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

Fairfax, Virginia
June 26–27, 2007

June 26, 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 a meeting on June 26, 2007, in Fairfax, Virginia, at 1:00 p.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

Ms. Cindy Aragon
(for Ada Pecos Melton)
American Indian Development Associates

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

Mr. Robert P. Boehmer
Global Advisory Committee Chair
Institute for Public Safety Partnerships

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

Lieutenant Don Grimwood
Ohio State Highway Patrol

Alan Harbitter, Ph.D.
Nortel PEC
IJIS Institute

Ms. Jane Horvath
Privacy and Civil Liberties Office
U.S. Department of Justice

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. Timothy H. Skinner** *SRA International, Inc.*
Mr. Michael McDonald *Delaware State Police*	**Ms. Martha W. Steketee** *Independent Consultant*
Captain Tim McGrail *Missouri State Highway Patrol*	<u>Staff</u>
Gerard F. Ramker, Ph.D. *Bureau of Justice Statistics* *U.S. Department of Justice*	**Ms. Christina Abernathy** *Institute for Intergovernmental Research*
	Ms. Monique LaBare *Institute for Intergovernmental Research*
Mr. John Ruegg *Los Angeles County Information Systems* *Advisory Body*	**Ms. Terri Pate** *Institute for Intergovernmental Research*

Chairman Wicklund welcomed everyone to the second GPIQWG meeting of 2007 and asked for introductions around the table. He informed the group that the next meeting is planned for October 9 and 10, 2007, at the same location, Hyatt Fair Lakes, Fairfax, Virginia.

Chairman Wicklund reviewed the agenda with the group and emphasized the purpose of the four presentations slated for the day's meeting—to keep GPIQWG abreast of the projects and products concurrently being developed by the other Global groups and subgroups. While today's meeting will follow a presentation and facilitated discussion format, tomorrow's meeting will be in a breakout format for continuing GPIQWG's product development. 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 Security Working Group's (GSWG) Technical Privacy Task Team Presentation: *Implementing Privacy in Justice Information Sharing: A Technical Framework*
- Global Updates, GAC Chairman Robert Boehmer
- Online Data Quality Resources
- IQ Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team: Status Report

GSWG's Technical Privacy Task Team Report

The following members of the Global Security Working Group's (GSWG) Technical Privacy Task Team provided an overview of the task team's newly drafted whitepaper, titled *Implementing Privacy in Justice Information Sharing: A Technical Framework*. These included John Ruegg, Los Angeles County Information Systems Advisory Body and GSWG Technical Privacy Task Team Chair; Alan Harbitter, Ph.D., Nortel PEC and IJIS Institute; and Mr. Alan Carlson, Justice Management Institute.

Mr. Ruegg began by describing to the group the original task with which the GSWG had challenged the task team—to review privacy policy products and determine the technological alternatives for defining those policies in electronically executable policy language. The task team identified the following priorities to meet this challenge: development of a privacy policy technical framework and associated components, application of the framework to a simple use case and a federated query, implementation of the framework, and development of a task progress summary.

The team looked specifically at the justice domain to support privacy policy and focused on the issue of access rather than on the collection of information. The focus of the white paper is not how to write a privacy policy. Instead, the group used the recommendations contained in the *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates* as the business requirements that needed to be translated into technical requirements

that could be validated against a sample use case. Through this process, the team worked to define a technical framework, identified metadata types to support electronic privacy policy implementations, reviewed vendor products and market maturity for designing and deploying policy services, and drafted a summary of design/implementation guidelines.

Mr. Harbitter provided a simplified overview of the technical framework that begins with the written privacy policy and uses technological tools to define domain specifics. These are specific to the justice community and are consistent with the systems currently in operation. A policy governs the actions/requests that a user places on a piece of information (content metadata). Electronic policy statements govern the ability to perform those actions/requests. The team defined the following electronic policy statements: policy decision points (PDP) and policy enforcement points (PEP).

- **Policy Decision Point (PDP)—**The disclosure decision is a function of current context, data category content, user, and where context and/or data category content changes over time via new information events, new context, and/or new data category content, resulting in a new policy disclosure decision.

- **Policy Enforcement Point (PEP)—**PEP is linked directly to the access mechanisms of the justice application.

Policy decision points are enforced with policy enforcement points. Electronic policy statements are supported by context around the situation prompting the action. A written policy must mesh with the PDPs and also with obligations (rules by which one can use/access the information) that are defined in machine-readable format. At the end of this framework is an audit of this process (action). Everything defined, selected standards, identified metadata, tools, and so forth, will fit within this framework.

Mr. Carlson described for the group the method by which the task team developed the electronic policy rule (how policies are abstracted into computer-understandable language). A general authorization policy rule defines what the user is allowed or not allowed to perform: some action on data categories under certain conditions for valid business purpose(s), subject to prior agreement to [optional] obligations. In other words, what are the factors that govern taking a certain action on this data? The term "obligations" implies that "we may let you access this data, but only under certain conditions, and you are obligated to handle the data in a certain fashion." We asked whether privacy policies can be structured according to this authorization policy rule. To convert a privacy policy into rules, we asked: what is the content of the data, what are the conditions, what is its use category, what are the obligations under which this data can be accessed, and so forth.

Categories are:

- **User** categories (who is this person; what is his/her role?),
- **Business purposes** (why do you want to use this information?),
- **Data** categories (areas of justice—courts, intelligence, arrest, etc.),
- **Conditions** on the use of the data (timeframe restrictions, justice sequence stage you are in),
- What **actions** can you take on the data?
- What are the **obligations**?

Mr. Ruegg talked about identified implementation issues (staging). With a traditional legal application (what they are currently dealing with), most of these have an authentication process (identity verification), authorization (program code logic), audit logging, and core application functions. This is the current status, but how do we move into the other framework (legacy application to authentication service)? We are just starting to maintain an external piece of software (a directory) that contains user identifications (IDs), roles, and so forth that you would authenticate against first, prior to using the application (e.g., the authentication is not built directly into the core application). We have to work on moving more of these tasks out of the application itself (e.g., auditing, authorization, validation of credentials). The PDP/PEP will specify what electronic privacy policy pieces need to be contained within the authentication. Then you can manage compliance, the kinds of accesses that are granted, and so forth. You can determine whether your policy supports that access. Now, "advanced identity and access management" products are debuting on the market, which allows you to bring this process out of the application. Other examples are user entitlement software, SOA registry, platform suites, and so on.

Another implementation consideration is the adoption of common open standards. For example, Web Services Federation (WS-Federation): WS-Policy Framework, WS-Trust, WS-SecureConversation, WS-Security, WS-MetaDataExchange, WS-Security Policy, policy assertion language (PAL), and domain-specific vocabulary (e.g., the National Information Exchange Model [NIEM] and Global Justice Extensible Markup Language (XML) Data Model (Global JXDM), privacy and data quality metadata additions). Of particular note: none of the vendors have a vocabulary ready for criminal justice to use. A lot of metadata that we are developing is going into the Global JXDM. One of the next-step items is to confer with the NIEM developers so that we are using common standards/terms. Implementation for this framework will take several years, but this is an industry direction.

Mr. Ruegg stated that the group was collaborating on the privacy policy metadata elements through the use of a Wikipedia "WIKI" at www.privacywiki.org/index.php/Privacy_Policy_Metadata_Requirements. This site is open to anyone who is interested in reviewing the metadata. It contains privacy policy metadata requirements, all of the reference documents that were reviewed throughout development, and key terms linked to definitions.

