

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

Scottsdale, Arizona

October 4, 2006

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 or Working Group) convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. on October 4, 2006, in Scottsdale, Arizona. Mr. Robert Boehmer, GPIQWG chair, led the meeting in the furtherance of and alignment with the GPIQWG's *Vision and Mission Statements*.

Attendees

The following individuals were in attendance:

Mr. Robert P. Boehmer, Chair
*Institute for Public Safety Partnerships
University of Illinois at Chicago*

Mr. Paco Aumond
Vermont Department of Public Safety

Mr. John A. Blackburn, Jr.
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Mr. David K. Byers
Arizona Supreme Court

Alan Carlson, Esquire
The Justice Management Institute

Mr. Cabell C. Cropper
National Criminal Justice Association

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

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

Barbara Hurst, Esquire
Rhode Island Office of the Public Defender

Erin Kenneally, Esquire
eLCHEMY, Incorporated

Ms. Susan A. Laniewski
*Justice and Public Safety
Bull Services*

Mr. Richard A. MacKnight
*Office of Science and Technology
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice*

Ms. Cindy Southworth
*National Safety and Strategic Technology
Project
National Network to End Domestic
Violence Fund*

Ms. Martha W. Steketee
Independent Consultant

Mr. Carl A. Wicklund
*American Probation and Parole
Association*

Staff

Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Meeting Overview and Goals

Chairman Robert Boehmer gave an overview of the meeting agenda (refer to Appendix A for complete agenda), which included the following key topics:

- **Information Quality (IQ) Priority Resources—Results of GPIQWG Survey of IQ Resources to Develop**
- **Breakout Groups**
 - **IQ Guidebook**
 - **IQ Assessment Tool**
 - **Privacy and IQ in Fusion Center Processes and Guidelines**
 - **Training and Outreach: Facets of Privacy and IQ Presentation for Conferences**

Chairman Boehmer gave the group an update on the Global Security Working Group's (GSWG) newly formed Technical Privacy Task Team and explained that the task team's goal would be to implement the tasks outlined in the Privacy Technology Task Force report. The new team will bring together technology and privacy policy practitioners. Erin Kenneally, Jane Horvath, Alan Carlson, and Owen Greenspan from GPIQWG will be on the team. The kickoff meeting is scheduled for October 31 and November 1, 2006, in conjunction with the Global Advisory Committee (GAC) meeting.

Chairman Boehmer provided a status update on the information quality fact sheet, entitled *Information Quality: The Foundation for Justice Decision Making*. A GAC review fostered a suggestion from Bart Johnson's office to substitute two positive scenarios (sample scenarios were submitted) rather than using only negative examples of bad information quality. This product is currently undergoing a DOJ review by Hope Janke, Counsel to the Director, and edits submitted by BJA have already been incorporated. Carl Wicklund suggested using, in place of the two positive scenarios submitted by Mr. Johnson, the example given at the Rocky Mountain Information Network (RMIN), Regional Information Sharing Systems (RISS), site visit regarding probation and release. Working group members agreed that the two submitted scenarios related more to the availability of information rather than the quality of the information. The group concurred that a positive scenario was needed and planned to use the RMIN/RISS example. One of the breakout groups at the meeting will draft this scenario.

The *Privacy Policy Development Guide* has been revised, and the latest revision is now available on the Overview CD. The update includes the addition of the *Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Templates for Justice Information Systems*. Chairman Boehmer

informed the group that BJA has requested that the templates be incorporated into the printed guide and that the title be changed to read *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*. Other CD enhancements included the addition of downloadable 28 CFR documents (Parts 20, 22, 23, and 46) and a link to DOJ's online Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) resource.

Regarding the *Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Templates for Justice Information Systems*, it was noted that Alan Carlson's name was missing from the GPIQWG membership list and that there was no acknowledgement to him in the introduction of the Acknowledgements section. The group agreed to revise the templates document to include Mr. Carlson's name and to credit him within the Acknowledgements section.

Chairman Boehmer reviewed with the group the tasks for the remainder of the meeting. The group will break up into four subgroups to each work on one of the top four IQ resources that were identified at the June 29, 2006, GPIQWG meeting. He noted that the IQ fact sheet, *Information Quality: The Foundation for Justice Decision Making*, anticipates that IQ resources are coming soon. Furthermore, BJA has suggested that the group consider privacy as a cycle of events—not just policy but also training, adherence, compliance, violations, etc. For example, BJA is sponsoring the Regional Fusion Center Conferences. A GPIQWG representative should be there to talk about privacy.

