

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

Fairfax, Virginia
October 9–10, 2007

October 9, 2007—Meeting Summary

Background, Purpose, and Introductions

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative's (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) convened the meeting on October 9, 2007, in Fairfax, Virginia, at 8:30 a.m. Carl Wicklund, Executive Director, American Probation and Parole Association and GPIQWG Chairman, led the meeting in furtherance of and alignment with the GPIQWG's *Vision and Mission Statements*.

Attendees

The following individuals were in attendance:

Chair

Mr. Carl Wicklund

American Probation and Parole Association

Vice Chair

Jeanette Plante, Esquire

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

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

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

Alan Carlson, Esquire
The Justice Management Institute

Mr. Cabell C. Cropper
National Criminal Justice Association

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

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

Mr. Scott D. Fairholm (GISWG Liaison)
National Center for State Courts

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

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

Lieutenant Don Grimwood
Ohio State Highway Patrol

Barbara Hurst, Esquire
Rhode Island Office of the Public Defender

Erin Kenneally, Esquire
eLCHEMY, Incorporated

Ms. Erin S. Lee
National Governors Association

Mr. Richard MacKnight, Jr.
National Institute of Justice

Mr. Michael McDonald
Delaware State Police

Captain Tim McGrail
Missouri State Highway Patrol

Ms. Ada Pecos Melton
American Indian Development Associates

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

Mr. Steve Siegel
Denver District Attorney's Office

Mr. Timothy H. Skinner
SRA International, Inc.

Ms. Cindy Southworth
National Network to End Domestic Violence
Fund

Ms. Martha W. Steketee
Independent Consultant

Mr. Phil Stevenson
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Ms. Mary Gay Whitmer
National Association of State Chief Information
Officers

Staff

Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Chairman Wicklund welcomed everyone to the final GPIQWG meeting of 2007 and asked for introductions around the table. He informed the group that the next meeting is planned for January 28–29, 2008, at the Embassy Suites DC Convention Center, Washington, DC.

Chairman Wicklund reviewed the agenda with the group and the plan for the day-and-a-half meeting. As has been customary for these meetings, there will be a combination of updates and reports along with breakout sessions for the task teams to continue work on the deliverables. Chairman Wicklund reminded the attendees that Global constituents are requesting information quality products in the field and that this group needs to continue its progress on those critically needed resources. Key agenda items for the day's meeting are:

- **Global Updates**
- **Federal Requirements Crosswalk**
- **Fusion Center Privacy Policy Development**
- **Planning for the Future**
- **Status Reports From GPIQWG Breakouts**
- **GPIQWG Breakouts**

Global Updates

Chairman Wicklund and Mr. Bob Greeves provided an update on the information presented at the Global Executive Steering Committee meeting. Presentations and status reports included those on the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) and the Justice Reference Architecture (JRA). JRA is built around a standard by the Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS). "Global is driving towards implementation." Mr. Greeves also gave an update on the Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management (GFIPM) initiative that is aimed at single sign-on capabilities for accessing systems. GFIPM has been successfully demonstrated to work for Pennsylvania's Justice Network (JNET). Los Angeles County Information Systems, Los Angeles, California, and the IJIS Institute are attempting to benchmark GFIPM in that area. The Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) also reviewed the technical recommendations from the Global Security Working Group's (GSWG) Technical Privacy Task Team that will be presented to the Global Advisory Committee (GAC) at the end of October. The GESC annual strategic planning meeting will be held on

January 15–16, 2008, with the leadership of Global and all the chairs of the working groups to articulate the year's priorities. Funds for Global for the current year are coming from the Crime and Information Technology Act (CITA) appropriations body.

Chairman Wicklund stated that there was some concern expressed at the last GESC meeting over the importance of coordination with the other working groups. As we look at information quality (IQ) issues, we need to be cognizant of how our priorities and deliverables fit within the Global structure. The next GAC meeting is scheduled for October 31, 2007. In conjunction with the GAC meeting, a *Global 101* Training (orientation for new members) will be held to help those people on the GAC or attending GAC meetings to better understand what Global represents and its purpose.

Working Group Liaison Updates

Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG) Update: Mr. Alan Carlson and Mr. Paco Aumond

A request was sent out to the criminal intelligence community on recommendations for revisions to the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 28 (28 CFR). At the last GIWG meeting, a summary of those recommendations was provided, including requests to lengthen the time period for retaining information and to hold or interrupt (pause) the retention period if individuals are under correctional supervision. The group was in consensus on not changing substantive parts of 28 CFR.

