

**Global Justice Information Network**  
**Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting Report**  
*Washington, DC — September 20, 2001*

**Convening and  
Introductory Remarks**

With the goal of facilitating information sharing across the breadth of justice and public-related disciplines and all levels of government, on September 20, 2001, the Global Justice Information Network (Global)<sup>1</sup> Advisory Committee (GAC or “Committee”) convened at 9:00 a.m. at the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Washington, DC. The meeting began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Colonel Michael D. Robinson, Director of the Michigan State Police, GAC Chair and International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)<sup>2</sup> representative, welcomed Committee members, federal observers, staff, and private citizens. Certainly, any effort in which the bottom line is increasing national public safety is of interest to all sectors of the justice community. However, in light of the events of September 11<sup>th</sup>, this GAC meeting had a particular gravitas and sense of urgency, evidenced by the large turnout of GAC members and interested public. As one participant noted, efforts of this Committee offer a real possibility to “turn information into justice.”

Committee members,<sup>3</sup> federal representatives, and staff introduced themselves in turn. The following were in attendance:

Mr. Doug Bodrero  
*Institute for Intergovernmental Research  
Tallahassee, Florida*

Lieutenant Colonel Ken Bouche  
*Illinois State Police  
Joliet, Illinois*

Mr. Dave Boyer  
*Office of Justice Programs  
Washington, DC*

Mr. David Byers\*  
*Conference of State Court Administrators  
Phoenix, Arizona*

Mr. A. Carlos Correa\*  
*U.S. Department of the Treasury  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Mike Carr  
*Justice Management Division  
Washington, DC*

Superintendent Melvin Carraway\*  
*International Association of  
Chiefs of Police  
Indianapolis, Indiana*

Mr. Henry J. Coffman\*  
*INTERPOL  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Gary Cooper\*  
*SEARCH  
Sacramento, California*

---

<sup>1</sup> More information on the Global Justice Information Network is available at <http://www.it.ojp.gov/global/>.

<sup>2</sup> More information on the IACP is available at <http://www.theiacp.org>.

<sup>3</sup> Global Advisory Committee members are denoted by an asterisk (\*).

Mr. Steve Correll\*  
*National Law Enforcement  
Telecommunication System  
Phoenix, Arizona*

Mr. Tom Coty  
*National Institute of Justice  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Cabell Cropper\*  
*National Criminal Justice Association  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Tom Faust\*  
*National Sheriff's Association  
Alexandria, Virginia*

Ms. Joyce Gammelmo  
*Office of Justice Programs  
Washington, DC*

Mr. David Gavin  
*Texas Department of Public Safety  
Austin, Texas*

Mr. Bob Greeves  
*Office of Justice Programs  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Alan Harbitter  
*PEC Solutions, Incorporated  
Fairfax, Virginia*

Mr. Thomas A. Henderson\*  
*National Center for State Courts  
Arlington, Virginia*

Mr. Louie Hentzen\*  
*National Association for  
Court Management  
Wichita, Kansas*

Mr. Kermit Humphries  
*National Institute of Corrections  
Washington, DC*

Mr. E. Hunter Hurst III\*  
*National Center for Juvenile Justice  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania*

Ms. Linda Lewis\*  
*American Association of Motor Vehicle  
Administrators  
Arlington, Virginia*

Ms. Donna Lindquist  
*Institute for Intergovernmental Research  
Tallahassee, Florida*

Mr. John Loverude  
*Joint Task Force on Rap Sheet  
Standardization  
Springfield, Illinois*

Ms. Donna Lyons\*  
*National Conference of State Legislatures  
Denver, Colorado*

Mr. George March  
*RISS Office of Information Technology  
Thorndale, Pennsylvania*

Rick Masters, Esquire  
*Council of State Governments  
Louisville, Kentucky*

Mr. Jay Maxwell  
*American Association of Motor  
Vehicle Administrators  
Arlington, Virginia*

Mr. J. Patrick McCreary  
*Office of Justice Programs  
Washington, DC*

Ms. Karen Michell  
*U.S. Department of the Treasury  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Andrew Molloy, Jr.  
*American Probation and Parole  
Association  
Richmond, Virginia*

Mr. Richard R. Nedlekoff  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Alvin Nixon\*  
*Administrative Office of the  
U.S. Courts  
Washington, DC*

Ms. Josephine Palma  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Washington, DC*

James Polley, Esquire\*  
*National District Attorneys  
Association  
Alexandria, Virginia*

Mr. Jim Pritchett  
*National Center for State Courts  
Williamsburg, Virginia*

Chief Charles Ramsey\*  
*Major Cities Chiefs' Association  
Washington, DC*

Chief Ed Reina\*  
*Yavapai-Prescott Tribal Police  
Department  
Prescott, Arizona*

Mr. Dave Roberts  
*SEARCH  
Sacramento, California*

Colonel Michael D. Robinson\*  
*International Association of Chiefs  
of Police  
East Lansing, Michigan*

Mr. Thom Rubel\*  
*National Governors' Association  
Washington, DC*

Mr. William B. Simpkins\*  
*Drug Enforcement Administration  
Arlington, Virginia*

Ms. Karen Sublett  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Washington, DC*

Mr. John G. Swanson\*  
*U.S. Postal Inspection Service  
Arlington, Virginia*

Mr. John Terry  
*Institute for Intergovernmental  
Research  
Tallahassee, Florida*

Mr. David Walchak\*  
*Criminal Justice Information  
Services Division  
Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Scott Wallace\*  
*National Legal Aid and Defender  
Association  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Richard H. Ward III  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Gerry Wethington\*  
*Missouri Office of Information  
Technology  
Jefferson City, Missouri*

Ms. Shevella Wilson  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Washington, DC*

Colonel Robinson introduced Mr. Richard R. Nedelkoff, newly appointed Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA),<sup>4</sup> OJP, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). Prior to his appointment, as an administrator in five states, Mr. Nedelkoff created juvenile justice and criminal justice programs that continue to serve as models for agencies across the country. The central themes of his diverse 21-year public service career have been the reduction of bureaucracy, production of quick results, implementation of innovative programs, and formulation of solutions to problem situations.

Mr. Nedelkoff expressed pleasure in addressing the GAC. He underscored the importance of justice information sharing in light of the fact that “the world has changed, changed forever” as a result of the September terrorist attacks; speaking further to this topic, he pledged his support for the Administration’s express focus on the War on Terrorism. Mr. Nedelkoff stated that throughout his career he has emphasized the forming of coalitions, collaborative efforts, and seeking information from practitioners—all hallmarks of the GAC—making directorship of BJA (and, by extension, the Committee) a natural progression of his professional interests and experience.

Mr. Richard Ward III, Deputy Director, BJA, was then introduced. Mr. Ward concurred with Mr. Nedelkoff on the importance of justice information sharing. Illustrative of the department’s commitment to this issue, Mr. Ward highlighted several justice information integration activities supported by OJP<sup>5</sup>:

- *Facilitation of Justice Information Sharing Standards*<sup>6</sup>
- *Privacy/Public Access Initiative*<sup>7</sup>
- *Data Exchange Points Project*<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> More information on BJA is available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/>.

<sup>5</sup> More information on OJP integration initiatives is contained in *An Overview of OJP Bureaus, Offices, and COPS Information Technology Initiatives*, available at <http://www.it.ojp.gov/integration/files/overview.html>.

<sup>6</sup> A briefing on this issue was delivered later in the meeting. Please see pp. 6-17 for further information.

<sup>7</sup> A briefing on this issue was delivered later in the meeting. Please see pp. 20-23 for further information.

<sup>8</sup> A briefing on this issue was delivered later in the meeting. Please see pp. 39-40 for further information.

- **Information Architecture**—BJA is partnering with the National Association of State Chief Information Officers, or “NASCIO,”<sup>9</sup> (formerly known as the National Association of State Information Resource Executives, or “NASIRE”) to conceptualize and implement appropriate architectures, frameworks, and information sharing standards to facilitate and simplify the movement of justice information across jurisdictional boundaries.

In 1998, BJA awarded NASCIO a grant to conduct a State Information System Architecture Survey. This survey gained national attention in 1999, resulting in a vision for and plans to develop an architecture template to be adopted by the states. NASCIO is continuing work to implement the template, or planning guideline, at the local and state levels.

- **Industry Working Group**—BJA is working with the Industry Working Group (IWG) to elicit private sector viewpoints on various planned policy and implementation initiatives and to get recommendations for improving government approaches to procurement reform, technology refreshment, standards, and software development. Also, BJA is examining the feasibility of tasking a non-profit iteration of IWG to provide information technology assistance to local and state government organizations.
- **Local Governance Models**—Through a cooperative agreement with OJP, Public Technology, Inc. examined the types of structures that local governments either use, are contemplating implementing, or oversee in their justice information systems integration efforts. Approximately 250 rural, urban, and suburban cities and counties throughout the country were surveyed. The resulting report, *Mission Possible: Strong Governance Structures for the Integration of Justice Information Systems*,<sup>10</sup> includes survey findings as well as featured case studies of counties in Minnesota, California, Virginia, and Oregon that have already integrated information among local criminal justice agencies.
- **Strategic Planning Initiative**—The National Governors’ Association (NGA),<sup>11</sup> 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 were awarded to states showing promise as national role models. To apply for this supplemental funding, states submitted justice information sharing project proposals deemed attainable within two years. The NGA, NASCIO, and National Center for State Courts

---

<sup>9</sup> More information on NASCIO and the Information Architecture project can be found at [www.nascio.org](http://www.nascio.org).

<sup>10</sup> This report is available at <http://www.it.ojp.gov/manage/files/PTI-Mission.pdf>.

<sup>11</sup> More information on NGA is available at <http://www.nga.org/>.

(NCSC)<sup>12</sup> reviewed the proposals and offered award recommendations to BJA. Grants—ranging from \$40,000 to \$1 million—were made available to the selected states<sup>13</sup> under a program authorized by the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998, and are being administered by BJA.

