

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

Washington, DC
August 13–14, 2008

August 13, 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 August 13, 2008, in Washington, DC, 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

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

Erin Kenneally, Esquire
eLCHEMY, Incorporated

The Honorable Anthony Capizzi
*Montgomery County Juvenile Court
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court
Judges*

Mr. Dominic LaMar
*Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center
(SPAWAR)
U.S. Navy*

Mr. Cabell C. Cropper
National Criminal Justice Association

Ms. Erin S. Lee
National Governors Association

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

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

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

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

Mr. Owen M. Greenspan
*SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice
Information and Statistics*

Mr. Michael McDonald
Delaware State Police

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

Mr. Adam Mercer
*Bureau of Justice Assistance
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice*

Mr. Patrick J. Henry
*Booze | Allen | Hamilton
Representing National Institute of Justice*

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

Gerard F. Ramker, Ph.D.
*Bureau of Justice Statistics
U.S. Department of Justice*

Mr. Timothy H. Skinner
SRA International, Inc.

Ms. Martha W. Stekettee
Independent Consultant

Mr. Phil Stevenson
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

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 welcomed the attendees to the summer GPIQWG meeting and announced that the next GPIQWG meeting is scheduled for December 16, 2008, in Washington, DC, at the Embassy Suites DC Convention Center. He explained that the structure of this meeting would encompass full membership discussion, departing from the previous breakout session format.

Mr. Wicklund provided the following updates from the August 2008 Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) meeting:

- October 23, 2008, is the next Global Advisory Committee meeting, with the Global 101 Training rescheduled until the spring, pending funding. Elections for GAC leadership will be held at that meeting. David Steingraber is the Elections Chair and will be sending out information on candidates.
- Funding: GESC discussed priorities for Global in the coming year, keeping in mind that Global is funded only through March 2009. There was a meeting with the Deputy Attorney General (DAG), GAC Chairman Bob Boehmer, and other Global representatives to discuss funding. As part of that meeting, the Global charter was once again signed by the DAG, ensuring that Global will continue as a federal advisory committee. The DAG has designated a staffer to research alternate funding for the future of Global. However, not knowing for sure whether funding will occur, the GESC looked at Global priorities and agreed that, for the information sharing environment to continue, the justice reference architecture (JRA) is still a key Global priority, as well as the development of information exchange points documents. These were identified as the two top priorities. There was also a discussion of maintaining the working groups, possibly in a pared-down approach. GESC is looking to stretch funding to extend from March 2009 through December 2009 by cutting costs in the committees/working groups. By the time the new administration assumes office and a new structure is in place, it could be several months. It is likely that Global will be on a continuing resolution until the new administration is established. The alternate plan put forth was to limit top priorities and to reduce the support of the committees and working groups. This is the most dramatic cut in funding that the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) has faced.

Global has typically been funded with deobligated funds—a patchwork method of funding. There was concern by many GESC members that we would like to see Global have its own funding rather than deobligated funds (which are unpredictable and are affected by other agencies looking for grant funds). A plan is to put together Global materials in readiness for introducing all that is Global to the new administration to kick-start its awareness of this program, its importance, and its successes. A transition meeting is scheduled for December 9, 2008.

- GAC priorities: For the upcoming GAC meeting, three priorities are up for discussion—corrections information, suspicious activity reports (SARs), and JRA (looking at Illinois' CLEAR system for piloting)—as well as exploration of bringing in other groups, such as the leadership of the Center for Missing and Exploited Children, to garner their participation. Global is considering restructuring towards public safety and bringing in local government

representation, such as the National Association of Counties, and possibly a stronger voice for the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (in partnership). These are potentials being considered.

- There was a presentation on the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) and a discussion about a request from the IJIS Institute for support on a resolution for its Information Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD). The issue was whether Global should be supporting individual IEPDs. The role of GAC is to advise, not to pass resolutions. We considered alternate ways to support that effort without involvement in a resolution. At a minimum, GAC may make a recommendation to the Attorney General to support the initiative.

The following status reports were provided on the four additional Global working groups:

- The Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG) has made good progress on the Justice Reference Architecture (JRA). The group is working on a documentation set as a starting point for the JRA. Documentation under development includes the:
 1. Execution Context Guidelines
 2. Service Specifications Guidelines
 3. Service Identification and Design Guidelines
 4. Service Level Agreement Template
 5. JRA Compliance Matrix

The GISWG Services Task Team is developing a set of reusable services that can be adopted nationally and will support the most commonly used information sharing requirements. The team will develop a starter set of service specifications for the fusion center. Finally, GISWG is developing templates for memoranda of understanding (MOUs) and service agreements.

- The Global Security Working Group (GSWG) is facilitating a couple of pilot projects for the Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management (GFIPM) initiative and is continuing to develop standards, documentation, and governance models. GSWG is hoping to add two additional pilots, depending on funding. The group would also like to explore pilots in the technical privacy area, but this is pending funding. GSWG is convening the GFIPM Development Delivery Team to further develop the GFIPM standards and to create a governance documentation set.
- The Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG) has developed the *Tips and Leads Issue Paper* and has also solicited comments for revisions to Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 28 (28 CFR)—Judicial Administration, Chapter 1—U.S. Department of Justice, Part 23 (28 CFR Part 23). 28 CFR Part 23 changes can be submitted online at www.regulations.gov and are due by September 2, 2008. Contact Mr. Michael Dever if there are any questions. Note that there have been some misinterpretations in the media regarding this revision. The interpretations are not factual. We would appreciate any comments from this group on these revisions.

