```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│  Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global)      │
│  Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) Meeting │
│                                                             │
│                    Washington, DC                           │
│                    January 28, 2008                         │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

January 28, 2008—Meeting Summary

Background, Purpose, and Introductions

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), and the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative's (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG) convened a meeting on January 28, 2008, in Washington, DC, at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Carl Wicklund, Executive Director, American Probation and Parole Association and GPIQWG chairman, led the meeting in furtherance of and alignment with the GPIQWG's *Vision* and *Mission Statements*.

Attendees

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

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

Alan Carlson, Esquire
The Justice Management Institute

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

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

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

Kimberly Lough
Criminal Justice Information Services Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Mr. Thomas MacLellan
National Governors Association

Mr. Michael McDonald
Delaware State Police

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

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

Mr. 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

Observers:

Erica Olsen
National Network to End Domestic Violence

Meghann Proie
Privacy and Civil Liberties Office
Office of the Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Staff

Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

John Wilson
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Chairman Wicklund welcomed attendees to the day-and-a-half GPIQWG meeting and asked for introductions around the table. He introduced newly appointed members Michael McDonald, who replaced Lieutenant Frank Higginbotham, and Ms. Kimberly Lough, who replaced Ms. Robin Stark. He announced that the next GPIQWG meeting is set for May 6, 2008, from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and May 7, 2008, from 8:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The location will be in the Washington, DC, or surrounding area. (Note: Location was later determined to be Annapolis, Maryland.) Chairman Wicklund referred the attendees to the draft meeting summary from the last meeting for their review and asked that changes be sent to Christina Abernathy, Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR).

Chairman Wicklund went over the agenda with the group and the plan for the meeting (see Appendix A for meeting agenda). Because of continued resource development, a combination of updates and reports followed by breakout sessions will be used to enable the task teams to continue work on the deliverables. Key agenda items for the day's meeting are:
- **Global and Liaison Updates**
- **Privacy Forum**
- **Privacy Products in Juvenile Justice: Community Feedback**
- **Privacy Technical Assistance Initiative**
- **IQ Dimensions—A Conceptual Approach**
- **GPIQWG Breakouts**
- **Status Reports From GPIQWG Breakouts**

Global Updates

Chairman Wicklund and Mr. Bob Greeves provided updates from the Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC), which held its annual steering meeting on January 15–16, 2008. The significance of that meeting was to establish priorities for Global for the coming year, while also considering the impact of reduced resources. GESC updates included:

- Status updates on the Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group's (GISWG) Justice Reference Architecture (JRA), Privacy Technical Framework specifications, and the Global Security Working Group's (GSWG's) Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management (GFIPM). The privacy technical framework will be field-tested to help implement privacy policy in a technical framework.

  Regarding JRA, Mr. Scott Fairholm added that the JRA is intended to provide a high-level framework for anyone who wants to implement information sharing. Based on Service Oriented Architecture (SOA), the JRA is anticipated to provide the guidance needed to allow true

interoperability. Capitalizing on the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) www.niem.gov, the JRA adds additional components necessary for a messaging envelope transfer. The JRA project relates to GPIQWG because the message envelope transfers have privacy and security issues. Services are being defined in a way that is highly reusable so that the JRA can be used across the enterprise. JRA defines how one system talks to another, the messaging, the envelope, the transfer, etc. NIEM is a starting point with the JRA as additional pieces rounding out true interoperability. The partners involved in the development of these components include Global, the Georgia Tech Research Institute (GTRI), and the IJIS Institute.

- Mr. Greeves informed the group that Colonel Bart Johnson, formerly of the New York State Police and Global Advisory Committee vice chair, has accepted a position with the Office for the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI). As such, Colonel Johnson has stepped down as vice chair of GAC. An interim election will be held to fill the position until the annual election in October 2008.

- Work is being done on the GAC bylaws, particularly regarding governance. One area for revision is the requirement that a working group chair be a GAC member. There is some discussion on looking at subject-matter experts who could serve in that role even though they are not voting members of GAC. They could attend GAC meetings but not have voting rights.

