

Global Justice Information Network
Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes
Washington, DC ~~3~~March 15, 2001

**Convening and
Introductory Remarks**

The March 15, 2001, meeting of the Global Justice Information Network (Global Advisory Committee (GAC or “Committee”)) convened at 9:00 a.m. at the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) offices, Washington, DC. Colonel Michael D. Robinson, GAC Chair, former President, International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), and Director of the Michigan State Police, welcomed committee members, federal observers, staff, and private citizens.

Committee members¹, federal representatives, and staff introduced themselves in turn. The following were in attendance:

Ms. Mercedes Bauermeister* <i>Conference of State Court Administrators San Juan, Puerto Rico</i>	Mr. Tom Coty <i>National Institute of Justice Washington, DC</i>
Mr. Dave Boyer <i>Office of Justice Programs Washington, DC</i>	Ms. Trelles D’Alemberte <i>Institute for Intergovernmental Research Tallahassee, Florida</i>
Mr. Bruce Buckley <i>Institute for Intergovernmental Research Tallahassee, Florida</i>	Ms. Carla Daniels <i>Bureau of Justice Assistance Washington, DC</i>
Ms. Linda Burek* <i>Justice Management Division Washington, DC</i>	Mr. Tom Faust* <i>National Sheriffs’ Association Alexandria, Virginia</i>
Superintendent Melvin Carraway* <i>International Association of Chiefs of Police Indianapolis, Indiana</i>	Mark Fleshman, Esquire* <i>Executive Office for United States Attorneys Washington, DC</i>
Mr. Tim Cadigan* <i>The Administrative Office of the United States Courts Washington, DC</i>	Mr. David A. Funk* <i>National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges Reno, Nevada</i>
Mr. Gary Cooper* <i>SEARCH Sacramento, California</i>	Ms. Joyce Gammelmo <i>Office of Justice Programs Washington, DC</i>
Mr. Cabell Cropper* <i>National Criminal Justice Association Washington, DC</i>	Major Billy Gordon* <i>Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Board Atlanta, Georgia</i>

¹ Global Advisory Committee members are denoted by an asterisk (*).

Mr. Bob Greeves <i>Office of Justice Programs Washington, DC</i>	Chief Charles Ramsey* <i>Major Cities Chiefs' Association Washington, DC</i>
Mr. Thomas A. Henderson* <i>National Center for State Courts Arlington, Virginia</i>	Colonel Michael D. Robinson* <i>International Association of Chiefs of Police East Lansing, Michigan</i>
Mr. Louie Hentzen* <i>National Association for Court Management Wichita, Kansas</i>	Mr. Thom Rubel* <i>National Governors' Association Washington, DC</i>
Ms. Christie Horton <i>Institute for Intergovernmental Research Tallahassee, Florida</i>	Mr. William B. Simpkins* <i>Drug Enforcement Administration Arlington, Virginia</i>
Ms. Mary Lou Leary <i>Office of Justice Programs Washington, DC</i>	Ms. Karen Sublett <i>Bureau of Justice Assistance Washington, DC</i>
Ms. Linda Lewis* <i>American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators Arlington, Virginia</i>	Mr. Tim Sweeney* <i>National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System Phoenix, Arizona</i>
Ms. Donna Lindquist <i>Institute for Intergovernmental Research Tallahassee, Florida</i>	Mr. William J. Taylor* <i>American Correctional Association Lanham, Maryland</i>
Winifred Lyday, Ph.D. <i>Office of Justice Programs Washington, DC</i>	Mr. David Walchak* <i>Criminal Justice Information Services Division Federal Bureau of Investigation Washington, DC</i>
Mr. Jay Maxwell <i>American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators Arlington, Virginia</i>	Mr. Scott Wallace* <i>National Legal Aid and Defender Association Washington, DC</i>
Mr. J. Patrick McCreary <i>Office of Justice Programs Washington, DC</i>	Mr. Richard H. Ward III <i>Bureau of Justice Assistance Washington, DC</i>
Ms. Heather Morton* <i>National Conference of State Legislatures Denver, Colorado</i>	Mr. Gerry Wethington* <i>Missouri Office of Information Technology Jefferson City, Missouri</i>
Mr. Thomas J. O'Reilly* <i>National Association of Attorneys General Trenton, New Jersey</i>	Mr. Carl A. Wicklund* <i>American Probation and Parole Association Lexington, Kentucky</i>
Don Prosnitz, Ph.D. <i>U.S. Department of Justice Washington, DC</i>	

Colonel Robinson reviewed the agenda. The following topics were slated for discussion:

- New Member Presentations
- Election of Global Chair and Vice-Chair
- Justice Information and Technology Standards Coordination Meeting Report
- Public Access/Privacy Initiative Briefing

- Future Focus of the GAC: Key Issues and Working Groups

Ms. Mary Lou Leary, Acting Assistant Attorney General, OJP, greeted GAC members, extending a particular welcome to representatives from the four new member agencies: Conference of State Court Administrators; National Association for Court Management; National Conference of State Legislatures; and National Governors' Association.

Ms. Leary expressed her pleasure at the repositioning of Global from the Justice Management Division (JMD) to OJP, noting the move will facilitate fundamental concerns such as adequate budgeting for integrated justice initiatives and coordination of integration efforts. Ms. Leary also expressed confidence that, regardless of the change in administration, justice information integration would remain a key issue for the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). She encouraged Committee members that during this transitional time, their expertise was more crucial than ever: "We are looking to you for good advice about setting priorities, predicting what the trends are...in the field, and how we can get ahead of the curve to be in the best position to help state and local jurisdictions with their information integration issues."

Mr. Richard Ward III, Acting Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), OJP, was then introduced. Mr. Ward concurred with Ms. Leary on the importance of Global, noting specifically that the *Annual Report 2000*² to the Attorney General, produced by the GAC in October 2000, was extremely helpful to OJP "in terms of...stretching limited resources...through some relatively untraditional partnerships, ensuring all [necessary parties] were at the table, and making effective use of resources to push the state and local integrated information sharing initiative forward." Mr. Ward also noted that recommendations in the report helped shape the following BJA integration efforts:

- *Facilitation of Justice Information Sharing Standards*³
- *Privacy/Public Access Initiative*⁴
- *Integrated Justice Information Web Site*—The Center for Integrated Justice Information (CIJI) Project is developing a comprehensive integration Web site. Plans for this "one-stop shop"—scheduled for public posting in early summer—are based on the following recommendations, capabilities, and alliances:
 - Research, program models, and links to other related organizations as vital components of the site
 - Identification of organizations offering technical assistance, and opportunities for peer-to-peer support

² This document is available at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/global/new/new_main.htm#Documents

³ A presentation on this issue was delivered later in the meeting. Please see pp. 11-19 for further information.

⁴ A briefing on this issue was delivered later in the meeting. Please see pp. 19-20 for further information.

