

Global Justice Information Network
Advisory Committee
Meeting Report
Washington, DC—April 11, 2002

**Convening and
Introductory Remarks**

On April 11, 2002, the Global Justice Information Network (Global)¹ Advisory Committee (GAC or “Committee”) convened at 9:00 a.m. at the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Washington, DC. Mr. Gary Cooper, Executive Director of SEARCH – The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics,² and newly assumptive Committee Chair, called the meeting to order. He welcomed GAC members, observers, support staff, and invited guests.

Chairman Cooper began by explaining the change in Committee leadership. Colonel Michael D. Robinson, prior GAC Chair, recently resigned as Director of the Michigan State Police to assume a command position within the Transportation Security Administration (TSA);³ he also resigned as the GAC representative of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)⁴ and GAC Chairman. Consequently, per **Section 4.2 – Election of Officers, Vice-Chairman:**

The election of the Vice-Chairman will be accomplished in a GAC meeting, limited to the actual appointees (no proxies), and use Robert’s Rules of Order. In the case of the resignation or incapacitation of the Chairman, the Vice Chair will assume the title and duties of the Chairman, and a new Vice Chair will be elected. The term of the Vice-Chairman will be for the period of the Charter (two years). Upon renewal of the Charter, the GAC will conduct new elections.

Accordingly, Chairman Cooper will head the GAC until spring 2003, the first Committee meeting following the renewal of the Global charter.

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

² For more information on SEARCH, please see <http://www.search.org/>.

³ The TSA was created by Congress and was charged with oversight of aviation security beginning in February 2002. Among the TSA’s responsibilities are implementing the many goals set forth in the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, including the setting of standards for airport security personnel and developing threat plans for airline and airport security.

⁴ More information on the IACP is available at <http://www.theiacp.org/>.

The April 2002 GAC agenda included the following topics:

- Introductory Remarks
- GAC Working Group Updates
 - Infrastructure/Standards Working Group
 - Security Working Group
 - Privacy/Information Quality Working Group
 - Outreach Working Group
- Justice Information Sharing-Related Presentations
 - Justice Integration Exchange Points Project
 - Industry Working Group and Integrated Justice Information Systems Institute
 - National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO) Tool-Kit
 - Tribal Justice Information Sharing
- GAC Business
 - GAC Membership
 - Election of Vice Chair
 - Working Groups
- Roundtable Discussion
- Next Steps and Future Activities

Before turning the floor over to Deputy Director Richard Ward III, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA),⁵ Chairman Cooper articulated his leadership goal of “raising the profile of this advisory committee to [that of a] national leadership body.” He wants to continue to ensure that GAC members “feel their valuable time taken away from the office is well spent.” Chairman Cooper then introduced Deputy Director Ward, calling him “a true friend of Global” in his longstanding Committee support.

Deputy Director Ward highlighted several opportunities to maximize the work of Global:

- 1) Expanding Global’s community of interest, to include public safety—This increased scope of representation is **imperative** after the terrorist incidents of September 11, 2001.
- 2) Outreach—This represents an area where “a small investment can have huge dividends” by providing local and state agencies with tools to make the best budgetary decisions in pursuit of broad-scale sharing of justice and public safety-related information.

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

- 3) Timely delivery of GAC-recommended tools and products to local and state agencies.
- 4) Coordinated GAC Working Groups—Just as stovepipe systems impede information sharing and inefficiently use resources, so, too, will “stovepipe Working Groups.” Where possible, Working Group chairs were encouraged to coordinate concurrent efforts and resources. For example, because “security” is a prime issue in the discussion of information privacy, it makes sense for the Privacy Working Group chair to leverage the activities and knowledge of the Security Working Group members.

Committee members,⁶ OJP officials, and invited guests around the table introduced themselves in turn. The following were in attendance:

Mr. David K. Byers*	Mr. Thomas A. Henderson*
<i>Conference of State Court Administrators</i>	<i>National Center for State Courts</i>
<i>Phoenix, Arizona</i>	<i>Arlington, Virginia</i>
Superintendent Melvin J. Carraway*	Ms. Norena Henry
<i>International Association of Chiefs of Police</i>	<i>American Indian and Alaska Native Affairs</i>
<i>Indianapolis, Indiana</i>	<i>Washington, DC</i>
Deputy Superintendent William Casey*	Mr. Louis J. Hentzen*
<i>Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board</i>	<i>National Association for Court Management</i>
<i>Boston, Massachusetts</i>	<i>Wichita, Kansas</i>
Mr. Henry J. Coffman*	Mr. E. Hunter Hurst III*
<i>INTERPOL</i>	<i>National Council on Juvenile and Family Court Judges</i>
<i>Washington, DC</i>	<i>Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania</i>
Mr. Gary R. Cooper*	Ms. Linda R. Lewis*
<i>SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics</i>	<i>American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators</i>
<i>Sacramento, California</i>	<i>Arlington, Virginia</i>
Mr. Steven E. Correll*	Mr. John Loverude
<i>National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System</i>	<i>Joint Task force on Rap Sheet Standardization</i>
<i>Phoenix, Arizona</i>	<i>Springfield, Illinois</i>
Mr. Cabell Cropper*	Ms. Victoria L. Major*
<i>National Criminal Justice Association</i>	<i>Criminal Justice Information Services Division</i>
<i>Washington, DC</i>	<i>Federal Bureau of Investigation</i>
Mr. Blake J. Harrison*	Deputy Director Kyle T. Nayback
<i>National Conference of State Legislatures</i>	<i>Office of Tribal Justice</i>
<i>Denver, Colorado</i>	<i>Washington, DC</i>

⁶ GAC Committee members are denoted with an asterisk (*).

Mr. Thomas J. O'Reilly*	Mr. Keith Tucker*
<i>National Association of Attorneys General Trenton, New Jersey</i>	<i>Executive Office of the U.S. Attorneys Washington, DC</i>
Chief Edward Reina*	Mr. Scott Wallace*
<i>Yavapai-Prescott Tribal Police Department Prescott, Arizona</i>	<i>National Legal Aid and Defender Association Washington, DC</i>
Mr. David Roberts	Mr. Richard H. Ward III
<i>SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics Sacramento, California</i>	<i>Bureau of Justice Assistance Washington, DC</i>
Mr. Michael J. Roggero	Mr. Lawrence P. Webster
<i>Missouri Supreme Court Jefferson City, Missouri</i>	<i>SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics Syracuse, Utah</i>
Mr. Robert P. Shumate	Mr. Paul Wormeli
<i>Integrated Justice Information Systems Institute Rockbridge Baths, Virginia</i>	<i>Viking Technology, Inc. Fairfax, Virginia</i>
Mr. Thom Rubel*	Mr. Joey R. Weedon*
<i>National Governors Association Washington, DC</i>	<i>American Correctional Association Lanham, Maryland</i>
Mr. William B. Simpkins*	Mr. Gerald E. Wethington*
<i>Drug Enforcement Administration Arlington, Virginia</i>	<i>National Association of State Chief Information Officers Jefferson City, Missouri</i>
Ms. Karen Sublett	Mr. Carl Wicklund*
<i>Bureau of Justice Assistance Washington, DC</i>	<i>American Probation and Parole Association Lexington, Kentucky</i>

GAC Working Group Presentations⁷

Global Advisory Committee Working Group representatives provided updates on their recent efforts.

