

Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative

Security Working Group

Meeting Summary

Washington, DC

January 31, 2003

Meeting Background and Purpose

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), convened the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Security Working Group (GSWG) meeting, January 31, 2003, in Washington, DC. The purpose of the GSWG meeting was to discuss justice information sharing models and then to identify real world examples that would illustrate selected models, security guidelines, and best practices. In addition, agenda topics included collaboration with the Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) and the Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG). Another high priority was the completion of the draft security document for the upcoming Global Advisory Committee (GAC) meeting. The meeting agenda and key discussion points included:

- ❑ Justice Models for Information Sharing
- ❑ Security Practices Application and Case Studies
- ❑ Emerging Technologies and Web Services Security
- ❑ GSWG Outreach Plan
- ❑ Maintenance Plan Document
- ❑ Future Assignments, Deliverables, Timetables, and Next Steps

Convening and Introductory Remarks

Mr. Steven E. Correll, GSWG Chair, and Executive Director of the National Law Enforcement Telecommunication Service (NLETS), convened the first GSWG meeting of 2003. He welcomed the participants to Washington, DC, and then informed them about recent updates on Global activities. The following individuals were in attendance:

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

Mr. Fred Cotton
*SEARCH, The National Consortium
for Justice Information and Statistics
Sacramento, California*

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

Randy A. Doucet, Esquire
*Law Offices of Cummingham
and Doucet
LeBlanc, Louisiana*

Ms. Beth Gammie
Institute for Intergovernmental Research
Tallahassee, Florida

Mr. Joe Hindman
Scottsdale Police Department
Scottsdale, Arizona

Mr. Ken Gill
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Washington, DC

Mr. Clay Jester
Institute for Intergovernmental Research
Tallahassee, Florida

Mr. Philippe Guiot
American Association of Motor
Vehicle Administrators
Arlington, Virginia

Ms. Lora Mellies
Missouri Office of the State
Courts Administrator
Jefferson City, Missouri

Alan Harbitter, Ph.D.
PEC Solutions, Inc.
Fairfax, Virginia

Ms. Monique Schmidt
Institute for Intergovernmental Research
Tallahassee, Florida

Justice Information Sharing Models

GSWG members discussed in detail the most common, special cases, and variants of information sharing models that exist in the justice and public safety communities. Based on their discussions, participants agreed to focus on a limited set of models at a higher level instead of providing an exhaustive listing of information sharing models. This discussion was facilitated by Mr. Alan Harbitter, PEC Solutions, Inc. In addition, Mr. Harbitter developed an outline that provided in-depth analysis on four distinct justice information sharing models; these models are described below. The group decided to further develop the models and to include three additional sections into the “Applying Security to Justice Information Sharing” document. The three sections include implementation models and definitions, general best practices, and two specific case studies for each model. Individuals were assigned tasks to complete and incorporate in each model.

1. Joint Task Force Model (JTF)—The JTF is characterized by the unique type of organizational structure because the participants are often assembled to combat a common threat, and security practices will be constructed independently from the member organizations.
 - Criminal Information Sharing Alliance¹—Mr. Ken Gill
 - Sacramento Valley High-Tech Crime Force—Mr. Fred Cotton
2. Peer Group (PG) Model—The PG Model represents a broad category of justice information sharing in which two or more independent organizations work together to provide each other information access and use.

¹ As of March 13, 2003, the Southwest Border States Information System (SWBADIS) has changed its name to Criminal Information Sharing Alliance (CISA).

- COPLINK—Mr. Joe Hindman
 - State of Wisconsin Integrated Justice Information Sharing—Mr. Alan Harbitter
3. Centralized Information Repository (CIR) Model—The CIR Model consists of large information storage with various justice organizations that connect to the data through public or private networks.
 - Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS)/National Crime Information Center (NCIC)—Mr. Charlie Pruitt
 - Kansas Bureau of Investigations—Mr. Fred Cotton
 4. Justice Interconnection Services Network (JISN) Model—The JISN Model is comprised of a number of related justice information sources (i.e., databases) that are generally scattered across a geographic region. The network owners provide a way to interconnect these sources and make them available to subscribing justice organizations.
 - National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System (NLETS)—Mr. Steve Correll
 - American Association for Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA)—Mr. Philippe Guiot
 - Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS)—Mr. Clay Jester

These models will form the framework for the document, and the GSWG agreed to add three new sections to the document to illustrate the justice information sharing models. The first section is called Models for Information Sharing, and the second section is called the Current Information Sharing Systems, which will describe their relationship to each model. These sections will be incorporated into the main document after the introduction, but before the reference sections that describe each domain. The third section is called the Guidelines for Applying Information Security Practices, and it will provide the conclusion to the original document. This section will provide the practitioner with insight into applying security principles into their unique environments.