- Inherent to Web site design, the ability to supplement and revise information in a timely fashion
- The following groups will support the Web site:
 - **BJA**⁵ will continue to provide resources and advisement;
 - The **National Center for Rural Law Enforcement (NCRLE)**⁶ will coordinate Web site content;
 - **REI Systems, Inc. (REI)**⁷ will be responsible for technical aspects of the project, such as Web site structure and posting of information; and
 - The **Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR)**⁸ will continue to provide services facilitating activities of the CIJI Council—a practitioner working group.
- **Strategic Planning Initiative**—The National Governors’ Association (NGA),⁹ in partnership with OJP, remains involved in an ongoing effort to assist and encourage states to convene their leaders to develop statewide strategic information-sharing plans. The initial phase of this project provided grants to support this vital planning process. Supplemental grants are expected to be awarded to states showing promise as national role models.

Mr. Ward commended the addition of NGA to Global. He looked forward to Mr. Thom Rubel, Director, NGA, briefing the group on the underutilized practice of strategic planning, especially as it relates to justice information integration: “If you can come up with an effective strategic plan for what your needs are [and] what resources you have, it goes a long way towards convincing state and local budget decision makers it’s the right way to go.” He continued by analogizing strategic plans to roadmaps: “Within a state system, [a strategic plan] lays out a blueprint of how to effectively achieve integration. What we’re intending here is not a model; it’s not a specific format, [but rather] somewhat of a roadmap. You want to get from point A to point B, and there may be 15 roads to get there. The strategic plan can help...you decide which one or combination of those roads to [take]....”

⁵ More information on BJA is available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/>

⁶ More information on NCRLE is available at <http://www.ncrle.net/>

⁷ More information on REI is available at <http://www.reisys.com/>

⁸ More information on IIR is available at <http://www.iir.com/>

⁹ More information on NGA is available at <http://www.nga.org/>

Concluding his remarks, Mr. Ward echoed Ms. Leary's appreciation of members' ongoing participation, noting many representatives have invested two years in the initiative. He also observed that Global interests have grown during this period and welcomed new participants by underscoring the necessity of their contributions: "We've expanded into other areas, and it's critically important that we form an effective partnership [with new member agencies] to push this initiative forward."

New Member Presentations

Reviewing the GAC Bylaws,¹⁰ Chairman Robinson highlighted the Committee's Guiding Principle that advocates the group be "vocal and visible in creating and communicating a shared vision among critical stakeholders/key executives regarding the Global concept." Abiding by this principle, members recognized a number of critical constituencies needed to be included in the GAC. Responsively, at the October 2000 meeting, four agencies were voted into membership:

1. National Conference of State Legislatures
2. National Governors' Association
3. National Association for Court Management
4. Conference of State Court Administrators

Respective agency representatives provided briefings.

National Conference of State Legislatures

Ms. Heather Morton, Policy Associate, National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL or "Conference"),¹¹ outlined her agency's background, current effort, and future projects.

Background

Founded in 1975, NCSL is a bipartisan organization serving the lawmakers and legislative staff of the nation's 50 states, its commonwealths, and territories.

The Conference serves as:

- A source for research, publications, consulting services, and meetings
- The national conduit for lawmakers to communicate with one another

¹⁰ GAC bylaws are available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/global/documents/bylaws.htm>

¹¹ More information on NCSL is available at <http://www.ncsl.org/>

- A “voice” for the states at the federal level, representing their interests before Congress, the administration, and federal agencies

NCSL informs state legislators and their staff on integration issues by tailoring products and services, such as providing a statutory framework for integrating criminal justice information systems.

Current Effort: NCSL/BJA Project

- Two-year project initiated in 1999
- Jointly managed by the Criminal Justice and Information Technology Program and Policy Program
- Objective: To develop and provide information addressing the importance of criminal justice information systems and the relationship between *enhanced systems* and *increased public safety and governmental efficiency*
- Project services:
 - A Web site,¹² which includes links to:
 - Publications
 - Federal funding opportunities
 - Audio from NCSL meetings
 - Identification and tracking of related legislation¹³
 - *Integrating, Improving Criminal Justice Information LegisBrief*, a two-page briefing document that can be used for background information, talking points, or response to constituents
 - Response to information requests
 - Participation in OJP Integrated Justice Consortium meetings and events

¹² This site can be accessed at <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/lis/CIP/intcrimjust.htm>

¹³ Related legislation is outlined in *Attachment A*.

Future Projects

Because of a continuing need for forums and information to assist states in their integration efforts, future NCSL projects include:

- Identifying related legislation, such as:
 - Integrated criminal justice information systems
 - Criminal records searches
- Convening integration-related meetings and/or providing related meeting programs
- Publishing articles and state legislative reports on integration issues
- Participating in ongoing Integrated Justice Consortium meetings and events

National Governors' Association

Mr. Rubel delivered the presentation on NGA's background, structure, and strategic planning efforts.

Background

NGA (or "Association") is the only bipartisan national organization of, by, and for the nation's governors. Its members are the governors of the 50 states, commonwealths of the Northern Mariana Islands and Puerto Rico, and territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. Through NGA, the governors identify priority areas and deal collectively with public policy and governance issues at both the state and national levels.

The Association's mission is to provide:

- A forum for governors to exchange views and experiences among themselves;
- Assistance in solving state-focused problems;
- Information on state innovations and practices; and
- A bipartisan forum for governors to establish, influence, and implement policy on national issues such as justice information integration.

NGA/Center for Best Practices: Focus on Technology

Housed within NGA is the Center for Best Practices (“Center”), a not-for-profit corporation organized into five divisions:

1. The Economic Development and Commerce Policy Studies Division
2. The Education Policy Studies Division
3. The Employment and Social Services Policy Studies Division
4. The Health Policy Studies Division
5. The Natural Resources Policy Studies Division

Mr. Rubel directs the Center’s State Information Technology Programs, providing technical assistance to governors and their offices. He voiced specific technology concerns of governors. Four years ago, in response to increased attention to technological issues, the governors organized an Information Technology (IT) Task Force.¹⁴ One task force activity involved surveying governors to determine their IT priorities. Nationwide, association members expressed two primary concerns:

1. Incorporating IT into education to enhance the learning process
2. Facilitating criminal justice information integration

As highlighted by Mr. Ward in his opening remarks, NGA has partnered with OJP to address this second concern:

OJP/NGA Strategic Planning Initiative

Each state was encouraged to establish a committee on strategic justice integration planning. The effort was designed as an intergovernmental collaboration, with each state convening representatives from the governor’s office, state executive and judicial branches, and local government. It was required that the team leader be directly accountable to the state’s governor. Forty-two states responded to the proposal.

From October 2000 to January 2001, NGA delivered workshops to the participating state teams that included the following components:

- Teams delivering briefings on their state’s current justice information integration status

¹⁴ Based on IT Task Force successes and in recognition of the broad impact of technology, the IT Task Force was recently replaced with a more comprehensive E-Governance Task Force.