Prior to breaking into the subgroups, Chairman Boehmer led a facilitated discussion on the four IQ priorities that were identified via an e-mail vote following the last GPIQWG meeting:

1. IQ Guidebook: This is a long-term resource that the group voted to develop. An outline and starting point on how to develop the guidebook should be determined.
 - A series of components of short-term resources will need to be developed before addressing the guidebook, since the components will become the sections of the guidebook.
 - IQ assessment is a short-term tool. The starting point for the guidebook has to be the development of the assessment tool, but at the same time, the group should also begin creating outlines and a timeline for the guidebook.
 - IQ assessment is part of a bigger picture. Completion of the assessment tool will help further the process of outlining content for the guidebook.
 - A suggestion was made to change the acronym "IQ" to "INFOQ" or something similar, because the term "IQ" might be misleading.
2. IQ Assessment: Dr. Richard Wang and Larry Fisher are very interested in being a part of the IQ Assessment Tool product. GPIQWG needs to establish a small group to develop a process for attaining an IQ assessment and include Dr. Wang and Mr. Fisher later in this resource's development. Owen Greenspan will lead this group.

3. Training and Outreach: GPIQWG has developed privacy policy products and an IQ fact sheet, but a strategy is needed for outreach and for distributing these at various conferences. A work plan is needed. Alan Carlson will lead this group.
4. Fusion Center Guidelines: The GPIQWG focus has shifted to IQ, but privacy should always be considered. The site visits to the Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center (ACTIC) and the RMIN facilities prompted everyone to think about additional privacy products and how to incorporate the *Privacy Policy Development Guide* into fusion center processes. Research needs to be done to determine where the fusion centers may need assistance.
 - Most of the fusion center and RMIN facility staff were not aware of the *Privacy Policy Development Guide*.
 - A primary challenge is to determine whether the fusion centers have a privacy problem and, if so, how to convince them of that fact. These facilities are doing a great job, but possibly GPIQWG can assist them in recognizing privacy issues. There was much concern regarding RMIN's portrayal of privacy and the sharing of information, such as, "Information is only being shared with law enforcement, so what privacy issues are there?"
 - Some level of assurances should be provided to the public. An agency should have some form of publicly available policy for when something goes wrong. A publicly available policy can be informative regarding privacy processes/protections. ACTIC and RMIN/RISS discussed a lot of the elements of privacy protections in their presentations, but it was not readily apparent that the elements employed were packaged into a policy. This may be an area where GPIQWG can provide assistance—to help package privacy elements into a policy or document that can be used later, when needed.
 - The impression given at the RMIN facility was that adherence to 28 CFR Part 23 completes privacy protection. Though RMIN is a clearinghouse of data, it is important to help RMIN recognize its role as an affirmative actor in the privacy protection process as it relates to information distribution. Information sharing and fusion centers need to be aware that information changes as it is transferred, and such centers must not rely solely on a local agency's privacy policies. Not owning the data that is shared does not remove the obligation to protect privacy in its distribution.

Though most fusion centers are end nodes, the vision is for all the fusion centers to eventually be connected. For years, the intelligence community has relied on the guidance of 28 CFR Part 23, yet law enforcement officers do not consider privacy rights except within the statutes that guide some of their processes. An example would be the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division's security policies regarding the National Crime Information Center (NCIC).

In terms of information sharing, is there any way to make privacy policies apply to agencies that access data and to ensure that agencies adhere to them? A memorandum of understanding (MOU) between agencies should outline privacy policies.

Though RMIN is doing well with 28 CFR Part 23, there are privacy considerations that go beyond 28 CFR Part 23. For example, inside an issue of the RMIN internal bulletin (shown to the GPIQWG members) that is distributed to member law enforcement agencies was an article about a missing woman who had recently been located and who did not want her existence and location to be shared with her family. However, the bulletin identified her by name and the town in which she currently lived.

There is a problem with disseminating information about people that has nothing to do with intelligence and in a situation where probable cause has not been reached; the risk becomes higher because there are no standards. A regulation is needed for data that does not reach "reasonable suspicion," and the issue is "Where and to whom do you disseminate it." For example, an individual may be suspected of having committed a burglary based on an eyewitness's identification. That information may be entered into a database that is accessed by a fusion center. As such, someone in law enforcement may see and act on that information. ACTIC and RMIN assert that "only law enforcement agencies" have access to the information, but there are plenty of examples of law enforcement misuse.