- Fusion centers: Mr. Bob Greeves is working with the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment (PM-ISE) and the Office for the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) staffers to help fusion centers get established. The National Fusion Center Conference is being held on March 19–20, 2008, in San Francisco, California. A lot of good technical assistance work has been provided by IIR. One of the objectives is to encourage fusion centers to produce a draft privacy policy. We are getting a lot of good responses with fusion centers that are drafting policies or have already turned in policies to IIR for review.

- A standard for suspicious activity reports (SARs) is to be released today.

- Additional Global activities include a priority to show how the different Global activities relate to each other. There has been an initiation of a "roadmap" project out of the Global Outreach Working Group (GOWG) that some GPIQWG members will be involved in. We are relying on the GESC to identify the artifacts that are a part of the roadmap.

- It has been suggested that the working groups remember that the role of a Global working group is to work in a framework of "recommendations" to GAC, not as an operational entity.

Liaison Updates

Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG)—Alan Carlson
This group has not met since the last GPIQWG, so there is nothing to report.

Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG)—Scott Fairholm
GISWG has three subgroups, and work is moving into a new phase with services:
- Justice Reference Architecture (concepts, relationships, and high-level components)
- Three subgroups
    1. Management and Policy Committee
        - Concept of Operations
        - General Participation Agreement
        - Reference Service-Level Agreement
    2. Service Interaction Committee
        - Execution Context Guidelines
        - Implementation Guidelines
        - Maintain existing service interaction profiles (SIPs) (Web Services, ebXML)
    3. Services Task Team (newest task team)
        - Services Description Project
            o Joint funding to IJIS and NCSC

- o   Create and operate Services Task Team
- o   Produce first round of deliverables
  - ▪   Guidance Documents
    - •   Services Specification Guideline
    - •   Services Identification and Design Guideline
    - •   A prioritized high-level business decomposition of the justice domain
  - ▪   Service Descriptions
    - •   Fusion Center Services
    - •   Fingerprint Services
    - •   Enabling Services
  - ▪   Metadata Taxonomy
  - ▪   Tools Strategy Recommendations

Global Security Working Group (GSWG)—Ms. Cindy Southworth
GSWG is going through a transition because of a change in leadership—Chelle Uecker has left the position.   John Ruegg, Director, Los Angeles County Information Systems Advisory Body, was designated as the interim chair by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). The working group has not recently met, but a summary of activity is provided below.

- •   In 2008, GSWG plans to maintain three security delivery teams—the Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management (GFIPM) Delivery Team, the Security Policy Delivery Team, and the Technical Privacy Policy Delivery Team (new team).

- •   GSWG's Web page, http://it.ojp.gov/GSWG, currently contains the following new privacy policy documents that are also in the meeting folders:

  1.   *Implementing Privacy Policy in Justice Information Sharing: A Technical Framework* report

  2.   *Implementing Privacy Policy in Justice Information Sharing: Executive Summary*

  3.   *Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management* flyer

- •   The GFIPM Delivery Team has completed the GFIPM Metadata Specification Version 1.0. It is currently being vetted, and input from GPIQWG is welcome. Please contact Monique LaBare, Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR), if interested in reviewing this product. GFIPM Web site is http://it.ojp.gov/GFIPM.

- •   The Security Policy Delivery Team is currently working on the security considerations for the Global Justice Federations document that will provide governance guidance (i.e., memoranda of understanding [MOUs, contracts, and agreements] and guidelines for minimum security requirements). The team is also looking into risk assessments and tools.

- •   The only planned meeting for 2008 is for the GFIPM Delivery Team on February 5–6, 2008, in Atlanta, Georgia.

Global Outreach Working Group (GOWG)—Anthony Capizzi
Outreach is the newcomer of the Global working groups, debuting in January 2007. GOWG has met twice since January (in July and October) but has accomplished the following in that period:

- •   Evaluation and recommendations for updating the Global Web site (www.it.ojp.gov/global). A lot of work has been completed on restructuring the content and on a new layout for the site.

