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Message from the Chairman
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The Global Justice Information Network is an ambitious initiative to develop and implement a standards-based information exchange capability that provides timely, accurate, complete, and accessible information in a secure and trusted environment. The effort seeks to incorporate existing systems, promote new capabilities, such as Web-based and Internet technologies, ensure compatibility, and reduce redundancy. The ultimate goal, of course, is to ensure that justice information in different media — including criminal history records, mugshots, and fingerprints — is readily available to the justice community on a need-to-know basis.

The value of a global justice information capability is that it is good for operational justice officials, including cops on the beat, deputy district attorneys, probation officers, and judges; it enables all disciplines in the justice community to produce better quality justice delivered in a more timely manner; and it results in safer communities because the currency that drives the justice system — information — is more readily, easily, and quickly available.

The Global initiative encompasses a number of multiple, ongoing activities undertaken by five Working Groups, one of which is the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group. As Chair of the Advisory Committee overseeing this effort, I am pleased to present this document, which is the first report produced by the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group.

Infrastructure is the primary building block upon which the rest of the Global capability rests; the importance of its role in this effort cannot be understated. This report is intended to communicate the Working Group’s early vision of infrastructure so as to obtain feedback in preparation for the Group’s final report. Our intention is to invite input from a wider range of justice officials than is represented on either the Working Group or the Advisory Committee.

Simultaneous activity by the other four Global Working Groups in such topic areas as privacy, security, resources, and operations, is ongoing, and reports on their efforts are expected in the near future. All of the Working Groups are making valuable contributions to this worthwhile effort.

Meanwhile, I would like to thank the members of the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group, and its chairman, Mr. Gerry Wethington, for their significant efforts in the preparation of this report. We value your input on this report, and look forward to your comments and suggestions.

Col. Mike Robinson
Chairman
Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee
Message from the Chairman
Infrastructure/Standards Working Group

The Infrastructure/Standards Working Group of the Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee is pleased to present this report, which the Working Group prepared and which is being released under the guidance and approval of the full Global Advisory Committee.

I would like to thank the members of the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group for their hard work and dedication in preparing this report. We intended for this report to serve as an introductory report of the Working Group’s progress to date within the larger Working Group effort. This introductory report will provide the justice community at large with a flavor of the particular issues and challenges involved in building the infrastructure so necessary to creating a global justice network capability. The issues involved in this effort are significant and affect officials in all justice disciplines; we realized that informing the justice community at large of these issues early on is crucial.

This report does not cover the work of the entire Global Advisory Committee effort. There are particular issues that are either not addressed in this report, or that are addressed very briefly, that will be the subject of subsequent reports to be published by the Global Advisory Committee. Some of these will be based on the work of other Working Groups within the Advisory Committee structure that have other focuses, such as privacy and security, and concept of operations.

As mentioned, this report is being released in summary fashion to inform the justice community of the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group’s work. While our work is not complete, we are seeking the broadest input and feedback about our views of the role of infrastructure in the context of the Global Justice Information Network initiative. We encourage and welcome all comments, suggestions, and recommendations; submission instructions are on Page 36 of this report.

Our intent is to use this feedback to better inform our efforts and to assist us as we prepare our final infrastructure report, which we hope to release in 2001. If funding is available, the Working Group is also proposing a national inventory of criminal justice infrastructures, and a national requirements analysis of justice officials from all justice disciplines.

Gerry Wethington
Chairman
Infrastructure/Standards Working Group
Global Justice Information Network
Advisory Committee
Executive Summary

The Vice President’s report, Access America: Reengineering Through Information Technology, identifies the creation of a “Global Justice Information Network” as a critical information-sharing need of the entire justice community. The Attorney General has taken a leadership role in the resulting Global Justice Information Network initiative, and has created an advisory committee of users to assist in the effort. The initiative envisions safer communities through cooperative and collaborative efforts to ensure that vital information is readily available to the members of the justice community as they perform their critical duties.

The attainment of a global level of justice information sharing can most efficiently be accomplished by using state-of-the art technologies to create a new network capability rather than creating a new network. Where possible, the goal is to enhance, expand, and link the current networks and systems under open, Web-based standards that enable a broader sharing of justice information.

The Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee is chaired by Colonel Michael Robinson, Director, Michigan State Police, and current president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. The Global Advisory Committee is a “group of groups,” made up of the associations and advisory boards whose constituent members represent justice automation planners and managers; justice information practitioners; and, most importantly, the end users themselves.

This introductory report regarding infrastructure was prepared by the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group under the guidance and approval of the full Global Advisory Committee, and anticipates the future work of the Working Group and the Committee. The purpose of this brief report is to provide the reader with the Working Group’s view regarding the role of infrastructure in developing a global justice network capability, and to ask for feedback on that view.

Section I of this report provides background on the Global Justice Information Network initiative, the Global Advisory Committee, and its five Working Groups; describes the purpose of this report; provides a definition of justice system infrastructure and an overview of the unique infrastructure challenges involved in creating a global network capability; and outlines the three steps needed to undertake a strategic plan for infrastructure development. These three steps are discussed in greater detail in sections II through IV.

Section II addresses the need to define user operational requirements of a Global Justice Information Network capability, and looks at the issue from the perspectives of the information management roles and responsibilities of government; the model functions of a global capability; and the guiding principles for developing such a capability. The section also briefly discusses the role of Web-based technologies in the development of the global network capability.
Section III addresses the need to identify the existing national infrastructure and capability for justice information sharing, and touches briefly on a number of national networks and associated systems, and lists other systems and telecommunications networks at the international, national, Federal, State, local/regional, and multistate levels.

Section IV addresses the third step in any infrastructure strategic plan: that of identifying the gaps between user operational requirements and the capabilities offered by existing infrastructure, and the need to develop a transition strategy that bridges the gap between the two.

Section V outlines the current initiatives that are contributing to the Global Justice Information Network capability, including Federal leadership initiatives that are assisting in the improvement of State and local justice information systems, as well as system integration efforts at the Federal and State levels.

Section VI, Conclusion, summarizes the major points of the report and provides contact information for the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group Chair, who is soliciting input from the justice community at large regarding this introductory report on infrastructure in relation to the Global Justice Information Network capability initiative.
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I. Introduction

The Global Justice Information Network

Vice President Gore’s 1997 report, Access America: Reengineering Through Information Technology, outlined his vision of delivering government services electronically and contained 18 major proposals to make government work better and cost less by reengineering through information technology. These proposals addressed a range of areas, including tax filing, export assistance, e-commerce and electronic benefits transfers, as well as public safety and criminal justice. In particular, Chapter A07 of that report, which addresses the information technology needs of the nation’s criminal justice community, identifies the creation of a “Global Justice Information Network” as a critical information-sharing need of the entire justice community. The Global Justice Information Network initiative resulting from the Access America report envisions safer communities through cooperative and collaborative efforts to ensure that vital information is readily available to all members of the justice community as they perform their critical duties. As the report states, “A Global Criminal Justice Information Network … would allow the criminal justice community to immediately share comprehensive case management, incident, and investigative data across local, regional, state, national, and international boundaries. Quick and easy access to law enforcement incident and arrest records would assist all components of the criminal justice community in apprehending, charging, prosecuting, and convicting criminals.”

While the law enforcement community has long established a significant information-sharing infrastructure, and currently shares critical information among a majority of its own members, the other sectors of the justice community are at various stages of infrastructure development and information sharing. The level of information sharing anticipated by the Access America report can only be attained by a significant cooperative effort by all disciplines within the justice community, including a common approach to making the best use of advancing information-sharing technologies.

1 The Access America report is available on-line at http://www.accessamerica.gov/reports/access.html.
2 Chapter A07 is available on-line at http://www.accessamerica.gov/reports/lawenf.html.
3 As used in this report, the terms “justice community” or “justice entities” refer to all justice disciplines, including law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, public defenders, the courts, corrections agencies, probation and parole departments, and other agencies that are directly involved in the justice process. The terms include both adult and juvenile agencies, as appropriate.
4 An example of how such information sharing could work in the real world is presented as Appendix A, which is an excerpt from a report by the National Association of State Information Resource Executives (NASIRE). While the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group appreciates the excellent description in the NASIRE report, the Working Group feels the scenario omitted a critical point: that positive identification should be based on fingerprints rather than a name check only, and that such positive identification affects the quality of decisionmaking after arrest, including decisions on charging, bail setting, sentencing, security classifications, etc.
The attainment of this level of justice information sharing can be accomplished most efficiently by using state-of-the-art technologies to create a new network capability rather than a new network. Where possible, the goal is to enhance, expand, and link the current networks and systems under open, Web-based standards that enable broader sharing of appropriate information. As new systems are designed within each justice discipline using the new technologies (Internet and Internet-like), they can be linked to the existing enhanced networks, bringing increased benefits to the new users and, at the same time, adding value to the nationwide infrastructure.

