



U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

OFFICE OF ANALYSIS, RESEARCH, AND TECHNOLOGY

CDL Third Party Testing Anti-Fraud May 7, 2008

Webinar Transcript

Presenters

- Quon Kwan, FMCSA Office of Analysis, Research, and Technology (ART)
- Greg Sensiba, Project Manager, American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators

Speakers (optional)

- Kirse Kelly, Web Conference Coordinator, FMCSA, ART

Description:

The objective of the project is to design, fabricate, and pilot-test system software for preventing and detecting fraud perpetrated by testers during the commercial skills portion of the Commercial Drivers' Licensing process. The Webinar will describe the background, history, pilot test results, current utilization, and future direction of the project as carried out by FMCSA and the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators

PRESENTATION— CDL THIRD PARTY TESTING ANTI-FRAUD**PRESENTATION TITLE SLIDE: CDL THIRD PARTY TESTING ANTI-FRAUD****Operator:**

Welcome, and thank you for standing by. At this time, all, participants are in listen-only mode until the question and answer period. If you would like to ask a question at that time, please press *1. Today's conference is being recorded; if you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. Now I will turn the meeting over to Web Conference Coordinator, Ms. Kirse Kelly. Ma'am you may begin.

Kirse Kelly (Web Conference Host, FMCSA ART):

Thanks Amy. Just a few logistics on today's webinar—we wanted to let you know, you can actually type in questions throughout. Like Amy said, we'll answer questions at the end, but feel free to type the questions in as you go. If they are for a particular speaker, if you can put their name with it, that would be great. The other thing I just want to let you know is that this presentation will be available for you at the end. You'll be able to download it from this Website. I know that's a favorite question of people. It will be available. So, I'll go ahead and turn you over to Quon Kwan from the FMCSA Office of Analysis, Research and Technology.

Quon Kwan (Program Manager, FMCSA ART)

Good afternoon. This is Quon Kwan. I'm the project manager for the CDL Third Party Testing Anti-fraud project.

SLIDE 2: TOPICS

Today, we're going to cover several topics concerning this software. I will cover the purpose, background, phases one and phases two and the milestones therein. Then I have Greg Sensiba with me. He's the project manager at the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators. He will cover essentially how the software works, the benefits of the software, the pilot test, the states involved, and some of the results from the pilot test. He'll also cover the final report and the recommendations that were made by the states involved in the pilot test and go over some current usage statistics. Then I'll take over and conclude with the next steps and the last chart will be our contact information.

SLIDE 3: PURPOSE

The purpose of this software—the purpose of the project—was to develop a software system for states to assist in preventing and detecting fraud perpetrated by third party testers during the skills testing portion of the CDL process.

Later on we are going to find out that this software is not limited to third party testers. It can be applied to in-house MVA or DMV examiners, too.

The skills test—for those who are not familiar with the skills test portion of the CDL process—the skills test consists of three parts. It starts usually with the vehicle inspection or the pre-trip, the basic controls test, and the third part of it is the road test.

SLIDE 4: BACKGROUND

Now some background on the project. The project was prompted by a U.S. Department Transportation Office of the Inspector General Investigation.

In May of 2002, the OIG issued their final report and they concluded that the issuance of fraudulent commercial drivers' licenses to be a nation-wide problem. It found suspected criminal activity in the CDL programs of at least 16 states. It identified large scale fraud in CDL programs of four states in which hundreds of CDLs were fraudulently issued. In one state alone, nine deaths were directly traced to crashes involving drivers with fraudulently obtained CDLs.

During the year of 2002, FMCSA was able to procure about \$1.1 million in funds from the Federal Highway Administration's Intelligent Transportation System Joint Program Office to initiate this CDL Anti-Fraud project.

In October of 2003, we kicked off a working group of—how many states was that Greg?

Greg Sensiba (Project Manager, American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators)

We had about seven or eight states that participated in the working group.

Quon Kwan

Initially we had about two dozen or so? Okay. So we had a working group with states acting as an advisory capacity on this project.

SLIDE 5: MILESTONES

The project consists of two phases. We started in September 2003 with a cooperative agreement with AAMVA to do the work.

In January 2004, both AAMVA and FMCSA conducted site visits to Florida, South Carolina and Wisconsin to look at their fraud issues and how they were trying to stop fraud in the issuance of CDLs in their state.