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.

⁷ GAC Working Groups are comprised of committee members and other subject-matter experts. These groups expand the general Committee's knowledge and experience, and carry out targeted activities on behalf of the GAC. Working Groups are formed around timely issues impacting justice information sharing and meet as often as necessary.

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.

Activities

Mr. Gerry Wethington, State of Missouri Chief Information Officer, Global representative of the National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO)⁸ and Chairman of ISWG, delivered the briefing.

In September 2001, the GAC Executive Steering Committee tasked each of the Working Groups with formulating a 2002 agenda. ISWG members determined their agenda was best served by establishing four committees along primary areas of emphasis. These ISWG committees—their objectives, anticipated products, and progress—are as follows:

1) Justice Standards Registry Program Committee

Objectives:

- Oversee Justice Standards Registry (JSR or “Registry”) Program operations and advise on standards registry procedures
- Evaluate program effectiveness
- Solicit contributors to JSR
- Review candidates for inclusion in JSR
- Define principles and guidelines for the Registry Program
- Develop Justice XML Data Dictionary guidelines
- Establish liaison with Outreach Working Group for promotion of the JSR

Anticipated Projects:

- Populated JSR
- Data Dictionary Registry
- Principles and Guidelines Registry
- Outreach Program
 - Recommended audience
 - Recommended message

⁸ Additional information on NASCIO is available at <https://www.nascio.org/>.

Progress:

- Finalized Internet-based Registry application
- Finalized *Justice Standards Registry Program Guide*
- Identified candidate standards for initial Registry inclusion
- Coordinating candidate standards submissions to the Registry

2) Coordination and Development Committee

Objectives:

- Develop guidelines for justice information sharing standards developers, emphasizing broad participation and base of business practices
- Oversee development of list of current initiatives
- Identify needed coordination among current efforts
- Provide a venue for face-to-face negotiations
- Oversee the Justice XML Data Dictionary initiative
- Establish liaison with Outreach Working Group to promote coordination and development activities

Products:

- Guidelines for standards developers in justice and public safety fields
- Support submission of at least four new standards to the JSR
- Outreach Program
 - Recommended audience
 - Recommended message

Progress:

- Building on the results of the original Extensible Markup Language (XML) Reconciliation Effort,⁹ this committee is coordinating the incorporation of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA)¹⁰ into the XML Reconciliation Effort
 - Phase II
- Planning next reconciliations to include the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)¹¹ and selected states
 - Phase III

⁹ The XML Reconciliation Effort is highlighted later in this report. Also, more information on the original XML Reconciliation Effort is available on the Global Web site at <http://www.it.ojp.gov/global>.

¹⁰ More information on AAMVA is available at <http://www.aamva.org/>.

¹¹ The FBI Web site is located at <http://www.fbi.gov/>.

- Monitoring the development of a standards reconciliation methodology

3) Justice Information Technology Infrastructure Framework Committee
 (“Infrastructure Committee”)

Objectives:

- Review *Interim Infrastructure Report*¹²
- Develop a concept of “infrastructure” that takes into account the political, technological, and organizational development of the last two years
- Supervise drafting of new infrastructure report
- Review *NASCIO Concept of Operations (Co-Ops) Report* and recommend next steps for GAC
- Establish liaison with Outreach Working Group to promote Justice Information Technology Infrastructure Framework Program

Products:

- Recommended definition of “justice infrastructure framework”
- Recommended Global Co-Ops Program direction
- Outreach Program
 - Recommended audience
 - Recommended message

Progress:

- Reconciling ISWG’s *Interim Infrastructure Report* with *NASCIO ConOps Report*
- Developing ISWG *Infrastructure Definition Report*

4) Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Committee

Objectives:

- Develop an agenda
- Advise staff on executing agenda
- Establish liaison with Outreach Working Group to promote Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Program

¹² This document is available at http://www.search.org/integration/pdf/GAC_Infrastructure_Rept.pdf.

Products:

- Strategic Plan for addressing this issue
- Outreach Program
 - Recommended audience
 - Recommended message

Progress:

- Reviewed a number of Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Guidelines
- Recommended content for ISWG *Infrastructure Definition Report*

Moving Forward: ISWG Next Steps

Expanded Coordination Activities

- Coordinate with the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) National Task Force on Interoperability (NTFI) Program¹³
- Solicit involvement of prosecutor/district attorney community in ISWG
- Coordinate with NASCIO on ConOps expansion and information architecture

Anticipated Activities

- Complete *Infrastructure Report*
- Complete AAMVA XML reconciliation
- Initiating selected states and FBI into XML reconciliation effort
- Conduct first annual review of the Registry Program

¹³ The mission of the NTFI is to help public safety achieve communications interoperability. To accomplish this, the NTFI will provide education/information to local and state elected and appointed officials and their representative associations regarding the benefits of interoperability, assist them in addressing the policies needed to overcome current barriers, and provide a forum for public policy makers to partner their efforts with the efforts of the public safety community to address interoperability issues in a more comprehensive way. The NTFI also serves as a conduit between local and state elected and appointed officials, their representative associations, federal officials, and those representing public safety and industry to help facilitate a unified policy front and resulting actions. The NTFI Web site is located at http://www.agileprogram.org/task_force/justnet.html.

Timeline

- **April – May 2002**
 - Infrastructure Committee Meeting
 - ISWG Meeting
 - Justice XML Data Subcommittee Meeting

- **Early August 2002**
 - Infrastructure Committee Meeting
 - ISWG Meeting
 - Review Infrastructure Committee progress
 - Deliberate infrastructure issues
 - Incorporate identified standards into the JSR
 - XML Justice Data Subcommittee Meeting
 - Final meeting
 - Delivery of XML reconciliation methodology and next version of Data Dictionary

- **Mid-November 2002**
 - XML Reconciliation Meeting with representatives from selected states
 - ISWG Meeting
 - Full committee deliberation of the *Infrastructure Report*

- **Early February 2003**
 - XML Reconciliation Meeting with selected states
 - ISWG Meeting
 - Delivery of *Infrastructure Report*
 - Determination of 2003 agenda

- **Late April 2003**
 - Final State XML Reconciliation Meeting
 - Delivery of next version of reconciliation methodology and Data Dictionary
 - ISWG Meeting
 - Delivery of *Annual Report: Review of the Justice Standards Registry Program*

The Extensible Markup Language (XML) Reconciliation Effort

Mr. Wethington then turned the floor over to Mr. John Loverude (Illinois State Police and Chairman of the Joint Task Force on Rap Sheet Standardization) and Mr. Michael Roggero (Information Technology Division Director, Missouri Supreme Court, and Chairman of the Justice XML Subcommittee). These gentlemen were invited

by the GAC to highlight one of ISWG's most successful standards coordination activities to date¹⁴— the XML Reconciliation Effort.