Projects between GIWG and the Criminal Intelligence Coordinating Council (CICC), gang intelligence (Gang Intelligence Strategy Committee) include Intelligence-Led Policy Strategy and privacy policy development for fusion centers.

- The Global Outreach Working Group (GOWG) conducted usability testing of the Global portion of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Information Technology (IT) Initiatives (OJP IT) Web site, www.it.ojp.gov and discussed reenergizing the working group by actively engaging members in identified deliverables:
 1. Communicating the value of Global to justice practitioners (including GAC members)
 2. Communicating the value of Global to DOJ officials and high-level decision makers

3. Capturing Global success stories, including testimonials of how certain Global deliverables assisted a specific agency or organization
4. Determining how best to communicate the value of Global to a changing administration
5. Engaging nonparticipating or underperforming GAC member agencies
6. Coordinating with support of other working groups
7. Refreshing the Global portion of the OJP IT Web site
8. Developing a Global Road Map

At the GESC meeting, Mr. Patrick McCreary, BJA, OJP, DOJ, and Mr. Michael Dever, BJA, OJP, DOJ, discussed the current privacy-oriented deliverable endeavors, not all of which are the primary responsibility of GPIQWG. A list of privacy deliverables was distributed that outlined which group was responsible for which deliverable. Categories included awareness, development and review, implementation, and review and audits.

Mr. Dever stated that, as of July 25, 2008, all of the feedback had been received on the privacy impact assessment, titled *Guide to Conducting Privacy Impact Assessment for State and Local Information Sharing Initiatives*, developed by SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics. The publication is currently undergoing an internal OJP review and approval.

Privacy Forum

A meeting is scheduled for September 3, 2008, between representatives from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the Information Sharing Environment (ISE) Privacy Guidelines Committee (PGC), DOJ, DHS, and the Office for the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) to talk about SARs and their effect on privacy. Mr. Wicklund and Mr. John Wilson, IIR, will also be in attendance. This is an outgrowth of a report issued by the ACLU that was critical of projects planned for SARs, labeling them as part of a domestic intelligence system. The issue was responded to effectively by ISE leadership, and there was a realization that there needs to be a stronger dialogue between government and privacy advocates to ensure that adequate privacy protections are in place.

Ken Mortensen reported on the release of the ISE PGC's *Information Sharing Environment—Suspicious Activity Reporting Functional Standard and Evaluation Environment: Initial Privacy and Civil Liberties Analysis* report, posted on the Program Manager (PM) for the ISE's Web site, www.ise.gov. The group is looking at testing environments and the two requirements of an ISE SAR: (1) it has to have a nexus to terrorism, and (2) it must state what determines what is a nexus to terrorism. Among the key recommendations is to make certain that there is recognition of the privacy issues that arise within this system. The analysis will require that fusion centers have an ISE SAR privacy policy in place before the sharing of any ISE SAR information. The requirements will stop short of requiring fusion centers to have a comprehensive privacy policy (which currently is voluntary) that is either inclusive of SAR provisions or supplemented by a SAR policy. Three states will participate initially, collecting SAR information from local law enforcement agencies within those states, and will be then joined by nine local fusion centers affiliated with the Major City Chiefs Association. Participation agreements will be established with local law enforcement agencies in which business rules will be outlined for submitting the SAR information. Our goal is also to encourage local agencies to adopt the same privacy protections for non-SAR information.

There are 185 functional SAR standards, grouped into 18 categories at the PM-ISE's office. The indicators of terrorism have been identified by law enforcement personnel from around the country.

A major issue is the disparate state laws that specify which information is private, confidential, and public. There is a need for an interstate compact on information sharing to develop common practices across state lines. Mr. Mortensen referred to the Interstate Indication Index (III), which could be a foundational model. Regarding core requirements, it is the state attorneys general and the courts who define what the law is. Without their participation, that resource is lost.

Privacy Technical Assistance Initiative

Mr. Michael Dever provided an update on the Privacy Technical Assistance Initiative. “We have already talked about the process to bring the fusion center policies into fruition and now the privacy impact assessment tool is in its final review and should be published soon,” said Dever. Mr. Dever stated that the team was focusing on the new partnership with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS’) Privacy Office and DHS’ Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. Through this partnership, the team is developing a CD with Mr. Russ Porter’s historical overview of privacy video and other tools. These resources will be combined with other tools as a complete training package—a suite of products for decision makers, managers, frontline public safety and criminal justice officers, as well as technology personnel—ranging from awareness and development to implementation and periodic review and audit. Several development tools are already published. “With the DHS partnership, we are looking for support in the implementation category when compliance is required, as well as training to bring agencies up to speed on the requirements. With that, the partnership will be looking at a set of draft FAQs we have developed and also how to use the content of the FAQs in a repackaged way (modules, Webinars, DVDs, and an online suite of products) to bolster implementation resources in the field once privacy policies are in place,” Mr. Dever stated.

