Southwest Alabama Justice Information Pilot Project Guidance

I Introduction

This memorandum consists of a set of proposed steps and guidance to be provided to the Southwest Alabama Justice Information Pilot Program Management Group. It is the goal of this document to assist the Management Group in defining the goals of the project. The document is also designed to help identify complex issues in the integration process and provide tools for resolving impediments.

II Integration Concepts

Ideally, the process of integrating multiple automated functional processes is a straightforward task, defined by a set of commonly perceived needs that must be addressed. The perception of need may be no more complex or formal than a mutual understanding that there needs to be more timely access to information. Having said that, there is a substantive difference between information sharing and information integration. Information sharing is the transfer of information from one agency to another. Information integration is a more complex concept, as agencies contribute data to a common network of data for use by multiple agencies and individuals. Both concepts converge when an integrated information system provides more comprehensive data sharing among contributors.

III Development Stages of the Information Integration Process

Just as there is more to Information Sharing than automating processes, Information Integration is far more complex than the purchasing of software, hardware and the creation of a data infrastructure. At the most basic level, it may be true that electrons passing through Fibre-Optic Cable represent Information Integration, but what good are those electrons if they answer the wrong needs? A complete Information Integration Process encompasses not only the physical and logical components of hardware and software, but also the development of the integrated system itself. An Information Integration Program assesses the needs of the users of the system and molds the system to suit the needs of those who will benefit from it most. The following steps summarize key milestones in creating a successful Information Integration Program:

1. ***Bring Key Stakeholders Together*:** Select and formalize a group of key stakeholders who can lend substantial, significant support to a jurisdiction-wide information sharing improvement effort. These stakeholders should be individuals who have a clear understanding of the functional processes to be integrated. Such individuals should include, but should not be limited to, representatives from the Law Enforcement, Court (Bench and Court Clerks), Prosecution, Defense, Corrections, Public Safety, Probation and Parole and Juvenile Justice communities. By bringing

these key groups together, a vision can begin to be formed, based on the perceptions that these groups have, about the Information Integration Process.

2. ***Develop Governance Structure***: Create an oversight structure to enable stakeholders to understand how they will work together and direct the project. As the functional needs of the Information Integration Process are defined, there will come a time when someone will have to make decisions regarding policy and implementation. The lesson learned from successful integration programs nationwide has been that the stronger and more clearly defined the Governance Structure is, the more successful the project is. The Governance Body, representing the Stakeholders must decide how the program development process will be driven.

   Most jurisdictions that integrate/share information have established a formal organizational structure that specifies a governing hierarchy. In fact, a formal organizational structure must exist in any integration effort to ensure effective planning and decision-making. A governance structure should be composed of people – often emerging from stakeholder meetings – who will make valuable contributions to the decision-making process. Many of these structures contain a mix of people with different talents and skills, especially a mix of IT and non-IT individuals (including senior policy making officials).

   The governance structure must establish credibility among all stakeholders. It is advisable to establish a three-tier governance structure composed of committees at the executive, mid-level management, and technical/user levels. Most often, the structure's committees have defined roles and responsibilities that have been agreed upon by representatives of all agencies, who have the ability to commit and make decisions on behalf of their organization.

   A) <u>Executive Committees</u>

   The executive groups must include members from each of the three branches of government, whether state or local, as well as executives of IJIS user agencies. Any group that will be responsible for any part of the implementation should be included. The purpose of this document is to focus on integration efforts at the state and county level. It should be noted; however, that a similar approach would be used at the state integration project level, in that, State Level executives, such The Governor and Justice Community Officials at the state's highest levels would be part of the Executive Committee.

   At the city/county level, this group may include people such as:

   - police chiefs
   - sheriffs
   - prosecutors
   - judges
   - mayors
   - probation and parole
   - court clerks and administrators
   - public defenders
   - local/regional corrections
   - county commissioners

- city managers
- city councilmen

The Executive Committee is responsible for the overall governance of integration, which includes setting policy and approving budgets. The Executive Committee should have access to objective technology advisors that will provide input regarding technical matters. This will ensure that policy and operations/systems decisions are technically feasible. Decision-making on Executive Committees that is done collaboratively helps build consensus and ensure that equal roles are established for each agency/member.

