

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

Fairfax, Virginia
June 29, 2011

June 29, 2011—Meeting Summary

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

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 June 29, 2011, in Fairfax, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m. The Honorable Anthony Capizzi (Judge Capizzi), Montgomery County, Ohio, Juvenile Court and GPIQWG Chair, led the meeting in furtherance of and alignment with the GPIQWG's *Vision and Mission Statements*. The following individuals were in attendance.

GPIQWG CHAIR

The Honorable Anthony Capizzi
Montgomery County, Ohio, Juvenile Court

Ms. Devon B. Adams
*Bureau of Justice Statistics,
U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ)*

Mr. Kevin J. Bowling
20th Circuit Court, Michigan

Colonel Steven F. Cumoletti
New York State Police

Lieutenant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

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

Mr. Robert Greeves
Bureau of Justice Assistance, DOJ

Ms. Alissa Huntoon
Bureau of Justice Assistance, DOJ

Barbara Hurst, Esquire
Rhode Island Office of the Public Defender

Ms. Anne Elizabeth Johnson
National Governors Association

Erin E. Kenneally, Esquire
eLCHEMY, Incorporated

Sheriff Michael Milstead
Minnehaha County Sheriff's Office

Mr. Joe Mollner
Boys & Girls Clubs of America

GPIQWG VICE CHAIR

Mr. Phil Stevenson
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Mr. Steve Serrao
Memex Law Enforcement Solutions, U.S.

Mr. Steve Siegel
Denver District Attorney's Office

Ms. Martha Steketee
Independent Consultant

Ms. Tammy Woodhams
National Criminal Justice Association

Mr. Carl Wicklund
American Probation and Parole Association

GUEST OBSERVERS AND SUBJECT-MATTER EXPERTS:

Michael Chamberlain, Esquire
California Department of Justice

Ms. Brooke Dickson-Knowles
Office of the Director of National Intelligence

Ms. Becki R. Goggins
Alabama Criminal Justice Information Center

Ms. Jennifer Luttmann
*Combined DNA Index System (CODIS)
Federal Bureau of Investigation*

Mr. Dennis Mondoro
*Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
Prevention, DOJ*

Lieutenant Leo Norton
Biometric Subject-Matter Expert

Mr. Jason O’Neal

*Chickasaw Nation Lighthouse Police Department,
Oklahoma*

Mr. John Lee Ruegg

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

Mr. W. Dave Russell

Fairfax County, Virginia, Police Department

Mr. David O. Steingraber

National Governors Association

Ms. Alecia Webb-Edgington

*SEARCH, The National Consortium of Justice
Information and Statistics*

IIR STAFF:

Ms. Christina Abernathy

Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate

Institute for Intergovernmental Research

WELCOMING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS

Judge Capizzi welcomed the attendees to Fairfax, Virginia, and made introductions around the room. He thanked Mr. Jason O’Neal, Chickasaw Nation Lighthouse Police Department, Oklahoma; and Mr. Dennis Mondoro, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, DOJ, for their attendance. He noted the broad representation from local, state, tribal, and federal agencies and thanked everyone for attending. He announced the next meeting, which will be on November 15–16, 2011 (a day and a half) in the DC area.

Judge Capizzi referred the group to the copy of the DVD titled *The Importance of Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Protections in American Law Enforcement and Public Safety*, which was provided in the meeting materials. This DVD was developed by the Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG) and the Criminal Intelligence Coordinating Council (CICC) primarily for presenting to line officers but also generalized for other justice fields. He stated that GIWG/CICC also planned to develop other DVDs specific to particular justice subject areas.

Judge Capizzi also referenced the *Global Privacy Resources* booklet and noted that it had been approved at the April 2011 Global Advisory Committee (GAC) meeting along with the *Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Development Guide for State, Local, and Tribal Justice Entities* and the *Global Privacy Policy Statement*. He thanked the task teams that had worked in between GPIQWG meetings to get these products completed.

Judge Capizzi requested feedback on the February 23–24, 2011, GPIQWG meeting summary. Since there was none, the summary was approved. He then provided an overview of agenda topics (agenda copy attached).

