

**Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global)
Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG)**

Phoenix, Arizona

March 14, 2007

Meeting Summary

Background and Purpose

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative's (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG or Working Group) convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. on March 14, 2007, in Phoenix, Arizona. Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG chair, led the meeting in the furtherance of and alignment with the GPIQWG's *Vision and Mission Statements*.

Attendees

The following individuals were in attendance:

Chair

Mr. Carl Wicklund
*American Probation and Parole
Association*

Vice Chair

Jeanette Plante, Esquire
*Office of Records Management Policy
Justice Management Division
U.S. Department of Justice*

Ms. Cindy Aragon (for Ada Pecos
Melton)
American Indian Development Associates

Lieutenant Frank Higginbotham
Alabama Bureau of Investigation

Mr. Francis (Paco) X. Aumand III
Vermont Department of Public Safety

Barbara Hurst, Esquire
Rhode Island Office of the Public Defender

Mr. John A. Blackburn, Jr.
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Erin Kenneally, Esquire
eLCHEMY, Incorporated

Mr. David K. Byers
Arizona Supreme Court

Captain Tim McGrail
Missouri State Highway Patrol

The Honorable Anthony Capizzi
*Montgomery County Juvenile Court
National Council of Juvenile and Family
Court Judges*

Mr. Mark Motivans
*Bureau of Justice Statistics
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice*

Alan Carlson, Esquire
The Justice Management Institute

Mr. Cabell C. Cropper
National Criminal Justice Association

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

Mr. Scott D. Fairholm
National Center for State Courts

Mr. Owen M. Greenspan
Law and Policy Program
SEARCH, The National Consortium for
Justice Information and Statistics

Mr. Robert E. Greeves
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice

Mr. Ronald Hawley
SEARCH, The National Consortium for
Justice Information and Statistics

Ms. Pat Nelson
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Mr. Niels Quist (for Jane Horvath)
Privacy and Civil Liberties Office
U.S. Department of Justice

Mr. Steve Siegel
Denver District Attorney's Office

Mr. Timothy H. Skinner
SRA International, Inc.

Ms. Cindy Southworth
National Safety and Strategic Technology
Project
National Network to End Domestic Violence
Fund

Ms. Robin Stark
Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS)
Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

Staff

Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Meeting Overview and Goals

Chairman Wicklund gave an overview of the meeting agenda (refer to Appendix A for complete agenda), which included the following key topics:

- Report on Global Security Working Group's (GSWG) Technical Privacy Task Team
- Global Outreach Working Group (Outreach Working Group)
- Information Sharing Environment (ISE) Privacy Guidelines
- Records Management
- Information Quality Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team Status Report
- Introduction to IQ Breakouts
 - IQ Guidebook
 - IQ Assessment Tool
 - Privacy and Information Quality in Fusion Centers
 - Training/Outreach
- Presentations from IQ Breakouts
- Timelines and Global Advisory Committee (GAC) Meeting Proposal
- Recommendations and Next Steps

Chairman Wicklund welcomed everyone to the first GPIQWG meeting of 2007 and introduced the newest GPIQWG members, who were appointed to the group in January. Due to several inactive seats on the roster, it was decided that the inactive seats and additional members would be beneficial to the Working Group's mission. Chairman Wicklund stated that he was very pleased to have the new membership and that with the new direction on information quality, the new members' perspectives and expertise would be an asset to this endeavor. Suggestions on new membership had been solicited from the GPIQWG body in November and December 2006, with the following new members approved and appointed in January 2007:

- **The Honorable Anthony Capizzi**, Montgomery County Juvenile Court, representing National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
- **Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse**, Privacy Officer, Illinois State Police
- **Lieutenant Frank Higginbotham**, Alabama Bureau of Investigation
- **Captain Tim McGrail**, Director, Criminal Records and Identification Division, Missouri State Highway Patrol
- **Mr. Timothy H. Skinner**, SRA International, Inc. (IJIS Representative)
- **Ms. Robin Stark**, Unit Chief—Audit Unit, Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

Chairman Wicklund also welcomed GPIQWG's new Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG) liaison, Mr. Scott Fairholm, National Center for State Courts, and the two guest presenters, Mr. Ron Hawley, SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, and Mr. Niels Quist, U.S. Department of Justice. Mr. Hawley, chairman of the newest Global working group, the Global Outreach Working Group, was to talk about the Outreach Working Group's outreach plan for Global products and training, and Mr. Quist was to present, in proxy for GPIQWG member Ms. Jane Horvath, on the status of the ISE Privacy Guidelines.

Following introductions around the room, Chairman Wicklund announced the following upcoming Global meetings. The GAC meeting will be April 18, 2007; the next IQAT Task Team meeting will be a half-day afternoon meeting on June 25th and a half-day morning meeting on June 26th, in conjunction with the next GPIQWG meeting. Chairman Wicklund expressed his desire to hold a day-and-a-half GPIQWG "working-style" meeting in June to further the progress on the IQ breakout groups. As such, a half-day GPIQWG meeting will occur on the afternoon of June 26th, and a full-day meeting will be held on June 27th. The IQAT Task Team and GPIQWG meetings will be held in the Washington, DC, area.