GIWG also discussed the draft *Tips and Leads Issue Paper* and the standards that apply to information that does not reach the level of reasonable suspicion. The paper recognizes that tips and leads are an important part of the law enforcement function and that there should be some guidance (e.g., best practices). Mr. Paco Aumond emphasized his positive impression of the GIWG Privacy Committee's level of commitment and protective nature over privacy issues. Those at the fusion-center level are highly concerned about privacy issues. Everyone around the table really liked the privacy template developed by Mr. Alan Carlson. Delaware and Iowa took the privacy policy template and used it to draft their initial privacy policies. Indiana has developed its privacy policy based on the Fair Information Principles (FIPs).

Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG) Update: Mr. Scott Fairholm

GISWG has primarily been focused on the Justice Reference Architecture (JRA), with the work distributed among three subcommittees: management/policy; service interaction (messaging requirements); and service definitions/design. At the October 2007 GAC meeting, GISWG will be submitting JRA version 1.4 for endorsement. GISWG is already beginning work on version 1.5. The three subcommittees are governed by an architecture committee, which plans to debut a new electronic business modeling language. GISWG is also looking for a way to wrap these products into a complete package. This group also covers metadata issues. Mr. Scott Fairholm advised GPIQWG attendees that as they think about data and services, there are associated privacy and IQ metadata for which we have to consider specifications. Mr. Fairholm recognized the GISWG's privacy task team on how it developed a method for current computer systems to implement privacy policy statements. Another ongoing priority is the federated identification (ID) project.

Global Security Working Group (GSWG) Update: Ms. Cindy Southworth

The last meeting was held in March 2007 prior to Ms. Cindy Southworth's appointment as liaison. The next meeting is tentatively planned for November 2007. GSWG is currently working with GISWG on the services and policy subcommittees.

Global Outreach Working Group (GOWG) Update: Mr. Anthony Capizzi

The Global Outreach Working Group is being chaired by Mr. Ron Hawley, SEARCH. Mr. Hawley attended all of the Global working group meetings and solicited input on methods for promoting Global products to practitioners. There is a separate GOWG subcommittee working on revising the Global section of the OJP Information Technology (IT) Initiatives Web site, www.it.ojp.gov/global. GOWG will be making a formal request to each working group to find out what primary product(s) they want to promote and will put a package together.

Federal Requirements Crosswalk

Mr. Tim Skinner, SRA International, Inc., talked with the group briefly about a draft crosswalk he had developed between 28 CFR Part 23 and the privacy requirements imposed on federal agencies and recommended that audit functions need to be working closely with the security group. The scope of the security group now extends to the fusion centers. Therefore, the GPIQWG subgroup that was addressing fusion-center issues was disbanded because it was duplicative of work being done by the security group. The crosswalk was drafted in reaction to the common response from state fusion centers that they are in compliance with federal privacy laws because they follow 28 CFR. The crosswalk reveals that 28 CFR specifically addresses very few of the federal privacy requirements.

Fusion Center Privacy Policy Development

Mr. Carlson provided a brief overview of the Northeast Regional Intelligence Group's (NRIG) pilot privacy technical assistance session. Mr. Carlson spoke of the background for the draft workbook used at the session—*Fusion Center Privacy Policy Development: Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Template*—and the resources/recommendations it contained. He and Ms. Patty Dobbs, Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR), held breakout sessions and led each group through the provisions and steps of the template. At the close of the day-long session, Mr. Thomas O'Reilly, BJA, requested that each fusion center commit to drafting a privacy policy within 90 days (December 1).

Based on the feedback received at the NRIG pilot, the template and presentations were enhanced and revamped for planned delivery to the other three regions (Southeast, Western, and Central) before year-end 2007. Each fusion center, by region, will be requested to complete a draft policy within 90 days of the TA session. All privacy policies are expected to be in prior to the National Fusion Center Conference in March 2008.

A state-level version of the fusion-center template, *Privacy Policy Development Workbook*, is currently in draft development for 2008. This will be considered for use in tandem with the *Global Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates* (Privacy Guide).

As part of the DOJ Privacy Technical Assistance project, Mr. Carlson is also working as a subject-matter expert (SME) on a pilot with the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) to develop a state-level privacy policy.

Planning for the Future

Chairman Wicklund stated that one of the issues that came out of the GESC was a need to review existing Global products to see whether they are relevant and/or marketable to the juvenile justice community. "If you work in juvenile justice, would you know the relevance to the Privacy Guide or the IQ Fact Sheet? Would these be of interest to juvenile justice agencies?" he asked. Mr. Capizzi stated that juvenile justice information is completely different. Sharing information should be very restricted and limited. One example is that in Ohio, juveniles come of age at 18, whereas in some states the age is 16.

