

**Global Justice Information Network
Advisory Committee Meeting
Washington, DC—October 18, 2000**

Meeting Minutes

Convening

The October 18, 2000, meeting of the Global Justice Information Network¹ Advisory Committee convened at 9:00 a.m. at the Hotel Washington, Washington, DC.

By way of background, in establishing the Global Justice Information Network (Global), the U.S. Attorney General reached out to local, tribal, state, federal, and international entities to create the Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee (GAC or “the Committee”). This “group of groups” is comprised of associations and advisory boards whose constituent members represent justice automation planners and managers; justice information practitioners; and, most importantly, justice community² end users.

Welcome

Michael D. Robinson, Global Advisory Committee Chair and former President, International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP),³ welcomed committee members, federal observers, staff, and private citizens.⁴ To best utilize attendees’ expertise, Robinson emphasized that no time constraints were placed on agenda items, an approach he hoped would encourage full and free discussion.

¹ More information on the Global Justice Information Network can be found at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/global/index.htm>

² As used in these minutes, the term “justice community” refers to all justice disciplines, 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 term includes both adult and juvenile agencies, as appropriate.

³ More information on the International Association of Chiefs of Police can be found at <http://www.theiacp.org/>

⁴ Per the Federal Advisory Committee Act, GAC meetings are open to the public. Meeting notices are published in the *Federal Register* to encourage public attendance. This meeting was announced in *Federal Register*/Vol. 65, No. 192/Tuesday, October 3, 2000/Notices.

Introduction of Committee Members

Committee members introduced themselves in turn. The following were in attendance:

Mr. Henry J. Coffman

*Interpol
Washington, DC*

Mr. Gary Cooper

*SEARCH, The National Consortium for
Justice Information and Statistics
Sacramento, California*

Mr. Cabell Cropper

*National Criminal Justice Association
Washington, DC*

Mr. Michael Duffy

*Information Management and
Security Staff
Justice Management Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC*

Mr. Tom Faust

*National Sheriffs' Association
Alexandria, Virginia*

Mr. David Gavin

*Criminal Justice Information Services
Advisory Board
Texas Department of Public Safety
Austin, Texas*

Mr. Thomas A. Henderson

*National Center for State Courts
Office of Government Relations
Arlington, Virginia*

Mr. John Maxwell

*American Association of Motor
Vehicle Administrators
Arlington, Virginia*

Ms. Sandra Moses

*Executive Office of the
United States Attorneys
Washington, DC*

Mr. Thomas J. O'Reilly

*National Association of Attorneys
General*

*Office of the Attorney General of
New Jersey*

*Department of Law and Public Safety
Trenton, New Jersey*

Chief Charles Ramsey

*Major Cities Chiefs' Association
Metropolitan Police Department
Washington, DC*

Colonel Michael D. Robinson

*International Association of
Chiefs of Police
Michigan State Police
East Lansing, Michigan*

Mr. William B. Simpkins

*Office of Investigative Agency Policies
Drug Enforcement Administration
Arlington, Virginia*

Mr. John G. Swanson

*United States Postal Inspection Service
Arlington, Virginia*

Mr. William J. Taylor

*American Correctional Association
Lanham, Maryland*

Mr. David Walchak

*Communication and Technical Branch
Criminal Justice Information
Services Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Washington, DC*

Mr. Scott Wallace

*National Legal Aid and
Defender Association
Washington, DC*

Agenda Review and Ratification

Robinson reviewed the agenda. Topics slated for discussion were as follows:

- Renewal of GAC Charter
- Transfer of committee management activities from Justice Management Division (JMD)⁵ to Office of Justice Programs (OJP)⁶
- End of Year Report to the Attorney General
- Committee membership

Members were given the opportunity to contribute additional agenda topics. Hearing no suggestions, the proposed agenda was approved.

Robinson noted that over and above examining the specific agenda items, the ensuing meeting discussion would help frame future goals of the GAC and the direction of Global activities.

Renewal of Global Advisory Committee Charter

Per the sunset provisions of Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA),⁷ Federal Advisory Committee charters must be renewed every two years. Robinson noted it was his understanding that the GAC charter was in the middle of said process and requested that Karen Sublett, Senior Advisor, Office of the Assistant Attorney General, OJP, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), advise on the status.

Sublett confirmed Robinson's statement: as of the meeting date, the GAC charter had been sent forward to the U.S. Attorney General for authorization. According to the Committee Management Officer of DOJ, no problems were anticipated, and the necessary signature was expected by the end of the week.