- Presentations on the central elements of justice information integration systems, including policy considerations
- How to promulgate or “sell” justice information integration
- The importance of measuring progress and outcomes, and how to accomplish these tasks

The initiative is now in its second phase, involving potential follow-up funding. Incorporating workshop principles, teams were asked to submit a brief plan for furthering justice information integration within their respective states. These plans require identification of existing or emerging efforts (i.e., two or three activities supporting justice information integration that can be accomplished within 24 months); key stakeholders supporting the proposal, resources—aside from additional OJP funds—to be leveraged, and other workshop components such as provision of outcome measurement. NGA will review these second-phase plans (currently 32 have been submitted) and recommend promising proposals to OJP for consideration. Along with additional funding, selected states will receive further training and peer-to-peer networking, as necessary.

National Association for Court Management

Mr. Louie Hentzen, National Association for Court Management (NACM),¹⁵ District Court Administrator, 18th Judicial District, Wichita, Kansas, delivered the presentation.

NACM is a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the quality of judicial administration nationwide at all levels of the court system. In carrying out its purpose, NACM strives to provide members with professional education; encourage the exchange of useful information; encourage the application of modern management techniques; and, through the work of its committees, support research and development in the field of court management, the independence of the judicial branch, and the impartial administration of the courts.

Mr. Hentzen is also involved in the Forum on the Advancement of Court Technology (FACT),¹⁶ a consortium of private sector companies and senior-level court representatives. FACT's mission statement is “to improve the quality of justice through communication between those who develop and provide technology and services and those who manage the courts.” FACT members support a variety of national court and technology management associations, including the National Center for State Courts (NCSC)¹⁷ and NACM.

¹⁵ More information on NACM can be found at <http://nacm.ncsc.dni.us/>

¹⁶ More information on FACT can be found at <http://fact.ncsc.dni.us/>

¹⁷ More information on NCSC is available at <http://www.ncsconline.org/>

Conference of State Court Administrators

Ms. Mercedes Bauermeister, Vice President, Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA),¹⁸ provided her organization briefing.

COSCA is dedicated to the improvement of state court systems. Its membership consists of the state court administrator or equivalent official in each of the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. The mission of COSCA is to provide a national forum to assist state court administrators in the development of a more just, effective, and efficient system of justice in a number of ways, including:

- Identifying and studying issues and, when appropriate, developing policies, principles, and standards related to the administration of judicial systems;
- Providing an effective network for the exchange of information, ideas, and methods to improve state courts;
- Facilitating cooperation, consultation, and exchange of information by and among organizations directly concerned with court administration; and
- Assisting in the formulation and implementation of national issues that affect state courts.

Mr. Thomas Henderson, Executive Director, NCSC, provided the following overview of the COSCA/NACM Joint Technology Committee (JTC),¹⁹ a collaborative effort by both organizations.

COSCA/NACM Joint Technology Committee

Realizing their organizations' objectives and issues of concern were often conjoined, members of the Conference of Chief Justices (CCJ), COSCA, and NACM formed the JTC to pool expertise and eliminate redundancy of effort. The JTC is equally representative of the two lead associations²⁰ in membership and leadership (i.e., co-chairs). The committee convenes three times a year.

¹⁸ More information on COSCA can be found at <http://cosca.ncsc.dni.us/>

¹⁹ The content of this section was compiled from Mr. Henderson's briefing, information provided by COSCA/NACM JTF staff, and information at:

<http://www.ncsc.dni.us/NCSC/CTP/HTDocs/Standards.htm> and

<http://cosca.ncsc.dni.us/jtc.html>

Therefore, some material included in this report is additional to the March 15 briefing.

²⁰ CCJ deferred leadership to COSCA and NACM.

JTC's five primary objectives are:

1. To develop functional standards for the courts;
2. To enhance sharing of information;
3. To educate court leaders as procurers, managers, and users of technology;
4. To conduct studies of pressing national technology issues; and
5. To monitor development of new technology.

In support of these objectives, JTC is engaged in activities focusing on the following areas:

Functional Standards²¹ for Case Management ~~3/4~~The JTC joined with the consortium for National Case Management Automation Functional Standards and NCSC in a three-year effort to assist state courts in automating their case processing systems. Together, these groups are developing guidelines to help state courts more effectively use their financial and staffing resources to obtain state-of-the-art computer systems, either through in-house development or procurement from software developers.

Currently, standards for civil cases have been developed. Efforts are underway (in various stages of completion) to develop standards for automated processing of criminal, juvenile, domestic relations,²² probate, and traffic cases.

Electronic-Filing: LegalXML Court Filing Standard²³ ~~3/4~~This proposed standard was developed to serve as a universal translator among different electronic filing systems. The standard is built on the following tenets:

- This proposed standard deals only with the data to be exchanged, not with electronic filing systems themselves. It will not define or constrain any court's electronic filing system, or define how it should operate.
- This proposed standard does not attempt to impose common terminology. For instance, the proposed standard calls for the sender to complete a data field "document title," but it does not attempt to

²¹ More information on functional standards is available at <http://www.ncsc.dni.us/NCSC/CTP/HTDocs/Standards.htm#LegalXML>

²² More information on domestic relations functional standards is available at <http://www.ncsc.dni.us/NCSC/CTP/HTDocs/msworddocs/drdet2.doc>

²³ More information on e-filing and use of XML in the courts can be found at <http://www.ncsc.dni.us/NCSC/TIS/JEDDI/Jeddi-1.htm>

create a standard list of document titles, such as “Motion of Extension of Time” or “Motion of Summary Judgment.” The standard developers understand that courts use different titles for the same matter: filers will be responsible for knowing the titles used by a particular court before filing a document electronically in *that* court. The XML standard will merely make it clear to the sending computer where to put the “document title,” and to the receiving computer where to find it.

- This proposed standard does not attempt to define the electronic format for legal documents. Rather, it defines the data to be sent with the document to enable a court to identify the documents and its sender, and to create the docket entry in the court’s case management information system (CMIS) for the filed documents. The standard also includes all data elements needed by a court to initiate a new case in its CMIS, if necessary.

The JTC has disseminated this proposal throughout the courts community for review and comment.

Public Access/Privacy Standards in the Courts

Credit Bureau Reporting Standards^{3/4}This project focuses on developing standards to support interaction between the courts and fiscal communities.

Advising the National Center for State Courts^{3/4}The JTC serves in an advisory capacity in planning NCSC Court Technology Conferences.

Model Process for Technology Procurement^{3/4}To maximize limited resources, the JTC is concerned with the most efficient, effective way for state courts to develop information architecture. A model process for procurement of technology will help in this area because, unlike private sector companies that exercise greater control over their various branches, state court systems are controlled by public funding and shaped by the unique needs of the individual courts. Consequently, state court jurisdictions often must develop entirely new computer applications or have software vendors tailor standard products to meet their specific requirements. With the rapid rate of change in computer technology, systems can become obsolete before they are fully implemented, and the procurement cycle must begin again. Streamlining or eliminating such iterative efforts will save time and money.

Information Clearinghouse for Court Managers—The previous dearth of centralized information for court managers—akin to the Westlaw or Lexis-Nexis systems utilized by judges and lawyers—prompted the JTC to design an Internet-accessible clearinghouse. Significant progress has been

made in executing this important resource. Initial posting for constituency review is anticipated shortly.

