

## **Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group**

**February 18-20, 2003**

**San Francisco, California**

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **Meeting Background and Purpose**

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice, convened the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG or “Working Group”) on February 18-20, 2003. The purpose of this meeting was to continue ongoing committee work in order to develop the Business Reference Model (BRM), define the standards governance process, review emerging technologies, and approve Justice Standards Clearinghouse (JSC)<sup>1</sup> for Information Sharing improvements. The meeting agenda and key discussion points included:

- ❑ Alabama’s Law Enforcement Tactical System (LETS)
- ❑ Progress of the Justice Extensible Markup Language (XML) Data Dictionary (JXDD) Effort
- ❑ Review of Committee Work Plans
  - Business Reference Model
  - Emerging Technologies
  - Governance
  - JSC Improvements and Evaluation Criteria
- ❑ Recommendations to the Global Advisory Committee (GAC)

#### **Convening and Introductory Remarks**

Thomas Henderson, GISWG Chairman, and National Center for State Courts Executive Director of Government Relations, convened the meeting and invited members and guests to introduce themselves and their areas of representation. The following participants were in attendance:

---

<sup>1</sup> Formerly known as the Justice Standards Registry (JSR).

Mr. John Aerts  
*Consolidated Criminal History  
Reporting System  
Norwalk, California*

Mr. Ben Artichoker  
*Cangleska, Inc.  
Kyle, South Dakota*

Mr. D. J. Atkinson  
*National Telecommunications and  
Information Administration  
Boulder, Colorado*

Mr. Bob Brinson  
*North Carolina Department  
of Corrections  
Raleigh, North Carolina*

Mr. Philip Broadfoot  
*Waynesboro Police Department  
Waynesboro, Virginia*

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

Mr. Paul S. Embley  
*Practitioners Assistance Team  
Frankfort, Kentucky*

Mr. Scott Fairholm  
*National Center for State Courts  
Williamsburg, Virginia*

Ms. Robin Gibson  
*Missouri Supreme Court  
Jefferson City, Missouri*

Ms. Evie Gray  
*National Telecommunications and  
Information Administration  
Boulder, Colorado*

Mr. Bob Greeves  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Washington, DC*

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

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

Ms. Jennifer A. Hicks  
*International Association of Chiefs  
of Police  
Alexandria, Virginia*

Mr. George W. Hogshead  
*Industry Working Group  
Wexford, Pennsylvania*

Mr. Tom Hopper  
*Federal Bureau of Investigation  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Mark Kindl  
*Georgia Tech Research Institute  
Atlanta, Georgia*

Ms. Diane Lewis  
*Executive Office of the United States  
Attorneys  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Brad Long  
*Oklahoma Department of  
Public Safety  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma*

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

Mr. J. Patrick McCreary  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Washington, DC*

Mr. Maury Mitchell  
*Alabama Attorney General's Office  
Montgomery, Alabama*

Mr. Eric Nelson  
*National Telecommunications and  
Information Administration  
Boulder, Colorado*

Mr. Dereck Orr  
*National Institute of Standard and  
Technology  
Gaithersburg, Maryland*

Mr. Val Pietrasiewicz  
*National Telecommunications and  
Information Administration  
Boulder, Colorado*

Mr. James Pritchett  
*Southwest Alabama Integrated  
Criminal Justice System  
Foley, Alabama*

Ms. Catherine Plummer  
*SEARCH, The National Consortium  
for Justice Information and Statistics  
Sacramento, California*

Ms. Donna J. Rinehart  
*Institute for Intergovernmental  
Research  
Tallahassee, Florida*

Mr. Michael J. Roggero  
*Missouri Supreme Court  
Jefferson City, Missouri*

Ms. Monique Schmidt  
*Institute for Intergovernmental  
Research  
Tallahassee, Florida*

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

Ms. Richelle G. Uecker  
*National Association for Court  
Management  
Minneapolis, Minnesota*

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

Mr. John Wandelt  
*Georgia Tech Research Institute  
Atlanta, Georgia*

## **Alabama's Law Enforcement Tactical System (LETS)**

Mr. Jim Pritchett, Southwest Alabama Integrated Criminal Justice System, and Mr. Maury Mitchell, Alabama Office of the Attorney General, presented a demonstration of Alabama's innovative Internet-based information portal. The success of LETS is based on its Internet-based information delivery system, which is designed specifically for Alabama's law enforcement community. The goals of the system are to keep costs to a minimum and to deliver output to where it is needed the most. Information records include any public records maintained by local and state governments, records available for law enforcement purposes, and "private" records as made available. For example, driver licenses, corrections, warrants, protection orders, pardons and paroles, criminal case index, misdemeanor index, prison census, and death certificates are the types of output records that are available for retrieval.