GLOBAL UPDATES

Mr. Carl Wicklund, Director, American Probation and Parole Association, and Vice Chair, GAC, provided highlights from a meeting held with Laurie Robinson, Assistant Attorney General, DOJ, and GAC leadership. He also said that Mr. Bob Boehmer, GAC Chair, met recently with Denise O’Donnell, the new Acting Director of BJA. One of the topics discussed was OJJDP’s efforts to develop a national information sharing solution for juvenile justice and to attain conformance with the Global Reference Architecture (GRA) and the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM). There has been some success with this effort. The ability to integrate the juvenile justice solution with others in the justice community is important. Global has worked to ensure that Global products are useful to juvenile justice.

Mr. Wicklund noted that the NIEM National Training Event will occur on August 23–25, 2011, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

He then spoke about the oversight of technical products and solutions (e.g., versioning) which is the focus of a newly developed GAC body, the Governance Standards Council (GSC). The standards coming out of our technical groups through this council will be forwarded to IJIS Institute’s SpringBoard for vetting, certification, and distribution to industry (Microsoft, IBM, and other technical leaders that participate in this process). Mr. John Ruegg, Los Angeles County,

California, Information Systems Advisory Body, added that IJIS's SpringBoard will certify these solutions, ensuring that there is a seal of certification for industry. Consumers will want that seal of approval for whatever products Global produces, and it is important for industry to have standards and confidence in those tools/solutions. Initially, the GSC is looking at those solutions that are part of the information sharing toolkit. The GSC will come up with standards for those items in the toolkit but, in future, may add to them.

Another effort by the GSC is the harmonization of technical solutions, especially around the most current privacy requirements. The GSC is considering how to harmonize the guidance and solutions that GPIQWG develops with Global's technology solutions for implementation purposes. There needs to be consistency between Global privacy requirements and the Global technical solutions. Both Judge Capizzi and Mr. Wicklund are members of the GSC.

The GAC, particularly the GESC and CICC, responded to a request by Kshemendra Paul, Program Director, Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment (PM-ISE), for the refresh of the National Information Sharing Strategy. The strategy was delivered through the AG to the White House's Office on National Strategy for Information Sharing. Ensuring that state, local, and tribal agencies are considered in this solution was a part of this effort, as well as assurance that technology solutions recommended are consistent with Global solutions.

Other Global efforts include the GIWG/CICC development of a pocket guide titled *Guidance for First Amendment Protected Activities* (e.g., for use by law enforcement during protests). The New Jersey State Police provided these to its law enforcement officers to guide them in protecting First Amendment rights during protest activities. In addition, GIWG's Privacy Committee is working with several members of GPIQWG on privacy issues related to justice use of social media for investigatory purposes. There is very little guidance for law enforcement, probation, parole, etc., on what to do with the information obtained through social media. Global is also looking at cloud computing, which is a growing trend, to provide less expensive solutions, especially to smaller agencies. Another Global priority is interstate information sharing and the state laws around what is deemed public records and what is not. When information crosses domains (courts, juvenile justice, drivers records, etc.), the process becomes complicated, especially considering the number of memoranda of understanding (MOUs) that would be needed from so many agencies to share and release that information. Global plans to develop a more efficient and comprehensive solution for the AG on interstate information sharing.

Finally, Global is developing a list of core guiding principles to help determine what efforts Global will pursue. The following is a brief list of these principles:

1. Youth violence, requested by the AG
2. Privacy as it relates to information sharing
3. The extent to which the outcome can be achieved
4. Whether or not the GAC is the appropriate venue for addressing the topic
5. The extent to which addressing the issue would duplicate efforts already under way
6. Practicality of the issue—what are the consequences of not addressing the issue, or is it something people care about?
7. Are there resources available?
8. Are there issues that are recommended by the members and partner agencies of GAC?

Recommendation: Mr. Phil Stevenson recommended an additional principle: that **the effort be one for both small and large agencies.**

Mr. Wicklund explained that, historically, the nexus for fusion center privacy policy efforts came out of GPIQWG. As part of the DHS/DOJ Fusion Process Program, all 72 designated fusion centers were required to develop privacy policies by March 31, 2011, in order to continue receiving DHS grant funding. He announced that 71 of the 72 completed DHS-approved policies.