Information Quality Program Guide

Vice Chair Jeanette Plante facilitated a discussion on the draft *Information Quality Program Guide* (IQ Program Guide) and stated that the discussion would be focused on filling in the gaps. Prior to this meeting, the guide had been developed by the IQ Program Guide Task Team. Now that the content was nearly complete, the team had been dissolved, with the remaining work to be completed in whole by the GPIQWG membership.

Ms. Plante informed the group that once revisions were made to the draft based on feedback from today’s discussions, a smaller team would meet (Ms. Plante, Ms. Martha Steketee, and Ms. Christina Abernathy, IIR) on September 11, 2008, to wordsmith the content. The draft completed from that meeting would be submitted to the GAC at the October 23, 2008, meeting to inform the GAC members of the progress of the guide and to demonstrate that it was near completion.

Ms. Plante led the attendees through the guide. Primary discussion topics, comments, and suggestions are provided below:

Target audience

- We want to be certain that the target audience includes both the champion to institute the program and the program manager. Examples are the chief data officer and the IQ manager and/or the unit that addresses the cross-functional units.
- We cannot forget that there are many small agencies in which there is one individual with many different titles.
- When the guide is released, it should target the bigger audience, but in terms of the document itself, the target is the people who are doing the work. We need to ensure that content is included to assist smaller agencies.

Governance

- Our approach is to think about how to use the agency’s existing governance process to adopt and implement an agencywide IQ program.
- It was suggested that governance be added up front. This suggestion was included in section VI. Establishing the Program, but it may need to be moved to an earlier section.

Organization of the guide

- The IQ Program Guide Task Team struggled with how to organize the content and restructured it several times before completing this version of the content outline. The content organization seems to work well as long as the content is complete and it has a reasonable flow to it.

- Suggestion to change “Why Is IQ Important?” to “Why Is an IQ Program Important?” It was agreed that keeping “Why Is IQ Important?” was part of the introductory focus that served as an awareness piece to grab the audience before moving into the introduction of an IQ program. The order of the content is attention-getter, educational, and the program. It was agreed that in section VI. Establishing the Program, “Why Is an IQ Program Important” would be highlighted.

Using the term “standards”

- It was suggested that a different term be used in place of “standards,” such as “business rules” or “guidelines” or “protocols.”

Using the term “integrated justice systems”

- In several places, the term “integrated justice systems” is described, but the notion of sharing in integrated systems has not been defined.
- The term “integrated justice systems” is outdated compared with defining the individual pieces that will be put together in a “services environment.” We should clarify to help the reader understand this.
- We are really describing bringing systems together in sharing information. We should consider discussing the way information sharing occurs.
- Suggest moving away from management of systems terminology.
- Suggest the following wording (on page 9, paragraph 2, sentence 2): “the flow of information across boundaries by various mechanisms.”

Executive overview

- The first three sections are really an executive overview; however, the first section (the “Why”) is weak in grabbing the reader’s attention. We should add some examples to grab the reader’s attention, without replicating the IQ Fact Sheet (which was developed for executives, whereas this was designed for operational personnel).
- Suggest reorganizing the first three sections into an executive overview.

Performance measures

- When talking about performance measures, we want to consider what the performance measures are.
- Suggest exploring, including the performance measures discussion earlier in the document.
- We do not want to get into a discussion of how to do performance measures; rather, we should inform readers that they need to develop performance measures.

Roles of information life cycle

- The roles of the information life cycle graphic on page 24 depicts a circular process for the life cycle of information as it relates to justice systems. We need to explore this concept and determine whether this is correct. Is this a circular process?
- Suggest removing the graphic.

Ms. Plante encouraged those attendees who had not had a chance to read the guide to consider reviewing it during the lunch break in preparation for the discussion that would continue following the break. Chairman Wicklund adjourned the attendees for lunch from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

The group reconvened at 1:00 p.m. and continued its discussion of the draft *Information Quality Program Guide*. During the remaining course of the day, Ms. Plante reviewed each content area and requested volunteers to take on sections that were either incomplete or needed refinement. Writing assignments are listed below:

IQ Program Guide Writing Assignments

All GPIQWG Members

- For Section I. “Why Is Information Quality Important?”—need scenarios or case examples to grab the reader’s attention (without replicating the IQ Fact Sheet).
- Section IV. C., 3. The Analysis, page 21, Information Life Cycle, the Incident Report chart—members are requested to add information to this chart and to expand this diagram.

IQ Assessment Tool Team (Ms. Erin Kenneally/Mr. Owen Greenspan)

- Section IV. C., 3. The Analysis, Common Questions to Ask, page 23—the IQ Assessment Process Task Team will write content and rework this section to incorporate the IQ Self-Assessment Tool (in the body of the guide and also in the appendix).

Mr. Cabell Cropper

- VI., C. Training, page 39—Mr. Cabell Cropper will rework this section.