Transfer of Global Management

Robinson thanked Sublett. He expressed optimism in the continuation of the GAC not only because of the anticipated charter renewal, but also due to the transfer of Global to a new managing agency. To talk further about this federal leadership and involvement in integration efforts, Robinson introduced Richard Ward III, Acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General, OJP, DOJ.

Ward expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to address the GAC. He began his

⁵ More information on the Justice Management Division is available at <http://www.usdoj.gov/jmd/>

⁶ More information on the Office of Justice Programs is available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/>

⁷ The Federal Advisory Committee Act can be found at <http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/legis/facacomp.htm>

presentation by outlining the tenets underlying the transfer of Global from the original Committee sponsor (JMD) to OJP. He summarized the fundamentals of the move by stating: “From the standpoint of *mission* and *resources*, it became apparent to everybody involved that a more appropriate home [for Global] in the Department of Justice would be the Office of Justice Programs.”

OJP and Global: Confluence of Mission

Regarding Global’s position in OJP’s overall integration agenda, Ward stated, “When you take the confluence of events and activities, clearly OJP is an appropriate home [for the Global initiative]. We see it as a very natural extension of a process of obtaining input and advice from organizations and practitioners about how to best push forward with the Department’s integration activities...[To that end], Global fits perfectly into that mission of OJP: how to best guide and provide leadership to the field to make informed decisions about how it spends billions of dollars of OJP money on integration initiatives and information technology.” Ward continued by noting: “When I say OJP is spending 2 billion dollars a year [on integration activities], that’s still *less* than 10 percent of the amount of state and local money.... Obviously, this is a huge area of expenditure of public dollars, and we feel very strongly our responsibility is to ensure that the money—from the OJP perspective, but also from a state and local taxpayer perspective—is spent wisely. We look forward to OJP’s ability to work with the Global Advisory Committee to help advise the Assistant Attorney General and the Attorney General on the most effective ways to provide leadership to the field and spend available dollars wisely....”

Resources: OJP Commitment to Integration Activities

Robinson agreed that the groups share a similar vision and dedication, resulting in Global “fitting better” within the OJP framework. The move appears to be beneficial to all agencies involved, and Ward pointed out the continued goodwill and participation of the previous sponsor by noting the attendance of Director Michael Duffy, Information Management and Security Staff, JMD.

Robinson then expressed a concern “carried over” from the transfer: adequate federal support, resources, and funding for justice integration projects. He requested that Ward speak further to that issue.

Ward responded by stating: “This area has become of such importance that the Assistant Attorney General decided she wanted to place it strategically within her office.” Presently, resources for integration activities are amalgams of various funding streams, such as Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)⁸ discretionary funds and Local Law Enforcement Block Grant funds. Ultimately, Ward stated, “our end goal is to make a strong and concerted pitch to get the [legislative] support necessary for specifically identifying money for the state and local justice information technology initiatives.”

To assure Committee members of OJP’s commitment to this issue, Ward enumerated current OJP-sponsored integration activities. These efforts can be grouped under several thematic areas.

⁸ More information on BJA can be found at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bja/>

Business Case

A well-crafted business case can be a powerful communication tool to increase support for integration efforts. This realization led to an award to the Center for Technology in Government, University at Albany, State University of New York. The subsequent publication, *And Justice for All: Designing Your Business Case for Integrated Justice Information*,⁹ provides valuable case models and tools that have proven successful in compelling diverse justice officials to participate, collaborate, and achieve information sharing. The research results and published material advise that achieving the benefits of integrated justice information can be difficult and complex. However, key officials and policy makers can meet the technical and organizational challenges through their commitment and realization that successes in this area directly impact communities by saving time, money, and lives.

Governance

Creating a governance structure to oversee the integration process and enable stakeholders to cooperatively and effectively work together remains one of the most important building blocks in any information technology initiative. Awards made to address this critical policy area were as follows:

- *Guidebook on Governance*, Public Technology, Inc.
- *Governance Survey and Assessments*, National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA)¹⁰ and SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics.¹¹

Information Architecture

Architecture collectively refers to those characteristics of a network, operating system, or application program that facilitate information sharing. Research focusing on national governmental architecture was completed through an award to the National Association of State Information Resource Executives (NASIRE).¹² The resulting publication, *Justice National Information Architecture: Toward National Sharing of Governmental Information*,¹³ was well received by officials from all levels of government.