Finally, Mr. Wicklund announced that the GESC will have a summer planning meeting on August 3, 2011, in Jersey City, New Jersey, and will also be meeting on October 12, 2011, in Washington, DC, followed by the GAC meeting on October 13, 2011.

STATUS OF OTHER PRIVACY EFFORTS

Ms. Alissa Huntoon, Policy Advisor, BJA, provided an update to the group on several related privacy projects. The Indiana Data Exchange (IDEx) project is one that is supported through BJA as a privacy policy technical assistance effort. Indiana initiated a request for technical assistance for privacy policy development for IDEx, which was new in its implementation—only five proof-of-concept exchanges currently under way. The privacy TA was completed, with the Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR) as lead, with a draft policy being developed quickly. The second part of the TA request was for guidance on implementing privacy “technically” in the IDEx system. A team of Global privacy technical subject-matter experts (SMEs) attended a conference call with Indiana to provide this guidance. Leveraging this work, BJA is next working with South Dakota on a similar project, coordinated through the National Governors Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices Privacy Policy Academy.

The National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) Forum will be held from July 31 to August 2, 2011, in Jersey City, New Jersey. In a session titled “Upholding Privacy Rights while Strengthening the Criminal Justice System,” Diane Graski, Court Technology Associate, will be present to talk about the National Center for State Courts’ effort with the privacy technical framework, and Jason Hutchens, Director, Planning and Assessment Division, Indiana Department of Homeland Security, will be in attendance to speak about IDEx.

Ms. Anne-Elizabeth Johnson, Policy Analyst, NGA’s Center for Best Practices, stated that NGA’s center is getting ready to roll out a new policy academy that focuses on promoting high-performing justice information systems. A solicitation is being put together to fund four candidate states that have well-developed justice information sharing systems (e.g., they are using NIEM or a combination of other Global tools). Each will be given \$30,000 to take on Global core capabilities: privacy, information quality, standard architecture (e.g., GRA), and access/authentication (Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management [GFIPM]).

Mr. Bob Greeves, Policy Advisor, BJA, said that the work this group did to develop the guidelines on writing privacy policies led to the successes of fusion centers and others. BJA also worked with NGA’s Privacy Policy Academy for CONNECT and the Hawaii Integrated Justice Information Sharing (HIJIS) Program and were successful with both projects in developing privacy policies. Mr. Hutchens approached Mr. Greeves to request privacy TA for developing the IDEx privacy policy. That was a great success. Sheriff Mike Milstead, Minnehaha County, South Dakota, Sheriff’s Office, requested the privacy TA for South Dakota. Since NGA had some resources remaining from its privacy policy academy, BJA decided to allocate those funds to South Dakota to duplicate the privacy TA efforts that went forth in Indiana. Sheriff Milstead also requested that the policy be written such that it is not only for the system but also for local agencies and departments, which can adopt the policy rather than having to write their own. He stated that there are also nine tribal jurisdictions that need to be included in this effort, along with many small police departments. A universal policy will enable each of them to have privacy policies in place. We have the right people at the policy level in South Dakota who are committed to Global products and want to make this happen.

GPIQWG PRODUCT STATUS: GLOBAL PRIVACY RESOURCES BOOKLET

Judge Capizzi provided a more in-depth overview of the newly GAC-approved *Global Privacy Resources* booklet. At the February 23–24, 2011, GPIQWG meeting, the Privacy Resources Task Team met in a breakout session and provided feedback and recommendations on how to feature the GPIQWG privacy series. One such suggestion was to ensure that the products are presented as being used in a cycle process (or a feedback loop), emphasizing that privacy policy is not just a one-time endeavor; rather, it is an ongoing cycle within an agency with an annual review kicking off the process. As such, a cyclical graphic, now called the Privacy Program Cycle, was developed to represent each stage of a privacy program. The privacy resources, which now include not only GPIQWG privacy products but also those of Global, Global’s partners, and DOJ-collaborated efforts, etc., were plugged into the Privacy Program Cycle according to where each product resides in each stage of the cycle. In this fashion, readers can quickly identify which products are for use at which stage of the cycle (awareness, assessment, policy development, implementation, training, etc.). The plan is to revise the GPIQWG Web page and the GPIQWG Products/Publications Web page to reflect this format for illustrating the