Mr. Loverude began by outlining the importance of XML to Global and, indeed, the entire justice community:

Global and XML

- XML is particularly powerful for information sharing
- Independent data representation opens new doors for information sharing among Global constituencies
- Providing development guidelines and the Justice XML Data Dictionary will reduce implementation costs for constituent's XML efforts
 - Widely-accessible venue for dictionary: Justice Standards Registry

XML – A Justice Opportunity to:

- Significantly improve the ability to share information
- Establish standards on the ground floor
- Guide and assist justice information systems developers
- Further other information sharing efforts

The reconciliation effort, its various phases, and accomplishments were then discussed:

Reconciliation Overview

- The effort was born of:
 - The recognized need for information sharing
 - The fact that XML justice standards development and implementation were already underway
 - The opportunity to improve and make more efficient the delivery of justice-related services to the nation's citizens

Reconciliation – Phase I: Three Original Partners

- XML Rap Sheet Standardization Project
- Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS) XML Data Exchange Specification

¹⁴ The XML section summary was compiled from the presentation by Mr. Loverude and Mr. Roggero, as well as support materials generated from the XML Reconciliation Effort.

- LegalXML Court Filing Standard Initiative

Reconciliation – Phase I: Accomplishments

- Reconciled three original partners’ data dictionaries
 - Used for different justice purposes
- Based on Phase I effort, developed principles for future XML reconciliations/implementations
 - *Lessons Learned* document produced—an XML reconciliation process report
- Justice XML Data Dictionary

Reconciliation – Phase II: Additional Partner

- AAMVA engaged
 - Driver’s license information
 - Vehicle information
- Utilizing XML reconciliation principles developed in Phase I

Reconciliation – Phase III: Next Steps

- Future partners:
 - Federal Bureau of Investigation
 - Select states
- Final validation of development efforts and products
 - Reconciliation principles
 - Justice XML Data Dictionary

Mr. Roggero briefed attendees on his Subcommittee, which falls under the purview of ISWG’s Coordination and Development Committee.

Justice XML Subcommittee—Objectives and Activities

- Discuss and monitor results of Phase I and Phase II activities
- Discuss an outreach strategy for future reconciliation efforts
- Justice XML Data Dictionary:
 - Currently 136 data elements reconciled
- *Lessons Learned* document
 - To be posted on the Global Web site
- Formulate plans and recommendations for continuing and follow-up activities
 - Maintenance of the Justice XML Data Dictionary
 - Discuss the scope of the Justice XML Data Dictionary

- Provide specific recommendations for building the Justice XML Data Dictionary
 - Use Phase I reconciliation principles as baseline
- Provide advice and recommendations to OJP via ISWG/GAC
- Conduct outreach activities to promote the Data Dictionary and reconciliation methodology
- Develop a plan for coordinating with organizations external to the justice enterprise

Mr. Loverude concluded the briefing on the XML Reconciliation Effort with several summarizing thoughts and “selling points” of the Justice XML Data Dictionary:

1. The Justice XML Data Dictionary is designed to maximize information sharing.
2. Adoption of the Justice XML Data Dictionary will be voluntary.
3. Adoption of the Justice XML Data Dictionary will be widespread.
4. Although there is still much work to do, this is already an outstanding effort.
5. There is no time to waste: the public needs the Justice XML Data Dictionary *now*.

ISWG Recommendations to the GAC

Mr. Wethington resumed the floor. ISWG Committee and Subcommittee members determined a number of items requiring GAC support in order to proceed. Therefore, Mr. Wethington concluded by enumerating a roster of ISWG 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.

- 1) The GAC recommends that the Office of Justice Programs provide for a formal, structured review of the Justice Standards Registry Program on an annual basis, or as necessary.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington, amended, and brought to a vote by Chairman Cooper. The motion carried unanimously as amended.

- 2) The GAC recommends that the Office of Justice Programs initiate a project to develop a suitable application to manage the Justice Data Dictionary.

Mr. Wethington made the motion. The motion was brought to a vote by Chairman Cooper and carried unanimously.

- 3) The GAC requests that its members of the “Big 7”¹⁵ and members representing the judicial branch and tribal communities confirm the presence/existence of a dialogue within those bodies on the issues of **business continuity** and **disaster recovery**.

The motion was made by Mr. Wethington and amended by Mr. Thomas Henderson, Executive Director, National Center for State Courts (NCSC),¹⁶ and Chief Edward Reina, Yavapai-Prescott Tribal Police Department and representative of the IACP – Tribal Law Enforcement Section. The motion was brought to a vote by Chairman Cooper and passed unanimously, as amended.

- 4) The GAC accepts and publishes the *Program Guide Justice Standards Registry Program*.¹⁷

Mr. Wethington made the motion. The motion was brought to a vote by Chairman Cooper and carried unanimously.

- 5) The GAC direct its Outreach Working Group to:
 - a. Raise the awareness of the importance of business continuity and disaster recovery in the justice community.
 - b. Promote the Justice Standards Registry Program and the Justice Data Dictionary efforts.

Mr. Wethington made the motion. The motion was brought to a vote by Chairman Cooper and carried unanimously.

Security Working Group

Background

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

¹⁵ The “Big 7” is a body comprised of agencies sharing an interest in local and state concerns. This coalition is made up of the National Governors Association; National Conference of State Legislatures; Council of State Governments; National Association of Counties; National League of Cities; International City/County Management Association; and U.S. Conference of Mayors.

¹⁶ Information on NCSC is available at <http://www.ncsconline.org/>.

¹⁷ Previously referred to as the Justice Standards Registry Program “ConOps” document.

standards for legacy networks/systems, as well as the new and enhanced networks and systems to which they are joined.

Activities

Mr. Steven Correll, Executive Director, National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System (NLETS)¹⁸ and Security Working Group (SWG) Chair, delivered the briefing. The update focused mainly on the SWG meeting held in early 2002.