The Global initiative is not a separate effort creating additional opportunities for redundancy or conflict regarding national justice planning, policy, and standards setting. Rather, it is an effort to advise the Attorney General regarding the concurrent planning and design efforts now underway in the area of justice systems integration, as well as to advise the Attorney General regarding the new and developing technologies that bear upon justice information sharing. Those tasked with undertaking the Global initiative will make recommendations to the Attorney General regarding the coordination and improvement of those efforts, and the effective employment of those technologies that might be accomplished through the Office of the Attorney General.

The Global Advisory Committee

In response to the call for a Global Justice Information Network in the Vice President’s Access America report, the Attorney General has taken a leadership role in coordinating the effort with local, State, tribal, Federal, and international justice entities. For advice in this effort, the Attorney General created the Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee. The purpose of the Committee is to define the core requirements of a Global Justice Information Network capability, specifically to include security and privacy protections, and to identify the challenges, such as funding, standards, and leadership, that might delay the network capability’s implementation. The Committee is a presidential advisory committee chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and is presently chaired by Col. Michael Robinson, Director of the Michigan State Police, and current president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

The Committee is a “group of groups,” comprised of associations and advisory boards whose constituent members represent justice automation planners and managers; justice information practitioners; and, most importantly, the end users themselves, at the Federal, State, and local government levels. This structure allows the Committee, through the development of concurrence among the

---

5 This is a formal statement of the Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee.

6 The Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee will make these recommendations when the work of it and its five Working Groups is completed.

7 Hereafter, Committee or Global Advisory Committee.
member groups, to positively affect the future of justice automation and information exchange capabilities. The Committee structure also greatly facilitates access to information needed for inter-jurisdictional and cross-discipline planning.

Being comprised of user groups, the Committee believes firmly in the need for ongoing user involvement in the network capability process. It is only through the support of the respective group memberships that the Global capability can come to fulfillment because the effort represents the involvement of the entire justice community. And it is only when the respective groups include the guiding principles for developing the Global Justice Information Network capability\(^8\) in their strategic plans, with milestones for including these guiding principles in their development efforts, that the inter-jurisdictional and cross-discipline information sharing will be enabled.

The following table lists the member organizations of the Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee.\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) Five such “guiding principles” were identified by the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group, and are outlined in section II.

\(^9\) A roster of committee members is included as Appendix B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Organizations of the Global Justice Information Network Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative Office of the United States Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• American Correctional Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• American Probation and Parole Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attorney General Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criminal Justice Information Services Federal Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IACP, State and Provincial Police Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major Cities Chiefs Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Association of Attorneys General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NASIRE (National Association of State Information Resource Executives), Representing the Chief Information Officers of the States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Center for State Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Criminal Justice Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National District Attorneys Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Legal Aid and Defender Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Sheriffs Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North Carolina Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reno-Sparks Indian Colony Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Department of Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, Office of Investigative Agency Policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
— **Working Groups of the Global Advisory Committee**

The Global Advisory Committee has identified five core working groups to expand the base of knowledge and experience required to address the key components of a Global network capability. These working groups are comprised of Committee members and other subject-matter experts from throughout the United States. The working groups are the:

- **Concept of Operations Working Group**, which is responsible for developing the Global concept.

- **Infrastructure/Standards Working Group**, which is responsible for 1) conducting an examination of justice information management and infrastructure activities with the goal of determining how each activity relates to Global, and 2) reviewing the major standards-related efforts currently underway and providing recommendations to remedy the breakdowns in interoperability.

- **Security Working Group**, which is responsible for identifying security requirements and controls necessary to implement Global.

- **Privacy Working Group**, which is responsible for assessing the efforts currently underway to address the impact of privacy issues on efforts related to public safety.

- **Resource Management Working Group**, which is responsible for reviewing major information technology funding streams.

**Purpose of this Report**

This introductory report regarding infrastructure was prepared by the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group under the guidance and approval of the full Global Advisory Committee. The purpose of this brief report is to provide a perspective of the Working Group’s research and planning efforts vis-à-vis the role of infrastructure in the development of a Global Criminal Justice Information Network capability, and to seek feedback on that perspective from the broad justice community. It should be noted that this initial report establishes a foundation upon which further research and development will be conducted pursuant to the broad mission of this project, as defined by the Global Advisory Committee.

---

10 A roster of Working Group members is included as Appendix C.

11 For information on how to provide feedback, see Page 36 of this report.
What is Infrastructure?

“Infrastructure” refers to a broad variety of mechanical, physical, and support technologies that enable and facilitate information and data exchange and communication among and between people, organizations, and units of government. Fundamentally, infrastructure includes networks and communications technologies, computer hardware and software, information technology standards, and support. Turban, et. al., define infrastructure as consisting of “the physical facilities, services, and management that support all computing resources in an organization. There are five major components of the infrastructure: computer hardware, general-purpose software, networks and communication facilities (including the Internet and intranets), databases, and information management personnel. Infrastructures include these resources as well as their integration, operation, documentation, maintenance, and management.”

For purposes of this report, the Committee views infrastructure as including not only the Internet and telecommunications lines and microwave towers, but also relevant national information and data systems that enable broad-scale information sharing and integration, as well as the level of automation among courts and justice agencies, and information systems standards, which facilitate information sharing throughout the nation.

The Infrastructure Challenges in Creating a Global Network Capability

In order to succeed in creating the “global” network capability, the justice community must overcome many challenges. When discussing the infrastructure aspects of the effort, however, three areas of special importance emerge:

— **Resources**

The challenges regarding resources for infrastructure must be met at all levels. While the Federal government can provide certain funds through the Department of Justice and other grant programs, the majority of the fiscal burden will rest upon the participating jurisdictions to enhance, support, and operate their systems.

— **Cooperation**

The justice community is beginning to meet the challenges regarding cooperation through various forums at all levels of government. Cross-discipline meetings are taking place throughout the country more frequently than ever before. To be effective, however, these meetings must result in appropriate governance structures that guide and support the infrastructure and processes being created to share information.

---

Similarly, technical challenges require the cooperative attention of the whole justice community. The automation infrastructures of the separate justice disciplines have developed over time according to the needs each discipline has experienced and the resources of each to meet those needs. Before now, there has been no broad-scale, cross-discipline coordination. Accordingly, the law enforcement community has developed rather robust, hierarchical records systems and networks for on-line, operational information, such as stolen property, warrants, missing persons reports, and criminal histories. For example, local police agencies enter operational data into their local records systems, and forward relevant data to regional and State information systems. That information which is of national relevance is then forwarded from the State repository to the national repository. As a result, there is data in the State repositories that is relevant to the agencies in that State that is not in the Federal repository because it does not have relevance to out-of-state police agencies. Certain misdemeanor warrants are an example of this sort of data. There is also data stored in State repositories that is not stored in national repositories due to resource or technology constraints, even though the data may have national relevance.

The courts have not previously developed a major national infrastructure, but are now working across the country to build automation solutions to their business needs. As those solutions are being developed, there is no indication emerging that the law enforcement, hierarchical model is a necessary or efficient solution in the courts environment. Rather, many courts are moving quickly to Web-based technologies to take advantage of the flexibility associated with that sort of records keeping and information sharing.

Steps in Undertaking a Strategic Plan for Infrastructure Development

The challenge then, is to develop an appropriate strategic plan for infrastructure development. It is the belief of the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group that three critical steps must be accomplished in this effort:

1. Understanding the operational requirements of a Global Criminal Justice Information Network capability.

2. Surveys of existing infrastructure and capabilities for justice information sharing.

3. Comparison of the user operational requirements and current infrastructure to determine where gaps might exist in the infrastructure, and the development of a research, development, and transition strategy to meet the growing need of a Global Criminal Justice Information Network capability.

These three steps are described in general detail in sections II, III and IV. Future Working Group reports will address each of these research stages in considerably more detail.
II. Defining User Operational Requirements

The development of a Global Justice Information Network capability is a large and complex task, involving many levels of government, jurisdictions, organizations, systems, and management structures. To define the user requirements of such an endeavor is a complex task, requiring the input of a broad range of users who span the breadth of the justice enterprise, and beyond. While such an effort is well beyond the modest objectives of this introductory report, the Committee felt it important to at least begin charting the course of this significant effort by discussing fundamental principles underlying a Global Criminal Justice Information Network capability and describing a methodology for defining the operational requirements of such a system.