B) Mid-level Management Committees

Mid-level managers are often information users who can set the tone for change. Successful integration efforts require support from executives to operations level users. Mid-level managers are an important link between executives and operations-level users, and should be included in the planning process. It is this level that determines the daily direction of the system, prepares the budget, and manages the operations and implementation of integration.

C) Technical/User Committees

The organizational structure should include committees of operations-level users. Line police officers, court clerks, and other system users are the key to day-to-day operations. While the executive and mid-level manager may be able to describe users' general tasks, it is very important to understand every step of what they do. If outside consultants are hired to examine the business process, it is imperative they work closely with users. Operations-level business processes in a county of 2,000,000 are significantly different than in a county of 200,000. There is no substitution for including users in the planning process.

The governing structure should include the Chief Information Officers (CIO) and Information Technology (IT) Managers of the major agencies involved. If an agency does not have a CIO or IT manager, if it is feasible they should plan to hire one. An unbiased consultant, not permitted to bid on subsequent technology contracts, may be hired to assist in the selection of qualified IT managers and vendors. If an executive selects a person within their organization to coordinate and oversee all IT issues, it is ***highly recommended*** that the candidate have the experience, skills and knowledge required of a professional IT manager.

I. Committee Interaction

Each committee has defined roles and responsibilities that are interdependent upon each other. For example, the executive level committee approves the design of IJIS, which has been developed and proposed by middle-management committees, who in turn will organize the implementation of IJIS. The user level

committees will provide valuable and crucial input regarding the design, such as whether a proposed business process change is feasible, and once in place, they will test its effectiveness.

II. Committee Leadership

A person with technical expertise should be included in each of the committees as an ex officio member. They will be able to provide guidance and respond to technical questions that may arise. It is recommended that this technical person not be the leader or chair of the committee (with the exception of the technical committees). Their role is to recommend technical solutions that accomplish the mission and goals set forth by the executive committees.

3. ***Develop Decision-Making Process*:** Formalize a process by which the governance structure will make decisions including policy planning, programming and implementing actions. This is especially important when functional specifications for the Information Integration Process are being defined. While it may be very desirable for the Process to be all things to all people, the odds are against it. There may not be enough funding to accomplish all the goals immediately. There may be physical or technical reasons why it may be impossible or impractical to include a component. The Stakeholders must have a clear understanding that decisions may have to be made that will balance what is ideal in creating an Information Integration Process and what is possible to create with the available resources.

   Information systems integration requires that many decisions be made throughout the project that will affect one or more agencies/departments. Decisions will be made regarding project goals, scope, funding, system development, and other crucial items. There must be a mechanism in place that specifies how decisions are made, who makes them, under what authority, and who carries them out.

   Rules that govern decision-making are most often built into the governance structure. Each level and each committee has a defined role in the decision-making process, which is most successful when it builds consensus. This process should include holding all parties accountable for their ideas, and it must establish authority while recognizing jurisdictional and constitutional independence. Problems requiring decision-making authority should be resolved quickly. Successful integration projects generally require monthly meetings at the executive level and weekly meetings at other levels. This requires commitment to regular meetings by executives and recognition of the importance of quick committee decisions. Projects can fail if stalled over the inability of agency heads or their representatives to come together and make decisions.

4. ***Develop Goals*:** The governing body of stakeholders must create a shared mission and a set of goals that all agree are optimal to achieve information integration and sharing. For Southwest Alabama, this is especially critical. At this time, there are some very

impressive formative ideas being generated. However, as the project develops, these ideas will have to become more clearly defined goals that can be used to identify budgetary, functional and technical needs. Ideally, this is an important part of the process, where a functional design document begins to take shape. A functional design document is more than an executive summary of general ideas. Realistically, a functional design document will be a living document that will define the following:

- A step-by-step breakdown of information process throughput. For example, such a breakdown might define how an integrated process would capture data at the point of an individual's arrest. The breakdown would then define how data would be shared and disseminated throughout the judicial process, through court processing channels, prosecution, defense, incarceration and release,

- Functional interaction with multiple data sharing entities at the Federal, State and Local level, identifying not only the desired organizations for interaction and data interchange, but definition of what data is to be integrated from these organizations,

- Exploration of meta-data generation or capture. Meta-data, for lack of a better phrase, is data about data. It may be prudent to consider what kinds of data report generation capabilities are desirable when defining the desired data to be integrated from other systems.

