

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

Annapolis, Maryland
May 6–7, 2008

May 6, 2008—Meeting Summary

Background, Purpose, and Introductions

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) convened a meeting on May 6, 2008, in Annapolis, Maryland, at 8:30 a.m. Mr. Carl Wicklund, Executive Director, American Probation and Parole Association and GPIQWG Chairman, led the meeting in furtherance of and alignment with the GPIQWG's *Vision and Mission Statements*.

Chair

Mr. Carl Wicklund

American Probation and Parole Association

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

Mr. Robert P. Boehmer, GAC Chair
Institute for Public Safety Partnerships

Alan Carlson, Esquire
The Justice Management Institute

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

Mr. Michael Dever
*Bureau of Justice Assistance
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice*

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

Lieutenant Don Grimwood
Ohio State Highway Patrol

Barbara Hurst, Esquire
Rhode Island Office of the Public Defender

Mr. Eric C. Johnson
*SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice
Information and Statistics*

Erin Kenneally, Esquire
eLCHEMY, Incorporated

Kimberly Lough
*Criminal Justice Information Services Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation*

Mr. Michael McDonald
Delaware State Police

Captain Tim McGrail
Missouri State Highway Patrol

Ken Mortenson
*Privacy and Civil Liberties Office
Office of the Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice*

Mark Motivans
*Bureau of Justice Statistics
U.S. Department of Justice*

Mr. Timothy H. Skinner
SRA International, Inc.

Ms. Cindy Southworth
*National Network to End Domestic Violence
Fund*

Ms. Martha W. Steketee
Independent Consultant

Mr. Phil Stevenson
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Presenters and Observers

Yang Lee, Ph.D.
Northeastern University

Ms. Toby Levin
Privacy Office
U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Mr. David O. Steingraber
Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance

Richard Wang, Ph.D.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Staff
Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

John Wilson
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Chairman Wicklund announced that the next GPIQWG meeting is scheduled for August 13–14, 2008, in Washington, DC, at the Embassy Suites DC Convention Center. This will be a full meeting of the entire GPIQWG membership without breakout sessions. The two GPIQWG deliverables, the *IQ Program Guidebook* and the *IQ Assessment Questionnaire*, are both at a point in development where the final work can be brought back to the full membership for refinement and final preparation. Today's and tomorrow's meetings will hold the final breakout sessions for the two task teams. Tomorrow's agenda will include a third breakout group gathered for the purpose of reviewing and soliciting feedback on the *Privacy 101 FAQs* developed by DOJ's Privacy Technical Assistance Program. Chairman Wicklund requested comments on the January 28–29, 2008, draft meeting summary. Alan Carlson, the Justice Management Institute (JMI), suggested correcting the title of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges referenced in the summary.

Chairman Wicklund displayed the published versions of the two new GAC-approved GPIQWG products, *Ten Steps to Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy* and *Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates: Policy Development Checklist*, and thanked the group for its efforts in developing these two useful products. He also referred the members to their meeting folders, which contained the March 2008, Volume 26, Number 1 issue of the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) Forum featuring GPIQWG member Mr. Phil Stevenson, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC). Chairman Wicklund commended Mr. Stevenson on his interview in the forum and asked each GPIQWG member to contact the Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR) if anyone has been interviewed or submitted an article to any publication. He also referred attendees to the *Global Highlights* newsletter, which not only featured the National Fusion Center Conference, but also included an excellent interview with one of our members—The Honorable Anthony Capizzi. This is distributed electronically and is available on the Global Web site, www.it.ojp.gov/global.

Global Updates

Global Advisory Committee (GAC) Chairman Mr. Bob Boehmer congratulated Chairman Wicklund for his election to GAC Vice Chair. He informed the group about the recent GAC bylaw revision to allow non-GAC members to serve as working group chairs. This change was made particularly to help provide technical leadership for the technical working groups and also to improve the mechanism for replacing chair positions. Presentations and status reports were provided to the GAC on the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM), the Justice Reference Architecture (JRA), and the Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management (GFIPM) projects. JRA and GFIPM presentations included discussions on how each project was incorporating Global products into its work. The JRA was being used in Utah significantly, and there were pilots being conducted with GFIPM. Chairman Wicklund added that GFIPM is developing a single sign-on where your name is associated with your clearance level rather than having multiple passwords and sign-ons for different systems. Southern California is working with the Automated Regional Justice Information System (ARJIS), and Alabama is participating in the CONNECT project.

Chairman Boehmer discussed the GAC resolution that was adopted to send a message to the Attorney General (AG) on the importance of Global, its impact and good work, encouraging the AG to continue funding the Global program. Global money is closely tied to the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grant Program (Byrne Formula Grant Program), which is in jeopardy. If funding is not provided or located, we anticipate a financial struggle by next spring in order to continue.

Mr. Ken Mortensen, Privacy and Civil Liberties Office, Office of the Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), stated that the Deputy Attorney General recognizes the importance and success of Global and is aware that the budget is a big problem. Mr. Michael Dever, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice, stated that internally BJA is trying to uncover every possible funding source to help and redirect for Global. For the long term, Global will need appropriations assistance. A lot of federal programs have assisted in Global products and have implemented Global products in their programs, such as the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and DOJ. We are now seeing more interconnectedness between working group deliverables, with privacy being a common topic among all working groups and their priorities. Years ago, Global's priorities were not privacy-related, whereas today privacy is a hot topic. There is now a dependent and complementary relationship among privacy, technology, and intelligence.

Chairman Boehmer informed the group that the next Global 101 Training class is scheduled for October 22, 2008, held in coordination with the Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC). The next GAC meeting will be on October 23, 2008, and will include GAC elections. He stated that Global outreach is now a big effort, thanks to the work of the newest Global working group—the Global Outreach Working Group.