Chairman Wicklund informed the group that the IQ fact sheet entitled *Information Quality: The Foundation of Justice Decision Making* has been published and is now available for distribution. It will be featured in the next Global newsletter, *Global Highlights*. Chairman Wicklund shared with the group that the *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates* was the most popular take-away at the National Fusion Center Conference, and speaker Captain William Harris, in his presentation, encouraged fusion centers to utilize the privacy guide. Almost everyone that spoke at the conference spoke about the importance of having a privacy policy. There was some concern, however, that the privacy workshops had not been well attended. GAC Chairman Robert Boehmer and Mr. Cabell Cropper have talked about developing resources for doing regional training sessions

where attendees could come and work through the privacy policy guidelines and walk out with a start to a privacy policy. Mr. Cropper was to talk about this with the Training/Outreach subgroup that afternoon. A traveling road show might be what is needed—we could send an agency a canned presentation and local people could be responsible for drawing the attendance.

Chairman Wicklund informed the group that the GPIQWG 2007 Business Plan was reviewed, in January, by the Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) and was well received. As a reminder, our priorities for 2007 are an IQ guidebook, IQAT, privacy/IQ in fusion centers, and training/outreach of privacy/IQ products.

Mr. Robert Greeves relayed BJA's interest in GPIQWG's moving into the implementation stage of using these privacy guidelines and producing success stories of those agencies or organizations that have implemented the *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*. Mr. Greeves encouraged the group to move their constituencies into the implementation of those guidelines. Chairman Wicklund pointed out that this would be a good task for the GPIQWG's Training/Outreach subgroup.

Chairman Wicklund said that he, Captain William Harris (Delaware), and Mr. John Ruegg (chair of the Technical Privacy Task Team) will be doing a privacy presentation at the upcoming 31st Annual International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Law Enforcement Information Management (LEIM) Conference and Exhibition, to be held May 21–25, 2007. “We need to think about ways to promote our products because they are significant. 28 Code of Federal Regulations (28 CFR) Part 23 is generally a primary focus regarding privacy for law enforcement and justice agencies, but we need to encourage them to look at privacy with a more holistic approach.”

GPIQWG members entered into an informal discussion on product promotion and agency/fusion center buy-in as follows:

- The privacy laws in each state are different. A generic presentation might not fit one state versus another. States have different laws, so they will have to perform a legal gap analysis. We need a model that would be more of a framework of what the agencies “should” be looking at and then provide guidance to get them to review their applicable laws.
- The PM ISE leaders do value privacy as a priority, but those at the operating level did not seem to display that perspective at the presentation in Arizona last October (2006). This may be something the Outreach Working Group should address regarding the encouragement of fusion centers to put privacy as a priority in their operational processes.
- In general, agencies are more concerned with security issues and protecting the systems from intrusion, but in doing so, they tend to miss the fundamental premise that while security is a part of privacy, privacy includes concerns that cannot be adequately addressed by security alone.
- One fundamental component of privacy that frequently goes uncompleted is the documentation that describes why data is collected, who collected it, what the quality of the information is, and what the sanctions are for improper use and disclosure.
- Guidance for agencies and fusion centers needs to be evolutionary. If agencies are told what they should do, as a response they will defend what they do. It will take some time, but buy-in from law enforcement will offer a lot of these changes.

- As practitioners from law enforcement, we need to get as much information as possible because we do not know how that information may relate in the future. When a state is getting a fusion center started, this will be vital to the process. Fusion centers across the country are still well behind the curve of where they would like to be. If we can address these issues early in the process of building a fusion center, it will be easier than retrofitting.
- Chairman Wicklund shared with the group that he had received comments about the privacy guidelines from across the country, stating that, upon initial review, the privacy guidelines presented a daunting task and that it was confusing as to where an agency should start.

Report on Global Security Working Group's Technical Privacy Task Team

Mr. Alan Carlson, the Justice Management Institute, and Erin Kenneally, Esquire, eLCHEMY, Inc., are both members of the Global Security Working Group's (GSWG) Technical Privacy Task Team. They have put together a status report from that group on the intersection between security and privacy. The nature of this group has been evolving. The current task is to try to determine some way to electronically automate privacy protection—in other words, express privacy rules in a way that computers can make conclusions and decisions on that information. They are finding that the task is much more complicated than expected. At the end of the last meeting, there was a discussion about the fact that the two halves of the group (GSWG security technical members and GPIQWG privacy policy members) do not have the same notion of what privacy is. The GSWG members tend to believe that protecting the system through security measures satisfies the protection of privacy, whereas the GPIQWG members on the team have a more expansive view of privacy.

"We have spent a lot of time, semantically, trying to get on the same page between the technical and privacy policy folks. That has been a challenge but a necessary one to bridge the knowledge between the two groups. When we say privacy, what are we referring to (commercial privacy policies, GSWG, or GPIQWG)?" The following are slideshow excerpts describing the privacy focus of each of these three areas/groups:

1. Commercial privacy policies are customer-focused, with the concern focusing on the protection of the customer's personally identifiable information, contact information, and account information, in an effort to ensure privacy. The scope of commercial privacy policies is the sharing of information within the enterprise and sharing with affiliated businesses, with customer consent being an essential element of sharing.
2. For GSWG, the privacy goal is to protect information from a wide range of accidental or malicious threats with three fundamental service areas: confidentiality, integrity, and availability.
 - Confidentiality concerns the mechanisms that support information access policies and is designed to ensure that information is not exposed to unauthorized parties.
 - Integrity reflects the accuracy or reliability of information products and requires processes and technology that prevent unauthorized modifications.
 - Availability is required to provide confidence that information systems will be accessible when needed.

GSWG's scope is that agencies (local, state, tribal, and federal) share information. Their primary concern is system security and preventing improper access to and use of information ("trusted sharing"). Implementation focuses on the user who is seeking the information. The privacy concern is about the individual who is the subject of the information. This concern is considered indirect, where individual consent is not relevant.