Training and outreach are critical, as well as performing legal research and understanding the laws governing privacy and disclosure. The next steps are privacy policy pilot projects, continued integration with the Justice Reference Architecture (JRA), and mature metadata and integration with NIEM, Global JXDM, and the Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management (GFIPM).

The following are questions and comments from the working group members, as well as responses from the presenters:

- Mr. Bob Greeves, U.S. Department of Justice, thanked Mr. Ruegg, Mr. Harbitter, and Mr. Carlson for making the technical descriptions readable and understandable by the working group's policy representatives. Mr. Greeves suggested that a more comprehensive glossary of acronyms might be helpful, as well as simplifying the diagrams down to the exchange package level (to show how this works in the real world). Mr. Greeves referenced mature metadata and the need to focus on where this metadata will go: somewhere in the Global JXDM, in the GFIPM module, in software outside these two worlds, and so on. Mr. Ruegg stated that GFIPM metadata is being incorporated into NIEM.

- What is the strategy to pitch this to industry, via working groups or through outreach? Mr. Carlson stated that initially they were given a six-month timeline to complete the framework and that one of their next tasks is to address outreach.

- Ms. Jane Horvath, U.S. Department of Justice, suggested that the Information Sharing Environment (ISE) Privacy Guidelines Committee (PGC) might also be a great source to review this and have it built into the architecture of the *ISE Privacy Guidelines*.

- Mr. Greeves suggested that the task team provide a presentation at an upcoming IJIS Institute meeting at the end of July and also to the vendor arm of the court community.

- Given a best-case scenario, when can people build their bid specifications around this? Mr. Ruegg stated that this could potentially be a next step occurring in concert with the pilots.

- Everyone agrees that this is a great model, but we have to deal with the realities of the legacy systems we are using now. We cannot expect this type of system to be implemented quickly. While no one disagrees that this is valuable, it becomes a daunting task. Mr. Ruegg replied that you could begin building the external services (auditing, authentication, etc.) as the first stage, read the security table in your legacy application, and then make it service-enabled, but that would be costly.

- Regarding the discussion on establishing a relationship between technical specifications and policy language, this framework is a good blueprint, but additional business rules and obligations are still needed. Will this group come up with a model for business rules and obligations? Mr. Carlson stated that federal agencies will need to come up with their own models specific to their needs, but that local and state agencies will look to the pilot projects to develop their models.

- A suggestion was made to expand on the PDP and PEP and test them with real products. Do you plan on writing a reference service of your own that would serve PDP/PEP to provide people with a model that could be readily picked up and used? Mr. Ruegg stated that they were referring more to products that are already commercially available because of the level of technical involvement in developing such a tool and the differences in systems (having to synthesize those).

- Michael McDonald, Delaware State Police, stated that he could see the impact of this on various systems, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) National Data Exchange (N-DEx) endeavor and on Law Enforcement Online (LEO). Do you envision this having an impact on the International Justice and Public Safety Network (Nlets) and the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) that exist today? This is the opposite of how we authenticate users at Delaware's state level. Within the state, we authenticate by user ID, but once the user is passed through to another state, you are a trusted user of Delaware and are not reauthenticated at the state switch. From an interstate perspective, there might be some difficulty for implementing this framework. Mr. Carlson stated that the framework itself would not require changes to Delaware's authentication approach; rather, the PEP/PDP would be an addition to the system. Mr. Ruegg stated that agencies will not need to go into the legacy system; rather, this framework will mean additions to the system externally.

GAC Chairman Robert Boehmer commended the three presenters on their presentation and the work the task team has engaged in. "In looking at various Global working groups and how they affect the other working groups and task teams, this is a great example of how different members from all working groups joined forces to address a complex topic and to develop a product that will benefit the priorities of all the working groups," he said.

Mr. Carlson asked the group if, based on the presentation provided, they felt overall that the framework was a feasible method for converting privacy policy into electronic format: "Do the conditions, obligations, categories, etc., sound like they will work as a way to express privacy rules?" he asked. Mr. Boehmer responded that the approach presented seemed to be a well-reasoned and logical solution to the task with which the team was challenged.

Mr. Wicklund thanked Mr. Ruegg, Mr. Harbitter, and Mr. Carlson for coming and sharing their work with the group and helping them to understand what has grown from their product, the *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*.

Action Item: This document was e-mailed to the group prior to this meeting. Mr. Ruegg requested written comments from GPIQWG by Friday, June 29.

Global Update

GAC Chairman Robert Boehmer provided an update on current and planned Global activities. A primary goal of the GAC is to make certain that the working groups are collaborating. Seeing the work of the GSWG's Technical Privacy Task Team was a clear demonstration of cross-membership strength. The framework presented has tremendous implications for the work of the Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG). For example, the discussions about sensitive and classified information at the Criminal Intelligence Coordinating Council (CICC) are directly applicable to this framework. Mr. Boehmer provided updates on the following Global and Global Working Group activities:

- For the Global intelligence community, the focus is on fusion centers. The first National Fusion Center Conference was held in Destin, Florida, on March 5–8, 2007, and was attended by approximately 550 attendees. It was a huge success. The next conference is planned for March 18–20, 2008, in San Francisco, California. Regional fusion center conferences are also being held.

- The next product for the GSWG is GFIPM. Again, the work on this resource is utilizing cross-membership from those working on the Technical Privacy Task Team. GFIPM was identified as a

priority at the January 2007 Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) meeting to get it moving forward and to seek additional funding.

- For the Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG), the priority is Justice Reference Architecture (JRA).

- Finally, the new Global Outreach Working Group, appointed by the GESC in January, will endeavor to raise awareness of Global and its work. A strategic plan has been drafted. Components of this effort include assistance in translating products into executive overviews to provide Global members with resources to bring back to their organizations and constituencies. Chairman Wicklund stated that it is one thing to develop Global materials, but another challenge is how to present these to Global constituencies—a consistent, compelling message that emphasizes the importance and implications of Global projects. The *Global Highlights* newsletter is one useful delivery tool for getting that message out.

- Another update is the funding and support for Global and Global products. The Global operations line item is around $4 million. Details are still being worked out at the DOJ level (approximately $13 million in appropriations for the entire Global project).

Chairman Wicklund thanked Mr. Boehmer for joining the working group and for his presentation, and he praised Mr. Boehmer's work as GAC Chairman.

Data Quality Resources

Tim Skinner, SRA International, Inc. and IJIS Institute representative, was requested to talk with the group about his recommendations on reviewing a selection of federal publications during the group's development of information quality products. This listing has been made available online at the Office of Justice Programs' (OJP) Information Technology (IT) Initiatives Web site, www.it.ojp.gov under the GPIQWG's Web page: http://it.ojp.gov/topic.jsp?topic_id=55, at the following address: http://it.ojp.gov/topic.jsp?topic_id=237. Mr. Skinner acknowledged that though this listing was primarily federal, he would expand on it with local and state publications. For a copy of the list, refer to Appendix B. This is a quick resource of statutes, regulations, and guides that touch on information quality at the federal level. The biggest mover of data quality requirements is the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which ensures that agencies are following the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) *Fair Information Principles*, http://it.ojp.gov/documents/ OECD_FIPs.pdf. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 28 (28 CFR) contains data quality requirements. A lot of activity is going on with OMB, especially within the Information Sharing Environment, where OMB is sharing terrorism-related information and law enforcement information related to terrorism. Also provided on this site are links to documents at the U.S. Government Accountability Office's (GAO) Web site. This online listing will be developed further by the next time we get together.