- •   Global Roadmap—Still in its structural stage, the first draft of a Global roadmap is business-oriented (a "how-to").   It is recognized that Global may have a lot of products that do not intuitively appear to tie in with one another. Having a "how-to" guide that demonstrates how to use the GAC materials using a solution type of roadmap would be beneficial.

- •   Global 101—Global 101 is an orientation type of training for all new GAC members, providing information on all that is Global. It is not, however, just for GAC members but also available for observers. Attendance has grown. Now, the number of observers has doubled. Over the past

two years, Global 101 has been a strong endeavor by GOWG, whose members have worked diligently to develop the training.

- A recurring issue is that GAC and working group members do not pass information on to the organizations they represent. As a result, GOWG will request that GAC Chair Bob Boehmer send the leadership of each organization an invitation to become involved with the GAC member who represents that organization. This will be an effort to make sure that Global's work is passed on to the constituencies.

- GOWG is trying to develop a template to send to Global partner organizations, from each working group, to summarize what happened at their meetings. GOWG is also going to try to publish articles in more publications, while increasing the frequency of the Global newsletter—Global Highlights—to every other month, rather than quarterly.

- There are usually opportunities to network after working group meetings. This networking is greatly beneficial, helping members discover and share resources and become informed of related endeavors. There is no opportunity to network and interact among GAC members or among GAC members and GAC observers. Therefore, we are going to try to create this type of event.

- Currently, there are no performance measures for determining the success of Global products. GOWG was organized to try to answer that need—to determine that what Global is producing is serving a need. Mr. Greeves added that the group ended up talking about measuring outputs, not outcomes. Outcomes are sometimes too difficult to measure. He advised that, as the group starts to work on a template to be used by one or all of the working groups, efforts be made to help working groups set a quantitative target audience.

Privacy Forum

Chairman Wicklund spoke to the group briefly about a privacy forum that is currently being explored. "How do we become more proactive in letting privacy advocates understand the good work that has been done around information privacy?" he asked. There has been some discussion about pulling together a small planning group made up of members from this group and from GIWG (fusion centers have brought a lot to the privacy table). The group would plan and coordinate a facilitated forum where advocates would be invited to discuss their concerns. It was suggested that the advocates be provided with copies of existing Global products in advance so that they have a chance to review those products. Creating an opportunity to hear these concerns supports our role and ability in advising the Attorney General on privacy issues. We would be remiss if we did not involve the advocacy groups on privacy projects. We have a better chance of getting their support if they are involved from the start. Chairman Wicklund stated that this idea is just getting off the ground and being considered and that a draft plan will soon be put together.

Mr. Ken Mortensen stated that he strongly encourages state and local agencies to go through the privacy impact assessment (PIA) process. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security's (DHS) PIA is a good example, but we need to also include the U.S. Department of Justice's (DHS) civil liberties assessment (reasonable autonomy, antidiscrimination, due process, etc.). It was suggested that the group reach out to the DHS Privacy and the DHS Civil Rights and Liberties offices to participate in the GPIQWG.

Juvenile Justice

Chairman Wicklund updated participants on the feedback received through the group's solicitation of input from juvenile justice representatives on GPIQWG products. The feedback received was minimal and included suggestions such as looking at the terminology and definitions used (e.g., juveniles are usually "arrested" or "taken into custody" or "adjudicated" or "convicted"). We also need to look at how we title GPIQWG products so that it is intuitive to juvenile justice communities that the product is applicable to them. Working through the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court

Judges, we may need to send the packets to staff who can take the time to look at the products. The primary responses received, however, indicated that the products are applicable to the juvenile justice community.

Privacy Technical Assistance Initiative

Mr. Michael Dever, DOJ, provided a status of fusion center privacy policies, the privacy technical assistance (TA) being provided at the state level, and the development of privacy training.