privacy products. This will ensure that the online resource list mirrors the *Global Privacy Resources* booklet as a roadmap to privacy resources. Next, the Privacy Guide's CD needs to be updated to reflect this new Privacy Program Cycle format. Judge Capizzi thanked IIR staff members for their work on the booklet.

Mr. Kevin Bowling, 20th Circuit Court, Ottawa County, Michigan, asked how these products are distributed. Judge Capizzi stated that distribution and promotion of our products is always a challenge. Global members work to get these products on the tables at conferences and various meetings and to provide them as resources whenever the topic of privacy is discussed. GAC and the Global Outreach Working Group (GOWG) are tasked with promotion of Global. IIR also receives requests for materials (from various agencies, and for meetings and conferences). Global is developing an online tool (a wizard) such that if agency members have a particular information sharing issue, the wizard can walk them through the various tools available to address it.

GPIQWG PRODUCT STATUS: REVISED PRIVACY GUIDE COMPANION PRODUCTS

Mr. Phil Stevenson, Ph.D., Director, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, and Vice-Chair, GPIQWG, provided an overview of each of the remaining products that need to be updated to reflect the new concepts and structure of the revised Privacy Guide. A drafting session was held on May 17–18, 2011, in Tallahassee, Florida, to revise the content of these three products (listed below):

1. *Privacy, Civil Liberties, and Information Quality Policy Development for the Justice Decision Maker*
2. *10 Steps to a Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy*
3. *Policy Development Checklist*

The goal is to have these products finalized and approved by GPIQWG in time for the October GAC meeting. A status follows on the work accomplished on these products.

Privacy, Civil Liberties, and Information Quality Policy Development for the Justice Decision Maker: The task team felt that with the development of an IQ Series Overview, the topic of information quality could be removed from the focus of this awareness document. Further, scenarios to illustrate privacy issues were suggested by GOWG. The resource was revised as an executive summary to provide administrators with a quick awareness of the issues and to emphasize the importance of privacy protections. GPIQWG members reviewed the draft document and made the following recommendations:

- Page 3, introductory language for the scenarios—Adjust the wording to state that “these issues have a number of privacy-related consequences though each highlights only one or more.”
- Page 3, scenarios—Swap the consequence for the first scenario with the consequence for the second scenario.
- Page 1, Risks section—Swap the language for the bullet that reads “Inconsistent actions within agencies” with “Limited ability to share information.”
- Page 3, third scenario—Change “loss of public support” to “loss of public trust in the agency.”
- Page 1, What Is Privacy section—Change language to read “is protected **by federal and state** constitutions.”
- Page 1, first paragraph—Add the word “trust” as in “strengthen **trust** and public confidence.”
- Page 1, scenario—Add a title to the scenario to match those on page 3. Merge the introductory language from page 3 onto page 1. Add a consequence like the others.
- Page 1, scenario—Remove “which had been disseminated through a local records management system into a national database.”
- Page 1, scenario—Change the color of the scenario title to match those on page 3.

10 Steps to a Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy: This product was revised to reflect the new concepts in the updated Privacy Guide, which meant that there were now only **seven** steps to the development of a privacy policy. Also, in the original 10 steps document, the back page featured only a description of Global. Now the back page contains a listing of the core concepts of a written privacy policy, as recommended in the SLT Policy Development Template. GPIQWG members reviewed the draft document and made the following recommendations:

- In an automated information sharing environment, there are concerns other than just state privacy laws. GPIQWG needs to emphasize that new privacy concerns arise from automated sharing systems that are not

covered by law. To reflect this, revise language on line 6 of the introductory paragraph to “for physical and automated information sharing environments.”