Mr. Wicklund recommended adding a compilation of articles and reports on protecting personally identifiable information.

IQ Assessment Tool Task Team Status Report

Ms. Erin Kenneally, eLCHEMY, Incorporated, gave a status report on the work accomplished by the Information Quality Assessment Tool (IQAT) Task Team at yesterday's and today's half-day meetings. Ms. Kenneally led the meetings in proxy for IQAT Task Team Chairman Owen Greenspan, SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, who was unable to attend. Ms. Kenneally began by stating that, given that IQ is a subset of privacy, it is a different concept that needs to be addressed on its own. Ms. Kenneally gave background on how the IQAT came to be established and its overriding goal. We have spent a lot of time trying to determine what IQ is, how it applies to the justice system, and the level at which IQ is handled. We spent a good amount of time inviting presentations at our first few meetings to determine the status of IQ in the justice community. A lot of work has been done on IQ, but not specifically in the justice domain.

There is a vital need for standards and guidance in this area. The task team began its approach with high-level IQ principles (IQ dimensions) and, after reviewing many individual justice events (processes), settled on

the incident report as a use-case example, applying the IQ dimensions to it. The team identified the Information Life Cycle as the model framework for presenting this information in a matrix-structured format. We cannot come up with a granular tool that applies specific metrics to every component of every justice event. This matrix, however, breaks down the flow and management of information (data) into three phases: creation/capture, use and maintenance, and disposition. Each phase drills down into three components: program management (the "who"), policies/procedures (the "what" and "when"), and information technology (IT) implications (the "how").

The IQAT Task Team has set a goal to come up with a reference library of various justice-event use cases; not every event, but several of the core processes (incident report, rap sheet, and sentencing, providing a birth-to-death perspective). Future plans will be to segueway into privacy technical metadata needs.

Mr. Greeves commented that we keep tying these things into specific use-case scenarios. We do not have a library on the specific use cases. There is no government body to define a finite set of justice use cases. This is something that Global should think about taking on at some level. Chairman Wicklund stated that one of the things the task team did was look at a criminal justice system flowchart titled *The Justice System*, developed by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, (BJS) located at http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/justsys.htm (Web page) or http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/cjsflowco.pdf (PDF download). The flowchart identifies and visually pinpoints specific criminal justice events that occur throughout the justice process, from entrance to exit. The flowchart is what we tried to work from in trying to look at use-case scenarios. It is complex when you start talking about the justice system and the compilation of justice processes involved. There is so much more that goes on in civil court that has an impact on what we are doing.

Chairman Wicklund stated that one of the things we discovered when we were figuring out where these IQ dimensions fit within the life cycle (matrix) of an incident report was that when you look at some of these (for example, "completeness"—is there a minimum amount of information required to file?), you really could customize them to many processes. Going through this exercise revealed that a lot of these dimensions and questions were broadly applicable to many justice events. If we can get other players in the system asking these questions, we can do a lot to move our systems forward in IQ. Ms. Kenneally stated that we tried to balance this notion of generalization with practicality. The questions contained within the matrix are general enough to apply to any number of justice information events, while the information technology component of the life cycle has granular practical information. Chairman Wicklund said that we had moved beyond calling this an assessment tool and clarified that it is more of an assessment process.

Ms. Kenneally informed the group that the team's next step is to solicit feedback on refining the questions presented in the matrix by taking it back to their home agencies and requesting input.

The following were comments/questions and responses:

- Who is the audience for this product? Who will be responsible for implementation? Chairman Wicklund replied that this kind of information is important for anyone who is originating or entering information. We need a product that is readable and understandable by all sizes of agencies and departments. Part of this is an evolutionary awareness issue. We are at early stages with IQ, and there are not a lot of drivers out there enforcing it. We are creating a starting point.

- This was one of the cruxes of privacy information when you are looking at sharing information. That is why there is a requirement in the *ISE Privacy Guidelines* that the agency, if passing data for which it does not know the level of quality, notify the receiving agency and provide methods for correcting that information. Once you begin sharing data, your privacy metric rises. This work is integral.

- We are not talking about a database cleanup exercise. We are talking about IQ as an ongoing program (not a one-time task) and a change in habits and values. With the evolution of the *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*, people are becoming more and more aware of this guidance on privacy policy. As people become aware that there is guidance on IQ, they will begin to expect it. The justice system has never considered that IQ is multidimensional.

- Some agencies are doing a lot of things that are data quality-related but they are not calling it data quality. There is a lot of great work going on, but no one knows it because agencies are not using the same terminology.

Privacy Technical Assistance (TA) Providers Meeting

Mr. Alan Carlson, the Justice Management Institute (JMI), gave the group an update on the kick-off Privacy Technical Assistance (TA) Providers meeting, held June 6, 2007, in Washington, DC, to explore getting technical and privacy policy assistance out into the field.

There are several groups, funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), OJP, and DOJ, that could collaborate and provide technical assistance, particularly in the area of privacy policy: SEARCH, JMI, and the Institute for Intergovernmental Research (IIR). BJA realized that each agency (SEARCH, JMI, and IIR) is already working on privacy-related endeavors and decided to put this group together to ensure non-duplication of effort and to leverage the groups' collective efforts toward one common goal.

A series of e-mails on the issue of privacy policy development was sent to each state to solicit interest in doing a pilot and in receiving technical assistance. One goal was to identify one or two states to help go through the entire privacy policy development process and document it as a model. Another was to determine what is already being done and who might already be utilizing the privacy guide. Not only did we ask agencies what kind of help they need, but we also talked about having to determine their resource capacity for going through this process. The action items that came out of that meeting (and some of the participating agencies they are assigned to) are as follows:

- Privacy impact assessment (assigned to SEARCH).
- State/territory point of contact (assigned to Bob Greeves).
- Success stories (assigned to IIR).
- *Ten Steps to the Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates* (assigned to IIR and GPIQWG).
- Application form for TA process (assigned to JMI).
- Criteria and evaluation of pilot states for demonstration project(s) (assigned to IIR).
- Privacy policy process for fusion centers.
- Identification of subject-matter experts.
- Feedback to SEARCH on Compendium of State Privacy Laws' categories.
- National privacy outreach (GOWG).
- Training and TA operational plan (IIR).

Closing Remarks

Chairman Wicklund briefly reviewed the plan for tomorrow's meeting—short presentations from the other three subgroups, with the remainder of the day consisting of working-style subgroup breakout sessions (IQ Guidebook, IQAT Task Team, Privacy in Fusion Centers, and Training/Outreach).

Ms. Horvath has requested that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) appoint a representative to sit in on meetings of this working group because DHS has to report on its efforts to work with local and state agencies, and this group is a good place to meet that requirement.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

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

Fairfax, Virginia
June 26–27, 2007

June 27, 2007—Meeting Summary

Purpose and Meeting Overview

Chairman Wicklund convened the second day's GPIQWG meeting on June 27, 2007, at 8:30 a.m. Chairman Wicklund welcomed the group and went over the purpose of the previous afternoon's meeting—to bring everyone up to speed on the activities of the other Global working groups and projects relevant to GPIQWG's mission. Today, we will begin by hearing an update from Mr. Greeves on current federal projects, move to status reports of the work accomplished to date by the remaining three GPIQWG subgroups (IQ Guidebook, Privacy in Fusion Centers, and Training/Outreach), and spend the remainder of the day in breakout sessions, with time set aside to reconvene for group issue resolution and support. We will finish the meeting with 15-minute briefs from each subgroup on the progress accomplished today and the subgroup's next steps.