Chairman Wicklund also asked the group for their suggestions on future products. Attendee suggestions were as follows:

Auditing Products:

- We should look at audit policies and applications and address those from a practical standpoint—how auditing can be used as provable compliance with privacy policy. Part of this would involve ensuring that information sharing and use is consistent with such policies. To tackle this, it makes sense to look at a combined group of people from GISWG, GSWG, and GPIQWG. This would be a good segue for the GSWG's former privacy technical task team and could be an issue for the GESC. Auditing goes beyond privacy. We have to look at IQ and how to build an audit capability for privacy and IQ requirements.

- Audit and enforcement are important, and so are continuous and ongoing training efforts. A lot of the violations are not based on malicious intent but on lack of training. BJA strongly supports training and training requirements.
- Instead of saying “audit,” we should say “evaluation and review.” Audit is different between policy personnel and IT personnel (different meanings for each).
- What we lose when we do not use the term “audit,” however, is the sense of what is implied in the use of the word “audit.”
- The implementation of privacy and IQ policies are programmatic—there must be a program, and one component of the program is audit. We need to instill the notion of evaluation and review (determining measures for additional steps) as an ongoing process.
- What are the principles that need to be embedded in agency auditing systems? Ms. Erin Kenneally volunteered to get help with developing a resource.
- We need to take existing audit standards and apply them to the justice community.
- We should research to see whether there has been a study at the local, state, and federal levels to determine what is being done regarding standard operating procedures.

White Papers:

- When we look at products, our work has been primarily on large-scale projects. Should GPIQWG produce more fact sheets or white papers on specific areas (e.g., retention policies in the justice community)? Ms. Kathleen deGrasse mentioned that there were three issues on which she recently wrote articles specific to Illinois: Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), state and local records act, and the breach statutes (California is the first to come out with this). If there is a breach in an integrated justice system, how is notification handled? Is there any exemption for law enforcement databases? It varies among states. There are approximately 30 states with breach notification laws. Chairman Wicklund requested that GPIQWG attendees submit ideas on fact sheets or white papers throughout the rest of the meetings.

Information Quality Program:

- We need to ensure that we approach information quality as a program, not one particular task. It affects everyone at every level. The notion of doing smaller pieces should be completed in the context of an overall program. We need to define program elements and then handle each one individually (each fitting within a framework)—smaller, more distinct and refined areas that we can later pull together as part of a larger program (each having relationships with the other).
- The IQ guidebook should include fusion centers as an audience. The topic of IQ comes up frequently, and it is fusion-center information that is shared most. It is important, however, that GPIQWG communicate with GIWG to ensure that GIWG is not already doing this. Most fusion centers are consumers of others’ databases, so IQ is not their eminent domain. It is the domain of others who are contributing data. We could address the legal authority over the information and the responsibility of the information. We should start at the source of the information since that is primarily the biggest IQ issue.

Training:

- GPIQWG needs to decide who the audiences are that need effective training (sworn officers, staff, etc.). Those participating in the breakout sessions should consider who would benefit from training on the particular breakout focus.

Breakout Status Reports

IQ Assessment Tool Task Team: Ms. Erin Kenneally

The team initially began by evaluating the arraignment process but found it difficult to assign responsibility for the ownership of information by the time it reached the court level. At the last meeting, the task team decided to select a different use-case scenario—the incident report. The team anchored off the IQ dimensions featured in the IQ Fact Sheet and applied them to the steps in an incident report. The team then determined placement of this information into the phases and components of the information life cycle. In the end, the team created a matrix that it then distributed to various constituents for review and feedback on usability.

IQ Guidebook Task Team: Mr. Paco Aumond and Ms. Jeanette Plante

The team reviewed the original outline and the document that Ms. Jeanette Plante began drafting. We added to the elements of IQ, tied in a discussion of IQ in the criminal history world, and rolled that into a discussion of MIT's IQ dimensions. We decided we needed to take the dimensions and put them into a justice context. There was some difficulty with this because most of the examples were law enforcement-related only, so the team needs some assistance with this. Drafting work will continue with content for the agency head/leadership responsibility section regarding policy development.

Information is as important as the outcome or disposition of the case. The team has entertained the idea of making the guidebook an IQ Program Guidebook. Information is two products—the information and the communication of the information. One of the dangers is getting stuck on collection (repositories and capture) and ignoring the information flow. There is a tendency, when talking about technical requirements, to minimize focus on the actual flow of information. A target audience needs to be defined, as well as the elements of the program. This team will work with the IQ Assessment Tool Task Team and will look for other areas in which this guide can assist users.