SEARCH is also conducting a study to identify key exchange points between justice agencies. It is anticipated that the research results will assist agencies in integrating local and state information systems.

⁹ This report is available at http://www.ctg.albany.edu/resources/htmlrpt/justice_for_all/index.htm

¹⁰ More information on NCJA can be found at <http://www.sso.org/ncja/index.htm>

¹¹ More information on SEARCH can be found at <http://www.search.org/>

¹² More information on NASIRE can be found at <https://www.nasire.org/>

¹³ This publication can be ordered at <https://www.nasire.org/publications/index.cfm>

Privacy/Access

The OJP Privacy Program sponsored the development of three products this year:

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.¹⁴ Comments on both drafts are solicited through the end of the calendar year.

In order to develop the third product, an OJP-sponsored planning workshop was convened by NCJA in Denver, Colorado, November 16-17, 2000, 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. Draft guidelines are expected to be available by early spring 2001.

This initiative complements studies sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS)¹⁵ and implemented by SEARCH to identify key privacy issues and provide recommendations for future actions in the privacy area.

In addition, in 2001, the University of New Orleans, Center for Society, Law and Justice, plans to convene a think tank to examine the basic framework for pursuit of ethics and privacy in the justice-related community.

Resource Center

The National Center for Rural Law Enforcement was awarded a grant by OJP to develop the Web site for an information integration resource center. The Center for Integrated Justice Information (CIJI) Council—a practitioners' working group—has the responsibility for the Web site development, including design and content. The site will be a dynamic Web-based resource enabling justice agencies at all levels of government to access and obtain timely and useful information on integration processes, initiatives, new policies, and technology developments. The resource center will include a wealth of information, such as integration profiles for states, compilations of best practices and success stories, funding approaches, lessons learned regarding integration and interoperability, system descriptions and overviews, telecommunications approaches, mobile data terminal and wireless initiatives, and model integrated systems.

Standards

¹⁴ Referenced draft documents are available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/integratedjustice>

¹⁵ More information on BJS can be found at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/>

The National Center for State Courts (NCSC)¹⁶ was awarded a grant by OJP to develop functional standards for adult criminal justice court case management systems. This work will be patterned after the successful development of functional standards by NCSC for civil court case management systems.

NCSC is similarly engaged in plans to develop functional standards for juvenile/family courts, domestic relations courts, and traffic courts. Based on the success of these initiatives and the impact that they have on the development of standardized private sector case management software, it may be desirable to encourage other jurisdictions (e.g., law enforcement, corrections) to develop functional standards to guide the development of standardized software by the private sector.

OJP has supported the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Intelligent Transportation Systems¹⁷ Initiative. A Memorandum of Understanding between OJP and DOT is being developed to establish a formal partnership, benefiting the area of standards development and other domains of mutual concern.

Strategic Planning

A significant strategic planning effort has focused on partnering with the National Governors Association (NGA)¹⁸ to assist and encourage each state to convene its respective leaders to develop a statewide strategic information-sharing plan. The initial phase of this project provided grants to each state to support this vital planning process; supplemental grants are expected to be awarded to those states showing promise as national role models.

Organization of the Industry Working Group is also an important step by OJP, coordinating integration efforts with the private sector. This area represents a particularly crucial interest to industry manufacturers, requiring input and ongoing dialog to achieve progress and integration of information systems.

Conclusion

Ward concluded his briefing on the transfer by reiterating that the transition is both positive and logical, enhancing the focus of Global's efforts while coalescing all integration projects under the same office. By combining Global with other OJP initiatives of substantive relation under the directorship of OJP Acting Assistant Attorney General Mary Lou Leary, DOJ can best utilize its resources and ensure the proper coordination with local and state integration efforts.

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

¹⁷ More information on DOT's Intelligent Transportation Systems can be found at <http://www.its.dot.gov/>

¹⁸ More information on NGA can be found at <http://www.nga.org>

Related Discussion

Designated Federal Employee

Committee members asked if a federal representative was assigned to facilitate the Global effort. Ward affirmed noting that, per FACA guidelines, the position is titled “Designated Federal Employee” (DFE). Karen Sublett has been appointed Global’s DFE.

Ms. Karen Sublett
Senior Advisor
Office of the Assistant Attorney General
Office of Justice Programs
Sixth Floor
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: (202) 616-3463
Fax: (202) 514-7805
E-mail: sublettk@ojp.usdoj.gov

Update: Web Site and GAC Bylaws

Sublett reminded the group that as a result of Global’s transfer, related documents needed to be updated to reflect OJP as the supervising federal agency. She specifically pointed to the Global Web site and GAC bylaws. Sublett stated she would make all allowable online changes. However, due to protocol, GAC members must vote on any revisions to the Committee bylaws.