Status of fusion center policies: Four regional meetings were held with privacy TA sessions provided to all four regions. It is anticipated that by the end of March 20, all the privacy policies will have been received.   (Update: By April 22, 2008, 26 policies had been received). Ms. Abernathy developed a checklist that correlated with the criteria in the fusion center privacy template for use in evaluating each policy. The checklist was provided to all attendees of the privacy TA sessions. A review process was established to provide effective feedback to the fusion centers. Contact was made every 30 days throughout the center's policy development process, and on-site TA was offered if needed or requested.

State and local level: The fusion center version of the privacy policy template was modified, with a draft provided to the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) to pilot and determine how effective it is at the state and local level. Texas and North Dakota have also requested non fusion center privacy technical assistance, with assistance being provided by members of the privacy TA provider's team, including SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, and the Justice Management Institute (JMI).

Training: In anticipation of policies being in place, training mechanisms are being explored to support privacy policy implementation. BJA's privacy TA providers have been meeting together and have solicited support from the DHS Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Office and the DHS Privacy Office. DHS has been helping with the training for first responders, fusion centers, and others. The group has compiled a list of frequently asked questions (FAQs) that reflects responses gathered from the privacy TA provider's group and others, such as ACJC's Mr. Phil Stevenson.

Chairman Wicklund stated that this group, GPIQWG, has had a huge impact throughout information sharing. There is so much attention being paid to privacy because of the work and products of this group. He thanked the group for its great work and emphasized that members should be very proud of how their efforts have grown.

Mr. Alan Carlson talked about work on a project with Nlets, The International Justice and Public Safety Network (Nlets) involving the sharing of driver's license photos and information across state lines. He talked about his success in working with Nlets to use metadata or codes that apply to particular fields with relation to privacy (privacy statements). Mr. McDonald stated that Maryland will be working with Nlets as a participating state. A valid reason for using a photo is for "positive identification." In some states, however, that is not a valid reason to share photos. Different states have different laws and policies regarding what can or cannot be shared or used. Mr. McDonald added that privacy advocates should be supportive of the ability to make a positive identification of a suspect (supported by a photo), since misidentification is a big privacy issue.

GPIQWG White Papers

Chairman Wicklund raised the issue of GPIQWG's involvement in the publication of white papers that may not necessarily be developed out of this group but that support the initiatives of this group. For example: geospatial mapping and information quality; biometrics and information quality. There may be people in GPIQWG's members' home (constituent) agencies who can assist in developing papers on topics such as these. Mr. Mortensen and Mr. Tim Skinner were members of a federal interagency group in which they drafted a white paper on privacy issues related to biometrics. The Office of Science and Technology Policy is also doing work (and developing white papers) on biometrics through its privacy subgroup.

Mr. McDonald shared that NIJ and OJP is cosponsoring a roundtable looking on a national plan for forensic evidence, including DNA. Mr. Steve Siegel suggested looking at emerging technologies to research and explore and to make some decisions on using them or development from there. A real problem is that victims cannot change their identities when mandatory biometrics are involved. Victims cannot change their biometrics.

Action Item: The group will send its white paper suggestions to Ms. Abernathy. If members know of products that are out there—information quality or privacy—that would make good white paper subjects, forward those to Ms. Abernathy. Mr. Skinner will send a copy of the biometrics white paper to the group for review.

IQ Dimensions—A Conceptual Approach

Chairman Wicklund spoke to the group about the struggle that the group has experienced applying the information quality (IQ) dimensions provided by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and the IQ characteristics of Larry English to justice processes. The group experienced difficulty in trying to apply these to justice processes. Additionally, the two task teams—the IQ Assessment Process Task Team and the IQ Program Guidebook Task Team—were having difficulty using the same IQ terms and definitions with their respective products. To help meet these challenges, Chairman Wicklund wanted to have some discussion on the dimensions so that members of each subgroup are using the same terms and language.

