Meeting Background, Purpose, and Introductions

The Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), convened the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG or Working Group) meeting on June 7-8, 2004, in Salt Lake City, Utah. In the past few years, this Working Group has been very active, supporting the development of the Justice Standards Clearinghouse for Information Sharing (JSC or “Clearinghouse”) and the Global Justice Extensible Markup Language (XML) Data Model (Global JXDM). These tools are aimed at facilitating broadscale information sharing and achieving the Global vision: Leading the way – getting the right information to the right people, in the right place, at the right time.

Moving forward, GISWG continues to focus on standards (see first agenda item, below) but is turning a considerable amount of attention to the issue of service-oriented architecture (SOA)—its implications, opportunities, and challenges for justice constituencies. As noted at the March Working Group meeting by Mr. Tom Henderson, National Center for State Courts (NCSC) and GISWG chairman: “SOA appears to solve [these outlined issues]. . .but if we have found nirvana, what does that really mean? What are the implications?” Considering this express intent of exploring SOA, GISWG was reconstituted at the beginning of 2004 with representatives from a different pool of expertise than in the past. This was the second GISWG meeting of the year.

The meeting agenda items were as follows:

- JSC, Global JXDM, and Other Outstanding GISWG Activities
  - JSC Status Report: Past, Present, and Revitalizing the JSC for the Future
  - Report from the Global XML Structure Task Force (XSTF)
- OJP Report
  - Supporting the Global JXDM through Grantee Guidelines
- Drafting the GISWG SOA Report
- Next Steps/Next Meeting
Chairman Henderson invited participants to provide introductions and express their topics of interest with regard to SOA. The following GISWG members, federal officials, and support staff were in attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Aerts</td>
<td>Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department, Norwalk, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. J. Atkinson</td>
<td>National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Boulder, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Clarke</td>
<td>Supreme Court of Washington, Olympia, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Clopton</td>
<td>National Institute of Justice, Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Coleman</td>
<td>Crime Information Bureau – Wisconsin Department of Justice, Madison, Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Correll</td>
<td>National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System, Phoenix, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Embley</td>
<td>Practitioner Resource Group, Frankfort, Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Gill</td>
<td>Office of Justice Programs, Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kael Goodman</td>
<td>New York Departments of Correction and Probation, New York, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Hawley</td>
<td>SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, Sacramento, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Henderson (Chair)</td>
<td>National Center for State Courts, Arlington, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Hicks</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Information Technology Standards Council, Alexandria, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Loverude</td>
<td>Joint Task Force on Rap Sheet Standardization, Springfield, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Matthias</td>
<td>Northrop Grumman Mission Systems, Denver, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick McCreary</td>
<td>Office of Justice Programs, Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri Pate</td>
<td>Institute for Intergovernmental Research, Tallahassee, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Rinehart</td>
<td>Institute for Intergovernmental Research, Tallahassee, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ryan</td>
<td>Minnesota Office of Technology, St. Paul, Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Schmidt</td>
<td>Institute for Intergovernmental Research, Tallahassee, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Sliski</td>
<td>Advanced Technology Systems, Inc., McLean, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Sykora</td>
<td>Minnesota Board of Public Defense, Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outstanding GISWG Activities

Justice Standards Clearinghouse for Information Sharing

Via phone, Ms. Christina Abernathy, Global staff support from the Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR), briefed Working Group members on the JSC—past and present—and solicited input for advancing the Clearinghouse since GISWG is the JSC governing body.

- The JSC was implemented online in September of 2002 and is housed on the OJP Information Technology (IT) Web site (www.it.ojp.gov)
- The JSC was developed as part of the DOJ’s interoperability effort to facilitate information sharing
- The JSC is/does:
  - A repository of technology and communications standards and specifications for promoting information sharing across the justice system
  - Captures existing standards and alerts users of new or emerging standards
  - Encourages users to contribute materials and learn more about standards from all levels of government
- The OJP IT Web site team has been charged with revitalizing the JSC. To that end, representatives from IIR, REI Systems, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) met to discuss how to make the JSC more “user-friendly” and foster activity. The group identified:
  - What should be revised?
    - Outdated content, standards, and processes
  - What does not work?
    - User-reported problems when submitting and searching standards
    - Inconsistent search results
  - What does the site need?
    - Better site structure
    - Improved navigation
    - Enhanced searching capabilities
  - How can users be better assisted?
    - Revise and enhance help topics, pop-ups, and help availability
- Ultimately, GISWG oversight was requested in the form of establishing a new JSC committee. This special committee will provide leadership and advisement on such issues as:
  - NTIA assumption of the administrative lead for the JSC, in both the hands-on submission and approval of JSC standards
  - Determining standard archiving intent—As newer versions are submitted, are outdated standards to be archived or can they be
deleted? To implement an archive mechanism that would function within the limitations of the standards database system, managed by REI Systems, extensive developmental resources will have to be authorized by OJP

- Updating the Justice Standards Clearinghouse Guide and Concept of Operations (ConOps). The latest revision was August 28, 2003. The new JSC committee will assist in the review and revision process and present the revised guide to the appropriate advisory body for approval

- Reviewing the JSC Performance Measures—The new committee needs to:
  - Review the JSC statistics REI has collected (to be provided by IIR) and present those to the Global Advisory Committee (GAC)
  - Develop targets for each of the next three years, as outlined in this document. Targets will be determined by the first year’s baseline data.
  - Begin work on a Web survey, outlined as a committee goal in this document

- Further defining the goals and guiding the future direction of the Clearinghouse

In recognition of these needs, Chairman Henderson formed the **JSC committee**, to be led by Mr. Mike Ryan, Minnesota Office of Technology, and staffed by representatives of those agencies (i.e., IIR, REI, and NTIA) involved in the day-to-day activities of the Clearinghouse.