Action Item: Revision of GAC Bylaws—To that end, Sublett will amend the bylaws, forward updated copies to GAC members, and coordinate a mail ballot vote on the revisions.

End of Year Report to the Attorney General

Dual Purpose of Report: Review and Projection

Discussion then turned to revision of the End of Year Report to the Attorney General, a task Robinson termed “the real meat of the work we have to perform today.”

Prior to the meeting, members were mailed a draft of the document for review. The draft was structured as follows:

Section 1 contained the following:

- Background information on the Global Justice Information Network (including transfer of the initiative from JMD to OJP), Global Advisory Committee, and Global Advisory Committee Working Groups.
- Review of directives from the 1999 End of Year Report, which contained critical next steps for the Committee to pursue in 2000. Two of these steps were 1) to conduct a justice information infrastructure study, and 2) to assess current privacy-related efforts.
- Overview of the remainder of the 2000 report, consisting of an additional two sections. Because (per 1999 recommendations) substantial GAC attention was devoted to the issues of *infrastructure* and *privacy*, the remaining sections were comprised of respective summary reports providing information briefings and fundamental assessments.

Section 2 contained a summary of *The Global Justice Information Network: An Introductory Report on Infrastructure*, a report issued in June 2000 by the Infrastructure Working Group with the support and endorsement of the entire GAC. This section represented an abridged version of the full report of the same title, available at: http://www.usdoj.gov/ag/global/documents/is_report.pdf.

Section 3 contained information on the Global Justice Information Network Privacy Initiative, including the following:

- Background on the import and complexity of the privacy issue as it relates to justice information integration;
- The purpose of the Privacy Initiative;
- Goals and components of Privacy Initiative 2000;
- A short conclusion for the entire End of Year Report.

The intent of this draft report was not only to serve as an initial document, but more importantly to serve as a springboard from which members could suggest additional substantive inclusions vis-à-vis future activities of the GAC.

Robinson explained, “I think [a projection of Global activities] is of value because it helps set the tone...for the next administration. It would clearly give them a document that they could go to and say, ‘What is this [justice information integration] issue all about? Where should the focus be? What do the experts say?’”

In keeping with that dualistic purpose, Robinson set the tenor of the exchange by stating, “As part of this discussion with regard to the year-end report, I would like to open the floor up to discuss those initiatives or efforts which the committee believes...need to be pursued, what...we need to be working on, what we are most interested in seeing achieved....”

Gary Cooper, Executive Director, SEARCH, made a motion to bring the draft report to the floor for discussion, revision, and approval.

Tom Henderson, Executive Director, National Center for State Courts, seconded the motion.

Robinson opened the floor for discussion.¹⁹

Issues: Revisions and Additions

Issue 1: Section I—Introduction

Cooper felt the portion outlining the GAC objectives and scope of concern should be expanded: “There are certain things that are missing [due to] an attempt to condense....”

Robinson agreed and referenced Global’s charter²⁰ and bylaws²¹ as containing more complete listings of the initiative’s mission, guiding principles, and goals.

David Gavin, Chairman, Criminal Justice Information Services Policy Board, Texas Department of Public Safety, pointed to the first page, noting the addition of a few words would clarify that Global is an *initiative* concerned with developing a new network- and information-sharing *capability*, not a new network.

Issue 2: Section II—Infrastructure Report Summary

William B. Simpkins, Assistant Administrator for the Operational Support Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, highlighted one of the listed “Model Functions of a Global Justice Network Capability,” noting additional language would head off a potential security question. In the draft report, the function reads as follows:

The ability to receive or *pull* operational information from another agency based upon actions the other agency has taken regarding subjects or cases.

Simpkins expressed concern that readers might confuse this as an unmitigated ability to access justice information—a proposition especially alarming to the law enforcement community. In actuality, data

¹⁹ As anticipated by Chairman Robinson, revision and approval of the End of Year Report commanded a large portion of the meeting time. All GAC members engaged substantially in the discussion; in the interest of brevity, these minutes highlight important issues raised during the process. However, by no means is this an exhaustive list of members’ contributions.

²⁰ A copy of Global’s charter is available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/global/documents/charter.htm>

²¹ A copy of Global’s bylaws is available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/global/documents/bylaws.htm>

can be “pulled” only if an agreement exists with the agency housing the operational information. Simpkins stressed the importance of noting this prerequisite.