Vice Chair Plante talked with the group about the recognition that the group is having difficulty developing guidance on defining, implementing, and ensuring information quality. We asked for subject-matter assistance from Richard Wang, Ph.D., and Larry English to find out what is currently available. In doing so, the group accepted the notion that we should be locked into one set of IQ attributes. This has been the biggest challenge. To help alleviate some of this struggle, Ms. Plante suggested that the group come to a consensus regarding an approach to the IQ dimensions.

By now, this group has recognized that there is no single set of IQ attributes that applies to all justice information across the board. Ms. Plante suggested coming up with dimensions that are core for **all** justice information, and then talking about the available dimensions falling within a contextual category.

Our stated goal is that information quality is the cornerstone of sound decision making. It inspires trust in the justice system (those who rely on the data are sure that what they are getting is what they are supposed to get) and it facilitates doing their job more efficiently. The IQ Program Guidebook Task Team considered core attributes as those that apply to all justice information. In segregating the dimensions into core versus contextual in the guidebook, we can better explore how the core dimensions can be analyzed and related to generally, with the justice entities applying contextual dimensions to their particular agencies and information.

Vice Chair Plante proposed the following core dimensions, based on discussion at the December 6, 2007, IQ Program Guidebook drafting session and a conference call with the IQ Assessment Process Task Team led by Mr. Owen Greenspan and Ms. Erin Kenneally, on January 7, 2008:

Core Dimensions (affects all three roles and can be applied across the board)
- Accuracy (free of error)
- Timeliness
- Completeness (appropriate amount of data)
- Interpretability (common lexicon: the words you use are the words that are understood; the vocabulary of a particular language or field [includes consistent representation]; e.g., common coding of form fields)
- Security (of the information across the board supports the vision of promoting trust in the information)

Contextual dimensions are episodically required (conditional/situational). What is peculiar to the nature of the information and the partners your agency shares with that requires the agency to do something else? The contextual dimensions drill down into a more granular approach to an agency's specific application or use of the information.

Though initially the participants agreed conceptually with this approach, upon further discussion (as definitions of contextual dimensions were discussed) the attendees, with different roles and different agency perspectives, felt that several of the contextual dimensions seemed to fit within the core category. Chairman Wicklund reminded the group of its goal—to simply develop some good direction on a process for information quality. "How can we do this simply?" he asked. He suggested that the group adjourn and come together the next morning, having considered this issue, and be ready to make a resolution on the approach.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.

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

Washington, DC
January 29, 2008

January 29, 2008—Meeting Summary

Chairman Wicklund convened the second day's GPIQWG meeting on January 29, 2008, at 8:30 a.m. Chairman Wicklund welcomed the group and thanked them for their participation and work accomplished at yesterday's meeting.

Attendees

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

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse
Illinois State Police

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

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

Kimberly Lough
Criminal Justice Information Services Division
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Mr. Richard MacKnight, Jr.
National Institute of Justice

Mr. Thomas MacLellan
National Governors Association

Mr. J. Patrick McCreary
Bureau of Justice Statistics
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice

Mr. Michael McDonald
Delaware State Police

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

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

Mr. 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

Observers:

Erica Olsen
National Network to End Domestic Violence

Meghann Proie
Privacy and Civil Liberties Office
Office of the Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

Staff

Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

John Wilson
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Chairman Wicklund reviewed the plan for the working group to focus on drafting work, breaking into three task teams: IQ Program Guidebook, IQ Assessment Process, and Training and Outreach. He stated that he would like to see the IQ Program Guidebook Task Team drill down into the outline, fill in the substance of the guidebook, and make assignments for areas that need additional completion. A separate drafting session for this task team will be scheduled prior to the May 6–7, 2008, GPIQWG meeting. (Update: The drafting session was held on March 14, 2008).

Chairman Wicklund requested that the IQ Assessment Process Task Team take other information points in the justice process, e.g., presentence investigation, and apply the model it has developed to those points. The assessment process deliverable will be a part of the guidebook.