User Operational Requirements

Defining the operational requirements of a Global Justice Information Network capability is a matter of determining the network capabilities for a broad range of users in very practical, tangible ways. These operational requirements should be clearly articulated, complete with performance requirements, as in the following examples:

- Every authorized justice agency shall be able to determine the correctional status of a person (for example, whether the person is incarcerated, on parole, on probation, under community services or correctional supervision, and the applicable conditions) within 2 minutes, with a status currency of 24 hours; or,
- Every authorized justice agency shall be able to obtain the criminal history record of a person who has one within 2 minutes, with a status currency of 24 hours.

Similar requirements can be established around other user needs, such as:

- Positive identification.
- Generation of warrants, building upon data provided by law enforcement.
- Determining pending charges, bail status, pretrial status statewide.
- Accessing investigative information.
- Subscription notification for a broad range of actions.
- Determining case status.
- Management, administrative, geographic information system, and analysis capabilities.

A number of questions have arisen regarding the broad scope and nature of the operational requirements of the Global Justice Information Network. In order to give a more finite definition to the nature of information sharing envisioned for the Global Justice Information Network capability, the Working Group examined the issue from three different perspectives: 1) the roles and responsibilities of government, 2) model functions, and 3) guiding principles.

**Information Management Roles and Responsibilities of Government**

For infrastructure planning purposes, the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group endorses the following generalization of the information management roles and responsibilities of the agencies at each level of government:

**Local justice agencies have primary responsibility to:**
- Support and maintain *information systems* within their own, individual agencies, although it is acknowledged that many States are providing direct funding of courts and their information systems, and other States have provided funding and other resources (such as computer equipment and software) to local agencies and jurisdictions in an effort to improve local agency automation, and thereby enhance the quality and timeliness of local agency data.
- Establish and enable the *sharing* of the day-to-day information that serves as the operational currency of locally integrated systems, (for example, sharing of general case information, court calendar and scheduling information, etc.).

**State justice agencies have the primary responsibility to develop, support, and maintain:**
- *Statewide information repositories/systems* that support the operational information needs of local (and State) users (for example, criminal history records, statewide warrants database, correctional information systems, etc.).
- *Standards* consistent with national standards to enable sharing of information among local jurisdictions, and between local jurisdictions and State and national systems.
- The *gateway* to relevant national/Federal information repositories/systems (for example, IAFIS, NCIC, NIBRS, etc.).
- The *infrastructure* that will support and enable integration of local agencies statewide (that is, to share data within their local environment, as well as with the State and national systems). Infrastructure development in this sense means that the State has responsibility for technical systems (for example, statewide fiber-optic lines, microwave towers, telecommunication systems, radio systems, and programs that permit sharing of information and that support general levels of automation within justice agencies), as well as the
development of open system standards that will lay the foundation for integrated systems planning and implementation at the State and local levels.

The Federal government has responsibilities, similar to those of State governments, to:

- Develop, maintain, and support national and Federal systems.
- Ensure integration of national systems.
- Serve as the gateway to international systems.
- Create and maintain the national and Federal infrastructure necessary to support integration of Federal, State, and local systems, including: nationwide information repositories/systems; technical infrastructure that enables the automated sharing of information between agencies and jurisdictions; and standards to enable sharing of information among local jurisdictions, to State systems, and to national systems.

Model Functions of a Global Justice Network Capability

In light of the above roles and responsibilities, certain model functions and guiding principles emerge. This is not to say that all of these functions will be accomplished through a network capability at the national level. Rather, these are models of information exchanges to be supported at the local, State, tribal, and Federal level.

Through work already accomplished by individuals and groups involved in the intergovernmental information-sharing initiatives, the following model functions have been identified as the foundation for justice user requirements and the development of a Global Justice Information Network capability:

The Five Model Functions of Information Sharing:

1. The ability to query local, regional, State, and national databases to assess the criminal justice status of a person.

2. The ability to push operational information from one agency to another based upon actions taken regarding subjects or cases by the sending agency.

3. The ability to receive or pull operational information from another agency based upon actions the other agency has taken regarding subjects or cases.

4. The ability to publish information regarding subjects, cases, events, or agency actions, such as scheduled court events, crime mapping, sex offender registry, etc.

5. The ability to subscribe to a notification service, such as a probation officer being notified of the re-arrest of his supervised clients.
These model functions are most efficiently fulfilled when:

- The information is captured at the originating point rather than reconstructing it later or having other, non-operational personnel capture it.

- The information is captured once and reused, rather than re-captured when needed again.

- The integrated systems fulfilling these functions are comprised of or derived from the operational systems of the participating agencies; they are not separate from the systems supporting the agencies.

Guiding Principles for the Development of a Global Justice Network Capability

Considering the roles and responsibilities of government in the operation of a Global justice network capability, and the aforementioned functions that such a networking capability would perform, the Committee has identified five principles to guide development:

1. Global will provide the functional capability that enables sharing — across organizational, jurisdictional, and time boundaries — of relevant justice-related information available from systems currently in place or planned for implementation. It will not be a new system or a central data warehouse into which data is forwarded from local, State, Federal, tribal, or international systems.

2. Justice organizations will retain the right to design, operate, and maintain systems to meet their own operational requirements. However, as with any network capability, participants must meet agreed-upon data, communication, and security requirements and standards in order to participate.

3. Standards will be defined, with user input, in terms of performance requirements and functional capabilities rather than hardware and software brand names.

4. Security and privacy will be priorities in the development of Global and in the determination of standards.

5. Global will build on current infrastructure and incorporate capabilities and functionality of existing information systems where possible.
The Role of Web-based Technologies

While it is inappropriate to discuss solutions before having adequately described the problem, the Working Group acknowledges that the emergence of Web-based technologies, in fact, describes one aspect of the anticipated Global justice network capability. For example, there is clear evidence regarding the future technologies being embraced by the States. A recent report from NASIRE: Representing the Chief Information Officers of the States titled *Toward National Sharing of Governmental Information* shows that the State Chief Information Officers (CIOs) agree upon the use of Web-based technologies as the future of information sharing within the States. That report includes a similar consensus from the State “Control Terminal Officers,” who have more specific, criminal justice responsibilities within the States. In fact, a number of States are moving their law enforcement networks to Web-based technologies at present (Pennsylvania, Florida, Nebraska, Texas, and Kansas, among others). Web-based technologies provide the flexibility and efficiency required for the development of a true “global” justice information network capability. A major challenge lies in developing the appropriate strategy to deliver data from the current and developing infrastructures while the users are in transition from the traditional networks to the enhanced Web-based network capability.

III. Identifying Current Infrastructure for Justice Information Sharing

In addition to defining the user operational requirements, the Global Justice Information Network effort must also identify the current infrastructure and networking capability. The Infrastructure/Standards Working Group created by the Global Advisory Committee is working on a more detailed description of the current infrastructure to address this need. This report lays out only a brief description of the major law enforcement systems. These systems operate within the context of the roles and responsibilities identified in section II.

The courts, prosecution, probation, parole, supervision, and corrections agencies do not have separate national information-sharing infrastructures at the level of the law enforcement systems described in this section. Agencies from these disciplines share at some level in the law enforcement systems, and many are now beginning to take advantage of Web-based technologies to enhance their information-sharing capabilities. In addition, policy foundations for information sharing are being established in some instances, such as the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision. These policies, and the cooperation their development reflects, will greatly enable the use of the Global network capability as it becomes reality.

Presently the majority of law enforcement agencies in the country communicate with other law enforcement and criminal justice agencies at the local, regional, State, and national level, as well as with local, regional, State, and national databases through a nationwide network hierarchy. In addition to any local and regional networks, in each State there exists an in-state law enforcement telecommunications system connecting the majority of law enforcement agencies and many criminal justice agencies. Those State-level law enforcement telecommunications systems are also connected to the following major national networks:

- The National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System (NLETS)
- The National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Network
- The Criminal Justice Information Services Wide Area Network (CJIS WAN).

Together, these networks constitute a major national telecommunications capability that currently provides law enforcement and criminal justice agencies access to a large suite of information systems. For example, law enforcement agencies share a common national index of their theft reports and warrants through the NCIC maintained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, the FBI has just brought on line the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS), which provides two-hour response to any electronically submitted arrest fingerprint card. This fingerprint system is integrated with the Interstate Identification Index (III), which is a national index of arrests that are maintained in the FBI files and in State repositories around the country. The FBI shares management of these systems with State and local users.
As previously mentioned, a number of States are moving their intrastate networks to Web-based technologies. This fact is significant because the State networks act as the gateways to these national systems in most instances, and the use of Web technologies lays the foundation for broader access. Another significant development regarding the use of Web technologies by law enforcement is the deployment of the Law Enforcement Online (LEO) network. While this Web-based network began as a dial-up system, it is now being tested on NLETs and the CJIS WAN. In addition, plans are to move it to the Internet in the near future. LEO is a network shared by criminal justice, public safety, and law enforcement, with the potential for use across all disciplines for global-type information sharing.