Scott Wallace, National Legal Aid and Defender Association, suggested the addition of a list of envisioned Global users, particularly to highlight the inclusion of public defenders: “We...defin[e] user operational requirements without defining users.... Most integrated systems around the states and localities do include defenders, but there are many that don’t.... So, I think it might be helpful to specify what our user groups should be and...[in that list] to specify public defender agencies.”

Issue 3: Section III—Privacy Piece and Conclusion

John Maxwell, Chief Operating Officer, American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, approved of the Privacy Initiative portion of the report: “As chief of the Privacy Working Group, I agree [that] what they put in here is a very accurate portrayal of what happened [this past year].”

Cooper suggested expanding the conclusion (included in Section III of the draft) and assigning the segment its own section.

Issue 4: Looking Forward—Beyond GAC 2000

➤ *GAC Support of Related OJP Efforts*

Within the to-be-added “Future Activities” section, Robinson proposed the following: “Dick Ward, at the beginning of our discussion, outlined several broad categories that [OJP] is moving forward with.... I think it would be wholly appropriate for this Committee to include in its year-end report...some statement of support for these areas of focus....”

To facilitate and enhance this suggestion, Ward offered to compile a one to two page addenda for the report, outlining the OJP integration efforts showcased earlier in the meeting. Robinson appreciated the addition.

John G. Swanson, Postal Inspector, U.S. Postal Inspection Service, moved that said statement of GAC support be included in the End of Year Report. Cooper seconded the motion.

➤ *Role of GAC: Product v. Policy Orientation*

Several members discussed the difficulty of mutually excluding “product” from “policy.”

Considering the day’s discussion and proposed future Committee activities, David Walchak, Deputy Assistant Director, Communication and Technical Branch, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, cautioned: “Certainly there has to be some product...[but] I am...concerned that we might be going down a path of being product-oriented as opposed to policy-oriented.”

Walchak's observation relates back to the GAC's express purpose, articulated in the Committee Mission Statement:²²

The Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee (GAC) will act as the focal point for justice information systems integration activities in order *to facilitate the coordination* of technical, funding, and legislative strategies *in support* of the Administration's justice priorities.

The GAC will *guide and monitor* the development of the Global concept. It will *advise* the Attorney General, President (through the Attorney General), and local, state, tribal, and federal policy makers in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches and *advocate* strategies for accomplishing a Global Network capability. (emphasis added)

Cooper questioned the feasibility of sole policy orientation: "On this issue of 'products' or 'not producing products,' it seems to me the reason we were created in the first place has to do with the...direction we were given from the Vice President's initiative: the whole point was to create this global information sharing capability in the justice field. In terms of defining that [capability]—so we can see if we're moving toward that—*somebody* has to produce that document so we can show we're making contributions. So, I can't see how this group *can't* be involved in products. Maybe [the GAC] doesn't write them, but if it's prepared by somebody else, [the Committee has] to monitor...so that document reflects what this group feels...., putting something out there for the world to see that describes 'what is a global criminal justice information sharing capability?' and 'how do we get there?' [Therefore], we have to have some involvement with products because we've been charged with putting that whole notion together."

Ward responded to Cooper, agreeing that the two activities are, in many ways, inextricably bound: "Let me clarify something.... I think I said it, and I'll say it again: anything this board recommends be developed...I see as [OJP's] responsibility to ensure it's developed. That *doesn't* mean you (GAC) advise and walk away. I'm not going to let you do that. If you advise on a product, say 'this is what needs to be done,' we'll go about getting draft product material ready. [Then] that [draft] will come back to this board to ensure it is [acceptable, because] in a sense, it's the *board's product* developed by OJP resources.... The board will play a very clear role in assuring that it's satisfied, that [the product] does, in fact, meet [the Committee's] definition...before it's published or goes out."

Responding to Ward's assurance, Cooper stated, "I'm very comfortable with that. I just wanted to make sure that we have a reason for being."

²² Per GAC Bylaws, available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/global/documents/bylaws.htm>

➤ ***International Focus***

Henry Coffman, Senior Information Resources Manager, Interpol, raised the issue of geographical scope of GAC concern: “The reason I say that is the international world...is not going to stop and wait for this Committee to do something; they’re still going to move on...” While acknowledging the immediate focus must be on establishing a national network capability, Hoffman advocated that the GAC state their awareness of the need for and goal of international justice information sharing.