Colonel Robinson reviewed the meeting agenda.<sup>14</sup> The following topics were slated for discussion:

- GAC Working Group Briefings
- Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision
- Enhanced Management of Criminal Dispositions
- Fingerprint-Based Court Dispositions
- Data Exchange Project
- GAC Annual Report
- Round-Table Discussion: Issues of Committee Concern

## **GAC Working Group Presentations**

GAC Working Groups are comprised of committee members and other subject-matter experts, and expand the general Committee's knowledge and experience. These groups are formed around timely issues impacting justice information sharing and meet as often as necessary. During 2001, the following working groups engaged in targeted activities on behalf of the GAC:

---

<sup>12</sup> More information on the NCSC is available at <http://www.ncsconline.org/>.

<sup>13</sup> A brief summary of each awarded project is available at <http://www.it.ojp.gov/initiatives/nga.html>.

<sup>14</sup> Committee gatherings are dynamic in nature. Consequently, the GAC Chairman may revise the agenda order to encourage the greatest degree of member and observer participation. Such was the case at the September 2001 meeting. However, to remain consistent with the printed agenda, presentation summaries contained in this document follow the original meeting schedule.

## **Infrastructure/Standards Working Group**

### **Purpose and Goal**

The Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (ISWG) was formed because successful broad-scale data exchange is greatly facilitated by (if not dependent on) the development and adoption of standards that enable transparent integration of disparate systems.

The goal of this working group is to define a framework that will assist government entities in establishing an operational environment that will enable them to share justice and public safety information within the guiding principles of the GAC. The framework will be designed to identify those critical components, programmatic and technical, necessary to develop and maintain a sound infrastructure.

### **Background**

Mr. Gerry Wethington, State of Missouri Chief Information Officer, Global representative of NASCIO and Chairman of ISWG, delivered the briefing.

As previously stated, successful data exchange across the justice constituencies hinges on coordinating standards. Currently there are numerous standards development efforts underway within the justice community, as well as other sectors such as public safety and transportation, which will undoubtedly enhance the overall safety of our citizens. Therefore, these activities, including efforts sponsored by industry, deserve close attention and coordination.

Recognizing this coordination to be imperative, in early March 2001, OJP sponsored a meeting to explore justice standards coordination. This event convened over 20 professionals dedicated to facilitating justice information sharing. Of the standards categories discussed, the group determined information sharing standards as the category requiring the most leadership.

The meeting goal was to identify a process to advance national justice information sharing standards. Attendees selected the GAC as the most appropriate body to support this endeavor. The participants asked that the GAC—through its ISWG—work with OJP to coordinate ongoing standards efforts in the justice community. This envisioned process would include cataloging and sharing of pertinent standards, as well as facilitating justice agencies' collaboration in standards development efforts.

Through the collaborative work of the meeting participants, a standards coordination process was developed and subsequently submitted for GAC consideration at the March 15, 2001, GAC meeting. Committee members unanimously ratified the proposal.

Upon receiving the support of GAC, members of the ISWG met in May, July, and September 2001 to refine the standards coordination process and discuss attendant issues, such as outreach activities—e.g., notifying the justice community of this valuable resource

and soliciting input—and the most appropriate mechanism to house the effort. ISWG members determined the Global Web site<sup>15</sup> as the most logical and accessible vehicle through which to publicize and execute the justice information sharing standards coordination process. The process will be contained within the Justice Standards Registry Program.

Mr. Wethington then briefed attendees on the fundamental tenets of the Justice Standards Registry Program (still in development). These principles, which will undergird the ISWG standards coordination program, have been the intensive focus of recent ISWG efforts.

### **Justice Standards Registry Program<sup>16</sup>**

As envisioned, **the goal of the Justice Standards Registry (“Registry”) Program** will be to collect information from, and provide useful information to, practitioners in the justice and public safety-related communities to facilitate interoperability and information sharing. Specifically, the aim of program is to identify—via a widely accessible mechanism (the Global Web site)—standards that are successfully used by practitioners to effect various levels of interoperability and information sharing.

The term “standards” may include:

- (1) Formal documents termed “standards” or “recommendations” by national or international Standards Development Organizations (SDOs),
- (2) Specifications, requests for comments, or other designated documents defined by Standards Related Organizations (SROs), or
- (3) Documents derived by other organizations, practitioner groups, or government entities that are designed to standardize functional operations, and/or the purchase of products and/or services.

All standards submitted to the Registry must come from a government agency or a representative of a government agency.

The **objectives of the Registry** program are as follows:

- A. To establish a central Web site where all justice and public safety-related practitioners can effectively receive and offer standards material regarding information technology (IT) interoperability and information sharing.
- B. To inform practitioners about the Registry, to acquaint them with its operation and benefits, and to encourage its use.
- C. To establish, within the Global Web site, a set of mechanisms by which practitioners can view information sharing-related standards submitted

---

<sup>15</sup> The Global Web site is located at <http://www.it.ojp.gov/global>. The Web site is discussed further in the *Outreach Working Group* section of this report.

<sup>16</sup> The Justice Standards Registry Program summary is taken from a publication drafted by staff at the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences, National Telecommunications and Information Administration; further information about this organization is available at <http://www.its.bldrdoc.gov/>.

by others; review comments related to practitioners' experiences with the listed standards; offer new or different standards for consideration; and share experiences relative to posted or suggested standards.

- D. To ensure that standards submitted for posting on the Web site are indeed offered by legitimate practitioners from the justice and public safety-related communities, from organizational entities with members who are practitioners, or from those with close ties to practitioners, and that the submitters have the required relationship to a governmental entity.
- E. To assist the practitioners in their quest for relevant information by highlighting, per each standard: (1) which groups of practitioners developed or influenced the development of the standard; (2) the scope or echelon of interoperability (local, state, regional, national, international) for which the standard is developed; (3) how many practitioners are using the standard, and/or how many may use the standard in the future; and (4) whether the standard conflicts with another standard in the Registry and/or provides an alternative approach to other posted standards.
- F. To assist practitioners in locating relevant information by characterizing each standard by subject area (e.g., data representation, Extensible Markup Language [XML], security), and by providing searches across a wide variety of parameters.
- G. To assist practitioners in their quest for information by developing a notification-subscription service through which practitioners can be automatically alerted when standards in their fields of interest have been incorporated into the Registry.
- H. To provide standards in the Registry that are relevant and accurate. To ensure this, periodic reviews will be conducted to reaffirm, revise, or withdraw the standards.

**Users and contributors to the Registry** will come from a variety of practitioner groups from the justice and public safety-related communities. Practitioner groups from local, state, federal, tribal, and international governments will participate, as well as organizations representing practitioners and their respective functions, including:

- Law Enforcement
- Corrections
- Courts
- District Attorney
- Public Defenders
- Probation/Parole
- Victim Services
- Fire
- Emergency Management Services
- Transportation
- Others—Public Works

**Ultimately, the success of the Justice Standards Registry will rely strongly on voluntary contributions from those in the justice and public safety communities.**

Since the Registry is being developed to assist a diverse set of users in the justice-and public-safety communities, a wide variety of standards are expected to be included. As previously noted, practitioners will submit standards developed by SDOs, SROs, and other entities addressing practitioners' needs. These standards will be of different types, will be focused on various elements of telecommunications and information technology (IT) architectural hierarchies, and will have reached different stages of maturity and implementation. This last point is particularly important: a standard (and its surrounding development activity) need not be complete in order for it to aid other efforts. Knowledge of standardization actions can many times lead to cooperative endeavors and synergistic products. Therefore, the inclusion of standards concepts, standards projects, and draft standards into the Registry will provide an "early warning system" for practitioners; this is an extremely important function of the program. Even after standards have reached their "final" status (either as "completed" or "implemented" standards), ongoing monitoring should occur. These standards need to be periodically resubmitted and revalidated to ensure only relevant standards remain in the Registry.

## **Next Steps**

A targeted group has been formed to advance the development of the Registry process. This group, the ISWG Process Development Subcommittee, will draw on Working Group members as well as standards experts outside the ISWG. Mr. Tom Hopper, Computer Engineer, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), will serve as chairman. When the Registry program is ready to receive submissions, a number of candidate standards have been selected to undergo the process.

The next presentation highlights several of these candidate standards—individually, and in relation to a reconciliation effort borne of these developers' willingness to collaborate in pursuit of a greater information sharing capability.

## **A First Test: The Extensible Markup Language (XML) Reconciliation Effort**

Mr. Wethington turned the floor over to Mr. John Loverude, Chairman, Joint Task Force on Rap Sheet Standardization, and Mr. Thomas Henderson, Executive Director, Office of Government Relations, NCSC, to brief the GAC on an example of successful justice information sharing standards coordination.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> The XML section summary was compiled from the presentation by Mr. Loverude and Mr. Henderson as well as support materials generated from the XML Reconciliation Effort.

## The Problem

Despite implications for increased public safety, there is no *universal* justice community standard for sharing data across information systems. In recent years—in this absence of a common mode of data exchange—many justice agencies have forged ahead alone, developing their own specific standards and databases for collecting and sharing information. These databases are typically constructed of different computer hardware, operating systems, and software products, and often contain information in different formats from other justice agencies' databases.

Prior solutions to problems resulting from dissimilar databases and information sharing standards include custom gateway programming, entry of the same data into multiple systems, and granting individual users access to different systems. However, a more manageable and less redundant alternative involves various agencies' electronic data simply being subjected to a translation process whereby the data locations are mapped and exchanged. This process would utilize XML to address problems of interoperability, allowing justice community agencies to exchange information with a maximum of flexibility at a reasonable level of development effort and cost.