The authors were instructed to include descriptive paragraphs about the information sharing systems and best security practices. Each author is responsible for reviewing the four models and then identifying the security practices in relationship to the security disciplines for each of the models. This information should not be repetitive of the original domains, but must be tailored to each of the models. The assignments were as follows:

1. Physical Security—Mr. Randy Doucet
2. Personnel Security Screening—Mr. Steve Correll
3. Separation of Duties—Mr. John Loverude
4. Identification, Authentication, Authorization, and Access Control—Mr. Alan Harbitter
5. Data Integrity and Intrusion Detection System (IDS) — Mr. Joe Hindman

6. Data Classification, Privacy, Confidentiality, and Disaster Recovery—
Ms. Lora Mellies
7. Change Management—Mr. Bob Brinson
8. Firewalls, VPNs, and other Network Safeguards—Mr. Clay Jester
9. Critical Incident Response—Mr. Fred Cotton
10. Security Auditing—Mr. Phillippe Guiot

Outreach Plan

The GSWG developed the following outreach plan, which will consist of a targeted and educational security awareness program geared towards the GAC members and their respective organizations. The marketing materials and media will consist of the following products and distribution process:

Marketing Materials:

- ❑ Two-sided information brochure (size 6 ½ x 9 ½)
- ❑ Tri-fold brochure
- ❑ Highlight in Web site news section
- ❑ News article
- ❑ Quotes from key practitioners regarding the value of information technology security to increase awareness

Multimedia:

- ❑ Interactive CD-ROM
- ❑ Web site (www.it.ojp.gov)
- ❑ .pdf files that can be downloaded
- ❑ Hard copy booklets

Distribution to Global practitioners and their respective memberships:

- ❑ Create personal introductory letters to be submitted from key directors, managers, and personnel
- ❑ Develop a Global template letter or memo to go out from the association directors to their respective association members
 - Template should recognize the value and availability of our security document
 - Correspondence should be signed by key individuals, for example
 - Tom Henderson signs letters to go out to NCSC members
 - Mel Carraway signs letters to go out to IACP members
 - Distribution to partner organizations, for example, the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP), National Governors Association (NGA), Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG)

New Security Topics

In order to collaborate with other Global Working Groups and to increase awareness of current and future security topics, the GSWG has agreed to form new task

teams under the umbrella of the GSWG, on a priority basis. The objective is to research and provide issue papers on topics that will benefit the justice community. These task teams will consist of subject matter experts, industry representatives, and justice practitioners. The first task team formed by Chairman Correll is the Global Web Services Security Task Force (GWSSTF). This team will consist of the following membership:

- Mr. Fred Cotton (*GWSSTF Chairman*), SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics
- Mr. Ken Gill, BJA
- Mr. Alan Harbitter, PEC Solutions, Inc.
- Mr. Jim Jolley, SEARCH
- Mr. Jim Pritchett, Southwest Alabama Integrated Criminal Justice System
- Mr. Bob Slaski, Advanced Technology Solutions, Inc.

Mr. Gill provided a valuable briefing session on the status of the Justice XML Data Dictionary (JXDD 3.0), future direction of the XML Structure Task Force, and on XML-based technologies. After Mr. Gill's presentation, the Working Group discussed the direction and focus of this newly formed task team.

Final Thoughts

GSWG members have focused on the production of a useful security framework that will serve a strong educational purpose, as well as provide a basis for improving security practices. This document will clarify practical issues concerning the secure sharing of justice information, and it continues to evolve into a better product with the contributions, direction, and expertise of GSWG members. Once assignments were delegated, with no further business before the GSWG, the meeting was adjourned.