In April 2004, some preliminary studies were done. These helped define the business rules or the business operations for the software and we had another study that defined the technical requirements for the software.

In February of 2005, AAMVA came up with a detailed design for the prototype of the software, and later on in that year, the working group adopted the name “Commercial Skills Test Information System” or CSTIMS as the abbreviated name for the software. We adopted this name because we found that this software was not limited to third party testers, but could be applied to in-house MVA or DMV testers and examiners. Second, it had value just alone in scheduling the test—the skills portion of the CDL test.

SLIDE 6: MILESTONES (CONT’D)

In 2005, we started Phase II of the project. AAMVA developed the software, the CSTIMS software; that started around March and it was completed about 11 months later in February 2006.

At that time, we conducted training. We got Alaska and New Mexico as volunteers to pilot the software. We trained them in February. In the following months we involved Arizona and South Dakota as partners in pilot testing of the software.

The pilot testing actually began in February 2006, with data being collected starting in April.

In August of 2006, the pilot test results were obtained and the states—the four states that participated—were brought into Washington, D. C. and they provided us a debriefing on and provided us feedback on the software and made some recommendations.

In December 2006, AAMVA finished a final report on the pilot test and compiled the results of the pilot test and concluded with recommendations to FMCSA.

These recommendations were briefed to us in January of 2007.

Now I’ll turn the webinar over to Greg.

SLIDE 7: WHO DOES WHAT?

Greg Sensiba:

Thank you, Quon. Just is a way of introduction here to make you understand a little bit about what the system does—there are various roles within the system that people can be assigned. The activities they can perform within the system are defined by the roles that they play. We’ll go over these quickly.

We’ve got a system administrator, which are the folks of us at AAMVA in Arlington who have the programmers and maintain the initial passwords for our jurisdiction administrators.

The jurisdiction administrator is the central point of contact for the jurisdiction. Because they know the people within the jurisdiction—they know what roles they should play—they have the authority and ability within the system to make those changes to the system.

The primary person probably on the state side is the CDL monitor. It's usually a person assigned to the MVA, the motor vehicle agency, a generic term we use because not every jurisdiction uses the same term, who is in fact the in charge of the CDL program in general.

We also have a role for the tester's "responsible party." One of the things we need to mention is the difference in our terminology. For standard terminology, a "tester" is an organization that employs the people who actually perform the skills test, and those are called examiners. I know many jurisdictions use different terms, but we picked one term that everyone could agree to and those are terms we used.

There's also an MVA clerk role. That role is limited basically to viewing the results of the skills tests that are provided by the examiners or the responsible party into the system for purposes of determining that all the required tests have been passed by the applicant in order to receive the CDL that they are applying for.

In a couple of ancillary roles, the auditing roles where the auditing function can be performed and tracked within the system to let people know the results of any audits that were done on a particular tester and/or examiner.

With the oversight responsibility that FMCSA carries, we also have a role for FMCSA. They do not have any kind of write capability to the system, they have read-only, but they can see all the data that is in the system. Their role is providing oversight.

SLIDE 8: WHO DOES WHAT (CONT'D)

That sounds pretty complicated. In this next slide, on slide [eight] shows the kinds of roles that people can have on the left side that can create or modify the roles that are in the table itself.

You'll see the system administrator can only create other system administrators, jurisdiction administrators and FMCSA personnel.

Jurisdiction administrators then can do the CDL monitor, the MVA clerk and the auditors. Again, we put that function down at the jurisdiction level because they're the ones who know their people. We at AAMVA and up at FMCSA don't necessarily know who those people are and what roles they should be provided.

The CDL monitor can create the responsible party for the tester as well as the examiners. Once they have passed the certification that the jurisdiction requires, then they can enter them into the system. No one can use the system until they have been certified by the jurisdiction and, in particular, the CDL monitor.

SLIDE 9: HOW THE SOFTWARE WORKS

There are a few things that the system does that we are calling prerequisites here on this slide.

You will notice that all skills tests must be scheduled in advance. This provides for oversight by either the jurisdiction or at the federal level; if there's an interest in a particular examiner or tester, to know what tests are being scheduled.

Again, all the examiners have to be in the system or they can't be assigned to perform a test or scheduled for a test, nor can they enter results if they aren't in the system as a user.