As part of the process of developing and defining goals for the project, significant attention needs to be devoted to Business Process Re-engineering. Business Process Re-engineering has many definitions and a number of applications in this project. One of the more important Re-Engineering processes at the practical level in this instance would suggest a review of how data is collected, reviewing the possibilities for generating and storing meta-data, and perhaps changing record layouts and storage options. The potential benefits of Re-Engineering the data collection and storage would include:

- Accelerated record access, through improved record layout, data normalization and record indexing,

- Generation of meta-data, which may provide a better means for generating statistical data and reports about the existing data,

- Improved data collection and dissemination, which may streamline the data access process. Improved data collection may also lead to the acquisition of more data resources that were previously untapped.

Theoretically, one of the purposes of the Southwest Alabama Pilot Project is to provide more useful ways for using available data. By creating a more substantial

means for sharing data across Federal, State, County and Local agencies, the potential to provide better user access to data increases. However, by reviewing and re-engineering business processes, it may be possible to not only provide more data access to more people, but also to provide better data visibility as well.

5. ***Determine Project Scope*:** Decide on a scope that meets immediate and future needs and is reasonable given jurisdictional resources. The conditions of the Southwest Alabama Integration Pilot Project grant clearly define that $7.5 Million dollars will be available for development. It is unknown whether additional future money will be available for sustenance and additional enhancements to the Integration Project. It is incumbent upon the project planners to take this funding situation into account when defining the project scope. This is a perilous step in the project decision-making process because this is the portion of the process where reality and fantasy diverge sharply. Goals can sometimes be confused with dreams. By defining scope accurately, basing decisions on needs versus desires, cost overruns can generally be avoided.

6. ***Complete Needs Assessment**:* Based on goals and scope, create a detailed set of information sharing needs, both intra- and inter- agency, of all participating agencies. Realistically, this is the most time consuming, painstaking step in the integration process. Developing a Functional Design Document throughout the process will help define most functional needs, but this is the point in the process where hardware, software and infrastructure considerations need to be identified and factored into the process of defining the Information Integration Project. Some basic questions need to be resolved in this step in the evolution of the Pilot Project, such as:

    - What will this Integration Pilot Project do, specifically? This question has to be the first one asked and the first one answered, clearly and concisely. If a clear definition of the project cannot be presented, all other questions are irrelevant.

    - Is the goal of the Pilot Project to integrate existing data resources into a common database, using existing software? Is the goal to develop a new software system and database package using existing data? Is our planned integration project a pass-through for multiple systems to communicate and share data? Are there other alternatives to these? What is the ***vision*** of integration for Southwest Alabama?

    - How will Federal, State and Local Systems communicate with each other? What infrastructure needs have been assessed? That is the current status of the infrastructure. What is the anticipated data volume? Can existing networks handle the data volume? Will communications infrastructures have to be improved? What improvements will be required? Is there an existing Intranet between the counties for sharing data, or will we have to use the public Internet and protect our communications from intrusion?

- What systems will need to communicate? How will those systems be identified? Have we identified all the systems that we want to interact with?

- Have we identified all the functional areas we want to integrate? Is there a logical process in place to merge the data? Can users get to the data easily? Do the right users have access to the right data?

- How will the best source of data be defined, so that the most detailed, most current data will be captured? Will we have to convert data from one format to another? Will we have to convert record layouts to make them more sharing-friendly?

- How will data redundancy be addressed? How do we keep from building redundant repositories of data? How do we keep from reinventing someone else's system, like the Alabama Office of Courts?

- Are existing network infrastructures secure? What improvements need to be made? Will there be a need to add firewalls? Will there be a need to encrypt data? Will there be a need to incorporate digital signatures? Is our existing networking secure? What security measures should we take?

- What is the best hardware solution? How many servers will be needed? How many CPU's per server. How much memory will be needed? How much storage will be needed? What kind of network connectivity will the servers need? What if new servers and old servers have different network specifications? Can we find hardware that will grow with our needs? What's the best operating system for the servers?

- Will a middleware solution be needed to help different contributing systems talk to each other? Will application program interfaces (API's) be necessary to move data from system-to-system and/or database-to-database? How many API's will be needed? How complex will the API's have to be?