3. For GPIQWG, the scope is also that agencies (local, state, tribal, and federal) share information, but the focus is on the individuals and organizations who are the subject of the information. GPIQWG's concern is for the "responsible collection, handling, management, review, and sharing" of information, with a priority on information quality and the protection of privacy and civil rights. As with GSWG, consent of the individual is not relevant.

"Whose privacy are we talking about? Do we need clarification of GPIQWG's scope of attention, or do we need a new term/phrase for GPIQWG's focus? We need to clarify with the GSWG what exactly it is GPIQWG is doing here and our understanding of what comprises privacy."

"Those in the technical field think of privacy from a system perspective, whereas we look at it from a legal, human perspective. Part of our role on that group is to facilitate that knowledge transfer. There is a desire from the technical field to automate privacy protection. As technology improves, the limits on implementation will be less. We should consider work that is already being done that takes policy language and interprets and codifies it into computer readable language. Technically speaking, as you codify policy into some sort of rules engine, certain conflicts readily occur. Technologists can identify these and seek changes that need to be made in the policies to resolve the conflicts."

Noted comments from the Working Group:

- To the degree that they are looking at access controls, I am assuming that there is federated identification (ID) representation at the table. Yes, there is representation on that group.
- Privacy is not just "should you be breached" but also "should you collect that information in the first place and how do you use it?" The vision was to plant the seeds into the minds of technical staff to understand and incorporate policies into their systems of the future.

"Policy has got to drive the technology because technology is the tool. The task team is looking at ways to leverage privacy policies by looking at existing products and seeing how we can modify them to fit. For technical implementation of privacy policies, the types of tools needed include authoring tools (translating privacy rules into machine-readable rules) and tools for implementing those machine-readable rules. The challenge is to take human policy and translate it into code (for example, something akin to the Justice Information Exchange Model [JIEM] tool, developed by SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, provides a framework to generate the policies to begin with). We are trying to identify tools that will fit within this framework."

Action: Chairman Wicklund stated that we need to designate a liaison to the GSWG and requested a volunteer. **Ms. Cindy Southworth volunteered to be the liaison.**

Global Outreach Working Group

Mr. Ron Hawley, SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics and Outreach Working Group chair, thanked Chairman Wicklund and the group for inviting him to come and share what the Outreach Working Group is doing on outreach. "I think the work you have done on outreach is a precursor, and you are one of the few working groups who have spent the most time trying to figure this approach out. We would like to leverage the thinking you already have in place." Mr. Hawley gave the background on how outreach had previously been addressed by Global and also related that the Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) established the Global Outreach Working Group in January 2007 to give outreach the attention and focus that are highly needed.

"One of the ad hoc tasks done in the past was an outline by Mr. Steve Correll, Nlets—The International Justice and Public Safety Information Sharing Network, of outreach tasks that could be done, such as notifications, newsletters, training, etc. But as you heard this morning, those suggestions begin to break down as you began to talk about them. For example, in your discussion on the development of the presentation in a box (the road show), the issue became deciding who the target audience was and how states' privacy laws are different from state to state."

"The Outreach Working Group wants to create an environment where we are more effective in helping each working group get their message out. We took a look at Mr. Correll's plan and updated the listing of activities that could be accomplished in a specified time frame, and we are trying to utilize those in the interim until we can complete our strategic plan. The National Information Exchange Model [NIEM] project was also a source we looked at. NIEM has a substantial outreach plan in place, and we will be incorporating some of their methods into our strategic plan."

"After reviewing all of these resources and formulating an initial plan, we took our ideas to the GESC and helped them understand our strategy: review the developments of the working groups, have inaugural face-to-face meetings, and present to GAC at the April 2007 meeting a detailed Global outreach plan that identifies the "low-hanging fruit" for quick wins, including the refinement of membership based on selected tasks. Ongoing current activities include the *Global Highlights* newsletter and support for Global participation in related conferences [for example the LEIM Conference]."

"One thing we intend to do is to send out a solicitation to the membership of the working groups and request that members contact, on behalf of their agencies, those within their agencies who are responsible for outreach to request their assistance and feedback to this group (Outreach Working Group). We would like to motivate people to participate who have the kind of expertise we need, such as marketing, to develop a framework that the working group can operate under. After that is done, the Outreach Working Group membership can change to meet more detailed tasks. Additionally, we would like to develop metrics to measure our success in getting the word out. Our focus is to develop tools to help the working groups get their message out—a template to promote and publicize products as they are completed. There is an awful lot of complexity in the work you are doing, so we want to create the mechanisms, avenues, and tools to help you disseminate your message, but the source of the content, itself, is the responsibility of the working groups (where the expertise lies). The Outreach Working Group would like to offer assistance, however, in putting working group outreach packages together for presentations at training and conference events."

One recommendation Mr. Hawley received from BJA was that we need to try to find examples of success stories at the local level in implementing Global's products and resources. A local message sells more than any other message.

"There was a lot of discussion on whether there should be a liaison between outreach to the working groups. We concluded that, at this stage, that was not a particularly good strategy."

Mr. Greeves stated that there is a need to put together a task team that could go into the field, on a short-range basis, to help local or state officials "walk through" a privacy policy process. Does that fit within the outreach plan? Mr. Hawley indicated that this is definitely one component of the outreach plan but that the expertise for it would not reside on the Outreach Working Group. "That would be more of a practical technical assistance effort for those ready to go through the process of developing and implementing a privacy policy. The responsibility for identifying those needs, in the initial stages, has got to be the working group. However, working group outreach information needs to be shared with the Outreach Working Group for purposes of tracking and determining trends. The Outreach Working Group's responsibility is to help this process along and make sure working groups' efforts and resources do not fall within the cracks."