Chairman Boehmer stated that he was not aware of many federal advisory committees that had produced the number of products that Global has. The number of hours and volunteer service provided by subject-matter experts (SMEs) to the development of these priorities is significant. Chairman Wicklund emphasized that the GPIQWG privacy work, under Chairman Boehmer's original GPIQWG leadership, has developed into a national priority. I believe we will see the same kind of interest and adoption as we begin to distribute the IQ products.

Mr. Bob Greeves asked whether there had been further effort to schedule a privacy forum or activity that all the privacy advocates could attend. Chairman Wicklund said that there had been some discussion about coordinating a forum in which privacy advocates could be invited to a facilitated discussion to express their concerns. Mr. Greeves, Mr. Russ Porter (Global Intelligence Working Group Chair), and I have talked about putting this together. Unfortunately, there have been so many priorities that it was put on the back burner, but it is on the table and will continue to be something we plan to pull together. It is important to have this dialogue. Mr. Mortenson described a meeting that he and Mr. Alex Joel, ODNI, had with privacy advocates and found very useful. They found that the advocates were extremely helpful. There are currently concerns with the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and Virginia's state fusion center. Mr. Greeves suggested that the media be present for such a forum to provide the public with the understanding that this type of discussion is going on. Chairman Boehmer asked Mr. Greeves to talk with BJA to establish a small group to move forward with planning this event. Ms. Cindy Southworth, National Network to End Domestic Violence Fund, stated that the initial discussion should be on a national level. We have impressive representatives at this table who are truly concerned about privacy. I think we would have the best chance of success if we do a national approach first, rather than a state and local approach. Ms. Southworth requested to be part of this effort.

Postmeeting Note: Following this May 6–7, 2008, GPIQWG meeting, a joint collaboration was established to involve the ACLU and other advocates with privacy for fusion centers and suspicious activity reporting (SAR) for a privacy forum. The joint collaboration is among DOJ, DHS, and ODNI. Funding has been granted to proceed with the privacy and civil liberties advocate meeting. This meeting will provide a forum to discuss the privacy controls of the evaluation environment project. It is anticipated that there will be GPIQWG representation on this team.

Working Group Liaison Updates

Global Outreach Working Group (GOWG)

Chairman Wicklund referred the group to the *Global Highlights* newsletter and the executive summaries for each working group that were originally prepared for the GAC meeting. The GOWG members have been working on enhancing the *Global 101 Training*, the design and launch of a new and improved OJP Information Technology (OJP IT) Initiatives Web site (planned to debut as a beta test at the October GAC meeting), and a road map on how the working groups intersect. The Global road map is envisioned as an online model that will graphically illustrate how the various Global pieces fit together—the complementary relationship between Initiative deliverables and activities.

Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG)

Mr. Alan Carlson referred the group to the GIWG summary contained within the meeting folders. He talked about Mr. Porter's slideshow, which has been used at the regional intelligence privacy technical assistance sessions, as well as conferences. Mr. Porter is passionate about privacy. The Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR) has videotaped his presentation and is working on developing a DVD. Other current work includes a vetting process for the *Baseline Capabilities of State and Major Urban Area Fusion Centers*; *Intelligence-Led Policing Guidelines* development; looking at gang intelligence (Gang Intelligence Strategy Committee); Criminal Intelligence Coordinating Council (CICC) and Major Cities Chiefs Association identification of promising practices and development of guidelines for suspicious activity reporting; institutionalization of the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* (NCISP) through the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA); ongoing support to the Interagency Threat Assessment and Coordination Group; and a vetting process for the *Defining Fusion Center Business Processes: A Tool for Planning*.

GIWG Privacy Committee

Mr. Paco Aumand stated that the GIWG Privacy Committee has focused on privacy in the fusion centers. We have done a wonderful job of focusing on privacy issues on a highly regulated entity, but we are not focusing on an emerging aspect of information sharing—records management systems whose information is part of integrated justice information sharing. The privacy committee did not meet at the last GIWG meeting. It is, however, working on an agenda for the next meeting. Revisions to 28 CFR Part 23 will be vetted through this committee prior to GIWG and then sent on to the CICC for final approval. One revision to 28 CFR was to change and lower the reasonable suspicion standard—the standard for entering intelligence information into any database. Mr. Aumand stated that not one law enforcement member, as part of that committee, was for changing the reasonable suspicion standard.

Global Security Working Group (GSWG)

Ms. Southworth was unable to attend the April 10, 2008, GSWG meeting but referred the group to the executive briefing. GSWG is currently working on updating the public release of GFIPM. The status of the justice credential, GFIPM development activities, and new GFIPM resources are under development. Current and future GFIPM projects include the Law Enforcement Information Sharing Program (LEISP)/OneDOJ federated identity pilot, DHS Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN) federated identity pilot, Los Angeles County GFIPM Pilot Initiative, and GFIPM partnership connecting Los Angeles County Criminal History Repository Systems and San Diego County's ARJIS. Possible GFIPM projects may involve CONNECT and fusion center applications.

Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG)

Chairman Wicklund stated that Mr. Scott Fairholm had served as the liaison between GISWG and GPIQWG. Mr. Fairholm has taken a new position and is no longer with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC). The liaison position remains open, but the efforts of that group are of such a technical nature that we may not have a GPIQWG member who could sit in and participate effectively. We are the least technical of all the groups in Global. Current and future GISWG efforts include continued work on the Global JRA deliverables and the transition to the Services Task Team for the development of high-priority and national shared services. GISWG Chairman Tom Clarke, NCSC, also provided a briefing to the GAC on Utah's Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA)—why Utah implemented SOA and how the JRA could have helped.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security: Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Update

Ms. Toby Levin, Senior Advisor for DHS' Privacy Office, provided the group with an update on DHS' Privacy Office activities and on DHS' Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties—the two offices in the Office of the Secretary of DHS. Ms. Levin has worked for DHS for three years, having come from the Federal Trade Commission. I have worked with Mr. Mortensen, the former Acting Chief Privacy Officer, for several years, as well as with Mr. Skinner, who you have as a resource on this group. I have also worked with Ms. Southworth on other initiatives. Ms. Levin commended the group on their work in privacy. “You have produced terrific work products. I have begun to be more aware of them in the past couple of months in a project with regard to fusion centers. I am very interested in your information quality efforts. When this comes out, we will definitely want to review and hopefully adopt it for our department as well.”

The DHS Privacy Office is the first statutorily mandated privacy office in the federal government. We have a useful Web site, www.dhs.gov/privacy, which contains a repository of all of our hard work (privacy impact assessments [PIAs], workshops, etc.). As a result of the 9/11 Act, our Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties was tasked with a lot of work to perform training for fusion centers. The assignment of this task is recognition that fusion centers do pose privacy issues and also the recognition that through training and policies, we can make a difference. As a result, we have developed a good working relationship with BJA to help develop the training materials for fusion centers and to build on the materials that this group has already developed. We want to develop a toolkit to incorporate Global products and others, as well as additional products so that the fusion centers will have the flexibility to use what works for them. Unlike the privacy policy template that fits across the spectrum of centers, we thought a toolkit would be value-added to this DHS training effort. DHS is working through government contracting to coordinate resources through BJA. As part of this project, we would like to explore a way to map the Global Web site with the DHS privacy site and to provide a “train the trainer” model, with additional media filling in the gaps where existing resources may not be sufficient (e.g., in the area of civil rights). We have already begun training the DHS representatives at fusion centers, having come to learn a lot of issues that they are facing. We need to ensure that these representatives have the authority to share information appropriately and to provide guidance. In terms of a timetable, we are behind schedule. We anticipate six to eight months before we have developed the materials that we would like to provide. As you point out, the issues are not unique to fusion centers. We want our materials to be useful in other contexts and other organizations that share information. A current gap is that our training only deals with federal laws and regulations, but the centers also face state statutes and laws that we cannot individually provide training on. Chairman Wicklund asked whether DHS is requiring the fusion centers to have a privacy policy to get federal funding. DHS guidelines for fusion centers include guidance that they develop privacy policies. Mr. Mortenson followed that there is also the Information Sharing Environment (ISE) which, in the ISE Privacy Guidelines, requires fusion centers to have privacy policies to participate in the ISE.

Ms. Levin stated that DHS is made up of some 22 components brought together by the Homeland Security Act. A number of them have a law enforcement function (Transportation Security Administration [TSA], U.S. Customs and Border Protection [CBP], U.S. Coast Guard, etc.). There are a number of components in intelligence and analysis (I&A) that have inherent privacy issues.

The DHS Privacy Office has an important role within DHS. Though it is relatively small (16 full-time employees), it is responsible for Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests within the department. We have more than 400 FOIA employees working just on those requests (finding out what the department is doing and dealing with those requests). We try to make sense of what the DHS programs are doing for the public. We are embedding ourselves into our other programs and have recently received subpoena powers. We are not operating as an Inspector General (IG) but are helping the programs to incorporate safeguards into their departments to protect privacy at the beginning of projects rather than at the end. We have built operations within the department so that we are involved in DHS programs, new DHS projects, and any program that deals with personally identifiable information (PII).

Mr. Dever stated that Ms. Levin has been making herself available and working with BJA. BJA has requested her input and review of GPIQWG products and provided feedback. She really has been contributing on several products. We are both trying to implement the same federal acts, and we have the same principles, so it is truly a wonderful relationship. Chairman Wicklund asked Ms. Levin whether she had any thoughts on the privacy forum. Our FACA committee has had a number of public forums. Ms. Levin responded, “It is always a

good vehicle, but I think there needs to be something more creative established. I am not sure that the advocates realize how much the state and locals are driving products that are being adopted at the federal level.” She suggested a possible workshop format that may be better received. Chairman Wicklund asked Ms. Levin to be involved in the forum planning process.

Regarding outreach, Ms. Levin stated their privacy committee has a quarterly CIO council representing all the federal agencies—another forum to raise awareness of the activities of Global. She also suggested that Global explore ways to educate the U.S. Congress on Global’s activities. There are a number of trade publications (she will provide a list) that deal with privacy.

Privacy TA Initiative Update

Mr. Dever stated that at the Privacy FAQs breakout tomorrow, he would like help on two projects—drafting special conditions language around recommendations for the PM-ISE and getting feedback on the Privacy 101 FAQs. The Privacy and Civil Liberties 101 Training is anticipated to be a road map type of CD that will incorporate all of the recent privacy components—SEARCH’s privacy impact assessment (PIA), the *State and Local Privacy Policy Development Template*, and Russ Porter’s importance of privacy video. This road map will incentivize the importance of complying with a privacy policy, as well as provide training and implementation guidance.