- Will new software have to be written to manage the integrated system? Will user interfaces have to be written? Is there an existing Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) solution that can resolve these issues? How can I find out about COTS solutions? Could we tailor the COTS solution to fit our needs?

- What database package should we use? What database package can grow with us? Does the database package have enough tools to fit our needs? Will we be at the mercy of a proprietary technology?

- How many users will there be? How do we get input of the grass-roots user?

- Who will do Quality Assurance and Configuration Management of the process? When should we freeze the Functional Design Document?

- Should we hire a contractor to build an Information Integration solution for us, based on specifications we define and control? Should we do all this ourselves? Could we or should we hire multiple contractors? Should we hire a technical manager to direct the process?

- How will we demonstrate the Pilot Project to other entities? Do we have office space? Do we need office space? Will we need to dedicate staff to the demonstration center? Does the demonstration center have the appropriate physical infrastructure to support the hardware and communications needs of the Pilot Project?

- Are we going to have to buy everyone in Southwest Alabama a new Personal Computer?

- How are we going to break down the Information Integration process to work in one Judicial District and then migrate the work to the other Districts? Do we want to break it down? Do we want to build it all at once, for all the Districts?

- Do we need to build this Integration Process quickly or can we take our time?

- After we have asked and answered all these questions, can we do all the things we want to do with the funding we have? What should stay and what should go, if we cannot do it all for the budgeted funding amount?

7. ***Design Information System*:** In collaboration with information technology advisors, develop and design an information system approach that meets the goals, objectives, and needs of the jurisdiction. After all the implementation questions have been answered, the functional and architectural needs have been assessed, the scope and goals resolved, it will still take time to build the Information Integration Process itself. With a refined Functional Design Document in place, users and practitioners should be able to accurately articulate their desires to technical advisors. Having said that, it is important for the functional and technical representatives to periodically revisit the Functional Design Document and confirm that the Integration Process is developing ***exactly*** as the assessed needs of the users and practitioners have defined it. Technical staff members are usually not practitioners and will implement what they think the users and practitioners want. If there is any ambiguity between what the users want and what the technical staff perceptions of need are, disappointment and disaster await.

   As the system is being designed, it is also important to address the notion of how the data will be managed. Aside from considerations dictated by what database software

is selected as part of the implementation, attention must be given to whether data must be converted from multiple different data formats.

8. ***Assess Costs*:** The jurisdiction should now be prepared to make a reasonable estimate of cost, providing all previous steps in the process have been adequately addressed. As part of the assessment process the following planning documents should be developed and agreed upon prior to implementation. These documents will allow the implementation authority control costs, by tightly controlling and monitoring the outlay of financial resources the designate the resources to be employed during the implementation phase. These documents are:

    - ***A Statement of Work*** – This document defines the specific details of what is required of all parties participating in the integration effort. This document defines all required deliverables and reports to be provided to the Project Director and specific due dates for completion by responsible parties.

    - ***A Work Breakdown Structure*** – This document provides a step-by-step diagram of how the deliverables in the statement of work will be accomplished and in what timetable. This document also defines the level of effort required to complete the tasks in the statement of work, as it applies to manpower allocations and resource expenditures. This document will contain detailed resumes of all implementation team members and the agreed-upon hourly fees to be charged by vendors against project resources.

9. ***Implement the System:*** In collaboration with information technology advisors, phase in the new process. This is a time-consuming activity. It could take months or years, depending on the path chosen. If integrating data sources in a single Judicial District is the interim goal, followed by expansion to the other Districts in Southwest Alabama, then lessons-learned can be derived during the initial implementation in the originating District. This is also the point in the system evolution process where strong configuration management processes need to be put into place that will maintain the direction of the project. Such processes are necessary to manage change during the implementation process and prevent the project from incorporating functionality that diverges from the goals set forth in the planning process. Such processes would include:

    - Locking in the element definitions placed in the Data Dictionary,
    - Freezing the Function Design Document Specifications, and,
    - Documenting Functional changes and subsequent implementations during the integration development process.

    While the integration process is being implemented, it is important to keep in mind that multiple tasks can be implemented at once, in a parallel fashion. Such parallel development keeps the process from being bogged down in bottlenecks created by technical manpower shortages in a particular discipline, hardware and software delivery delays or functional implementation difficulties.