- Add a thumbnail for the Privacy Guide to the front page, and draw a connection to it in the language. Also, add a thumbnail of the SLT Policy Development Template on the back page.
- Add information on both pages’ introductory sections to refer readers to where the documents are located online.
- Step 4, bullet 2—Change to read “by performing” a Privacy Impact Assessment.

Policy Development Checklist: This product was retitled *Policy Review Checklist*, since it is for use when **reviewing** draft or finalized privacy policies to ensure that they meet the core criteria in the SLT Policy Development Template. Additional columns were added so that the checklist could also be used for an agency’s annual policy review. GPIQWG members reviewed the draft document and made the following recommendations:

- It was suggested that this be a launching point, as the beginning of a performance measure for having met the requirements of a privacy policy. The IJIS Institute’s SpringBoard could be a useful resource for certifying whether an agency has met the standards for the core components of a privacy policy.
- Revise the introductory paragraph to emphasize that this could be used **during** the drafting process to check work on the draft policy. It was unclear whether this could be used as a midstream policy drafting tool.
- Add a column to the checklist for “Criteria Not Addressed.”

Action item: Ms. Abernathy will send out an e-mail with this revised document for a two-week vetting. Post-meeting note: The revised checklist was distributed for GPIQWG vetting on July 11, 2011.

Action item: John Ruegg is to speak at the November 15–16, 2011, GPIQWG meeting about the privacy technical framework and the privacy requirements in the revised Privacy Guide and SLT Policy Development Template.

GPIQWG PRODUCT STATUS: AN INTRODUCTION TO FAMILIAL DNA SEARCHING—ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Mr. Stevenson referred the group to the first draft of the familial DNA issue paper. This is the result of a task team breakout session held at the February 23–24, 2011, GPIQWG meeting, with additional work added from two task team Webinars held since that time. This product is very close to being finalized, and the task team felt it was ready for the full working group’s input. Mr. Steve Siegel, Director, Special Programs Unit, Denver District Attorney’s Office, stated that he appreciated the work that went into this paper and that the team had really put a lot of effort into making it a useful document that reflects the real situation in familial DNA searching. He noted that Virginia has adopted a familial DNA searching program and that Florida and Louisiana are very close, as well. This is going to be very useful to them and any other states considering this capability. Maryland is the only state that has a statute against familial DNA searching, though outreach is ongoing from Maryland’s law enforcement agencies and district attorneys’ office to encourage them to pursue this.

This paper targets multiple audiences: crime victims, states considering this functionality, states that are performing familial DNA searches, etc. The audience is broad. Also this paper reads very nicely as an article that could be placed in a trade publication. It is important to note that there is a distinction between the exoneration community and the prosecution community on their views of familial DNA searching. Lab staff members get calls from their policymakers quite frequently, and the lab can provide this paper as a brief starting place to educate policymakers.

GPIQWG members reviewed the draft document and made the following comments and recommendations:

- The task team was asked to tone down the language to minimize the perception that DNA samples can be collected only from the perpetrator or defendant. A way to reflect this is to use the term “alleged,” as in “alleged perpetrator” more frequently.
- Issue 5, second paragraph—Change the sentence that reads “However, the fact that the database contains a disproportionate representation is irrelevant.” to read, “While familial searching may exacerbate any disproportionate impact that already exists, that is a function of other factors and not the science of familial DNA searching.” The term “exacerbate” will need to be reworked to yield a term that means “reflects” or “mirrors” the disproportionality of offenders in the system. A discussion will continue offline with the task team

to revise this language. A Webinar will be held to finalize these changes, in readiness for the summer GESC meeting on August 3, 2011.

Note About Issue 5: Certain youth advocacy groups will have problems with Issue 5. Familial searches will affect the children of adult offenders in the DNA database. For example, say that we have an offender in the database whose four kids are not in any database and are not offenders. These children come into the sphere of being investigated because they are offspring of the offender. Because there are more minorities in the system at a certain level, more children of minority families are contacted. The reasons for this are other than this science. We have to be sensitive to this issue and tone the language down.

Action item: Mr. Siegel will send language to Ms. Abernathy regarding the factors for minority overrepresentation.