Attendees

The following individuals were in attendance:

Chair
Mr. Carl Wicklund
American Probation and Parole Association

Ms. Cindy Aragon (for Ada Pecos Melton)
American Indian Development Associates

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

Mr. Robert P. Boehmer
Global Advisory Committee Chair
Institute for Public Safety Partnerships

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

Lieutenant Don Grimwood
Ohio State Highway Patrol

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

Mr. Timothy H. Skinner
SRA International, Inc.

Ms. Martha W. Steketee
Independent Consultant

<u>Staff</u>

Ms. Christina Abernathy
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Ms. Terri Pate
Institute for Intergovernmental Research

Federal Projects

Mr. Robert Greeves talked with the group about two privacy-related federal projects (supported by IIR): the Information Sharing Environment (ISE) Privacy Guidelines project and the Privacy TA Providers initiative. The ISE Privacy Guidelines Committee (ISE/PGC) has established four working groups: Model Privacy Policy and Implementation Process; Civil Rights and Civil Liberties; Training and Outreach; and State, Local, and Tribal. The PGC is meeting for the first time with the civil rights working group on June 28, 2007. It will be interesting to see how they define issues. Privacy has grabbed a foothold at the higher levels in the federal community for information sharing, and BJA/OJP/DOJ are encouraging involvement in such projects.

Mr. Paco Aumond, Vermont Department of Public Safety, mentioned that he had been requested to participate on the Global Intelligence Working Group's (GIWG) Privacy Committee (fusion centers). Chairman Wicklund stated that it was important to ensure GPIQWG crossover and liaison representation there. Mr. Carlson also serves on that working group. Mr. Greeves stated that there is some overlap between the task focus of the GPIQWG's fusion center subgroup and the GIWG's privacy committee. Though GPIQWG's approach to privacy is more high level and the GIWG's is more operational, there should be combined efforts. Chairman Wicklund stated that we will probably address this overlap at the next Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) meeting. We need to get all the working group chairs together and coordinate our efforts so there is no duplication of effort or conflict. GAC Chairman Boehmer stated that the GPIQWG's fusion center subgroup may be short-term and will soon be dissolved. The GESC is aware of this possibility and is monitoring these efforts.

It is evident that the federal agencies, through the ISE, are not going to share information with fusion centers unless they establish privacy policies that are at least as comprehensive as the *ISE Privacy Guidelines*. There are potential problems coming because states have different privacy policies.

Master Sergeant Kathleen deGrasse, Illinois State Police, stated that she had met with FBI N-DEx representatives. Illinois' privacy policy will state that Illinois owns its data. Master Sergeant deGrasse asked whether anyone had looked into the ownership of data once that data passes to another state. Michael McDonald added that Maryland is an N-DEx state and that his agency contributes data daily. We do not have a formal privacy policy agreement with the FBI except for what we have through NCIC. They did not insist on our having a privacy policy in place before we contributed data. Chairman Wicklund commented that there is some utility over an interstate compact for the information sharing environment between states. Mr. McDonald stated that the work that we are doing is important, but that if we get too wrapped around the axle, information sharing will be disrupted. Ms. Cindy Aragon, American Indian Development Associates, stated that in New Mexico we want to share information with the tribes. We are drafting intergovernmental agreements between the tribes and with New Mexico so that the tribes still have sovereignty.

GPIQWG Subgroup Status Reports

IQ Guidebook

Mr. Paco Aumond provided an update on the work accomplished on sections of the *Information Quality Guidebook*. The guidebook is oriented towards a high-level manager and how he or she would set up an IQ program. It highlights that this is an ongoing process and does not end. At the last GPIQWG meeting, a draft chapter outline was developed for this guidebook. Working on that outline, we turned to the drafting process for the content of those identified chapters. The IQ assessment resource on which the IQ Task Team has been working will end up being pulled into the guidebook in a couple of the outlined sections. A draft of the introduction section was recently completed by Jeanette Plante, Office of Records Management Policy Justice Management Division, U.S. Department of Justice. The introduction emphasizes that IQ is multidimensional and that if you do not have good information, you do not have good decision making. For the purpose of business records, Ms. Plante identifies the phases of the information life cycle and goes on to define those phases. The draft talks about retention and retention policies. We do need to talk a little more on the subject of disposition. Our challenge as we move forward is to reevaluate the outline to determine what content should be included in this guide. The challenge will be defining some of those dimensions, taking a look at disposition, better defining roles and responsibilities, and recommending specific policies and procedures that should be in place. This guidebook could address a vast number of areas. We intend to flesh out the attributes more and identify those as they apply to IQ. Some of them are addressed in the IQ Fact Sheet. Though the dimensions are identified there with basic descriptions, they are not addressed as definitions within the justice process.

Privacy and IQ in Fusion Center Processes

Since the last meeting, Mr. Carlson has drafted a stump speech (or talking points) for fusion centers and has sent it to the breakout group and IIR for review. He used the speech with GAC Chairman Boehmer at several conferences and refined it as they went along. This group would like to find specific negative and positive examples of situations in which agencies have had problems or success with privacy/IQ to show "this is real." These anecdotes are hard to come by. Chairman Wicklund talked about his presentation at the Law Enforcement Information Management (LEIM) Conference with Captain William T. Harris, Delaware Information and Analysis Center. Captain Harris stated that handing the press their privacy policy was a positive experience because it answered a lot of concerns that were raised. (Note: a good positive example.) Judge Tony Capizzi asked whether Mr. Carlson was receiving positive feedback on the stump speech presentation. Mr. Carlson replied that the common response is "Okay, we get it—where's an example?" GAC Chairman Boehmer stated that they had cut down the presentation because there were so many questions and that the questions themselves ended up making the presentation better.

Training/Outreach

Mr. Cabell Cropper, National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA), talked about the progress made by the Training/Outreach group. The stump speech Mr. Carlson and GAC Chairman Boehmer have put together is the basis for the presentation that this group will be assimilating for the NCJA forum at the end of July. The group will be condensing presentations that can be used as the workshop-in-a-box.

Mr. McDonald informed the group that if you are looking for positive success stories, the FBI publishes the *CJIS Link* that highlights success stories on information sharing. Though a lot of stories are focused on fingerprints, there are good examples of high-profile crimes.

Mr. Greeves readdressed Chairman Wicklund's earlier comment about using a general high-level privacy approach versus the fusion center's operational approach. He said that something should be worked out between the GIWG's privacy committee and this one with regard to the fusion center approach. Chairman Wicklund stated that there needs to be a meeting of the working group chairs to discuss the best way to collaborate and deal with the duplication.

<h1 style="text-align: center;">GPIQWG Subgroup Breakout Sessions</h1>

Charge to the subgroups: Chairman Wicklund restated that the plan for today is to spend in-depth time in breakouts to further draft work on these products. He encouraged the Training/Outreach subgroup to talk about how to introduce the dimensions of information quality. GAC Chairman Boehmer said, "When we talk about privacy, we say 'care about privacy' because it's important," and we follow up with practical resources. We need to follow the same patterns for IQ—follow up with practical recommendations.

The Training/Outreach subgroup is led by Cindy Southworth, who was unable to attend. Chairman Wicklund asked Mr. Cropper to lead the group's breakout session. Chairman Wicklund asked the group to come up with a new resource, *Ten Steps to the Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*. This is one of the needs identified by the Privacy TA Providers meeting, and it was discussed that the GPIQWG needs to take the lead in developing this overview.