The Training and Outreach Task Team was requested to divide its time between two goals: (1) finalizing the *Privacy and Civil Liberties Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates: Policy Development Checklist* and the *Ten Steps to a Privacy* Policy one-pager and (2) reviewing the privacy guide, the executive overview, and the IQ Fact Sheet for relevance to juvenile justice (e.g., scenarios, chapter headings, titles, glossary of terms).

After the morning sessions, the groups will break for lunch and return at 1:30 p.m. They will then provide interim status reports on completions, problems, plans for development, timeframes, etc. Chairman Wicklund asked for the groups to identify the participants for each task team. Task team participants were identified as follows:

1. IQ Program Guidebook—Paco Aumand, Jennie Plante, Phil Stevenson, Kathleen deGrasse, Kim Lough

2. IQ Assessment Process—Owen Greenspan, Erin Kenneally, Barbara Hurst, Alan Carlson, Don Grimwood, Michael McDonald, Mark Motivans, Bob Greeves, Scott Fairholm, Tony Capizzi

3. Training and Outreach—Martha Steketee, Tim Skinner, Ken Mortensen, Meghann Proie, Michael Dever, Steve Siegel, Thomas MacLellan

At 1:30 p.m., Chairman Wicklund reconvened the afternoon session of the GPIWG meeting. BJA Program Official Patrick McCreary attended and spoke with the group about demonstrated progress. "This last year, I have seen great progress as far as implementing products in the field for privacy. I think our role in contributions to practitioners is to see the collective work as a change agent for the field. Fusion centers, in a matter of months across the country, have begun to develop their privacy policies and have them reviewed in a collaborative effort. This is a huge impact. We are trying to put the building blocks together for providing technical assistance. On the intelligence fusion center side, we are doing everything in a joint delivery mechanism (DHS, DNI, DOJ), which provides a great impression to the field that this is a partnership." Mr. McCreary thanked Chairman Wicklund for his continued leadership and the group for its great effort.

Interim Breakout Status Reports

Training and Outreach Task Team
The team revised the checklist to make it a user-friendly document geared toward a privacy champion or a privacy officer. The checklist was developed for use as a companion to the privacy guide. Therefore, the team suggested adding an additional column correlating checklist components with sections of the guide.

The team also created a consolidated one-page, ten-step flyer (a snapshot) to encapsulate the checklist and guide information into an easy-to-grasp, talking-points brief, titled *Ten Steps to a Privacy Policy*. A key enhancement was adding a section on the privacy and civil liberties officer, based on commentary that Mr. Mortensen has heard about implementing a privacy policy.

The team held an in-depth discussion on the inclusion of the term "civil liberties" in the top-ten flyer as compared with the content of the privacy guide it was developed to support, and also against the impact it may have on the small local agency. Chairman Wicklund recommended that on the checklist, there be a footnote inserted that describes what "civil liberties" means. Many entities on the local level are a long way from doing this—developing a privacy policy.

Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
From a substantive standpoint, the team formulated the content of the assessment questions it wants agencies to ask, to see how IQ attributes apply to real justice events. At this point, the questions need to be altered in the way they are presented. How do you word questions to embrace the user? It is our job to design the tool so that it is usable. We decided that we were not going to start from the top down; rather, we began with evaluating the questions (the real value in the tool that address the real quality issues). So, in essence, we rephrased the questions. When the group reconvenes in the second part of the day, it plans to finish rephrasing questions that will later be sent out to the larger group for review. The group concluded that a simplified list of questions may be better presentation format or that the information should be plugged into the information life cycle. Substantively, the group has what it needs and all that remains is to explore the format.

Information Quality Program Guidebook Task Team
The team took the existing outline, annotated it, and documented the substance of each part of the outline. The questions the IQ Assessment Process Task Team is developing will fit within the questions section of the guidebook. The analysis tool will work well as an appendix to the guide. We have identified issues, ideas, and concepts that need further explanation. We are not worrying about the organization of the guide at this point; rather, the team is more concerned with developing the substance of each section. The team will be holding a separate drafting session in Washington, DC, on Friday, March 14, 2008.