- GPIQWG should consider the oversight committee at ACTIC to encourage awareness of privacy considerations. There may be a counterpart oversight advisory group over RMIN or even a national entity over the RISS Program that has the leadership to raise awareness and add privacy policy to their agenda. The RISS National Policy Group sets policies for the RISS community. It might be beneficial to invite the RISS chief executive officer (CEO) to a future meeting to discuss RMIN's privacy policies and procedures. The presentations given at both the ACTIC center and the RMIN/RISS facility addressed the more day-to-day tasks, but GPIQWG's privacy endeavor relates more to policy and administrative tasks.
- Privacy considerations with regard to ACTIC and RMIN/RISS are an information sharing issue rather than an intelligence/fusion center issue because the data begins at the information sharing stage before it ever becomes intelligence. Fusion centers are a step up from information sharing, linking items of information together into intelligence. Rather than reinventing the law enforcement criminal intelligence analyst process, GPIQWG is concerned with advising who should share what with whom and when. One avenue may be researching intelligence analyst training curricula to see whether there is a section on privacy and legal ramifications that could be enhanced. In Arizona, information sharing law enforcement agencies have to complete and adhere to the privacy components of the Terminal Operator Certification (TOC).

- It is important that GPIQWG work through the Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG) (for example, Russ Porter) and possibly through BJA because of their heavy involvement with these facilities.

Subgroup Outlines

The GPIQWG membership divided into subgroups and worked to draft initial outlines for developing or addressing each of the four priorities. The following are the outlines each group developed:

IQ Guidebook

Bob Boehmer, Paco Aumond, and Carl Wicklund

Proposed chapter outline:

- Introduction
 - Why is IQ important?
 - What is the purpose of the guide?
 - How do you use the guide?
 - Who is this guide for?
- Elements of IQ
 - Definition (IQ, data versus information)
 - Dimensions
 - Recognize traditional measures of accuracy, completeness, and timeliness, explaining that these are still involved but expanded
 - Some dimensions on input, output, storage, and retention
- Assessment
 - Audit methods
 - Baseline measurements
 - Mr. Greenspan's IQ Assessment Tool
- Leadership/Responsibility
 - Who is responsible?
 - End user responsibilities
 - Executive sponsorship
 - Who is responsible for commercial data providers?
 - Governance
- IQ Practices (and policies, if necessary)
 - Elements (Who can edit?)
 - Roles
 - Corrections, recourse
 - Policy development (follow similar steps as in the *Privacy Policy Development Guide*)
 - MOU issues/elements
 - Expunge/seal

- Completeness
- Auditing
- Dispute resolution
- Governance
- Gap analysis/legal review—include liability

- Training and Outreach
 - Why should everyone care?
 - What should be included?
 - Who should be trained?

- Appendices
 - Sample policies
 - Model policies
 - Sample/model MOUs
 - Checklists
 - Sample/model assessment tools
 - Sample/model audits

IQ Assessment Tool

Owen Greenspan and Erin Kenneally

Objective: A self-inspection methodology that enables justice entities to measure and periodically reevaluate information quality. Individual criteria will be summed to produce an information quality score.

Target:

- Source agencies that share information with integrated justice systems
- Integrated systems

Process:

- Examine current auditing processes and criteria
 - What do audits mean in the law enforcement world (FBI CJIS process and NCIC)?
 - Audits of National Fingerprint File (NFF) conducted by FBI CJIS.
 - State agency auditing processes and how states audit local agencies (for example, NCIC).
 - What does auditing mean in relation to the non-law enforcement components of justice systems engaged in justice information sharing? Seek assistance from GAC members.

- Identify and define the quality dimensions
 - Review Dr. Wang's and Mr. English's materials with the expectation that the scope will be broader than accuracy, completeness, and timeliness (e.g., reliability, believability).
 - Get input from potentially impacted entities.

- GAP analysis and needs assessment
 - Quality criteria alongside audit practices. Can audit practices provide measurable data for scoring?

- Sampling
 - Develop guidance for sampling data to assess quality dimensions.
- Develop a scale to score dimensions using objective criteria for assigning scores. (For example: Completeness may be 99 percent, which gives a 100 percent score.)
 - This step identifies strengths and weaknesses.
- Not all dimensions will likely lend themselves to numeric scoring and will need to be treated differently in the self-assessment.
- Formula that yields an overall score
 - Judgments about building a weighted formula.
 - Flexibility to adjust weight in different contexts.

Instruction:

- How to conduct?