**Major National Networks and Associated Systems**

The full report of the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group will include a detailed discussion of the major national networks and associated systems that comprise the current justice information-sharing infrastructure. The intent of this introductory report is simply to list the major operational national networks and associated systems that exist today upon which we could build the Global capability.
— National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System

The National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS) is a nationwide network that links all States and many Federal agencies together for the exchange of criminal justice information. The NLETS network is owned by NLETS and managed in partnership with its users through an advisory process. In each State, an interface agency is responsible for maintaining an intrastate law enforcement telecommunication system that delivers the messages throughout the State. Those connections enable State-to-State communication: any criminal justice agency using a State law enforcement telecommunications system in one State can communicate with any criminal justice agency using a law enforcement telecommunications system in any other State. This includes all major and most smaller police agencies. In addition, many prosecutors, probation departments, parole offices, and so on, communicate with each other and with local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies through these systems.

In addition to the administrative messaging capability, NLETS provides real-time access to many information sources, as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Available from other States via NLETS</th>
<th>National Files Available to NLETS Users</th>
<th>Information Available from Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Vehicle Registration Information</td>
<td>• Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Gun Tracing Data</td>
<td>• Wanted Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Driver License Information</td>
<td>• Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Tracking Information</td>
<td>• Stolen and Registered Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criminal History Record Information</td>
<td>• FAA Aircraft Registration Data</td>
<td>• Driver License Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Boat Registration Data*</td>
<td>• National Impound Vehicle File</td>
<td>• Stolen Article Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Snowmobile Registration Data*</td>
<td>• National Drug Pointer Index</td>
<td>• Stolen Gun Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Road and Weather Information*</td>
<td>• Hazardous Material Information</td>
<td>• Stolen Securities Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parole Information*</td>
<td>• Immigration and Naturalization Service Law Enforcement Support Center</td>
<td>• Stolen Boat Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Probation Information*</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Criminal History Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Corrections Information*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sex Offender Registration Information*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Information not available from all States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 The NLETS Board of Directors and State Point of Contact representatives oversee this advisory process.
NLETS has a broad user base, as shown in the next table. This extraordinary law enforcement network provides invaluable services to these agencies on a daily basis. The list below represents law enforcement and criminal justice agencies that use NLETS more than 1 million times every day via their nearly 327,000 terminals. These agencies have come to rely upon the real-time availability of NLETS for the execution of their routine and life-critical duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members Authorized to Access NLETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Department of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treasury Enforcement Communications System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— U. S. Customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Internal Revenue Service Inspection Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U. S. Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Immigration and Naturalization Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— U. S. Marshal’s Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Interpol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Postal Inspection Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Naval Investigative Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Air Force Office of Special Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Secret Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Center for Missing and Exploited Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Department of the Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Bureau of Indian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— U. S. Park Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Bureau of Land Management, Law Enforcement Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department of the Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Insurance Crime Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal Protective Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Veterans Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Royal Canadian Mounted Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• El Paso Intelligence Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethics and Program Integrity Investment Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Inspector General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Members Authorized to Access NLETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Departments of Army, Navy and Air Force / Armed Forces Police Detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Washington Navy Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Capitol Police, Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Institutes of Health, Protection and Security Management Branch, Bethesda, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Inspector General Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Virgin Islands (through Puerto Rico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General, Dallas, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Department of Transportation, Odometer Fraud Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Export Enforcement, Investigative Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Small Business Administration, Office of Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Gallery of Art, Security Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smithsonian Institution, Security Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• American Samoa Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal Aviation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amtrak Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• U.S. Agency for International Development, Office of the Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Federal Emergency Management Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General Accounting Office, Special Investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Railroad Retirement Board, Office of Inspector General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food and Drug Administration, Division of Inspector General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to connecting to NLETS, each State law enforcement telecommunications system also connects its users to the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) network. The NCIC and NCIC network are owned by the FBI and managed in partnership with its users through an advisory process. These connections provide access to the NCIC 2000 system, which came on-line in July 1999, and its predecessor, the legacy NCIC network, which has provided access to the NCIC databases since 1967.

NCIC is a national index of the theft reports, warrants, and other criminal justice information gathered from law enforcement agencies across the country. It provides real-time (end-to-end 12-second response time required) notification of critical status information regarding persons and property to police officers by the side of the road, case investigators, booking personnel, prosecutors, probation and parole officers, and others. This information is entered in real-time by the law enforcement agencies participating in NCIC, which also assume the responsibility to remove the information once it is no longer active. In this manner, almost all police departments in the country share their theft reports, warrants, missing person reports, and so on, with each other in an on-line, real-time mode. The system has been in operation since its inception in 1967. At present, the users generate more than 2 million transactions per day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Vehicles</td>
<td>Wanted Person Reports (Warrants)</td>
<td>Information Regarding Agencies Originating NCIC Entries (ORI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles Used in Felonies</td>
<td>Foreign Fugitive Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen License Plates</td>
<td>Missing Person Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Boats</td>
<td>Protective Order Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Articles</td>
<td>Persons of Possible Danger to Secret Service Protectees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Securities</td>
<td>Sex Offender Registration Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen Guns</td>
<td>Persons on Supervised Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovered Guns</td>
<td>Violent Gang and Terrorist Organization (and members) Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 The FBI’s Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board (CJIS APB) oversees this advisory process.
Access to NCIC in each State is managed by a Control Terminal Agency (CTA), often the State police organization. Within each State, the local, State, tribal, and Federal agencies access the NCIC through the CTA’s point of interface. A Federal Service Coordinator in the respective CTAs manages direct Federal agency access. Each user agency must abide by strict system standards of operation, verified through annual data validations and biennial audits. The system will only accept transactions strictly formatted according to NCIC standards.

The NCIC network also provides inquiry access to the Interstate Identification Index (III). The III system is an example of the evolution of a justice information-sharing infrastructure. III is changing the management of the country’s national criminal history records systems from a centralized database managed by the FBI to a decentralized system where the detailed record information resides in the States. The III index “points” to the criminal history record residing either in the FBI system or the particular State(s) holding the information. The III utilizes the telecommunications systems of the FBI, the individual States, and NLETS to respond to requests for criminal history information. This decentralized system promotes the use of State records, which are more complete, and reduces the FBI workload in maintaining and disseminating the records. The III system is an example of the cooperation of the criminal justice community over the years to create an information-sharing capability. In some States, prosecutors, probation departments, parole offices, pretrial release offices, and the like take advantage of this system at present through the law enforcement telecommunications infrastructures. Access to the III system can be extended to courts and additional criminal justice agencies through existing and future telecommunications capabilities.

Until the passage of the *National Crime Prevention and Privacy Compact* in 1998,\(^{17}\) the III had been managed by a partnership of the FBI and the State and local users through the Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board, also known as the CJIS APB. The Compact Council created under the terms of the compact now also participates in the management of III through its authority to set policy for the use of III for noncriminal justice purposes.

\(^{17}\) Public Law 105-251; 112 Statutes at Large 1870. Codified at 42 USCA § 14611 *et seq.*
The Criminal Justice Information Services Wide Area Network (CJIS WAN), owned by the FBI and managed in partnership with its users, is the means by which States are connected to the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS). The CJIS WAN is the telecommunications infrastructure supporting the decentralization of criminal history records throughout the country. As with the NCIC network, this WAN has a connection in each State, which allows for the electronic submission of arrest fingerprints to the FBI from the State criminal history repository. That submission causes the creation of a criminal history record in III. The CJIS WAN also provides for the electronic submission of latent fingerprints for the investigation of crimes, and for submission of the fingerprints of noncriminal justice applicants for national background searches.

The implementation of the CJIS WAN in July 1999 provides the national infrastructure for the verification of a person’s identity at the time of arrest. It has long been an accepted fact that numerous persons provide false identification at the time of arrest in order to avoid being detected as having warrants for their arrest, being identified as probation or parole violators, being associated with their previous criminal history, and so on. With IAFIS in place, those States that have built, or are building, intrastate AFIS systems capable of accepting electronic submission of fingerprints from local arresting agencies will be able to forward those electronic fingerprints to FBI and receive a response as to that person’s national identification and criminal history within 2 hours. In order to take advantage of this capability, the local agency must have a booking system in place to capture the fingerprints electronically or to convert them into an electronic format, and the State must have an AFIS capable of receiving those electronic submissions and forwarding them to the FBI IAFIS. States and local agencies are moving forward with developing these capabilities.

All of these transactions must be accomplished using a National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) standard that was developed by the FBI and users for the transmission of fingerprints and arrest information. The establishment of the NIST standard in combination with the development of the local livescan systems, the State AFIS systems, and the FBI IAFIS is an excellent example of the type of work that must be done in other areas to create and support a Global Justice Information Network capability.