- Issue 11—The first sentence contradicts the second. We need to explain more about familial searching software and that familial searching is not done in CODIS. CODIS is a program, not a database. Issue 11 needs further work. Recommend reintroducing the CODIS discussion into the introduction.
- Add the term “security” or “safeguarding” in relation to the information itself, where applicable, throughout the paper.
- Is this paper going to be used to inform laws that may need to be revised? It was agreed that that was not the role of this particular paper. If, as Mr. Wicklund recommended earlier, this paper is used as an article, that focus could be added.
- Tribal nations do not have separate databases of their own. Instead, they upload to the federal databases, so there is no pool of just tribal DNA information. One tribal nation is interested in setting up its own DNA laboratory, but that has not happened yet. Most tribes have only just started considering DNA.
- In the introduction, remove the phrase “or multiple crime scene perpetrator profiles.”
- Page 2, first paragraph—Take out the term “qualifying” and just leave the term “persons.”
- Issue 5, first paragraph—Halfway through the paragraph, “The lab conducting the search may review other demographic information” should be rephrased as “may choose to review other demographic information.” In the following paragraph, which reads, “some commentators,” remove the last sentence that starts “Following.”
- Issue 7, in the middle of the paragraph—End the sentence at “not the perpetrator.”
- Issue 9—Rephrase to “... the extent of genetic and non-DNA genetic investigative information...”
- Introduction, page 2, halfway through the paragraph—Add “additional genetic testing and” in the sentence that reads, “In addition, if ...”
- Delete footnote 1.
- Issue 2—End the second sentence at “that may be eligible.”
- Issue 3—Change the word “Other” to “Local.”
- Issue 5—Remove the last sentence of the second paragraph.

GLOBAL PRIVACY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE STATUS: COLORADO FAMILIAL DNA SEARCHING PRIVACY POLICY

Mr. Siegel provided an update on the Colorado Bureau of Investigation’s Familial DNA Searching Privacy Policy. The policy has completed its review in the agencies that handle this capability, such as the Denver District Attorney’s Office. It was determined that the policy will not need to go through the Denver Attorney General for final review and that it should be ready to move forward in the next couple of weeks.

NEXT GPIQWG BIOMETRIC PRODUCT: PRIVACY PRINCIPLES OF FAMILIAL DNA SEARCHING—A MODEL POLICY

Judge Capizzi stated that he would work with Ms. Abernathy and Mr. Stevenson to recommend members and subject-matter experts (SMEs) for a task team to begin working on this model policy. Those individuals will be contacted to begin this effort.

GPIQWG PRODUCT STATUS: *GUIDE TO CONDUCTING PRIVACY IMPACT ASSESSMENTS FOR STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL JUSTICE ENTITIES*

Judge Capizzi asked for volunteers to join a task team that will meet for two days to revise the content of this guide. Ms. Brooke Dickinson-Knowles, Privacy Coordinator, PM-ISE, has had experience completing privacy impact assessments and volunteered to assist the team. SEARCH representatives will be appointed to the team, since SEARCH developed the first PIA guide. Mr. Kevin Bowling volunteered, as well as Lieutenant Kathleen deGrasse. Given that there are technology issues in the PIA, GPIQWG may want to run this product by someone technical, such as Mr. Ruegg.

GPIQWG IQ SERIES

Mr. Wicklund stated that a member of the CJIS Advisory Policy Board commented to him about having used the IQ series products to look at data and having found it very useful. Though the member has not looked at all of the data, the member has used it to look at particular IQ dimensions and to see what shape the data is in. The member has not formalized a report, however, because of the open-records requirements. It is important to realize that there are people who are using the IQ products, even if informally, to check their data to make corrections. Judge Capizzi asked if a success story could be written.