## **Committee Reports**

### **Infrastructure Framework (IF) Committee – John Loverude, Chairman**

#### Issue One: Business Reference Model (BRM)

In December 2002, the Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) delegated the task of developing a justice-based BRM. At that time, the newly formed IF Committee initiated discussions regarding the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) BRM as developed for the federal executive branch of government by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Federal Enterprise Architecture Program Management Office (FEAPMO).<sup>2</sup> The BRM is a function-driven framework for describing the business operations of the federal government independent of the agencies that perform them. Mr. John Loverude noted, "The federal government has put out a business reference for the federal executive branch of government, and our task is to develop the BRM for justice information sharing."

In light of the critical nature, substantial work load, and accelerated timeframe required to produce the BRM report, it was decided by the GESC to obtain a writer to conduct research, develop the draft, and to author the end product. Mr. Loverude has recommended Ms. Catherine Plummer, SEARCH, to staff this project.

Mr. Loverude provided a report on the committee work that is underway. The goal is to accomplish two immediate tasks. The first task is to define the sub-functions of justice organizations for the federal executive branch. The IF Committee has added prosecution, defense, and judicial proceedings; however, they may revisit these

---

<sup>2</sup> FEAPMO, The Business Reference Model Version 1.0, July 18, 2002, [www.feapmo.gov](http://www.feapmo.gov)

definitions and sub-functions for each of these lines of business, if necessary. The second work effort is to evaluate local, state, tribal, and regional levels, and then define the lines of businesses. The IF Committee decided to incorporate the core business of justice within the scope of this report. For example, although the California Department of Corrections has the responsibility for the electrical power plant, electricity is not a core function of justice. In addition, various aspects of public safety will not be included in the report, at this time, because of the lack of representation from the fire and emergency management services within the IF Committee. However, there are fringes of public safety that law enforcement has been involved with that may be included, such as business continuity planning, disaster recovery, and disaster management.

The timeline for completion of the BRM report is late summer or early fall 2003. The IF Committee has identified 95 percent of the sub-functions and lines of businesses. Plans for the next meeting include discussion of the draft language for the introduction and body of the report and the validation of their findings. The IF Committee has targeted the July 2003 GISWG meeting for a draft review.

Mr. Henderson reminded GISWG participants that any committee draft is intended for GISWG participants only, and any draft version is intended for the purpose of soliciting comments. This report may go through several renditions, and general distribution of the draft report is not authorized.

#### Issue Two: Framework Report

The IF Committee began the process of outlining the subject matter for the Framework Report. Three components discussed in detail were the introduction, types of information needs, and the future vision for information sharing. The Committee decided to include a significant introduction, which will provide background information on the nature of justice in the United States. Mr. Loverude stated that justice in this country is primarily a function of local entities, municipalities, and counties. In addition, he said, "It is critical to emphasize that it is the local entities that administer justice in this country." One example is local governments are primarily responsible for immediately responding to acts of terrorism. And, to a lesser extent, justice is a function of state governments who facilitate information sharing initiatives. The federal government has a much different purpose, and these various functions will also be noted in the introduction.

Mr. Loverude reported that there is wide range of information needs among the justice community. One such need is the capability to inquire upon a specific database to validate a particular piece of information. For example, the National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System answers the question of whether or not a particular driver's license is valid. The IF Committee will review the variety of information needs and provide information on the variety of solutions that are already developed, implemented, and working. The report will also note the evidence of significant progress that has been made over the years.

The future vision for justice information sharing is an important topic. After significant discussion, the IF Committee decided not to develop a single vision. Instead, they will focus on developing multiple plans to meet future requirements for information sharing. For example, Mr. Pritchett's demonstration of the LETS was useful to this

Committee because it illustrates a successful method of implementing information sharing within regional jurisdictions, and it provides one useful solution for achieving the vision.