The current plans for the CJIS WAN call for an expanding use, to include non-CJIS services. The first major addition is to use the WAN for the delivery of certain laboratory services, such as the DNA information shared among the States and FBI. The long-term plans of FBI call for the NCIC 2000 Network and the CJIS WAN to be consolidated into a single network.

---

Law Enforcement Online (LEO) is an “intranet” provided by the FBI exclusively for the law enforcement, criminal justice, and public safety communities. The unique value of LEO is its ability to use Web-based technology to deliver communications services and distance learning to local, State, and Federal personnel on an any-time, any-place basis. In its current state, the LEO service provides facilities for electronic communications, including electronic mail (e-mail), chat rooms (private on-screen interactive keyboard conversations), bulletin boards, LEO Special Interest Group (LEOSIG) communications, calendars (national, State, and LEOSIG), and Distance Learning Programs. As LEO continues development, it is transitioning to a fully operational, production system that will support the growing community of law enforcement, criminal justice, and public safety users requesting access to the LEO service. Any approved employee of a duly constituted local, State, or Federal law enforcement, criminal justice, or public safety agency or an approved member of an authorized LEO Special Interest Group (LEOSIG) can currently access LEO at no cost to the user. Users currently access the LEO system through a national toll-free dial-up network, but the addition of other communications delivery systems, such as NLETS and the Internet, are currently under development. As of December 31, 1999, LEO has over 21,000 registered users and is projected to grow to 30,000 users by the end of fiscal year 2000.

In addition to serving the at-large LEO users, LEO is currently serving the needs of a gradually expanding list of LEO Special Interest Groups (LEOSIGs), as shown in the following table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFO</td>
<td>Asset Forfeiture Online</td>
<td>AFT</td>
<td>Association of Firearms and Toolmark Examiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEA</td>
<td>Airborne Law Enforcement Association</td>
<td>ALEAN</td>
<td>Airport Law Enforcement Agencies Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSIR</td>
<td>Awareness of National Security Issues and Response</td>
<td>ASCLD</td>
<td>American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLET</td>
<td>American Society of Law Enforcement Trainers</td>
<td>ASUCRP</td>
<td>Association of State Uniform Crime Reporting Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIISG</td>
<td>Criminal Intelligence Information Sharing Group</td>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>CALEA Implementation Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJIS</td>
<td>Criminal Justice Information Services</td>
<td>CLEIG</td>
<td>Combined Law Enforcement Intelligence Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
<td>FBI-BDC</td>
<td>FBI Bomb Data Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBINAA</td>
<td>FBI National Academy Associations</td>
<td>HIDTA</td>
<td>High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAATI</td>
<td>International Association of Auto Theft Investigators</td>
<td>IABTI</td>
<td>International Association of Bomb Technicians and Investigators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IACLEA</td>
<td>International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators</td>
<td>IACP</td>
<td>International Association of Chiefs of Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IALEFI</td>
<td>International Association of Law Enforcement Firearms Instructors</td>
<td>IAUO</td>
<td>International Association of Undercover Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFOC</td>
<td>International Fellowship of Chaplains</td>
<td>JRSA</td>
<td>Justice Research and Statistics Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAS</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Analyst-Secure</td>
<td>LEEDA</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Executive Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEEP</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Exploring Program</td>
<td>LENS</td>
<td>Law Enforcement Negotiation Support Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>Major Cities Police Chiefs</td>
<td>MLE</td>
<td>Military Law Enforcement (American/Canadian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIA</td>
<td>National Technical Investigators’ Association</td>
<td>NCAVC</td>
<td>National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCMEC</td>
<td>National Center for Missing and Exploited Children</td>
<td>NCLRE</td>
<td>National Center for Rural Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTP</td>
<td>National Cybercrime Training Partnership</td>
<td>NDIC</td>
<td>National Drug Intelligence Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDPO</td>
<td>National Domestic Preparedness Office</td>
<td>NEI</td>
<td>National Executive Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIAIA</td>
<td>National Internal Affairs Investigator Association</td>
<td>NIBIN</td>
<td>National Integrated Ballistic Information Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICB</td>
<td>National Insurance Crime Bureau</td>
<td>NIPC</td>
<td>National Infrastructure Protection Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLETS</td>
<td>National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System</td>
<td>NSA</td>
<td>National Sheriffs’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTOA</td>
<td>National Tactical Officers Association</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>State Chiefs Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWG</td>
<td>Scientific Working Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SWGDAM</td>
<td>DNA Materials Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SWGDRUG</td>
<td>Drug Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SWGDE</td>
<td>Digital Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SWGFAST</td>
<td>Friction Ridge Analysis, Study and Technology (Latent Fingerprints)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SWGMA</td>
<td>Materials Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SWGDOC</td>
<td>Document Examination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SWGIT</td>
<td>Imaging Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIG</td>
<td>Terrorism Investigative Group</td>
<td>TLEIUA</td>
<td>Texas Law Enforcement Intelligence Units Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCE</td>
<td>Mississippi Gulf Coast Violent Crimes Information Exchange</td>
<td>VICAP</td>
<td>Violent Criminal Apprehension Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
— National Integrated Ballistic Information Network

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) and the FBI currently operate parallel ballistics imaging systems programs. The cornerstones of these programs are two separate and distinct technologies that are not interoperable. Both systems, however, have demonstrated successes. Currently 225 sites are operating with either one of the two systems. Approximately 800,000 submissions have been entered into the systems, resulting in 8,000 hits. These hits have resulted in convictions for crimes such as murder where, previous to the existence of this technology, there were no leads. Another problem exists, however, in that there is no national network connecting the similar systems at their different locations. This lack of interoperability and interconnectivity has resulted in a situation where the full potential of ballistic technology has not been reached. The law enforcement community throughout the nation currently has over 200 stand-alone systems.

In 1997, the ATF and FBI signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that established the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network (NIBIN) Board, whose goal was to coordinate the United States government ballistics imaging efforts. In December 1999, another MOU between the ATF and FBI was signed. This agreement capitalized on the particular strengths of the two agencies. One new unified ballistic imaging system has been agreed upon. This system — NIBIN — combines the best aspects of the former systems. The ATF will be responsible for the unified system’s hardware and deployment. The FBI will be responsible for the networking of this system using the CJIS WAN. The nation has been divided into 16 separate regions for deployment purposes. The first region to have the new unified system’s equipment installed is located in California, and is scheduled for a September 2000 deployment date.

Other Systems and Telecommunications Networks

The full report of the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group will include a detailed discussion of the systems and telecommunications networks that comprise the current justice information-sharing infrastructure. The intent of this introductory report is simply to list the major operational systems and telecommunications networks that provide the current capability to share justice information:

— Systems

Systems include the hardware, software, and applications needed to process justice-related information. The current global infrastructure includes systems at the international, national, Federal, State, regional/local, and multi-state levels.

International: An international system supports the justice activities of more than one country, nation, or territory. Identified systems include Interpol’s Automated Search Facility.
**National:** A national system supports the justice activities at local, State, tribal, and Federal levels. Identified systems include:

- III/NFF: Interstate Identification Index/National Fingerprint File.
- LEO: Law Enforcement Online, a public safety intranet.
- CODIS: Combined DNA Index System, a national index of DNA profiles.
- NDPIX: National Drug Pointer Index.
- NICS: National Instant Criminal Background Check System, used for presale firearm background checks.

**Federal:** A Federal system supports the justice activities of one or more agencies at the Federal level only. Identified systems include:

- TECS: Treasury Enforcement Communications System.
- JABS: Joint Automated Booking System, a Federal booking capability.
- NIPC: National Infrastructure Protection Center.
- IDENT: the Immigration and Naturalization Service’s two-print AFIS capability for searching aliens entering the country.

**State:** A State system supports the justice activities at the State, regional, and/or local level. Identified systems include the following.\(^{19}\)

- Criminal History Records Systems.
- State Stolen/Wanted Systems.
- State Correction Information Systems.
- State Judicial Information Systems.
- State Laboratory Systems.
- Driver and Vehicle Registration Systems.
- Supervised Release Systems.
- Juvenile Justice Systems.
- State Parole Systems.
- State Probation Systems.

**Regional/Local:** A regional/local system supports the justice activities at the local or regional level. Identified systems include:

- Local Law Enforcement (Records Management Systems).
- On-line Booking Systems.
- Jail Management Systems.
- Local Warrant Systems.

\(^{19}\) See Page 29 for a description of how Kansas implemented its state system.
- Local Court Systems.
- Local Prosecutor Systems.
- Local Juvenile Systems.
- Local Parole Systems.
- Local Probation Systems.

