

FACT SHEET:

Right to Equitable and Professional Auto Industry Repair (REPAIR) Act (H.R. 1566/S. 1379)

According to a July 2025 national poll,¹ more than 83% of Americans support the REPAIR Act (H.R. 1566/S. 1379), legislation that will create a national vehicle right to repair law, ensuring a consumer's right to choose how and where they fix their vehicles. That same poll shows that support for vehicle right to repair is strongly bipartisan, with 84% of Republicans and 82% of Democrats supporting the REPAIR Act. Access to repair and maintenance data is the cornerstone of competition, accessibility, and affordability in vehicle repair. The legislation creates a nationwide parity model that obligates vehicle manufacturers to provide vehicle owners and independent repair shops with access to the same repair and maintenance data, in the same way that they make it available to themselves or to their franchised dealerships.

This document rebuts the claims made against the REPAIR Act by the opponents of consumer choice and competition in vehicle repairs.

CLAIM: *The bill opens the door for third parties, including data brokers and foreign adversaries, to access sensitive, vehicle-generated information, such as real-time location and driving behavior, for sales and marketing purposes.*

RESPONSE: This claim is false. The REPAIR Act is carefully drafted to preserve only the vehicle owner's right to repair their vehicle at the location of their choice. The bill safeguards access to two narrowly defined sets of data: vehicle-generated data and critical repair information. Both sets of data are limited to repair and maintenance functions; neither definition includes either real-time location or driving behavior (both of which automakers appear to currently provide or sell to other third parties).²

.....

CLAIM: *The bill creates cybersecurity and safety vulnerabilities.*

RESPONSE: This claim is false. The REPAIR Act is based on a parity model meaning that the manufacturers are only obligated to give independent repair shops access to repair and maintenance data “in a manner that is subject to the same cryptographic or technological protections as any motor vehicle manufacturer, affiliate of a motor vehicle manufacturer, motor vehicle dealer, authorized motor vehicle service provider, or any other third party to whom the motor vehicle manufacturer provides such data.” Sec. 4(a)(2)(B)(ii).

As Senators Josh Hawley (R-MO), Elizabeth Warren (D-MA), and Jeff Merkley (D-OR) recognized in their December 2024 [letter](#) to vehicle manufacturers, there are significant “concerns about automakers’ fierce opposition to nationwide efforts to secure car owners’ right to repair the vehicles they own in the way they choose” with particular concern around “the automakers’ hypocrisy with regard to data sharing. The industry has raised concerns about data sharing with independent repair shops to justify opposing right to repair, while earning profits from sharing large amounts of personal data with insurance companies.”

What is most disingenuous about the objection to the REPAIR Act is that the manufacturers agree with the REPAIR Act’s model. The REPAIR Act allows vehicle manufacturers to use the same transmittal protocol for consumers and independent shops as they use for themselves or their franchised dealers. If cybersecurity risks exist in that model, they already exist for the variety of parties to whom vehicle manufacturers are already sending this data. See Exhibit A (Alliance diagram).

.....

CLAIM: *The bill removes consumer choice in parts and repairs. The legislation empowers insurers, not vehicle owners, to dictate the use of parts and process.*

RESPONSE: This claim is false. The REPAIR Act is not an insurance bill – it is legislation that will create a level playing field from which competition can thrive. Vehicle owners comparison shop for insurance based on price, options, and logistics. They can choose between options for parts, repairs, maintenance, towing, or availability of loaner vehicles. The REPAIR Act does not pressure a consumer into any option. If anything, the bill gives vehicle owners greater freedom of choice by ensuring that vehicle manufacturers may not restrict these options in a deceptive manner at point of sale or render the vehicle owners’ choice useless through technological restrictions.

.....

CLAIM: *The advisory committee created by the REPAIR Act lacks required seats for cybersecurity professionals or safety engineers – instead, favoring commercial interests.*

RESPONSE: The bill designs the committee to be a working group of experts to report to Congress. The aftermarket industry has no objections to adding other experts to the committee as directed by Congress.

.....

CLAIM: *Consumers already have access to repair data.*

RESPONSE: This claim is false. A 2024 independent [survey](#) concluded that 51% of independent repair shops send up to 5 cars each month to the dealer due to data restrictions. 63% of shops surveyed reported experiencing a restriction on repair data daily or weekly. Vehicle data limitations cost independent repair shops an estimated \$3.1 billion each year. As more advances in vehicle technologies occur, these numbers will only get worse for both consumers and the automotive aftermarket.

.....