Ms. Erin Lee

- VI, Implementation of the Program—Need an introduction to this section. There are no actionable steps included this section. Does this section actually address implementation? Focus: 1. Get buy-in from staff; 2. Train them. Reformat as steps 1, 2, 3 Erin will send suggestions to Jennie.

Ms. Jennie Plante

- Foreword—Ms. Plante will work this section. Need to add a statement about resource requirements and emphasize that this is a resource to enable agencies to get resources. When talking about an ongoing program, agencies are continuously seeking staff and support.
- Section IV. C., 3. The Analysis, page 20—Ms. Plante will draft a connecting paragraph between framework and justice events/roles and then plug them into the life cycle (language that introduces/presents the Information Life Cycle Incident Report chart).
- Section V. Establishing the Program, page 24—Ms. Plante will write introductory text to introduce this section.
- Section V., B. Who, 3. Strategic Planning, page 25—Ms. Plante will add information about resource requirements, acknowledging that many agencies do not have an abundance of resources.
- Section V., B. Who, 5. Policy Considerations for the Governance Body, page 27—Ms. Plante will insert an “it depends on the agency” statement.
- Section VIII. Tools, SIPOCO Method—Ms. Plante will locate and research restrictions on use.

Ms. Kathleen deGrasse

- Section IV. C., 3. The Analysis, page 22, the ICLEAR graphic—Ms. deGrasse will revise the graphic to a more generic representation, explore getting approval to use, and suggest placement for this up front in the discussion on integrated justice systems as an example.

Mr. Ken Mortensen

- Section IV. D. Implement and Document Choices, page 23—Mr. Mortensen will draft a paragraph that summarizes the work that has been completed (the core and contextual analysis) and document the choices of attributes selected as standards (and/or business requirements).

Mr. Michael McDonald

- Section V. C. Program Elements, 8. Systematic Monitoring, Evaluation, Review, and Validation, b) What do you measure?, page 31—Mr. McDonald will collaborate with Dr. Wang on this section. Dr. Wang will draft language that Mr. McDonald will assist in

making law enforcement/justice relevant and will reword the existing content to make it consistent with the core versus contextual dimension discussion.

Mr. Owen Greenspan

- Section IV. C., 2. Roles and their Relationship to Information Quality, page 19—Mr. Greenspan will revise this section.

Mr. Paco Aumand

- Section VI. B. Internal Marketing—Mr. Aumand will work with Dr. Wang on this section and will explore other examples on how to train policy issues. Examples would enhance this. Internal marketing is the catalyst to promote the program throughout the organization.

Rich Wang, PhD.

- Section V. C. Program Elements, 8. Systematic Monitoring, Evaluation, Review, and Validation, b) What do you measure?, page 31—Mr. McDonald will collaborate with Dr. Wang on this section. Dr. Wang will draft language that Mr. McDonald will assist in making law enforcement/justice relevant and will reword the existing content to make it consistent with the core versus contextual dimension discussion.
- Section VI. B. Internal Marketing—Mr. Aumand will work with Dr. Wang on this section and will explore other examples on how to train policy issues. Examples would enhance this. Internal marketing is the catalyst to promote the program throughout the organization.
- Appendix B, MIT Information Quality Dimensions—Dr. Wang will supply the revised dimensions that were adjusted for justice and law enforcement for the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) IQ pilot.

Mr. Tim Skinner

- Section VI., Implementation of the Program, A. Organizational Structure and Necessary Alliances—Mr. Skinner will send a link on the Information Sharing Environment (ISE) Privacy Guidelines that addresses memoranda of understanding (MOUs) and what should be included.

Ms. Plante thanked the attendees for their attention and hard work, and for participating in a productive review of the drafted guide. Ms. Plante gave a special thanks to those who volunteered to draft or refine content.

Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Chairman Wicklund expressed his appreciation for the work performed by the working group, stating, “This is why this is called a ‘working group.’ I appreciate your flexibility and cooperation in hanging in there and working through this product.” He informed the group that the next day’s meeting would take a different focus—that of finishing the final draft of the IQ Assessment Tool. He stated that the goal was to walk away from the meeting with a final draft ready for approval at the October 23, 2008, GAC meeting. “With clear direction from Ms. Kenneally and Mr. Greenspan to get us there, we should be able to accomplish this goal,” stated Mr. Wicklund. “The people that have participated on the IQ Assessment Process Task Team have contributed good work. Though it has been challenging, it was a necessary process to achieve the product we currently have.” Mr. Wicklund thanked the members of the task team and emphasized that this tool will be an important resource in the field.

Chairman Wicklund adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

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

Washington, DC
August 13–14, 2008

August 14, 2008—Meeting Summary

Chairman Wicklund reconvened the Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group meeting at 8:30 a.m. The following members and observers were in attendance.