ISE Privacy Guidelines

Chairman Wicklund introduced Mr. Niels Quist, Counsel with the U.S. Department of Justice, who was invited to give an updated presentation on the status of the Information Sharing Environment (ISE) Privacy Guidelines. Chairman Wicklund encouraged the members, as they reviewed the information, to consider how the ISE Privacy Guidelines intersect with the *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*.

Mr. Quist began by describing both what the ISE is and what it is not. "The ISE is not a single database from state, local, tribal [SLT], and federal agencies. The ISE is a process to share terrorism information between federal agencies but also between SLT governments, as well as international governments and the private sector. One of the ISE guidelines, Guideline 5, was developed to provide privacy guidance on how to govern the information."

The ISE Privacy Guidelines apply to information about U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents that is subject to information privacy or other legal protections under the U.S. Constitution and federal laws of the United States. For the intelligence community, protected information includes information about "United States persons" as defined in Executive Order 12333. Protected information may also include other information that the U.S. government expressly determines—by Executive Order, international agreement, or other similar instrument—should be covered by these guidelines.

Mr. Quist reviewed the components of ISE Governance:

- ISE Privacy Officials—Each "federal" agency's senior official with overall agency-wide responsibility for information privacy issues shall directly oversee the agency's implementation of and compliance with these guidelines.
- ISE Privacy Guidelines Committee—This committee was established by the ISE Program Manager (PM-ISE) to provide ongoing guidance on the implementation of these guidelines, so that agencies follow consistent interpretations of applicable legal requirements, avoid duplication of effort, share best practices, and have a

forum for resolving issues on an interagency basis. It is chaired jointly by Ms. Jane Horvath, DOJ, and Mr. Alex Joel, Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), with membership consisting of the ISE Privacy Officials.

- Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB)—There is some pending legislation that may change how the current board is constituted. Some of the criticism of the board is that there is no civil liberty group type of representation. The PCLOB should be consulted for ongoing advice regarding the protection of privacy and civil liberties in agencies' development and use of the ISE. The ISE Privacy Guidelines Committee (PGC) serves as a mechanism for the PCLOB to obtain information from agencies and to provide advice and guidance consistent with the PCLOB's statutory responsibilities. The PGC works in consultation with the PCLOB.
- ISE Privacy Protection Policy—Each agency shall develop and implement a written ISE privacy protection policy that sets forth the mechanisms, policies, and procedures its personnel will follow in implementing these guidelines. Agencies should consult with the PGC as appropriate in the development and implementation of such policy.

Mr. Quist described the four working groups recently established under the PGC. These working groups were established for the purpose of providing guidance and developing resources to support the ISE. The four groups are the Model Privacy Policy Implementation Process Working Group, who will develop model policies for agencies to use; Training and Outreach Working Group; SLT Working Group, who recognize that SLTs need to be involved in the ISE with regard to implementation processes for privacy protections; and Legal Issues Ad Hoc Working Group.

Nonfederal entities and SLT agencies that wish to participate in the ISE will have to develop and implement protection policies at least as comprehensive as those contained within the ISE Privacy Guidelines. SLT information that is coming to the federal agencies is protected by our privacy policies. With regard to SLT access, the plan is to first work with federal agencies and get them established before moving on to the SLT level because there are state and local laws that may complicate access. Chairman Wicklund shared that there is concern about this type of approach—"This is how we are doing it, and you [SLT] have to adjust"—rather than being involved in the process from the beginning. Those who worked on the ISE Privacy Guidelines did bring SLT participation into the process at the beginning but realized that there were unique and intricate issues associated with SLTs; thus, they refocused on federal agencies first, with a plan to address SLTs next. The Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR) is working with the ISE Privacy Guidelines project and is promoting the SLT agencies. However, because the federal agencies have been mandated to become compliant "right now," that is their current focus, but SLT agencies will likely come on board via fusion centers.

Mr. Steve Siegel asked how closely this aligned with our IQ resources. "It does not incorporate all of the elements we have identified, but it does address the traditional elements of IQ. One thing we have learned is that IQ is multidimensional." Mr. Alan Carlson indicated that those who developed the ISE Privacy Guidelines did use the *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates* in the drafting of the ISE Privacy Guidelines. Through the U.S. Attorney General and GAC, there are mechanisms in place for SLT agencies and Global to impact and provide recommendations. Mr. Quist suggested letting the ISE Privacy Guidelines Committee know about the work Global is doing on training and outreach.

Mr. Quist stated that the PGC was in the process of developing a model policy for federal agencies, but one concern is that they do not have the authority to mandate what policies SLT agencies put in place. Ms. Terri Pate, IIR, indicated that the ISE project is currently working on developing a model policy process to help agencies when drafting their own policy and with the implementation the ISE policies, but they have noted that there is not a “one-size-fits-all” policy.

Regarding fusion centers, the PGC anticipates that fusion centers will be the primary points of contact within states or regions for further disseminating terrorism information consistent with DOJ’s *Fusion Center Guidelines* and applicable SLT laws and regulations. Fusion centers are intended to collaborate with organizations such as the Joint Terrorism Task Forces (JTTFs), Field Intelligence Groups (FIGs), and the Information Sharing Analysis Centers (ISACs).

Mr. Quist informed the group that the ISE Web site (www.ise.gov) was now available with a section devoted to the ISE Privacy Guidelines, including an introduction, FAQs, and supporting documentation, such as Global’s *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*.