Mr. Dave Russell, System Manager, NOVAIRS, Fairfax County, Virginia, Police Department, mentioned the following as a success story. Over the last couple of years, his agency has built system queries designed to account for privacy protections and the collection of (biometric) information in a way that avoids things that would be privacy issues. The system was designed in such a way that when information (for example, fingerprints) is collected in the field, once cross-checks are made and the individual is unknown in the system, the information is deleted. Also, if one of his agency's devices is separated from the police cruiser, its functionality terminates, and it cannot be used or accessed. He stated that the department is building a system in the DC area that takes GPIQWG recommendations and implements them. Mission creep and secondary uses are taken very seriously. Next, the department plans to develop a privacy policy.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT IQ PRODUCTS

Judge Capizzi stated that one challenge GPIQWG has, in regard to identifying future products, is that we have received numerous recommendations but only a limited number of resources are available. At the November 15–16, 2011, meeting, GPIQWG will spend a significant amount of time scoping the priorities for 2012 and articulating them for the 2012 GPIQWG Business Plan.

One example of a recommended focus is license-plate readers. These devices have been the subject of discussion among several Global working groups. To address this topic, the GESC may appoint a Global task team, populated with members from GIWG and GPIQWG, to address developing guidance on license-plate readers. There is not a lot of information out there, and providing more information needs to be a priority.

NEXT STEPS AND CLOSING REMARKS

Judge Capizzi thanked everyone for their participation and input at today's meeting and reminded the group about the next meeting, scheduled for November 15–16, 2011, in the Washington, DC, area. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

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



Hyatt Fairfax at Fair Lakes
12777 Fair Lakes Circle
Fairfax, VA 22033
(703) 818-1234

June 29, 2011



Commonwealth A Banquet Room

Agenda—Wednesday, June 29, 2011

8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

Welcoming Remarks and Overview

*The Honorable Anthony Capizzi, GPIQWG Chair and Judge,
Montgomery County, Ohio, Juvenile Court*

Topics

- ◆ Welcome:
 - Guest—Jason O’Neal, Chief of Police, Chickasaw Nation Lighthorse Police Department, Oklahoma
 - Guest—Dennis Mondoro, Strategic Community Development Officer, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ)
 - New GAC Member—Kevin Bowling, Court Administrator, 20th District Court, Ottawa County, Michigan
 - GAC Member—John Ruegg, Director, Los Angeles County Information Systems Advisory Body, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, California
- ◆ GAC-approved GPIQWG products:
 - *Global Privacy Resources* booklet
 - *Global Privacy Policy Statement*
 - Privacy Guide, including the *Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Development Template for State, Local, and Tribal Justice Entities*
 - Vetting results (tribal, juvenile justice, etc. review)
 - Publication pending GAC approval of revised companion products
- ◆ February 23–24, 2011, GPIQWG draft meeting summary
- ◆ Agenda overview
- ◆ Date for next GPIQWG meeting: November 15-16, 2011

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



Hyatt Fairfax at Fair Lakes
12777 Fair Lakes Circle
Fairfax, VA 22033
(703) 818-1234

June 29, 2011



Commonwealth A Banquet Room

Agenda—Wednesday, June 29, 2011 (continued)

9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

Global Updates

Mr. Carl Wicklund, Global Advisory Committee (GAC) Vice Chair and Executive Director, American Probation and Parole Association

Topics

- ◆ June 6, 2011, meeting with Laurie Robinson, Assistant Attorney General
 - *Global Privacy Policy Statement*
- ◆ NIEM National Training Event, August 23–25, 2011, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- ◆ Updates from April 2011 Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) and Global Advisory Committee (GAC) meetings
 - *Global Highlights*, May 2011
 - *The Importance of Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Protections in American Law Enforcement and Public Safety* (line officer video), in meeting folders
- ◆ Completion of DOJ/DHS Fusion Center Privacy Technical Assistance Program—71 designated center policies completed
- ◆ Next GAC dates:
 - GESC Summer Planning Meeting – August 3, 2011
 - GESC, October 12, 2011, and GAC, October 13, 2011
- ◆ Global working group updates

9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

Status of Other Privacy Efforts

Bob Greeves, Policy Advisor, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and Ms. Alissa Huntoon, Policy Advisor BJA, OJP, DOJ

Topics

- ◆ Indiana IDEX Project
- ◆ National Criminal Justice Association (NCIA) Forum
- ◆ Privacy technical assistance effort—South Dakota
- ◆ National Governors Association (NGA) High Performing Justice Information Sharing Working Group Meeting – June 15, 2011

10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.