Related Discussion

Ms. Linda Lewis, American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA),²⁴ expressed her pleasure at being designated the new AAMVA GAC representative. She informed the group that federal law now requires motor vehicle agencies to integrate systems with other disciplines;²⁵ for example, with courts and law enforcement to share data on convictions and traffic citations. Ms. Lewis noted GAC representation of these constituencies and looked forward to members' assistance in facilitating this mandate.

Committee Elections

Per GAC bylaws, election of the Committee Chair and Vice-Chair must be held upon Charter renewal (i.e., two-year intervals). This meeting coincided with the prescribed election period. Ms. Karen Sublett, Special Assistant to the Director, BJA, and Global Designated Federal Employee (DFE), officiated the process.

Ms. Sublett opened the floor for nominations for GAC Chair. Mr. Gary Cooper, Executive Director, SEARCH, the National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics,²⁶ and GAC Vice-Chair, nominated Chairman Robinson for reelection. Mr. Carl Wicklund, Executive Director, American Probation and Parole Association, seconded the motion. The motion was brought to a vote and carried unanimously. Chairman Robinson was confirmed for two additional years.

Ms. Sublett opened the floor for Vice-Chair nominations. Mr. Gerry Wethington, Chief Information Officer (CIO), Office of Information Technology, State of Missouri, nominated Mr. Cooper for reelection. Mr. Tim Sweeney, Executive Director, National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System,²⁷ seconded the motion. The motion was brought to a vote and carried unanimously. Mr. Cooper was confirmed as Vice-Chair for two additional years.

Elections being concluded, Chairman Robinson advised that later in the meeting, attendees would determine GAC issues of particular importance. To become better informed on two potential areas of emphasis, members were briefed on recent activities impacting justice information integration *standards* and *privacy considerations*. The

²⁴ More information on AAMVA is available at <http://www.aamva.org/>

²⁵ As used in this report, the terms "discipline," "justice discipline," or "justice community" refers to all justice entities, including law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, public defenders, the courts, corrections agencies, probation and parole departments, and other agencies that are directly involved in the justice process. The terms include both adult and juvenile agencies, as appropriate.

²⁶ More information on SEARCH is available at <http://www.search.org/>

²⁷ More information on NLETS is available at <http://www.nlets.org/>

presentations dovetailed with Mr. Ward's opening comments, in which he underscored these issues as priorities for BJA integration efforts.

Justice Information and Technology Standards Coordination Meeting Presentation

Chairman Robinson requested Mr. Wethington present on a recent standards-related effort. Taking the floor, Mr. Wethington introduced himself to new members, explaining that in addition to being the Missouri CIO, he is also the Global representative of National Association of State Information Resource Executives (NASIRE)²⁸ and Chairman of Global's Infrastructure and Standard Working Group (ISWG).²⁹ He then recounted the productive Justice Information Technology and Standards Coordination meeting, held in St. Louis, Missouri, which yielded specific recommendations for coordination of justice information integration standards.

Meeting Background

Successful sharing of justice information fundamentally depends on the development and adoption of standards enabling the transparent integration of disparate systems. Currently, there are numerous standards-related efforts underway within the justice community. Other governmental and private sector disciplines are also involved in standards projects that will ultimately impact the justice community. To facilitate integrated justice systems, it is essential to coordinate these various efforts.

Recognizing this coordination imperative, on March 1-2, 2001, OJP convened a group of over twenty professionals dedicated to facilitating justice information sharing, specifically through the development of standards review processes. These attendees represented a wide range of technological expertise and authority from all levels of government, and included justice automation planners and managers, justice information practitioners, industry representatives, and end users. On average, each attendee had over 15 years of experience in the information sharing and/or standards development fields. Mr. Wethington served as facilitator.

²⁸ More information on NASIRE can be found at <https://www.nasire.org/>

²⁹ By way of background, to fully explore the core requirements of and challenges to a Global capability, a number of Working Groups were formed to expand the base of the GAC's knowledge and experience. These groups are comprised of GAC members and other subject-matter experts from throughout the United States. One group is the *Infrastructure and Standards Working Group*, responsible for: 1) conducting an examination of justice information management and infrastructure activities to determine how each activity relates to Global, and 2) reviewing the major standards-related efforts currently underway and providing recommendations to remedy breakdowns in interoperability.

Meeting Goal and Agenda

The meeting goal was stated as follows:

To identify a *process* to advance national justice information technology standards.

To that end, the group was charged with developing a coordination process to identify the ongoing standards-setting efforts within the justice community, to include a method to support the publishing, cataloging, and sharing of pertinent standards.

The following topics were addressed during the meeting:

- Identification of Standards Categories
- Characteristics Associated with Standards Coordination
- Development of a Standards Coordination Process
- Recommendations

Identification of Standards Categories

Attendees determined four critical standards categories:

1. Performance Standards
2. Functional Standards
3. Technical Standards
4. Information Sharing Standards

Information sharing standards was determined as the category requiring immediate coordinative leadership. This decision was reached due to considerations including the following: the group felt that the private sector plays an active role in developing *technical standards*; *performance standards* are largely determined locally; *functional standards* were felt to be in the purview of each respective discipline, depending on operational and business needs; and, ultimately, all agency levels and standard types interact under the umbrella of *information sharing standards*.

Although not specifically addressed during this meeting or in the resulting documents, participants requested that functional, performance, and technology standards be addressed by OJP during future standards coordination meetings.

Characteristics Associated With Standards Coordination

In order to determine the most appropriate organization to coordinate the standards review process, participants discussed characteristics of an ideal standards coordination body. The following list enumerates these characteristics:

- **Awareness**—Stature to facilitate awareness of the standards process among the various disciplines.
- **Process**—Ability to understand the information sharing standards process and to vigorously support this process.
- **Coordination**—Capability to coordinate activities and exchanges between constituent agencies.
- **Repository**—Equipped to maintain a cache of information critical to data exchange. The following were identified as crucial to successful justice information sharing:
 - **Data Definitions**
 - (Model) **Data Dictionary**
 - **Data Sets**
 - **Transactions/Data Exchange**
 - **Documents**
 - **Events** (e.g., incident of arrest)
- **Conflict Management**—Adept at mediating intra- and inter-disciplinary conflict.
- **Operationally Driven**—Acknowledges and appreciates that the operations of the various constituent disciplines drive the standards development process.
- **Voluntary**—Acknowledges and appreciates that adoption of standards by justice community agencies is voluntary; can strongly advocate, but does not have the authority to dictate standards.
- **Need for Common Enterprise**—Actively supports justice information sharing and facilitation of related standards.
- **Representative of Constituency**—Comprised of key stakeholders, representative of the entire justice community.

Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee

After considering the characteristics delineated above, attendees selected the GAC as the most appropriate body to support this endeavor. The participants asked that the GAC—through ISWG—work with OJP to coordinate ongoing standards efforts in the justice community. This process will include publishing, cataloging, and sharing of pertinent standards.