By way of background, XML was developed out of the standard generalized markup language (a page definition and formatting language). XML is sanctioned by the World Wide Web Consortium<sup>18</sup> to define a way of transmitting and representing data. XML is designed to transmit *data* and the *meaning of the data* by allowing 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 fully support the general XML standard. Major database vendors and their database applications provide software development “tools” to assist justice agency technical staff to develop and use XML more efficiently and productively within agency applications. XML is very developer-friendly, yet ordinary users with no particular XML expertise can look at an XML file and make sense of it. The XML standard is designed to be independent of vendor, operating system, source application, destination application, storage medium, and/or transport protocol.

## XML Solutions: Three Approaches

In March 2001, to explore XML facilitation of justice information sharing, OJP, through the ISWG, supported the convening of XML Technology Working Group. Participants in this (ongoing) effort are data-exchange experts from three XML justice information sharing projects and standards specialists from the Institute for

---

<sup>18</sup> More information on the World Wide Web Consortium is available at <http://www.w3.org/>.

Telecommunication Sciences, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA).<sup>19</sup>

Information about the three participating XML projects follows:

1. ***Joint Task Force Rap Sheet Standardization Project***

In 1995, the National Task Force on Increasing the Utility of the Criminal History Record recommended expanded data content, a presentation format (page layout) for the expanded content, and the creation of a transmission format for the interstate sharing of criminal history information. The National Task Force included representatives from the FBI, FBI Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Advisory Policy Board (APB), National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System (NLETS),<sup>20</sup> NCSC, and SEARCH, the National Consortium for Justice and Statistics (“SEARCH”). Its members were a diverse array of justice practitioners drawn from the judiciary; prosecution; court administration; local, state, and federal law enforcement; juvenile justice pre-trial services; and state criminal records repositories.

In 1996, the Joint Task Force (JTF) on Rap Sheet Standardization—with representation from the FBI CJIS Division, the APB, NLETS, SEARCH, and local and state law enforcement agencies—was formed to carry forward the work of the National Task Force by developing a standardized criminal history transmission format.

Subsequently, this original JTF draft specification presentation format was revised with additional data and an XML-based transmission format. Although it was a significant task to transform the specification from its previous American National Standards Institute/National Institute of Standards and Technology (ANSI/NIST) version to one using XML, the data elements have remained largely unchanged. The most significant additions are the data elements that allow for transmission of images.

2. ***LegalXML Court Filing Standard Initiative***

Pursuant to discussions at an August 1999 planning meeting, the Conference of State Court Administrators/National Association of Court Managers Joint Technology Committee (JTC) formed an E-Filing Standards subcommittee to pursue an Internet electronic filing specification for the courts.

---

<sup>19</sup> More information on NTIA is available at <http://www.its.bldrdoc.gov/>.

<sup>20</sup> More information on NLETS is available at <http://www.nlets.org/>.

To that end, in December 1999, the JTC voted to partner with LegalXML,<sup>21</sup> a non-profit organization that facilitates development of XML standards for application within the legal community. This coalition produced the LegalXML Court Filing Standard.

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, nor 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 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.

### 3. **Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS)<sup>22</sup> XML Data Exchange Specification**

During 2000, the Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS) Program developed an XML Data Exchange Specification to allow law enforcement agencies to more easily share criminal intelligence

---

<sup>21</sup> More information about LegalXML is available at <http://www.legalxml.org/>.

<sup>22</sup> More information about RISS is available at <http://www.iir.com/riss/>.

information with a maximum of flexibility at a reasonable level of development effort and cost.

The RISS XML Data Exchange Specification has several features that facilitate and enhance data sharing between different agency criminal intelligence databases:

- Certain criminal intelligence systems are required by law, regulation, or funding guidelines to be in compliance with the 28 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 23, which contains criminal intelligence system operating policies. The RISS XML Data Exchange Specification is in compliance with applicable federal law and regulations governing the storage and dissemination of information in online criminal intelligence databases. Where compliance is not required, the RISS XML Data Exchange Specification allows the 28 CFR Part 23 portions of the specification to be ignored.
- The RISS XML Data Exchange Specification supports four different levels of information exchange: a query, a query response to allow a “picklist” to be generated, detailed information about a “picklist” record, and submitting officer contact information.
- The RISS XML Data Exchange Specification is designed to provide support for legacy systems to allow data sharing without major changes. Systems can share their data by the addition of an interface that communicates according to the XML Data Exchange Specification. This allows systems to share their data more easily than other data-sharing solutions. The system may be modified or upgraded without requiring other systems that share data to make major changes. As long as compliance is maintained with the XML Data Exchange Specification, no other system will be affected by modifications or upgrades to one agency’s database.
- The RISS XML Data Exchange Specification can be easily modified to allow for additional elements and functionality as additional or revised needs are identified.

While each of these three XML projects addressed specific constituencies’ needs, Working Group members acknowledged early on the unifying goals of enhanced agency efficiency and increased public safety. In response, participants have worked toward reconciling the three specifications and creating a common data dictionary for use by other developers of XML justice information sharing standards.

## **The Result: Reconciliation Yields Enhanced Information Sharing**

Through the efforts of the XML Technology Working Group members, over 125 XML data tags (a step which helps identify data element content) have been reconciled between the three specifications. The resulting *XML Justice Data Dictionary* will be posted on the Global Web site, to serve as a blueprint for related efforts. Additionally, participants have distilled important “lessons learned” and standards development principles, such as “agreeing not to conflict” to ensure a single tag does not mean different things across systems wishing to share information. These lessons and principles, as well as a brief history of the XML reconciliation effort, are being drafted into an *XML Reconciliation Process Report*, which will also be available on the Global Web site.

## **Next Steps**

The three projects plan to submit their respective revised standards and the attendant common *XML Justice Data Dictionary* and Standards Development Principles to ISWG for processing through the Justice Standards Registry Program. To that end, XML Working Group participants presented a number of proposals to ISWG, which were in turn ratified and integrated into today’s ISWG recommendations to the GAC.<sup>23</sup> (Mr. Wethington presented the entire ISWG slate of recommendations following the briefing by Mr. Loverude and Mr. Henderson.)

As far as continuing the momentum of this foundation effort, if approved by the GAC, an important step is expansion of the XML Reconciliation Effort. After considering a number of candidates, it was decided that the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA)<sup>24</sup> is an excellent candidate for inclusion. The data AAMVA shares—such as information about driver licensing and vehicle registration—is certainly relevant to the justice community. Also, AAMVA has standards ready for submission to the ISWG process, and is developing its own XML Data Dictionary. Logically, collaborating on these efforts will benefit all parties.

The floor was returned to Mr. Wethington.

## **Moving Standards Coordination Forward: ISWG Recommendations to the GAC**

Over the course of recent meetings, ISWG members determined a number of items requiring GAC support in order to proceed. Therefore, Mr. Wethington concluded the ISWG presentation by enumerating a roster of proposals for GAC consideration. Discussion followed each recommendation, and in some instances, minor amendments were made to the proposal language. For the sake of brevity, the recommendations listed below reflect any amendments. GAC member voting specifics are included.

---

<sup>23</sup> For a list of recommendations ratified by the GAC at this meeting, please see *Attachment A*.

<sup>24</sup> For more information about AAMVA, please see <http://www.aamva.org/>.

1) Recommend to the U.S. Attorney General that OJP:

- Establish the Justice Standards Registry Program,
- Incorporate this program into the Global Web site, and
- Establish an annual budget to institutionalize the program.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Gary Cooper, GAC Vice Chair and Executive Director of SEARCH, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

2) Direct the Global Outreach Working Group to:

- Develop a program that promotes the Justice Standards Registry Program as one that is nationally recognized and enables information sharing and interoperability between and within public safety, justice, and related information technology systems, and
- Prepare a “Value Statement” to highlight easily recognizable benefits to those considering the Justice Standards Registry Program.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Louis Hentzen, District Court Administrator, National Association for Court Management, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

3) That upon completion, editing, and review by necessary parties, OJP release the *XML Reconciliation Process Report* as soon as possible.

- This *Reconciliation* document chronicles the history, standards development principles, and achievements of the coordinative efforts between:
  - JTF Rap Sheet Standardization
  - RISS XML Data Exchange Specification
  - LegalXML Court Filing Standard

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. John Swanson, Program Manager, Information Technology Division, U.S. Postal Inspection Services, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

4) That OJP assign ownership of the developed *XML Justice Data Dictionary* to a qualified entity for the purpose of sponsoring its submission to the Justice Standards Registry Program.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Henderson, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 5) That OJP assign ownership of the developed XML Standard Development Principles to a qualified entity for the purpose of sponsoring its submission to the Justice Standards Registry Program.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Swanson, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 6) That OJP, upon establishment of the *XML Justice Data Dictionary* within the Justice Standards Registry, assign the role of caretaker of that Dictionary to a qualified entity.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Hentzen, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 7) That Global recommend that OJP be directed to continue its support of the information sharing standards development process; e.g., XML and related efforts within/between justice and other partners.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, amended (reflected above), and seconded by Jim Gallagher, Esquire, Acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Justice Management Division. The motion, as amended, was brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 8) That Global recommend that OJP facilitate an outreach effort, through the Global Advisory Committee, to identify and contact other XML efforts and parties.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, amended (reflected above), and seconded by Mr. Henderson. The motion, as amended, was brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 9) That Global recommend that OJP, through Global/ISWG, to promote convening ad hoc groups, as needed, in support of XML and other justice and public safety-related information sharing and standards initiatives.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Cooper, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 10) That Global recommend that OJP, through Global/ISWG, continue in its advisory capacity regarding XML-related issues.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Cabell Cropper, Executive Director, National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA)<sup>25</sup>, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 11) That Global accept and authorize ISWG to proceed with the following agenda:

---

<sup>25</sup> More information on NCJA is available at [www.ncja.org](http://www.ncja.org).