Ms. Jeanette Plante, DOJ and GPIQWG vice chair, talked about the implications of the ISE Privacy Guidelines regarding GPIQWG products. Ms. Plante suggested that GPIQWG’s IQ products could be helpful to the ISE’s next steps, as well as in its training. Additionally, GPIQWG, in turn, could reference the ISE Privacy Guidelines in GPIQWG products. Another suggestion that would be valuable is a rules assessment. “SLT agencies need to take the Global privacy guide and determine the rules. They need to sit down and do an analysis of all federal laws that affect privacy and privacy considerations so that there is a consistent resource that federal agencies can use with a consistent interpretation.”

Chairman Wicklund thanked Mr. Quist for coming and providing the presentation and Ms. Horvath for sending a representative to talk with the group. He also suggested a change in the agenda to allow Ms. Plante to do her presentation on records management prior to the break for lunch and then proceed to the report from the IQAT Task Team.

Records Management

Ms. Jeanette Plante spoke about records management (RM) and its affect on agencies, as well as amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on the discovery of electronic information. The phases of the records lifecycle are: creation/capture, management/use, and disposition. At each phase, agencies should have authorities defined, and policies and procedures that allow for their management. Governmental entities are required by law to keep records of actions, functions, and activities. In the federal sector, the only person with the authority to dispose of federal records is the archivist of the United States which is managed by approved retention schedules. Most states have records management requirements for government records. Records retention and dispositions affects privacy, access, security, integrity, etc. Many of the business rules for RM are the same rules that you need for privacy implementation and for data quality. I bring this to your attention because it is another source of information to help you manage the information of your agency. In addition, new amendments to the federal rules of civil procedures that became effective December 1, 2006 have begun to set the standards for the production of electronic information in a legal setting. It is important

that you go back to your jurisdictions and see who is involved in this type of activity (RM) in preparation for these upcoming changes.

The records lifecycle is a good organizational construct for analyzing information quality needs and policies. At each phase (creation/capture, management/use, and disposition) there are three components: program management (people and processes), policies/procedures, and information technology (IT). If at each stage of the lifecycle, you have optimized these program elements, you have gone a long way toward ensuring good quality information.

Chairman Wicklund adjourned the meeting for lunch at 11:35 a.m. and requested that the group return and resume the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

Information Quality Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team Status Report

Mr. Owen Greenspan, SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, and chair of the Information Quality Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team, gave a presentation on the discussions and progress made by this GPIQWG subgroup. Initially, the IQAT Task Team was established to create a single IQ assessment tool. The group has identified what tool(s) are needed and conducted underlying research on existing resources. The research and resources reviewed to date include:

- GPIQWG's IQ Fact Sheet, *Information Quality: The Foundation for Justice Decision Making*.
- "The Multiple Dimensions of Information Quality," excerpt from *Introduction to Information Quality*, an MIT Information Quality publication by Fisher, Lauria, Chengalur-Smith, and Wang.
- *Methods of Data Quality Control: For Uniform Crime Reporting Programs*, presented by Robin Stark, Unit Chief, FBI CJIS, written by Dr. Samuel Berhanu, Chief, Crime Analysis, Research, and Development Unit, FBI CJIS.
- Delaware State Police Auditing Methods, presented by Michael McDonald and Barbara Pollitt, Delaware State Police.
- Ohio Law Enforcement Automated Data System (LEADS)—Auditing Methods, presented by Lieutenant Don Grimwood, Ohio State Highway Patrol.
- ISO 9001:2000 Standards Compliance Presentation by Judie Welch and staff, Records and Identification Bureau, Phoenix Police Department.

"We have talked about whether to develop one product or several. The determination is that we want to develop multiple resources. We have gone beyond the traditional elements of IQ and have settled upon setting some high-level principles." Applicable to this task are the following:

- Define an approach that can be applied across the spectrum of justice entities.
- Address metrics.
- Develop principles beyond accuracy, timeliness, completeness, and accessibility dimensions.

- Ensure that the product is useful.
- Follow the information life cycle matrix, shown below, and include definitions for each phase and for each component of each phase.

Information Life Cycle Matrix

	Components of Each Phase		
Information Life Cycle Phases (below):	Program Management	Policies and Procedures	Information Technology
Creation and Capture			
Use and Maintenance			
Disposition			

Next steps for the group:

- Develop high-level principles.
- Provide definitions of the information life cycle phases and components.
- Plug high-level principles into the applicable phases and components of the information life cycle.
- Illustrate principles by applying them to specific processes (e.g., booking).

The team went through brainstorming sessions and came up with high-level and low-level questions to ask before beginning a self-assessment (see Appendix B for the draft Information Quality Assessment Questionnaire). Each of these will be slotted into the Information Life Cycle Matrix shown above. Some of these questions relate to creation/capture, some relate to disposition, and some relate to all three phases. Conceptually, the notion will be to apply the high-level principles (questions) to a particular process in the justice system, such as booking.

Introduction to IQ Breakouts

Chairman Wicklund reintroduced the four breakout topics (IQ Guidebook, IQ Assessment Tool, Privacy and Information Quality in Fusion Centers, and Training/Outreach) and suggested that the breakout groups meet until 2:30 p.m. and then return to report back to the Working Group. Chairman Wicklund asked for volunteers to lead the breakouts. Ms. Plante led the IQ Guidebook group; Mr. Greenspan is the chair of the IQAT Task Team—as such, he led that breakout; Mr. Carlson led the Fusion Center group; and Ms. Southworth led the Training/Outreach group.