Proposed Standards Coordination Process

Considering previous discussions and decisions, participants drafted the following **Standards Coordination Process** statement:

The success of integrated justice programs is intricately linked to the development and adoption of a standards coordination process that will permit transparent integration of disparate systems. Currently there are numerous standards development efforts underway within the justice community. Standards efforts underway in sectors such as public safety and transportation have an impact on the overall justice community. Therefore, these activities, including those sponsored by industry, deserve close attention and coordination, as appropriate.

In order for the standards coordination initiative to succeed at facilitating integrated justice systems, it is essential to coordinate and integrate ongoing efforts to produce a suite of **Justice Information Sharing Standards (JISS)**. The following is proposed to achieve that goal.

Process Concepts:

1. The **Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee (GAC)** can play a unique role in supporting coordination of the numerous standards efforts underway. Through the leadership and advice of GAC members, OJP can be assured that the needs of all justice community constituencies are considered. The JISS coordination process can be best implemented by the GAC with publishing, cataloging, and sharing of pertinent standards provided by OJP.
2. As the specific organizational element within the GAC responsible for reviewing major standards efforts related to interoperability, the **Infrastructure and Standards Working Group (ISWG)** should be responsible for coordinating the JISS effort.
3. The ISWG should, as a priority, develop the standards coordination process necessary to support the JISS effort, submitting it to the GAC for approval.

4. As standards are identified, developed, and coordinated, the JISS initiative will require staff and funding support. Staff support and technical assistance for the ISWG should be provided through OJP.
5. Primary development of standards should remain within individual justice system disciplines.

Roles and Responsibilities:

Infrastructure and Standards Working Group (ISWG)

- Encourage inclusion of all justice system disciplines and components and also industry within and beyond the GAC in the standards development process.
- Coordinate the JISS effort with professional standards organizations.
- Review submitted standards (from professional and discipline-specific working groups) for the purpose of assuring the published standards coordination process has been followed.
- Return all standards to their respective submitting disciplines with comments.
- When warranted, the ISWG forwards the reviewed standards to the GAC for recognition.

Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee (GAC)

- Recognize the submitted standards or return them to the ISWG with comments.
- When standards are recognized, forward them to OJP with a recommendation for publication.
- Encourage members and constituents to comply with and to promote implementation of the recognized standards.
- Encourage members to recognize and participate in the standards coordination effort.
- Encourage all federal justice-funding agencies to support the adoption of recognized standards as a requirement for federal funding of local and state systems.

- Encourage adoption of recognized standards through publications and contacts with member organizations.

Office of Justice Programs (OJP)

- Functions as the clearinghouse for collecting standards, including providing notification that a standard has been submitted to the GAC for review.
- Upon recommendation of the GAC, catalog and publish JISS.
 - Cataloged standards should include both recognized and non-recognized standards.
 - Published standards should only include recognized standards.
- Encourage adoption of recognized standards using available resources.
- Make technical assistance resources available for GAC/ISWG, including internal DOJ staff and contractual technical assistance providers.
- Encourage an inclusive process involving not only members of the justice community but also related disciplines, industry, and all affected units of government.
- Provide the funding necessary to support the JISS initiative, including the publication of recognized standards and catalogs.
- Provide the staff necessary to support the entire standards coordination and review process and JISS.

In addition to the development of the Standards Coordination Process, the group recommended additional supporting activities:

Supporting Activities

1. Develop a recommended plan supporting the Standards Coordination Process for presentation at the GAC meeting to be held March 15, 2001, in Washington, DC.³⁰
2. Also present said plan at the XML (Extensible Markup Language) Workshop, to be held March 28, 2001, in Kansas City, Missouri.³¹

³⁰ Completed.

³¹ This plan was slated for discussion at the March 28 XML Workshop.

3. Notify the GAC³² that the Joint Task Force is moving forward with the XML Rap Sheet Specification.³³
4. Notify the GAC that the Joint Task Force is developing a justice data dictionary.³⁴
5. Take a leadership role in facilitating action plans addressing pertinent standards categories in justice disciplines.
6. Ensure *Standards* is an agenda item at the upcoming GAC meeting.³⁵

Additional Benefits

Mr. Wethington noted this process implicitly yields important benefits:

- Comprehensive Standards Catalogue—While Global *recognition*³⁶ connotes a certain imprimatur, the proposed cataloging of all submitted standards is an important component. Mr. Wethington explained: “A standard that doesn't have national implications *does* have implications [at a local or state level].... If a discipline at the municipal level went to the trouble of identifying a standard, it may not have far-reaching impact, but there may be other municipal-level disciplines that find value in that.... They now have to have a place to look for such standards. So, it's important to catalogue...all the standards....”
- Early Warning System—Through receipt and review of submitted standards, and cataloging of *all* standards, an “early warning system” is achieved. These activities will inform constituencies via GAC representatives (“pushing” information back to the disciplines) of new efforts, providing timely opportunities for multidisciplinary assistance

³² The Chairman of the JTF is responsible for this notification. This item is important, as the Rap Sheet Specification (and associated activities) is likely to be the first specification recommended to the proposed standards process.

³³ By way of background—in 1995, SEARCH group hosted the National Task Force on Increasing the Utility of the Criminal History Record, which recommended expanded data content, a presentation format (page layout) for the expanded content, and creation of a transmission format for the interstate sharing of criminal history information. To move the model forward toward implementation, several organizations voluntarily formed a Joint Task Force (JTF) whose members represent the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board (CJIS APB), NLETS, SEARCH, and several local and state law enforcement agencies. As a result of this recommendation, and after revisions in consideration of new technology, the referenced XML specification was produced by the JTF on Rap Sheet Standardization. Additional information on XML follows later in the report.

³⁴ Completed by Mr. Wethington and Mr. Sweeney at this meeting.

³⁵ Completed.

³⁶ Mr. Wethington and other GAC participants of the St. Louis meeting emphasized that because Global will not mandate standards, the terms “approve” or “disapprove” are inappropriate. Instead, standards that are favorably reviewed, per articulated guidelines, will be “recognized” by Global and recommended to OJP for publication.

and/or collaboration. Conversely, GAC representatives will provide updates on standards-related efforts from the field, “pulling” information up through the constituencies to apprise fellow Committee members.

Discussion and Proposal Ratification

Mr. Ward commended Mr. Wethington and attendees of the St. Louis meeting for their achievements. He noted this type of recommendation is precisely what the Committee was established for and is well suited to do: advise the U.S. Attorney General that a particular course of action is extremely important to the progress of integrated justice information.

Several attendees favorably commented on the proposed standards coordination process.

Mr. Cooper made a motion for GAC acceptance and support of the proposal. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Chairman Robinson called for comments or questions.

Mr. Sweeney requested the inclusion of timeframes. Mr. Wethington responded that currently, only broad concepts of the process have been determined. If ratified, the proposal will be remanded to the ISWG for refinement, including insertion of time specifications. Speaking to further refining the process, Mr. Wethington addressed Chairman Robinson: “My goal would be to come back to you, Mr. Chairman, at the next meeting...and report—as an Infrastructure and Standards Working Group Chair—on the fine-tuned program, and that we've had the opportunity to run a [submitted standard] through to test [the process].”