Mr. Dever introduced the new draft PIA resource, titled *Guide to Conducting Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) for State and Local Information Sharing Initiatives*, developed by SEARCH, the National Consortium for Justice Information Statistics. Mr. Dever would like this group to review the PIA and to provide recommendations and changes by Wednesday, May 14, 2008. He also would like suggestions on other groups that should receive the PIA. Performing a PIA is being promoted as a completely voluntary process. The gaps we have right now are around implementation within the organization. It was suggested that we follow this with an implementation guideline and then provide an auditing/compliance component for self or independent evaluation of compliance. SEARCH’s PIA has already been vetted by several GPIQWG members. A lot of what GPIQWG has developed have been front-end products, whereas there is a need for guidance on how to implement. Ms. Levin spoke to similar experience that we hold federal agencies to the PIA and ask for updates or changes, but there are no resources for audits and implementation. Another issue is using technology. Technologies may be available for applying or building into the system the rules that are identified in policies to ensure that information is being used only according to these rules. Chairman Wicklund will talk with Mr. Boehmer and the GESC regarding coming up with resources to address such a guide, since this will require quite a bit of funding. Obviously, people who have been looking at this implementation would be good to pull in on this task.

The Privacy 101 FAQs that will be discussed in the breakout tomorrow were developed as a foundational piece that will prompt training content. The breakout session will help tailor the FAQs to allay concerns of those who are at the point of considering developing a privacy and civil liberties policy.

Fusion Center Privacy Policies—To date, 29 privacy policies have been completed and submitted to IIR, which is reviewing them against the criteria established in the *Fusion Center Privacy Policy Development Template*. Mr. John Wilson, IIR, stated that some of the difficulties in assessing the privacy policies are that some centers operate a criminal intelligence information (CII) database, while others draw from whatever agency contains the CII database. Some are operational, and some are not. Another issue is that very few states know what their state laws cover. They all include statements in their policies indicating that they are going to follow applicable federal laws. A supplement is needed to define exactly what in federal law actually applies to a state or local fusion center. Also, I have noticed that when a lot of fusion centers receive their reviews, we have to be aggressive in getting them to respond. There is hesitancy on their part. Implementation of these policies is going to be significant, especially in terms of auditing and making adjustments.

National Institute of Justice (NIJ) IQ Questionnaire Pilot Presentation

Chairman Wicklund thanked Richard Wang, Ph.D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology's (MIT) Information Quality (MITIQ) Program, for rejoining the group and introduced his latest book, *Journey to Data Quality*, written and donated by Dr. Wang and Yang Lee, Ph.D. This book instructs that IQ is an ongoing event, which is the mantra we have been promoting.

Dr. Wang stated that he wanted to talk with the group about getting its feedback on a questionnaire he developed as a tool specifically written for law enforcement. Dr. Wang acknowledged the sponsor of this effort, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and also MIT and the work they provided. This is a self-assessment tool to determine IQ from a stakeholder's perspective and correlates with the IQ Dimensions. We wanted this questionnaire to be simple because it will be provided to dispatchers, law enforcement officers, etc. These are the people we consider to be the stakeholders. The intent is to make this questionnaire available to the public once it is finalized, particularly online via the MITIQ Web site. Dr. Lee thanked GPIQWG attendees for the invitation to attend and participate in this meeting. She stated that she had been working in the IQ field for about 20 years and worked with an information and operations group for Northwestern University. She is also editor in chief for a new IQ journal, *ACM Journal of Information and Quality*.

Our work with NIJ is to deliver this instrument so that NIJ can approve it and make it available for law enforcement agencies. The intent for this particular pilot is that only aggregate information will be provided to agencies. Most people are conscientious about their work. They can tell you where the gaps and problems exist. Dr. Wang stated that he would like GPIQWG members to read and respond to the questionnaire questions, and then they will run statistics to validate certain items to determine whether the questions work based on the validation score. He stated that they will go through several pilots before finalizing the questions. Each agency will dictate, or choose, what report it would like to evaluate based on its position within that agency (dispatchers versus law enforcement, etc.). After selecting a "critical" report or system, the pilot audience will answer the prototype questions so that we can determine whether the questions are useful. Then we will validate the questions and score them to determine what remains and what is needed. You will only do an assessment of dimensions that are applicable and useful to your organization. Regarding the original IQ Dimensions, we have combined and reduced them to the ones that are most relevant to law enforcement officers. The questionnaire is separated into four sections—Information Quality, Overall Assessments, Your Perspective, and Your Background. We plan to make the form available online so that answers can be typed in.

Dr. Wang indicated that a main point of the questionnaire is to determine how information quality relates to job performance. We are linking business performance in what the agency hopes to achieve in job performance—demonstrating a path or connection between information quality and job performance. What we have learned over the past 20 years is that it is best to go and ask for an employee's perspective. In the last section of the questionnaire, we ask generically about the background of the individual so that when we publish this as a paper, we can identify (generically) the audience or pilot group. Because of their diverse backgrounds, different groups working on different tasks may express different difficulties doing the same tasks or using the same data. Identifying the different groups will reveal these differences for an organization.

Dr. Wang stated that they had completed a pretest with the U.S. Navy's Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) program. With GPIQWG's input, he will be better able to develop a more useful assessment instrument. Chairman Wicklund asked Dr. Wang what he would like from us. Dr. Wang would like GPIQWG attendees to take the questionnaire and fill it out, returning the questionnaire and any feedback they may have by tomorrow's meeting.

Status Reports from GPIWG Breakouts

IQ Assessment Process Task Team—Ms. Erin Kenneally, eLCHEMY, Inc.

Ms. Kenneally stated that the team had left off with the task of rephrasing the assessment questions and grouping them into categories. Our hypothesis was that we could put together a list of general questions that could be generalized across justice events. We started with an incident report, drafted generic and logical questions that applied to this process, and then tested them against a presentencing report (PSI). A conference call was held to revise the questions for a PSI (included in the meeting folder). Some of the questions drafted that may have been too general were narrowed down to look at the underlayer.