Chair

Mr. Carl Wicklund

American Probation and Parole Association

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

Erin Kenneally, Esquire
eLCHEMY, Incorporated

The Honorable Anthony Capizzi
*Montgomery County Juvenile Court
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court
Judges*

Mr. Dominic LaMar
*Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center
(SPAWAR)
U.S. Navy*

Ms. Ayn H. Crawley
U.S. Department of Homeland Security

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

Mr. Cabell C. Cropper
National Criminal Justice Association

Mr. Thomas MacLellan
National Governors Association

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

Mr. Michael McDonald
Delaware State Police

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

Mr. Adam Mercer
*Bureau of Justice Assistance
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice*

Mr. Owen M. Greenspan
*SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice
Information and Statistics*

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

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

Richard Wang, Ph.D.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Mr. Patrick J. Henry
*Booze | Allen | Hamilton
Representing National Institute of Justice*

Mr. Steve Siegel
Denver District Attorney's Office

Mr. Timothy H. Skinner
SRA International, Inc.

Ms. Martha W. Steketee
Independent Consultant

Mr. Phil Stevenson
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Staff
Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Chairman Wicklund welcomed everyone back to the second day of the Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group. He thanked the attendees for their focused attention and hard work at yesterday's meeting. He reviewed the agenda and reminded the group that though today was a short half-day meeting, he hoped that much would be accomplished—a final draft of the IQ Assessment Tool for submission to the GAC in October, a plan for the assessment GPIQWG product success, and a consensus on 2009 GPIQWG deliverables.

Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team

Ms. Kenneally demonstrated the mock layout of the IQ Assessment Tool (matrix) and explained that the team spent considerable time identifying common justice events and testing them against the questions outlined in the matrix. Then, the group segregated the matrix into core and contextual dimensions within the information life cycle so that the matrix was consistent with the concepts presented in the IQ Program Guide.

Ms. Kenneally stated that the team took the dimensions, chose a common justice event, and came up with information-quality questions that would logically be associated with each dimension. Following this procedure with several justice events, the team realized that some of the questions were the same no matter which justice event was used. Therefore, the team decided to generalize the questions so they would apply to most justice events and to create a tool that could be custom-fitted. The team tested and refined the questions against a presentencing investigation, an incident report, a sentencing report, and a corrections report. Though the questions may not be applicable to all events, primarily they will be useful to most justice events.

At the drafting session held on July 9, 2008, in Chicago, Illinois, the team wrapped up the questions and drafted an introduction. Ms. Kenneally requested feedback on the name "IQ Assessment Tool." There was a consensus to use the word "tool" instead of "process" and to change "assessment" to "self-assessment." The resulting name is "Information Quality Self-Assessment Tool."

Ms. Kenneally reviewed each column heading in the matrix:

- IQ Dimension, Question
- Answer (Y/N)
- Applicability/Rationale/Confidence Level (IQ label)
- Corrective Action/Recommendation
- Priority
- Status
- Remarks

Chairman Wicklund suggested including an explanation of what each column means (e.g., a key) in the introduction section and explaining what each of the columns is asking the user to do. It was also suggested that the tool include a "how to use this tool" section instructing the user, step by step, on how to complete the matrix. Chairman Wicklund stated that the final draft will need to be piloted in several agencies to ensure that the tool is a useful resource and that we have provided the most understandable directions for its use.

Other member suggestions included the following:

- Is it a practitioner tool or a management tool? If the manager and practitioner audience are combined, should the tool be simplified? Management will look at these self-assessments to

see whether they comply with policy. Could it be stripped down more? Can the introduction be adjusted for both audiences, management and practitioners—practitioners complete the evaluation and managers review (for example, to see whether the evaluation meets business requirements).

It was suggested that the group was getting too complex with the previous suggestions, and a recommendation was made to simply focus on the practitioner. Realistically, there is not time for management to read through this tool. Management would rather know where the agency is on a particular system for information quality (good, okay, or bad)—a general view of where the agency stands on information quality. We really just need to satisfy the needs of one particular segment. Chairman Wicklund concurred that this was the original intent of the tool: to provide a basic overview (are we okay or not okay, overall). At the end of the assessment, management can be presented with a result of this evaluation. We need to make this the best tool for the practitioner. We should make sure, when we look at individual categories, that they are in fact useful to the practitioner because it keeps this tool uncomplicated and keeps us focused.

The consensus was that the tool should not target managers.

- A suggestion was made to provide direction on what to do with the results once the agency is finished with the assessment. Engaging agencies in pilot-testing might also help the Global Outreach Working Group. Maybe we should not be worrying about semantics but instead about substance—“How will this be useful to you?”

Ms. Kenneally facilitated a discussion of the column headings and worked with the group to develop explanations for specific headings. The resulting explanations are listed below.

Explanation of columns

IQ Dimension	No explanation.
Question	No explanation.
Answer (Y/N)	No explanation.
Applicability/Rationale/Confidence Level	Why the process/procedure is done. Examples: because we have always done it, for an ethical standpoint (the right thing to do), for statute compliance purposes, for policy reasons (business requirements), etc. Confidence level means confidence in the quality of the information. How confident is the agency in its process of validating the information? Evaluation ratings could be: yes, no, maybe, not applicable, or possibly red, green, and yellow. Use what works for the agency.
Corrective Action/Recommendation	Descriptive action of what should be done. Include in the recommendations any thoughts on policies, procedures, MOUs, technology, or training.
Priority	The agency's priority for addressing the actions or recommendations within the agency or system (e.g., high, medium, low); what to address first.

Status	Status of recommended actions (e.g., complete, in process, not begun).
Descriptive Remarks	No explanation.