Chairman Robinson voiced his approval of this refinement process. Hearing no further questions, he brought the explicated motion to a vote. The motion carried unanimously, confirming GAC support for the proffered Standards Coordination Process.

Integrated Justice Information Privacy Initiative Briefing

Mr. J. Patrick McCreary, OJP, was introduced to brief the group on the Privacy Initiative.

Background

Mr. McCreary stated that increasingly, justice system leaders are asked to develop justice information privacy policy for new technologies without the benefit of established law, regulation, or policy precedent. In developing what is often new policy, it is

important for justice leaders to consider traditional information practices, as well as the effects of advancing technologies.

To that end, the purpose of the Privacy Initiative is to:

- *Provide* privacy policy and technology design assistance for integrated justice systems...
- *To* local, tribal, and state justice practitioners...
- *By* broadening the justice system's traditional privacy discussion...
- *To include* the new and emerging information collection, use, storage, and sharing capabilities of integrated justice information systems.

Products

To accomplish this purpose, the Privacy Initiative is sponsoring development of three products. Mr. McCreary emphasized that these products are offered to constituencies as *tools*, and similar to the GAC's assistance with standards issues, should not be viewed as mandates.

1. Privacy Design Principles for an Integrated Justice System
2. Privacy Impact Assessment for Justice Information Systems
3. Guidelines for Public Access to Records

The first two products have been completed in draft form and are available on the OJP Web site.³⁷

To develop the third product, a series of OJP-sponsored public access workshops is being convened to identify issues associated with public access to records, brainstorm strategies and guidelines for addressing these issues, recommend participants for future workshops to develop guideline content, and suggest an agenda and process for developing the guidelines. Over 100 participants have contributed expertise to these exchanges, representing a wide range of disciplines impacted by this issue. Draft guidelines should be available this summer.

Mr. McCreary also discussed the utility of incorporating vignettes to facilitate the marketing of justice information sharing and privacy protection. (Several participants stressed the need for public relations/outreach in this area.) Such a project would compile real life stories associated with the application of information technology in the justice arena, as well as anecdotes from "daily life" information sharing. A collection of these anecdotes could assist OJP and its partners in obtaining funding and policy support

³⁷ These documents are available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/integratedjustice/>

for integrated justice systems. The anecdotes could also inform privacy guideline developers to prevent real life mishaps due to improper sharing of information.

Related Discussion

Mr. Scott Wallace, National Legal Aid and Defender Association, encouraged members to carefully consider the privacy issue, noting they were addressing a public concern *and* ensuring a constitutional right. Echoing other members, Mr. Wallace stressed that mistakes regarding this type of data could have serious repercussions. He expressed the importance of focusing on records access by *justice system players*. “I think that [this group] is what the public is primarily concerned about.” He also pointed out that we need to acknowledge not only the theoretical underpinnings of privacy issues, but also the constitutional underpinnings. This is a core value in this country as it relates to both criminal justice processes as well as personal information. I recommend we have a strong grounding in the fundamental American concept of privacy.”

Future Focus of the GAC

As the final tasks of the day, attendees determined key issues for GAC advocacy and leadership and reconstituted the GAC Executive Steering Committee and working groups to address these issues. The GAC Bylaws describe these subgroups as follows:

Executive Steering Committee—The Chair will appoint the Executive Steering Committee with due consideration for interdisciplinary representation. The Executive Steering Committee will consist of stakeholders and have the following responsibilities:

- Set priorities, direct research, and prepare advisory recommendations for the approval of the GAC and, upon their approval, forward advisory recommendations to the U.S. Attorney General (or the designated appointee of the U.S. Attorney General) and Congress.
- Schedule meetings and develop GAC meeting agendas with the final approval of the Chair and DFE.
- Consolidate and report GAC concerns and recommendations to the GAC and any other appropriate organizations.
- Track and report results and/or actions taken on GAC concerns and recommendations.
- Solicit additional technical, professional, and administrative assistance, as necessary, to effectively and adequately address GAC concerns and support GAC activities.

Working Groups—With the input of the GAC and DFE, the Chair will establish working groups, which may include non-Committee representatives, to provide oversight for a specific research area or representation of a specific justice segment. Working groups may consist of representatives of DOJ, constituent organizations, or other appropriate organizations.

Potential Issues of Emphasis

To frame the discussion, Chairman Robinson first referred members to the Annual Report 2000. In this document, a concluding section forecast six key issues requiring ongoing examination and attention in the year 2001. These areas were listed as follows:

Issue 1: The Evolving Global Concept—The GAC proposes a reexamination of the basic assumptions upon which Global is founded. Of particular interest are the identification of all users, including criminal justice and noncriminal justice users at local, tribal, state, federal, and international levels; their information needs; and the purposes for which information can be shared. Attention should be paid to identifying Global's functional requirements and its principles of operation. In addition, the management structures for justice information sharing need to be reexamined in light of developing technologies and changing user needs.

Issue 2: The National Global Infrastructure ^{3/4}The GAC is cognizant of the need for and goal of international justice information sharing. In support of a worldwide information sharing capability, a first crucial step is to conduct a national infrastructure inventory to identify the information sharing capability currently in place in the United States. This examination would enable a gap analysis to be conducted to identify the barriers that must be overcome to meet the user needs and expectations of Global, as identified in the Evolving Global Concept above. The GAC advocates OJP's Integration Initiative efforts as critical to the successful development of a national capability.

Issue 3: Data Quality in Information Sharing ^{3/4}Given the degree to which information sharing will be expanded, it is imperative that the highest levels of data quality be assured through appropriate controls. Special attention should be given to policies and procedures regulating activities such as data collection, data entry, data review, data audit, and data dissemination. Accuracy, completeness, and currency should be included in the benchmarks for quality.

Issue 4: Privacy and Access^{3/4} While global justice information sharing will ultimately yield safer communities, simultaneous and rigorous attention must be devoted to privacy concerns. The rights of individuals must be protected in light of vastly expanded information-sharing capabilities. In any single situation, there may exist differing privacy issues from multiple states, multiple agencies, and multiple disciplines. The privacy concerns for each must be addressed.

Issue 5: The Role of Security in Information Sharing—As the Global concept actualizes, the security of the entire enterprise is only as strong as the weakest link. Security standards must be established that can serve the enhanced information-sharing capability. Special attention must be paid to the fact that security standards must be effective for the legacy networks and systems, as well as the new and enhanced networks and systems to which they are joined.

Issue 6: Facilitating Full Participation for all Disciplines^{3/4} In order to reach the full information-sharing capability envisioned by the GAC, all disciplines within the justice community must universally employ information technology among their members. Historically, some disciplines have had difficulties in obtaining resources to acquire and implement appropriate information systems; for example, probation, parole, public defense, and pretrial services. While not detracting in any way from other efforts, attention should be given to identifying and addressing the technological needs of these disciplines (and others) to enable them to be full participants in Global.