The subgroups will meet from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. and work on these identified tasks. They will reconvene at 11:00 a.m. with the full GPIQWG membership for group issue resolution and peer support. Chairman Wicklund asked for a list of subgroup members. They are listed as follows, though not all members were present at this meeting (those present are indicated by an asterisk):

IQ Guidebook	Training/Outreach	Fusion Centers	IQAT Task Team
Lead: Jeanette Plante	Lead: Cindy Southworth	Lead: Alan Carlson*	Lead: Owen Greenspan
Paco Aumond*	Cabell Cropper*	Bob Greeves*	Erin Kenneally*
	Erin Lee*	Kathleen deGrasse*	Carl Wicklund*
	Tim McGrail*	Tim Skinner*	Barbara Hurst*
	Martha Steketee*	Frank Higginbotham	Tony Capizzi*
	Steve Siegel	Scott Fairholm	Cindy Aragon*
			Richard MacKnight*
			Don Grimwood*
			Michael McDonald*
			Jeanette Plante
			Robin Stark
			Gerard Ramker
			Mark Motivans

Since the IQ Guidebook group is currently a group of only two, with Mr. Aumond the only member present, Chairman Wicklund stated he would join that breakout session and requested that GAC Chairman Boehmer and Mr. Richard MacKnight, National Institute of Justice, work with that group today. The group is anticipated to grow and be populated with select GPIQWG members and recommended subject-matter experts. It will potentially begin to meet for separate drafting sessions, similar to those held in the development of the privacy guide.

Breakout sessions proceeded with the members reconvening at 11:00 a.m.

GPIQWG Subgroups—Reconvene for Group Issue Resolution and Support

The subgroups met together at 11:00 a.m. to brief the group on the discussions and work that was accomplished during the first breakout session and to discuss any issues or concerns. The following are summaries of these briefs:

IQ Guidebook

This group reviewed the draft chapter outline (provided below) from the previous meeting and revisited the topics there. Mr. Aumond stated that they felt Ms. Plante had done an excellent job of drafting the introduction. The group spent time talking about the second chapter, "Elements of IQ," how to incorporate the dimensions in the IQ Fact Sheet (titled *Information Quality: The Foundation for Justice Decision Making*) into the

guidebook, and how to address those in the justice process. The information life cycle will comprise a section and will map where the dimensions fit within it. The resource being developed by the IQAT Task Team will fit within this chapter. The subsequent chapters, Leadership/Responsibility (who is responsible) and IQ Practice, complete the foundation for developing an IQ program. The dimensions, policy, mapping of information flow, and so forth, will become an IQ program framework. The group also talked about policy templates—applying one information exchange and applying the dimensions to that exchange. We also talked about the fact that this cannot be too simplified since there are a lot of complex subjects that must be addressed.

Draft 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 and Implementation Templates*)
    - 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 audit

Regarding the Leadership/Responsibility chapter, Mr. Aumond raised the issue of encouraging and supporting a movement for the states to designate privacy officers and said there is a lot of pushback on making that a priority with states. Mr. Greeves stated that there are three states with chief privacy officers but no strong movement among the other states. Privacy issues tend to get assigned to the deputy chief information officers (CIOs), while others have different arrangements. Mr. Aumond stated that it all starts with privacy. A privacy officer should establish policies around security, privacy, and IQ. Chairman Wicklund concurred and stated that some agencies operate under the assumption that if they have a security officer, they have privacy covered. It is not true, however, that if you have a privacy officer, you have security covered. When we talk about executive leadership, there needs to be a position tasked with the role of privacy officer.

Privacy in Fusion Centers

This group discussed the stump speech for fusion centers and focused on the concept that when talking about a policy, it is not just privacy. The focus is on information sharing and civil rights and civil liberties, in addition to privacy. The group discussed how to raise awareness of the need to develop a privacy, civil rights, and civil liberties policy, not the process itself. We talked about the reasons we should emphasize to fusion centers for wanting a policy, what can happen if they have none or an inadequate one, and the benefits of having a policy. Different standards and kinds of laws apply to the different kinds of data you have, so centers have to look at the types of data they collect and maintain. We want to add what the GSWG's Technical Privacy Task Team is doing with PDP/PEPs to the discussion, bring in people and show them actual help, such as DOJ links and other references (e.g., OJP IT Web site, the National Criminal Intelligence Resource Center (NCIRC), and possibly www.LLIS.gov—a DHS Web site that provides access only to fusion center employees), use real-life articles, and highlight the ISE's requirement of having a privacy policy to participate in the ISE. The stump speech outline will be converted into a PowerPoint presentation and include talking points to guide the presenter. Master Sergeant deGrasse also raised the issue of addressing privacy policy in state-to-state policies (interstate compacts).

Chairman Wicklund and GAC Chairman Boehmer emphasized that this group should submit talking points through Mr. Aumond for times when he participates on the GIWG's privacy committee.

Action Item: Mr. Carlson will provide a listing of references for loading onto the OJP IT Web site and NCIRC.

Training/Outreach

Mr. Cropper stated that this group looked at the *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates* for developing a one-pager of talking points to brief policy level administrators. We went through the guide's table of contents, came up with ten bullet points, and further interwove IQ into the research piece. The emphasis of this will be: "You need executive sponsorship to get these projects in place." We will continue to refine these and will make them available for anyone making those kinds of briefings. GAC Chairman Boehmer suggested that this might be a good resource to prepare for draft presentation at the October 31, 2007, GAC meeting.

IQAT Task Team

Ms. Kenneally facilitated a comparison (mapping) between the original listing of high-level and low-level questions drafted at the March 2007 meeting and the table of "IQ Dimensions as Applied to an Incident Report," developed at the separate IQAT Task Team meeting yesterday. Then attendees plugged this information into the information life cycle. This mapping exercise was completed for purposes of completeness, to determine whether there were gaps and what areas needed changes or enhancements. Ms. Kenneally stated that the group would like to vet the completed matrix through the GPIQWG and through our home agencies. Refer to Appendix C for the Information Life Cycle of an Incident Report.

The attendees broke for lunch from 11:50 a.m. to 1:20 p.m. Following lunch, attendees returned to their breakout sessions.

GPIQWG Subgroup Breakout Sessions (*Continued)*

Charge to the subgroups: Chairman Wicklund stated that the breakouts would meet from 1:20 p.m. to 2:15 p.m., with a 15-minute break and then (at 2:30 p.m.) reconvene with the GPIQWG for the remainder of the day. Subgroup leads will provide their final status reports (on today's progress) at that time. He requested that each group report on the action items it will be working on between now and the next meeting. One thing that is becoming more apparent is the need to bring in SMEs (Richard Wang, Ph.D., MIT Information Quality [MITIQ] Program, Massachusetts Institute of Technology [MIT], and possibly Larry English, INFORMATION IMPACT International, Inc.) for review and feedback. We will have to talk further about how to approach this and at what point in product development we should solicit SME input.

Breakout sessions were held from 1:20 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. and the members reconvened at 2:30 p.m.

Final Status Reports From GPIQWG Subgroups

IQ Guidebook

Mr. Aumond said that this group went over the chapters of the guidebook and spent a lot of time talking about how the dimensions fit in the context of the justice world. We need to really look at the IQAT Task Team's resource prior to completing this section.   This group discussed the work that Dr. Wang is doing and the need to reengage him in this group. Dr. Wang is currently developing an assessment tool for justice entities, and this working group should collaborate with him. Because of Dr. Wang's academic background and his work at MIT, it is important that we include him in this development. In terms of the substance of where we go from here, we need to start producing draft language.