Training and Outreach Task Team:

Chairman Wicklund asked whether this group could look at past products and consider future products with regard to applicability to the juvenile justice community. "Are our products juvenile justice friendly?" he asked. Ms. Martha Steketee and Ms. Ada Pecos Melton will join this group's discussion. This group should look at a major beginning- and end-point product from OJDDP for information sharing in juvenile justice.

Global's new Global Outreach Working Group (Ms. Erin Lee and Mr. Capizzi both attend) is formulating a more global outreach plan. The group will be meeting in November 2007. The GPIQWG Training and Outreach group may not need to take as grand an approach as the outreach working group, but there is still a need for a focus on training.

Privacy in Fusion Centers: Mr. Alan Carlson

The PowerPoint presentation on talking points regarding privacy policy continues to evolve and be refined. One of the approaches that Mr. Russ Porter used at the Northeast Regional Intelligence Group (NRIG) Privacy TA Session was to provide a historical perspective (how things were developed, e.g., 28 CFR Part 23). We need to incorporate that into our training and talking points. Also, there are plenty of news articles on bad information quality and what went wrong, but there is a need to focus on "benefits" or positive examples of information quality.

The talking points are written generically. Chairman Wicklund used them in combination with the "presentation in a box." Chairman Wicklund raised the question as to whether this team should continue developing the fusion-center talking points presentation since Mr. Porter, those handling the regional fusion-center privacy TA sessions, and GIWG have taken this on for fusion centers. "Raising the level of need to have privacy policies developed and implemented in fusion centers—is this still a need or is it now occurring? Do we need to continue this breakout, or can we dissolve it and move to a different focus?" he asked. Mr. Carlson agreed that he was fine with sunsetting this team but would still like to receive feedback on the presentation for use at the regional meetings and conferences. A GPIQWG member consensus was reached to dissolve the Privacy in Fusion Centers Task Team.

Chairman Wicklund asked the members who participated on this task team to spend time addressing the applicability of current products to the juvenile justice community and to recommend, if needed, additional products/resources.

The meeting was adjourned for lunch from 12:00 Noon until 1:30 p.m.

GPIQWG Breakouts

Chairman Wicklund reconvened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. and gave a charge to the attendees regarding the GPIQWG breakout sessions. He asked each group to be able to report out on what was currently being accomplished, any challenges the groups faced, and what needs existed for future

development (for example, does the group anticipate needing a drafting session). The attendees broke into their breakout sessions and reconvened together at 4:00 p.m. to provide interim status reports.

Interim Status Report: Training and Outreach Task Team—Juvenile Justice Review

Lead: Alan Carlson
Tony Capizzi
Kathleen deGrasse
Michael Dever
Bob Greeves
Erin Lee
Steve Siegel
Cindy Southworth
Martha Steketee

Training: The team discussed whether to focus on training to implement policies or training once policies are in place. Participants came up with a list of categories of types of users (including nonusers, victim advocates, the bar, etc.) that will be converted into a matrix listing the types of products needed for use in training (as they relate to the category of user). The group identified some of the types of training that could work for this list of users. The vision for the matrix is to present a bigger picture and to identify what each particular type of training could contain. The next step will be to work on a hands-on component. The group also talked about readiness—if a group has not received GPIQWG materials, it may not be ready for training, whereas marketing the materials to group members may be more appropriate to draw their interest.

GPIQWG Product Applicability to Juvenile Justice: Mr. Capizzi will send materials to ten different states in which he has direct contact with judges for the purpose of soliciting their feedback on GPIQWG products. Ms. Ada Melton also volunteered to solicit similar feedback from state and tribal representation. The group talked about looking at GPIQWG products to determine whether they were marketable “as is” to juvenile justice and explored the development of an explanation sheet to translate products for juvenile justice, as well as possibly developing different framing of current products. For example, the IQ Fact Sheet lists criminal justice scenarios but does not include juvenile justice examples.

Finally, the group talked about overall collaboration—are we making connections to different endeavors and organizations for juvenile justice (e.g., Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention [OJJDP] interaction and collaboration)? The group plans to make contact with these groups through BJA (Mr. Michael Dever). In the past, Global has reached out to them but has not had a lot of success. They should be invited to the table prior to any in-depth redesign of products. Mr. Carlson also talked about contacting the smaller contingency groups to ask how GPIQWG products fit their organizational needs (e.g., probation).

The group plans to work on the *Ten Steps to the Privacy Guide* at tomorrow’s breakout session.

Interim Status Report: IQ Guidebook Task Team

Lead: Jeanette Plante
Paco Aumond
Steve Siegel
Phil Stevenson
Mary Gay Whitmer

The new title of the guidebook will be “Information Quality **Program** Guidebook.” In it, the core IQ dimensions for the justice and law enforcement communities will be defined.

Audience: Head of an agency or organization that creates and captures, maintains, uses, receives, disseminates, and disposes of justice information.

Core dimensions identified:

Accuracy

Completeness

Timeliness

Trustworthiness/Believability

Understandability/Clarity

Revised chapter outline:

- I. **Introduction**—What this is and why you should look at it
- II. **Who**—Who are the leaders and what are their responsibilities?
 - a) Leader is responsible for the program (re: IQ)
 - b) IQ is? We define dimensions
- III. **Program Elements**—(What of each element ensures dimensions?)
(This will include tools such as the IQ Assessment Tool.)

Defined roles and responsibilities
Articulated policies and procedures
Integration with IT
Integration with business processes/systems
Education and training
Evaluation and review
- IV. **Planning and Analysis**—Goals: assessment, program plan, power documents
- V. **Policies and Procedures**

IQ dimensions: The team realized that to determine which IQ dimensions were most critical, it would be better (rather than simply adopting MIT's) to instead settle on a core set of dimensions for justice information and then reference the other approaches available. Mr. Owen Greenspan and Ms. Erin Kenneally suggested that those dimensions be consistent with the ones being used by the IQ Assessment Tool Task Team. Mr. Paco Aumond suggested revisiting the fundamental attributes of IQ that the criminal history record system has followed for years. As a reminder, GPIQWG never revisited whether the group should formally adopt MIT's dimensions. In terms of law enforcement and justice information, MIT's terms can be very abstract, but mostly they do not all directly translate to law enforcement data. The group plans to identify the core dimensions and refer users to other resources for additional IQ dimensions.

Program elements include defined roles/responsibilities, policies/procedures (this will include tools such as the one under development by the IQ Assessment Tool Task Team), integration with information technology (IT) and business systems, education/training, and evaluation/review. This is a holistic approach, not a focus on one particular area or task.

Discussion ensued between members of the (newly labeled) IQ Program Guidebook Task Team and members of the IQ Assessment Tool Task Team regarding the IQ dimensions terms that each group is using. The two groups agreed to collaborate at the next breakout session to ensure that both teams are consistent and that the terms used will be useful and understandable to justice users.

Interim Status Report: IQ Assessment Tool Task Team

Lead: Owen Greenspan

Don Grimwood

Scott Fairholm

Barbara Hurst

Erin Kenneally

Richard MacKnight

Michael McDonald

Ada Pecos Melton

Mark Motivans

Tim Skinner

At the October 10 breakout session, the team will formulate the purpose statement and audience for this tool. Also, the team will do an analysis that takes the work accomplished thus far and compares it with other materials. The team felt that the layout and format of the matrix developed at the last meeting was somewhat confusing and that perhaps some retitling would be helpful. In reviewing the matrix, the team identified gaps in the content of the questions and plans to map the matrix questions to another resource to ensure completeness.

Notes taken during the IQ Assessment Tool Task Team breakout discussion:

Feedback from communities

Ms. Kenneally and others reported that they had a tough time receiving feedback and determining the person from whom to get feedback within their own communities. This raises the question: “Who is the audience for which we are designing this?”

The following are attendees’ concerns over the latest version of the “Information Life Cycle of an Incident Report.”

- Terminology: Disposition—for law enforcement, this refers to the status of a case versus the retention of records.
- Dimensions represented in the matrix:
 - **Timeliness**—With regard to information sharing and exchange transparency—how often are these shared, and how timely is the sharing of this information? Does that enhance/detract from what we have on the matrix?
 - **Objectivity**—Is this just asking how each agency deals with writing a narrative? Do agencies allow objectivity, or is this steering them towards not including subjective information? If the protocol for information is to identify it as objective or subjective, should subjective information be excluded?
 - The narrative has the potential to be subjective. A police report contains both types of information (objective and subjective). The intention of using the term “objectivity” is to get agencies to consider the degree of objectivity and for the users of information to be aware of whether the information is objective or subjective.
 - Regarding victims reporting incident information online and law enforcement’s review—how much filtering is done to make the report objective? Do we need to write a paragraph that addresses this? A description in the narrative—objective versus subjective information? The two sentences provided in the matrix on objectivity are vague and need to be more precise.
 - Objectivity is a function of the context. It anchors around the speaker/author of information. The assessment or capture of the information reveals who the author is (law enforcement, victim, etc.). Police reports usually indicate “the victim said” or “witness two stated.” As such, the author of the information is indicated.
 - We simply need to state, “A good narrative should be able to distinguish between objectivity and subjectivity.” People have different writing styles. If agencies do not approach this process seriously and rely, train, and insist on good supervisory review, there will be problems.
 - Caution should also be applied when considering software products that claim to self-correct. Supervisors, in general, will believe this to be true and will end up not

interacting with such sections. We do not want to encourage the narrative to write itself.

- A good narrative is “accurate” in its description, regardless of whether it is objective or subjective.
- Should it be indicated on this form whether agencies have supervisory checks and balances in the case of subjective narratives? Having a checks-and-balances procedure might be a good control on objectivity. Or should we operate under the assumption that the majority of agencies, as a rule, include information such as badge number, identification of author, etc.? Inconsistencies in police reports are usually associated with the types of data that are unique to the individual agency. About 85 percent of reports have commonalities in what they collect. There are existing models.
- **Accountability**—A dimension not included is accountability. Who is responsible for the data? Is this implied in the enforcement dimension? What about traceability?
- **Security**—Correction on page 2 of the matrix where there is specific wording: “Do you exercise sufficient controls to verify the identity of individuals when completing a report?” It reads as if the identity of the person completing the report is meant rather than what it is—the identity of the person the report is about.
- **Audience:** Who is this written for—the agency that does the collection and/or multiple-agency users? Is this designed at the individual or the agency level? Is the matrix considered high or low level? This has to be useful to the whole justice community or it has no value, but if we apply this to the law enforcement level (collection), it will be useful downstream.

What is the audience looking for? Is all the information treated equally, or is it viewed in two aspects—information that is good/acceptable and information that is discretionary narrative? If this were written only for law enforcement and not for downstream, the report would never leave the agency. As this product develops further, it needs to be written so that it is meaningful downstream. For example, the information that goes into a police report should accurately represent and document the incident so that, at the prosecutor’s level, the incident is properly documented.

There are many cases in the courts in which information is voluntarily entered into the system that does not affect that particular stage of the justice process but is known to later affect another stage downstream. There are always conflicts over this because individuals are not compensated for entering the information that seems to be in demand later on.

- **Purpose Statement:** What are the purpose and goals of this document? Is it an agency self-assessment tool? Does this matrix help to determine why information is being collected in the first place? Does it assess the mechanism for capture and quality of the end product and its distribution? What is the purpose of measuring the quality? In a larger information-quality program, this would appear to serve as a reference project used to evaluate the IQ program, supporting the overall mission. Is one goal for this tool to instill confidence in the data (to both users external to the agency and those using/receiving the information)?

This tool is two things: a self-assessment tool on the information the agency collects and also a consumer assessment tool. It must focus on both the producer and the consumer of the information—the source and the downstream consumers.

“The purpose of this tool is to assess the degree to which agency information collection and communication supports the agency’s mission.”

Tomorrow, the IQ Assessment Tool Task Team will work on developing a mission/purpose statement and defining the audience.

Closing Remarks

Chairman Wicklund emphasized the importance of maintaining momentum between meetings. If there is no communication between meetings, members have to reintroduce themselves to the concepts that were previously understood. For the breakout sessions tomorrow, Chairman Wicklund advised each group to determine what it is going to take to maintain momentum and communication so that at the next meeting, the members are not retracing their footsteps before moving forward.

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

October 10, 2007—Meeting Summary

Introduction and Charge for the Day

Chairman Carl Wicklund convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. and welcomed the attendees back for the second day of GPIQWG meetings. Today's meeting will be from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 Noon and will resume the work begun at yesterday's breakout sessions.

Attendees

The following individuals were in attendance:

Chair

Mr. Carl Wicklund

American Probation and Parole Association

Vice Chair

Jeanette Plante, Esquire

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

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

Mr. Richard MacKnight, Jr.
National Institute of Justice

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

Mr. Michael McDonald
Delaware State Police

Captain Tim McGrail
Missouri State Highway Patrol

Alan Carlson, Esquire
The Justice Management Institute

Ms. Ada Pecos Melton
American Indian Development Associates

Mr. Cabell C. Cropper
National Criminal Justice Association

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

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

Mr. Steve Siegel
Denver District Attorney's Office

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

Mr. Timothy H. Skinner
SRA International, Inc.

Mr. Scott D. Fairholm (GISWG Liaison)
National Center for State Courts

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

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

Ms. Martha W. Steketee
Independent Consultant

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

Ms. Mary Gay Whitmer
*National Association of State Chief Information
Officers*

Staff

Lieutenant Don Grimwood
Ohio State Highway Patrol

Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Erin Kenneally, Esquire
eLCHEMY, Incorporated

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Mr. Bob Greeves informed the group that the Privacy TA Initiative—sponsored by BJA in collaboration with the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), SEARCH, the Justice Management Institute, and the Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR)—is developing training, using the National Center for State Court’s (NCSC) online training mechanism, and will collaborate on the content with all the participating partners.

Charge for the Day

Chairman Wicklund recommended that the IQ Assessment Tool Task Team and the IQ Program Guidebook Task Team meet together for the first 45 minutes to settle on the core IQ dimensions that will be retrofitted for justice. He also requested that these dimensions be selected and defined, offline, over the next six weeks. Since the two teams will be utilizing IQ dimensions and definitions, they need to be consistent.

Chairman Wicklund requested that the Training and Outreach Task Team continue to make recommendations on white papers and one-page fax sheets that could be developed around privacy and information quality.

The breakout groups will resume and meet from 8:45 a.m. until 10:30 a.m. and will reconvene together at 10:30 a.m. for final status reports.

Breakout Final Status Reports

Chairman Wicklund reconvened the GPIQWG participants from their breakout sessions at 10:30 a.m. and asked each group to report on its product status.

Combined IQ Program Guidebook and IQ Assessment Tool Task Teams—Alan Carlson

The groups combined to work on scoping the IQ dimensions to the basic core elements that would be used for both group’s products for consistency. The group decided not to take the approach to follow “all” of the MIT IQ dimensions that were featured in the IQ Fact Sheet but instead to identify core dimensions that more directly apply to justice.

Core Elements	Related IQ Dimensions
Accessibility	Ease of manipulation Accessibility Conciseness
Timeliness	Timeliness
Accuracy	Objectivity Free of Error
Security	Security
Completeness	Completeness Value Added
Objectivity	Relevancy Believability/authenticity—the extent to which data is true and credible
Validation	

Retention	Relevancy Reputation (source) Consistency Interpretability
------------------	---

Training was identified as a required component of the overall IQ program.

The participants found it a difficult process to go from conceptual dimensions to actual concrete data functionality dimensions. The challenge is in selecting the perfect term or definition because the terms will be viewed differently by different parts of the justice process. The best the team can do is come up with some best-case terms and allow each justice area to apply those terms to its own area. The important thing is to get the justice community to think of IQ beyond accuracy and timeliness. Chairman Wicklund stated that he truly appreciated the effort everyone has put forth in trying to accomplish this task.

Action Item: Within two weeks, using the document titled *IQ Dimensions Applied to Incident Report*, the group will endeavor to enhance/revise it (for example, change the label “concise representation” to a term more meaningful to the justice community, such as “standard representation”) and suggest dimensions that might need to be combined due to similarity (for example, adding “accuracy” and “objectivity” to the list). The group will send its evaluations/suggestions to Ms. Christina Abernathy, who will consolidate these and send the responses back to the two groups for feedback. In addition to reviewing definitions, the group will suggest examples to help illustrate the meaning implied in the definition.

Action Item: The IQ Program Guidebook Task Team will put together a smaller group for a drafting session. Ms. Abernathy will confer with Mr. Aumond and Ms. Plante to determine who should be involved in this session. (Note: A drafting session was later scheduled for December 6, 2007, in Washington, DC, with attendees Mr. Aumond, Ms. Plante, Mr. Phil Stevenson, and Ms. Abernathy. Chairman Wicklund and Mr. Michael McDonald will join later drafting sessions.)

Training and Outreach Task Team—Ms. Cindy Southworth

Ms. Southworth guided the team through revisions and restructuring of the draft outline—*Top Ten Steps to Privacy*. The intent of this document is not paragraphs of data, but rather a one-page checklist.

The team also worked on the training matrix for implementing privacy policies and the training categories—training topics, details on privacy policy, lessons learned, etc. The team also talked about how BJA’s training focus would fit within this matrix.

Action Item: Ms. Southworth will send both documents to Ms. Abernathy.

White paper suggestions were:

- Ownership
- Retention
- FOIA
- State/Local Records Act
- Breach Notification Laws

Action Item: As the groups discover other related IQ resources, they should send those to Ms. Abernathy. Those could be added as resources for the IQ Program Guidebook.

Action Item: Mr. Bob Greeves asked that IIR help finalize the letter that Mr. Capizzi will be sending to the juvenile court judges. He asked Ms. Abernathy to send him a draft prior to distribution and to send Mr. Ada Pecos Melton a final copy for her use with the tribes.

Closing Remarks

Chairman Wicklund expressed his appreciation for all of the participants' efforts during the day-and-a-half meetings. Privacy and information quality are both difficult to "wrap your arms around." We knew that privacy would be no easy task. Information quality was anticipated and is proving to be even more of a challenge.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 Noon.

Attachment A

**Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group Meeting
October 9–10, 2007**

Agenda

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



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



October 9–10, 2007

Agenda—Page One

Shenandoah/Blueridge Banquet Room

October 9, 2007

- 8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. *Continental Breakfast*
- 8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m. **Welcoming Remarks and Introductions**
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair
Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ Next meeting date: January 28, 2007 and January 29, 2007
 - ◆ June 26–27, 2007, GPIQWG Draft meeting summary
- 8:45 a.m. – 9:15 a.m. **Global Updates**
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair
Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ Global Advisory Committee (GAC) and Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) updates
 - GESC meeting: October 30, 2007
 - GAC meeting: October 31, 2007
 - ◆ Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG) Update
Mr. Alan Carlson
 - ◆ GIWG Privacy Committee Update
Mr. Paco Aumond
 - ◆ Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG) Update
Mr. Scott Fairholm
 - ◆ Global Security Working Group (GSWG) Update
Ms. Cindy Southworth
- 9:15 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. **Federal Requirements Crosswalk**
Mr. Tim Skinner
Anticipated Discussion Topic
- ◆ Federal Crosswalk document, purpose and use

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



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



October 9–10, 2007

Agenda—Page Two

Shenandoah/Blueridge Banquet Room

October 9, 2007

9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

Fusion Center Privacy Policy Development

Mr. Alan Carlson, The Justice Management Institute

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ DRAFT—*Fusion Center Privacy Policy Development: Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Template*
- ◆ Pilot technical assistance training class: September 18, 2007
- ◆ Privacy technical assistance

10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.

Break

10:15 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Planning for the Future

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ◆ GPIQWG products marketable/applicable to juvenile justice
- Future resources/products for GPIQWG to develop

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon

Status Reports From GPIQWG Breakouts

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Reports on completed tasks, current work, and future plans from each group, as follows:

- ◆ Information Quality Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team
Mr. Owen Greenspan and Ms. Erin Kenneally
- ◆ Information Quality Guidebook
Mr. Paco Aumond
- ◆ Training and Outreach
Mr. Cabell Cropper
- ◆ Privacy and Fusion Centers
Mr. Alan Carlson

12:00 Noon – 1:30 p.m.

Lunch (on your own)

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



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



October 9–10, 2007

Agenda—Page Three

Shenandoah/Blueridge Banquet Room

October 9, 2007

1:30 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.

GPIQWG Breakouts

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Breakout groups are as follows:

- ◆ Information Quality Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team
- ◆ Information Quality Guidebook
- ◆ Training and Outreach
- ◆ Privacy and Fusion Centers

2:45 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Break

3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Resume GPIQWG Breakouts

4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

GPIQWG Breakout Interim Status Reports

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Outline of Discussion Topics:

- ◆ Reports on progress made, current challenges, and requests for assistance from each group, as follows:
 - Information Quality Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team
Mr. Owen Greenspan
Ms. Erin Kenneally
 - Information Quality Guidebook
Mr. Paco Aumond
 - Training and Outreach
Mr. Cabell Cropper
 - Privacy and Fusion Centers
Mr. Alan Carlson
- ◆ Plan for the following day's GPIQWG meeting
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

5:00 p.m.

Adjournment



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



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



October 9–10, 2007

Agenda—Page Four

Shenandoah/Blueridge Banquet Room

October 10, 2007

- 8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. *Continental Breakfast*
- 8:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m. **Introduction and Charge for the Day**
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair
Anticipated Discussion Topics
◆ Charge to the breakout groups
- 8:45 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. **Resume GPIQWG Breakouts**
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair
Breakout groups are as follows:
◆ Information Quality Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team
◆ Information Quality Guidebook
◆ Training and Outreach
◆ Privacy and Fusion Centers
- 10:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. *Break*
- 10:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. **GPIQWG Breakout Final Status Reports**
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair
Outline of Discussion Topics:
◆ Reports on progress made, current challenges, requests for assistance, and future tasks from each group, as follows:
• Information Quality Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team
Mr. Owen Greenspan
Ms. Erin Kenneally
• Information Quality Guidebook
Mr. Paco Aumond
• Training and Outreach
Mr. Cabell Cropper
• Privacy and Fusion Centers
Mr. Alan Carlson

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



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



October 9–10, 2007

Agenda—Page Five

Shenandoah/Blueridge Banquet Room

October 10, 2007

- 11:30 a.m. – 12:00 Noon **Next Steps and Closing Remarks**
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ◆ Next steps/action items
 - ◆ Next meeting date
- 12:00 Noon *Adjournment*