➤ ***Future Efforts: Broad-based Outline of Future Activities***

The Committee concluded substantive discussion on the End of Year Report revision by determining the content—including level of detail—for the section on “Future Activities.” Thomas O’Reilly, National Association of Attorneys General, noted that conveyance of these plans was “probably the best purpose this document can serve.”

Discussion involved all members. Participants expressed and appreciated the import of articulating an overall vision for the GAC while simultaneously defining areas for focused attention. In addition to referencing the two working group (i.e., *infrastructure* and *privacy*) reports included in the draft document, a third publication helped determine key issues: Robinson noted, “[I have a] really good, definitive document²³...on an outline of tasks and approaches that various working groups were going to take. I think it is a good starting point to...fill in the gaps.”

Using a flip chart and dynamic, free-flowing exchange, the Committee listed areas of particular concern.²⁴ Regarding the level of detail to be included in the report, Robinson stated, “I think that in talking to many of you, you agree that what we need to do in the year-end report is somewhat broad in nature: identify those issues [of future interest] from a broad standpoint.” The group concurred.

Before the Committee shifted focus to more mechanical concerns, Gavin reiterated: “Just for clarification, what we’re going to do in the report is identify the issues, but not drill down the task lists.... We’re going to reach out to the issues identified for the other working groups not identified currently, and...[articulate] the overarching issues. [Again, we’re] *not* [listing] specific tasks, because those have yet to be approved by the GAC.” GAC members agreed.

Issue 5: Final Revision Process

With the major questions of content resolved, the Committee turned their attention to the specific process of revising the End of Year Report. Sublett noted the impending deadline: OJP planned to deliver the final report to the Attorney General by the end of the month.²⁵

²³ This draft document, *Working Group Reports* (dated April 6, 1999), is available upon request. Please call (850) 385-0600, extension 285, for more information.

²⁴ Areas of special concern, as identified by the GAC, are outlined on pp. 15-16 of this report.

²⁵ The Committee successfully met the OJP deadline of October 31, 2000.

Due to the tight turnaround time, and to take advantage of the upcoming Steering Committee Meeting, Cooper proposed a solution for “wordsmithing” the revision and tying up other associated loose ends: “How I would amend my [original] motion [to approve the report] is [the following]: to approve the comments and changes discussed today, with the provision that the Steering Committee finalize the language, based on your recommended changes to the draft.” Henderson again seconded the motion. Robinson recognized the advantage of timeliness of such a tack: “That will get us approval of the report without having to take another vote at a later date.” Robinson brought the motion to a vote; the motion carried.

Resolutions: Revised Report²⁶

The issues raised concerning revision of the GAC report were resolved as follows:

Issue 1: Introduction

Enumeration of Global's purpose and goals was expanded, per approved language found in the initiative's Charter and Bylaws.

Care was taken to express Global's intent to foster a new network *capability* rather than a new network.

Issue 2: Infrastructure Working Group Report

To easily anticipate questions resulting from excises made during summarization, the GAC decided to simply include the entire document.²⁷

Issue 3: Privacy Piece and Conclusion

Per Maxwell's imprimatur, the Privacy Initiative section was included without revision.

An expanded conclusion was added to the end of the report, constituting the new "Section 5."

Issue 4: Looking Forward—Beyond GAC 2000

GAC Support of Related OJP Efforts—Language of support for OJP integration projects was included in the section outlining future GAC activities (constituting the new "Section 4"). Per Ward's suggestion, these OJP efforts were enumerated in an addendum, which is inserted in the back of the report.

Product v. Policy Orientation—Consistent with language in the Committee Mission Statement, the report conveys a tone of anticipated policy advisement and expert guidance. However, both the GAC and OJP tacitly understand the roles of "policy provision" and "product generation" to be interconnected to a certain extent vis-à-vis monitoring and editorship.

International Focus—Acknowledgment of the ongoing importance of the international justice community integration efforts is included in the report.

²⁶ The revised document, *Global Justice Information Network, Annual Report 2000*, is available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/global/yearendreport00/june00.pdf>

²⁷ The document, *The Global Justice Information Network: An Introductory Report on Infrastructure*, is included as "Section 2" in the Annual Report 2000, available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/global/yearendreport00/june00.pdf>

Future Efforts—Per the approved revision process,²⁸ the Steering Committee finalized this portion of the report, constituting the new “Section 4.” This section is printed in the final document as follows:

Section 4: Global Advisory Committee Focus—2001

The integration issues of standards and privacy (highlighted in Sections 2 and 3, respectively) continue to demand substantial attention from the Global Advisory Committee (GAC or “the Committee”). Other areas also require examination and attention. To that end, the Committee recognizes the following areas of special concern for the upcoming year:

⇒ **The Evolving Global Concept**

The GAC proposes a reexamination of the basic assumptions upon which the existing Global Criminal Justice Information Network (“Network”) capability 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 the functional requirements of the Network capability and its principles of operation. In addition, the management structures for the current Network capability need to be examined in light of developing technologies and changing user needs.