Break

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



Hyatt Fairfax at Fair Lakes
12777 Fair Lakes Circle
Fairfax, VA 22033
(703) 818-1234

June 29, 2011



Commonwealth A Banquet Room

Agenda—Wednesday, June 29, 2011 (continued)

10:15 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. **GPIQWG Product Status: *Global Privacy Resources Booklet***

Judge Capizzi

Topics

- ◆ April 11, 2011, task team Webinar and GPIQWG electronic vetting
- ◆ Draft *Privacy Series Overview*, retitled *Global Privacy Resources*
 - Expanded to include Global and DOJ partner products
 - Resources grouped according to stages in privacy program cycle
 - GAC-approved
 - GPIQWG Web page redesign
- ◆ Recommendations for next steps; Global Privacy Resources CD

10:45 a.m. – 12:00 Noon **GPIQWG Product Status: *Revised Privacy Guide Companion Products***

Mr. Phil Stevenson, GPIQWG Vice Chair and Director, Statistical Analysis Center, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Topics

- ◆ May 17–18, 2011, Privacy Resources Drafting Session, Tallahassee, Florida
- ◆ *Privacy, Civil Liberties, and Information Quality Policy Development for the Justice Decision Maker*
 - Removed IQ focus and retitled *Executive Summary for Justice Decision Makers: Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Program Development*
 - Summary of changes and added features
- ◆ *10 Steps to a Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy*
 - Retitled *7 Steps to a Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy*, reflecting revised Privacy Guide
 - Summary of changes and added features
- ◆ *Policy Development Checklist*
 - Retitled *Policy Review Checklist*
 - Summary of changes and added features
- ◆ GPIQWG discussion and approval of revised products

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



Hyatt Fairfax at Fair Lakes
12777 Fair Lakes Circle
Fairfax, VA 22033
(703) 818-1234

June 29, 2011



Commonwealth A Banquet Room

Agenda—Wednesday, June 29, 2011 (continued)

- 12:00 Noon – 1:30 p.m. *Lunch (on your own)*
- 1:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. **GPIQWG Product Status: An Introduction to Familial DNA Searching: Issues for Consideration**
Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Siegel
Topics
 - ◆ April 11, 2011, and April 28, 2011, Task Team Webinars
 - ◆ GPIQWG review and recommendations
 - ◆ Next steps for this product
- 2:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. **Global Privacy Technical Assistance Status: Colorado Familial DNA Searching Privacy Policy**
Steve Siegel, Director, Special Programs Unit, Denver District Attorney's Office
Topics
 - ◆ Results of Denver District Attorney's review
 - ◆ Feedback by Colorado Bureau of Investigation
 - ◆ Current status and plan for completion
- 2:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. **Next GPIQWG Biometric Product: Privacy Principles of Familial DNA Searching—A Model Policy**
Judge Capizzi
Topics
 - Identification of priorities and next steps
 - Task team appointment
- 3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m. *Break*
- 3:15 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. **GPIQWG Product Status: Guide to Conducting Privacy Impact Assessments for State, Local, and Tribal Justice Entities**
Judge Capizzi
Topics
 - ◆ Next priority on 2011 GPIQWG Business Plan
 - ◆ Revisions needed to mirror Privacy Guide concepts
 - ◆ Task team appointment

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



Hyatt Fairfax at Fair Lakes
12777 Fair Lakes Circle
Fairfax, VA 22033
(703) 818-1234

June 29, 2011



Commonwealth A Banquet Room

Agenda—Wednesday, June 29, 2011 (continued)

4:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

GPIQWG IQ Series

Mr. Wicklund

Topics

- ◆ GPIQWG IQ Series success story—Winston-Salem Police Department
- ◆ Pennsylvania Data Quality Project to test IQ Series—County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania
- ◆ Recommendations for next products/pilot(s)

4:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Next Steps and Closing Remarks

Judge Capizzi

Topics

- ◆ Review of action items, task team appointments, and assignment of tasks
- ◆ Next meeting reminder: November 15-16, 2011

5:00 p.m.

Adjournment



BJA
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice