Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Advisory Committee (GAC)

Meeting Summary[1]
Arlington, Virginia¾September 28-29, 2004

Convening and Introductions

Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Advisory Committee (GAC or "Committee") Chairman Mel Carraway convened the fall 2004 meeting and reviewed the agenda.[2] GAC members and proxies introduced themselves and are listed below (for a complete attendee roster, including federal partners, invited guests, and support staff, please submit requests to Global support staff at [850] 385-0600, extension 285). The following were in attendance:

Michael A. L. Balboni
National Conference of State Legislatures
Albany, New York

Kenneth A. Bouche
SEARCH, The National Consortium for
* Justice Information and Statistics*
Springfield, Illinois

Willie Bradley (proxy for William Casey)
Criminal Justice Information Services
* Advisory Policy Board*
Boston, Massachusetts

Mike Brown (proxy for John Thompson)
National Sheriffs' Association
Alexandria, Virginia

Timothy Cadigan
Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts
Washington, DC

George M. Camp
Association of State Correctional
* Administrators*
Middletown, Connecticut

---

[1] This summary covers events of the fall 2004 GAC meeting. The proceedings took place over the course of two days, from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on September 28 and 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 Noon on September 29. This report does not note evening adjournment on the first day nor reconvening on the second day. Also, in the interest of document structure and report comprehensibility, the order of events described herein does not necessarily mirror the agenda order. However, the **content** is reflective of meeting activities and resolutions.

[2] **Attachment A.**

Melvin J. Carraway
International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) - Division of State and Provincial Police
Indianapolis, Indiana

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

Cabell C. Cropper
National Criminal Justice Association
Washington, DC

Michael Duffy
Justice Management Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

Edward A. Flynn
National Governors Association
Boston, Massachusetts

Tom A. Henderson, Ph.D.
National Center for State Courts
Arlington, Virginia

Barbara Hurst, Esquire
National Legal Aid and Defender Association
Providence, Rhode Island

E. Hunter Hurst III
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Linda R. Lewis
American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators
Arlington, Virginia

Harlin R. McEwen
IACP
Ithaca, New York

Michael Muth
INTERPOL – State and Local Liaison Division
Washington, DC

Thomas J. O'Reilly
National Association of Attorneys General
Trenton, New Jersey

Jerome M. Pender
Federal Bureau of Investigation Criminal Justice Information Services Division
Clarksburg, West Virginia

Jeanette Plante, Esquire
Executive Office for United States Attorneys
Washington, DC

Charles H. Ramsey
Major Cities Chiefs Association
Washington, DC

Edward Reina
IACP – Indian Country Law Enforcement Section
Prescott, Arizona

William B. Simpkins
U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration
Arlington, Virginia

Martin Smith (proxy for Steven Cooper)
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC

Richelle G. Uecker
National Association for Court Management
Santa Ana, California

Gerald E. Wethington
National Association of State Chief Information Officers
Jefferson City, Missouri

New GAC representatives were introduced: Jeanette Plante, Esquire, now represents the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys; Mr. Jerome Pender now represents the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division; Mr. Michael Muth now represents INTERPOL – State and Local Liaison Division; and Secretary Edward Flynn now represents the National Governors Association. Proxies in attendance for absent GAC members were Tom Henderson, Ph.D., representing National Center for State Courts (NCSC), for Mr. Carl Wicklund (American Probation and Parole Association) and Mr. David Byers (Conference of State Court Administrators); Mr. Willie Bradley for Mr. William Casey, representing the CJIS

Advisory Policy Board, Mr. Mike Brown for Mr. John Thompson, representing the National Sheriffs' Association, and Mr. Martin Smith for Mr. Steven Cooper, representing the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS).

Welcoming Remarks

Chairman Carraway focused his welcoming remarks on recent Committee success stories, noting, "I am extremely proud of all that Global has accomplished in the last few months." These notable achievements included the following:

❑ A National Kick-Off Event was held on May 14, 2004, at the Great Hall of Justice, during which the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* (NCISP or "Plan")[3] was lauded by numerous criminal justice officials at the local, state, and federal levels, including The Honorable John Ashcroft, United States Attorney General; The Honorable Deborah Daniels, Assistant Attorney General (AAG), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ); Director Robert Mueller, FBI; and General Frank Libutti, Under Secretary, DHS. The Plan is the cornerstone project of the Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG).

❑ The momentum generated by this Kick-Off Event will be leveraged by members of the GIWG and the recently established Criminal Intelligence Coordinating Council (CICC), which held its inaugural meeting on June 24, 2004, in Washington, DC. One of the cornerstones of the NCISP, the CICC will focus on:

  o Ensuring that every chief, sheriff, and law enforcement executive gains an understanding of their agency's role in the development and sharing of information and intelligence.
  o Serving as the voice for local law enforcement in their efforts to develop and share criminal intelligence.
  o Focusing on developing a framework for implementing and ensuring the longevity of the standards-based intelligence plan, training coordination, technology coordination, outreach and education, and resource coordination.
  o Advising the U.S. Attorney General, the Secretary of DHS, the Congress, and state governors on the best use of criminal intelligence to keep our country safe.

❑ Colonel Kenneth Bouche, Illinois State Police and GIWG chair, and Chief Joseph Polisar, Garden Grove, California, Police Department serve as cochairs of the CICC.

---

[3] The NCISP and associated materials are available on the Global Web site, located at http://it.ojp.gov/global.

- Colonel Bouche added the following comment regarding CICC attention to the *9/11 Commission Report*:[4] "There's some really solid recommendations in this report on how to reform national intelligence, but there isn't a single recommendation on how those reforms are going to impact, be joined with, or be consistent with the work of state and local law enforcement. So *immediately,* this has become a charge of the CICC, and we're working very hard to make sure that state and local governments have a voice in this, because 95 percent of the people who are going to be conducting the type of work at a terrorist event come from state and local law enforcement. That's not counting our first responders and those of you who work in different disciplines that support us. The federal government makes up a very small portion of this . . . ."

- Since its release, the Global Justice Extensible Markup (XML) Language Data Model (Global JXDM), Version 3.0, touted as "an outstanding innovation," is receiving much praise around the country. Notably, the Global JXDM was one of eight recipients of the American Council for Technology (ACT) Award, presented May 24, 2004. Success of the Global JXDM can be directly attributed to the hard work of the Global XML Structure Task Force (XSTF), a group that continues to improve, expand, and promote Global JXDM-related activities throughout the justice community and beyond.

- The Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) finalized a high-level privacy policy paper and has begun work on the anticipated hands-on companion workbook slated for GAC review in April 2005.

Chairman Carraway concluded his remarks by noting the fall program's new and more interactive GAC agenda format, with emphases on member participation and feedback, action items, and panel presentations on "hot topics" (specifically, at this meeting, "privacy" and "intelligence" as these broad categories apply to, impact, and are addressed by the Committee).

John Morgan, Ph.D., National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and Science Advisor to AAG Daniels, began his remarks by congratulating Chairman Carraway: "Your leadership and the work that you've done with Global have been absolutely essential to the success of the efforts." He expanded on the theme of Global accomplishments, structuring his remarks around achievements supporting integrated justice and intelligence sharing. Regarding integrated justice, Dr. Morgan remarked that extensive training for XML developers (in support of the Global JXDM) has gone very well and has been well received. He emphasized the importance of community buy-in: "Getting the developers excited about XML and knowledgeable about how to implement systems that are truly in conformance with the Global JXDM is critical. We (at OJP) are very interested in making sure that over the next year we have in place resources that will allow us to expand this [Global JXDM] beyond the community of software developers,

---

[4] Available at http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/index.htm

into the rest of the criminal justice community, to raise awareness and extend the use of the data dictionary . . . not only in criminal justice, but in partners to criminal justice as well." Regarding the Committee's work in intelligence sharing activities, Dr. Morgan lauded Global's work to improve standards for criminal intelligence analysis training and fusion center[5] efforts. He closed by highlighting two partner associations whose complementary works bolster the mission of Global (and vice versa):

(1) The Law Enforcement Information Technology Standards Council (LEITSC)[6] is fostering the growth of strategic planning and implementation of integrated justice systems by promoting the merits of information technology (IT) standards, providing advice to the nation's law enforcement community on technical aspects of IT standards, sharing practical solutions, and representing the voice of law enforcement in the expansion of justice and public safety information technology standards. LEITSC is accomplishing critical work, particularly in the area of functional standards for computer-aided dispatch (CAD) and record management systems (RMS), and—as importantly—provides an excellent model for cooperation among various associations; this mirrors the GAC's fundamental philosophy of collaboration and esprit de corp across the entire justice landscape. "I'm glad that we have a representative from that council here [Ms. Jennifer Zeunik], and that the law enforcement organizations are buying into and seeing the path forward to implementing the guidance and policies that Global has put on the plate for criminal justice practitioners."

(2) Dr. Morgan expressed appreciation for participation by DHS in Global activities: "It really is a testimony to the work that this group [GAC] has done in building consensus in the criminal justice community around best practices and policies that can improve the use of intelligence across the federal, state, and local spheres, and . . . I appreciate the Department of Homeland Security's recognition of that and participation with Global and in our CICC processes."

Committee Business

Before moving on to panel presentations, Global Working Group reports, and guest briefings, Chairman Carraway dispensed with GAC business.

The spring 2004 GAC meeting minutes, summarizing the April 21-22 meeting, were presented for approval. (The document was distributed in advance for members' review and comment; this GAC meeting summary review-and-approval process is a standing Committee procedure.)

Recommendation: Mr. William Simpkins, representing the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, moved to ratify the document without change. Dr. Henderson seconded. The motion was brought to a vote and passed unanimously.

---

[5] Information on fusion center activities is available at http://it.ojp.gov/documents/guideline_for_law_enforcement_intel_fusion_centers.pdf.
[6] More information on LEITSC is available at http://www.leitsc.org.

Action: The document will be posted on the Global Web site and provided in hard copy format by request.[7]

Coordinating Resources Toward a Common Good: Update on Global Grant Incentives Efforts

Mr. Thomas O'Reilly, newly appointed Global Outreach Coordinator and GAC representative from the National Association of Attorneys General, briefed members on the status of the document *Grant Incentives for Justice Information Sharing.* This paper and attendant recommendations were reviewed by the GAC in October 2003, refined (per Committee feedback) by the Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) in July 2004, and recommended to DOJ for further action. Mr. O'Reilly reminded attendees of the impetus behind this effort: "Several years ago, the concern by the GAC was that there was a lot of funding coming into the system, and we wanted to make sure this didn't continue to contribute to the phenomena of 'silos,' or disconnected information system . . . .   As such, we started to work on incentives, or to put it more plainly: how do we leverage the dollars in terms of making sure that the Global standards are used appropriately, and allow for that flow and free exchange of information between the various branches of the system?"   The document recommends that DOJ take the following actions with all DOJ funding programs:

1. Encourage each state to adopt the concept of a statewide Justice Information System (JIS) Planning Board (or "Coordination Board"), similar to the membership of stakeholders in Global. To encourage creativity, membership should include justice practitioners who represent the justice, courts, and public safety stakeholders but not be limited to Global; the private sector; foundations; or local, state, tribal, and federal government agencies. This Coordination Board will be responsible for reviewing all DOJ funding provided to local and state governments to ensure that resources are leveraged to support information sharing.

2. A special condition should be added to each DOJ grant with an IT component, irrespective of funding source, requiring that all subgrantees coordinate with their state JIS Planning Board for review and comment by a coordination body.

3. DOJ should provide technical assistance, training, identification of model policies, and promising practices to all subgrantees to assist them with coordination activities.

4. DOJ should continue to coordinate with federal government agencies to ensure all information-related activities are coordinated to facilitate information sharing.

---

[7] Hard copies of Global documents are available from Global support staff by calling (850) 385-0600, extension 285.

5. DOJ should consider enhancing incentives for those jurisdictions that demonstrate that they have not only adopted the Global model (i.e., included justice community representation by the interested justice practitioner) but have also explored and are utilizing funding sources from other local, county, state, and federal departments (i.e., Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], Highway Safety, and DHS) in a collaborative fashion. Systems that leverage these additional funding sources to broaden the base of participation and increase the value of the information contained within the system should be considered to receive priority funding.

6. DOJ should empower Global to continue to support and coordinate current and emerging standards for justice information systems in cooperation with the NIJ, National Institute for Standards and Technology, private sector, and other appropriate standards-setting bodies.

Since the grant incentives document was finalized, some concrete steps have occurred:

- To support the Global JXDM, OJP tapped Global expertise to craft grantee guideline language. The goal of these instructions is simplicity and a tone of "guidance, not mandating." With input from Global Infrastructure Working Group (GISWG, the parent organization for the Global JXDM effort) members, the following statement was crafted for immediate use by OJP, with widespread program office integration slated for the 2005 funding cycle:

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

- At their August Board of Directors meeting, the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) adopted the Global grant incentives document. This organization's endorsement is particularly salient because, per Mr. O'Reilly, "NCJA's membership represents all the Byrne Grant and other DOJ funding streams in each of the respective 50 states. So again, it's following the money, putting that group together to try to encourage and adopt these standards."

- Outreach efforts have been initiated with the Office for Domestic Preparedness, DHS, to adopt a similar standard for a number of their grants.

- Next steps include assembling the state Coordination Board (see 1. *above*), to "move the Global mission forward and ensure that we don't

use some of the funding to create additional silos but move toward the objective of the interoperability of the data systems."

"Privacy" in the Justice Information Sharing Arena

Inaugurating Global's new agenda structure was the briefing/panel presentation component on privacy considerations related to justice information sharing. The block began with an update on Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG or "Working Group") activities by Mr. Cabell Cropper, GPIQWG chair and GAC representative for NCJA. He began by introducing his new vice chair (and new GAC representative), Jeanette Plante, Esquire, and Working Group member Barbara Hurst, Esquire, representing the National Legal Aid and Defender Association. Working Group activities have focused on supporting development of two products: *Privacy and Information Quality Policy Development for the Justice Decision Maker,*[8] a high-level awareness booklet underscoring the critical need for agency allocation of resources and commitment to the topic, and construction of a companion hands-on *Workbook*. Much of the research on this latest tool kit has already been accomplished, and the Working Group looks forward to presenting a draft for Committee consideration in spring 2005. Mr. Cropper outlined the sections of the workbook as follows:

I.   Message From the Chair
    i.   *Why Should an Agency Use This Workbook?*
    ii.   *The Need for State Leadership*
    iii. *How This Workbook Was Developed*

II.   Introduction
    i.   *The Purpose of This Workbook*
    ii.   *How to Use This Workbook*
    iii. *Definitions*

III. Developing the Project Structure
    i.   *Identifying a Champion/Executive Sponsor*
    ii.   *Assigning a Project Leader*
    iii. *Building the Project Team*
    iv.   *Project Team Development Tasks*

IV.   Making the Case: Resource Justification
    i.   *Why Does Your Project Need Money? Staff? Equipment? Offices?*
    ii.   *How Will You Use These Resources?*
    iii. *Developing a Draft*

V.   Stakeholders and Workgroups
    i.   *Who Are These "Stakeholders"?*
    ii.   *Why Involve These Individuals?*

---

[8] Available at http://it.ojp.gov/documents/200411_global_privacy_document.pdf.

iii. *Defining Their Roles*
iv. *How to Get (and Keep) Them Involved*

VI. Analyzing the Legal Requirements
 i. *The Necessity of Analysis*
 ii. *Some Questions That Need Answering*
 iii. *Limit, Allow, Mandate*

VII. Understanding the Flow of Information
 i. *The Importance of Workflow Analysis*
 ii. *Who Touches the Information?*

VIII. Information Quality
 i. *Elements of Information Quality*
 ii. *Analyzing Information Quality Needs*

IX. Developing the Elements of the Privacy Policy
 i. *Some Common Elements of Current Policies*
 ii. *Using FIPs as a Starting Point*
 iii. *Planning for and Performing Policy Evaluation*
 iv. *A Policy Template*

X. Development of Information Quality Policy
 i. *The Need for a Separate Policy*
 ii. *A Policy Template*

XI. Policy Implementation
 i. *Executive Sign-Off*
 ii. *Publication*
 iii. *Outreach*
 iv. *Training*

XII. Appendices and Resources

Mr. Cropper then introduced the subject-matter experts lending their views to "**Perspectives on Privacy in the Justice Information Sharing Arena**." The panel featured Mr. Peter Sand, DHS; Lance Hoffman, Ph.D., George Washington University; and James Dempsey, Esquire, Center for Democracy and Technology.

- Mr. Sand's presentation addressed the role of information today, the challenges of privacy in relation to the new currency of information (i.e., being seen as a barrier), the Privacy Office of DHS,[9] and privacy and technology.

  Regarding the importance of information, he noted: "Terrorism requires secrecy. It feeds on the unknown and it uses fear as an

---

[9] More information on the Privacy Office of DHS is available at http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/display?theme=9&content=3961.

aggression in itself. Most disruption is caused generally by peoples' uncertainty about what may happen, and that causes a sustained, ever-present worry and fear . . . ." The response to terrorism is either (1) to end fear, thereby dismantling that psychological weapon in the terrorists' arsenal, or (2) to eradicate terrorism. Both of those solutions point to one thing: the value information can deliver. About this new currency, Mr. Sand explained: "Information is itself a new material for us as humans. It leaves things akin to footprints, fingerprints . . . we believe we're starting to see characteristic type prints, behavior prints [in information] . . . you could look into certain information and say, 'This is a print of somebody's physical characteristics—their biometrics, or their behavior, like their shopping patterns,' things like that. So, information, as this new material, has this unique quality. The more you use technology, the more you create records, the better, because it actually teaches us more."

However, this high value placed on information sets privacy to be (erroneously) viewed as an **impediment**, not a safeguard: "It's seen as something that stops this great activity [information transactions]. That we can actually create [through information] a vector to safety, to progress, to happiness . . . privacy is seen as one of the things that stops that progress." Providing education on not only the *benefits* but also on the *absolute necessity* of sound privacy policy[10] is key in countering this "barrier" perception.

Dr. Hoffman highlighted what he believes are the key issues in the privacy discussion:

- Building accountability
- Preventing identity theft
- Individual freedom vs. personal security
- Intellectual property
  - Owning your own data (and renting it out)
  - Pay per use (metering) for many things
- Wearable, mobile, wireless, implanted items
- "Always on, all the time"
- The proper technical protocols to deal with these
- How can we break out of "build fast, fix later (never)"?
- Policy issues
  - Computer acceptance of terrorist screening systems may hinge on the resolution of privacy issues
- Trust models
  - Current trust models typically focus on authentication, security, and privacy, ignoring other key issues that are just as important: usability, reliability and availability. Also, the current models typically focus on a trust level for a single

---

[10] GPIQWG's *Privacy and Information Quality Policy Development for the Justice Decision Maker* was created specifically in response to this need for education and awareness.

classification of users; however, there are often multiple types of users who need different levels of trust and operational capabilities. This scalability needs to be incorporated into new technological systems.

Mr. Dempsey discussed the importance of ensuring data *accuracy* as an integral part of an agency's privacy policy process. He also stressed the imposition of *consequences* when privacy and/or information quality (accuracy) tenets have been violated. He stated his belief that the biggest challenges in these regards (accuracy, consequences) are proposals for transportation screening (such as the CAPS 2 program, which would rate travelers as "green," "yellow," or "red" according to their perceived risk level). This led to a spirited debate regarding the "use limitation principle" as it applies to law enforcement activities. Specifically discussed was the use of databases created primarily for prevention of terrorism, such as the systems designed to screen airline passengers. Several members of the GAC voiced opinions that these networks could, and should, be used for solving other major crimes.

Mr. Dempsey also spoke about the Markle Foundation report, *Creating A Trusted Information Network for Homeland Security*,[11] by the Markle Task Force on National Security in the Information Age (Task Force). In December 2003, the Task Force released this report, which concluded that by using currently available technology, the government can set up a network that substantially improves the ability to prevent terrorist attacks and protect civil liberties. It provided details for the necessary elements of a proposed System-wide Homeland Analysis and Resource Exchange (SHARE) Network that the Task Force asserts would more effectively combat terrorism than our current system, while protecting privacy. GAC members expressed **strong concerns** to Mr. Dempsey regarding the report. First and foremost, the report fails to highlight (or mention) the Global effort as a longstanding initiative in the area of justice-related information sharing; GAC members were never invited to contribute to the Task Force or even polled for input (despite offers to the Markle Foundation to provide such assistance); and, the Markle report (as well as the *9/11 Commission Report*) failed to address the need and value of connectivity to local and state law enforcement. Mr. Dempsey advised that the Task Force did try to include the principle of information sharing at the local and state levels. He further advised that he felt the Markle Task Force would welcome at least one representative of local and state law enforcement, and he agreed to take the word back that Global should be involved in future discussions.

In summary, all panelists agreed that privacy is an issue that should be addressed fully, at the beginning of information sharing initiatives; unfortunately, privacy considerations are generally the last component considered when creating new technology (and usually inadequately, if at all).

---

[11] Available at
http://www.markle.org/markle_programs/policy_for_a_networked_society/national_security/projects/taskforce_national_security.php#report1.

Counterterrorism Collaborative Interoperability Project

Another key agenda item was the demonstration of the Counterterrorism Collaborative Interoperability Project (CCIP). Mr. Ken Cassine, Law Enforcement Online (LEO); Mr. Angelo Fiumara, Regional Information Sharing Systems® (RISS); Mr. Glen Gillum, Criminal Information Sharing Alliance network (CISAnet); and Mr. Chris Holmes, DHS Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN), showcased their respective systems and illustrated how they are working to promote interoperability among the participating networks. The CCIP combines the best features of each of the partner systems to form a new connectivity and information sharing environment that will provide more effective communications and more efficient responses to better deter, detect, and prevent criminal and terrorist activities.

Since July 2004, several meetings have taken place between DHS, the FBI, DOJ, RISS, and CISAnet to discuss how interoperability among the systems can be achieved. This initiative represents significant collaboration among several of the country's largest criminal justice information systems. Not all the information contained in each of the member systems will be accessible to every agent of the other organizations. Instead, each agency will determine what information it is willing to share, along with user vetting requirements and protocols.

Information shared will remain within the agency that has collected it; however, each organization will allow the other participating member systems access to selected information that it has gathered and published. On September 20, 2004, HSIN, RISS, and CISAnet demonstrated the ability to post information in their individual databases and review/retrieve the information via the other systems. HSIN and LEO achieved connectivity by cross-posting information.

To accomplish their goal, the group formed a timeline that allows for systematic growth toward mid- and long-term interoperability. The first step in this process was to establish a clear understanding among all parties regarding technical requirements and other considerations. Once the requirements have been met, the next step calls for the participating members to develop the ability to share and publish information.

The vision for interoperability is system compatibility, which is defined in three stages:

- Near-term (60 days)—sharing and publishing appropriate finished products and documents; this was accomplished by September 20, 2004.
- Mid-term (3 to 6 months)—enabling individual users to collaborate among themselves.
- Long-term (12 to 18 months)—enabling federated search capabilities and sharing chat and whiteboard information, data integration, protocols, standards and, possibly, single sign-on features.

CCIP Panelists turned to the Committee membership and asked: What can we do for you? For Global? Colonel Bouche requested the same demonstration be given the following week to the CICC. He noted, 'I don't want to speak for the entire council

[CICC], but I can tell you that the one thing we'll be immediately interested in is the universal collaboration tool . . . . I really think that that is going to be the piece we talk about a lot . . . . The next step is not only sharing information but ***collaborating***." This groundbreaking technology was well received by Committee members; panelists were commended for their work.

Wireless Security and the
SAFECOM Statement of Requirement

Mr. Steven Correll, Global Security Working Group (GSWG or "Working Group") chair and GAC representative from the National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System, updated the Committee on his Working Group's activities, specifically focusing on wireless issues. He explained this emphasis by noting, "It was a gap in our first product [*Applying Security Practices for Justice Information Sharing*[12]] that came out. We pulled the SAFECOM program—our partners at DHS—into this process and have found it very beneficial in our efforts as we identify the differences in security, comparing wired environments to wireless environments, and try to highlight them in a[n addendum to the] best practices document."

Mr. Correll noted the SAFECOM *Statement of Requirements* (SoR) is "excellent material for review and incorporation into Global security-related documentation." To that end, Mr. Tom Coty, director for Technology and Standards, SAFECOM, was invited to brief Committee members on the program and document. A recommendation from the group was anticipated at the presentation conclusion.[13]

Mr. Coty began with an overview of the program. SAFECOM, a program housed under DHS, is the first national program designed by public safety for public safety. As a **public safety practitioner-driven program**, SAFECOM is working with existing federal communications initiatives and key public safety stakeholders to address the need to develop better technologies and processes for the cross-jurisdictional and cross-disciplinary coordination of existing systems and future networks. The scope of the public safety community is broad: the customer base includes over 50,000 local and state public safety agencies and organizations; federal customers include over 100 agencies engaged in public safety disciplines such as law enforcement, firefighting, public health, and disaster recovery. SAFECOM makes it possible for the public safety community to leverage resources by promoting coordination and cooperation across all levels of government.

SAFECOM's near-term initiatives are as follows:

- Develop a process to advance standards necessary to improve public safety communications and interoperability.
- Integrate coordinated grant guidance across all agencies providing grants for public safety communications and interoperability.

---

[12] Available at http://it.ojp.gov/documents/asp/.
[13] GAC members were provided advance access to the *Statement of Requirements* for review in preparation for on-site discussion.

- Provide training and technical assistance for public safety communications and interoperability.
- Create a one-stop shop for public safety communications and interoperability.
- Research, develop, test, and evaluate existing and emerging technologies for improved public safety communications and interoperability.

SAFECOM's long-term goals include:

- Providing policy recommendations.
- Developing a technical foundation for public safety communications and interoperability.
- Coordinating funding assistance for public safety communications and interoperability.
- Creating and implementing a national training and technical assistance program.

In support of the initiatives and goals of SAFECOM, the SoR was crafted, outlining future public safety wireless communications and interoperability requirements. The SoR provides the public safety community with a shared vision and describes how first responders can use in-the-field information resources more efficiently when responding to a variety of emergency events. The SoR's other purposes are to encourage the communications industry to better align its research and development efforts with public safety needs and to identify public safety operational issues when discussions regarding laws and regulations take place.

The SoR/SAFECOM presentation raised two specific implications for Global, per the following resolution:

Recommendation: Mr. Harlin McEwen, representing IACP, moved that the GAC recognize and support the SAFECOM SoR as a valuable resource for justice information sharing and as a model for the wireless information sharing initiative. Mr. Correll seconded the motion; the motion passed unanimously.

Action: The GAC will contribute expertise to the SAFECOM/SoR program through the participation of select members on the SoR-related Steering, User Needs, and Architecture/Standards Committees. (Note: Mr. Muth was tapped as one of the Global representatives; Mr. McEwen will continue to lend his wireless communication expertise, serving as an excellent liaison between the groups.)

GAC Leadership Elections

Global leadership positions (chair and vice chair) are elected every two years; the fall 2004 Committee meeting coincided with this election cycle. In advance of the September meeting, Mr. Cropper, GAC Elections Coordinator, sent correspondence to all Committee members. Excerpts of this language, outlining the general election process and governing rules, read as follows:

This message is sent in support of the upcoming biennial election of the Global Advisory Committee (GAC or "Committee") chair and vice chair. This event will take place during the fall 2004 GAC meeting, to be held September 28-29, 2004, at the Sheraton Crystal City Hotel, 1800 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, Virginia.

In addition to your attendance at the upcoming GAC meeting and your vote, we need your nominations for Committee chair and vice chair. (These positions are currently held by Superintendent Melvin J. Carraway, Indiana State Police, and GAC representative from the International Association of Chiefs of Police – Division of State and Provincial Police; and Mr. Gerald E. Wethington, state of Missouri Chief Information Officer, and GAC representative from the National Association of State Chief Information Officers, respectively.)

To that end, please consider the Committee roster and give serious, advance thought in determining strong leadership candidates.

Nominations for GAC chair and vice chair can be made in two ways:

1)   <u>**In advance.**</u>
2)   <u>**From the floor**</u>**, at the fall Committee meeting.**

Paper or verbal ballots will be cast on-site, per determination of Chairman Carraway. Interested parties may nominate themselves; incumbents are eligible for consecutive terms. All candidates must be Committee members and "practitioners," as previously defined (i.e., governmental employee).[14] Elected leaders will begin their tenure immediately following adjournment on September 29 at 12:00 Noon and serve for two years.

For your guidance during this process, following are election-related sections of the *Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative Bylaws* ("Bylaws").[15] As noted, elections occur every two years. Additionally, a quorum, or at least 51 percent of the membership, must be present in order to elect Committee leaders. Governing considerations regarding Committee attendance, voting, and proxies are contained in **Bylaws Section 4.0, Meetings.**

---

[14] Prior to the election process, this eligibility requirement was underscored in a special presentation, given by John Wilson, Esquire, Office of General Counsel, OJP, to clarify voting regulations. In his briefing, he explained: "The Depart ment of Justice established a policy that only governmental employees—that is: federal, state, tribal, or local employees—may serve in these [chair and vice chair] positions. This is for two reasons: (1) to reduce the possibility of organizational conflict of interest (those who are involved in establishing specifications, which result in competition for government funds, have to recuse themselves if there is a direct organizational interest; of course, it is very difficult for the chair and vice chair to recuse themselves from direct involvement in those kinds of matters), and (2) to reduce the potential for the perception that the business of the Global Advisory Committee is being conducted in a way that serves private rather than public interest of its organizational members."

[15] Available at http://it.ojp.gov/documents/GACBylaws.pdf.

Mr. Cropper took the floor to supervise the elections.

Nominations for GAC chair were announced: Incumbent Chair Carraway and Mr. Wethington. Mr. Correll moved to close the floor for nominations; Mr. McEwen seconded. Paper ballots were cast and counted**. Moving forward, the chair of the GAC will be Melvin Carraway.**

Nominations for GAC vice chair were announced: Incumbent Vice Chair Wethington and Ms. Richelle ("Chelle") Uecker, representing the National Association for Court Management. Mr. Muth moved to close the floor for nominations; Dr. Henderson seconded. Paper ballots were cast and counted. **Moving forward, the vice chair of the GAC will be Gerry Wethington.**

Service-Oriented Architecture

Dr. Henderson, chair of the Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group, brought before the Committee for recommendation and action a progressive document, *A Framework for Justice Information Sharing: Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA)*.[16] The paper contained an ambitious slate of recommendations.

Background: What is SOA?[17] Information sharing is a long-standing practice among justice agencies, particularly within the law enforcement community. As society becomes more mobile, the importance of sharing data to improve police effectiveness grows exponentially. The technology available has been critical to the ability to share. The kinds of information, the working partnerships, and the types of data exchanged have been transformed as society has moved from paper, telegraph, telephones, and teletype machines to computers and wireless communications. The arrival of the World Wide Web (the Web) and the technologies that support it have spawned a brave new world of information sharing that goes beyond exchanges among specific partners to embrace the whole of the justice community—law enforcement, prosecutors, defense counsel, courts, probation, corrections—and a host of corollary disciplines such as homeland security, fire, emergency services, health, education, transportation, and motor vehicle licensing.

SOA incorporates six fundamental principles for the sharing of information in the justice community:

1. The architecture must recognize innumerable independent agencies and funding bodies from local, state, tribal, and federal governments.
2. Information sharing must occur across agencies that represent divergent disciplines, branches of government, and operating assumptions.

---

[16] Available at http://it.ojp.gov/topic.jsp?topic_id=57.

[17] SOA has been treated extensively in previous Global documentation; please search the Global Web site at http://www.it.ojp.gov, or call staff at (850) 385-0600, extension 285, with specific questions. The following background information was not part of Dr. Henderson's briefing, but is included for readers new to the subject.

3. The infrastructure must be able to accommodate an infinite range of scales, from small operations with few participants in a rural county to national processes that reach across local, state, tribal, federal, and even international boundaries.
4. Information sharing must occur among data sources that differ widely in software, hardware, structure, and design.
5. Public sector technology investment must reflect and incorporate the lessons and developments of the private sector.
6. The infrastructure design must be dynamic, capable of evolving as the information sharing requirements change and the technology is transformed.

The SOA concept of design allows the original data owners to control their own data, both in terms of who is allowed to access it and in ensuring the integrity of the data. It allows agencies to retain the investment they have made in their existing systems, while at the same time gaining access to valuable information contained in other agency systems. It uses the technology of the Internet, which is user-friendly and readily understood by most users of today's computer systems.

GAC members were provided advance copies of the SOA report with the knowledge they would be called to take action. Dr. Henderson noted, "The report . . . is intended for the manager and policymaker who are responsible for providing the leadership, resources, and management of the justice community. Technologists are already addressing the questions of design, software, and hardware. The more important issues of how SOA will serve the business concerns of the justice community must still be confronted. Only the police, prosecutors, public defenders, judges, court managers, probation officers, corrections officers, and their cohorts in relevant fields who are responsible for leading and managing their agencies can resolve these issues. It is to them we commend this report." The floor was opened for comments. Many Global members (and observers alike) applauded the document, noting SOA is already the "way of industry" and applauding GISWG foresight to "get ahead of the curve" when often, justice agencies (and the public sector, in general) are late adopters of technological innovations. This is an opportunity for the private sector and justice community to work in concert.

Recommendation: Mr. Flynn made a motion to accept the SOA report and attendant recommendations. Ms. Plante requested an amendment to the motion: in keeping with privacy panelists' theme of "address privacy early and significantly," language emphasizing privacy policy development should be added to the document. Dr. Henderson agreed and requested that Ms. Plante and Ms. Hurst provide the appropriate additions. Mr. Flynn amended his original motion; Mr. McEwen seconded the motion, as amended. The recommendation was put to a Committee vote and passed unanimously.

The resolution was accepted as follows:

The GAC adopts this report (as amended to address privacy and information quality issues) of the Global Infrastructure/Standards

Working Group, titled *A Framework for Justice Information Sharing: Service-Oriented Architecture* **(SOA).**

Global:

- **Recognizes SOA as the recommended framework for development of justice information sharing systems,**
- **Adopts the report's action agenda for its activities to further the utility of SOA for the justice community, and**
- **Urges the members of the justice community to take corollary steps in the development of their own systems.**

According to the preface of the report, "Global's approval was based on the understanding that SOA is an approach that is most likely to result in an infrastructure that will support its vision of how information should be shared among the justice community. That vision can be stated as follows:

Any member of the justice community can access the information they need to do their job, at the time they need it, in a form that is useful, regardless of the location of the data.

Several things about this statement are important. First, the emphasis is upon access to information, not the origin of the data. Second, the focus is on the form, utility, and content of the message that the user receives. And third, it expects that information sharing will cross agency, discipline, and government boundaries. This is an ambitious vision that requires an equally ambitious action agenda."

Global XML Structure Task Force

Mr. Paul Embley, GXSTF chair, highlighted recent XML activities.

- *Resources*: The Global JXDM CD has been updated, enhancing usability, refining the scenario portion of the tool in response to Committee and other users' feedback, and generally "maturing" the product to keep pace with the evolution of the Global JXDM. This resource is undergoing a comment-and-review process, and attendees were encouraged to provide feedback.
- *Training*: Building on the success of the two previous training opportunities (presented in Georgia and Alaska), a Global JXDM Developer's Workshop will be held November 8-10, 2004, in Syracuse, New York. Interested parties were encouraged to visit the Global Web site for more information and online registration.
- *Outreach*: GXSTF members have made "significant progress in reaching out to a number of other groups," including participation in

the ComCARE Alliance[18] and the newly-launched DHS Office for Interoperability and Compatibility, and have developed a closer bond with Office Administrative Services and Integrated Systems, Incorporated (OASIS) and some of their technical committees.

- *Privacy*: In November, at the request of the GPIQWG, the XSTF will begin exploring privacy tags.
- *The Global JXDM[19] – Continuing to Refine and Evolve:* Version 3.0.2 has officially been released. This latest release of the Global JXDM, Version 3.0, series is enhanced to increase the ability of justice and public safety communities to share justice information at all levels, laying the foundation for local, state, and national justice interoperability.

Global Intelligence Working Group Activities and National Focus on Intelligence Sharing

Colonel Bouche, GIWG ("Working Group") chair and GAC representative from SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, began this last agenda block by highlighting his Working Group's recent accomplishments. In addition to the NCISP National Kick-Off Event and establishment of the CICC (both of which were outlined by Chairman Carraway during opening remarks), GIWG efforts have included:

- *NCISP Minimum Training Standards*
  During the first six months of 2004, GIWG collaborated with a subgroup of DOJ's Counter-Terrorism Training Coordination Working Group (CTTWG) to develop minimum training standards for the six training classifications outlined in the NCISP. A report, *Core Criminal Intelligence Training Standards for United States Law Enforcement and Other Criminal Justice Agencies,[20]* was drafted in August 2004, approved by the GIWG and the CTTWG. This report contains standards for each classification and time allotments for each standard, as well as suggested curriculum.

  "Core Criminal Intelligence Training Standards for United States Law Enforcement and Other Criminal Justice Agencies" was being brought before Global for formal recognition.

---

[18] The ComCARE Alliance is a broad-based national coalition of more than 90 organizations that includes nurses, physicians, emergency medical technicians, 911 directors, wireless companies, public safety and health officials, law enforcement groups, automobile companies, consumer organizations, telematics suppliers, safety groups, and others who are working to encourage the deployment of life saving wireless communications networks and technologies that will more efficiently connect America's mobile public to emergency agencies.

[19] For more information on the Global JXDM, Version 3.0.2, and the resources and tools associated with the product, refer to the Global JXDM Web site at http://it.ojp.gov/gjxdm. To specifically access the Global JXDM, Version 3.0.2, refer to http://it.ojp.gov/jxdm/.

[20] Since the date of this meeting, the report name has been changed to *Minimum Criminal Intelligence Training Standards for United States Law Enforcement and Other Criminal Justice Agencies*.

- *Chief Executive Curriculum*
  In addition to minimum training standards, curriculum was created for the executive-level training classification. The curriculum is consistent with the minimum training standards outlined in the NCISP. A focus group was held in February 2004 with participants from GIWG, as well as other intelligence experts, to assist in compiling issues and materials for developing curriculum. What resulted from the focus group is a four-hour executive briefing course that includes information regarding the NCISP, intelligence-led policing, basic intelligence, legal and privacy issues, and available resources.

  A pilot course of this curriculum will be presented on October 14, 2004, in Atlanta, Georgia. The curriculum will be modified, if necessary, and combined with the minimum training standards to form a training blueprint. It is anticipated that the blueprint will be submitted to OJP and recommended for adoption in November 2004.

- *NCISP Executive Outreach Seminar*
  In an effort to develop outreach/educational products for the NCISP, the GIWG Training/Outreach Committee created a curriculum (PowerPoint presentation) in August 2004 to specifically address the NCISP.

  The CICC and the GIWG are attempting to implement the curriculum at the local level through the use of mechanisms such as the IACP, State Associations of Chiefs of Police (SACOP), and other organizations. The PowerPoint is currently used by the CICC and GIWG members when performing outreach activities for Global. Numerous presentations have been conducted on the NCISP, the CICC, and Global activities at various state, regional, and national conferences/meetings.

  The PowerPoint presentation was being brought before Global with the intention of being included in the reference library on the NCISP CD.

- *Development of Fusion Center Standards*
  The development of fusion center standards began with a discussion of the fact that several local and state agencies are developing fusion centers, using funds received from DHS, with no standards in existence for fusion and data integration centers to use in order to ensure interoperability with other centers or law enforcement and homeland security agencies. The initial meeting of the Global-sponsored Fusion Center Focus Group occurred in August 2004. The participants represented local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies.

  The focus group discussed numerous facets of fusion centers and agreed that standards should be developed to assist law enforcement

agencies in establishing intelligence fusion centers in their states or regions. The ultimate goal is to produce a document that includes basic elements of an intelligence fusion center, suggestions and steps for agencies to establish fusion centers, model policies, and other examples and materials to help implement a fusion center concept.

In the interim, a document is being developed that summarizes these efforts. This document will include guiding principles (similar to the NCISP *10 Simple Steps* document). It is planned that this document will be distributed at the IACP Annual Conference in November 2004.

- *Law Enforcement Analytic Standards*
  Beginning in October 2003, the International Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysts (IALEIA) began developing the analytic standards as recommended in the NCISP (Recommendation 12). The input for the standards was obtained through a number of meetings, IALEIA's Web site, and the GIWG and CICC membership, as well as many other agencies and individuals. The final listing of analytic standards was approved by the IALEIA Board in June 2004. There are a total of 25 standards—7 for analysts and 18 for analytic products.

  After vetting through GIWG and the CICC, IALEIA will produce the *Law Enforcement Analytic Standards* booklet for distribution to its members and for use by the law enforcement and intelligence communities. Since the standards were done in conjunction with the GIWG and the CICC, in direct support of the NCISP, Global is cosponsoring the production of the booklet and approved the use of the Global logo on the booklet. The booklet will be distributed at the November 2004 Annual IACP Conference.

  The standards were being brought before Global for formal recognition.

- *Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit (LEIU) Audit Checklist for the Criminal Intelligence Function*
  The NCISP recommends periodic audits of criminal intelligence operations and files to ensure guidelines and other regulations are put into practice. The LEIU has previously assisted local and state law enforcement agencies in conducting audits of their criminal intelligence function, and the NCISP recommended that enforcement agencies use the *LEIU File Guidelines* as a model for criminal intelligence file maintenance. As such, the LEIU, in conjunction with the GIWG Privacy Committee, developed the Audit Checklist to assist agencies in conducting a self-assessment of their criminal intelligence function.

  The LEIU Audit Checklist was being brought before Global with the intention of being included in the reference library on the NCISP CD.

- *JICC Liaison Activities*
  The CICC has two members that serve as liaisons to the Justice Intelligence Coordinating Council (JICC). This assignment began in April 2004. The CICC members are Mr. Russell Porter and Mr. Peter Modafferi. They attend the JICC meetings, provide briefings to the CICC on their activities, and assist DOJ with obtaining input and feedback on JICC-sponsored activities and requests for information.

Recommendation: In consideration of Colonel Bouche's briefing and the handout materials provided, Mr. Correll made the following motion:

The *Audit Checklist for the Criminal Intelligence Function* and *NCISP Executive Outreach Seminar PowerPoint* are approved for addition to the reference library on the NCISP CD, and the *Law Enforcement Analytic Standards* booklet and *Core Criminal Intelligence Training Standards for United States Law Enforcement and Other Criminal Justice Agencies* report are recognized by the GAC as valuable resources in the pursuit of justice-related information sharing.

Mr. Michael Duffy, representing the Justice Management Division, DOJ, seconded the motion. The motion was brought to a vote and passed unanimously.

Colonel Bouche introduced the **intelligence panel,** composed of experts in the field, including Mr. Russ Porter, Iowa Department of Public Safety; Mr. Richard Russell, DHS; Ms. Maureen Baginski, FBI; and Chief Daniel Oates, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Police Department. These experts provided updates on major intelligence issues and the critical role of law enforcement at the local and state levels (an issue largely absent from the *9/11 Commission Report*). The panelists also discussed intelligence initiatives underway in their own organizations, as well as in the GIWG and CICC.

- Ms. Baginski and Mr. Russell engaged the Committee in a dynamic discussion regarding intelligence reform and related legislation, particularly Executive Order 13356, *Strengthening the Sharing of Terrorism Information to Protect Americans*.

  Action: In response to the discussion, and the panelists' advice, support, and willingness to champion state and local participation in intelligence reform, DOJ and DHS requested that the CICC coordinate the assignment of several full-time local and state representatives for a 60- to 90-day time period beginning in late October 2004 to assist with the implementation plan for Executive Order 13356. The individuals will serve as the focal point for coordination of all DHS/DOJ tiger team activities related to the provision of local and state law enforcement input into the implementation plan. Issues will be identified and shared with other members of the CICC.

  Mr. McEwen and other Committee representatives thanked Mr. Russell and Ms. Baginski, noting, "We really appreciate your effort [in advocating state and local involvement], and we know that

you're our friends at Global . . . ." He continued by supporting the position that state and local representatives be *directly* involved in the dialogue: "I think the message is very clear. If we're there in the beginning and have the ability to talk on our own behalf and not expect you to paraphrase what we're saying, it will work much better and it will speed up the process. And, you only need one or two good spokespeople."

- Chief Oates provided a local law enforcement officer's perspective on local policing, community support, and privacy. He supported earlier comments about privacy and the need for inclusivity, preplanning, and communitywide buy-in by summarizing: "The lesson I took from the Ann Arbor community and opposition to the Patriot Act is this: If we're talking about intelligence and we're talking about partnerships, and we're talking about sharing with the federal government, then *privacy concerns are terribly important*. We won't get funding, we won't get the support we need, and we won't get the intelligence we crave without somehow reassuring a majority of our population that we can do this [information sharing and intelligence exchange] in a way that protects reasonable privacy concerns."

- Mr. Porter provided a more in-depth treatment of the CICC, stressing up front the importance of this agenda topic: "This really is an important issue for all of you—the Criminal Intelligence Coordinating Council and what it's taking on—because intelligence right now is *center stage*. *It's a priority*. We're in a state of change, a state of flux, and we have to give it the time and attention it needs. We have to seize the day." His presentation addressed the following topics:

  - CICC Mission
    - Advise Congress, DOJ, and DHS
    - Guidance, long-term oversight with NCISP implementation
    - Advocate for criminal intelligence sharing
    - Concentrate on:
      o Coordination between and among federal and nonfederal agencies
      o Policy and standards development
      o Intelligence training coordination
      o Privacy and civil liberties protection
      o Technology coordination
      o Outreach and education
      o Resource coordination

  - NCISP Implementation
    - National Kick-Off Event; resolutions of support
    - Transition to CICC ("Council")
    - NCISP Assessment Tool
    - Outreach
    - Develop and deliver intelligence training

- Coordination between federal and nonfederal agencies
- Functional map of systems
- Model privacy policy and privacy checklist
- Standards for fusion center development
- Analytic standards
- Outreach to President and Congress

- Challenges and opportunities for the CICC
  - Technology is important, but it must <u>support</u> (not drive) the intelligence process
    - Trust and personal relationships are key
  - Leveraging, coordinating, training, resource inventory
    - 19,000 agencies/800,000 cops
    - Resources: what's there and what isn't
    - Engaging the federal – local/state
    - *9/11 Commission Report*
    - Protecting privacy and civil liberties

Mr. Porter concluded with two thoughts regarding the CICC and implementation of the NCISP: "It's about coordination and leadership . . . while intelligence is a priority, at center stage and in a state of change," and "Plans are only good intentions unless they immediately degenerate into hard work."

Adjournment

Before adjourning, Chairman Carraway thanked Committee members, program officials, and guest presenters for their participation and expertise. He reviewed the dates of the upcoming Global Working Group meetings[21] and the **spring 2005 GAC meeting, to be held April 27-28, in Washington, DC.** (Committee members were requested to mark their calendars *now,* before they quickly fill with new-year obligations). Chairman Carraway also implored GAC members not already involved in a Working Groups to "make that commitment."[22] Having no further business and hearing no further questions, the meeting was adjourned.

---

[21] Global events are listed on the OJP IT Event Calendar, located at http://it.ojp.gov/topic.jsp?topic_id=5.

[22] To volunteer for a Working Group or learn more about opportunities for Global involvement, Committee members should call Global staff at (850) 385-0600, extension 285.

Attachment A

Global Advisory Committee
Fall 2004 Meeting Agenda

Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative
Advisory Committee Meeting
September 28-29, 2004

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
1800 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia
(703) 486-1111

Agenda – Page One

Tuesday, September 28, 2004

1:00 p.m.   *Convene*

1:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

- Introductions
- Welcoming Remarks
- New Member Introductions
- Ratification of April Minutes and Other Global Business
  Melvin Carraway, Global Advisory Committee (GAC) Chair
- Office of Justice Programs (OJP) Message
  *John Morgan, Ph.D., National Institute of Justice, Science Advisor to
  Assistant Attorney General Deborah Daniels, OJP*
- Success Story: National Criminal Justice Association Resolution and the
  Future of Global Outreach
  Thomas O'Reilly, Global Outreach Coordinator

1:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.   Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG):
                                Development of *Product II: Privacy and Information Quality Policy Workbook*
                                     Cabell Cropper, GPIQWG Chair

2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.   Panel: Perspectives on "Privacy" in the Justice Information Sharing Arena
                                James Dempsey, Center for Democracy and Technology
                                Lance Hoffman, Ph.D., George Washington University
                                Peter Sand, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

3:30 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.   *Break*

Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative
Advisory Committee Meeting
September 28-29, 2004

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
1800 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia
(703) 486-1111

Agenda – Page Two

Tuesday, September 28, 2004 (continued)

3:45 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.   Counterterrorism Collaborative Interoperability Project (CCIP)—
Demonstration
*Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN, formerly JRIES), Regional
Information Sharing Systems (RISS), Criminal Information Sharing Alliance
Network (CISAnet), and Law Enforcement Online (LEO) Representatives*

4:15 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.   Global Security Working Group (GSWG): SAFECOM's *Statement of Requirements
for Wireless Information Sharing*
Steven Correll, GSWG Chair
Tom Coty, DHS

4:45 p.m. – 5:15 p.m.   GAC Leadership Elections: Chair and Vice Chair
John Wilson, Esquire, Office of General Counsel, OJP
Cabell Cropper, GAC Election Coordinator

5:15 p.m.   *Adjournment*

Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative
Advisory Committee Meeting
September 28-29, 2004

Sheraton Crystal City Hotel
1800 Jefferson Davis Highway
Arlington, Virginia
(703) 486-1111

Agenda - Page Three

Wednesday, September 29, 2004

8:30 a.m.	*Reconvene* *GAC Chairman Carraway*

8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.   Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG):

- *A Report to Global on a Proposed Agenda for Developing a National Justice Information Sharing Infrastructure*
Tom Henderson, GISWG Chair
- Global Justice XML Data Model (GJXDM)-Related Activities
Paul Embley, Global XML Structure Task Force Chair

9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.   Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG):

- *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* (NCISP) Kick-Off Event
- NCISP Executive Outreach Seminar
- Fusion Center Intelligence Standards Focus Group
- *Law Enforcement Analytic Standards*
- Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit (LEIU) Audit Checklist
- NCISP Training Standards
- Chief Executive Curriculum
Kenneth Bouche, GIWG Chair

10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.   *Break*

10:15 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.   Panel: Intelligence Sharing, and What the 9/11 Report Left Out
Russ Porter, Iowa Department of Public Safety
Richard Russell, U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Maureen Baginski, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Chief Daniel Oates, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Police Department

11:45 a.m. – 12:00 Noon   Wrap-Up, Next Meeting, and **Adjournment**
Chairman Carraway