Original Working Groups

Chairman Robinson then listed the five original working groups, associating these with the previously enumerated issues:

- **Concept of Operations Working Group** (most closely associated with *Issue 1: The Evolving Global Concept*)
- **Resource Management Working Group** (mainly focused on funding issues)
- **Infrastructure and Standards Working Group** (associated with *Issue 2: The National Global Infrastructure* and *Issue 3: Data Quality in Information Sharing*)

- **Privacy Working Group** (associated with *Issue 4: Privacy and Access*)
- **Security Working Group** (associated with *Issue 5: The Role of Security in Information Sharing*)

Chairman Robinson directed members to look at the list and ask whether those groups lend themselves to the accomplishment of the goals or whether there needs to be some changes.

GAC 2001: Issues and Working Groups

Productive exchanges yielded the following reconstituted GAC working groups, responsible for addressing corresponding key issues.

- **Security Working Group**³⁴ It was noted that developments have prompted a renewed emphasis on security issues and a corresponding need for leadership.
 - The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has in recent years increased technology-based security efforts, for example, developing the National Infrastructure Protection Center (NIPC).³⁸ The NIPC—located in the FBI's headquarters building in Washington, DC—partners representatives from U.S. government agencies, local and state governments, and the private sector to protect our nation's critical infrastructures. Established in February 1998, the NIPC is the national focal point for gathering information on threats to critical infrastructures. It is the principal means of facilitating and coordinating the federal government's response to an incident, mitigating attacks, investigating threats, and monitoring reconstitution efforts. The NIPC includes investigators and analysts experienced in computer crimes and infrastructure protection. It is linked electronically to the rest of the federal government as well as private sector Information Sharing and Analysis Centers (ISAC), providing law enforcement and intelligence information and reports to relevant local, state, and federal agencies, and private sector ISACs.
 - Mr. Wethington stated that we should talk to CIOs and look at their number one agenda item, digital government, which is taking private sector e-commerce principles and moving them into government so it can do electronic transactions with citizens and businesses. He also stressed the need for a broader role for the security working group.

³⁸ More information on the NIPC is available at <http://www.nipc.gov/>

- Underscoring the broadening scope of security, Ms. Linda Burek, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, JMD, informed the group that from a federal standpoint, security involves three areas: 1) confidentiality, 2) integrity, and 3) availability.
- **Privacy/Public Access Working Group** As highlighted by the earlier briefing and related discussions, leadership is needed on issues of information privacy, criminal history records, criminal intelligence information, juvenile justice information, and civil justice information. It was brought out that the justice system—at all levels of government—is only beginning to address information privacy as impacted by advancing technological capabilities. Continued focus on this topic is imperative, because information privacy may become one of the most important technology issues of the 21st century.
- **Infrastructure/Standards Working Group**
 - Chairman Robinson reiterated his commendation of the GAC-ratified Standards Coordination Process: “We already have a working group that...is doing an excellent job with infrastructure/standards, and that effort will continue along the...direction [outlined] today. I think that's an exciting piece of work, and is exactly how this committee needs to be utilized....”
 - Several participants highlighted XML³⁹ as a powerful force in information sharing and standards development. Mr. Bob Greeves briefed attendees on an upcoming XML Workshop, to be held March 28, 2001, in Kansas City, Missouri. By way of background, the objectives of that meeting are to:

³⁹ XML was developed out of the standard generalized markup language (a page definition and formatting language), and is sanctioned by the World Wide Web Consortium to define a way of transmitting and representing data. XML is designed to transmit both data as well as the meaning of the data. It allows data “tags” that define both the name of a data element and the format of the data within that element. XML also allows structured relationships to be defined; e.g., one named person (subject) in the database might have multiple street addresses and multiple criminal associates, all of which XML is capable of recognizing, revealing, and communicating as “relationships.” XML is easily transmitted as text over the current Internet infrastructure. It is compatible with major Internet transmission protocols, and is also highly compressible for faster transmission. Almost all major software vendors are fully supporting the general XML standard. Major database vendors and their database applications provide software development tools to assist agency technical staff to develop and use XML more efficiently and productively within agency applications. XML is both developer-friendly as well as generally allowing users without related expertise to make sense of an XML file. The XML standard is designed to be independent of vendor, operating system, source application, destination application, storage medium, and/or transport protocol.

1. Educate workshop attendees concerning the importance of adopting XML standards within the justice community to improve the future of information sharing and integration of justice information systems.
2. Exchange information regarding directions taken and lessons learned among implementers of XML in the justice community.
3. Identify what types of support and resources are required by the justice community developing and implementing XML efforts.
4. Identify what sources of support and resources are currently available to the justice community engaging in XML efforts, such as the support available from justice participation in LegalXML.
5. Assess the adequacy of support and resources available from identified sources, such as LegalXML, and the feasibility of expanding the role of those support organizations to more adequately address issues of justice and justice affiliated communities that are not currently participating; e.g., corrections, probation and parole, and the prosecution and defense bars.
6. Determine whether additional support and resources are needed; e.g., maintenance of a directory of XML schemas (including the syntax of data tags, such as data element names and element attributes) implemented within various applications, contact information about existing XML-enabled applications available for future reference by application developers employing XML, coordination of XML-inclusive initiatives, etc.
7. Identify commercial vendor products and tools that can be employed by justice communities engaged in XML efforts.
8. Identify organizations that will advocate for and provide support of the developed XML standards.
9. Determine what role (if any), such as coordination, leadership, or funding of demonstrations, OJP should play in supporting efforts to build XML-enabled

applications in the justice information-sharing community.

10. Determine whether additional workshops are needed in this topic area, and if so, determine the participants.

Minutes will be produced after the meeting and made available to GAC members.

- **Marketing/Outreach Working Group**^{3/4}GAC members proposed forming this new working group to meet the critical need for promotion of Global—both within and beyond the GAC member agency community. A number of points were made in this regard.

➤ *Constituency Advocacy*

Mr. Wethington noted that up to this point, GAC members have engaged mainly in representing their affiliate disciplines in the integration dialogue—essentially “pulling up” issues for GAC consideration. However, it is equally important for members to act as GAC advocates *within* their constituencies. “We [need to] ‘push back down’ information through our organizations and associations, and get...them to really understand what is being discussed at the national level—that it’s not a mandate, but rather a model that’s being developed, and we’re trying to build consensus. And before we begin endorsing...[as the collective GAC], we need to know that every one of our groups will endorse those same things. If there’s an element that prevents one of our groups from doing that, we have an obligation to bring that information back. To me, that’s a fairly significant conversation we should be having as to what are our roles and responsibilities are in sitting on this body.... It’s really a new charge and a new mission to impose upon ourselves as representatives of our associations at this body.”

Chairman Robinson agreed that as the GAC moves forward, advocacy is the next logical step, building on the group’s foundation: “I see advocacy as a huge issue for this group to be engaged in over this particular term.... I think that’s not a criticism on the committee actions to date, either: we had to spend a great deal of time...to reach consensus of what should be done. I would hope we would now set ourselves on a track...where we can advocate the program more successfully than we have in the past.”