SWG members determined the following goals:

- Identify and promote minimum effective security standards for enhanced justice information sharing
- Identify differences between security policies
- Discuss how minimum effective security standards are defined
- Provide security policy and technology design assistance for integrated justice system
- Incorporate existing security efforts into a uniform concept for policy makers
- Decide whether the SWG should conduct a gap analysis of existing systems and policies
- Determine what underlying enterprise architecture the SWG should recommend
- Discuss if it is possible to have a uniform security standard

SWG members reviewed the FBI Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS)¹⁹ Division Security Policy, concentrating on the following key issues:

- Identification/Authentication
- Auditing/Audit process
 - Governance
 - Sanctions
 - Compliance
 - Accountability
 - Education
 - Awareness
- Wireless communication
- Encryption
- Public key infrastructure
- Training
- Firewalls
- User agreements
- Access controls

¹⁸ Information on NLETS is available at <http://www.nlets.org/>.

¹⁹ More information on FBI CJIS is available at <http://www.fbi.gov/hq/cjisd/cjis.htm>.

- Personal/Technical/Physical security
- Incident response

SWG members made the following determinations:

- It is important to protect centralized information and have an underlying architecture for multiorganizational sharing
- It is possible for the justice community to arrive at a commonly acceptable security policy
- Whatever the architecture, there should be encryption for minimum security
- Security standards requirements should be multilayered for top, medium, and low-end systems
- Security standards should be uniform in approach and methodology

Action Items

In pursuit of their goals, SWG members outlined the following action items as “next steps”:

- Collect existing justice information security policies
- Identify and review security practices
- Create a reference library of security policies and best practices
- Research the role that the U.S. Office of Homeland Security (OHS) plays in justice information sharing
- Determine minimum security standards for information sharing
- Develop a security “tool-kit” similar to the NASCIO Enterprise Architecture Development Tool-Kit²⁰
- Identify additional SWG members
- Reconvene in St. Louis, Missouri, in May

Privacy/Information Quality 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.

²⁰ The NASCIO Tool-kit is highlighted later in this report.

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: The *Justice Information Privacy Guideline*²¹

Mr. Cabell Cropper, Executive Director, National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA)²² and Chair of the Privacy/Information Quality Working Group (PWG), updated Committee members on the PWG’s major effort to date: production of the *Justice Information Privacy Guideline* (“*Guideline*”).

To begin, Mr. Cropper answered the question: What is the *Guideline*? The *Guideline* is a manual for practitioners on how to implement privacy policy which:

- Provides practical “how to” processes
- Underscores the importance of addressing privacy issues
- Establishes a generic framework

The document was created in response to a number of needs, including the need for a forum and mechanism to address open-record legislation, and the need to explore the potential for misuse of personal information when sharing records.

This *Guideline* 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.

²¹ A draft *Guideline Executive Summary* is included as **Attachment A**.

²² More information on NCJA is available at <http://www.ncja.org/>.

When completed, this comprehensive document will include the following sections:

Privacy and Justice Information Systems, which:

- Defines information privacy policy, justice records, and integrated justice information systems
- Describes the importance of information privacy policy
- Discusses the impact of technology on privacy

Privacy Design Principles for Justice Information Sharing, which:

- Describes the history of privacy codes
- Discusses privacy characteristics in justice systems
- Defines privacy design principles

Privacy Policy Review, examining:

- Exchange of information within justice systems and disclosure to public
 - Determines rules for interagency exchange
 - Determines rules for public access
- Politics and the policy process

Privacy Policy Drafting Template section, helping users with:

- Data element analysis
 - Mapping information flow
 - Determining information attributes
 - Establishing a baseline
- Policy design template
 - Data accuracy
 - Purpose statement
 - Scope of policy
 - 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:

- Mapping information flow
- Analyzing agency question and answers
- Assessing agency responses
- Analyzing integrated system question and answers
- Assessing integrated system responses
- Resolving privacy issues

Next Steps for the *Guideline* and the PWG

The next step toward publication of the *Guideline* is a review by the GAC members and selected public/private entities.

In pursuit of PWG goals, members look forward to the following activities:

- Reviewing policies/technologies related to information systems that identify individuals
- Supporting a compendium of information on privacy issues, including research documents
- Reviewing existing policies from government agencies and private sector
- Examining statutes on public access, open records, and privacy
- Identifying additional PWG members

Outreach Working Group

Background and Goal

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

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, delivered the briefing, highlighting a number of GAC outreach efforts.

Publications

GAC members facilitated publication of a Global Executive Summary in *Police Chief* magazine,²³ and inclusion of an article on the XML Reconciliation Effort in the *Office of Intergovernmental Solutions Newsletter, Issue 11: XML Applications in Government*.²⁴

²³ The editorial focus of the September 2001 *Police Chief* magazine was “Innovative Technologies in Law Enforcement.” Global officials produced an executive summary on the GAC, which was featured in the magazine under Chairman Robinson’s signature.

²⁴ Available at: http://www.gsa.gov/attachments/GSA_PUBLICATIONS/extpub/11-DL-OJP.htm.

OJP Information Technology (IT) Initiatives/Global Web Site²⁵

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,”²⁶ previously referenced. 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 member agencies and representatives (including URLs and electronic 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 *Guideline*, and the *GAC Annual Report*
- Housing the Justice Registry Program

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 copy²⁷ and online²⁸
- *Mouse pads* promoting the OJP IT Initiatives/Global Web site
- A generic *Global PowerPoint presentation*, for personal and/or professional reference, is accessible on the Global Web site. This presentation can be tailored per occasion and audience.²⁹

²⁵ Available at <http://www.it.ojp.gov>.

²⁶ Located at <http://www.it.ojp.gov/global/>

²⁷ For copies of these cards, please call Global support staff at (850) 385-0600, extension 285.

²⁸ Available at <http://www.it.ojp.gov/global/admin/files/global.pdf> and <http://www.it.ojp.gov/services/files/it-ojp-gov.pdf>.

²⁹ Please contact GAC support staff at (850) 385-0600, extension 285, for information about tailoring this resource.

- The Outreach Working Group is coordinating with the ISWG Outreach Development Subcommittee to create promotional information for the Justice Standards Registry Program.

Spreading the Word

Superintendent Carraway thanked Committee members for providing presentations on the Global initiative at the following events:

- IACP mid-year conference
- STARS meeting
- Justice Integrators Focus Group
- SEARCH Symposium on Integrated Justice Information Systems
- Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board
- Law Enforcement Intelligence Forum
- Conference of State Court Administrators/National Association for Court Management Joint Technology Conference
- Commerce Department Interoperability Conference
- Integrated Justice Symposium
- FBI - National Executive Institute

In closing, members were encouraged to continue promoting the GAC through formal measures—such as presentation at justice-related conferences—as well as informal means; i.e., “word-of-mouth,” throughout their constituencies.