> **Action items:**
> - Prepare drafts of information around the elements of IQ and around the Leadership/Responsibility chapter.
> - Would like to do a drafting session (in person) and further the drafting work.
> - Prior to the drafting session, Mr. Aumond will take on drafting the definitions of the dimensions in the justice context. The subgroup will review and incorporate those. Mr. Aumond will also draft the Leadership/Responsibility component. *Two weeks' deadline.*

Privacy in Fusion Centers

Mr. Carlson stated that this subgroup continued its discussion from this morning, with Ms. Jane Horvath joining the subgroup as well as the members of the Training/Outreach group. We chose to use the term "data management policy" rather than "privacy policy." The group's focus is not on dictating what fusion centers' policies should look like, but rather on raising the issues (possibly via an overview or a brief document).

The group spent some time discussing what this subgroup is doing that is different from activities of GIWG's privacy committee. We talked about possibly putting together a template for a fusion center privacy

policy. (Concurrent Development Note: In August, IIR developed a template for fusion centers under the Privacy Technical Assistance Project, synthesizing concepts of three state agency privacy policies (Delaware, Iowa, and Indiana), and incorporating the requirements of the *Fusion Center Guidelines*, the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan*, the *Privacy Policy Development and Implementation Templates*, all currently published, as well as several draft guidelines and documents under the ISE, and more. This template, titled *Fusion Center Privacy Policy Development: Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Template*, was vetted through select Global members, as well as the ISE's PGC Training/Outreach working group and the State, Local, and Tribal Working Group. This template was later piloted at the Northeast Regional Intelligence Group meeting, with fusion center representatives. Mr. Carlson was on hand to help facilitate this pilot technical assistance.

Action Items:
- Mr. Carlson will finalize the stump speech so that Mr. Aumond can take it to the GIWG privacy committee.
- Conduct a comparison and gap analysis between the *Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties Policy Templates* and 28 CFR to demonstrate risk areas to fusion centers whose adherence to 28 CFR is their only source of privacy protection guidance.
- Meet with the GIWG privacy committee to collaborate.
- Suggested: draft and gather existing MOUs of state-to-state and state-to-federal compacts to start collecting statements from those sharing agreements.

Training/Outreach

Mr. Cropper said that this subgroup took the executive talking points (ten-steps document) and further finalized them. This group also joined Mr. Carlson and the fusion center subgroup.

Action items:
- Vet the final talking points.
- Develop a PowerPoint presentation, including talking points, within the next couple of weeks.
- Chairman Wicklund will make this presentation at the NCJA forum. The group will evaluate the content and the presentation.

IQAT Team

Ms. Kenneally stated that this group finished transferring information from the questionnaire to the information life cycle matrix format and that group members felt they had made significant progress. Information-quality assessment is a tough subject, and the group is now much farther along in creating a usable and customizable product. The matrix and the questions, processes, and concepts it contains is general enough, yet also specific enough, to be used for other justice information reports/sets of data.

Action items:
- Group members will vet this draft matrix to their home agencies and will also keep track of the types of people who have reviewed it.
- We started with an incident report and then identified several other relevant core justice information reports/sets of data (e.g., rap sheet and presentence report). We will go through the same exercise applying these to other justice events.

Chairman Wicklund commented on how much he appreciated the work and the level of assimilation it took to formulate this framework.

Next Steps and Closing

Chairman Wicklund thanked everyone for all of their hard work and commitment to the tasks and meeting goals. "I appreciate everyone's effort. This group has had a significant impact across a number of levels of government. I think you should be proud of the work you're doing," he said. He reminded the group again of the next meeting date, October 9–10, 2007, at the Hyatt Fair Lakes, Fairfax, Virginia.

Mr. Wicklund adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Appendix A

Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group

Meeting Agendas
June 26, 2007 and June 27, 2007

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

June 26, 2007

Agenda—Page One

Shenandoah/Blue Ridge Banquet Rooms

1:00 p.m.–1:15 p.m.	**Welcoming Remarks and Introductions** *Mr. Carl Wicklund, GPIQWG Chair*

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Next Meeting Date
- March 14, 2007, GPIQWG Meeting Summary

1:15 p.m.–1:30 p.m.	**Meeting Goals and Purpose** *Mr. Carl Wicklund*

Outline of Meeting Topics
- Technical Privacy Task Team
- Privacy and Information Quality (IQ)-Related Initiatives
- IQ and Privacy-Related Resources to Consider
- IQ Assessment Tool Task Team

1:30 p.m.–3:00 p.m.	**Global Security Working Group's (GSWG) Technical Privacy Task Team** *Mr. John Ruegg, Technical Privacy Task Team Chair* *Mr. Alan Carlson, The Justice Management Institute* *Mr. Alan Harbitter, Chief Technology Officer, Nortel PEC, and* *IJIS Institute Representative*

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- History, Background, Time Frame, and Vetting Process
- Privacy: Technical Versus Policy Perspective and Approach
- Technical Privacy Task Team Priorities
  - Technical Requirements
  - Metadata Requirements
  - Technical Software Alternatives
  - Technical Design and Implementation
- Presentation: Technical Privacy Task Team Paper
  - Findings, Recommendations, and Next Steps
- Facilitated Roundtable Discussion
  - Integrate GPIQWG Feedback

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

June 26, 2007

Agenda—Page Two

Shenandoah/Blue Ridge Banquet Rooms

3:00 p.m.–3:15 p.m.	*Break*

3:15 p.m.–4:30 p.m.

3:15 p.m.–3:30 p.m. **Global Updates**
Mr. Robert Boehmer, GAC Chair

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Global Advisory Committee (GAC) and Global Executive Steering Committee (GESC) Updates
- GESC Meetings: August 1, 2007, and October 30, 2007
- GAC Meeting: October 31, 2007

3:30 p.m.–4:00 p.m. **Data Quality Resources**
Mr. Tim Skinner, SRA International, Inc.

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- GPIQWG Data Quality Resources Online
- Recommendations and Benefits of:
  - U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Management and Budget (OMB), U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Multistate Anti-Terrorism Information Exchange (MATRIX), and Other Established Data Quality Resources

4:00 p.m.–4:15 p.m. **IQ Assessment Tool Task Team: Status Report**
Ms. Erin Kenneally, IQ Assessment Tool Task Team
(in proxy for Mr. Owen Greenspan)

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Current Background Material Review
- IQ Assessment Questionnaire
- Product Outline: Information Life Cycle

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

June 26, 2007

Agenda—Page Three

Shenandoah/Blue Ridge Banquet Rooms

4:15 p.m.–4:45 p.m. **Privacy Technical Assistance (TA) Providers Meeting**
Mr. Alan Carlson, The Justice Management Institute

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Background/Purpose
- Participation: DOJ, DHS, GPIQWG, Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG), The Justice Management Institute (JMI), and SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics
- GPIQWG's Development and Vetting Role
- June 6, 2007, Meeting Action Plan Items:
  - Privacy Impact Assessment
  - State/Territory Point of Contact
  - Success Stories
  - Ten Steps to the *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates*
  - Application Form for TA Process
  - Criteria and Evaluation of Pilot States for Demonstration Project(s)
  - Privacy Policy Process for Fusion Centers
  - Identification of Subject-Matter Experts
  - Feedback to SEARCH on Compendium of State Privacy Laws' Categories
  - National Privacy Outreach
  - Training and TA Operational Plan