Chairman Wicklund stated that, once finalized, the tool will be presented to the GAC in October for approval and will be field-tested following that approval. The working group will need to determine how to get the tool out to the field, once GAC approves it. Further, the IQ Program Guide is being presented as an informational status update to the GAC. The IQ Self-Assessment Tool will be piloted/field-tested in the months following the GAC approval so that the final tool can be published as part of the IQ Program Guide. The IQ Program Guide will answer the question, "So what do we do next?"

Chairman Wicklund expressed appreciation by Mr. McCreary for all of the work coming out of this group. He also thanked Mr. Stevenson for drafting and submitting Chapter Nine, titled *Cautionary Notes about Statistical Information*, in the IQ Program Guide.

GPIQWG Self-Assessment of Current Products

Ms. Plante explained that the extent to which GPIQWG can demonstrate that it has been successful will determine continued funding. She also suggested that it would be a good idea at the next meeting to review the GPIQWG *Vision* and *Mission* statements.

Ms. Plante began by requesting the attendees to submit anecdotal and success stories. We should be able to say, "This served as the underpinning of this document and the resulting document has been used X times in X places." Clearly, the quality of work that went into GPIQWG products has been the reason they have been so well-accepted. We have established a method for core consistency, across the board, in terms of how agencies approach the articulation of their privacy policies.

We should write a success story on the use of the *Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates* (Privacy Guide). For example, the Privacy Guide was used as a foundational piece for both the *Guidelines to Ensure that the Information Privacy and Other Legal Rights of Americans are Protected in the Development and Use of the Information Sharing Environment* (ISE Privacy Guidelines), as well as the *Fusion Center Privacy Policy Development: Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Template* (Fusion Center Template). With the Fusion Center Template, we can actually do some quantifying (i.e., number of fusion center privacy policies drafted).

GPIQWG needs to complete a self-assessment so that we have something to support arguments in favor of continuing this group or in support of where this area may fit within a potential restructuring of Global.

Chairman Wicklund asked Michael Dever to come up with some examples of how the GPIQWG products have been used. Chairman Wicklund referred to the Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision, to which he forwarded the Privacy Guide and which found great value in it. Mr. Thomas MacLellan stated that he and Ms. Erin Lee could draft an e-mail and solicit feedback from the National Governors Association (NGA) community.

Action Item: The group will e-mail success stories and evidence of use of GPIQWG products to Ms. Abernathy prior to the next meeting.

Based on the information received, it was suggested that GPIQWG put together a white paper to present to GOWG and GAC. Tasks may include:

- Task 1: Document where GPIQWG products have been used and have been valuable, including success stories.
- Task 2: Recommendations to GOWG that GPIQWG would be able to determine the number of policies that have been drafted using GPIQWG tools and adopted and a request for GOWG's assistance in how to handle the priority.

Task 3: Use the OJP IT Web site to solicit feedback based on the amount of activity with these products (e.g., number of downloads, number of hits).

Judge Capizzi stated that GOWG was not set up to access the quality of the products coming out of the working groups. Chairman Wicklund stated that GOWG could determine the success of those working groups.

Chairman Wicklund stated that changes were coming and that it was appropriate that this group revisit the *Vision* and *Mission* statements. Ms. Plante suggested that the GAC also complete a self-assessment. An issue has always been how successful the GAC is at getting the information out to its constituents. This is why GOWG was created.

Action Item: GPIQWG will review the *Vision* and *Mission* statements at the December 16, 2008, meeting.

In concluding this discussion, Chairman Wicklund stated that there are two results envisioned from this assessment—success stories and recommendations on moving forward. The recommendations for moving forward would include: (1) moving existing GPIQWG products forward to additional audiences; and (2) what to do with the products GPIQWG is currently working on.

GPIQWG 2009 Deliverables

Chairman Wicklund asked the group for its suggestions on privacy or information quality resources that should be the group's focus for 2009. What are the areas of need? Products suggested included:

- Privacy and IQ Resources for Biometrics—There are privacy and information quality issues associated with biometrics (facial recognition, DNA, iris scans, urinalysis). The justice system is collecting, storing, linking to cases, and sharing this information. Chairman Wicklund stated that there was general interest among GESC with regard to biometrics.
 - **House Presidential Directive 59:** There is a new Presidential Directive, issued in June 2008, to consolidate and coordinate federal levels regarding biometrics and screening related to national security (not just for terrorism, other threats). Under the Presidential Directive, the U.S. Attorney General (AG) has been directed to develop policy with regard to privacy and civil liberties for biometrics. DOJ is now seriously looking at biometrics (FBI's CJIS, as well) due to this Directive. This is a good time to come into this subject area and explore development to meet these needs.
 - **Ongoing Biometrics Projects:**
 - DOJ is looking at DNA as the primary technique for accuracy in identifying an individual. Virginia had the first innocence case in which someone submitted his DNA to prove he was not at fault and to clear himself of a charge. Through this endeavor, DNA is not going to be used to determine the identity of an individual; rather, it will be used in matching.
 - The National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) Biometrics Committee has been working on privacy issues and has produced some resources. Refer to www.biometrics.gov. Mr. Tim Skinner and Mr. Ken Mortensen drafted a paper several years ago on biometrics that describes the use of biometrics in state and local agencies and how they interface there. NSTC's focus is on protocols and standards for biometrics. The privacy effort has been a secondary priority. How do we dovetail biometrics into the work that has already been done? Before we decide what we should do with biometrics, we should research what already exists.
 - Mr. MacLellan stated that NGA, in collaboration with NIJ, has a forensic policy project looking at the future of DNA. This is something the group should definitely be involved in.