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 April meeting, the GAC heard presentations³⁰ on the following justice information sharing topics:

³⁰ Briefings were supplemented with PowerPoint presentations and handouts. In the interest of brevity, these presentations and documents are summarized herein. Readers interested in a full set of the supporting materials can call Global support staff at (850) 385-0600, extension 285.

- Justice Integration Exchange Points Project
- Industry Working Group and Integrated Justice Information Systems Institute
- NASCIO Architecture Tool-Kit
- Justice Information Sharing in Indian Country

Presentation: Justice Integration (Data) Exchange Points Project ³¹

Mr. David Roberts, Deputy Executive Director, SEARCH, and Mr. Lawrence Webster, Justice Information Systems Specialist, SEARCH, provided the briefing.

Background

The Justice Information Exchange Points project—conducted by SEARCH and funded by BJA—supports the integration of justice information systems. In conducting the initial phases of this research project, SEARCH accomplished five objectives:

1. Developed a model for analyzing criminal justice information exchange
2. Implemented the model in a software tool to collect, document, analyze, and portray graphically data about criminal justice information flow and business processes
3. Collected detailed information about criminal justice information exchange in five pilot states (Colorado, Kansas, Minnesota, New Mexico, and Pennsylvania)
4. Provided graphic, tabular, and narrative information to the participating states about their criminal justice information exchange for input into integrated system design
5. Analyzed similarities and differences between states to increase the understanding of how the criminal justice system operates, which will make future integration efforts—and the development of national standards—easier, faster, cheaper, and more effective

³¹ This summary draws on both handout materials provided by the speakers and additional sources, such as agencies' Web sites.

The Justice Information Exchange Model

With the assistance of the five pilot states, SEARCH developed the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM), consisting of five universal dimensions:

1. **Processes**—The stages of a given subject’s case as he/she moves through the criminal justice system (e.g., investigation, detention, pre-disposition supervision)
2. **Events**—The decision points that trigger the exchange of information between two or more agencies or entities (e.g., arrest, disposition, sentencing hearing)
3. **Agencies**—The entities that send and receive justice information (e.g., city law enforcement agency, prosecutor’s office, trial court)
4. **Conditions**—Factors that determine the flow of information (e.g., if the arrestee is an adult or a juvenile, if the suspect is in custody)
5. **Information**—The paper-based or electronic information that is exchanged between the agencies, including specific documents, data sets (data elements that generally flow together), and individual data elements

To understand information exchange in the context of the JIEM, consider the following example:

When a local law enforcement agency arrests a subject who is over 18 years of age and takes that subject into custody, it sends an arrest report to the prosecutor’s office so that the prosecutor may determine whether or not to file charges with the court.

Following, this exchange is parsed into the five dimensions of the model—some of which occur at both the sending and receiving ends of the transactions—and shown in the arrest report example below. (Note: This document consists of a number of data exchange elements that are organized into data sets, which are not shown in detail in this example.)

Prevailing Process	Investigation
Initiating Event	Arrest
Sending Agency	A local law enforcement agency
Conditions	If the subject is over 18 years of age <i>and</i> the subject is taken into custody
Document	Arrest report
Recipient Agency	Prosecutor’s office
Prevailing Process	Investigation
Subsequent Event	Prosecution charging decision

The initiating event (i.e., the arrest) may trigger additional exchanges. For instance, local law enforcement also may send a booking report to the jail for use in the booking process. Therefore, events may initiate one or more exchange, depending on the nature of the event and the conditions in effect.

Once the prosecutor receives the arrest report, he/she must determine whether to file charges. The subsequent event, the prosecution charging decision, becomes the initiating event for later exchanges. Defining these subsequent events allows for the tracking of process flow information throughout the criminal justice system.

The SEARCH JIEM Modeling Tool

The JIEM Modeling Tool is a SEARCH-developed software package. The five pilot sites used this tool during the initial phase of this project. Since completion of the initial phase, other states³² have also begun to use the JIEM Modeling Tool to understand criminal justice information flow and prepare for greater integration of their justice systems. The data collection software has undergone numerous refinements and enhancements, and more changes are expected as the project continues.

The Modeling Tool provides a Web-based user interface, business logic, and relational database designed to document information flow and business rules in criminal justice operational processes. In using the Modeling Tool, representatives of justice system organizations discuss and analyze current data flow within their operations and enter specific information about each exchange. Once the data about all of the exchanges are entered into the Modeling Tool, it is possible to generate tabular and graphical reports that help criminal justice leaders understand how their system works at a level of detail far greater than was known—or possible to know—before. This information can be used to identify redundancy, bottlenecks, and opportunities to improve justice system work flow. It also identifies the individual exchanges that should be the highest priority for automation and provides critical information for design of the interfaces.

Participants in the Justice Information Exchange Project are not required to purchase hardware or software licenses in order to use the Modeling Tool. SEARCH provides the software free of charge via an online download process, and also provides training and technical assistance at no charge. Though a considerable investment of staff time is required, participating states receive a wealth of information in the form of charts, reports, and diagrams to assist them in their integration efforts. In return, the site is asked only to use the Modeling Tool in a manner that is consistent with other states, to support the national scope objectives of the project.

The Importance of Analyzing Business Processes

SEARCH believes that in order to implement a viable technological solution for integrated justice, each site must first identify and understand its business processes. The Modeling Tool was designed specifically for the analysis and documentation of these

³² At the time of this briefing, over 100 local and state jurisdictions had requested the Modeling Tool.

business processes and flow of justice information. It enables justice system practitioners to systematically decompose complex transactions and activities, using a common tool and language. The Modeling Tool, however, can only succeed if all organizations that are a part of the criminal justice process are represented by knowledgeable and committed subject-matter experts who have sufficient time and resources to complete the task.

For More Information and Next Steps

More information on the project is available at:
http://www.search.org/integration/info_exchange.asp.

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.

Presentation: Industry Working Group and Integrated Justice Information Systems Institute³³

Mr. Paul Wormeli, Chairman, Industry Working Group, and Mr. Bob Schumate, President, Integrated Justice Information Systems (IJIS) Institute, provided the briefing.

Industry Working Group (IWG)

IWG Background

Consider that more than 90% of justice systems are implemented by industry, and that industry is a driving force that influences system technology. In 1999, in response to this integral link between industry and justice information systems, a number of information technology companies serving local, state, and federal law enforcement and criminal justice agencies coalesced to form the IWG.

- The focus of the IWG is IJIS
- The IWG charter charges the group to contribute to the implementation of integrated justice information systems throughout the country by applying the knowledge and experience of the information technology industry
- The IWG was established to find ways information technology **industry** could support the goals and objectives of OJP IJIS initiatives in areas where industry can make a unique contribution to the success of related programs

³³ This summary draws on both handout materials provided by the speakers and additional sources, such as agencies' Web sites.