GPIQWG discussion regarding "Sampling/Developing a scale to score dimensions"

- In an incident, what is the priority for which element to look at first?
- If part of coming up with a number is a ratio for the distance to reaching the 100 percent goal, it may be best to use a relative value concept. (For example: What is the overall weight and priority of one dimension over another?)
- The methodology described above relates to a project on integrated systems by the University of Albany's Center for Technology in Government (CTG) called the Capability Assessment Tool. GPIQWG might be able to leverage or strengthen this tool and ensure that IQ is integrated into one of its nine different pillars. One of the Capability Assessment Tool pillars should be privacy/IQ.

Training and Outreach

Alan Carlson, Cabell Cropper, Barbara Hurst, and Cindy Southworth

Objective: To create a demand to improve privacy/civil rights/civil liberties protections.

- Sell
- Help

Sell: First, encourage awareness of the need to review and revise privacy/civil rights/civil liberties policies and business practices; then offer training and assistance.

- 1) Teaser—Why is there a concern regarding privacy/civil rights/civil liberties protections?
 - a) Research and locate oversight/leadership groups and professional meetings that might provide some agenda time.

- i) Plenary session, as well as breakout
- ii) At existing meetings of groups
- iii) Use speakers who have credibility with audience
- iv) Prepare basic speech and notes for use by speakers using the same concepts as the IQ fact sheet:
 - (1) Why important; risk assessment
 - (2) Major elements; IQ as well as privacy
 - (3) Hot spots
 - (4) Need for and finding the champion

Teaser examples the group suggested—MATRIX, Enron, etc.

Provide short video clip or Flash demo demonstrating poor information quality or a privacy-related event. Then, include "For further information, go to a Web link."

- b) Resources
 - i) Identify opportunities—prepare a spreadsheet of groups, contacts, meeting dates, and valued speakers (subgroup)
 - ii) Prepare a “stump speech” with notes (AC)
 - (1) Request examples and horror stories (BH)
 - iii) Go to meetings and present (GPIQWG members)
 - c) Timeline—begin immediately
- 2) Special condition in requests for proposals (RFPs), proposals, and grants
- a) Add a special condition to BJA funding, such as an existing special condition to be Global JXDM-compliant
 - b) Initially, conditions would require applying agencies to:
 - i) Do a gap analysis of existing privacy/civil rights/civil liberties policies and business practices; what do you have?
 - ii) Discuss what you will do to address the gaps
 - c) Identify what types of grants this would be applicable to
 - d) As more materials and training are developed, require them to develop/revise policies
 - e) Resources—look at existing special conditions (Tom O’Reilly assist)
 - f) Timeline—draft proposed condition immediately; start approval process
- 3) Mass communication/distribution of materials, including notice of availability of materials
- a) Notice of CDs and Global Web site

- b) Ghost-written article for publication in newsletters, professional journals, etc.
 - i) International Association of Chiefs of Police's (IACP's) *Police Chief* magazine
 - ii) *Government Technology* magazine
 - iii) *Court Manager* magazine
- c) WEBinar, podcast with basic pitch/message on privacy and help available
- d) Ongoing distribution of information about recent accomplishments and enhancements
- e) Resources—draft article (AC)
- f) Timeline—in next month

Help: Once agencies are in a position to move forward on privacy protection issues, how can GPIQWG help them get started?

- 1) Offer miniworkshops “attached” to another conference or meeting
 - a) Half- to one-day; before or after
 - i) Examples: Tenth National Court Technology Conference (CTC 10), National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA), SEARCH, Global events
 - b) Agenda goals would be to:
 - i) Catalyze jurisdictions to move forward
 - ii) Point out what is available to help them (guidelines, templates, etc.)
 - iii) Jump-start the policy development process
 - iv) Identify hot spots
 - v) Identify and convince champion; person who attends is initial champion, with job to find the “ultimate” champion
 - vi) Who needs to be at the table?
 - vii) Leave with an action plan to draft a policy
- 2) Resource list/listserv; peer-to-peer network
 - a) Assemble a list of people who are working with these issues in jurisdictions
 - b) Use the list to seek ideas and information and to disseminate ideas and approaches
 - c) Regional groups as well as national
 - d) Resources—people who are doing speeches

- e) Timeline—evolves as jurisdictions who have done something are identified
- 3) Technical assistance to jurisdictions
- a) Do a field survey and solicit feedback on the type of assistance that is most needed.

