AAMVA’s Ignition Interlock Program Best Practices Working Group developed the *Ignition Interlock Program Best Practices Guide* to build on the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s (NHTSA) *Model Guideline to State Ignition Interlock Programs* and the Association of Ignition Interlock Programs Administrators’ (AIIPA) *Standardized Vocabulary & Standardized Best Practice Recommendations*. It is intended to fill in the gaps not addressed by these documents and offer additional guidance to DMVs legislatively charged with administering ignition interlock programs.
Introduction

As of this 2015 printing, every U.S. jurisdiction and many Canadian jurisdictions within British Columbia, Manitoba, Northern Territories, Ontario and Quebec make ignition interlocks available within the construct of an administrative, judicial or hybrid program. Research tells us that these programs reduce offender recidivism and help protect public health. However, there is no “model program” or national strategy that addresses every component of an ignition interlock program, in part because they are administered in a variety of ways. By using the NHTSA and AIIPA documents available in conjunction with AAMVA’s Ignition Interlock Program Best Practices Guide, jurisdictions can find a complete set of best practices to help build or maintain effective ignition interlock programs.

History and Background

In March 2015, the Obama Administration sent Congress its GROW AMERICA Act, a $478 billion transportation reauthorization measure which builds upon the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
bill signed into law in 2012. It affects AAMVA members in the following ways:

- It gives grants to states that have adopted or are enforcing a law restricting the DUI offenders to operation of vehicles equipped with an ignition interlock device or mandates participation in a 24-7 sobriety program.

- It requires jurisdictions to enforce one minimum one-year penalty for repeat DUI offenders—either license suspension, mandatory use of the ignition interlock equipment or participation in a 24-7 sobriety program.

There are three types of ignition interlock programs:

**Administrative Ignition Interlock Programs**

are managed by the DMV, are centralized, can be extended easily to all eligible offenders (even prior to conviction) and the programs are administered consistently throughout the jurisdiction. Jurisdictions can monitor usage, order installation, manage administrative appeal hearings, and impose

---

*Interest in the technology that led to breath alcohol ignition interlock devices (BAIIDs) dates back to the 1960s, but they didn’t increase in popularity until the 1980s after public outcry over the rising human toll due to alcohol-impaired drivers on the road.*
sanctions, substance abuse treatment and other conditions.

**Judicial Ignition Interlock Programs** utilize the powers and resources of the court to ensure program compliance. They can address underlying addictions of participants, make use of various sanctions, including prison, the threat of prison, fines and community service.

**Hybrid Ignition Interlock Programs** combine features of both administrative and judicial programs. They are increasing in popularity because they offer the combined strengths of both programs, but the dual approach requires additional coordination and financial support.

**Manufacturer Performance Standards**

The NHTSA’s model specifications detail device functionality requirements, but it is important to establish proper manufacturer performance standards related to customer service, including:

- A 24-hour toll-free help line for program participants
- Quarterly reporting of complaints and resolutions
- Notification of software changes
Approval of new devices only after service center requirements are identified, including availability in remote areas

Designation of a manufacturer contact person for each jurisdiction

Mandatory response times

Service Delivery Standards

Rules should provide clear expectations to manufacturers on providing service delivery throughout a jurisdiction, including:

- Approval processes for each location
- Clear objectives for delivery, plus the right to unannounced audits

Additional AAMVA Manufacturer Standards Recommendations

- Jurisdictions should require service center locations for installation and/or service/calibration no more than 100 miles (160 km) from any location, or establish rules that allow for possible mobile servicing.
- Mail-in calibration should not be allowed unless accompanied by periodic in-person servicing.
Manufacturer Oversight

Administrators should establish procedures and guidelines that facilitate the approval and oversight of ignition interlock manufacturers and service centers, including:

- Program managers should become familiar with the NHTSA’s Model Specifications for Breath Alcohol Ignition Interlock Devices (2014) and Model Guidelines for Ignition Interlock Devices (2013).

- Specific wording, as provided on p. 11 of the AAMVA’s Ignition Interlock Program Best Practices Guide, should be used to define certification requirements.

- Concur with AIIPA and NHTSA recommendations regarding alcohol set points, testing and retesting, alerts, emergency overrides, calibration, breath sample volume, warm-up time, anti-circumvention, tamper proof seals, quality assurance plans, vehicle-interlock interface, camera usage, oversight/monitoring, program contacts, device approval requirements, service center inspection, technician approval/renewal, and database requirements and retention.

A full list of AAMVA best practices recommendations as well as when to refer to and concur with guidelines provided by AIIPA and NHTSA documents, can be found on pp. 12-17 of the Ignition Interlock Program Best Practices Guide.
Participant Oversight

There are several critical components jurisdictions should consider when structuring an ignition interlock program, including:

- Resource requirements
- Application/enrollment
- Affordability
- Participant monitoring
- Treatment and behavior modification
- Uniform driver license restrictions
- Violations/monitoring/compliance-based removal
- Exemptions for medical conditions and employer-owned vehicles

Standardized Reporting Process

All manufacturers within a jurisdiction should report ignition interlock data in a consistent format as defined by the DMV, whether using electronic or paper reporting (though paper reporting is not recommended).

Installation Reports include manufacturer, participant and installation details and should be provided within 24 hours of installation.
- Regular Service Reports assist in review and evaluation and include any and all events related to the device, including readings, violations and malfunctions.

- Removal (uninstall) Reports provide all details regarding the device’s removal.

- Manufacturers Reports detail and summarize information related to their services, including number of users, device failures and complaints.

Reciprocity

There are two driver’s license agreements between states—the Driver License Compact, which provides uniformity of information exchange, and the Nonresident Violator Compact, which standardizes the processing of non-resident violators. Still, inconsistencies and miscommunications remain. In an attempt to enable cooperation between jurisdictions, the best practices document offers recommendations for how to address:

- When a participant moves to another jurisdiction.

- When a non-resident receives an alcohol violation/conviction in your jurisdiction.
A person can drive more than 200 times while under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs without being arrested and charged. A “first offender” more accurately is a person “first time caught.”

Outreach & Communication

Following are recommendations for outreach to key stakeholder groups:

- Legislative – Develop and disseminate an educational brochure.
- Judicial – Hold judge and probation officer training sessions.
- Law Enforcement – Utilize the AAMVA’s roll-call style training video (included in the DVD).
- Public – Increase public awareness of program benefits.
- Offender/Participant – Provide detailed explanations of usage and benefits to all program participants via literature, a website and in-person interactions. (See Maryland MVA sample brochure on p. 33 of the best practices document.)
Conclusion

Ignition interlock programs are beneficial to public health, but consistency of administration is challenging because there is no comprehensive national standard for existing programs or blueprint for building a new program. If jurisdictions use AAMVA’s *Ignition Interlock Program Best Practices Guide* to fill in the gaps of the existing guidelines from the NHTSA and AIIPA, they will be in a better position to build, implement and maintain an effective program.

About AAMVA’s Ignition Interlock Working Group
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