

# Anti-Fraud

Presentation by the Anti-Fraud
Committee

Las Vegas, Nevada

October 31, 2006



Chairman

Gary Wano

GW & Son Auto Body

garywano@gwandson.com

Vice Chairman TBD



Gene Hamilton Sports & Imports

geneh@mindspring.com

**Bob Smith** Storm

bobsmith@storminc.com

Jeanne Silver CARSTAR Mundelein

jeanne@carstarmundelein.com

Rod Enlow CCAR

enlow@ccar-greenlink.com



**Denise Pina** Brea Auto Body, Inc

breaautobody@yahoo.com

Steve Vettel Pacific Collision Centers

Svettel@pacificcollision.com

George Eliades ARA

george@a-r-a.org



**Terry Ott** 

**Customer Service Consultants** 

ott5353@sbcglobal.net

**Bill Garoutte** 

Elite Dent Alliance

billg@EliteDent.com



# Today's Topic

Arbitrary Changing of Automated Times Published by Information Providers



# Today's topic

- The Anti-Fraud committee wanted to bring attention to an issue of concern that repair shops face today
- A nationwide survey was conducted to determine if automated times from the information providers are being arbitrarily changed from the shop's original estimate



# What the Findings Show

- An overwhelming majority of respondents answered that automated times are being changed without either their knowledge or consent
- These are published times. To our knowledge, there are no published database procedures that reduce refinish times



# Survey Questions

The 2006 Anti-Fraud Committee asked INSIGHT to survey the industry concerning the arbitrary changing of automated times from the information providers without the knowledge or consent of the repair facility. Here are the results from the respondents.



■ Do you receive estimates from other parties that contain refinish times that have been arbitrarily changed from the automated times?

■ Yes 88%

■ Sometimes 8%

■ No 4%



■ If Yes or Sometimes, what percentage of estimates contain changed refinish times?

**41%** 



■ If Yes or Sometimes, what is the percentage of reduction in refinish times?

**37%** 



Are you able to recover the appropriate time if you request it?

■ Yes 11%

■ Sometimes 64%

■ No 25%



Are changed times and system overrides part of any contract(s) you may have with another party?

Yes

15%

■ No

85%



- Primary reason(s) given to your shop if the automated database time has been overridden:
- Partial paint/Blend within repaired panel 72%
- Insurer's company policy/Insurer's system 26%
- Miscellaneous/Other



# Survey Respondent Stats

East	16%
Last	10/0

■ South 13%

■ Northeast 17%

■ Midwest 33%

■ Southwest 12%

■ Mountain 3%

■ Northwest 7%

■ West 7%



- Out of the 72% Partial Paint, Blend Within Responses:
- "They also tell us it really didn't take us as long as the computer time says anyway."
- "XXX Insurance has its own time"
- "They don't understand that repaired panels are not blend panels. Selective ignorance."



- More Out of the 72% Partial Paint, Blend Within Responses:
- "Spot paint and blend within the panel (whatever that means)."
- "They feel this is sufficient. The whole panel is not being color coated, just the required area."
- "The whole panel wasn't damaged. Didn't require featheredge and prime."



- Out of the 26% Company Policy Responses:
- "It is set up in the database which they say can't be changed."
- "Upper management requires that we override the estimating system."
- "Our system says we only pay for..."



- More Out of the 26% Company Policy Responses:
- "We don't pay for that."
- "This is company policy. This is all we can pay."
- "Because they can."
- What's wrong with this picture!!!



#### **Observations**

- This is a *serious problem*
- Declining revenues for repair shops
- Lost tax revenue (sales tax, income tax)
- Repairer needs to remain the repair expert
  - ◆ Increasing complexity of repair standards
  - ◆ Liability for proper repairs



#### **Observations**

Nowhere, in any contract, has specific language stipulating a reduction of published automated times been observed

But... All shops are being asked to reduce automated times



#### Observations

Questionable ethics/legality of changing published automated times



# Blend within the panel?

An actual example of a partial paint allowance





# Back to last meeting...

More data has been submitted.



# Food for thought

As recently published:

"As ...(Insurance) is learning, the amount owed is the amount dictated by the insurance policy, not some arbitrary lesser amount the insurer simply wants to pay."

Published in Collision Week, Wednesday 4 Oct 2006



# Update on Underwritten Estimates

Ct#	Ref.		Start \$ Amt.	\$An	nt.@ Completion		Supp. Balance \$		Average \$ Supp	Туре	Tax %	Tax \$		
726		\$	1,813,696.54	\$	3,665,186.87	\$	(1,851,490.33)		(511,885.28)		7.597			
	Avera	age	RO Completed	\$	5,048.47									
Aver	START RO	\$	2,498.20		AVER	ΑG	SE SUPPLEMENT \$	\$	(2,550.26)					
AF	C ASR.	\$	2,550.26							Тах р	er RO	\$ (78.69)		
	Approximate # Shops 40,000													
	# RO/Shop	Co	onsumer Shtg		Tax \$ Short		Consumer Short		Tax \$ (-) State					
	1	\$	(2,550.26)	\$	(193.74)	\$	(102,010,486.50)	\$	(3,147,791.41)					
	10	\$	(25,502.62)	\$	(1,937.43)	\$	(1,020,104,865.01)	\$	(31,477,914.11)					
	50	\$	(127,513.11)	\$	(9,687.17)	\$	(5,100,524,325.07)	\$	(157,389,570.57)					
	100	\$	(255,026.22)	\$	(19,374.34)	\$	(10,201,048,650.14)	\$	(314,779,141.15)					
	250	\$	(637,565.54)	\$	(48,435.85)	\$	(25,502,621,625.34)	\$	(786,947,852.87)					
	500	\$	(1,275,131.08)	\$	(96,871.71)	\$	(51,005,243,250.69)	\$	(1,573,895,705.74)					
	1000	\$	(2,550,262.16)	\$	(193,743.42)	\$	(102,010,486,501.38)	\$	(3,147,791,411.49)					



# Thank you!