- **Current Privacy/IQ Biometrics Issues:**
 - **Familial searches:** Mr. Steve Siegel's office focuses on the expansion of databases (DNA on arrest or conviction) and familial search, which raises a lot of privacy issues. This is a major national argument regarding familial searches. GPIQWG needs to provide guidance as an objective source—if you are going to do it or not do it, here are the issues related to quality and privacy—versus taking a position on the issue.
 - **Linking biometrics to cases:** This is a huge issue and right on task with what is going on today, since biometrics is becoming more useful as a tool for law enforcement. One of the concerns is that information (biometrics) about who you are physically cannot be changed, whereas names, addresses, and social security numbers can be changed. Linking information or cases to biometrics is a hot issue. Incorrectly linking a DNA record to a conviction is extremely difficult to disprove. Mr. Mortensen agreed that this is a very important issue and exactly what this group should focus on.
 - **Secondary use of biometrics:** Another issue is that techniques in DNA create a window into information about you that has nothing to do with the criminal justice field (e.g., DNA showing a propensity for cancer). This secondary use of DNA is a big concern. People are worried about predictors that say, "You are liable to be a violent felon and you will act based on these predictors" even though the person has never committed a crime. Justice needs to establish only the identifiers it plans to use in its DNA analysis and not have the ability to determine unrelated predictors.
 - **Juvenile offenders:** Juvenile offenders in Ohio are required to submit DNA samples. This creates a huge privacy issue because the information is stored and can be used later (tied in to future adult crimes, etc.).

In summary, the group identified the following privacy and information quality issues with biometrics (though they all seemed to primarily related to DNA):

- the collection/analysis of DNA (analyzing only the predictors relevant to justice)
- the use of DNA (linking to a case)
- the storage and sharing/dissemination of DNA

GPIQWG's Proposed Exploration of Biometrics:

- GPIQWG needs to bring in subject-matter experts (SMEs), such as FBI CJIS. Mr. Owen Greenspan suggested bringing in SMEs with regard to the Compact. SMEs will be part of the next process to help the group learn about the issues and develop resources.
- A suggested GPIQWG product might be the refinement of the existing Fusion Center Template in the context of biometrics. The current template seems to be written around intelligence. The group could explore the template with another discipline in mind.
- Chairman Wicklund stated that the focus should not be just on DNA but also on other biometrics (e.g., tattoos, urinalysis, facial recognition, retina scans, finger and palm prints). The discussion needs to encompass biometrics in total.

Action Item: GPIQWG will spend part of the next meeting listening to presentations from SMEs (forensic examiners, forensic lab practitioners, etc.) to initiate its exploration of this field.

Members made several recommendations for biometrics SMEs:

- Mr. Mortensen recommended John Woodward, who was with the U.S. Department of Defense and now works for the Central Intelligence Agency. He has written extensively on privacy issues.
- Mr. MacLellan has a network of lab directors, and he will also talk with NIJ about who it might recommend.
- NIJ created the Center of Excellence on Biometrics in New York City, New York. This group could speak to privacy.
- FBI CJIS has also created a center for excellence on biometrics.
- Mr. Skinner will check with the IJIS Institute for SMEs.

Other recommendations for future products:

- Mr. Greeves spoke about the difficulties experienced with fusion centers in the quality of the privacy policies drafted. Are there consistent issues based on weaknesses in the guidance we have provided or based on refusal to follow the template, or other reasons? He suggested that GPIQWG make recommendations to review these issues and possibly to update the Fusion Center Template.
- Another area to explore is the growing effects of using geographic information systems (GIS) with law enforcement. Social services are using it. Mr. Skinner will resend the e-mail about this topic.
- Mr. Aumand suggested drilling down into the Privacy Guide (i.e., exploring the Fair Information Principles [FIPs]) and determining whether we need to provide more guidance to the fusion centers and the intelligence community. Are there more tools that we could develop (e.g., the issue of merging information)? Chairman Wicklund suggested we check first with GIWG and GIWG's Privacy Committee to ensure that they are not already addressing these issues. We may want to look at the fusion centers that have submitted privacy policies and see whether they may be having trouble implementing the policy.

Closing Remarks

Chairman Wicklund reminded the group that the next meeting is on December 16, 2008, in Washington, DC, and that it will be only a one-day meeting. He then reviewed the action items and thanked everyone again for all of their effort and contributions to this group and to the meetings. "We will be able to present to the GAC with a lot of pride in October."

The meeting was adjourned at 11:32 a.m.

This page intentionally left blank.

Attachment A

**Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group
August 13–14, 2008
Meeting Agenda**

This page intentionally left blank.