- Identify and prioritize infrastructure projects, to include revision of the *Infrastructure Interim Report*, and the incorporation of NASCIO reports and other pertinent efforts that will aid and accelerate the sharing of justice information, and
- Monitor the operation of the Justice Standards Registry Program and make recommendations for improvement.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Swanson, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 12) That the Global Executive Steering Committee develop strategic recommendations that effectively link ongoing information sharing and integration efforts within OJP for the benefit of the justice and public safety communities.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Steve Correll, Executive Director, NLETS, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

## **Security Working Group**

### **Background and Goal**

The Security Working Group was formed in recognition of the fact that the security of the entire justice information exchange enterprise is only as strong as the weakest link. Of particular importance is the determination of effective security standards for legacy networks/systems, as well as the new and enhanced networks and systems to which they are joined.

The goal of this working group is to inform the justice and justice-related communities about acceptable integrated justice system security measures, encouraging them to adopt security standards that have been reviewed to ensure trusted partnerships and data integrity.

### **Recent Activities**

Mr. Correll delivered the Security Working Group (SWG) briefing. Mr. Correll recently assumed Chairmanship of the group from Major Bill Gordon, Atlanta Police Department.

Mr. Correll's presentation focused on the SWG's first meeting, held via teleconference on Wednesday, September 12, 2001. Major Gordon served as Chair of that

meeting, and Mr. John Terry, the Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR),<sup>26</sup> was moderator. Twelve participants joined in the call.

The agenda included:

- Introduction to the overall goal of the SWG (previously enumerated)
- Identification of minimum security standards necessary to allow justice information sharing
- Overview of justice information security issues (summarized below)
- General discussion (highlights following)

### Overview of Security Issues

Conference call participant Mr. Alan Harbitter, Chief Technology Officer, PEC Solutions, presented an overview of issues critical for the security of justice information systems. He identified the following technical issues that need to be addressed:

- Electronic trust
- Data confidentiality and integrity
- Protection of critical infrastructure
- Managed security systems
- Security in a mobile context

These issues span three security categories:

1. Confidentiality—This entails the protection of private data from inappropriate access. Ensuring confidentiality while sharing information requires establishing electronic trust between organizations within the justice community. Agencies have different ways of operating their own systems. A basic trust is essential to ensure the smooth sharing of information on how each agency operates their system and handles their information. Two questions needed to be answered first: What constitutes the basis for electronic trust? What do organizations expect from each other?
2. Integrity—*Integrity* refers to the accuracy of the officially posted records and documents, which must be safeguarded against hackers. For example, Sex Offender Lists have to have a high level of integrity.
3. Availability—Systems providing information essential to the law enforcement process must be ready when needed. Justice organizations need to establish policies that properly protect privacy rights while making needed information available as required by law.

---

<sup>26</sup> IIR is funded by BJA to provide support to the GAC and associated working groups. This assistance takes a variety of forms and includes meeting planning, report preparation, Web site development, and conference call coordination. Information on IIR is available at <http://www.iir.com>.

## General Discussion

- Sense of Urgency—At this time of increasing hacker incidents and terrorist attacks, there is an urgent need to protect justice-related infrastructures and employ managed security systems. Justice information systems need to increase their guard against these potential risks through intrusion testing, vulnerability assessments, and development of Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) technology.<sup>27</sup> Different industry and technical groups are developing PKI technology. In order to ensure interoperability within the justice community, agencies need to agree on how to use PKI to make sure their technologies are compatible.

Major Gordon stated that the SWG needed to move quickly, especially since the security issue is so timely.

- Leveraging Existing Resources—Mr. Clay Jester, IIR, suggested that the SWG should look at the types of security measures already available; for example, the Security Assertions Markup Language (SAML),<sup>28</sup> an XML-based security standard for exchanging authentication and authorization information.
- Immediate Practitioner Need: Glossary of Security-related Terms—Several participants suggested assembling a glossary of security terms, to include definitions of data types needing protection. It was decided the glossary should be housed on the Global Web site.

## Next Steps: Face-to-Face Meeting

Conference call participants agreed that the SWG should hold its first face-to-face meeting in mid-January 2002; a group of 12 to 15 working group members will be assembled. This group will be tasked with defining the issues and needs of practitioners in the security area. To answer those fundamental questions, it was suggested that two-thirds of the focus group representatives be practitioners. To achieve this composition, key personnel from each justice-related constituency (e.g., law enforcement, courts, corrections) will identify persons who can knowledgeably participate in a dialogue about security-related policy and technological issues.

Mr. Correll looked forward to reporting on the January gathering—including presenting a 2002 SWG agenda—at the next GAC Meeting.

---

<sup>27</sup> For additional information on PKI technology, see <http://www.pkiforum.org/>.

<sup>28</sup> More information on SAML is available at <http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/security/> and <http://www.xmltrustcenter.org/saml/index.htm>.

# Privacy Working Group

## Background and Goal

The Privacy Working Group was formed because of the growing need to address information privacy as impacted by advancing technological capabilities. Indeed, *privacy* may become one of the most important technology issues of the 21st century.

The goals of this working group are to assist governments in ensuring that personal information will not be inappropriately disseminated or misused, and that there are safeguards against the collection and use of inaccurate information—particularly when the information is disseminated in open environments such as Internet-based systems. The GAC will provide practical templates and tools for assessing jurisdictions’ privacy and public access issues, and for implementing policies to balance these interests.

## Recent Activities

Mr. Scott Wallace, Director of Legal Services, National Legal Aid and Defender Association (NLADA)<sup>29</sup>, and Vice Chair of the Privacy Working Group, outlined the group’s major effort: production of the *Justice Information Privacy Guidelines* (“*Guidelines*”).

This resource is chiefly a composite of three publications originally conceived as stand-alone documents:

1. *Privacy Design Principles for an Integrated Justice System*, providing implementers with a broad list of privacy issues to be considered before and during the development of integrated systems.
2. *Privacy Impact Assessment for Justice Information Systems*, providing implementers with a road map for determining the level of privacy protection offered by existing and planned systems, and guidance on how to protect sensitive systems and associated data.
3. *Public Access to Criminal Justice Electronic Records*, guiding policy makers in determining what data should be made public and raising awareness about the substantial concerns that shape access to this information.

The *Guidelines* document—which is in the final drafting stages by Anne Gardner, Esquire, Assistant U.S. Attorney, Eastern District of Arkansas—builds on the strengths of these documents and includes supplementary information. In addition to Ms. Gardner’s extensive efforts, foundation work for this resource has been done by members of the Privacy Working Group (via conference calls) and other similarly concerned focus groups. When completed, the comprehensive document will include the following sections:

---

<sup>29</sup> More information on NLADA can be found at [www.nlada.org](http://www.nlada.org).

- **“Introduction of Justice Information Systems,”** addressing:
  - What is an integrated justice information system?
  - Defining a justice “record”
  - Describing information privacy
  - Privacy Impact Assessment—Four questions determining whether an agency should conduct as such an assessment
  - Who should be responsible for assessing/implementing a privacy policy?
  
- **“Privacy Design Principles”** section, promulgating the following ideas and intentions:
  - Broad, general principles from which local, state, and tribal jurisdictions can develop working privacy policies
  - Intends to supplement laws and regulations
  - Intends to spark discussion on applying privacy policy to justice information systems
  - Intends to spark discussion on information technologies that can improve privacy protections

This section also examines the follow data-collection principles:

- Purpose of collection
  - Limits placed on collection
  - Quality assurances
  - Limit placed on use
  - Security safeguard placed on data
  - Openness principles/policies
  - Individual rights
  - Data accountability
- 
- **“Application of Privacy Design Principles”** section, helping users—
    - Determine privacy rules for interagency information exchange
    - Develop a data element decision tree, to
      - Identify non-disclosure information
      - Identify disclosure information
      - Identify publicly accessible information
    - Develop a written Public Access Policy
      - Information can change from “public” and “non-public,” depending upon timing
    - Determine information essentials
      - Value
      - Accessibility
      - Cost
      - Education and training

- “**Privacy Policy Template**” section, helping users—
  - Develop a Privacy Policy Template
    - Purpose statement
    - Defined policy scope
    - Verification and correction statement
    - Who is approved for access?
    - What information can be accessed?
    - Method of access
  
- “**Privacy Impact Assessment**” section, answering the following questions—
  - What is a Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA)?
  - What are the objectives and goals of a PIA?
  - When is a PIA needed?
    - Relevance
    - Timing
  - Who develops the PIA?

This section also addresses:

- Defining risk
- Technical points of risk
  - Authentication
  - Access control
  - Confidentiality
  - Non-repudiation
  - Integrity
  - Availability
- Managing risk
- Conclusion—Overview of Entire Process

## Next Steps

To move the *Guidelines* forward, as well as further examine privacy issues related to justice information sharing, the following actions are recommended:

- When the *Guidelines* draft is finished, distribute to members of the Privacy Working Group for their review. Additionally, determine other privacy experts to include in this process, and perhaps hold a small group meeting to facilitate the review.
  
- When completed and vetted, promote the *Guidelines* via several avenues:
  - Hard copy distribution
  - Electronic access via the Global Web site
  - Development of version on CD-ROM

- Orient high-level legislators to the privacy issues by hosting discussions on the topic, to include consideration of legislation.
- Determine additional members for the Privacy Working Group.

## **Outreach Working Group**

### **Background and Goal**

To engender widespread justice information sharing participation and support, a great deal of education and sharing of expertise still needs to take place.

The goal of the Outreach Working Group is to inform the justice and justice-related communities about the functions, activities, and objectives of the GAC, encouraging them to create an environment that promotes the sharing of justice information utilizing efficient and cost-effective technologies and practices.

### **Recent Activities**

Superintendent Mel Carraway, Indiana State Police and Outreach Working Group Chairman, joined the meeting by conference call. He highlighted a number of outreach efforts and projects executed since the last GAC meeting.

- ***Publication***

The *Police Chief* Magazine

According to their Web site,<sup>30</sup> *Police Chief* is the “...official monthly publication of the IACP provid[ing] a forum for sharing the collective expertise of the law enforcement practitioners who write the magazine articles. [The] principal mission is to enhance our readers’ understanding of the latest trends and practices in the law enforcement profession.... Each issue of *Police Chief* focuses on a different topic of special interest to police executives, determined by reader response to independent surveys and direct feedback from IACP committees.”