**Multistate:** Multistate systems support the justice activities within one or more States. Identified systems include:

- WIN: Western Identification Network, an AFIS consortium of western States.
- SWBS ADIS: Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System.
- RISS: Regional Information Sharing Systems. Comprised of six regional centers in six different States that share intelligence and coordinate efforts against criminal networks that operate in many locations across jurisdictional lines.

--- **Telecommunications Networks**

Telecommunications includes the hardware/network components used to distribute justice-related information. The current Global infrastructure provides telecommunications at the international, national, Federal, State, and regional/local levels. Identified telecommunications systems at each level include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Example Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>Interpol’s Wide Area Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| National       | CJIS WAN: Criminal Justice Information Services Wide Area Network  
                  | NLETS: National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System  
                  | NCIC: National Crime Information Center  
                  | LEO: Law Enforcement Online                         |
| Federal        | TECS: Treasury Enforcement Communications System  
                  | JCN: U.S. Department of Justice’s Justice Consolidated Network  
                  | FTS2000: Federal telephone provider contract          |
| State          | State Backbones                                      
                  | State Law Enforcement Telecommunications Systems      |
| Regional/Local | Local Area Networks  
                  | Regional Wide Area Network                           |
| Public         | Internet                                             |
IV. Identifying Gaps Between User Operational Requirements and the Current Infrastructure Capabilities

Having identified these major telecommunications and systems capabilities, the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group recognizes that they do not fulfill the anticipated user requirements for greater information sharing using Web-based technologies. The present capabilities must be incorporated into the full Global capability to the greatest extent possible, but clearly these systems cannot be moved into a Web-based environment in a single effort. As States develop Web-based networks, however, there will be more and more Web-enabled access to these systems. In addition, there are interim strategies for bridging to Web-enabled access that can effectively add value to information-sharing efforts. The important thing at this early stage is for agencies at all levels of government to begin to develop the same vision of the ultimate Global capability utilizing open standards and common methodologies.

The Working Group concurs with the following excerpts from the NASIRE report, which express a similar sentiment from the State CIOs regarding the roles of the present infrastructure and the future capabilities:

> In order for a national architecture to make sense and be defensible, it must be based on open standards, and it must be attuned to the technological direction of information technology, especially the Internet and Internet-like solutions.\(^2^0\)

> Nationwide information sharing requires a nationwide telecommunications infrastructure, using existing facilities where available and providing new facilities where necessary. The telecommunications infrastructure must be based on open technical standards, for reasons of vendor-independence and ease of evolution over its life cycle. The open standards adopted should be those associated with the Internet, for reasons of broad interoperability and availability of a broad pool of technologically sophisticated labor.\(^2^1\)

> ...The achievement of nationwide governmental information sharing does not depend on any future technological breakthroughs; present technology is sufficient. It does not depend on changing the hearts and minds of present practitioners; there is broad consensus on the desirability of such sharing and on the technological directions to be taken. It depends on leadership, on funding, on participation, and on patience.\(^2^2\)

---

\(^2^0\) NASIRE Report, p. 4. Emphases in original text.

\(^2^1\) Ibid.

\(^2^2\) Ibid, p. 5.
V. Current Initiatives Contributing to the Global Effort

While the previous sections of this report have described steps that must be taken to coordinate the development of a Global capability, there are ongoing efforts at many levels that are independently contributing to the development of greater information sharing among justice agencies. Not all are focused on Web-based solutions, but they are all focused on the cooperation, communication, and interoperability required to advance information sharing.

Justice information system planners across the nation are designing and implementing enhanced automation to meet their own needs while they are also searching for efficient ways to share information with those who need their information and those whose information they need. The Federal Leadership Initiatives identified below are examples of Federal priorities in this area. The System Integration Initiatives listed below are examples of activities whose successful completion will contribute directly to the goals of the Global initiative, and which have a direct relationship to the infrastructure component of the Global capability.

Federal Leadership Initiatives

The Federal government’s commitment to enable a greater Global capability is reflected in two closely related initiatives. The first is the Access America/Global effort of the Justice Department described herein which addresses the ability to share information on a massive scale. Under the leadership of the Attorney General, this effort focuses upon the national strategy, architectural framework, infrastructure, and application (functional) components of a Global network capability. Cutting across these components are a number of activities targeting the operational justice systems of the Federal government, their ability to share information with one another, and the ability of each to share information with State and local justice agencies, as well as the infrastructure development and systems integration needed to enable dramatically improved information sharing among State and local justice agencies.

A part of this response by the Attorney General that is closely related to infrastructure is the initiation of a national discussion regarding standards. The use of open standards is fundamental to the success of the Global initiative, and concurrence on the role, implementation, and administration of standards is essential to their successful use. The Office of Justice Programs (OJP), which is facilitating this national discussion, has asked the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group to play a leadership role in the standards effort. Together, bringing forth broad user input, we can establish a national strategy for the use of standards for justice information sharing.
The second Federal initiative, the *Crime Identification Technology Act* (CITA), was passed by the Congress in 1998 and will be administered by the Department of Justice. The Act authorizes a five-year grant program of $1.25 billion dollars dedicated to the application of information and identification technologies to improve the administration of justice. One of the Act’s goals promotes strategic planning for integrated systems. For fiscal year 2000, the Congress appropriated $130 million for CITA.

However, CITA is not the sole Federal grant program to help develop a global capability. Monies from various grant programs, such as the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Program, the Local Law Enforcement Block Program, and Community Oriented Policing Services, can be used to implement justice information systems. Those system implementation efforts can be planned so they are developed in ways to permit integration with other justice systems. Together, those programs receive appropriations that total in excess of $1 billion annually.

**System Integration Initiatives**

— *Efforts to Establish a Compatibility Between Immigration and Naturalization Service and Federal Bureau of Investigation Fingerprint Systems*

This initiative is important because it clearly represents the sort of information sharing that must be accomplished within a Global Justice Information Network capability. The reliable identification of persons whose entry into the United States may be prohibited is critical to the mission of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and contributes significantly to the public safety of all citizens.

The Congress has directed the Department of Justice to develop a plan for access by the INS into the FBI IAFIS in a real-time manner. The evolving plan includes a two-print search at the time of apprehension by INS. If the person’s record is not already in the FBI IAFIS, the INS will send in a full ten-print submission, which will create a record in the FBI file. Storage of the ten-print card in the IAFIS will allow local, State, tribal, and Federal police agencies to identify the same individual, were he or she to return to the United States undetected and be arrested for a crime in a local community. In addition, the ten-print card will allow for the searching of latent fingerprints.

These efforts at communication and cooperation between two Federal agencies, which will enhance the ultimate justice mission of public safety for the whole country, are a good example of the cooperative efforts and infrastructure development required to reach a Global network capability.
In 1990, the National Task Force on Criminal History Record Disposition Reporting was jointly sponsored by SEARCH and The National Center for State Courts and supported by a grant from the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics. The Task Force produced a report that included a series of recommendations to improve disposition reporting and an additional recommendation urging action to improve the format and content of the criminal history record, as well as response times for providing the criminal history record to the court. In response to the last recommendation, with funding from BJS, SEARCH sponsored a Task Force on Increasing the Utility of the Criminal History Record. Where the first task force was comprised primarily of courts representatives, the second task force was representative of the justice system at the various levels of government and had several noncriminal justice users and representatives from several justice associations. In 1995, the Task Force produced a report that included a model State criminal history record in terms of both data content and record format. The report was circulated broadly and was well received.

In 1996, SEARCH, the FBI Criminal Justice Information Services Advisory Policy Board (CJIS APB), the National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System (NLETS), and the FBI formed a Joint Task Force on Rap Sheet Standardization (JTF) and began working on the development of two standards: one for the improvement of the printing of the criminal history record and one to facilitate the transmission of criminal history information.

The first standard is for the presentation of the information. That is, the JTF has created a common, easy-to-read format for a rap sheet printout. The idea is that if all criminal history repositories used the same format (based on the above-referenced model) for printing rap sheets, users would be able to understand a person’s criminal history record, regardless of its source. The Working Group strongly endorses this concept, especially with the continuing increase in the use of rap sheets for noncriminal justice purposes.

Equally as important is the JTF’s work on a standardized “transmission” format for criminal history information. The significance of a standardized transmission format becomes immediately apparent when viewed in coordination with the JTF’s work to create a new methodology for the consolidation of responses to criminal history information requests. The JTF proposes that all State criminal history repositories and the FBI should use a standardized format for sending

---


responses to criminal history inquiries. The repositories would send their standardized “transmission” format responses to NLETS, which would consolidate them into a single, chronologically ordered, easy-to-read, and standardized presentation format. The FBI has agreed to send their responses to NLETS for consolidation with any other State information.