IQ Program Guidebook Task Team—Mr. Paco Aumand

Mr. Aumand stated that the task team held a drafting session on March 14, 2008. This team has been diligent in providing content based on the initial outline, which has been reworked. The guidebook is far from being finished as a draft but, nonetheless, we are making significant progress on it. The group continues to challenge itself in what IQ means in the context of justice information systems and the IQ dimensions that are relevant to our work. The team has explored the agencies' individual roles and how they fit within the life cycle of information. All of these issues are pretty challenging to put into language that is understood. This guidebook will be most useful if we can apply it to a particular instance, e.g., an incident report. It is our intention to include the IQ Assessment Questionnaire as part of this guide so that there will be some specific examples. We may need several case studies as well.

Training and Outreach—Ms. Cindy Southworth and Ms. Martha Steketee

Ms. Southworth stated that this team completed its goals to create the two newly published products—*Ten Steps to Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy* and the *Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates: Policy Development Checklist*. The two new products have been very well received and will be quite useful in the field, especially at the higher level for leadership. Our task team was incredibly collaborative. There was not one main person who made it all happen; it was a team effort. Ms. Southworth stated that, having met these goals and in the interest of furthering the two IQ products, the team was disbanding and that its members will move on to participate on the other task teams.

Chairman Wicklund adjourned the meeting for lunch at 12:00 Noon and instructed the members to reconvene after lunch at 1:30 p.m. in their respective task team meeting rooms.

GPIQWG Breakout Sessions

The meeting reconvened with members meeting in two separate breakout sessions from 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Mr. Aumand led the IQ Program Guidebook Task Team breakout session, while Ms. Kenneally led the IQ Assessment Process Task Team breakout session. A summary of activities for each session is provided in the Interim Status Report below.

GPIQWG Task Team Interim Status Reports

At 4:30 p.m., the breakout sessions adjourned and the GPIQWG members reconvened together to receive interim task team status reports. A summary of activities from each task team follows.

IQ Program Guide Task Team

Mr. Aumand stated that the task team went through the draft guidebook (up to page 41 of 48 pages) and made decisions about the areas that were incomplete or had questions noted. The team proposed to change the title of this document to “guide” versus “guidebook” or “handbook” because of its general approach, whereas a handbook would indicate a more detailed process. (Meeting summary notation: With this determination, the IQ Program Guidebook will now be referred to as the IQ Program Guide from this point forward.) Mr. Aumand assisted the team in making writing assignments for the sections that could not be completed at the meeting. Writing assignments are listed below. The team contributed a lot of debate and discussion about many of the points. Mr. Aumand commended Dr. Wang for his help and participation. The team anticipates having a draft for the August 13–14, 2008, GPIQWG meeting. Chairman Wicklund commended Mr. Aumand for his leadership.

The following writing assignments were made:

- II. How to Use This Handbook and III. What Is Information Quality?
Ms. Steketee will merge this list with that on page 11 (where it will reside).
- IV: What Is the Process for Ensuring IQ for Your Organization?
Mr. Mortenson will provide a little more explanation/description to introduce the broad chapter topics. List the headings: Analyze and Establish Organization IQ Standards; Establishing the Program, Implementation of the Program; and Evaluation.
- V. Analyze and Establish Organization IQ Standards

Mr. Stevenson will create a single, circular model that represents the information life cycle and how these roles fit within.

- V., 2. Roles and Their Relationship to IQ
Mr. Aumand will take the concept of approval and highlight it in the roles and diagrams.
- V., 2., I-CLEAR Diagram
Mr. Aumand will talk with Ms. Plante on how this is to be incorporated into this document. This may involve work with Ms. deGrasse on developing introductory text.
- V., C. Analyze Your Information to Determine Information Quality Attributes/Dimensions in the Context of Your Justice Entity
Mr. Stevenson will write a conclusion/wrap-up statement for this section—a statement or two as to why these questions are important. This is a conclusion to C., a way for the agency to wrap its arms around what dimensions it should apply. These are questions the agency should think about to determine the dimensions that fit.
- D. Implement and Document Choices
Mr. Mortenson will draft a paragraph that summarizes the work that has been done (the core and contextual analysis) and that documents the choices of attributes selected as standards.
- VI. Establishing the Program
Ms. Plante will write introductory text to introduce this section.
- VI., C. Program Elements, 9. Follow-up and Resolution
Mr. Stevenson will draft content for this section.
- VII., A., 1. Stakeholders
Ms. deGrasse will keep this section generic and parallel the checklist stakeholders section (e.g., who are the stakeholders—for this section, we will focus on internal but also recognize that there are external stakeholders who have a stake in the IQ program). The intent is for the user to pick an area for which he or she wants to implement an IQ program (e.g., incident report) and then identify stakeholders. Need some statement as to “why you would want certain roles on this committee” and to make a distinction between the team responsible for developing the IQ standards versus stakeholders who need to buy in (victims, etc.). Ms. deGrasse will factor the idea of roles into who the stakeholders are (collector, custodian, and consumer). The project team is a group of internal stakeholders, but its members represent a specific type of stakeholder (collector, custodian, and consumer). There are also external stakeholders who may want to have input into the program. Need to make a distinction. Rather than use the example provided, Ms. deGrasse will use a generic IQ example.
- VII., A., 2. MOU/MOA
Mr. Skinner will send a link on ISE Privacy Guidelines that addresses MOUs and what should be included.

Ms. Lough will send the CJIS security policy to Ms. deGrasse to help her in the MOU/MOA section.

Ms. deGrasse will continue drafting this section. It needs a clear statement that MOU/MOA is an implementation of the policy. We need key elements to capture in a core MOU/MOA:

- Establish ownership of information.
 - Have an IQ program in place. Identify legal responsibility and what comprises the IQ program: service-level requirements, contact person, process for corrections, etc.
- Pull in, as appropriate, bullets already listed.