- IWG operates under the following guiding assumptions:
 - Integrating justice information systems is a national imperative
 - The virtual enterprise is the model of what must be created to link justice agencies
 - **Public/private partnerships must be developed to achieve success**

IWG Members

In recognition of the importance of this issue, companies have appointed senior executives to IWG. These seasoned professionals are experienced in the design and implementation of justice information systems and can tap other corporate resources to contribute to the knowledge and discipline of successful system implementation. Members serve on a purely voluntary basis; OJP supports travel and meeting expenses.

Objectives

During IWG formative meetings, members defined their objectives:

- Become a "sounding board" for OJP in the review and planning of IJIS program elements, to provide important and often overlooked industry input into the program planning and evaluation process
- Identify impediments to nationwide implementation of integrated justice systems from an industry perspective
- Provide assistance to justice agencies in understanding integration and facilitating the implementation of integrated systems
- Undertake specific tasks in support of nationwide Integrated Justice Information Systems (IJIS) initiatives

What stands in the way of IJIS?

In support of their objectives, IWG members determined issues that are impediments to or that impact successful implementation of IJIS. These roadblocks include:

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Interagency competition | • Governance models |
| • Lack of understanding | • Complexity of solution |
| • Lack of resource | • Lack of customers' project management expertise |
| • Managing technology | • Untrained staff |
| • Lack of interoperability standards and guidelines | • Investment risk |
| • Procurement methodology | • No perceived market |
| • Lack of a clear vision | • Reliance on paper |
| • Resistance to change | • Legacy system dependence |

To address these impediments, IWG has undertaken a number of action items, including the creation of the IJIS Institute.

Integrated Justice Information Systems Institute

IJIS Institute Background

The mission of the IJIS Institute (“Institute”) is to undertake activities that improve the environment within which multidisciplinary projects involving integrated justice information systems take place.

The IJIS Institute is the functional extension of IWG, providing a vehicle to:

- Enter contracts
- Accept grants
- Conduct projects
- Hire and support staff

Membership in the Institute is open to any company regularly offering services and/or products in support of justice information systems.

Current Activities

The Institute is engaged in a number of activities, including:

- Providing technology assistance
 - Early on-site technology advice
 - Brief technology seminars
- Offering courses and seminars
 - Project Management Course—Recognizing the critical importance of trained project management in IJIS implementation, the IWG arranged to design and conduct the IJIS Project Management Course, delivered through Auburn University. The Institute/IWG is exploring the possibility of offering this course nationwide.
 - Emerging Technology Seminars—Starting in the fall, seminars will be conducted on three timely issues:
 - XML
 - Data mining
 - Security issues

The Institute is also involved in various demonstration site projects and research and development projects.

For More Information

Additional information on the Industry Working Group and IJIS Institute is available at <http://www.ijis.org/>. This Web site offers IWG products, technology chat rooms, a calendar of IWG and related events, links to technology providers, and reference material.

Presentation: NASCIO Tool-Kit³⁴

Mr. Wethington delivered the briefing.

Background

The NASCIO Enterprise Architecture Tool-Kit (“Tool-Kit”) and NASCIO's Adaptive Enterprise Architecture Development Program are the products of a partnership between NASCIO, the NASCIO Architecture Working Group, and the U.S. Department of Justice.

Adaptive Enterprise Architecture Development Program

The NASCIO Enterprise Architecture Committee provides oversight for all aspects of the Adaptive Enterprise Architecture Program. The committee developed the NASCIO architecture framework and the explanatory document, and continues to lead NASCIO's ongoing effort to champion the benefits of sound infrastructure and enterprise architecture.

This program is engaged in the following objectives and activities:

- Pursuing national sharing of governmental information
- Internal evangelization
- Defining domains and disciplines
- Pictorial framework of architecture
- Tool-Kit production
- Review and validation of products and activities

In addition to the Tool-Kit described below, GAC members may be interested in other NASCIO Architecture Committee products:

³⁴ This summary draws on both handout materials provided by the speakers and additional sources, such as agencies' Web sites.

Architecture Validation Report³⁵—The Architecture Validation Report is based on feedback received from review of a draft version of the Tool-Kit. Three sites were selected to participate in the review process, representing state and local government at various stages of architectural development. This report contains each site's suggestions for enhancement to the Tool-Kit document.

Enterprise Architecture: A Blueprint for Better Government (Video)³⁶

Enterprise Architecture Brochure³⁷—This brochure contains an introduction to the Adaptive Enterprise Architecture Program.

NASCIO Justice Report – Toward National Sharing of Governmental Information³⁸

NASCIO Tool-Kit³⁹

The Tool-Kit document presents NASCIO's architectural framework for integrated information and data sharing between local and state governmental entities.

The document contains sections addressing:

- The business case for enterprise architecture
- Governance models supporting implementation and management of the necessary architecture
- An instruction set for developing or modifying enterprise architecture
- Templates for architecture design
- Samples provided by state and local governments with established architecture
- An appendix containing a lexicon and descriptions of the NASCIO architecture framework disciplines

³⁵ This document can be downloaded at https://www.nascio.org/hotIssues/EA/EA_Validation.pdf.

³⁶ The video can be viewed at <https://www.nascio.org/hotIssues/EA/architecture.ram>.

³⁷ A copy of the brochure can be downloaded at https://www.nascio.org/hotIssues/EA/enterprise_architecture_brochure.pdf.

³⁸ The report can be downloaded at <https://www.nascio.org/hotIssues/justice/Fullrept.pdf>.

³⁹ The NASCIO Tool-Kit is available at <https://www.nascio.org/hotIssues/EA/AEADTool-Kit.pdf>.

For More Information

Mr. Wethington encouraged Committee members with additional questions regarding the Tool-Kit or other architecture issues to contact the following:

Ms. Cheryl Edwards
Architect Issues Coordinator
Suite 600
167 West Main Street
Lexington, Kentucky 40507-1324
Phone: (859) 231-1971
E-mail: cedwards@amrinc.net

Presentation: Tribal Justice Information Sharing⁴⁰

Ms. Norena Henry, Director, American Indian and Alaska Native Affairs Desk (AI/AN),⁴¹ OJP; Deputy Director Kyle Nayback, Office of Tribal Justice (OTJ),⁴² OJP; and Chief Reina provided the briefing. They 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.

Tribal Communities: Unique Challenges

Tribal communities face unique challenges to sharing justice-related information. These impediments include:

Complex jurisdictional composition

Of the 561 federally-recognized tribes, there are:

- 225 law enforcement agencies
- 302 tribal justice systems
- 69 jails and detention facilities or other correctional facilities

There is a need to build relationships between tribes and surrounding jurisdictions.

