Dealer Reassignments - Background information - NY is changing its process so that dealers will report reassignments to the title system electronically. If a vehicle is sold out of state, the NY dealer will print an MV-50 and attach it to the title document, in addition to updating the title database. When verifying the title, another state must have both the old title document and

the MV-50. To help states verify titles that should have MV-50s attached, NY proposed to add the MV-50 data to the NMVTIS VIN pointer file so that other states could recognize that the MV-50 should be with the title document and so that the states could verify the date and document number on the MV-50.

Background - This is a new issue. NY requested consideration be given to tracking dealer reassignments in NMVTIS. Some states allow numerous sales to be documented on back of title and additional paper documents. NY is requiring all dealer reassignments to be submitted electrically. How can the accurate chain of ownership be documented and does it need to be in NMVTIS. Does this help establish a more complete electronic record of the vehicle history?

III. Subgroups meet to discuss issues and report back their recommendations

The working group was divided into three subgroups, several issues were assigned to each subgroup along with instructions to discuss the possible solutions, provide recommendations for resolving the issue and document their jurisdiction for their recommendation. They met for most of the day and presented their recommendations in the afternoon which are documented in the NMVTIS Business Rules Status Report.

IV. NMVTIS updates were provided

Vivienne reviewed the annual report and reviewed the presentation that was provided to the NMVTIS Advisory Board in September. It clearly demonstrated the significant grow in NMVTIS over the past few years.

V. States offered some feedback on NMVTIS Challenges and Successes

The states were asked to share their thoughts on any challenges or successes they have experienced.

a. Challenges

There was general agreement that some states have lost their more knowledgeable employees, as well as the history on some decisions and the training has not been adequate for new employees.

There are some WG members that would like to have an on-line integrated system, but they do not have resources and it may not be seen as a priority by the decision makers.

When bordering states do not participate in NMVTIS it causes manual processing which is time consuming and can result in errors.

Some states require other states to pay for their data.

One state indicated that they were trying to implement a new system and update NMVTIS so they could become a fully integrated state, at the same time turned out to be impossible. They had to put the NMVTIS upgrade on hold.

The NMVTIS procedures manuals are complex and can be overwhelming.

It would be beneficial to have web inquiries available to county offices.

Some states found that it can be difficult to obtain resources within the states that are available to work on NMVTIS.

Titled vehicles that are exempt from NMVTIS are problematic as there is not a standard electronic process to notify the current state of title, when the vehicle has been re-titled in another state.

Law enforcement needs to remove theft files for recovered stolen.

b. Successes

One state indicated that they were very successful when they implemented NMVTIS. They created a strong team that had expertise in many areas such as business units, IT staff that had expertise with AAMVA interfaces, and management support. They conducted significant testing. It took a strong commitment from the whole team but they implemented in less than a year. The key was to have the right people on their team.

Another state discussed how important it is to document internal business rules. It also creates a history of decisions to help when staff changes.

Another state indicated that NMVTIS is a great resource and helps them to discover possible stolen vehicles which they turn over to their law enforcement right away. Their developer did a good job providing them with a system that enables them to fully use NMVTIS.

One state pointed out that CDLIS went through many problems that have “lessons learned” that could benefit NMVTIS.

A state indicated that they have a good system for resolving theft hits. They generate documents for law enforcement and they can investigate.

VI. Subgroup Reports and recommendations

The subgroups provided their recommendations for each issue which can be found on the WG’s status report. They discussed their reasoning and the pros and cons for their recommendations.

VII. Adjourned for the day

Meeting Summary 9/18/12

I. Recommendations

The full group continued to review the subgroup recommendations. See NMVTIS Business Rules Status Report.

II. Re-engineering

Mekala Joy provided an update and presentation of the re-engineering project. See presentation attached.

III. Second Tier Priority Issues

The subgroups decided to continue to work on the remaining issues in the subgroup configurations. Each subgroup selected three more issues to review, discuss and develop a recommendation for the next steps. See attached status report. Conference calls will be scheduled for each of the subgroups. Charlie will provide background information during the call.

IV. Adjourn