- VII., B., Internal Marketing
Mr. Aumand will work with Dr. Wang on this section. What are other examples of how you train policy issues? Examples would enhance this. This internal marketing would be a catalyst to promote the program throughout the organization.

- VIII., Evaluation, A. Auditing
Mr. Skinner will pull from ISE sources and draft some language.

IQ Assessment Process Task Team

Ms. Kenneally stated that the group was very productive and focused on several tasks. The team decided to explore using the format shown in SEARCH's *Guide to Conducting Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) for State and Local Information Sharing Initiatives* as a documentation piece for the IQ Assessment Questionnaire. The team will use a similar format as the checklist in the PIA. This should provide the user with an objective documentation tool. The team went through the comments reviewers had provided on the IQ Assessment Questions and fine-tuned those. We took the PSI and mapped it to the IQ Assessment questions, identified gaps, and added to it accordingly. Tomorrow, the team will go through the assessment questions for two other events—incarceration and a statistical analysis report. The group will be meeting on July 9, 2008, in Chicago, Illinois, for a drafting session, where they will draft instructions for using the questions/process and clean up the tool. Ms. Kenneally stated that they need to develop a smooth segue between the tool and the IQ Program Guide. Where is it going to be located in the guide, aside from the appendix? If it is simply added as an appendix, it will not be as useful as it could be as part of the guide. Chairman Wicklund recommended that at the drafting session, they look at where the assessment tool fits within the IQ Program Guide.

Closing Remarks

Chairman Wicklund expressed his gratitude for the hard work and concentration on furthering these products. He informed the group that, as planned, he will not be able to attend the meeting tomorrow but that Ms. Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair, will lead the meeting. Mr. Boehmer thanked the group and commended them for all of their hard work. He stated that the GAC meetings are structured so that GAC members listen to presentations and review products for approval that are already complete, whereas this is a group of people who roll up their sleeves and get the work done.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

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

Annapolis, Maryland
May 6–7, 2008

May 7, 2008—Meeting Summary

Background, Purpose, and Introductions

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) convened a meeting on May 7, 2008, in Annapolis, Maryland, at 8:30 a.m. Ms. Jeanette Plante, Justice Management Division, U.S. Department of Justice, and GPIQWG Vice Chair, led the meeting in furtherance of and alignment with the GPIQWG's *Vision and Mission Statements*.

Vice Chair

Jeanette Plante, Esquire

*Office of Records Management Policy
Justice Management Division
U.S. Department of Justice*

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

Mr. Robert P. Boehmer, GAC Chair
Institute for Public Safety Partnerships

Alan Carlson, Esquire
The Justice Management Institute

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

Mr. Michael Dever
*Bureau of Justice Assistance
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice*

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

Lieutenant Don Grimwood
Ohio State Highway Patrol

Barbara Hurst, Esquire
Rhode Island Office of the Public Defender

Mr. Eric C. Johnson
*SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice
Information and Statistics*

Erin Kenneally, Esquire
eLCHEMY, Incorporated

Kimberly Lough
*Criminal Justice Information Services Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation*

Mr. Michael McDonald
Delaware State Police

Captain Tim McGrail
Missouri State Highway Patrol

Ken Mortenson
*Privacy and Civil Liberties Office
Office of the Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice*

Mark Motivans
*Bureau of Justice Statistics
U.S. Department of Justice*

Mr. Timothy H. Skinner
SRA International, Inc.

Ms. Cindy Southworth
*National Network to End Domestic Violence
Fund*

Ms. Martha W. Steketee
Independent Consultant

Mr. Phil Stevenson
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Presenters and Observers:
Yang Lee, Ph.D.
Northeastern University

Ms. Ayn H. Crawley
Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties
U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Mr. David O. Steingraber
Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance

Richard Wang, Ph.D.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Staff
Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

John Wilson
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Plante welcomed the attendees back and asked each team to identify the primary tasks the teams need to attend to today to bring a more final draft to the August 13–14, 2008, meeting. The August meeting will not hold breakout sessions; rather, the final work on these products will be done as part of the full group.

IQ Program Guide Task Team—Mr. Aumand stated that the team planned to discuss the remaining pages that contained questions or gaps, determine how they fit within the overall document, and assign writing responsibilities for the incomplete sections.

IQ Assessment Process Task Team—Ms. Kenneally stated that her group has established a game plan for the meeting and will be assigning remaining tasks in preparation for the July 9, 2008, drafting session.

Privacy 101 FAQs—Mr. Dever plans to finalize the review of the FAQs, which those attending the breakout session have already seen and discussed on a previous conference call, and to draft special condition language for future awards regarding fusion centers' compliance with the ISE Privacy Guidelines.

Ms. Plante asked Dr. Wang for his observations on GPIQWG's development and goals. Dr. Wang stated that he had visited most federal agencies and found that primarily they outsource to local companies. He had never seen guidelines established agencywide by subject-matter experts who volunteer enthusiastically to work on them. He stated, "It is amazing to see what you all do and accomplish. This group is very valuable, because you have the grassroots people here volunteering to make it all work. In terms of goals, I would like to see best practices. The IQ Program Guide, when complete, should be field-tested. Any general theory should be applied in at least one instance. This would answer the question, 'Does it work?' You are setting up policies and guidelines for many people. They will treat this guide as the final word and will cite it—that is the magnitude of the significance of your work." Dr. Wang stated that Vice Chair Plante had spoken about the future focus of this group: "It is obvious that your work and the privacy deliverables have been very successful. Where we will end up with IQ will also be very successful. Therefore, it is important that you determine how you are going to capture and evaluate whether the IQ resources work."