⇒ **The National Global Infrastructure**

The GAC is cognizant of the need for and goal of international justice information sharing. In support of a worldwide 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 the Network capability, as identified in the *Evolving Global Concept* above.

OJP’s Integration Initiative efforts regarding infrastructure and standards are critical to the successful development of a national capability.

⇒ **Data Quality in Information Sharing**

Given the degree to which information sharing will be expanded through the envisioned Network capability, it is imperative that the highest levels of data quality be assured through appropriate controls. Special attention should be given to

²⁸ See *Issue 5: Final Revision Process* in the preceding section.

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.

⇒ **Privacy and Access**

The privacy rights of individuals must be protected in light of the vastly expanded information sharing capability anticipated for the Global Network. In any single situation served by the Network capability, there may exist differing privacy issues from multiple states, multiple agencies, and multiple disciplines. The privacy concerns for each must be addressed.

OJP also recognizes that, while designing a justice information sharing system will ultimately yield safer communities, simultaneous and rigorous attention must be devoted to privacy concerns.

⇒ **The Role of Security in Information Sharing**

As the Network capability grows, the security of the entire enterprise is only as strong as the weakest link. Security standards must be established that can serve the enhanced Network 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.

⇒ **Facilitating Full Participation for all Disciplines**

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 the Global Network capability.

Partnership: OJP Integration Initiatives

In addition to concentrating on the above issues, the GAC looks forward to collaboration on, acting in an advisory capacity to, and strong support of the OJP integration initiatives. The GAC recognizes and embraces the activities of OJP that contribute significantly toward the development of a Global Justice Information Network capability.

Support of standards development and privacy policy represent two prominent areas where OJP has targeted funding and contributed greatly. Many partnerships have been forged with national

organizations and associations in an effort to bring national leaders together to address these issues. As previously noted, although progress has been made in both of these areas, they remain a high priority as GAC and OJP look toward the challenge of meeting the needs of the justice community in the coming year.

All of OJP information technology initiative activities focus on the integration of justice systems at the local and state levels, thereby enabling more justice agencies to exchange information in a “global” capacity.

OJP currently sponsors integration activities in the following areas:²⁹

- Business Case
- Governance
- Information Architecture
- Privacy/Access
- Resource Center
- Standards
- Strategic Planning³⁰

New Membership

The final agenda item concerned membership expansion of the GAC. Before the floor was opened for nomination of new agencies, Robinson stated that several existing Committee seats were vacant due to staff retiring and/or changing positions. Robinson asked attendees to think about suitable replacements with an eye toward a few provisions: “One of the things...is the need to identify—within these organizations—[individuals] who have a standing within their associations, whom constituents recognize as leaders on this issue..., and, at the same time, ensure diversity on the Committee.”

The group then offered suggestions and discussed the merits of extending Committee membership invitations to a number of agencies. Debate followed over which agencies would best expand the base of integration knowledge, expertise, and experience without increasing the size to the point of unwieldy.

The following agencies were proposed as top selections:

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

²⁹ For further information about OJP integration initiatives, please see the summary of Ward’s briefing on pp. 4-7 of these minutes.

³⁰ Indicates conclusion of *Section 4: Global Advisory Committee Focus—2001* contained in the End of Year Report.

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.

- **Conference of State Court Administrators**³¹—The Conference of State Court Administrators (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 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. The mission of the Conference of State Court Administrators 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 relating 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.

- **National Association for Court Management**³²—The National Association for Court Management (NACM) vision statement reads as follows:

The National Association for Court Management will be a global leader in the achievement of an interdependent, accessible, and forward looking Judicial Branch that is committed to excellence. NACM will provide outstanding service to its members through quality professional development, relevant publications, collegial fellowship, and opportunities to participate in the organization. The core values of integrity, visionary leadership, innovation, and cooperative collaboration will be reflected throughout NACM.