We also require that information on the test site, the vehicle used and the results are all entered into the system.

SLIDE 10: HOW THE SOFTWARE WORKS (CONT'D)

You may be wondering based on the vast number of jurisdictions out there, not everybody does it the same way, obviously. To try to accommodate that, we have introduced the concept of what we call jurisdiction parameters. There are some examples here on this slide: the maximum number of tests per day that an examiner can administer—if that threshold is exceeded, an alert is sent out. We'll talk about alerts in the next slide. There is also a parameter talking about how many testers an examiner can work for. Some jurisdictions allow this, some don't.

We also found there are cases where border states, certain examiners who work for a tester can actually perform skills tests for multiple jurisdictions. We made an allowance for that for those jurisdictions that allow it.

Again, another difference that jurisdictions have is the minimum number of days in advance that an exam must be scheduled. Also, how many days after you fail a test do you have to wait before you can take another test? That can be set at "zero" for those states that don't require a waiting period. I think the highest we had, somebody said, was one week.

We also set up the maximum number of days after the accomplishment of the test to enter those results into the system or to update them. What we didn't want is people making modifications to show a pass and then immediately turning around after the CDL was issued and changing the score. Although the CDL monitor can update results at any time based on any information he or she gathers in the course of any kind of audit or investigation.

Another parameter we set up was nighttime testing, whether that's allowed or not within the jurisdiction. If you remember we had Alaska as one of our pilot jurisdictions. If we hadn't allowed nighttime testing, they'd be closed down for six months out of the year, which they said wasn't what happened. The majority of jurisdictions don't allow it, but there are some occasions where it needs to be done.

SLIDE 11: HOW THE SOFTWARE WORKS (CONT'D)

I mentioned earlier that if some of the parameters, the limits are exceeded, there will be alerts that are posted. Here on slide 10, we have some examples of some of the alerts that are generated. If an examiner is scheduled for more tests than the jurisdiction thinks is reasonable, an alert is sent. You should realize that alerts don't stop the process, for the most part. They are just

notification to the CDL monitor or whoever else is signed up for the alerts that something out of the ordinary has happened and that it should be investigated.

Also, there were some concerns that FMCSA raised about examiners performing tests at multiple sites on the same day. We have an alert that says if that happens. Again, we don't say whether it's fraudulent or not, because the test sites could be within easy driving distance and that could be acceptable.

There's an alert that's published if an examiner is scheduled to work for more testers than is allowed by the jurisdiction parameter. This can happen if an examiner changes employment and the new employer puts him or her in the system before the old employer has taken them out.

We also will notify the CDL monitor if the tester or examiner is under sanction and the test is accomplished by an examiner under sanction or an examiner working for a tester that is under sanction. We will allow the entry of the data into the system, because we want to capture the actual results of all tests, but we will again alert to the CDL monitor that there may be something he or she wants to look at to determine if any fraud has occurred.

We also will send an alert out if an examiner performs a test for which he or she is not qualified. We do keep track of all the qualifications of all of the examiners—make sure that a Class A test, for instance, is given by someone with Class A credentials.

SLIDE 12: HOW THE SOFTWARE WORKS (CONT'D)

Along with the alerts, we also have reports. We actually have 11 reports. We only show a few here.

The tester report talks about just basically the background information on the tester, who the responsible party is, how many examiners they expect to have, how many tests, the capabilities for their examiners, kind of high level things.

An Examiner Multi-Employment Report—I mentioned earlier that it is possible that some jurisdictions allow an examiner to work for multiple testers, and if they do they will show up on this report.

One of the obvious reports we would want to have is a test Pass/Fail Report saying how many. Not only do we do by examiner, by tester, by jurisdiction, but we also provide statistics in comparison to the rest of the user community of systems on how many of their tests and what their relationships are with the other jurisdictions. We do not show any of the actual test results to any other jurisdiction; those are limited to the jurisdiction in which the testing has occurred.

There is a Schedule Report, again, that could be used for covert monitoring and a report on any sanctions by any tester or examiner that might have occurred.

There are other reports in the system and they're all listed in the speaker notes on the presentation you'll be able to download after this Webinar.

SLIDE 13: BENEFITS

That's it. There are quite a few benefits that we see to this system.