GPIQWG discussion notes:

- If privacy products and IQ resources are bundled together for outreach, it may be limiting or difficult, rather than separating training and outreach for each approach independently.
- Though this [above suggestion] may be a good approach at some point, GPIQWG is just beginning to develop IQ resources and may not be ready to separate them.

Fusion Centers

Martha Steketee, Susan Laniewski, Bob Greeves, John Blackburn, and Richard MacKnight

In what way should GPIQWG approach fusion centers to encourage them to evaluate privacy protections and to develop a privacy policy? Note that fusion centers are at various stages of development and there may be practices already in place.

Task 1: Raise awareness among fusion centers of the importance of developing a privacy policy. This could be internal or external. Apply the fact that fusion centers are designed for the appropriate sharing of information. Demonstrate the benefits of a privacy policy and how a publicly available policy is beneficial in the event of a crisis. GPIQWG needs to encourage fusion centers to communicate the privacy policies already in place.

Subtasks:

- Communicate the importance of a privacy policy to fusion center leadership at regional meetings and other forums.
- Develop a brochure for the general public or for training that describes the fusion center process. An example might be a basic privacy policy posted on Web sites.
- Help fusion centers become ready to respond by inventorying privacy policies through a privacy policy audit.

Task 2: Identify a fusion center at the state (or states) level that can be the “poster child” or success story; for example, Arizona, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New York.

- ACTIC is a long-term, established fusion center and could be a pilot candidate.
- Massachusetts' new fusion center recently completed an audit that may be useful as a sample.
- Vermont and New York are colocated fusion centers. A fusion-to-fusion comparison might be beneficial for the purpose of developing a road map.
- GPIQWG should consider using Iowa (via Russ Porter) as an example.

In a fusion center, there are various kinds of assessments going on: public records assessment or information that is available to the general public. The next step is the analyst handing over this gathered information to law enforcement. Are there collation and dissemination requirements?

Subtasks:

- Take advantage of regional centers and conferences to gain access to multiple fusion center directors and encourage them to explore on an operational level (or develop commonalities of) privacy processes across management. There are different levels and different focuses based on those levels.
- Examine the expansion of fusion analysis capabilities to support nontransnational first response (e.g., bioterrorism, pandemics, and natural disasters).

Products:

- Publicly available version of the privacy policy (public relations kind of product)
- Checklist for fusion centers to use in developing their audit
- F.A.Q. (for public and for internal use)
- Workflow
- Identify and compile operational/tactical privacy checkpoints to support information exchange and assessment (different types of policies can apply to each level of workflow). There is no blanket privacy policy that covers everything at a fusion center, such as highly sensitive information, etc.

GPIQWG comments:

Chairman Boehmer stated that GPIQWG needs to ensure that this endeavor ties in to the efforts of the GIWG and the Criminal Intelligence Coordinating Council (CICC).

Action Items

Following the subgroup outline presentations, the group identified general tasks related to current or former GPIQWG products, as well as action items for developing the new resources and addressing the priorities, in preparation for the next GPIQWG meeting:

- When incorporating the *Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Templates for Justice Information Systems* into the *Privacy Policy Development Guide* as Appendix A, add into Appendix A's introductory cover sheet an acknowledgement to Alan Carlson and the Justice Management Institute. Mr. Carlson suggested that it be added in the introductory text in the Acknowledgements section of the templates.
- Draft and send a thank-you note to Bart Johnson, New York State Police, and his staff for their submission of two positive scenarios for incorporation into the latest information quality resource—*Information Quality: The Foundation for Justice Decision Making*.
- Draft and send out thank-you letters from GPIQWG to the Arizona Counter Terrorism Information Center (ACTIC) and the Rocky Mountain Information Network (RMIN) staff for allowing the GPIQWG members to visit their facilities and for their comprehensive presentations.
- Reach out to the staff coordinating the fourth Regional Fusion Center Conference to see whether the scheduled presentation on Global products and the *Privacy Policy Development Guide* could also include some discussion on GPIQWG's concerns regarding privacy policies in fusion centers. It would be beneficial to offer assistance to fusion centers in identifying the privacy elements within their operational policies and to help them package that information into a privacy policy. In addition, GPIQWG needs to request volunteers to do a pilot with GPIQWG working through this task. Richard MacKnight, who is attending the conference, will contact Russ Porter, who will be giving the Global products and privacy presentation, to see whether he can incorporate these suggestions into his presentation.
- Christina Abernathy will send out the four subgroup outlines to the GPIQWG membership and ask them to decide which product they would like to continue working on to further these outlines.
- The GPIQWG majority agreed that the product to develop first is the IQ Assessment Tool. Chairman Boehmer suggested that a meeting be held prior to the next GPIQWG meeting and then follow up a few weeks later with a GPIQWG meeting.