➤ ***Success Stories***

Similar to the vignettes described by Mr. McCreary earlier in the meeting, Mr. Ward noted that “success stories” could prove important advocacy tools. This tactic would explain integration concepts in meaningful ways to the different constituencies. “One of the things we’re actively pursuing over the next year is to begin a vignette series, and hopefully use the [CIJI] Web page as the [disseminating] vehicle...[as well as] trade publications and association magazines.” Mr. Ward requested members’ assistance in submission of such vignettes.

➤ ***Additional Outreach Approaches***

Mr. McCreary enumerated development of two products that will support the marketing effort:

1. A *Monograph* highlighting integration efforts in Minnesota
2. A Global tri-fold publication or similar medium, particularly suited as handout material at meetings and seminars

Related to this last item, a number of participants stressed GAC representation as program speakers at both large-scale conferences and smaller group meetings. Colonel Robinson suggested participation in IACP’s Annual Conference, and another member suggested representation at the National Association of Counties 2001 Annual Conference, to be held July 13-17, 2001, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

• **Executive Steering Committee**

Chairman Robinson stated that we need to reconstitute the GAC Executive Steering Committee and make sure it is representative of the various components of the justice system.

Per group consensus, this committee will be charged with the complex task of accurately and intelligibly defining the Global Concept of Operations. Several preliminary suggestions were:

- To focus on promoting “information sharing” versus “integration,” especially at the national level, to avoid constituency resistance and other turf issues.

- To think of Global as a three-tiered process model, starting with a foundation comprised of localities' various systems; moving through the middle layer comprised of pieces facilitating information sharing, such as standards; to the top tier (i.e., goal or outcome of the process), which is large-scale justice information sharing. The GAC should focus on providing leadership for the middle and top layers because, according to Mr. Wethington, "I don't think the systems should ever be part of our focus; the systems remain the focus of the discipline that has operational responsibility for that business function."
- Global should ultimately be concerned with reconciling differences in various justice information sharing systems.

Additional Considerations

Members also raised the following issues:

- **GAC-sponsored Integration Capability Inventory/Gap Analysis**

Reiterating an activity suggested in *Issue 2: The National Global Infrastructure*, Mr. Wicklund proposed conducting a national inventory to assess local and state agencies' justice information integration capabilities. He provided a hypothetical example of infrastructure disparities within a single locality: "Law enforcement may have state-of-the-art equipment and sharing capabilities; the courts may not have state-of-the-art, but they're doing a pretty good job; and then, within that same district, you may have...a rural area probation department where they're still using...index cards for their processing." He stated his belief that facilitating justice information integration is a huge task that has to be addressed, but first we have to understand how big that problem is.

Mr. Wethington stated that the ISWG could compile such information from efforts already underway, obviating a separate GAC survey. He pointed to the following projects as providers of gap analysis data:

- NGA Strategic Planning Initiative, outlined by Mr. Rubel;
- Submissions to the GAC-ratified Standards Coordination Process;
- Justice Integration Exchange Points project,⁴⁰ being conducted by SEARCH; and

⁴⁰ More information on this project is available at http://www.search.org/integration/about_link2.asp

- Architecture efforts:
 - Research focusing on national governmental architecture was completed through an award to NASIRE. The resulting publication is *Justice National Information Architecture: Toward National Sharing of Governmental Information*.⁴¹
 - Recently, a group of architecture program personnel met to determine products critical to developing efficient and acceptable information architecture. Attendees cited a *Concept of Operations* and an *Architecture Template* (i.e., technological framework of how information should flow among different jurisdictions) as necessary. These products are slated for drafting and peer review.

While not specifically opposed to ISWG compiling the information, Mr. Henderson voiced his concerns about the GAC initiating a full-scale gap analysis. He continued by noting that because technology is such a dynamic field—with attendant system updates, enhancements, and replacements occurring constantly—the infrastructure inventory would be outdated as soon it was published. Instead, Mr. Henderson proposed cataloging different strategies to facilitate integration per level of agency capability. He suggested developing a measure of where you are with technology development, when you developed your system, and what issues you are dealing with in terms of information sharing.

Chairman Robinson and Mr. Cooper concurred. Mr. Cooper added to Mr. Henderson's comments and clarified GAC's primary purview: "What [the] Infrastructure [and Standards Working Group] has talked about is documenting where we are now: what infrastructure is in place that permits and supports global sharing of information, not necessarily what each department has in terms of its case management or reference management system.... We're going to be making recommendations about improvements, enhancements, or the next steps with that *national* infrastructure, [because] I think our focus is national.... We're talking about global sharing, not about the integration of these local systems.... [We need to ensure] they know the picture we're painting as far as national/global sharing so they can make plans accordingly, but I don't see us getting right down into the individual agency's IT decisions."

⁴¹ This publication is available at <https://www.nasire.org/publications/index.cfm>

- **Justice Information Integration: A Sense of Urgency**

Mr. Sweeney stressed that the GAC is positioned to make a large impact on the integration landscape, but there is a real sense of urgency for timely leadership: “States like Wisconsin and Florida are already developing [integrated] systems, and we can help...but we have a small window of opportunity.... They’re not going to wait.” Several participants asked Mr. Sweeney to elaborate on this sense of urgency, specifically, if tools are available to advance integration capabilities.

Mr. Sweeney noted the planned submission to ISWG of a model Data Dictionary. This list of common data definitions, in concert with the XML standard previously discussed, will facilitate justice information sharing by making the exchange of many types of data easier, more cost-effective, and available to agencies with Internet capabilities, irrespective of varying system architectures. Mr. Sweeney summarized the importance of XML: “XML is also going to change everything we do, and it’s going to make those things far, far less expensive.”

- **Judicial Representation on the GAC**

Mr. Tim Cadigan, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, encouraged GAC representation by federal judges. He noted, “In the federal judiciary, we’re going to have trouble...making this happen without bringing the judges along. I think they would [support Global’s mission] if they understood it and were more involved.... In the federal court system, the policies are set and made by the judges, and an initiative like this can be implemented or killed based on...one or two judges....” Mr. Hentzen concurred.

Mr. Cooper suggested these key federal judges referenced by Mr. Cadigan be invited to the next GAC meeting. Members agreed with this suggestion, adding that working group gatherings were also options for inclusion. Mr. Cadigan will ascertain the judges’ interests in participating in Global events.

The American Judges Association (AJA)⁴² was also offered as a possible outreach venue for this constituency.

⁴² More information on AJA can be found at <http://aja.ncsc.dni.us/index.html>

Adjournment

Chairman Robinson appreciated the members' input and explained that the new working groups would be staffed shortly. Nominated members will be contacted prior to the next meeting, forecast for fall 2001.

Committee members, federal representatives, and support staff were thanked for their contributions. Looking toward future gatherings, Chairman Robinson solicited presentation suggestions.

The meeting was adjourned.