CLAIM: *The REPAIR Act may exclude franchised dealers from receiving the benefits of the bill. For example, a franchised GM dealer could be precluded from receiving the repair information necessary to repair other vehicle brands. This could put dealers at a competitive disadvantage.*

RESPONSE: The REPAIR Act includes franchise dealers as both designees of the vehicle owner and as motor vehicle repair facilities. The aftermarket fully supports franchise dealers having access to repair and maintenance data for every vehicle they want to repair.

.....

CLAIM: *The legislation is unfair because franchise dealers invest on average \$334,000 annually on machinery and shop equipment and \$82,000 annually on technician training.*

RESPONSE: The REPAIR Act is competitively neutral. It requires vehicle manufacturers to provide repair and diagnostic data to the aftermarket in the same manner, cost, and time it provides such data to franchise dealerships. Moreover, independent repair shops often invest as much, if not more, in their businesses. because they frequently must purchase software and tools from multiple vehicle manufacturers. For example, one independent repair shop reported spending more than \$400,000 in 2024 on education, equipment, and facilities. These investments pay off – vehicle owners trust their independent mechanics and value the competitive alternative to the dealerships. <https://www.consumerreports.org/cars/car-repair-shops/car-repair-shop-survey-chains-dealers-independents-a1071080370/>.

.....

CLAIM: *Dealers must meet significant regulatory requirements under the FTC Safeguards Rule and FTC Act to be able to safely and securely handle customers' vehicle data.*

RESPONSE: This statement is intentionally misleading. The Safeguards Rule applies to dealers because of their financing and leasing activities and would apply with equal force to any independent repair shop engaged in those activities. The burden of Safeguards Rule compliance arises from the dealers' status as "financial institutions" under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA) by virtue of either financing (or facilitating the financing of) automobiles or leasing automobiles for longer than 90 days.³ The rule does not apply to repair activities.

RESPONSE (continued): With respect to protecting consumer information, independent repair shops today are subject to the same FTC Section 5 obligations as dealers (or any business that handles sensitive customer information). The FTC found in 2019 that the record contained “no empirical evidence to suggest that independent repair shops are more or less likely than authorized repair shops to compromise or misuse customer data” and “supports arguments that . . . independent repair shops would be equally capable of minimizing cybersecurity risks, as are authorized repairers.” ⁴

.....

CLAIM: *A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report confirms the information and tools necessary to repair vehicles are already available to independent repair shops.*

RESPONSE: This claim relies on statements from eight automakers (all of whom oppose right to repair) interviewed by the GAO as evidence that repair data is available. What the claim omits is that on the same page of the report, the GAO stated that: “[h]owever, nine of the 14 independent repair stakeholders described limitations related to being able to access specific vehicle data, in some cases for specific automakers.” GAO Report, at 6. The GAO went on to report that “one complaint filed with NHTSA alleged that a vehicle owner took their vehicle to an independent repair shop that could not do the work because the shop lacked the access to program the vehicle. In addition, there were multiple Task Force complaints from independent repair shops regarding an inability to diagnose vehicles.” GAO Report, at 6.

.....

CLAIM: *The legislation would empower the FTC to expand the definitions included in the bill at their own discretion and create additional paperwork for customers of franchised dealers at the point of purchase.*

RESPONSE: H.R. 1566/S. 1379 gives the FTC, in consultation with NHTSA, the ability to modify definitions in the future to account for developing vehicle technology that might give vehicle manufacturers the ability to block consumers’ access to their repair and maintenance data in unforeseen ways. This is not an unfounded concern. For example, the wireless transmission of data from vehicles (telematics) was not the threat to data access in 2012 when the parties first developed a non-binding memorandum on repair data access that it is today. The “paperwork” mentioned is a one-time, point-of-sale notice – like existing disclosures already required in commercial transactions (e.g., warranty, financing, emissions).

.....

CLAIM: *The 2014 national memorandum of understanding (MOU) guarantees access to repair and diagnostic information for all repair facilities.*

RESPONSE: This claim is false. The MOU is a voluntary, non-binding, unenforceable framework that does not address current vehicle technologies and does not “guarantee” anything. The current inability of independent shops and vehicle owners to access repair and maintenance data demonstrates the need for federal legislation to guarantee the level playing field and the ability of vehicle owners to choose where and how to maintain their vehicles.

.....