First off, from a jurisdiction perspective, it's web based—there's no development cost for the jurisdiction. We don't want to say it's free—there are training costs associated with it. Certainly, initially there'll probably be some dual entry work until people are satisfied that the system does, in fact, provide the capability they need if they decide they want to go paperless.

We don't limit the same examiner being required to give all three portions of the skills test. We do allow—as long as they are within the same testing organization, the tester, any of the qualified examiners can give any of the three pieces. You could have, in fact, three different examiners giving the three pieces of the test.

We also implemented the concept of a certification control document. These are documents used by some jurisdictions that are preprinted with numbers on them for control. They pass those out to the examiners or the testers and keep track of what happens to the status—not allowing to be used more than once. We also track any certification control documents that are reported as stolen or lost, as well as those that are actually used.

As Quon mentioned earlier, early on it became pretty apparent that this was not just a third party testing mechanism. It's applicable to jurisdiction examiners, as well as third party examiners. For those jurisdictions who do not have third party testers, this is still a tool that can be used for your own jurisdiction testers.

As we mentioned earlier, scheduling in advance was one of the big things that users wanted so that either the State or the Federal folks can do the oversight for any kind of covert monitoring that they want to provide.

We talked earlier about the alerts. Anything that comes out of the norm is alerted. Again, this system does not identify instances of fraud, necessarily. All it does is it highlight those situations that may warrant further investigation which may lead to the determination of fraud.

The multiple reports that are available are valuable for, certainly the third party testers—a lot of them have to send in a monthly report to the jurisdiction's MVA to the CDL monitor. This system, because of the tracking of the schedules and the actual tests themselves, reduces that requirement. I know at least one jurisdiction does not require those paper reports anymore. They take all their information out of the system itself and reduce the workload on their testers.

SLIDE 14: PILOT TEST

Quon mentioned earlier the pilot which we started in 2006. We did have four states including their third party testers who volunteered to help us with the evaluation of the pilot. We trained them in February and March 2006, and the pilot ended on August 15, 2006.

The table here on [slide 14] gives you an idea of how many applicants, how many tests were scheduled, how many were administered, and the pass rate for those four jurisdictions.

One thing to realize—when we talk of a test, in systems, each piece of the basic skills test is considered a test. A vehicle's inspection is a test, the basic controls skills is a test and the road test is considered a test. So, to see how many of the three-part tests you have to divide these figures by three. Some of these others don't divide by three evenly because some jurisdictions will—certainly some of the CDL training schools—will put their people through the basic vehicle inspection course and then go out and give everyone a vehicle inspection, and then go back to the classroom, go through the basic control skills, and then test them all on that.

SLIDE 15: PILOT TEST (CONT'D)

At the debriefing in August of 2006, we came up with quite a few recommendations and we'll get into those on the next slide. They certainly liked the fact that they could streamline the management of their skills testing. They automated scheduling and reporting. For those jurisdictions considering going paperless, we've eliminated the two problems you see on the screen here; hard to read certifications, as well as, as I mentioned earlier, reports from the testers to the CDL monitor. That requirement was eliminated. Three of the four states requested continuation of the CSTIMS indefinitely. In essence, we're still operating it and still running now.

SLIDE 16: FINAL REPORT

At the August 15th debrief, we were able to determine 13 enhancements that were deemed the most important, even though they go from critical to low, from the jurisdictions. We'll talk about these in the next few slides.

SLIDE 17: FINAL REPORT (CONT'D)

The ones rated critical and high and, in case you're wondering, the reason we lumped these together, is because initially FMCSA was planning to fund us to do just the critical and high enhancements. Quon will talk about that a little bit later—that there's some more money has come forward, and we're going to be able to try to do all of the enhancements recommended.

One of the very first ones is the reduced redundant data entry. As I mentioned, each piece of the skills test is considered a separate test. If the same vehicle was used, for instance, on each part of that test, the vehicle data had to be entered each time. That's something that people thought was a waste of time. Once you had it in there once, you should be able to transfer that over to the next test. We certainly agree.

Streamline Screen Navigation—that seems to be one of the things that people are always asking for. It's never fast enough or quick enough to get to the different screens and that's something we're going to work on very hard.

We want to be able to expand the skills test result information, certainly to the MVA clerk. All they were seeing was a pass/fail indicator. The request was for more information: *Who did the test? Who administered the test?* and *What was the result of each of those pieces of the tests?* for better monitoring before issuing the CDL.