Mr. Greeves stated that BJA would like to see GPIQWG develop a Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy Development Implementation Guide. He stated that there is a significant call for providing end users with guidance on how to implement the policies they develop. Ms. Plante concurred and furthered that there is also a need to work on evaluation and measurements.

Mr. Boehmer introduced Mr. David Steingraber, who represents the National Governors Association (NGA). Mr. Boehmer has been encouraging GAC members to be more involved in the Global working groups. Mr. Steingraber wanted to share his observations of the GPIQWG meeting yesterday. He stated that he was overwhelmed by the extent of effort the group had put into their products: "You have done a thorough job. I have to echo some of Mr. Greeve's concerns about having an implementation and training strategy to get end users involved." He stated that there has been a lot of focus on the fusion centers but agreed that the real issue is linking record management systems (RMS) and providing resources for RMS users. He stated, "Merging

data from various sources and identifying ownership of the information is a real issue. We have looked at assigning a score for reliability so that officers could look at that score and make some determination on how reliable the information is. There is a need to educate people on the limitations of name searches, because that is a prime area where common names can be confused and mistaken identity happens. I recommend you include in your membership those in the open-records arena. For example, the media in Wisconsin can sue to obtain information, so you never know what or when information may be disclosed. Those people need to be at the table, not necessarily those opposed to information sharing, but select individuals from that perspective that need to be engaged.”

Dr. Lee requested that the attendees fill out the NIJ pilot questionnaire provided yesterday and return the questionnaire and any feedback to her and Dr. Wang before they leave today.

Ms. Plante adjourned the group to allow members to attend their respective breakout sessions.

GPIQWG Breakout Sessions

Ms. Plante led the IQ Program Guide Task Team breakout session, Ms. Erin Kenneally led the IQ Assessment Process Task Team breakout session, and Mr. Dever led the Privacy 101 FAQs breakout session. A summary of activities for each session is provided in the Final Status Reports below.

GPIQWG Task Team Final Status Reports

At 11:15 a.m., the breakout sessions adjourned and the GPIQWG members reconvened together to receive final task team status reports. A summary of activities from each breakout follows.

IQ Program Guide Task Team

Ms. Plante stated that the task team made substantial progress and was committed to having a draft by the August GPIQWG meeting. The team mostly worked on the evaluation piece of the book: performance measures, what you evaluate, how you evaluate, and continuous improvement (i.e., a feedback loop) process. The final pages of the draft were reviewed, outstanding questions answered, and the following writing assignments made.

- Foreword
Ms. Plante will work on the resource requirements statement.
- VI., 3. Strategic Planning
Ms. Plante will add information about resource requirements.
- VIII. Evaluation, A. Introduction
Mr. Stevenson will draft/revise this section and will make a distinction between evaluation and performance measurement. He will add a statement that it is a continual process and that evaluation is ongoing (you do not sunset the project).
- VIII. Evaluation, B. What Do You Measure?
Mr. McDonald and Dr. Wang will collaborate on this section. Dr. Wang will draft language that Mr. McDonald will assist by making law enforcement/justice relevant.
 2. Ms. deGrasse will check on CALEA standards.
 3. Ms. deGrasse will draft sample language for the example—Traffic Stop Statistical Study.
- VIII. Evaluation, C. How Do You Measure?
Ms. Lough and Mr. McGrail will work on this section.
 2. Audit—Mr. Skinner will pull audit information from ISE documents and draft some language.

- VIII. Evaluation, D. Continuous Improvement
Mr. Aumand will work on this section.
- IX. Tools
Ms. Plante will locate and research restrictions for us on the SIPOCO.

Mr. McDonald will provide FBI/CJIS audit templates/guides (preaudit packet) and a technology audit.

IQ Assessment Process Task Team

Ms. Kenneally stated that the team had finished going through the edits from feedback received prior to this meeting and had refined the content. The team will be applying the questions to two new justice events (incarceration and a statistical analysis report) to test whether the questionnaire can be generalized to other common justice processes. Responsibilities were assigned, and the team will hold separate conference calls for each justice event. The task team will complete the final draft at the July 9, 2008, drafting session in Chicago, Illinois.

Privacy 101 FAQs

Mr. Dever stated that they had had a good session. The group reviewed the FAQs format. Mr. Skinner will circulate the revised FAQs to the same group for further feedback with a target deadline of May 21, 2008. Ms. Ayn Crawley, Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, DHS, offered to reach out to her constituents for a practitioner review. The desire is to create a training tool for those centers that have already drafted privacy policies. A final draft will be disseminated to the group once complete.

Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Ms. Plante advised the group that for the August meeting, the focus will be working on final drafts and developing educational/training tools, as well as tools that focus on the products we already produced. Mr. Boehmer expressed his and GAC's appreciation for all of the hard work this group has contributed.

Mr. Greeves stated that one goal of the GOWG is to solicit success stories from agencies that have used Global products. There is some reluctance to commit to a new product until we evaluate what we have done. One thing that would make the privacy guide more useful is a pilot project or best practices. Ms. Plante stated that she was in favor of having a discussion on the agenda for evaluating the success of our products and determining whether we have maximized the ability of justice entities to pay more attention to and implement good policies—a self-evaluation of what this group has done and whether we have been successful. An agenda item will be established to further this discussion at the August 13–14, 2008, meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

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



DoubleTree Hotel Annapolis
210 Holiday Court
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 224-3150



United States
Department of Justice

May 6–7, 2008

Agenda—Page One

Mainsail East Ballroom

May 6, 2008

8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.

Continental Breakfast

8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.