During the implementation process, Vendors will submit to the Project Director detailed monthly reports detailing expenditures for project related costs, including labor, software and hardware acquisition, communications and network implementation costs and other direct charges.

10. ***Inform and Educate Community:*** Ensure that others in the jurisdiction, at all levels, are informed and educated about the intentions of the project, its implementation process, and anticipated impact and outcomes. User acceptance is a key issue in the development of any integration process. An underlying fundamental principle must be kept in mind throughout the Information Integration development process; any implementation is a waste of resources if it provides no added value and no one uses the process. By educating the user/practitioner community of the value of the integration process and the eventual goals of the implementation and by utilizing the feedback provided by the assessment and incorporation of user needs, the new integration process will find community support and acceptance.

11. ***Evaluate and Maintain System*:** The new information system or strategy must be monitored and maintained to ensure the new approach meets all previously agreed to information sharing goals, scope and needs. Evaluation of the system's usefulness and impact is essential. Success breeds the desire for added enhancement. It may be true that by providing a new tool to the Justice Community through better data access, goals will be achieved and perhaps lives will be saved. With a successful implementation, the user/practitioner community will desire new enhancement and functionality.

IV Critical Issues

A number of critical issues often influence the process of integration and sharing. For the implementation to be successful, planners, who must make solid choices during each step, should fully understand these issues. Jurisdictions that attempt to improve information sharing must employ staff with strong knowledge and skills in these critical areas:

- Project Management,
- Business Process Reengineering,
- Basic Technology Design,
- Vendor Issues,
- Privacy Requirements,
- System Security Requirements,
- Data Integrity.

1. Project Management

Implementing an integrated criminal justice information system can be a long-term endeavor. It is complex, and often requires the complete dedication of an individual that

can manage the process from the beginning. Many localities choose to hire an outside consultant with project management experience. Whether or not an outside consultant is chosen, someone will be required to manage the project on a daily basis.

The project manager will oversee daily operations and interface with executives and others to discuss policy issues as they arise. He/she should have a thorough knowledge of the state's criminal justice system and public safety issues, an understanding of executive level policy and decision-making, and should possess project management, public relations, negotiation and delegation skills. Ideally, he or she will also have some technical background. Project management is essential to the success of IJIS and a well-trained, effective project manager is a fundamental requirement.

Due to the rapid changes in technology, timeliness is crucial to IJIS development. The project manager should be expected to set tasks, milestones and deliverables and to report the status of these tasks on, at least, a monthly basis. Accountability is critical, and expectations of individuals in their assigned tasks should be clarified for everyone involved to ensure effective identification and resolution of problems.

Managing consultants and vendors can be challenging. Software developers must be informed of the importance of meeting deadlines and should be aware of consequences for falling behind schedule (e.g. penalty fee assessments). Guidelines and expectations must be established up front and in writing. The project manager is responsible for managing vendors and must do so proactively.

2. Business Process Reengineering

After hiring/appointing a project manager, and prior to developing IJIS software requirements, a very thorough understanding of the day-to-day operations of the criminal justice system is required. This means understanding the purpose of each form utilized in the criminal justice system, everything contained on it, everywhere it travels, how and why. An equal understanding of every process and management system must be gained. Unmet needs of system users must be identified. Every segment of the operations of criminal justice systems and agencies must be understood, examined and re-examined for effectiveness. This is part of Business Process Reengineering (BPR).

Definitions of BPR vary dramatically. One definition, contained in a publication of the National Academy of Public Administration, focuses on "government" reengineering:

> *Government business process reengineering is a radical improvement approach that critically examines, rethinks, and redesigns mission product and service processes within a political environment. It achieves dramatic mission performance gains from multiple customer and stakeholder perspectives. It is a key part of a process management approach for optimal performance that continually evaluates, adjusts or removes processes.*

BPR may be the biggest threat to the success of implementing IJIS. The assessment of business processes and information flows, and the reasons for the current processes, must be thorough, it is the foundation for the redesign of information flows. It is imperative this assessment examine the reasons for existence of processes that may seem inefficient. Often times these underlying reasons, which are not immediately apparent to a system user or outside consultant, will have to be considered during redesign. Data ownership issues are one example of such reasons. The assessment should make recommendations for redesign and for types of technology that would allow implementation of the redesign. Ultimately, results should drive software development and ensure that a product that meets the needs of the criminal justice system is the result.