Chairman Wicklund expressed appreciation to each of the task teams for the work they had accomplished and advised that further ideas or additions to any of these deliverables would be welcome.

The groups moved into their final breakout sessions until 3:30 p.m.

Final Breakout Status Reports

Chairman Wicklund reconvened the task teams at the joint GPIQWG meeting at 3:30 p.m. and requested a final status report from each group. He also asked the Training and Outreach Task Team members whose products are now wrapping up to completion, to consider which of the other two IQ task teams they would like to join at the next meeting.

Training and Outreach Task Team
The team looked at definitions in the glossary of the privacy guide and added two terms—"disposition" and "justice professional." The team defined "disposition" to include conviction and suggested changing references to conviction in the privacy guide to "disposition" since the term is more relevant to juvenile justice. The team will coordinate with Ms. Abernathy to develop a definition of "justice professional." (Update: Both definitions were drafted and incorporated into the revised February 2008 version of the privacy guide.)

The team reviewed the IQ Fact Sheet, titled *Information Quality: The Foundation for Justice Decision Making*, to determine whether there is a way to incorporate a juvenile justice scenario. **Action item:** Ms. Steketee and Ms. Southworth will talk with Tony Capizzi about coming up with an information quality scenario for juvenile justice.

The team then finalized the drafts of the *Top Ten Steps to a Privacy Policy* and the Policy Development Checklist. **Action item:** Mr. Skinner will send those documents to Ms. Abernathy via e-mail. (Update: The documents were received, edited, formatted, and submitted to the GAC for approval.)

Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
The group spent the remainder of the time finalizing the IQ dimensions questions, specifically as they relate to the incident report. **Action item:** This group will vet the questions through GPIQWG via e-mail. After feedback is received, a small group of team members who are familiar with the presentencing (PSI) report will take the list from the incident report and determine whether there are questions in PSI that are not addressed in the incident report. (Update: A conference call was held on April 21, 2008, in which a PSI version of the questions was drafted.) The goal is to create a question list that is generalizable across all justice events. This group will then finalize incident report questions based on the gaps between the report and PSI.

Information Quality Program Guidebook Task Team
The team worked on illustrating, in a flowchart (for the guidebook maintenance and use section), the communication of information, based loosely on the Illinois iCLEAR program. The team will hold a conference call over the next two weeks to further writing assignments and will also meet for a drafting session on March 14, 2008, in Washington, DC. The team will also address a model (or checklist) for memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between two agencies sharing information. Mr. Greeves cautioned the team not to duplicate SEARCH's reference model which flows from the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) tool, because information exchanges and standards have been produced there.

Closing Remarks

Chairman Wicklund reminded the participants about the dates for the next GPIQWG meeting, May 6–7, 2008, to be held in the Washington, DC, area (location information to be provided once established). He stated that he appreciated the opportunity to move among each task team's breakout groups and was pleased to observe that everyone was participating and providing input. "I was impressed with the level of discussion and the variety of points of view. We have come up with very solid products because of the diversity of input."

Chairman Wicklund thanked the attendees for their invaluable contributions and commitment of time to the GPIQWG endeavors and encouraged them to continue submitting their ideas for enhancing the deliverables currently in development and their ideas for future products.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attachment A

**Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group Meeting
January 28–29, 2008**

Agenda

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

Embassy Suites DC Convention Center
900 10th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 739-2001

January 28–29, 2008

Agenda—Page One

Capital A Banquet Room

January 28, 2008

1:00 p.m. – 1:15 p.m.

Welcoming Remarks and Introductions
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Agenda review
- Spring meeting date: May 6–7, 2008
- October 9–10, 2007, GPIQWG draft meeting summary

1:15 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.