During the discussion, GISWG participants centered their comments on the concept of the future vision. Participants recommended that the local levels need to be recognized in terms of their successful implementations. Members inquired about the future vision on the local level. GISWG participants requested that the IF committee concentrate on promoting practitioners and existing infrastructures at the local level. Mr. Henderson asked the group to discuss how to exploit local implementations, innovations, and infrastructures in order to transfer initiatives to a larger scale.

The timeline for completion of the Framework Report is fall 2003. The report will be limited to 25-30 pages. It will include four different elements—local, state, tribal, regional, and federal information exchanges. The primary audience will be the policymakers, decision makers, and the funding sources. Another potential audience will include new justice practitioners from a variety of disciplines.

### Issue Three: Network Survey

The GESC will create a four to five person task team to develop the network survey. The GISWG will provide resources as requested by the GAC; however, this task is no longer the responsibility of the IF Committee.

### **Emerging Technologies (ET) Committee – Jim Roggero, Chairman**

The mission of the ET Committee is to identify, assess, and characterize emerging technologies and standards that impact justice information sharing and make appropriate recommendations. The ET goals are to gain insight into emerging technologies and to establish enduring institutional basis for the Extensible Markup Language (XML) work products. The objective is to focus on the issues that are global rather than specific. With regard to the mission at hand, the ET Committee plans to work on the following tasks:

- Update and status of Justice XML Data Dictionary (JXDD) v3.0
- Namespaces
- Justice XML Registry (JXR)
- Justice Reference Model/Architecture
- Emerging Technology Review
- Recommendations

### Issue One: ET Committee Survey

The ET Committee will survey the Global membership about pressing emerging issues and resource implications. Further discussions on the ET survey are planned for future meetings.

## Issue Two: Justice Data Model

The ET Committee discussed in detail the various alternatives to address the justice namespace requirements. The namespace is a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) which is the way to identify the content on the World Wide Web. The URI can be either a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) or a Uniform Resource Name (URN). The ET Committee recommended that the namespace <http://global.gov> be registered in order to meet immediate project requirements.

Mr. Mark Kindl, Georgia Tech Research Institute (GTRI), presented information on extended concepts on the components of the Justice Data Model. The Justice Data Model will interface with the Justice Registry Server which is electronic business XML (ebXML) compliant. Components of the Justice Registry Server include the lifecycle manager, the query manager, various registry clients, and other registry servers. The ET Committee discussed, in detail, the possibility of using the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) tool as one possible registry client. In addition, the Justice Data Model consists of the Justice XML Repository, which includes implementation specifications, baseline components, reusable components, and extensible models. GTRI will develop a glossary that will define the terminology that is currently being used in order to clarify the Justice Data Model.

## Issue Three: Education/Outreach/Communication

With regard to the Justice Data Model, the ET Committee plans to develop a comprehensive and unified message to deliver to justice communities. The outreach and education plan will be defined at future meetings and the ET Committee will identify staff that will facilitate coordination of emerging technology outreach and education.

## Issue Four: Technical Assistance

The ET Committee recommends that the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) center system be used to provide technical assistance during the implementation of JXDD v3.0.

## Issue Five: XML Structure Task Force (XSTF)

Mr. John Wandelt presented the report from the XSTF. He reported that the XSTF is on track for the March 31, 2003, Justice XML Data Dictionary (JXDD) beta version 3.0 release date. After the March release, the XSTF will request comments from the justice community, and they will refine the product during a 60-day vetting process. In June 2003, there will be several pilot activities that will take place throughout the country to test and validate the JXDD v3.0. These pilot projects will require technical assistance, which is currently being planned. There will be follow-up on capabilities that will be identified during the piloting stage. The next stage is to continue through the development of JXDD version 4.0. The Resource Definition Framework version of the product will provide a more practical implementation of object relationships. Efforts to represent object relationships and to solve relational challenges are currently underway.

## Issue Six: Emerging Technologies (ET)

Mr. Jim Roggero reported on the work activities regarding emerging technologies within the justice community. The definition of emerging technologies, as developed by the Committee, is technologies that are mature enough to be successfully implemented, but have not been widely deployed within the justice community. The ET Committee has identified a list of potential emerging technologies to research for white papers and other actions that will feed into the process model. Work activities will focus on topics outlined below.