If an outside consultant is hired to perform a BPR study, ensure that internal professionals are included on the study team. An outside consultant may fail to ask the right questions and may decide something is not useful, or is inefficient, without understanding the reason for its existence. The consultant must have criminal justice system experience, without it their BPR value to criminal justice agencies is limited.

3. Basic Technology Design

a) Open Architecture/Interoperability Standards

When selecting hardware, software and communications systems, vendors whose systems are not proprietary and can easily connect with devices and programs made by other manufacturers should be selected. Open architectures use off-the-shelf components and conform to approved standards. For a further discussion on these and other technical issues, information can be obtained from the following website:

http://webopedia.internet.com/standards/open_architecture.html

Open architecture means that the specifications of the architecture are public. Written assurances should be obtained from vendors that systems purchased for a state are not proprietary; that they conform to specified standards and that they will connect with other open systems.

4. Vendor Issues

a) Types of Vendors

It is likely more than one vendor will be utilized when integrating information systems. Generally speaking, vendors follow into the following categories:

- *Consultants:* A consultant may be hired to assist in a business process reengineering study, and/or to provide assistance in making decisions about which vendors to select when purchasing hardware, software and communications equipment.

- *Database Management:* Contract with a vendor that will sell you a method and the corresponding technology to store, retrieve and query large amounts of data. Examples of this include data warehousing and datamarts.

- *Software/Hardware Developers:* Contract with or hire software developers to build a product that allows users to receive and manipulate data. Ultimately this will be the computer screen that an operational user sees and uses.

- *Outsource Firms:* A firm may be hired to complete as an assigned task. For example, a training and technical assistance consultant may be hired to train to all new IJIS users.

b) Contract Issues

A written contract should always be in force when dealing with any vendor. Jurisdictions must not accept "boilerplate" contracts. The contract should be written for the specific project and should contain clauses with penalties for cost and time overruns. It should iterate the circumstances under which the contract may be terminated. Expectations of the vendor should be as concise as possible.

In the case of technology development and implementation, the contract should include a pilot testing phase and a specified length of time for performing corrections in response to the beta test. The contract should also include language regarding ongoing technical support after the initial implementation is completed.

Other issues to be specified in the contract are interoperability standards/proprietary systems, measurement for successful job completion, and jurisdiction for necessary legal action. Legal counsel should be employed in the review of all contracts.

The implementation of Public/Private partnerships and shared risk/benefit strategies is a relatively new concept to IJIS implementations. In some cases, as new, re-usable technology solutions are developed, opportunities may arise for governments to enter into partnerships with Vendors to share the financial risks of the initial implementation, when the possibility exists that the project could be implemented in multiple additional jurisdictions.

c) Locating Experienced Vendors

It is imperative that an experienced vendor with a strong track record of successful system integration is utilized. Many state and local agencies have purchased inadequate systems from vendors who subsequently went out of business. Some states have had legislation written to exempt integration projects from bid laws and enable contract award to the most qualified bidder (as opposed to the lowest bidder). Extensive research, including contacting states and localities in this report and others around the country, should be completed. Seek available expertise and wisdom of professionals who have

implemented integration. When speaking to a vendor representative, the client should request multiple references and follow through by contacting those references.

5. Privacy Requirements

In recent years new federal and state legislation has increasingly authorized access to criminal history information for non-criminal justice purposes. For example, the National Child Protection Act authorizes background checks for employees providing services to children, the elderly and the disabled. The FBI has reported that the number of requests for criminal history information for non-criminal justice purposes now exceeds the number of requests from the criminal justice community. As a result, law enforcement is tasked with responding to requests authorized by legislation while acting consistently with federal and state laws governing privacy. They are faced with the following questions:

- What level of verification is appropriate for non-criminal justice checks (name only, social security number or fingerprint)?

- Should the criminal history or conviction data be available for non-criminal justice purposes not specifically authorized by statute?

- Should criminal history or conviction information from closed record states be accessed or released for non-criminal justice purposes authorized in one state but not another?

- What fee should be assessed for non-criminal justice checks in order to cover resources allocated to these checks?

The answer to these questions varies widely from state to state. One state may have very restrictive privacy laws while another state may make name-only checks of all conviction information readily available to the public for a nominal fee using the worldwide web.