- **National Conference of State Legislatures**³³—Legislators in the 50 states together represent 250 million people of varying politics, diverse cultural backgrounds, and different economic conditions. Fairly representing this diversity of

³¹ More information on COSCA can be found at <http://cosca.ncsc.dni.us/>

³² More information on NACM can be found at <http://www.nacmnet.org/>

³³ More information on NCSL can be found at <http://www.ncsl.org/>

constituents can be daunting. To this end, the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) provides a variety of services to help lawmakers tailor policies that will work for their states and their constituents. The mission of NCSL is as follows:

- Improving the quality and effectiveness of state legislatures;
 - Fostering interstate communication and cooperation; and
 - Ensuring legislatures a strong, cohesive voice in the federal system.
- **Conference of Chief Justices³⁴ (CCJ)**

Initially, some members expressed reservation at voting in new agencies without a certain level of background research and recommendations from an ad hoc membership subcommittee. However, Cooper noted, “I’m prepared to vote on [the nominated agencies] now, and then if you want to investigate the others, that’s legitimate. We’ve been talking about this to a certain degree on the [Global Advisory] Steering Committee for some time, and if we wait another six months until this Advisory Committee meets again, there are going to be [critical] decisions made, particularly in the courts; they’re working on standards and other things right now.”

O’Reilly concurred: “I’ve had some experience...and found that the NGA and the legislative group (NCSL) were valuable resources—particularly the legislative group—in terms of going back and selling this [integration] idea. So, I make a motion that we move immediately to take the appropriate steps to recommend to the Attorney General or [Department of] Justice to expand the membership by the organizations...articulated.”

William Taylor, Project Development Specialist, American Correctional Association, emphasized the need for the courts to be adequately represented. This critical component of the justice community has historically lagged in terms of both funding and representation.

Henderson agreed, but cautioned against the inclusion of one of the proposed agencies, pointing to an overlap in representation: “The addition of the Chief Justices would not be necessary; they have not been deeply involved in this. They’ve by-and-large deferred to COSCA on integrated justice information issues, and in the interest of keeping the group reasonable, I would suggest we not extend the invitation to them.... If you have [COSCA] at the table, you have the Chiefs.”

Action Item: Expansion of Membership—O’Reilly revised his motion, proposing GAC membership invitations be extended to NGA; NCSL; NACM; and COSCA. Henderson seconded the motion. Robinson brought the motion to a vote; the motion carried.

Related Discussion

Several other related issues were discussed:

³⁴ More information on CCJ can be found at <http://ccj.ncsl.org>

Additional Nominations

Other organizations proposed for membership included:

- National League of Cities (NLC)³⁵
- National Association of Counties (NACO)³⁶
- Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators

Further invitations of membership were tabled until GAC future activities were more precisely articulated. At that point, comparing Global’s goals and objectives with the GAC roster will evidence the need (if any) for representation by additional disciplines. Then, more informed nominations can be made. Robinson also noted, “There would be nothing to preclude us from sending invitations to those [additionally nominated] people to attend the next meeting to observe...”

Membership Guidelines

Duffy asked if there might be justificatory and explanatory value in identifying specific criteria by which to judge nominees. He noted, “I ask that question both for the purposes of [*justification*]—if somebody comes to you and says, ‘Why aren’t I on there?’—and it may also provide the Attorney General an *explanation* as to why certain organizations are recommended...”

Ward answered that formalizing membership criteria vis-à-vis specific guidelines within GAC bylaws might ultimately be counterproductive by proving too restrictive. He stated, “I’m fairly comfortable as long as there is a clear [GAC] articulation of the reasons that organizations are being brought on—why and what value they bring to the table—as the recommendation goes through the approval process.”

Agency Representatives

Regarding the type of individual most appropriate to represent his/her agency on the Committee, Robinson explained, “We have a mix of practitioners...and staff and executive directors...from [member] organizations. The only thing that we have stressed...is that we want people, whether...staff or practitioners, who are recognized by those organizations and the constituencies they represent as knowledgeable leaders on the issues [concerning] their constituents’ interest. In some cases, it is staff; in some cases, it’s a practitioner. [Ultimately], we want people around the table who understand the issues—who can add to the discussion and bring value to the group itself—but [who] are also then emissaries back to their own organizations to carry the [Global] message...”

³⁵ Several members advocated including both the city and county associations (NLC and NACO, respectively) due to distinct divisions in jurisdictional interest and authority.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

Robinson concluded by projecting the next GAC assembly for late February/early March 2001.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m.

minutes-GAC mtg-dca-oct 00.doc