Welcoming Remarks and Introductions

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair and Global Advisory Committee (GAC) Vice Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ Agenda overview
- ◆ Next GPIQWG meeting: August 13–14, 2008, Washington, DC
- ◆ January 28–29, 2008, GPIQWG draft meeting summary
- ◆ GAC-approved GPIQWG products:
 - *Ten Steps to a Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy*
 - *Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates: Policy Development Checklist*

8:45 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

Global Updates

Mr. Robert Boehmer, GAC Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ Updates from GAC meeting held April 10:
 - NIEM, GFIPM, and JRA presentations
 - Working group updates
 - Remarks by Mr. Kevin O'Connor, new Associate Attorney General
 - Amendment to GAC Bylaws—working group leadership
 - GAC Resolution to the Associate Attorney General
- ◆ GAC dates:
 - GAC meeting, October 23, 2008, at the Gaylord National Convention Center Hotel in Washington, DC
 - Global 101 Training, October 22, 2008, same location as above
- ◆ Global working group liaison updates:
 - Global Outreach Working Group (GOWG)
The Honorable Anthony Capizzi
 - Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG)
Mr. Alan Carlson
 - GIWG Privacy Committee
Mr. Paco Aumand
 - Global Security Working Group (GSWG)
Ms. Cindy Southworth

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



DoubleTree Hotel Annapolis
210 Holiday Court
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 224-3150

May 6–7, 2008



Agenda—Page Two

Mainsail East Ballroom

May 6, 2008

- 9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. **U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS): Update on Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Activities**
Mr. W. Kenneth Hunt and Ms. Toby Levin, DHS Privacy Office
Ms. Ayn Crawley, DHS Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ DHS Privacy Office—activities
 - ◆ DHS Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties—activities
- 10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. **Break**
- 10:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Privacy Technical Assistance Initiative**
Mr. Michael Dever, U.S. Department of Justice
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ Update on Privacy 101 training development
 - ◆ Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) guide for state and local agencies
 - ◆ Status of fusion center privacy policies and review process
- 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. **National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Pilot: Self-Assessment Information Quality Instrument**
Richard Wang, Ph.D., Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and
Yang Lee, Ph.D., Northeastern University
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ IQ progress update since last GPIQWG meeting in June 2007
 - ◆ Current work with NIJ
 - ◆ Self-assessment information quality instrument
 - ◆ Assistance needed—instrument validation
 - ◆ Instrument benefits to GPIQWG
 - ◆ Open discussion

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



DoubleTree Hotel Annapolis
210 Holiday Court
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 224-3150



United States
Department of Justice

May 6–7, 2008

Agenda—Page Three

Mainsail East Ballroom

May 6, 2008

11:30 a.m. – 12:00 Noon **Status Reports From GPIQWG Breakouts**

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Reports on completed tasks, current work, and future plans

- ◆ Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
Ms. Erin Kenneally
- ◆ Information Quality Program Guidebook Task Team
Mr. Paco Aumand
- ◆ Training and Outreach
Ms. Cindy Southworth and Ms. Martha Steketee
- ◆ Sunsetting the Training and Outreach Task Team
- ◆ Charge to breakouts

12:00 Noon – 1:30 p.m. **Lunch (on your own)**

1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. **GPIQWG Breakouts**

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Breakout groups

- ◆ Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
— Harbour Room
- ◆ Information Quality Program Guidebook Task Team
— Mainsail East Ballroom

3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m. **Break**

3:15 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. **Resume GPIQWG Breakouts**

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



DoubleTree Hotel Annapolis
210 Holiday Court
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 224-3150

May 6–7, 2008



Agenda—Page Four

Mainsail East Ballroom

May 6, 2008

4:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

GPIQWG Breakout Interim Status Reports

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Outline of Discussion Topics

- ◆ Reports on completed tasks, current work, and future plans
 - Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
Ms. Erin Kenneally
 - Information Quality Program Guidebook Task Team
Mr. Paco Aumand
- ◆ Plan for the following day's GPIQWG meeting

5:00 p.m.

Adjournment



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



DoubleTree Hotel Annapolis
210 Holiday Court
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 224-3150



United States
Department of Justice

May 6–7, 2008

Agenda—Page Five

Coastal East Room

May 7, 2008

- 8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. ***Continental Breakfast***
- 8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m. **Introduction and Charge for the Day**
Ms. Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair
Anticipated Discussion Topics
◆ Charge to the breakout groups
- 8:45 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. **Resume GPIQWG Breakouts**
Ms. Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair
Breakout groups are as follows:
◆ Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
— Harbour Room
◆ Information Quality Program Guidebook Task Team
— Coastal East Room
◆ Privacy 101 Questions Subgroup
— Windward Room
- 10:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. ***Break***
- 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Resume GPIQWG Breakouts**
Ms. Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair
Breakout groups are as follows:
◆ Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
◆ Information Quality Program Guidebook Task Team
◆ Privacy 101 Questions Subgroup

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



DoubleTree Hotel Annapolis
210 Holiday Court
Annapolis, Maryland 21401
(410) 224-3150



United States
Department of Justice

May 6–7, 2008

Agenda—Page Six

Coastal East Room

May 7, 2008

12:00 p.m. – 12:30 p.m. **GPIQWG Breakout Final Status Reports**

Ms. Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair

Outline of Discussion Topics:

- ◆ Reports on completed tasks, current work, and future plans
 - Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
Ms. Erin Kenneally
 - Information Quality Program Guidebook Task Team
Ms. Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair
 - Privacy 101 Questions Subgroup
Mr. Michael Dever

12:30 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. **Next Steps and Closing Remarks**

Ms. Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics:

- ◆ Next steps/action items
- ◆ Next meeting date: August 13-14, 2008, Washington, DC

1:00 p.m. ***Adjournment***