---

**Global XML Structure Task Force (XSTF) and Global Training and Technical Assistance Committee (GTTAC)**

Mr. Paul Embley, XSTF chair, began by summarizing the purpose of the XSTF: “The whole effort is about killing fat code…that’s what we’ve been doing for years.” He then provided the updates, highlighting the following:

- The operational release of Global JXDM (“Model”), Version 3.0, in mid-January has been almost **too successful**! Resources—manpower, education, and assistance with the Model—have been stretched thin (hence, the large-scale training effort, discussion following).

- To assist with the complex nature of the Model, tools are currently under development. Mr. Embley noted, “The goal [is] that someone out of college with a couple years of XML coding can write a schema in a few days.” A listing of tools and access to those tools will be facilitated through the Global Web site.

- “What we [XSTF] need from you [GISWG]”:
  1) Outreach
  2) Continued engagement
3) Provision of feedback and acting as a conduit to information, to avoid people working on same issue/duplicating efforts
4) Continued support—“we won’t be done anytime soon”

Mr. Embley answered questions of certification by a standards body, such as the Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS), (the XSTF is concerned about associated costs “squelching participation”) and the creation of reference documents (the XSTF would like to have authoritative sources create these [e.g., American Association for Motor Vehicle Administration, for driver history]).

Regarding the GTTAC, Mr. Embley spoke about the very successful Global JXDM Developer’s Workshop, held May 11-13, 2004, on the campus at Georgia Tech, School of Management, in Atlanta, Georgia. Feedback from the 300+ attendees was overwhelmingly positive, and similar training is being planned for early July in Alaska. Additionally, he discussed the GTTAC Outreach and Communications Subcommittee, which is under the leadership of fellow GISWG member Mr. Scott Fairholm, NCSC. The subcommittee objective is to create an overall strategy, marketing plan, and communications plan to ensure a consistent message as Global JXDM is implemented throughout the justice community.

**OJP Report: Grantee Guidelines**

To support the Global JXDM, representatives from OJP spoke about the need for grantee guideline language. The goal of these instructions: simplicity and a tone of “guidance, not mandating.”

With input from GISWG members, the following statement was crafted for immediate use by OJP, with widespread program office integration slated for the 2005 funding cycle:

To support public safety and justice information sharing, OJP requires the grantee to use the Global JXDM specifications and guidelines for this particular grant. Grantee shall publish and make available without restriction all schemas (extensions, constraint, proxy) generated as a result of this grant to the component registry as specified in the guidelines. This information is available at [www.it.ojp.gov/gjxdm](http://www.it.ojp.gov/gjxdm).

**GISWG SOA Document Development**

Working Group members devoted the remainder of the meeting time to working towards production of the GISWG SOA document (slated for presentation to the GAC in September). The objectives of this report include:

- Defining SOA for policymakers and managers
- Suggesting a strategic approach for Global and justice-interested agencies
• Identifying issues that need to be delegated to other Working Groups (e.g., security, privacy, and data quality)
• Identifying issues to be addressed by GISWG (e.g., registries, interagency service agreements, and standards development)

Mr. John Loverude, SOA Paper Task Team Leader, led members through a discussion of key elements of the report. Items examined included audience, goal, tone/slant of document (technical vs. business case), registries, “what’s missing,” and recommendations.

Regarding the fundamental question of registries, Chairman Henderson formed the GISWG Registries committee, to be led by Dr. Tom Clarke, Supreme Court of Washington. This group is charged with exploring and recommending solutions to the issues surrounding registries for the justice community that will be required by an SOA. The Committee will begin work in the fall of 2004. Registries are a critical component of SOA. They are relatively new phenomena, however. Form, governance structure, and operational requirements are still evolving. This group will explore their operations in other fields and make recommendations to the GAC on registries development for the justice enterprise.

**Next Steps/Next Meetings**

Considering the input provided by GISWG members, Mr. Loverude and select members of GISWG will begin the SOA drafting process. The intent is to present this paper to the GAC at the fall meeting. Prior to that delivery, presentations to other GAC Working Groups will be made to incorporate the various efforts (e.g., input regarding privacy and security matters). GISWG members were encouraged to share any ideas or comments with Mr. Loverude.

The next GISWG meeting was forecast for late fall 2004 (likely October). Having no further business, and hearing no further questions, the GISWG meeting was adjourned.
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