The editorial focus of the September 2001 *Police Chief* is “Innovative Technologies in Law Enforcement.” Global officials were invited to produce an executive summary on the GAC, to be included in this issue of the magazine. A draft was produced and is currently featured in the magazine under Chairman Robinson’s signature.

---

<sup>30</sup> Located at: <http://www.theiacp.org/pubinfo/pc/>.

- ***OJP Information Technology (IT) Initiatives/Global Web Site***<sup>31</sup>

GAC members contribute significantly to the OJP IT Web site, a comprehensive site developed for justice practitioners at all levels of government and all stages of justice information sharing. Topics include:

- Information sharing initiatives
- Computer systems information exchange processes
- New policy and technological developments
- Procurement
- Model information sharing system
- Information sharing “lessons learned”
- Promising practices.

As a featured part of the OJP IT Web site, users can access the ***Global-specific*** “site within the site,” referenced during the ISWG presentation. This site serves a variety of functions:

- Notifying the public of upcoming GAC meetings and posting of related *Federal Register* announcements
- Outlining the structure of the GAC, including listing of Committee leaders, member agencies and representatives (including URLs and contact information, respectively), and Working Groups
- Publishing GAC and Working Group documents, such as meeting summaries, presentations, Security Working Group *Glossary of Terms*, Privacy Working Group *Guidelines*, and the *GAC Annual Report*
- Housing the Justice Information Registry Program, including results of the XML Reconciliation Effort, highlighted by Mr. Wethington and Mr. Henderson during the ISWG Working Group briefing.

- ***Collateral and Instructional Aids***

Several pieces of support and “leave behind” materials have been/are being developed to assist GAC members in their outreach activities:

- *Promotional cards* outlining Global and the OJP IT Initiatives Web site are available in hard copy<sup>32</sup> and online.<sup>33</sup>
- *Mouse pads* promoting the OJP IT Initiatives/Global Web site are planned for production in early 2002.
- A generic PowerPoint presentation about Global is being developed, for access from the Global Web site.

---

<sup>31</sup> Available at: <http://www.it.ojp.gov>.

<sup>32</sup> For copies of these cards, please call IIR staff at (850) 385-0600, extension 285.

<sup>33</sup> Available at: <http://www.it.ojp.gov/global/admin/files/global.pdf> and <http://www.it.ojp.gov/services/files/it-ojp-gov.pdf>.

- A videotape on Global, emphasizing the importance of broad-scale justice-related information sharing and outlining GAC-related activities in pursuit of this capability, is planned for development in 2002.

### **Next Steps: Continue Spreading the Word**

In closing, Superintendent Carraway thanked attendees for their efforts in advancing the GAC. He encouraged members' continued promotion of the Committee through formal measures—such as presentation at justice-related conferences—as well as informal means; i.e., “word-of-mouth,” throughout their constituencies. The new Global Web site and informational cards should prove invaluable support tools in these conversations.

### **Reports from the Field: Efforts Impacting Justice Information Sharing**

The GAC has engaged the entire justice community in a dialogue about information sharing for several years. As a result of this longevity and comprehensive Committee composition, the GAC has established itself as a premier forum for briefing a broad range of constituencies on justice data exchange efforts. Through these presentations, a reciprocal flow of information is achieved: constituencies are informed of ongoing and new efforts via GAC representatives “pushing” information back to the disciplines, thereby highlighting resources and providing opportunities for collaboration; conversely, GAC representatives and invited guests provide reports from the field, “pulling” information up through involved constituencies to apprise fellow Committee members about activities of which they may be unaware.

In this spirit, at the September 2001 meeting, the GAC heard presentations on the following information exchange efforts:

- Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision
- Enhanced Management of Criminal Dispositions
- Fingerprint-Based Court Dispositions
- Date Exchange Points Project

## **Presentation: Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision<sup>34</sup>**

Mr. Kermit Humphries, Program Specialist, National Institute of Corrections,<sup>35</sup> and Rick Masters, Esquire, General Counsel, Council of State Governments,<sup>36</sup> provided the following presentation:

### **Background**

The primary reasons for supervising convicted adult offenders are to protect the public and to address offenders' behavioral needs to avoid future criminal activity. Within a state there are statutes, rules, regulations, public and private agencies, information systems, and personal relationships that permit identification of offenders. However, that in-state guidance and structure ceases to clearly exist when a probationer or parolee resides or receives community-based treatment in a different state or United States territory. While the reciprocal spirit of interstate supervision requires that the "sending state" request courtesy supervision from the "receiving state" before probationers/parolees can live in that state, what has been *absent* is any form of automated exchange of related information: case files are sent through the mail, and information is rarely shared beyond the constituencies of probation and parole. Additionally, although interstate supervision of parolees and probationers is a nationwide public safety concern, it is *not* a federal responsibility. This is because more than 95% of these supervised offenders (estimated at more than a quarter of a million) are under state or local jurisdiction.

### **Previous Response**

The Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Probationers and Parolees ("Compact") is aimed at protecting the public from actions by offenders under the jurisdiction of courts or paroling authorities, regardless of which side of a state boundary an offense is committed. However, the current system is over 60 years old—outdated and overwhelmed.

Additionally, the organizational structure surrounding the Compact is in need of review. Currently, Compact administrators join together through the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators Association (PPCAA) for the purpose of maintaining rules and managing activities. While operating under language contained in the Compact, this body does not draw specific power and authority from the Compact.

Therefore, problems associated with the Compact's outdated system and organizational structure include:

- Frequent violations of Compact rules
- Little ability to enforce Compact compliance

---

<sup>34</sup> This summary reproduces handout materials provided by the speakers.

<sup>35</sup> More information on the National Institute of Corrections can be found at <http://www.nicic.org/>.

<sup>36</sup> More information on the Council of State Governments can be found at <http://www.csg.org/>.

- Slow and unreliable exchange of case information
- Lack of available routine data

### **The Revised Compact**

In response to issues such as those enumerated above, a replacement Interstate Compact has been proposed and is expected to take effect within 12 months. (The revised Compact has been introduced in 44 states and must be enacted by 35 of these to take effect; currently, 24 states have enacted the revision.) Regardless of advancing technology, no automated system is feasible without the creation of an organization with legal authority and resources to manage Compact policies and compliance. Acknowledging this, a major goal of this replacement Compact is to create an organizational structure that will permit timely exchange of information about the offenders who have permission to travel to or reside in other states.

As planned, the new Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision will serve corrections well in the management of parolees and probationers moving between states. However, nationwide public safety will be greatly enhanced when *all* related information systems have the capacity to retrieve appropriately selected information about these individuals. In pursuit of this goal, a Web-based approach is the best option: it will resolve the needs presented by the adult offender population; facilitate widespread information sharing; and be within the capacity of agencies to implement. This final phase of the Compact project still needs to be initiated, and interoperability with other justice systems must be designed into any system created.

### **Final Thoughts: Why There *Must* Be Effective Interstate Supervision**

According to the speakers, the reason for interstate supervision of adult offenders is simple: public safety. Absent an effective interstate compact, there are no nationwide controls on the movement of local and state probationers and parolees. Consider the following:

***Fragmented System***—On January 1, 1996, 3,285 local probation and parole offices were being operated by 861 separate agencies. This high degree of decentralization requires the establishment of protocols, guidelines, and structures to facilitate interstate and interagency probation and parole business such as case transfers and investigations.

***Public Trust and Confidence***—Managing offender populations is becoming increasingly complex. Local and state governments are passing measures dealing with special offender and high-risk groups, such as registering sex offenders and notifying victims regarding offenders' locations. Probation and parole must be able to satisfy compliance requirements, track the location of offenders, smoothly transfer supervision authority, and—when necessary—return offenders to the originating jurisdictions. Interstate activity involving offenders must be governed by public policies that ensure equity and justice for all involved parties, including victims of crime.

**Reduced Re-offending**—There are legitimate reasons why it is most likely an offender will succeed (that is, not re-offend) in a certain location. Those reasons generally relate to responsible family support and employment. In response, the existing Compact permits a probationer or parolee to reside in a different state if:

1. The person is a resident or has family members residing within the receiving state and can find employment there. The offender must have an offer of employment or a visible means of support; or,
2. Though not a resident of the receiving state and not having family members residing there, the receiving state consents to the probationer or parolee being sent.

**Numbers of Offenders**—In 1997, states reported that over 115,000 adult offenders (3% of all active probation/parole cases) had been transferred from one state to another. It is estimated that an equal number of offenders are authorized to travel across state lines for various reasons. Therefore, a reasonable estimate of the number of adult probationers and parolees living or traveling in states other than where they were convicted is approaching a quarter of a million, and growing annually.

Chairman Robinson thanked Mr. Humphries and Mr. Masters for their presentation, noting it as a “particularly timely issue.”

### **Presentation: Enhanced Management of Criminal Dispositions in State and National Repositories<sup>37</sup>**

Mr. David Gavin, Assistant Chief of Administration, Texas Department of Public Safety, gave the following presentation.

#### **An Overview**

Over the last decade, with significant support from grant monies made available to states from the National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP),<sup>38</sup> Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS),<sup>39</sup> OJP, progress has been made in attaching court dispositions to fingerprint-supported notations of arrest. While these efforts have improved the nation’s disposition reporting rate, much remains to be done. For example, the growing sophistication of judicial information systems has simplified reporting to state repositories. At the same time, it has also highlighted the need for a new look at the problem of criminal histories in light of the growing volume of dispositions that *cannot* be linked back to arrests.

---

<sup>37</sup> This summary reproduces handout materials provided by the speaker.

<sup>38</sup> More information on NCHIP is available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/nchip.htm>.

<sup>39</sup> More information on BJS is available at <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/>.