These JTF efforts represent significant progress in the sharing of justice information. All members of the justice community need criminal history records. At present, that information is delivered in a variety of nonstandard formats from the various States. The present formats are unique to the States and do not lend themselves to easy translation from one State to the next. To have all that information chronologically ordered in one rap sheet will contribute significantly to the effectiveness of the justice system.

In addition, the transmission standard allows the States to plan now for the future when they will receive the diverse criminal history data from other States and the FBI in this format. They can create programs to print the rap sheet information in any proprietary intrastate formats that might be used to address specific intrastate needs. They may want to print only convictions, or only certain classes of offenses. The transmission standard provides significant flexibility for the future use of criminal history information in ways that are not possible today.

Equally important as the final product, the process used by the JTF to establish this standard provides a model for other “Global” efforts. It was a dedicated effort of several of the Committee constituent member groups. It was a long-term commitment. It will require the endorsement and the implementation of all the member groups to reach its full potential.

The Infrastructure/Standards Working Group views the rap sheet standard work as a potential flagship of the Global effort and a good example of the benefits that can be derived from such cooperation.

— Kansas Criminal Justice Information System

As many States have done, Kansas has conducted an ongoing effort to provide a cohesive network of automated criminal justice resources. The Kansas Criminal Justice Information System (KCJIS) project is one step toward attaining that goal. “Internetworking” is a large part of the new technology platform implemented for the KCJIS. Providing access to criminal history information through the Internet and other public networks, rather than implementing a dedicated or private network, provided $1.5 million in annual cost avoidance to the State of Kansas, plus more than $1 million in annual cost avoidance to local criminal justice agencies, courts, and prosecutors.

Implementation of KCJIS began in 1996 with a budget of slightly more than $10 million. Approximately $1 million in additional funds were spent to acquire and implement the security hardware and software required to transmit criminal history data over the Internet.
In addition to the Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI), agencies involved in the project are: Kansas Attorney General’s Office, the Kansas Highway Patrol (KHP), the Kansas Department of Corrections, the Juvenile Justice Authority, the Division of Information Systems and Communications (DISC), the FBI, local law enforcement agencies, courts, prosecutors, the State Office of Judicial Authority, and the Kansas Department of Revenue.

The KCJIS project funded the following activities, among others:

- A new Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS).
- Replacement of a Tandem telecommunications switch with a Microsoft NT Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) switch.
- Replacement of a 4.8K dedicated Systems Network Architecture network with a minimum 56K TCP/IP network.
- Re-engineering of the KBI central repository for adult and juvenile criminal history data.
- Local large-system interfaces.
- Free case management system software to local law enforcement agencies to enable them to submit electronic Kansas Incident Based Reporting System data to the KBI.
- Free case management system software to courts and prosecutors to enable them to submit electronic Kansas Disposition Reports to the KBI.
- Electronic mail (“email”) server and licenses to provide free email accounts to local criminal justice agencies.
- Criminal history World Wide Web server for criminal justice agencies only.
- Criminal history Web server for public data access.
- A training center and a back-up site.

The system was built following these architectural guidelines:

- KCJIS will be an open system;
- Hardware will be redundant;
- KCJIS will share electronic data;
- KCJIS will use Kansas Wide Area Information Network and common Internet service providers; and
- KCJIS will spawn appropriate unsolicited e-mail messages.

A governance structure was developed to effectively plan, manage, and operate the KCJIS. The scope of the governance structure is limited to State and local agencies involved in the criminal justice process and noncriminal justice agencies that utilize the criminal justice information in licensing individuals. Three of the most important entities within the governance structure are:

1. **The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council.** This is the highest level of authority within the governance structure and includes: the Governor, the Attorney General, the Director of the KBI, the Secretary of Corrections, the Chief Justice of the Kansas Supreme Court or a designee, the Secretary of Social and Rehabilitation Services, and the Commission of Juvenile Justice. The Council provides executive direction and insight to aid State efforts to
improve its CJIS.

2. **The KCJIS Advisory Board.** The Advisory Board is comprised of both State and local representatives of key CJIS stakeholders.

State representatives include chief managers involved with CJIS from: the Kansas Sentencing Commission, the KBI, the Department of Corrections, the Office of Judicial Administration, the Kansas Juvenile Justice Authority, the KHP, the Secretary of Administration, the Chief Information Technology Officer, the Division of Information Services and Communications, the Department of Education, the Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services, and the Department of Health and Environment.

Local representatives included individuals designated by: the Kansas Association of Chiefs of Police, the Kansas Sheriffs Association, the Kansas County/District Attorneys Association, the Kansas District Judges Association, the Kansas District Court Clerks and Administrators Association, the Kansas Community Corrections Association, the Kansas Court Services Officers Advisory Board, the Kansas Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, and the Kansas Magistrate Judges Association.

The KCJIS Advisory Board advises the Coordinating Council on the progress of existing projects and will initiate discussion of policy or procedural changes required for KCJIS implementation. The Advisory Board is also responsible for briefing the Information Resource Council on new development and implementation of new information technology to facilitate the sharing of information and policies between agencies and branches of State government.

3. **The Standards and Technology Task Force.** The task force evaluates available information technology to establish standards that enable KCJIS agencies and applications to operate and share information smoothly and effectively, including standards for hardware, software, and data across KCJIS project agencies and departments. To date, the task force has established standards for network, hardware, application, data, imaging, and messaging. These standards provided for an “open system architecture,” which has enabled users to purchase hardware off the shelf or by State contract.

The Kansas CJIS represent one State’s attempt to move toward the benefits of Web-based technologies. Additional information about the Kansas project is available on the Internet at [http://www.kbi.state.ks.us](http://www.kbi.state.ks.us). Other States, such as Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Washington, have similar efforts underway. The activities of the States are especially important in this regard, because in the law enforcement environment they provide the gateway to the national systems.
— National Standards for Court Case Management Information Systems Program

The Conference of State Court Administrators (COSCA) and the National Association for Court Management (NACM) have initiated a program to develop national standards for court case management information systems (CMIS). Begun in September 1998, the program is designed to create a comprehensive set of functional standards that define the capabilities of, and information to be produced by, case management information systems. The program is being directed by the COSCA/NACM Joint Technology Committee, with staffing support from the National Center for State Courts.

The functional standards will address the following:

1. The operational court and case management functions and subfunctions that should be supported and made more efficient by the software applications, for example, case initiation, indexing, docketing, recordkeeping, scheduling, document generation (notices, summons, forms, etc.), calendar management, hearings, accounting, State and Federal reporting, management reporting.

2. The general types of data and data sets that should be included in the system (not specific data element definitions or coding structures).

3. The manner in which the application should support the coordination or integration of various functions and subfunctions performed by court personnel.

4. The nature of integration of applications software for one case type or module with the applications for others (for instance, linking the systems for criminal, family law, and civil to ensure coordinated handling of cases involving domestic violence).

5. Necessary external interfaces or levels of integration, within and outside of the court system, for example, the appellate courts; reporting to the Supreme Court/Judicial Council or other State entities; and integration with prosecution, defense, corrections, juvenile justice, child support, or protective services authorities; and providing access to the public.

6. The manner in which the CMIS application should support/be integrated with new technologies, such as electronic filing, document management, imaging, Internet/Intranet, video, and teleconferencing, electronic funds transfer, voice response systems, kiosks, and courtroom technology.

In sum, the functional standards specify what a court case management information system must be able to do. Development of a comprehensive, dynamic set of functional standards for court case management information systems will have the following benefits:
1. They will provide thorough specifications for a full range of the functional capabilities and features deemed desirable in case management information systems, based on state-of-the-art systems. The standards should substantially reduce the cost and time associated with the systems design and requirements analysis phases of court automation projects. They are intended to serve as a framework for evaluating existing systems/applications and identifying missing functional components or less-than-complete components, for purposes of planning needed upgrades or acquiring new systems.

2. They may serve as a starting point for the definition of data standards for those courts that do not already have them.

3. They will provide guidelines for improved sharing of data with other courts and justice agencies.

4. They may guide the incorporation of new technologies in existing or planned systems.

5. They may be used as an input for reexamining and reengineering existing business processes, thereby contributing to increased efficiency in court operations.

6. They will provide vendors with consensus specifications that may be incorporated in their products. This should yield software products that are more functional and universally beneficial. It should also reduce vendor costs and, therefore, the cost of products for the consumer. It may also enable them to invest more dollars in research and development, for the further improvement of such products.

A separate set of standards will be developed for each general case type: civil; criminal; juvenile; family law; probate, including guardianship and mental health; and traffic. The program began by developing standards for civil case types, which were completed in November 1999. The process used for this initial set of standards will be extended to the other five case types.