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



Embassy Suites DC Convention Center
900 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 739-2001



United States
Department of Justice

August 13–14, 2008

Agenda—Page One

Capital C Banquet Room

August 13, 2008

8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.

Beverage Service

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
- ◆ Fall GPIQWG meeting date
- ◆ May 6–7, 2008, GPIQWG draft meeting summary

8:45 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

Global Updates

Mr. Carl Wicklund and Mr. Bob Greeves, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ)

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ Updates from August GESC meeting
- ◆ 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

9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

Global Working Group Updates

Mr. Carl Wicklund

Working Groups

- ◆ **Global Outreach Working Group (GOWG)**
The Honorable Anthony Capizzi, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, and Mr. Adam Mercer, DOJ
 - Enhancement of Global 101 Training
 - Global Road Map
 - OJP IT Web site status report:
 - Update on new OJP IT Web site development
 - Anticipated debut and future plans
- ◆ **Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG)**
 - Proposed revisions to 28 CFR Part 23
- ◆ **Global Security Working Group (GSWG)**
- ◆ **Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG)**

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



Embassy Suites DC Convention Center
900 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 739-2001



United States
Department of Justice

August 13–14, 2008

Agenda—Page Two

Capital C Banquet Room

August 13, 2008

- 9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m. **Privacy Forum Update**
Mr. Carl Wicklund and Mr. Bob Greeves
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ DOJ, DHS, and ODNI collaboration
 - ◆ Planning meetings
 - ◆ Fall forum
- 9:45 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. **Privacy Technical Assistance Initiative**
Mr. Michael Dever, DOJ
- 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
- 10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. **DOJ Privacy and Civil Liberties Activities**
Mr. Kenneth P. Mortensen, DOJ (ODAG), and Mr. Paul Garrett, DOJ (OCIO)
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ Status of Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties Privacy Act Overview
 - ◆ Update on Privacy Process for Suspicious Activity Reporting (SAR)
- 10:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Break**
- 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 Noon **Information Quality Program Guidebook**
Ms. Jeanette Plante, GPIQWG Vice Chair, and Mr. Paco Aumand, Vermont Department of Public Safety
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ Overview of research and completed work
 - ◆ Target audience and scope of the guidebook
 - ◆ Chapter outline overview
 - ◆ Content review
- 12:00 Noon – 1:30 p.m. **Lunch (on your own)**

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



Embassy Suites DC Convention Center
900 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 739-2001



United States
Department of Justice

August 13–14, 2008

Agenda—Page Three

Capital C Banquet Room

August 13, 2008

1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Information Quality Program Guidebook, *continued*

Ms. Jeanette Plante and Mr. Paco Aumand

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ Outstanding/incomplete chapter content
- ◆ Suggested new content
- ◆ Relevant tools for inclusion

3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Break

3:15 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.

Information Quality Program Guidebook, *continued*

Ms. Jeanette Plante and Mr. Paco Aumand

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ Writing assignments
- ◆ Completion timeline
- ◆ Vetting the guidebook
- ◆ Suggestions on layout/packaging

4:15 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

GPIQWG

Mr. Carl Wicklund

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ Review of today's action items/writing assignments and setting deadlines
- ◆ Plan for the following day's GPIQWG meeting

4:30 p.m.

Adjournment

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



Embassy Suites DC Convention Center
900 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 739-2001



United States
Department of Justice

August 13–14, 2008

Agenda—Page Five

Capital C Banquet Room

August 14, 2008

- 8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. *Beverage Service*
- 8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m. **Introduction and Charge for the Day**
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair
Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ Charge to the group—Finalizing the IQ Assessment Questionnaire
 - ◆ Presentation at fall GAC meeting for approval
- 8:45 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. **Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team**
Mr. Owen Greenspan, SEARCH, the National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, and Ms. Erin Kenneally, eLCHEMY, Inc.
Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ Overview of research and completed work
 - ◆ Generalizing to justice events
 - ◆ Target audience
 - ◆ New introduction section
 - ◆ Titling of the questionnaire
 - ◆ Questionnaire layout, packaging, and vetting
 - ◆ Presentation to GAC for approval
- 10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. *Break*
- 10:15 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. **GPIQWG Self-Assessment of Current Products**
Ms. Jeanette Plante
Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ How do we determine whether our products are successful?
 - ◆ Ideas/suggestions for a self-assessment

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



Embassy Suites DC Convention Center
900 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 739-2001



United States
Department of Justice

August 13–14, 2008

Agenda—Page Six

Capital C Banquet Room

August 14, 2008

10:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.

GPIQWG 2009 Deliverables

Mr. Carl Wicklund

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ Products for 2009
 - Potential Challenge of Biometrics and Information Quality
 - Quality of collected and stored biometric information
 - What are the risks and issues associated with quality?
 - Product suggestions and where to begin
 - Recommended subject-matter experts
 - Statistical Reporting and Information Quality
 - Target audience
 - Scope of this resource and potential tools
 - Recommended subject-matter experts
 - Other recommended products

11:45 a.m. – 12:00 Noon

Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Mr. Carl Wicklund

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ Next steps/action items
- ◆ Next meeting date

12:00 Noon

Adjournment