The reasons for the inability to link dispositions to arrests are varied. They include:

- Confusion generated by prosecutors' charging decisions;
- The fact that many felony dispositions begin as misdemeanors, which are initiated with a citation rather than an arrest;
- Administrative errors resulting in lost tracking numbers;
- Adjudications that begin by indictments rather than arrests; and
- Inadequate reporting or non-reporting of fingerprints at time of arrest.

In an effort to identify some solutions to the problem of missing dispositions, BJA convened a focus group on June 26, 2001, to consider a new concept of operations regarding the gathering, storing, and disseminating of criminal dispositions in state and national repositories.

### **Focus Group Discussion of the Problem**

Focus group members were in general agreement that the role of criminal history repositories has undergone a major transition: law enforcement and criminal justice agencies have traditionally been the primary user of the repositories for investigative and court purposes, but that is no longer the case. The increasing emphasis by the state and national legislatures on criminal background screening for persons in positions of trust (often administering to members of vulnerable populations)—nurses, teachers, day care workers—has brought the repositories a new emphasis. The FBI now performs only slightly fewer non-criminal justice fingerprint searches than criminal justice searches. The “Brady Bill” requirement for background searches for the purchase of firearms is perhaps the most notable non-criminal justice use of these repositories.

This increasing non-criminal justice workload has dramatically highlighted the problem of missing dispositions. In most cases, the entities initiating those searches are seeking disqualifying criminal dispositions rather than histories of arrest; however, the inquiries are processed through the state and national criminal history repositories that mostly rely on the existence of arrest records for the application of dispositions. Of course, the existence of arrests in the records and in the responses is important because they provide law enforcement agencies investigative value, and can provide non-criminal justice agencies with notice of an open arrest that needs to be reviewed for its dispositions. If the rising national need for criminal dispositions is a call for a more effective national criminal dispositions background check system, how should this call be answered? Is there a need for a radically different system, or can the state and national criminal history repository systems be approached in a new way, to build on their strengths and make them more effective in replying to the need for criminal dispositions?

The focus group members acknowledged that there are many issues relevant to the availability of dispositions, but viewed the issue linking dispositions to arrests as particularly suitable for emphasis at this time. In many states, there are dispositions being reported—

often electronically—that cannot be applied to the computerized criminal history file because the corresponding arrest event has not been reported. Many states link the dispositions to the arrests through the SID and tracking number or other case-related information. Without the links to those arrests, the dispositions are either returned to the submitting agencies or remain in “suspense” files, oftentimes invisible to law enforcement inquires and non-criminal justice background searches. Most practitioners would agree that the creation of a name-based disposition file to make these “unlinked” dispositions visible is not the ultimate answer. However, the focus group participants acknowledged that such an approach opened possibilities for enhancing access to the current records in the short term.

The question then became: Can dispositions be reported to and retained in the state and national criminal history files without their having to be linked to arrests? To answer that, focus group members discussed how to link a disposition to the person rather than to the arrest, that is, how to link a disposition to a person when a link to an arrest is absent.

The group agreed that linking the disposition to the person must be accomplished through fingerprints. Members discussed issues associated with fingerprinting persons subsequent to disposition for submission to the repository systems, including the legal, technical, policy, operational, philosophical, and other issues related to this approach. A wholehearted endorsement of this concept could require a shift regarding how dispositions are reported and managed in this country.

The focus group identified three different situations to be considered:

1. *Situation One*—When the person has a previous arrest record in the file, the arrest fingerprints for the disposition in question have been submitted and exist in the computerized criminal history file, but the reported disposition cannot be linked to that arrest for reasons like a lack of a tracking number, or a discrepancy in the dates of arrest or other information. If the disposition is reported without fingerprints, it cannot be entered into the file. If fingerprints were to accompany the disposition report, the disposition could be verifiably linked to the person and perhaps even to the correct arrest, and could be entered into the file.
2. *Situation Two*—When the person has a previous arrest record, but the arrest fingerprints for the disposition in question have not been submitted, and do not exist in the computerized criminal history file. When the disposition is submitted without fingerprints, it cannot be entered into the file. If fingerprints were to be submitted with the disposition, the disposition could be linked to the individual via the fingerprints submitted with other arrests, and the disposition could be entered into the criminal history file as a “stand-alone” disposition.
3. *Situation Three*—When the individual does not have a previous arrest record and the arrest fingerprints for the disposition in question have not been submitted. There is no record for the person in the computerized criminal

history file. The focus group discussed the *establishment* of the record with disposition fingerprints, but at this point was only comfortable with the idea if the fingerprints were a full, rolled set of fingerprints, such as would be reported upon arrest.

## **Focus Group Findings**

As previously stated, the group agreed that non-reported dispositions remain a problem, and efforts to assist courts and court clerks in reporting should continue to be a part of the national strategy for improving dispositions in criminal history repositories. However, the focus group findings were limited to the topic of linking reported dispositions within the repository.

The following findings were determined:

1. *The association (by fingerprints) of the disposition directly with the person when the link through the arrest is not possible will increase the number of dispositions in repositories.*
2. *This concept has value and deserves investigation with leadership from the national level. The national leadership has to be collaborative among law enforcement, prosecution, courts, pre-trial, defense, corrections, probation/parole, FBI, and DOJ, among other key stakeholders.*

Focus group members felt very strongly that the effort would only be successful if all participants understood that this is a system-wide issue that crosses disciplines, and that an effort by all parties will be required—this is not just a “courts issue” or repository issue. The national discussion will only reach critical mass if national leadership groups take this collaborative approach to their members.

3. *Activities at the local level will have to be collaborative among the components of the justice system, including law enforcement, prosecution, courts, probation/parole, corrections, and pre-trial services.*

The corollary to the above finding is that actual implementations will have to carry forward that collaborative effort. Since it is not a single source problem, the solution must be the result of combined efforts.

4. *The strategy of using fingerprints to link dispositions to persons is just one of a range of efforts that must be undertaken to increase the availability of dispositions through criminal history record repositories.*

The focus group discussed that the quality of criminal history records is determined by more factors than the linking of dispositions to arrests. For example, the reporting of dispositions remains a problem in many

areas. As such, the focus group emphasizes that the linking of dispositions directly to the person when the link through the arrest is not possible is an area that has not received much attention. The focus group believes that significant improvements can be made in this area, which will contribute to the overall quality of the records, but other efforts must continue.

5. *The emphasis is on positive identification in order to enhance the linking of events to the individual. All events are important, and the lack of a link to the arrest should not prevent the entry of an event into the repository when positive identification is available.*

The focus group was concerned that this emphasis on dispositions was not in any way intended to diminish the importance of arrest data for investigative and law enforcement purposes, or the value of linking dispositions to the person through the arrest, whenever possible. The intention is simply to bring a new perspective to dispositions, without reducing the importance of the arrest data.

6. *The operational means by which fingerprints are captured and associated with dispositions in any given jurisdiction will have to be determined at the local and state level.*

The focus group believed very strongly that any operational implementation of this concept must be locally determined. The purpose of national leadership is to bring emphasis to the concept and to establish any national functional standards that should accompany the effort. As long as they comply with state and national standards, the local practitioners must adapt their processes in their own manner.

7. *“Flat fingerprints” appear to provide a new opportunity for associating dispositions to persons.*

The focus group was very interested in the use of flat fingerprints as an efficient means of taking prints that could be associated with dispositions. The group recognized that there are many issues surrounding the use of flat fingerprints, though, and recommends that those issues be investigated. Of special importance is the need for testing of the accuracy that would be achieved using flat prints for search/submission, and in evaluating the effects upon local, state, and national Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems (AFIS). The focus group was keenly aware of the preliminary nature of any recommendation regarding the use of flat fingerprints in this manner, but also believed that the potential benefits warrant a full suite of tests and demonstrations to confirm or contradict such a recommendation.

8. *While the operational means by which fingerprints are captured and associated with dispositions in any give jurisdiction will have to be determined at the state and local level, **national leadership is important.***

*The Global Advisory Committee should provide this leadership by urging exploration of linking dispositions directly to the individual (via fingerprints) when the link through the arrest is not available. The GAC should also urge pilot projects to test this concept's implications for criminal history repositories.*

Focus group members hope the GAC will take their ideas, further develop them, and convert them into recommendations from the GAC to the U.S. Attorney General for follow-up activities.

### **Committee Discussion Recommendation<sup>40</sup>**

*Finding Number Eight*, outlined above, brought to the table the focus group's solicitation for Global involvement. While not all presentations to the GAC result in action by or advisement from the Committee, members felt this issue warranted formal measure. Consequently, Mr. Wethington motioned that the GAC "recognize the importance of enhancing the management of criminal dispositions." Committee involvement in this broad topic could include more specific activities such as:

- Exploring the application of technologies for reliable and accurate identification of individuals.
- Exploring the issues associated with updating a criminal history record with prosecution, adjudication, supervision, or other criminal history events when those events cannot be linked to an arrest notation that has already been entered into the criminal history repository.

Mr. Correll seconded the motion. Chairman Robinson brought the motion to a vote; the motion carried unanimously.

### **Presentation: Fingerprint-Based Court Dispositions<sup>41</sup>** **The Future of Criminal Dispositions** *Accuracy, Reliability, and Timeliness*

Building on the previous briefing, Lieutenant Colonel Ken Bouche, Assistant Deputy Director, Illinois State Police, provided the following presentation:

#### **Criminal Justice Identification and Criminal Disposition Reporting**

---

<sup>40</sup> For a complete listing of recommendations ratified at the September 20, 2001, GAC Meeting, please see *Attachment A*.

<sup>41</sup> This summary reproduces handout materials provided by the speaker.

The challenge of positive identification in criminal dispositions involves answering three fundamental questions:

- Who are you?
- What have you done?
- Where have you been?

The key to answering this challenge—accurately identifying specific individuals—rests in connecting a person’s fingerprints to their demographic and biometric<sup>42</sup> record. Rolled ten-print fingerprint impressions are the cornerstone of the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) System. However, criminal justice agencies generally fingerprint individuals only once: at the time of criminal arrest. No reliable biometric identification method tracks an individual from arrest through conviction and sentencing, or alternately, acquittal.