- Information sharing
- Wide application
- High return on investment
- Priority of technologies for which the ET Committee can influence the implementation or application within the justice and public safety domain
- Education on issues related to the implementation of emerging technologies

The ET Committee made a recommendation to the GISWG to make high-speed Internet access available to rural justice and public safety agencies at an affordable cost. BJA requested the ET Committee to provide a one-page paper on the topic. The GISWG made a resolution to amend the recommendation and approved it as follows:

***Global Advisory Committee supports the activities that would make high-speed Internet access available to rural justice and public safety agencies at an affordable cost.***

This recommendation will be brought forward to the GAC.

## **Justice Standards Clearinghouse (JSC) – Jim Pritchett, Chairman**

### Issue One: Governance Structure

Mr. Pritchett reported on the process being developed to monitor the work products or outputs of GISWG. The JSC Committee discussed various process models, in detail, in order to clarify the steps involved in bringing new ideas, inquiries, and projects to the GISWG. The JSC Committee recommended that a higher level view of the production process model be developed for current and future projects, maintenance, and standards development. Mr. Pritchett reported that a process model is necessary, to map out any new ideas, and it should involve the following steps:

- Ideas emerge (external and/or internal)
- Validate and accept
- Establish project structure
- Execute project
- Project transition assessment
- Project team recommendation

- Transition approval and implementation
- Life-cycle maintenance

Mr. Henderson commented that the reason the group is discussing the process concepts is because of the nature of the charge from GAC. It is necessary to sponsor products, but not move into operations because the group is encouraging standards, such as XML, to facilitate justice information sharing. A detailed model will eliminate the need for the GISWG to debate on operational aspects of products, and it will provide the GISWG with the steps involved with transitioning and transferring products at the appropriate time.

The JSC Committee plans to have a draft of the governance model developed by September 2003. Mr. Pritchett requested staffing support to develop the steps as noted in the process model. Any recommendations for consideration will be presented to the GISWG in July 2003.

#### Issue Two: XML Justice Data Model Transition/Governance

At the request of Mr. Henderson, a small task force convened on Wednesday, February 19, 2003, to discuss XML governance. The task of developing the guidelines for the Justice Data Model was assigned to Mr. Val Pietrasiewicz, National Telecommunications and Information Administration. The timeline for developing the guidelines was two to three weeks.

#### Issue Three: Justice Standards Clearinghouse (JSC) for Information Sharing

The JSC Committee is responsible for the review and approval of major JSC improvements. The JSC Committee reviewed and approved the restructuring of the keyword changes to streamline and facilitate searches on the JSC. Administrative clarifications that are specified in the Concept of Operations document may be adopted without a formal vote. These changes will take place immediately; however, the JSC Committee must review major improvements for informational purposes.

#### Issue Four: JSC Annual Report and Evaluation Criteria

The JSC Committee is tasked with developing the evaluation criteria for the JSC, as delegated by the GESC. Performance evaluation should include:

- Effectiveness in communication
- Content
- Quantitative analysis
- Performance metrics
  - Awareness and outreach
  - Establish a baseline
- Evaluation of JSC

Discussion from the GISWG participants included further evaluation criteria for consideration. One such criterion is to identify justice practitioners who are not using the

JSC and to complete an analysis of why they are not using it. Mr. Henderson requested the Committee to evaluate Web statistics of who is currently using the JSC.

The timeline for this task is to develop a working draft prior to the July 2003 GISWG meeting. The goal is to have the evaluation criteria completed prior to the October GAC meeting. Once completed, the evaluation criteria will turn into an annual report to be distributed to the GAC. The JSC Committee will provide direction to the Institute for Intergovernmental Research staff for the development of the evaluation criteria.

### **Future Meetings and Final Thoughts**

The next meeting is tentatively planned for July 8-10, 2003. The GISWG will continue to develop a comprehensive and unified message that begins with a broad conceptual framework about what information sharing is and how it integrates into the business of justice information sharing. The recommendations noted by the GISWG are necessary to support information sharing and to use the technology in the justice community. The work activities of the committees will clarify practical issues concerning the sharing of justice information. Having determined their future course of action, with no further business before the GISWG, the meeting was adjourned.