CLAIM: *The REPAIR Act is “overbroad” as it would regulate a heavy-duty vocational truck the same as a family sedan.*

RESPONSE: While their form and function are different, for purposes of repair and maintenance data, light- and heavy-duty vehicles are the same. The mechanical components of both classes of vehicles generate codes that tell a technician what is wrong with the vehicle and how to repair it regardless of the vehicle frame around those components. Repair professionals and DIY’ers have accessed these codes for more than 100 years to keep their vehicles running. Moreover, dealers and independent repair shops have managed mixed-OEM configurations since such configurations started. The American Truck Dealers (ATD) itself acknowledges that independent shops are qualified to work on bespoke configurations by stating that “truck dealers often sublet repair work to independent repairers when appropriate.” (ATD Letter, at 1). The REPAIR Act simply preserves that same access into the future as light duty and heavy-duty vehicles become more technologically sophisticated.

.....

CLAIM: *The REPAIR Act should exclude heavy-duty trucks because they are subject to unique safety regulations.*

RESPONSE: While commercial vehicles have additional safety requirements such as inspections, weight limits, and driver qualifications, a baseline of safety is knowledgeable and informed repair and maintenance. The REPAIR Act does not alter or remove any existing safety requirements. It simply guarantees that all repairers – whether independent or dealer-affiliated – have the same access to the data and tools needed to perform safe, lawful maintenance. The commercial vehicle market is (and should be) as competitive as the light-duty market – fleet owners need choices to drive down prices and increase safety and accountability. If manufacturers and their captive dealers are the only option for repairs, fleets will pay more, have longer repair wait times, and jeopardize the health of America’s supply chains.

.....

CLAIM: *The REPAIR Act would allow non-factory-trained independent garages to perform work and repairs on customers’ vehicles and be compensated by the manufacturer at a lesser rate.*

RESPONSE: The REPAIR Act does not address or change the relationship between the manufacturer and the franchise dealership for warranty work. Franchise dealerships perform most warranty repairs, while the aftermarket performs over 70% of post-warranty repairs. The focus of the REPAIR Act is preserving equal access to repair and maintenance data for independent repair shops. It has nothing to do with rates for warranty work paid to franchise dealerships or any other entity performing the work.

.....

CLAIM: *Dealership technicians...are constantly brought up to speed on the proper and safe repair of vehicles, ensuring vehicles are repaired correctly the first time. Independent garages are not privy to this proprietary information or training....*

RESPONSE: There is no evidence to support the claim that dealerships do better work than independent shops. In fact, the data demonstrates the opposite. The aftermarket performs 70% of post-warranty repairs. That statistic alone demonstrates that vehicle owners trust their independent repair shop. Independent survey results confirm that vehicle owners trust their independent mechanics and value the competitive alternative to the dealerships. <https://www.consumerreports.org/cars/car-repair-shops/car-repair-shop-survey-chains-dealers-independents-a1071080370/>. This claim seems designed to create a monopoly for their dealerships and thereby decrease competition, drive up prices, and reduce accessibility to repair, especially in rural areas.

.....

CLAIM: *The REPAIR Act would undermine mandates that auto dealerships are fairly compensated by manufacturers for warranty work.*

RESPONSE: This unsubstantiated claim has nothing to do with the REPAIR Act. The bill creates a level playing field for access to repair and maintenance data. This level playing field in turn creates competition for vehicle owners' business, leading to well-trained and well-paid technicians.

.....

-
1. The poll was conducted by [The Tarrance Group](#) (commissioned by the [CAR Coalition](#)) from June 8-10, 2025, among 1,000 national vehicle owners and has a margin of error of +/- 3.1%.
 2. Vehicle-generated data as data "generated (or generated and retained) ... related to diagnostics, prognostics, repair, service, wear, calibration, or re-calibration of parts or systems required to return a vehicle to operational specifications in compliance with Federal motor vehicle safety and emissions laws, regulations, and standards." Sec. 3(a)(24); Critical repair information, tools, and parts" means "all necessary technical and compatibility information, tools, and motor vehicle equipment ... for the purpose of maintaining or repairing a motor vehicle" or to "return a vehicle to operational specifications." Sec. 3(a)(6).
 3. Automobile Dealers and the FTC's Safeguards Rule Frequently Asked Questions, FTC (June 2025), <https://www.ftc.gov/business-guidance/resources/automobile-dealers-ftcs-safeguards-rule-frequently-asked-questions>.
 4. FTC, Nixing the Fix: An FTC Report to Congress on Repair Restrictions at 16, 30–31 (May 2021), https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/nixing-fix-ftc-report-congress-repair-restrictions/nixing_the_fix_report_final_5521_630pm-508_002.pdf.