One thing that we did not have at the time we started was the current CDL Test Model, the 2005 model. We're going to incorporate that as an option of a testing model to pick, which will then eliminate some of the other entries that are on the current testing model which require access, for instance, on the test.

Changing, correcting or deleting duplicate data was one of those things we struggled with early on. We decided that we'd rather keep everything in there and if we had any deletions to do we'd let our developers do it. We need to reinvestigate that, especially under the circumstances where someone enters incorrect data and realizes it and needs to delete somebody. Although we do have to be careful about who gets deleted out of the system. If they have any kind of activity within the system, we would not allow their deletion.

If I could highlight one thing that caused the most problems was for our CDL monitors, who in most cases was also our jurisdiction administrator. Right now, to do jurisdiction administrator functions, they have to log in with a different ID than they do for a CDL monitor. If you remember, there are different activities that can be performed by each of those roles. It would be a real pain for them to have to log back out to do something when they were already logged in. We would like to have a single login for a person and assign that person multiple roles.

SLIDE 18: FINAL REPORT (CONT'D)

On the medium level, we'd like to enable the capability to set specific criteria for notification, especially. Right now, I mentioned that there was a bunch of alerts. One of those is a Schedule Change Alert. Once the test is scheduled, if it changes by as little as five minutes, a notification is sent out. Many of the jurisdictions said they'd like to have a threshold below which they would not be alerted and that would reduce the number of alerts they get.

They'd also like to be able to filter on the alerts. Right now it just shows up almost like an e-mail inbox and the date received, with no filtering and sorting capabilities.

We currently log as an audit trail only the test and schedule records, so we can tell which examiner entered their information for test results, but the only thing we have is on the testing and scheduling. We don't have anything on the entry of examiners, for instance, or applicants in this database. We don't know who did those, and that is one of the things we want to enhance, is our capability to track all of those—any changes made to the system.

Certainly, there are more reports that will be required. We only talk here on the slide on applicant data. We don't really have any reporting applicants, but it was brought to our attention that yes, we should have that. There are other reports that jurisdictions at FMCSA have highlighted also.

We would like to expand the pass/fail reporting to provide statistics, more meaningful statistics for various organizations that use the system.

SLIDE 19: FINAL REPORT (CONT'D)

Here on slide [19] we talk about the two low priority recommendations. One was to provide import/export capability from the system, either to CDLIS, the Commercial Drivers License Information System, the National Highway [Traffic] Safety Administration's Problem Driver Pointer System, or PDPS, but the biggest thing was for external analysis. That's really where people wanted to do—to be able to take the data out and put it in an Excel spreadsheet and manipulate it anyway they wanted.

Because we have some locations throughout the United States that don't necessarily have access to high speed internet, there was a requirement or request to be able to work over low speed and/or dial up connections. Whether that will require changes to the application—to provide a separate screen or not, is still to be decided.

SLIDE 20: CURRENT USAGE

Even after the final report was done and the pilot was over, three of the jurisdictions continued on and are still using CSTIMS today. From the start, when the first jurisdiction came on board in April of 2006 through April 30th of this year, you can see the number of tests scheduled. We have up to 32,000 tests scheduled, over 8,700 applicants and almost 24,000 tests administered, and the pass rate has been about 92 percent for those three jurisdictions.

So that, in a nutshell, is where we are and how we got there; I'll turn it back over now to Quon for where we're headed in the future.

SLIDE 21: NEXT STEPS

Quon Kwan:

Where do we go from here? We just drafted a statement of work for AAMVA to carry out the enhancements or improvements that we identified and that they identified in the final report.

Virtually all the recommendations that were made by the States that were involved in the pilot test will be implemented.

We have been able to identify \$650,000 in FY08 funds. That will be made available to AAMVA to carry out these recommendations.

We will sign a cooperative agreement with AAMVA as soon as our PR is processed.

In the meantime, we'd like to attract more State participation and users in these systems and we would like to reconvene the State working group.

SLIDE 22: NEXT STEPS (CONT'D)

After all the enhancements and improvements are made in the software—and we envision this would take over the course of one year—we would again have some kind of testing and debugging to make sure those enhancements and improvements worked and were able to function without interfering with the existing capabilities of the software.