Chairman Wicklund gave a charge to the breakouts: “Come up with one task or objective that you and your team will work on between now and the next meeting (via e-mail, conference calls, etc.). We need to continue the momentum of developing these priorities. For

those in the lead, please keep in touch with your team in between GPIQWG meetings. Some of your groups may have to meet more often than breakouts, depending on where you are in the development of your group's resource."

The breakout groups met from 1:15 p.m. until 2:30 p.m. and returned with reports on their progress.

Presentations From IQ Breakouts

The following are outlines contributed by each breakout during its progress reports.

IQ Guidebook Report

Lead: Jeanette Plante

Paco Aumand

Who is the audience? There are two.

1. Senior leadership (a teaser document) – Why is IQ important?
2. IQ Program Manager – We need to get this resource to those in organizations whose responsibility it is to develop a program of information quality. For example, it is not the Attorney General, but it might be the Attorney General for the Justice Management Division. This is the person who recognizes or has been instructed to recognize that there needs to be a program for IQ.

If we look at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's dimensions, we can see there is a whole different group of people—the users. Although we are writing this guidebook for those responsible for inputting information, we had a discussion regarding the users who, we decided, could be recognized within the guidebook. Also, we discussed the importance of this occurring throughout an organization simultaneously rather than vertically. This is a reason for a direction—to institutionalize the approach throughout the organization.

There are many things to do to develop a program, including defining program elements such as strategic planning, directives, training, policies, and integration of IQ principles.

Action Items—The breakout group proposes to:

- Write a draft of the introduction section that includes the following: Why is IQ important, what is the purpose of the guide, how do you use the guide, and who is this guide for?
- Draft the elements of the IQ chapter: definitions (IQ, data versus information), dimensions, recognizing traditional measures, and dimensions on input, output, storage, and retention.
- Develop a stand-alone piece on what an IQ program looks like (showing the elements).
- Solicit assistance from GAC to gather additional policies that are out there.

Projected completion date: Next GPIQWG meeting

Assessment chapter now encompasses assessment, evaluation, and review.

IQ Assessment Tool Report

Lead: Owen Greenspan

Barbara Hurst, Erin Kenneally, the Honorable Anthony Capizzi, Robin Stark. Also participating was Cindy Aragon (in proxy for Ada Pecos Melton) and Niels Quist (for Jane Horvath).

We renamed processes as events. Initially, we looked at the judicial process and the events of that process. Then we chose one, arraignment, and determined the types of information associated with that event, as shown below:

Information Associated With Arraignment:

1. Criminal history
 - Is this the correct person?
 - Is the criminal history correct?
 - Is the criminal history authoritative?
2. Pretrial services agency report
3. The complaint
4. Courts record system
5. Pending other charges
6. Warrant information
7. Drug assessment (questionnaire, not a drug test)
8. Department of Corrections information
9. Incident report (may be used as a basis for the court complaint or complainant affidavit)
10. Representation information
11. Immigration status
12. Pre-arraignment bail
13. Victim advocate report
14. Custody information/status (detained or released)
15. Victims notification (SAVIN)

Action Items—The IQAT Task Team proposes to:

- Come up with additional questions underneath each piece of information (refer to the second column of the Information Quality Assessment Questionnaire, Appendix B).
- Determine whether we need additional principles (higher-level questions) in respect to the information under arraignment.
- Determine whether there are any principles that do not relate or apply to this event.
- Provide best practices/solutions/guidance to the lower-level questions.
- Provide authoritative definitions for the information life cycle phases and components.

Projected completion date: Next GPIQWG meeting

Chairman Wicklund mentioned that some of these are fill-in-the-blank items while others are narrative and subjective. Mr. Tim Skinner stated that the data quality act requires agencies to come out with guidelines for data quality, which may help with this process.

Privacy and Information Quality in Fusion Centers

Lead: Alan Carlson

Bob Greeves, Kathleen deGrasse, Tim Skinner, Frank Higginbotham, Scott Fairholm

What is a fusion center? The answer is, there is not one model for fusion centers and we need to be sensitive to the fact that they are doing different kinds of things. The direction we settled on was to develop a speech or talk that could be delivered to an audience such as those running or setting up a fusion center. The point of the talk would be to get people to realize that privacy and information quality are important and that we need to do something about privacy. Furthermore, we need to convince fusion centers that privacy goes beyond 28 CFR Part 23

How would a law enforcement officer querying a fusion center want privacy issues taken care of? That answer will help to demonstrate that an officer can do a better and more efficient job with quality information that is more relevant to an investigation. The idea would be to put together a presentation that could be requested from IIR, along with a listing of people who would be willing to present this talk. Or we could provide a canned speech that someone at the local agency could deliver. We need to take advantage of how law enforcement officers relate—for example, have a law enforcement officer talk to law enforcement officers. We need to identify those who could be in that position.

Action Items—The breakout group proposes to:

- Circulate an outline of talking points (in three phases: draft outline, solicit feedback, and finalize for June).
- Determine whether we are addressing it from the right perspective.
- Develop a PowerPoint talk to emphasize to fusion centers why they should be concerned about accuracy, and then follow that with privacy.

Projected completion date: Next GPIQWG meeting

Leading in with the accuracy issue prior to presenting privacy will do a better job of capturing the attention of the audience. One route for this might be a focus on liability as well as demonstrating the positive benefits.