Bob Greeves gave a PowerPoint presentation on the BJA Resource CD and described the products that are contained within it. Mr. Greeves highlighted the products and tools that might be applicable to the GPIQWG's member agencies and to GPIQWG's goals.

Next Steps

A meeting of the IQ Assessment Tool group will be coordinated to occur prior to the next GPIQWG meeting. Owen Greenspan will lead that group.

Mr. Greeves suggested inviting a RISS representative (such as Jerry Lynch) to speak to the GPIQWG regarding RISS's perspectives.

Chairman Boehmer concluded that the site visits really gave the group a good perspective in regards to privacy and information quality. Mr. Greeves suggested that the GPIQWG consider making another fusion center or RISS facility site visit.

Chairman Boehmer also suggested that a presentation on GPIQWG products be made at the National Fusion Center Conference to be held in March 2007.

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

APPENDIX A

Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group

Meeting Agenda

October 4, 2006

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



Scottsdale Marriott Suites Old Town
7325 East Third Avenue
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251 ♦ (480) 945-1550



United States
Department of Justice

October 4, 2006

Agenda—Page One

First Health Conference Center

- 8:00 a.m.–8:30 a.m. *Continental Breakfast*
- 8:30 a.m.–8:45 a.m. Welcoming Remarks and Introductions
Robert Boehmer, GPIQWG Chair
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ♦ Update on Technical Privacy Task Team
 - ♦ Status of *Information Quality: The Foundation for Justice Decision Making*
 - ♦ Update to the *Privacy Policy Development Guide* Overview CD
 - ♦ Finalized *Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Templates for Justice Information Systems*
- 8:45 a.m.–9:00 a.m. Meeting Goals and Purpose
Robert Boehmer
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ♦ Review of GPIQWG's Privacy and IQ Priorities
 - ♦ Fusion and RISS Center Site Visits
 - ♦ Information Sharing Environment (ISE) Guidelines
- 9:00 a.m.–10:00 a.m. Facilitated Discussion: Information Quality Priority Resources
Robert Boehmer
- Anticipated Discussion Topics
- ♦ Results of GPIQWG Survey of IQ Resources to Develop
 - ♦ Formation of Subgroups for Each Resource
 - ♦ Charge to Subcommittees
- 10:00 a.m.–10:15 a.m. *Break*
- 10:15 a.m.–11:45 p.m. Breakout Session: Information Quality Subgroups
- Subgroup Discussion Topics
- ♦ IQ Guidebook
 - ♦ IQ Assessment Tool
 - ♦ Privacy and IQ in Fusion Center Processes and Guidelines
 - ♦ Training and Outreach/Facets of Privacy and IQ Presentation for Conferences

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



Scottsdale Marriott Suites Old Town
7325 East Third Avenue
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251 ♦ (480) 945-1550



United States
Department of Justice

October 4, 2006

Agenda—Page Two

First Health Conference Center

- 11:45 a.m.–1:15 p.m. *Lunch (on your own)*
- 1:15 p.m.–2:15 p.m. Breakout Session: Information Quality Subgroups (continued)
- Subgroup Topics
- ♦ IQ Guidebook
 - ♦ IQ Assessment Tool
 - ♦ Privacy and IQ in Fusion Center Processes and Guidelines
 - ♦ Training and Outreach/Facets of Privacy and IQ Presentation for Conferences
- 2:15 p.m.–3:00 p.m. Recommendations From Subgroups
- Subgroup Topics
- ♦ IQ Guidebook—Outline of Tools to Be Contained Within
 - ♦ IQ Assessment Tool—Target Standard, What Will Be Assessed, Process for Assessment, Etc.
 - ♦ Privacy and IQ in Fusion Center Processes and Guidelines:
 - Is the privacy component adequate for fusion centers?
 - Does the *Fusion Center Guidelines* document address IQ?
 - ♦ Training and Outreach/Facets of Privacy and IQ Presentation for Conferences
- 3:00 p.m.–3:15 p.m. *Break*
- 3:15 p.m.–3:45 p.m. Additional Privacy Issues
Robert Boehmer
- 3:45 p.m.–4:15 p.m. Next Steps
Robert Boehmer
- 4:15 p.m.–4:30 p.m. Closing Remarks
Robert Boehmer
- 4:30 p.m. *Adjournment*