Then we would have another pilot test or user test of the enhanced or improved version of the software, go through another debugging if there were any bugs, and then do a user retest.

SLIDE 23: NEXT STEPS (CONT'D)

We envision the software would be ready for national deployment by 2010. This would include drafting of training materials, conducting pilot training, then finalizing training materials—including the revisions or changes that we found out that were necessary from the pilot training—and, finally, provide the train-the-trainer training in each jurisdiction.

SLIDE 24: NEXT STEPS (CONT'D)

Beginning in fall of this year, States may apply for FY 2009 CDL grants to adopt CSTIMS or migrate over to CSTIMS.

CDL grant funds may be used for CSTIMS expenses such as training, travel and laptop computers. There will be an announcement by the CDL team this fall.

SLIDE 25: CONTACT INFORMATION

And that concludes our presentation.

This chart contains our contact information with our phone numbers and email addresses.

[33:53]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Kirse Kelly: This is Kirse Kelly. We'd just like to thank you for participating. We will now begin our question and answer period of the webinar. You can ask questions by dialing *1 one on your phone or by typing them in the box that's to the left. If you do use the phone, please state your name clearly so that our operator, can pronounce your name properly. As mentioned at the beginning, if you have a question for a specific person, go ahead and put that person's name in your question, so that we can have them answer it. Once again, you will be given a chance to download a copy of the presentation at the end of the webinar, so there is no need to ask about that. If you have to leave early, you

can return to this Website later, today or tomorrow and download it at that time.

Philip Scarpace: *If the examiner is under sanction for a month, can he put in false dates indicating when he gave a test?*

Greg Sensiba: Yes. In fact you could do that. Something we hadn't—I don't think we considered before, but that's why we have the maximum period to update. If the test results aren't put in within the jurisdiction's specified time period, then the system would alert someone on it. That's something we hadn't considered. That's a good thought. We should keep that in mind when we start looking at the enhancements of the system.

Tandy

Alexander: *Can this system be used for non-commercial driver exams?*

Greg Sensiba: Technically, I think yes, it could be. It's not designed for that. It was designed only for the commercial tests because all the test results of course right now are set up only for commercial skills test. If you set up a different kind of a testing matrix, then you could, in fact, use it for that, but because it's sponsored by FMCSA, it's probably not going to get their blessing to go non-commercial.

Philip Scarpace: *Can an examiner enter test results if he did not schedule a test on the system?*

Greg Sensiba: Yes, in fact, most of the time the jurisdictions schedule through their responsible parties. They are the ones who either schedule and/or enter the test results within the tester itself. Jurisdictions can decide whether or not they want their examiners to actually enter results or they can pass them off to an administrative person who can put those results in.

Kirse Kelly: Operator, do we have any questions on the phone line at this time?

Operator: We do have one from Mr. Terry Chapman. Sir, your line is open.

Terry Chapman: *Hello. What I wanted to know is how is this information delivered to the DMV offices.*

Greg Sensiba: The system software itself is internet-based, so if the DMV has access to the internet, then they have access to all the data.

Terry Chapman: *So, it's not automatically delivered if you have an auto test system or an automated system. You'll have to go in there actually to the website and get this information yourself?*

Greg Sensiba: No, alerts will be sent to an email address. You will be notified via your own normal email when an alert has been posted, if you are looking for alerts only. If you are looking for scheduled information within the norm, that would be on the test site.

Terry Chapman: *So for pass/fail, you would have to go in there and see who took the test and see if they passed or failed or something like that. Correct?*

Greg Sensiba: That's correct.

Kirse Kelly: Is there anyone else, Operator?

Amy: There are no other questions at this time.

Rhode Island

DMV: *Is this is a stand-alone system or does it have to be tied to the current DMV system?*

Greg Sensiba: Actually, it's completely stand-alone. One of the requests we had was to be able to integrate with some of the DMV licensing systems. That's one of the low priority ones you saw on the previous slide. Right now, no—it's all stand-alone; it's on the internet. There are no development costs, although there are probably some training costs.

Tandy

Alexander: *Can CSTIMS alerts be stored for later review by the CDL monitor?*

Greg Sensiba: Yes, all the system alerts are in fact posted in the application itself, as well as the email notification I mentioned earlier, so you can always go back and see what alerts were sent to you inside the CSTIMS itself.

Dennis McGee: *With all the various operating systems available, will this work with the various computer systems that the States are using?*

Greg Sensiba: I'd have to go back to the technical folks to find out exactly what their requirements were, but I think they require Internet Explorer. I don't think it's set up for Foxfire or anything like that. I think we have the names of the people who set it up and we'll try to follow it up directly with you to let you know the answer to that.

Anita Orsino: *Are you going to do a demonstration on the web in the future?*

Greg Sensiba: We do have a demo system that we have done in the past. I don't know if there's a plan for that until after we get the enhancements made. It's something we haven't considered right now as far as doing a demo.

Bill Lloyd: *If a state currently has a system similar to this, will that state be required to change to CSTIMS?*

Quon Kwan: This is Quon with FMCSA. The answer is no. If the state already has an automated system, the state will not be required to change to CSTIMS. We've identified in a survey that was conducted for us by AAMVA, currently about 11 states have their own in-house or automated system that does scheduling.

Lynn Rhodes: *Can grant funds be used to provide internet connectivity to third party testers?*

Quon Kwan: I don't have the answer to that. The folks in the CDL team will have to answer that, and they will probably be putting on a Webinar in this coming fall to announce the availability of CDL grants. At that time they would probably get into the details of this.

Kirse Kelly: Operator, do we have any questions on the phone at this time?

Operator: We do have one more question from Mr. Phil Scarpace.

Phil Scarpace: *I'm from Wisconsin here. I just want to make sure I understand this system. With this system, would an examiner be required to go into the software program to enter his schedule of tests or is that just an option?*

Greg Sensiba: We require—this is Greg Sensiba from AAMVA again—the system is set up to require a schedule in advance because of the fraudulent oversight. It does not have to necessarily be the examiner that puts the schedules in. The tester's responsible party who may be the person who answers the phone or handles the walk-ins can actually schedule those for you. Once that schedule is produced, the examiner is notified of that schedule if his/her name is provided to the schedule, and the applicant is also given a copy of that. The examiners don't have to enter their schedules nor do they have to enter the test results if they opt to or do it the other way.

Phil Scarpace: *Okay. Now, in answer to my other question earlier then, if I understand it correctly, if a company didn't enter a scheduled test—let's just say they gave a test to somebody and then, let's say, the person passed the test, and they wrote out all the paperwork, or they could enter it in the system, too, I guess, right?*

Greg Sensiba: At that point, in that situation, they would have to enter a schedule first and then a test immediately following, because the test results can't be put in without a schedule. In that case, depending upon the jurisdiction parameter for the number of days in advance that the schedule has to be entered, the CDL monitor might get an alert that says the schedule was entered inside the window, and would then have the capability to investigate to see if there's any fraudulent activity associated with that.

Phil Scarpace: Okay. Alright, I think that's all the questions I had right now, thank you.

Greg Sensiba: To reiterate, every test has to have a schedule before you can enter actual results.

Dominick

Loiacano: *Have all the States' CDL program managers been informed regarding the existence of this software?*

Quon Kwan: The answer is, we don't know. We tried to reach all the CDL program managers in the States through the distribution list that AAMVA has. I believe there are over 2,000 on that list. There was also an email instruction from our associate administrator for the Field to have all the State program managers at FMCSA contact their counterpart in the DMVs of the States to inform them of this software. So if they haven't heard yet, they will be contacted.

Michael A.

Loose: *We have circumstances where the waiting period is a minimum of two weeks. Is it possible to accommodate our State's policy?*

Greg: Yes, you can specify up to 99 days—I believe we have it in days in the system. I'm not sure exactly if that waiting period was prior to scheduling or after failure, but either way, the system would handle that.

Kirse: Operator, are there any questions on the phone?

Operator: There are no questions at this time.

Tim Cotter: *If a state wanted to implement this system, approximately how much would the upstart cost be?*

Greg Sensiba: Again from a development perspective, there's zero cost, unless you don't have internet access and you have to pay for that. The cost you would incur would be training. I don't think it's decided yet whether that's going to be in person or over the internet, or bringing people to the Washington, D. C. area for training. In the past, when we did the pilot, we actually physically went out there just because we had so many third party providers and testers that were anxious to do this, it made much more sense for us to go there rather than them come here. Now we have, certainly more advanced technology than we had a couple of years ago, so doing something over the web might be possible. We'd have to just calculate what the cost of bringing everybody in to one location or the time required for your staff to spend coming up to speed on the system would be. Again, no development costs, but there is training cost.

Thanigai

Ranganathan: *The whole idea of OMB pushing enterprise architecture is to reuse and share to enable cost savings and cost avoidance. If this system can be extended to use for non-commercial drivers and the need exists, FMCSA should encourage it.*

Rhode Island

DMV: *Is the third party software going to be mandatory?*

Quon Kwan: I'll try to answer this question. No, the third party software is not mandatory at this time, but we don't know what Congress has in mind. If they feel that the fraud problem is so pervasive that it requires a law to be passed to mandate it, then we would have to enforce it. For the time being, it is not mandatory.

Diane Gee: *When the program is implemented, will all states be required to have full participation by all contracted third parties?*

Quon Kwan: The answer is related again to the last question that I answered. "Will it be mandatory?" depends on what Congress legislates. Until it's legislated, it probably will not be mandatory.

Question: *Would states with an automated system already be required to train the primary scheduling personnel along with the jurisdiction administrators?*

Kirse Kelly: We're not clear on that question. If you could just do *1 and ask it over the phone, we can get to that.

Tim Bradley: *Can the public schedule their own tests on the system based on the availability of the tester?*

Greg Sensiba: Right now, no. The only people who can schedule exams are those people who are users of the system. We hadn't considered linking that up to a telephone call-in system or anything like that. That may be part of the import/export request that people have—they might be able to have the public call in to just import the file by someone who is a user of the system. Then they would assign an examiner to that particular test. Right now, no—the way it is setup, the public does not have access.

Peter DePuccio: *Why allow testers/examiners under sanction to conduct the test?*

Greg Sensiba: This is kind of a two-part question. First off, if an examiner is under sanction at the time of the schedule, or is scheduled for something and didn't get sanctioned, the system alerts the CDL monitor of what's happened so the tester can provide another backup person.

So the question directly asked is why would you allow to enter? What our philosophy was if anything that actually happens should be recorded in the system. If the examiner was under sanction and actually performed the exam, we should track that information. It may require the applicant to come back because he was tested by someone under sanction who shouldn't have given it. Again, our basic philosophy was anything that's happened should be recorded and tracked in the system.

Kirse Kelly: Do we have anyone on the phone line?

Operator: There are no question from the phone.

Skip Hood: *Next is another comment that highly recommends this or similar system as an effective anti-fraud tool and it's been instrumental in the three major CDL fraud prosecutions in Florida in the last two years.*

Tandy

Alexander: *What is the monthly operating cost for a user license fee?*

Quon Kwan: Well, right now it's free, courtesy of FMCSA. We will have AAMVA write or draft a business plan for us to analyze how to make this system, how to make the software self-supporting or self-sustainable. At that time, the user fee will be determined.

Kirse Kelly: Okay. That's the last written question. Operator, are there any other phone questions?

Opeartor: No, there are not.

[50:33]

Kirse Kelly: We just want to thank you for participating in today's Webinar and we'd like to just ask you to fill out our short evaluation and give us any suggestions that you have for future webinars. You can also download the presentation at this time. Just click on the title in the download presentation pod and hit **Save to my Computer**. Now, this is one of a series of webinars of the FMCSA Office of Analysis, Research and Technology, so we want to ask you to please check out our Website at www.fmcsa.dot.gov/art. You can see it up there on the screen. Just review and register for future Webinars.

It looks like actually we have a couple more questions.

Michael A.

Loose: *If a driver shows up at a DMV service center and the testing facility did not schedule a test, or the examiner did not put the test results in the system, will the DMV employee know from the CDLIS or PDPS system that the tester and the examiner did not put the schedule or test results in?*

Greg Sensiba: No, there's no linkage right now between CDLIS and PDPS, so that information would not be known. If a jurisdiction is using CSTIMS and the driver comes in saying he passed a test, but there are no results, the MVA clerk would not have any information in CSTIMS that would prove that the driver took the test and therefore would not issue the CDL. That's the process that we envision.

Kirse Kelly: We would like to thank everyone for participating and thank you, Operator, for your help today.

[52:38]