4:45 p.m.–5:00 p.m. **Closing Remarks**
Mr. Carl Wicklund

Anticipated Discussion Topics
- Plan for the Following Day's GPIQWG Meeting

5:00 p.m. *Adjournment*

BJA Bureau of Justice Assistance

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

June 27, 2007

Agenda—Page One

Shenandoah/Blue Ridge Banquet Rooms

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
♦ Reminder of the next meeting date
♦ Review of June 26, 2007, GPIQWG meeting

8:45 a.m.–9:00 a.m.   **Meeting Goals and Purpose**
Mr. Carl Wicklund

♦ Today is a "Working-Style" Meeting
♦ Anticipated Meeting Plan
  ▪ GPIQWG Subgroup Status Reports
  ▪ GPIQWG Subgroup Breakout Sessions
  ▪ GPIQWG Subgroups—Reconvene for Group Issue Resolution and Support
  ▪ GPIQWG Subgroup Breakout Sessions (continued)
  ▪ Presentations From GPIQWG Subgroups
  ▪ Action Items
♦ Review of GPIQWG Priorities:
  ▪ Information Quality (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

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

June 27, 2007

Agenda—Page Two

Shenandoah/Blue Ridge Banquet Rooms

9:00 a.m.–9:45 a.m.

GPIQWG Subgroup Status Reports: Work Accomplished to Date
(Fifteen-Minute Briefs. Note: IQ Assessment Tool Task Team presented yesterday, June 26, 2007.)

- ♦ IQ Guidebook
  Mr. Paco Aumond (in proxy for Ms. Jeanette Plante)

- ♦ Privacy and IQ in Fusion Center Processes and Guidelines
  Mr. Alan Carlson

- ♦ Training and Outreach/Facets of Privacy and IQ Presentation for Conferences
  Ms. Cindy Southworth

9:45 a.m.–10:00 a.m.

Break

10:00 a.m.–11:00 a.m.

GPIQWG Subgroup Breakout Sessions
Mr. Carl Wicklund

Anticipated Discussion
- ♦ Charge to the Subgroups
- ♦ Subgroup Breakouts:
  - ▪ 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

11:00 a.m.–12:00 Noon

GPIQWG Subgroups—Reconvene for Group Issue Resolution and Support
Mr. Carl Wicklund

Subgroups to Present Issues for Group Discussion
- ♦ 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

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

June 27, 2007

Agenda—Page Three

Shenandoah/Blue Ridge Banquet Rooms

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

1:30 p.m.–2:30 p.m.   **GPIQWG Subgroup Breakout Sessions (continued)**

2:30 p.m.–2:45 p.m.   *Break*

2:45 p.m.–3:45 p.m.   **Presentations From GPIQWG Subgroups**
(Fifteen Minute-Briefs—Work Accomplished Today)

> Subgroup Presentation 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

3:45 p.m.–4:15 p.m.   **GPIQWG Recommendations and Next Steps**
Mr. Carl Wicklund

> Anticipated Discussion Topics
> ♦ Action Items
> ♦ Resource Development Timelines
> ♦ Recommendations for August 1, 2007, GESC Meeting
> ♦ Plan for Recommendations for October 31, 2007, GAC Meeting

4:15 p.m.–4:30 p.m.   **Closing Remarks**
Mr. Carl Wicklund

4:30 p.m.   *Adjournment*

BJA Bureau of Justice Assistance

Appendix B

Federal Data Quality Resource List

Federal Data Quality Resources

Items highlighted in red are recommended for data quality resource use.

Statutes

Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e) (data quality requirements), http://www.usdoj.gov/oip/privstat.htm

The Data Quality Act, Public Law 106-554, Section 515

Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA)

Gramm-Leach-Bliley (GLB) Act , 15 U.S.C. Section 6801, http://www.ftc.gov/privacy/glbact/glbsub1.htm

Paperwork Reduction Act, Public Law 104-13, 44 U.S.C. Section 3501 *et seq.*

National Archives and Records Administration, 44 U.S.C. Section 2101 et seq. (enabling legislation requiring NARA to determine data retention issues)

Regulations

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) *Guidelines for Ensuring and Maximizing the Quality, Objectivity, Utility, and Integrity of Information Disseminated by Federal Agencies*; republication, 67 Fed. Reg. No, 36, at 8452-60, http://www.noaanews.noaa.gov/stories/feb22.pdf

28 CFR Part 123 (data quality requirements for certain criminal intelligence systems)

Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information ("Privacy Rule"), 45 CFR Parts 160 and 164, http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/combinedregtext.pdf

Gramm-Leach-Bliley Privacy Regulations, 16 CFR § 313, 65 Fed. Reg. 33646 (May 24, 2000), http://www.infolinkscreening.com/InfoLink/Resources/LegalIssues/PrivacyIssues.pdf

Policy Guidance and Standards

OMB *Privacy Act Implementation, Guidelines and Responsibilities*, 40 Fed. Reg. 28,948, 28,965 (July 9, 1975), http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/inforeg/implementation_guidelines.pdf

Implementation of the Privacy Act of 1974, Supplementary Guidance, 40 Fed. Reg. 56741 (December 4, 1975), http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/inforeg/implementation1974.pdf

Appendix I to OMB Circular No. A-130, *Federal Agency Responsibilities for Maintaining Records About Individuals,* http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a130/a130appendix_i.html

OMB *Privacy Act Guidance*—*Update* (May 24, 1985), http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/inforeg/guidance1985.pdf

Final Guidance Interpreting the Provisions of Public Law 100-503, the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988, 54 Fed. Reg. 25818 (June 19, 1989), http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/inforeg/final_guidance_pl100-503.pdf

OMB *M-05-15, FY 2005 Reporting Instructions for the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and Agency Privacy Management* (June 13, 2005), http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/fy2005/m05-15.html

OMB M-03-22, *Guidance for Implementing the Privacy Provisions of the E-Government Act of 2002* (September 26, 2003), http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/m03-22.html

OMB M-01-05, Guidance on Inter-Agency Sharing of Personal Data—Protecting Personal Privacy (December 20, 2000), http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/m01-05.html

OMB M-99-05, Instructions on complying with President's Memorandum of May 14, 1998, "Privacy and Personal Information in Federal Records," January 7, 1999, http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/m99-05.html

OMB Circular No. A-130, Appendix I: Federal Agency Responsibilities for Maintaining Records About Individuals, http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a130/a130appendix_i.html

OMB M-7-16, *Safeguarding Against and Responding to the Breach of Personally Identifiable Information* (May 22, 2007), http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/memoranda/fy2007/m07-16.pdf (requiring federal agencies to review their data holdings and ensure that data quality requirements are being met)

U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) *Overview of the Privacy Act of 1974* (May 2004), http://www.usdoj.gov/oip/04_7_1.html (links to discussion and citations to court decisions interpreting agency Privacy Act of 1974 data quality requirements)

DOJ's Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global), Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG), *Privacy, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties: Policy and Templates for Justice Information Systems,* September 2006, at 4 & 17, http://www.it.ojp.gov/documents/Privacy_Civil_Rights_and_Civil_Liberties_Policy_Templates.pdf

DOJ's Global, GPIQWG, *Privacy Policy Development Guide and Implementation Templates,* October 2006, at 7-11, *http://it.ojp.gov/documents/Privacy_Guide_Final.pdf*

DOJ's Global, GPIQWG, *Privacy and Information Quality Policy Development for the Justice Decision Maker,* September 2005, http://it.ojp.gov/documents/200411_global_privacy_document.pdf