⁴⁰ This summary draws on both handout materials provided by the speakers and additional sources, such as agencies' Web sites.

⁴¹ Information on the AI/AN Desk is available at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/americanative/whats_new.htm.

⁴² Information on OTJ is available at <http://www.usdoj.gov/otj/>.

Elevated crime rates

Tribal law enforcement face twice the crime rate as the rest of the country, with 50% fewer officers than comparable rural areas.

Limited access to information

Tribal law enforcement has limited access to national law enforcement information systems, such as the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS).⁴³

Less than 50% of tribal law enforcement have access to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC)⁴⁴ and NLETS.

- Currently, NLETS is the means by which the U.S. Department of Justice provides emergency notifications to law enforcement agencies across the country. Without access to these systems, tribal police do not receive direct communication about border alerts or other emergency situations.

Limited Resources and Education

- Lack of consistent training
- Lack of hardware and software
- Lack of infrastructure throughout Indian Country poses access and sustainability problems

Addressing the Problem: Current Initiatives

Although Indian Country *does* face special impediments to sharing information, several projects are underway to address the problem:

⁴³ 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, Bureau of Justice Statistics 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 **NIBRS**, which collects data on each reported crime incident. The UCR Program is currently being expanded to NIBRS.

⁴⁴ By way of background, the **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.

BJA: Technical and Technology Assistance

BJA and the AI/AN Affairs Desk have partnered with the OTJ to facilitate the planning, designing, and implementing 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 providers to each other. 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 each other (facilitated by geographic proximity, economic connections, and family 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 NIBRS-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, NCIC). 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*⁴⁵

In October 2001, with the support of OJP, the IACP met with representatives from tribal communities and their justice systems to address concerns about safety and justice in Indian Country. One of the issues discussed was the facilitation of information sharing. It was suggested 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 discussed whether an IACP Indian Country Law Enforcement Section representative (and also 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.

Further Assistance: Recommendations to the GAC

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. Specific recommendations were made addressing issues they considered of preeminent concern.

Resources—Any and all U.S. Department of Justice initiatives and activities on information sharing and integrated justice should include Indian tribes and Indian Country representatives. More resources should be made available to tribes (e.g., resources from the Crime Information Technology Act).

Coordination of Resources—To coordinate resources to Indian tribes to support information technology and integrated justice initiatives, a portion of current tribal allocations should be dedicated to this issue. This should be supplemented with other appropriate resources.

Education—There should be consistent training for personnel in tribal justice communities on information technology and integrated justice, security and access, policy and procedure development, and other appropriate areas.

Border Issues—Resources for technology should be made available to include tribal law enforcement in the existing law enforcement communications network. Tribes should be provided the ability to access NCIC and NLETS immediately.

⁴⁵ The Indian Summit report is available at <http://theiacp.org/documents/pdfs/IndianSummit.pdf>.

Communications—A summit should be held on information sharing and integrated justice as it relates to Indian Country, and a publication should inventory current information technology and integrated justice initiatives throughout Indian Country.

Indian tribes should be invited to appropriate forums with state and county agencies to foster relationships between jurisdictions.

Representation—The Committee should accept additional nominations of Indian Country representatives to the GAC.

Chairman Cooper thanked Ms. Henry, Deputy Director Nayback, and Chief Reina. He noted the issue of justice information sharing in Indian Country was indeed more complex than the Committee may have imagined. However, the GAC does not have the authority or resources to address each of the recommendations in the manner requested. Chairman Cooper concurred with the fundamental idea that additional attention needs to be paid to tribal issues, and promised that GAC members would address the concerns to the extent of their ability during the remaining portions of the meeting. The presenters expressed appreciation for any assistance the Committee can offer.

GAC Business

Chairman Cooper then addressed GAC business issues requiring Committee member input or consideration.

Membership

A hallmark and chief strength of the GAC is its composition: the carefully balanced representation of all components of the justice community. However, due to a number of factors (new and necessary emphasis public safety agencies, personnel changes, recognition of underrepresented constituencies) the membership of the GAC required reexamination.

Vacancy

Because of Colonel Robinson's resignation from the GAC, the IACP seat is now vacant. Several persons were suggested to fill the position, including Mr. Harlin McEwen, Chairman, IACP Communications and Technology Committee and active GAC Working Group member. Mr. McEwen was especially recommended due to his familiarity with Global via his longstanding association with ISWG.

Maintaining a Balanced Composition: New Member Agencies

In consideration of the Indian Country presentation, Committee members discussed expanding tribal representation on the GAC.⁴⁶ Both Chief Reina and Ms. Henry suggested the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI)⁴⁷ as an appropriate agency for GAC membership. Per GAC bylaws,⁴⁸ an agency must be voted on by Committee members before an invitation of membership is extended. Chairman Cooper advised that if NCAI is determined the most appropriate agency to balance tribal representation on the GAC, support staff would conduct the necessary e-mail polling.

Several members expressed concern about the underrepresentation of prosecutors on Global. The solution: a representative from the National Association of Prosecutor Coordinators (NAPC)⁴⁹ will be invited as an observer to the fall 2002 GAC meeting. Should a membership invitation appear to be the next logical step, the admission protocol (as previously noted) will be initiated.

Changing Climate: Involving Public Safety

As underscored by BJA Deputy Director Ward during his opening remarks, the public safety community is now inextricably linked to justice-related activities. Accordingly, GAC members should consider expanding the Committee scope to include an appropriate public safety entity.

A number of agencies were suggested, including the TSA. However, after much discussion, members agreed to explore participation from the Office of Homeland Security (OHS).⁵⁰ Very much in keeping with the cooperative tenet of the GAC, OHS was selected for its comprehensiveness in composition (i.e., serving as the umbrella

⁴⁶ Previously, Chief Ed Reina, Yavapai-Prescott Tribal Police Department and representative from the IACP – Indian Country Law Enforcement Section, has served as the sole Indian Country representative on the GAC. However, each of the Working Groups includes members from agencies concerned with tribal matters.

⁴⁷ Founded in 1944, the NCAI is the oldest and largest tribal governmental organization in the United States and serves as a forum for consensus-based policy development among its membership of over 250 tribal governments from every region of the country. NCAI's mission is to inform the public and the federal government on tribal self-government, treaty rights, and a broad range of federal policy issues affecting tribal governments. For more information, please see <http://www.ncai.org/>.