In most states, criminal history record systems exhibit a linear dependency. To ensure the posting of a correct disposition on the appropriate record, the state central repository requires a court disposition be matched to the initial charge, fingerprints, and unique document control number (DCN). Dispositions are entered into state and national criminal history repository files only to the extent that they are reliably linked to previously reported fingerprint arrest submissions. This procedure is problematic because arrests are frequently either not reported by local law enforcement or reported with data errors that cause the record to fail to post in the CCH database. Additionally, with the increase of direct grand jury indictments, notices to appear, and summonses, defendants are arriving in court without ever being fingerprinted. Added confusion occurs if the prosecutor modifies charges or creates a final disposition by dropping charges but fails to report the modifications in a timely fashion with the correct DCN. Finally, cases may be combined or charges modified in court. Because of these factors, comparing paper and/or electronic records of arrest and disposition on the same person is difficult.

One solution to this problem lies in a fingerprint-based link between the subject and final disposition. Biometric identification done at critical encounters in the criminal justice process would ensure the integrity of the criminal history database. Fingerprint-based reporting also eliminates the dependency of all subsequent CCH entries to the original arrest event. This method provides real-time updating of records, rapid access to a variety of customers, and reduced data-entry error. Since all information is coordinated through the fingerprint image, the recurring problem of different reporting practices among criminal justice agencies can be eliminated. In short, the association of a person’s fingerprints with their disposition, independent of arrests, will dramatically increase the number of dispositions in the CCH repository.

## **Flat Fingerprint-Based Disposition Reporting Initiative**

---

<sup>42</sup> Biometric identification is the automated measuring of one or more specific attributes of a person, with the goal of distinguishing that person to prove identity. Some examples are speech patterns, DNA, and fingerprints. For the purpose of this briefing, “biometric identification” refers only to fingerprints.

Fingerprint identification no longer is limited to the use of rolled fingerprint impressions. Flat or “slap” fingerprinting offers a much simpler process without the stigma of traditional, controlled ten-print rolling. As mentioned earlier, the increased demand for civil applicant background checks has driven the development of rapid and positive fingerprint-based identification systems. For example, Ohio’s WebCheck system provides identification services for a variety of purposes based on flat fingerprint impressions, though it has not been used for criminal disposition reporting.

**In an effort to maximize the opportunities of flat-print technology, a focus group convened by the NCJA was charged with examining the issues of criminal justice identification and criminal disposition reporting in light of this capability.** Ultimately, the focus group recommends that DOJ seek to create and fund partners to develop demonstration projects that use flat impressions to radically change criminal justice identification and reporting. (Note: Consideration of the “slaps” option by the GAC is subsumed by the broader motion, ratified during the previous briefing.) Initially, these projects should focus on the development of a circuit court application for rapid identification and real-time biometric-based disposition reporting. The analysis and design phases of this project must ensure that the system will meet non-criminal justice background checks and other areas where historically name-based inquiries were used to access the criminal history database. Finally, when wireless technology supports the transmission of fingerprint images more efficiently, this capability can be extended to patrol cars and other mobile applications. In these venues, this emerging technology will offer many benefits to all program participants, including the following improvements:

***Public Safety Decision-Makers (Criminal and Non-Criminal Justice)***

- Enhances the capability for more timely and reliable criminal justice decisions through the improved posting of dispositions into the criminal history records system in the state central repository.
- Provides complete, correct, and timely access to critical information at each step of the criminal justice process.
- Increases police officer safety by efficient fingerprint-based inquiries and accurate identifications via mobile data technologies. Officers have access to real-time, nationwide information.
- Permits the dissemination of conviction data without the posting of a corresponding arrest event.
- Increases the safety of children through accurate identification and clearance of foster parents in emergency placement situations.
- Increases the safety of children by accurate screening of school bus drivers and other personnel involved in childcare.
- Increases State Attorneys’ efficiency by allowing real-time access to criminal history records with the ability to modify and/or post additional charges when a ten-print record already exists.
- Provides a portable, 24-hour solution for fingerprint-based submissions and responses from the field.

- Reduces the cost of submitting fingerprint inquiries for licensing or employment purposes to the public and non-criminal justice agencies.

### ***Courtroom Procedures***

- Provides rapid, positive identification of the defendant.
- Delivers complete, up-to-date information for judicial decisions.
- Automates and simplifies the reporting process.

### ***Computerized Criminal History Improvements (State Central Repository)***

- Increases accurate disposition reporting.
- Allows for the posting of dispositions without arrest fingerprint cards and provides a more accurate picture of an offender's involvement in the criminal justice system.
- Provides real-time posting and updates.
- Provides biometric-based, reliable information.
- Renders obsolete name checks and problems associated with uncertain identifications.
- Requires very little, if any, additional staff to process identification requests.
- Provides rapid confirmation of name hits by a real-time, fully automated fingerprint matching system.

### ***Corrections***

- Accurate prison visitor screening reduces gang contact with state prisoners and hinders individuals from bringing contraband into prison.
- Accurately tracks transportation of prisoners.
- Accurately reports incarceration/release dates to the state central repository.
- Increases reporting accuracy of DNA samples by matching fingerprint identifications to samples at the time they are taken.

### **A Practical Example of “Slaps”: From Concept to Implementation—Program Development in Illinois (e-AFIS)**

Illinois has begun preliminary work on a concept to attach flat fingerprints to dispositions to accomplish non-linear posting of dispositions to the central repository. However, bringing this from concept to implementation is not as simple as purchasing and installing computer hardware. The Illinois project requires re-thinking on a systems level, including needs assessments and action plans reflecting individual jurisdictional requirements. Preliminary discussions are underway between the Illinois State Police and

several circuit clerks, sheriffs, states attorneys, and circuit court judges regarding reporting fingerprints with court dispositions to determine the most productive approach for all involved. The key to this approach is that the activities must be collaborative among the components of the justice system, including law enforcement, prosecution, defense, courts, probation/parole, corrections, and pre-trial services.

The Illinois project will be divided into several phases:

- The initial phase will start with the establishment of a project action team in each participating jurisdiction. Additionally, a multijurisdictional oversight committee will serve as a collaborative group in guiding the entire project. The action teams will conduct needs assessments; based on these, the teams will make recommendations as to how their respective jurisdiction's record keeping and reporting procedures should be changed to take advantage of current technologies.
- The second phase will include re-engineering the existing AFIS through the development and acquisition of necessary computer hardware and software to facilitate flat fingerprint technologies.
- During this second phase, Illinois will also begin the development of a front-end program and communications model to connect the courts with a flat fingerprint file server at the state's central repository. Once the technology is in place, the system could be rolled out to a test group of circuit courts. The circuit clerk will electronically transmit court dispositions, combined with flat print impressions, to the system for real-time entry into each defendant's computerized criminal history file.
- While the Illinois State Police is expanding and modifying its systems, the circuit clerks will also be re-engineering their current manual and computerized operations to participate in the envisioned system.
- This project will require development and acquisition of computer hardware and software at the county and/or circuit level. As in most states, Illinois counties are not financially able to support such an undertaking. Therefore, the success of this project will be highly dependent on the availability of federal grant funding.

Chairman Robinson thanked Lieutenant Colonel Bouche for his presentation, appreciating its coincidence with Mr. Gavin's briefing.

### **Presentation: Justice Information (Data) Exchange Points Project<sup>43</sup>**

---

<sup>43</sup> This summary reproduces information found on the SEARCH Web site, at <http://www.search.org>. More information about this project is contained in *Planning the Integration of Justice*

Mr. Cooper, Mr. David Roberts, Deputy Executive Director, SEARCH; and Mr. David Usery, SEARCH, provided the following presentation.

The Justice Information Exchange Points project—conducted by SEARCH and funded by BJA—is designed to facilitate the development of integrated justice information systems planning and implementation throughout the nation. Integration of justice information systems refers to the justice community’s ability to access and share critical information at key decision points throughout the justice process. Identification of these key decision points and development of information exchange models will further nationwide integration efforts.

Among other things, SEARCH has developed a conceptual framework to present the flow of justice information between criminal justice agencies (including courts); define the key events that trigger the need to share information; identify the agencies involved in the exchange; and describe the nature of the information exchange.

Project staff has developed a research tool and methodology to capture detailed information regarding the events, agencies, information, and exchange conditions associated with justice information integration. This research tool and methodology has been tested in five states:

1. Colorado
2. Kansas
3. Minnesota
4. New Mexico, and
5. Pennsylvania

Project staff conducted this initial testing by loading data regarding these five states’ information exchanges based on research, planning, and implementation documents provided by each state. Following initial in-house testing and validation, project staff has met several times with representatives of each of the five states.

While the research tool and methodology were tested with good results, the dimensions of information exchange have been even further developed and the research tool and methodology have been refined. The enhanced research tool is now Web-enabled and is being used by several jurisdictions as a data-collection tool allowing for the documentation of criminal justice process flow information. The project’s final report is currently being edited and will be submitted to BJA for publication. Once the final report is published, it will be made available on the SEARCH Web site.

Chairman Robinson thanked the SEARCH officials for their briefing and looked forward to reviewing the Exchange Points project’s final report.

Committee focus was then directed to an eminent GAC project slated for completion before the New Year.

## **GAC Annual Report to the U.S. Attorney General**

Issuance of a Global Justice Information Network Annual (“End of Year”) Report is in keeping with the GAC’s mission to improve the administration of justice and protect the nation’s public by **promoting** and **advising** the highest levels of government on practices and technologies for the secure sharing of justice information. A chief vehicle for this GAC advisement to the federal government (through the Assistant Attorney General, OJP, and U.S. Attorney General) is the annual report.

Additionally, because the GAC operates in accordance with Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), this report is required to satisfy FACA guidelines stipulating advisory committees issue annual reports summarizing its activities and “such related matters as would be informative to the public.”