DOJ's Global, GPIQWG, *Information Quality: The Foundation for Justice Decision Making*, February 2007, http://it.ojp.gov/documents/IQ_Fact_Sheet_Final.pdf

DOJ's Global, Global Intelligence Working Group (GIWG), *Fusion Center Guidelines: Developing and Sharing Information and Intelligence in a New Era,*

Illinois IJIS Privacy Policy Subcommittee report on "*Privacy Issues Confronting the Sharing of Justice Information in an Integrated Justice Environment,*" September 2006, at 3, http://www.icjia.state.il.us/iijis/public/pdf/PRV/PRV_commiteeIssues_September2006.pdf

DOJ Office of the Inspector General, *Review of the Terrorist Screening Center's Efforts to Support the Secure Flight Program*, August 2005, at 24, http://www.usdoj.gov/oig/reports/FBI/a0534/final.pdf (discussing data quality issues at the Terrorist Screening Center)

U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), *Agency and Reseller Adherence to Key Privacy Principles* (April 2006), http://www.gao.gov/highlights/d06421high.pdf

GAO Highlights—*Key Federal Privacy Laws Do Not Require Information Resellers to Safeguard All Sensitive Data* (June 2006), http://www.gao.gov/highlights/d06674high.pdf

GAO Highlights—*Agencies and Resellers Vary in Providing Privacy Protections* (April 2006), http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06609t.pdf

Other GAO privacy-related testimony and reports can be found at: http://www.gao.gov/docsearch/app_processform.php?app_id=docdblite_topicsearch&submit=search&topic_search=Privacy

Appendix C

Incident Report
as Applied to the Information Life Cycle Matrix

Information Life Cycle of an Incident Report

Information Life Cycle Phases (below):	Components of Each Phase		
	Program Management (Responsible Agency or Individual) **Who**	**Policies and Procedures** (Relationship to IQ Dimensions) **What/When**	**Information Technology** (Relationship to IQ Dimensions) **How**
Creation and Capture	Dispatcher, first responder (i.e., patrol officer), data entry operator, etc.	**Believability:** Is there a reason to question the credibility of the information on the incident report (for example because of the sources of the input)? **Timeliness:** Do you have policy mandates for capture? Do you have timelines for electronic input into the record system? **Completeness:** Is there a minimum amount of information/data (a form) required to file a report? **Concise Representation:** Are there restrictions on the types of information that can be included? **Concise Representation:** Are there rules in place that dictate how information will be captured or documented (i.e., do you allow narratives? If so, is there a threshold limit on length)? **Objectivity:** Does the narrative contain value judgments? **Objectivity:** Is subjective information distinguishable from factual?	Number of steps required for data entry (synchronization from paper to electronic). How does the electronic record correspond to the paper record? What checks and balances are in place when transferring information from analog/paper to electronic? **Accessibility:** In what format is the information collected and stored (electronic or paper)? **Ease of Manipulation:** Is the data electronically entered/transmitted? **Timeliness:** Do you have alerts/prompts that certain records need to be entered? **Completeness:** Are there required fields for reporting? **Completeness:** Is a minimum amount of data (a form) enforced in your information technology record keeping? (Do you have the field or option to enter or expound and provide additional details [a narrative]?) **Objectivity:** Does the narrative contain value judgments?

Information Life Cycle of an Incident Report

Information Life Cycle Phases (below):	Components of Each Phase		
	Program Management (Responsible Agency or Individual) **Who**	**Policies and Procedures** (Relationship to IQ Dimensions) **What/When**	**Information Technology** (Relationship to IQ Dimensions) **How**
Creation and Capture (Continued)		**Relevancy:** Is the information relevant for the task at hand? Is there superfluous information captured? **Reputation:** Do you account for source reliability and/or content validity? **Security:** Are data entry operators screened, commensurate with the sensitivity of the data they are handling? **Security:** Do you exercise sufficient controls to verify the identity of individuals when completing a report? Do all of the data entry components involved in an event conform to quality control procedures? Are the personnel involved with data collection and entry appropriately trained?	**Objectivity/Believability:** What goes into the value judgment of information to be entered? **Concise Representation:** Do you have structured codes/tables (to minimize errors)? **Consistent Representation:** Are the same data fields captured for similar incidents? **Consistent Representation:** Do you use the same underlying data formats (i.e., GJXDM)? **Interpretability/Consistent Representation:** How are null fields handled? What are the implications from a data management format?
Use and Maintenance	Supervisors who have to sign off, investigators, prosecutors, defense, courts, data entry and record-keeping personnel, clerks, researchers, planners	**Value-Added:** Does the information serve a justice business purpose? **Accessibility:** Is the information accessible to anyone who is authorized? Who owns the information?	**Accessibility:** In what format is the information collected and stored (electronic or paper)? **Security/Accessibility:** Does the system enforce and allow credentialed access (role-based access)? Are you in compliance?

Information Life Cycle of an Incident Report

Information Life Cycle Phases (below):	Components of Each Phase		
	Program Management (Responsible Agency or Individual) **Who**	**Policies and Procedures** (Relationship to IQ Dimensions) **What/When**	**Information Technology** (Relationship to IQ Dimensions) **How**
Use and Maintenance (Continued)		Can the original report be corrected or does it have to be supplemented? If so, by whom? If corrections are made, are they propagated both forward and backward? When corrections are supplemented, is the original information retained for evidentiary purposes? Correction mechanism—what is your threshold event for permanence of a record? **Interpretability:** Are the syntax and semantics of the information known and uniform? **Interpretability:** Is there authoritative reference defining codes, terms, etc.? Do you have a mechanism to address new data elements that are needed? **Free of Error:** Is data verified? Are reports reviewed? **Relevancy:** Is the information relevant for the task at hand? Is there superfluous information captured? **Objectivity:** Is subjective information distinguishable from factual? **Reputation:** Do you account for source	**Ease of Manipulation**: Is the data electronically entered/transmitted? If electronically entered and stored, is it in compliance with FBI CJIS standards? **Timeliness:** Do you have alerts/prompts that certain records need to be entered? **Ease of Manipulation:** Can data be aggregated and/or mapped? **Security:** Is there a check and balance or validation to ensure that the data is being used for a justice purpose? **Security:** Do you have authorization, authentication, and access codes on reports? **Security:** Are you in compliance with the current recognized standard for data encryption? **Timeliness:** Do you have an alert system to notify you when records need to be reviewed and potentially disposed of? **Value-Added:** Is there a justice business purpose being served?

Information Life Cycle Phases (below):	Components of Each Phase		
	Program Management (Responsible Agency or Individual) **Who**	**Policies and Procedures** (Relationship to IQ Dimensions) **What/When**	**Information Technology** (Relationship to IQ Dimensions) **How**
		reliability and/or content validity? **Security:** Do you have authorization, authentication, and access codes on reports?	
Disposition		**Security:** Do you have authorization, authentication, and access codes on reports? **Timeliness:** Do you have policy mandates for disposition (retention schedules)? **Security:** Do you have policies governing data dissemination outside of your agency?	**Ease of Manipulation:** Is the data stored electronically? **Timeliness:** Do you have an alert system to notify you when records need to be reviewed and potentially disposed of? **Timeliness:** Do you have an archival storage method for inactive records? If disposition is to move the storage of inactive records, do you have technological solutions for storage/archiving of inactive records? **Security:** Do you have authorization, authentication, and access codes on reports? Are validation rules in place for the electronic transfer of information (format of data)?

The table header "Information Life Cycle of an Incident Report" spans the top of the table.