Global Updates
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Global Advisory Committee (GAC) and Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) updates
  - GESC meeting: January 15–16, 2008
  - GAC meeting: April 9–10, 2008
- U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ, Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) updates
  Mr. Robert Greeves
- Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG) update
  Liaison: *Mr. Alan Carlson*
- GIWG Privacy Committee update
  Liaison: *Mr. Paco Aumond*
- Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG) update
  Liaison: *Mr. Scott Fairholm*
- Global Security Working Group (GSWG) update
  Liaison: *Ms. Cindy Southworth*
- Global Training and Outreach Working Group update
  Liaison: *The Honorable Anthony Capizzi*

2:00 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.

Privacy Forum
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Formation of privacy and intelligence panel
- Fusion centers and advocacy groups

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

Embassy Suites DC Convention Center
900 10th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 739-2001
January 28–29, 2008

Agenda—Page Two

Capital A Banquet Room

January 28, 2008

2:15 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
Privacy Products in Juvenile Justice: Community Feedback
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair, and The Honorable Anthony Capizzi

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Community feedback solicited and received
- Product revisions and future resources

2:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Privacy Technical Assistance Initiative
Mr. Michael Dever, U.S. Department of Justice

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Update on Privacy 101 training development
- Status of fusion center privacy policies and review process

3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.   *Break*

3:15 p.m. – 4:45 p.m.
IQ Dimensions – A Conceptual Approach
Jeanette Plante, Esquire and GPIQWG Vice-Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Direction and concepts
- IQ program versus IQ project
- Core dimensions
- Contextual dimensions
- Results of IQ dimensions review: list of recommendations/additions

4:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Plan for Tomorrow's Meeting and Closing Remarks
Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Priority task: Ten Steps to the Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates
- IQ assessment process
- IQ Program Guidebook draft content
- Training/outreach product and user category matrix
- Plan for juvenile justice product revisions

5:00 p.m.   *Adjournment*

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

Embassy Suites DC Convention Center
900 10th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 739-2001

January 28–29, 2008

Agenda—Page Three

Capital A Banquet Room

January 29, 2008

8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	**Welcoming Remarks and Introductions**

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics
♦ Plan for the day
♦ Deliverable expectations

9:00 a.m. – 9:45 a.m. **Status Reports From GPIQWG Breakouts**

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

15-minute updates on completed tasks, current work, and future plans from each group, as follows:
♦ Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
Mr. Owen Greenspan
♦ Information Quality Program Guidebook
Jeanette Plante, Esquire and GPIQWG Vice-Chair
♦ Training and Outreach
Ms. Cindy Southworth and Ms. Martha Steketee

9:45 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. **GPIQWG Breakouts**

Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair

Breakout groups are as follows:
♦ Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
♦ Information Quality Program Guidebook
♦ Training and Outreach

10:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. *Break*

11:00 a.m. – 12:00 Noon **Resume GPIQWG Breakouts**

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

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

Embassy Suites DC Convention Center
900 10th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 739-2001

January 28–29, 2008

Agenda—Page Four

Capital A Banquet Room

January 29, 2008

1:30 p.m. – 2:15 p.m.	**GPIQWG Breakouts: Interim Status Reports** *Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair*

15-minute updates on progress made, current challenges, and requests for assistance from each group, as follows:

- ♦ Information Quality Assessment Process Task Team
  - *Mr. Owen Greenspan*
- ♦ Information Quality Program Guidebook
  - *Jeanette Plante, Esquire and GPIQWG Vice-Chair*
- ♦ Training and Outreach
  - *Ms. Cindy Southworth and Ms. Martha Steketee*

2:15 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.	**Resume GPIQWG Breakouts**
3:15 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	*Break*
3:30 p.m. – 4:15 p.m.	**GPIQWG Breakout Final Status Reports** *Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair*

Anticipated Discussion Topics

- ♦ 10-minute reports on completed tasks and future plans from each group
- ♦ Anticipated timelines
- ♦ Plan for Global Advisory Committee review (April 9–10, 2008)

4:15 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.	**Action Items and Closing Remarks** *Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair*

Anticipated Discussion Topics

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

4:30 p.m.	*Adjournment*