Currently there is no recognized constitutional right to privacy in criminal history records. Speculation exists about potential Supreme Court rulings regarding this issue. In one case, the Supreme Court held that police did not violate any constitutional right to privacy because the disclosure of the plaintiff's arrest for shoplifting was based on a claim that the state could not publicize a record of an official act such as an arrest. [1] In a more recent case, Department of Justice v. Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press[2], the Supreme Court held that there was a statutory right of privacy in comprehensive, automated criminal history records.

---

[1] Paul v. Davis, 424 U.S. 693, 713 (1976).

[2] Department of Justice v. Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749 (1989). (plaintiff was arrested for shoplifting and the charges were dismissed, his name and picture were included in a police flyer of "active shoplifters" distributed to merchants).

A number of state and federal appeals courts have recently examined "Megan's Laws", which require police to notify specific individuals (usually schools or neighbors) of the name and residence of paroled sex offenders. Originally, these laws involved the police notifying neighbors living within a certain range of a paroled offender with phone calls or flyers. More recently, however, states have begun to post the information on the Internet. The specifics of the laws, the registration requirements and notification procedures vary from state to state and as such the court decisions to date vary. Many of the laws have been appealed on double jeopardy, due process and right to privacy issues.

When determining the capabilities and uses of the system, and whether to build in easy public access to certain records, states and jurisdictions must weigh additional costs against potential litigation costs. Additionally, with the emergence of an increasing awareness of privacy issues in Integration planning, the Privacy Design Principles being developed by the Office of the General Counsel and the Ontario Privacy Commission should be carefully introduced during the development of functional and technical specifications.

6. Security Requirements

There are a number of different information security issues that should be considered in the design or specification of any statewide information management system. These issues can generally be classified into the following:

- *Network Security:* Includes, but may not be limited to, server performance, server traffic analysis and management, channel broad-width considerations, firewall management/ administration, server capacity as a function of changes in user population, systems management/maintenance, and systems performance benchmarking/measurement and database/transmission encryption issues.

- *Access Security:* Involves protection of data that is captured, manipulated or processed by the system. It also includes account security functions such as user access management (password and authentication management). Process security involves ensuring the integrity of potentially incompatible applications that may be required to coexist in a particular system. This issue is of particular importance in cases where dissimilar systems are required to have some level of shared data or access across the network. Finally, a system for detecting and counteracting attempts at hostile and unauthorized system access (hacking) is usually required in most large (statewide) systems.

- *Disaster Management Planning:* Preparations for the much publicized Y2K event was a good example of this sub-topic. The potential for catastrophic hardware, database or backbone failure may increase exponentially as a function of the number of users and the level of systems resources they require as a function of installed system capacity. A comprehensive and adequately supported plan for the timely recovery of these events is usually written in the contract language for statewide installations.

- *Physical Security:* Although sometimes overlooked, this important area involves the physical protection of IM systems and their mission critical components from both natural disasters and hostile human intent. This requirement is often met, in part, by the establishment of a hardened and secured information processing area in which the main servers, routers and online storage media can be adequately protected.

Regardless of how effective a given system installation may address any one of the above issues, it is the effective administration of system security that is often the key ingredient in providing an efficient and stable computing environment.

7. Data Integrity

Ensuring the integrity and reliability of data and information is a priority in any IJIS effort. It is crucial that data is correct and that information users have confidence in IJIS and the information it shares. There are several steps that must be taken to help ensure data integrity:

- A "data dictionary" must be constructed that contains common definitions and procedures. A common basis of understanding at the detail level must exist to enable accurate record matching and ensure reliability. (Example)

- Data ownership rules and data sharing standards must be defined.

V Conclusion

This document is a framework for developing an integrated justice system in Southwest Alabama. There are many methodologies available to create the IJIS system and the Office of Justice Programs is not married to any particular methodology over another, provided the implementation features true Information Integration, as opposed to Information Sharing or Process Automation. It is hoped that the document has answered Integration Process questions in a substantive manner, while also generating new thought in the planning of the process.

VI Acknowledgements

The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), Integrated Justice Planning Model, provided general planning concepts and integration steps cited in this document. The Office of Justice Programs thanks the IACP for the assistance and co-operation in the development of this document.