⁴⁸ Section 3.2 of the GAC bylaws states: “Authority to appoint organizations to the GAC is delegated to the U.S. Attorney General or his/her designee. Appointments will be made upon the advice of the full Committee.” Continuing, Section 3.2.1. states: “All potential new member organizations must be nominated for membership by current GAC representatives. The full Committee must vote to determine whether the nominated organization should be recommended for membership. Potential organizations must be approved by a majority vote of the GAC.”

⁴⁹ The mission of the NAPC is to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and information, and the development of programs and services for the mutual benefit of prosecutor coordinators and prosecutors. For more information, see <http://www.napcsite.org/>.

⁵⁰ Subsequent to this meeting, President Bush proposed elevating OHS to a cabinet position by creating the Department of Homeland Security. While acknowledging these recent activities, for the purposes of this document, OHS and the proposed Department of Homeland Security should be considered interchangeably.

organization for agencies like TSA). As noted on the introductory portion of the agency's Web site:⁵¹

The changing nature of the threats facing America requires a new government structure to protect against invisible enemies that can strike with a wide variety of weapons. Today no one single government agency has homeland security as its primary mission. In fact, responsibilities for homeland security are dispersed among more than 100 different government organizations. America needs a single, unified homeland security structure that will improve protection against today's threats and be flexible enough to help meet the unknown threats of the future."

GAC Executive Steering Committee members will determine the best course of action to involve OHS. Committee members will be notified if any action is taken or vote needed prior to the next GAC meeting.

Election of Vice Chair

Chairman Cooper's assumption of GAC leadership left the Vice Chair position vacant. Chairman Cooper opened the floor for nominations.

Superintendent Carraway and Mr. Dave Byers, Conference of State Court Administrators (CSCA),⁵² nominated Mr. Wethington. Mr. Carl Wicklund, American Probation and Parole Association (APPA),⁵³ made the motion to close nominations. Many GAC members seconded the motion. Chairman Cooper put the nomination to a vote, and Mr. Wethington was unanimously elected Vice Chair of the GAC, effective immediately.

Working Groups

Chairman Cooper requested a show of hands of Committee members serving on one of the four GAC Working Groups. Noting the limited response, Chairman Cooper strongly advocated greater participation. He stressed that the Working Groups are the workhorses of the GAC, exploring timely justice information sharing issues in depth and pursuing the necessary activities to advise and inform the greater Committee. This, in turn, is a key mechanism by which GAC recommendations are promoted, reviewed, and slated for consideration by the Assistant Attorney General, OJP, and the U.S. Attorney General.

While subject-matter experts are important supplements the groups' rosters, GAC member participation is crucial for continuity between the parent organization and its subsidiaries.

⁵¹ Located at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/deptofhomeland/>.

⁵² Information on COSCA is available at <http://cosca.ncsc.dni.us/>.

⁵³ Information on APPA is available at <http://www.appa-net.org/>.

Committee members interested in joining a particular Working Group are encouraged to contact the appropriate Chairman (enumerated in the “Working Groups” section of this report).

Roundtable Discussion: Addressing Tribal Concerns

Responding to the request for assistance articulated by Chief Reina and Ms. Henry at the end of their presentation, GAC members discussed facilitation of justice information sharing in Indian Country. Committee members determined the best first step in addressing this issue to leverage the current GAC structure rather than forming a separate Indian Country Working Group. This tact is especially relevant to guarding against duplication of Working Groups’ efforts, and will also help define tribal concerns more clearly.

After a substantial exchange, Committee members agreed to convene an ad hoc group to examine information sharing and information access needs in Indian Country. GAC Indian Country representatives and OJP staff involved in tribal programs will designate appropriate members of this group, which will be charged with accomplishing two primary tasks:

1. Examining the agendas of the standing GAC Working Groups to determine omissions relative to information sharing in Indian Country. From this determination, the ad hoc group members will recommend either: a) altering the agendas of the standing Working Groups, or b) supplementing the membership of the standing Working Groups to appropriately address identified issues.
2. As a product of this ad hoc group meeting, members will document issues of justice and public safety-related information sharing and information access in Indian Country relative to three categories:
 - a. Access to national information (e.g., NCIC, NLETS) to allow justice agencies to work and make appropriate, effective decisions
 - b. Information sharing between agencies in Indian Country and agencies in the surrounding states and counties
 - c. Any standardized technology and information management rules and protocols within the tribal justice system that allows for the processing of justice-related information, such as data about individuals or cases

Participants will report their findings and additional recommendations to the GAC Executive Steering Committee. If necessary, the Committee will design further steps to adequately address tribal concerns. (As previously highlighted, GAC members

immediately and responsively took steps to bridge any representational gaps by proposing membership of the NCIA into Global.)

The GAC-sponsored Justice Information Sharing in Indian Country meeting was tentatively scheduled for mid-July.

Next Steps and Future Activities

Pursuant to the day's resolutions and looking ahead to standing tasks of the GAC, Chairman Cooper enumerated the following upcoming activities:

Within the Week

The NIJ National Task Force on Interoperability (NTFI), mentioned earlier in the meeting, was scheduled to meet April 12-13, 2002, in Washington, DC. Committee members were welcomed to attend.

July 2002

GAC Executive Steering Committee Meeting, examining:

- Broadening GAC scope to include public safety
 - Meeting with representative from Office of Homeland Security
- GAC Annual Report – Preliminary Planning
 - Issuance of this 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.
 - 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 their activities and "such related matters as would be informative to the public."
 - In accordance with FACA, this document will be posted on the Global Web site to facilitate public access, and should be completed by November 2002.

Justice Information Sharing in Indian Country Meeting

GAC Chair and Vice Chair will provide a briefing on Global at the beginning of the meeting to familiarize participants with the initiative. Afterwards, Indian Country representatives will have an opportunity for a private, free-flowing dialogue. Participants will provide a meeting report to the GAC Executive Steering Committee. Deputy Director Nayback is scheduled to moderate the exchange. GAC support staff will coordinate meeting logistics.

Fall 2002

GAC Meeting – September or October in Washington, DC

Agenda item—Exploring the use of **special conditions** to promulgate the efforts and recommendations of the GAC

- This topic is expected to consume a sizeable portion of the agenda
- Background information may need to be provided to GAC members to prime them for discussion
- Mr. Byers and/or Mr. Thomas O'Reilly, National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG),⁵⁴ were suggested as moderators of the segment

Duration—GAC meeting agendas are becoming more robust. Meetings may be extended to a day and a half.

Interested parties are encouraged to attend

- For more information, contact the Global Designated Federal Official, Ms. Karen Sublett, BJA, at (202) 616-3463, or sublettk@ojp.usdoj.gov.

In closing, Chairman Cooper thanked Committee members, federal representatives, and support staff for their contributions. Hearing no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

⁵⁴ More information on the NAAG is available at <http://www.naag.org/>.

Attachment A

Privacy Guideline: Executive Summary