Lieutenant Frank Higginbotham, Alabama Bureau of Investigation, stated that when an event takes place and an officer starts recording that event, the breeder documents begin to get developed. “It is a training issue that needs to be pushed down to the academy level. We need to provide guidance on how to write reports more accurately and emphasize the importance of the quality of the information. These documents are being created in an environment where accuracy is not a priority. We need to emphasize that the better your document is, the better it feeds into the whole justice process. Fusion centers are designed, primarily, as intelligence gatherers, and we are looking at accuracy as pertaining to a particular event. There are parts of the event that are set (time, date, etc.) that can be checked for accuracy down the road. However, on the intelligence side, the information that they are working with is more descriptive. For example, in Alabama, if they determine that information in a case file is intelligence, they will rate or grade it as such. Though the grading is subjective, we have an intelligence report that officers can use when they have a hunch that a situation is intelligence-related to fill out and turn in to our analysts to determine if it is intelligence.”

Training/Outreach

Lead: Cindy Southworth

Dave Byers, Steve Siegel, Tim McGrail, Cabell Cropper, Pat Nelson

Vision: We want people to actually open the materials and use them, not just distribute them.

We came up with three strategies to begin with:

1. Engage Global membership broader than this group and ask them whether they would be willing to present a workshop in a box on privacy policy at their national associations. One idea was to do a Webinar or a workshop in person so it is less intimidating.
2. Identify Global members who might be willing to pilot a privacy guidelines project (e.g., Illinois).
3. Have conversations with the National Council of State Governments, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Governors Association, and so on and engage them to foster study groups (or teams) in their states.

Action Items—The breakout group proposes to:

- Focus, first, on workshops.
- Get on the fall GAC agenda in Washington, DC, and request time to do a mini train-the-trainer to engage the Global members to involve their agencies. Or, at a minimum, schedule a separate time in conjunction with the GAC meeting to do a train-the-trainer workshop.
- Via e-mail, get volunteers to work on different pieces of the workshop in a box. We plan to do a briefer version (slideshow) of the guidebook and make it more approachable.

Completion: Fall GAC meeting in November 2007.

We need a “privacy for dummies” type of document. The *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates* is quite daunting. Case studies would help to drill down to the practitioner level and reveal a lot of the confusion and issues associated with this.

Timelines and GAC Meeting Proposal

Action Item: For the June GPIQWG meeting, Chairman Wicklund requested that in addition to the completed action items, each breakout team also show up with newer “Next Steps” for each of these products. This information will be shared at the next GAC meeting (what has been accomplished and what we are going to accomplish). For the April GAC meeting, Chairman Wicklund suggested the following content for briefing the GAC members:

- ISE Privacy Guidelines
- GSWG’s Technical Privacy Task Team
- *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*—Ask for a show of hands from those that know of agencies that are using it. If none are known, ask why.

Discussion proceeded regarding the method by which this information would be presented to the GAC and how to engage them in the process and put the onus on them to be active

participants. The intent is not to simply brief the GAC, but to engage them. What we really want is for them to go back and become champions. Suggestions from the attendees included:

- Communicate with the GAC in the interim, and give them an assignment that could be tied to a discussion at the November GAC meeting.
- Present Ms. Southworth's list of outreach venues (Webinars, etc.), and lead a facilitated discussion on what they might suggest as good approaches for outreach. Ask them what they would be interested in attending.
- Involve them in hypothetical (narrated) scenarios.
- Ask attendees to step forward and discuss ways in which they have taken our products and implemented them. "What have you done to push these products down to your constituents?" A facilitated discussion could let participants know that they are not alone in the level of their efforts.
- Seek input on obstacles GAC members face when getting the materials implemented by their constituents.

Action Item: Chairman Wicklund and Ms. Plante will talk further about the approach of the GAC presentation.

Recommendations and Next Steps

Chairman Wicklund recommended that the next GPIQWG meeting in June be a day-and-a-half "working-style" meeting with fewer presentations and more hands-on time for the four breakout groups to develop the 2007 priority resources.

Chairman Wicklund gave the following charge to the group: "While we are talking about GAC obstacles as to distributing and implementing our products, we need to be cognizant of how we, as members of the GPIQWG, are doing the same—promoting our products to our constituents."

If you have comments about this meeting and how it went, please e-mail Chairman Wicklund. Chairman Wicklund expressed appreciation for the energy the attendees gave to the GPIQWG meetings and for everyone's efforts and involvement.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Appendix A

GPIQWG Meeting Agenda

March 14, 2007

Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) Meeting



Sheraton Crescent Hotel Phoenix
2620 West Dunlap Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85021 ♦ (602) 943-8200

March 14, 2007



Agenda—Page One

Crescent 3 Banquet Room

- 8:00 a.m.–8:30 a.m. **Continental Breakfast**
- 8:30 a.m.–8:45 a.m. **Welcoming Remarks and Introductions**
Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair
Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ♦ New Members/Introductions
 - ♦ Global Working Group Liaisons
 - Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG) Liaison
Scott Fairholm, National Technology Policy Advisor, National Center for State Courts
 - Appoint GPIQWG Liaison to Global Security Working Group (GSWG)
 - ♦ Next Meeting Date
- 8:45 a.m.–9:00 a.m. **Meeting Goals and Purpose**
Carl Wicklund
Jeanette Plante
- Outline of Meeting Topics
- ♦ GPIQWG Priorities: 2007 Business Plan
 - ♦ Privacy and Information Quality (IQ)-Related Initiatives
 - ♦ IQ Assessment Tool Task Team
 - ♦ Continuation of GPIQWG IQ Subgroup Breakouts
- 9:00 a.m.–9:15 a.m. **GPIQWG, Global, and Related Updates**
Carl Wicklund
Jeanette Plante
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ♦ Published Information Quality (IQ) Fact Sheet—*Information Quality: The Foundation for Justice Decision Making*
 - ♦ Update on Technical Privacy Task Team—*Erin Kenneally*

Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) Meeting



Sheraton Crescent Hotel Phoenix
2620 West Dunlap Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85021 ♦ (602) 943-8200



United States
Department of Justice

March 14, 2007

Agenda—Page Two

Crescent 3 Banquet Room

- 9:15 a.m.–9:30 a.m. **Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) Outreach Committee**
Ron Hawley, GESC Outreach Committee Vice Chair
Anticipated Discussion Topics
♦ Promotion of GPIQWG Products Via GESC Outreach Committee
- 9:30 a.m.–10:00 a.m. **Information Sharing Environment (ISE) Privacy Guidelines**
Niels Quist, Counsel, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ)
Anticipated Briefing and Discussion
♦ Newly Released: *ISE Privacy Guidelines*
♦ Implications/revisions for *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*
- 10:00 a.m.–10:15 a.m. *Break*
- 10:15 a.m.–11:00 a.m. **IQ Assessment Tool Task Team**
Owen Greenspan
Anticipated Discussion Topics
♦ Summary of Research and IQ Assessment Tool Progress
- 11:00 a.m.–11:30 a.m. **Records Management**
Jeanette Plante
Anticipated Discussion Topics
♦ Overview and issues relating to records management
- 11:30 a.m.–11:45 a.m. **Introduction to Breakouts: Information Quality Subgroups**
Subgroup Drafting Topics
♦ IQ Guidebook
♦ IQ Assessment Tool
♦ Privacy and IQ in Fusion Center Processes and Guidelines
♦ Training and Outreach/Facets of Privacy and IQ Presentation for Conferences
- 11:45 a.m.–1:15 p.m. *Lunch (on your own)*

Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) Meeting



Sheraton Crescent Hotel Phoenix
2620 West Dunlap Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85021 ♦ (602) 943-8200



United States
Department of Justice

March 14, 2007

Agenda—Page Three

Crescent 3 Banquet Room

- 1:15 p.m.–2:30 p.m. **Breakout Session: Information Quality Subgroups (continued)**
- Subgroup Drafting Topics
- ♦ IQ Guidebook
 - ♦ IQ Assessment Tool
 - ♦ Privacy and IQ in Fusion Center Processes and Guidelines
 - ♦ Training and Outreach/Facets of Privacy and IQ Presentation for Conferences
- 2:30 p.m.–3:15 p.m. **Presentations From Subgroups**
- Subgroup Presentation Topics
- ♦ IQ Guidebook—Outline of Tools to Be Contained Within
 - ♦ IQ Assessment Tool—Target Standard, What Will Be Assessed, Process for Assessment, Etc.
 - ♦ Privacy and IQ in Fusion Center Processes and Guidelines
 - ♦ Training and Outreach/Facets of Privacy and IQ Presentation for Conferences
- 3:15 p.m.–3:30 p.m. **Break**
- 3:30 p.m.–4:15 p.m. **GPIQWG Recommendations and Next Steps**
- Carl Wicklund*
Jeanette Plante
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ♦ Action Items
 - ♦ Resource Development Timelines
 - ♦ Recommendations for April 2007 Global Advisory Committee Meeting
- 4:15 p.m.–4:30 p.m. **Closing Remarks**
- Carl Wicklund*
Jeanette Plante
- 4:30 p.m. **Adjournment**



Appendix B

GPIQWG Information Quality Assessment Tool
(IQAT) Task Team

Information Quality Assessment Questionnaire

March 14, 2007

Information Quality Assessment Questionnaire

High-Level Questions (Information includes fingerprints.)		Lower-Level Questions (Information includes booking.)
<p>Do you take steps to ensure the information captured is accurate, complete, sufficient, and timely?</p> <p>Do you ensure the information is secure?</p> <p>Do you assess the quality of the information?</p> <p>Do you allow for multiple people to enter the information?</p> <p>Do you specifically assign duties and responsibilities to the people responsible for data capture?</p>	<p><u>Arrestment:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Criminal history <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this the correct person? • Is the criminal history correct? • Is the criminal history authoritative? 2. Pretrial services agency report 3. The complaint 4. Courts record system 5. Pending other charges 6. Warrant information 7. Drug assessment (questionnaire, not a drug test) 8. Department of Corrections information 9. Incident report (builds the complaint) 10. Representation information 11. Immigration status 12. Pre-arrestment bail 13. Victim advocate report 14. Custody information/status (detained or released) 15. Victim notification (SAVIN) 	<p>How?</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Automated mechanisms Manual mechanisms</p> <p>DNA collection (note for Mr. Greenspan)</p> <p>How? (Secure as in transit, in storage, etc.)</p> <p>Are data entry personnel screened?</p> <p>How routinely do you assess the information?</p> <p>Authorization and authentication</p> <p>Do you use a turnkey for the booking processes?</p>

<p>Do you consider data entry accuracy and information quality a performance measure? (agency or individual)</p> <p>Do you take steps to ensure the captured information entered into your system is accurate/complete/timely? Do you verify?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">How and when do you verify information in the system?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">What is the source or do you verify against some source?</p> <p>Do you periodically review your collection mechanism for relevance (a business need)?</p> <p>Do you have a mechanism for correcting information?</p> <p>Do you provide training on information quality?</p> <p>Do you have a disposition policy?</p>		<p>Is data entry a specialized position?</p> <p>Do you verify?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">How do you verify information on the arrest report?</p> <p>How do you assess your business case for collecting information?</p>
--	--	---

<p>Do you have a uniform format for entry? If not, do you have a policy for determining the additional data elements needed?</p> <p>Do you disseminate data outside of your agency?</p> <p>Do you have written documentation outlining the procedures above?</p>		
--	--	--