Members of the GAC Executive Steering Committee—comprised of the GAC Chair and Vice Chair; four working group chairs; and two at-large representatives from the GAC—constructed the 2001 Annual Report outline the previous day, and content will be informed by proceedings from the year’s two GAC Meetings and various Working Group activities. The report will contain—

- An introduction to the problem of justice information sharing;
- Background of the GAC;
- Summary of 2001 activities; and
- Forecast of efforts for the coming year.

In accordance with FACA, this document will be posted on the Global Web site to facilitate public access, and should be completed by November 2001.

## **Round-Table Discussion**

As the final item of the meeting, Chairman Robinson opened the floor for GAC members to raise further issues warranting GAC consideration.

## **Justice Information Sharing in Indian Country**

Ms. Norena Henry, Director, American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) Affairs Desk,<sup>44</sup> OJP, and Chief Ed Reina, GAC member, Yavapai-Prescott Tribal Police Department, advocated that to truly pursue national justice and public-safety information sharing, the GAC must consider the state of data exchange within Indian country, and between Indian country agencies and other constituencies. Justice integration planning must be sensitive to the unique cultural, economic, and organizational issues of these sovereign nations while at the same time ensuring interoperability with non-tribal systems.

Several related projects were highlighted:

- ***BJA: Technical and Technology Assistance***  
BJA and the AI/AN Affairs Desk are partnering with the Office of Tribal Justice<sup>45</sup> to facilitate the planning, designing, and implementation of integrated information systems by various Indian nations. In particular, BJA is supporting an effort to share justice information among the Navajo, Hopi, and Zuni nations.

This pilot project is based on *Full Court*, an automated case management system used by the Pueblo of Zuni. The system links the tribal court, probation, detention and jail facility, child welfare, substance abuse treatment center, and domestic violence service provider to one another. Automatic linkage permits coordinated case management of offenders as they move through the justice system. Just as importantly, this linkage permits coordinated service delivery for children, battered spouses, youthful offenders; families in need of services; and crime victims as they move through relevant institutions.

The *Intertribal Integrated Justice Pilot Project*, the BJA effort based on *Full Court*, aims to increase the electronic sharing of information on protection orders on domestic violence, 24-hour emergency services, and driving under the influence. To reach this goal, each of the Navajo, Hopi, and Zuni nations will participate in three phases of the project:

- **Phase I** – Integrating tribal systems (such as law enforcement, courts, and prosecutors)
- **Phase II** – Sharing information between the Navajo nation, Hopi tribe, and Pueblo of Zuni.
- **Phase III** – Sharing information with other jurisdictions (i.e., county, state).

Given the three tribes' strong, intrinsic connections to one another (facilitated by geographic proximity, economic connections, and family

---

<sup>44</sup> More information on the AI/AN Desk is available at

[http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/americanative/whats\\_new.htm#top](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/americanative/whats_new.htm#top).

<sup>45</sup> More information of the Office of Tribal Justice is available at <http://www.usdoj.gov/otj/pub.htm>.

linkages), the expanded *Full Court* system has a very good chance at increasing the effectiveness of each community's law enforcement and justice programs.

- ***Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS): National Justice Technical Assistance Center***

A national technical assistance center will be established for tribal criminal justice agencies to obtain expertise in developing their statistical collection and reporting processes as well as to ensure their participation in national information systems. Technical assistance will include oversight for the conversion to National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)<sup>46</sup>-compliant crime reporting and the development of other types of crime data to ensure participation in BJS statistical reporting programs. Technical assistance will also be provided to help tribal authorities participate in national criminal justice information systems (e.g., anti-stalking, criminal history background checks, National Crime Information Center [NCIC]<sup>47</sup>). The center will be proactive in identifying good models in Indian country for statistical collection/analysis activities, undertaking multi-tribe demonstrations, and locating tribal agencies most in need of assistance. The center should be self-initiating in terms of tribal activities and will ensure a high level of coordination with Bureau of Indian Affairs law enforcement policies, practices, and new initiatives.

- ***IACP Summit: Improving Safety in Indian Country***

In October 2001, with the support of OJP, the IACP plans to meet with representatives from tribal communities and their justice systems to address concerns about safety and justice in Indian country. One of the issues slated for discussion is the facilitation of information sharing. Up for consideration: the suggestion that Indian country law enforcement and justice agencies adopt an already well-defined set of standards, such as NCIC and NIBRS. Further, to ensure that the standards are appropriate to Indian country, participants will discuss whether an IACP Indian Country Law Enforcement Section representative (and also

---

<sup>46</sup> By way of background, the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program, which began in 1929, collects information about crimes reported to the police. In 1982, BJS and the FBI sponsored a study of the UCR Program with the objective of revising it to meet law enforcement needs into the 21st century. A five-year redesign effort to provide more comprehensive and detailed crime statistics resulted in the **National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS)**, which collects data on each reported crime incident. The UCR Program is currently being expanded to NIBRS.

<sup>47</sup> By way of background, the **National Crime Information Center (NCIC)** system provides a computerized database of documented criminal justice information for authorized users. The purpose for maintaining the NCIC system is to provide a computerized database for ready access by a criminal justice agency making an inquiry, and for prompt disclosure of information in the system from other criminal justice agencies about crimes and criminals. This information assists authorized agencies in criminal justice and related law enforcement objectives, such as apprehending fugitives, locating missing persons, locating and returning stolen property, as well as in the protection of the law enforcement officers encountering the individuals described in the system.

perhaps a tribal judge, tribal prosecutor, and a community leader) should be appointed to serve on the NCIC/NIBRS Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board and work group.

As evidenced by the above programs, OJP is cognizant of the importance of this issue, and has initiated related activities. However, Ms. Henry and Chief Reina encouraged more attention to information sharing in Indian country and more tribal representation in GAC activities.

Along those lines, Mr. Wallace also suggested greater participation in GAC efforts by representatives from the defense community.

Chairman Robinson appreciated the suggested enhancements to Committee efforts. He noted the best way to accomplish increased participation by both groups is to nominate representatives to the GAC Working Groups, and encouraged Mr. Wallace, Ms. Henry, and Chief Reina to do so through contact with the Working Group chairmen.

### **Information Sharing in the State of Missouri**

Mr. Wethington previewed a recently produced videotape about Missouri's information sharing architecture, and the importance of this function to the conduct of state business and citizens' well-being. In particular, members of the Outreach Working Group took note of the tape, as it was very well done and may serve an example for a similar product about the function and activities of Global.

### **Adjournment**

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

The next GAC will be held in spring 2002.

*The meeting was adjourned.*

## **Attachment A**

**GAC-Ratified Recommendations  
September 20, 2001**

*Attachment A*

**GAC-Ratified Recommendations  
September 20, 2001**

- 1) Recommend to the U.S. Attorney General that OJP:
- Establish the Justice Standards Registry Program,
  - Incorporate this program into the Global Web site, and
  - Establish an annual budget to institutionalize the program.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Cooper, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 2) Direct the Global Outreach Working Group to:
- Develop a program that promotes the Justice Standards Registry Program as one that is nationally recognized and enables information sharing and interoperability between and within public safety, justice, and related information technology systems, and
  - Prepare a “Value Statement” to highlight easily recognizable benefits to those considering the Justice Standards Registry Program.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Hentzen, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 3) That upon completion, editing, and review by necessary parties, OJP release the *XML Reconciliation Process Report* as soon as possible.
- This *Reconciliation* document chronicles the history, standards development principles, and achievements of the coordinative efforts between:
    - JTF Rap Sheet Standardization
    - RISS XML Data Exchange Specification
    - LegalXML Court Filing Standard

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Swanson, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 4) That OJP assign ownership of the developed *XML Justice Data Dictionary* to a qualified entity for the purpose of sponsoring its submission to the Justice Standards Registry Program.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Henderson, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 5) That OJP assign ownership of the developed XML Standard Development Principles to a qualified entity for the purpose of sponsoring its submission to the Justice Standards Registry Program.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Swanson, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 6) That OJP, upon establishment of the *XML Justice Data Dictionary* within the Justice Standards Registry, assign the role of caretaker of that Dictionary to a qualified entity.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Hentzen, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 7) That Global recommend that OJP be directed to continue its support of the information sharing standards development process; e.g., XML and related efforts within/between justice and other partners.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, amended (reflected above), and seconded by Mr. Gallagher. The motion, as amended, was brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 8) That Global recommend that OJP facilitate an outreach effort, through the Global Advisory Committee, to identify and contact other XML efforts and parties.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, amended (reflected above), and seconded by Mr. Henderson. The motion, as amended, was brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 9) That Global recommend that OJP, through Global/ISWG, to promote convening ad hoc groups, as needed, in support of XML and other justice and public safety-related information sharing and standards initiatives.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Cooper, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 10) That Global recommend that OJP, through Global/ISWG, continue in its advisory capacity regarding XML-related issues.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Cropper, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 11) That Global accept and authorize ISWG to proceed with the following agenda:

- Identify and prioritize infrastructure projects, to include revision of the *Infrastructure Interim Report*, and the incorporation of NASCIO reports and other pertinent efforts that will aid and accelerate the sharing of justice information, and

- Monitor the operation of the Justice Standards Registry Program and make recommendations for improvement.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Swanson, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 12) That the Global Executive Steering Committee develop strategic recommendations that effectively link ongoing information sharing and integration efforts within OJP for the benefit of the justice and public safety communities.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Correll, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.

- 13) That the Global recognize the importance of enhancing the management of criminal dispositions. Committee involvement in this broad topic could include more specific activities such as:

- Exploring the application of technologies for reliable and accurate identification of individuals, and
- Exploring the issues associated with updating a criminal history record with prosecution, adjudication, supervision, or other criminal history events when those events cannot be linked to an arrest notation that has already been entered into the criminal history repository.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, seconded by Mr. Correll, and brought to a vote by Chairman Robinson; it carried unanimously.