The standards development process is designed to take advantage of work already completed by those agencies that have implemented some of the better case management information systems at the State and local levels. Specifications on those systems, as well as functional requirements in recent, well-developed requests for proposals, are reviewed and synthesized into a preliminary draft of functional standards for each module. Other input to this document includes a review of related technical or reporting standards, various vendor systems, and specifications that have guided the effective integration of systems among justice system partners in selected jurisdictions.
The draft standards are then refined through a series of reviews by “expert” field representatives who comprise a Joint Systems Development Team (JSDT). The JSDT members include experienced operations and technical staff from selected State and local courts. The reviews include the opportunity to provide written comments on draft standards, as well as input through face-to-face meetings. Toward the end of the development process, a meeting is held to gain the perspective of vendors. The meeting includes representatives from the JSDT. Final drafts of the standards are then publicized on the Internet and circulated as requested, for additional input, before publication and final distribution. At several stages of the process, the draft standards are reviewed by a Steering Committee established by COSCA and NACM to guide the project. Finally, the Civil Standards are given a final review and recommended for adoption by the COSCA/NACM Joint Technology Committee.

As of this report date, the process has been successfully tested in the development of civil case management standards. In subsequent efforts, representatives from other disciplines will be invited to join the JSDT to ensure the court standards can accommodate exchanges of data and information with other agencies, for example, law enforcement, corrections, prosecutors, welfare agencies, drug treatment centers, juvenile detention centers, etc.
VI. Conclusion

The Infrastructure/Standards Working Group emphasizes that the development of a Global Justice Information Network capability can only be accomplished over time through the cooperative efforts of many different individuals and groups. The almost universal move toward Web-based technologies provides an unprecedented opportunity to bring information sharing from many disciplines to the justice community. The Working Group views its first challenge as defining the user operational requirements of a Global capability and identifying current capabilities and efforts to build and expand existing infrastructure. Once user requirements are well defined and gaps in existing infrastructure are determined, the Committee feels confident in the development of a plan to bridge the gaps, leveraging existing resources to better meet the evolving needs of the justice enterprise.

It is extremely important that the early vision of infrastructure for the Global information-sharing capability be agreed upon nationally, so that user-systems in all disciplines are building toward the same goal. With that concern in mind, the Infrastructure/Standards Working Group has produced this introductory report to obtain feedback on the initiative and the early vision of infrastructure. In order to make the final infrastructure report as meaningful as possible, users are asked to send comments and recommendations to your association’s or group’s representative on the Global Advisory Committee, or to the Working Group chairman, whose address is listed on the following page. All persons involved in justice information automation are invited to comment, not just those represented on the Global Advisory Committee.

Major Points of Report

1. Better information received in a timely manner equates to the improved delivery of justice.

2. An improved and expanded Global Justice Information Network capability is needed to meet the growing demand the justice community and others have for better quality information delivered rapidly.

3. A capability of this proportion requires a significant infrastructure.

4. Tomorrow’s infrastructures will benefit immensely from our considerable existing infrastructure.

5. To expand and improve upon today’s infrastructure, the Global initiative must take advantage of developing technologies, particularly Web and Internet technologies.
6. Global is more than a geographic reference; in this case, it also refers to the global justice community. Tomorrow’s infrastructure needs to serve and enable all segments of the justice community.

7. To develop a strategic plan for an infrastructure needed to enable an improved and expanded Global Justice Information Network capability, efforts must be undertaken to:
   a. Conduct a national inventory of this nation’s current infrastructure.
   b. Identify the nationwide justice community’s requirements of such an infrastructure.
   c. Conduct a gap analysis.

8. To accomplish this most effectively, your input is needed.

**Where to Submit Comments**

Submit comments and recommendations regarding this report to:

Mr. Gerry Wethington  
Chair, Infrastructure/Standards Working Group  
Director, Information Systems Division  
Missouri State Highway Patrol  
1510 East Elm Street  
Jefferson City, Mo. 65102-0568

Phone: (573) 526-6200  
Fax: (573) 526-6274  
E-mail: gwething@mail.state.mo.us
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Appendix A: A Potential Real-World Example of Justice Information Sharing

This appendix offers a potential real-world example of governmental information sharing using criminal justice processes, as described in a recent report issued by NASIRE (National Association of State Information Resource Executives), Representing the Chief Information Officers of the States.\

1. A suspicious police officer submits a query to the statewide warrant system and discovers from the response that the subject of his car stop is wanted.

2. A police officer arrests a subject, then completes and (digitally) signs an arrest document which describes the crime, arrest and arrestee, stores the document in the police information system, and finally affixes to the arrestee a bracelet containing the arrest document number.

3. The arrestee is taken to the sheriff’s office to be booked. The sheriff’s information system uses the arrest document number, scanned from the subject’s bracelet, to pull the arrest document from the police information system, and uses data from that report to (partially) fill in the booking document.

4. The sheriff’s information system, using personal-description data in the arrest report, pulls the arrestee’s local, state and national criminal history records, and, based on the information in these documents, a person who makes a security decision enters that decision into the sheriff’s information system which assigns an appropriate cell.

5. The sheriff’s information system uses information from the arrest and booking documents to fill in a standard press release and pushes it to the appropriate web page.

6. The sheriff’s information system uses information from the arrest and booking documents along with the mug shot and electronic fingerprint capture submission, using live-scan or card-scan solutions, to push to the state criminal history repository the arrest report required. The state repository’s information system will, after its own processing, push the information to the national criminal history repository maintained by the FBI.

7. The sheriff’s information system pushes to the prosecutor’s information system the arrest document, booking document and three criminal history records, and the prosecutor’s information system uses some of this

---

25 NASIRE Report, pp. 10-11. Text emphases and footnotes are from original text.

26 The terms “query,” “response,” “push,” “pull,” “publish,” and “subscribe” … are information-sharing modalities; each is appropriate to a different operational setting for information sharing. NASIRE Report, p. 13.

27 The italicized phrase “information system” is meant to denote the computerized information system operating under program control without human intervention. Ibid.
information to (partially) fill in a prosecution case intake document. An assistant prosecutor views all the available information and makes the decision to prosecute.

8. The assistant prosecutor decides the specific charges to be filed, and the prosecutor’s information system prepares the charging document using statute-specific standard charging language plus information from the earlier police and sheriff’s documents. The assistant prosecutor (digitally) signs the charges and the prosecutor’s information system pushes the charges to the court’s information system.

9. The court information system creates the initial records for a new case, assigns it, reviews the judge’s calendar, and sets a time for a preliminary hearing. It then pushes to the prosecutor’s information system and the public defender’s information system information concerning the assigned judge, courtroom, date and time. The prosecution’s information system reviews its workload and fills in its calendar by assigning the hearing to one of its assistant prosecutors, and the public defender’s information system similarly assigns the hearing to one of its defenders.

10. Throughout the course of the trial the prosecutor’s and defender’s information systems push digitally signed motions to the court’s information system, the court’s information system pushes copies of motions and notifications of hearings to the prosecutor’s and defender’s information systems, and the human parties, namely the prosecutor, defender, defendant and judge, meet and make decisions. At appropriate times, the court’s information systems pushes notifications to witnesses who are required to attend a given hearing or trial portion, and the prosecutor’s information system pushes notifications to victims at important milestones of the case.

11. At one point the defendant, who is free on her own recognizance, fails to appear for a court date and the judge issues and digitally signs a warrant, which the information system pushes to the original arresting agency for service.

12. As the trial ends the judge decides the case and passes sentence, which the court’s information system transforms into a (digitally) signed document which it then pushes to the sheriff’s information system to send the newly convicted prisoner to the state prison, pushes another such document including the sentence ordering the prison’s information system to receive the prisoner, pushes yet another document to the defender’s information system setting the date by which a notice of appeal must be filed, and so on.

13. Later the prison’s information system and the parole information system coordinate the transfer to parole.

14. Unfortunately, while on parole the subject commits a crime and is arrested. When the booking information system retrieves the criminal history record via electronic fingerprint transactions, it ‘notices’ that the subject is on parole and that the parole agency has subscribed for news of any arrests during the time
of parole. It pushes to the parole *information system* an arrest notification message. The parole *information system* then prepares a parole violation document and pushes it to the appropriate parole officer for consideration.

The example, up to this point, has shown only interactions among the governmental entities which are usually thought of as comprising the criminal justice system. But there are many other entities which are pulled into the criminal justice *process*. For example:

- Private defense attorneys;
- Jurors and potential jurors;
- Public and private schools (truancy, vandalism);
- Public and private half-way houses;
- Public and private diversion alternatives to incarceration;
- Fire and other Public Safety governmental components for combined operations;
- Alliances of nearby police agencies for combined operations;
- State and Federal agencies for periodic reporting on local crimes, arrests, prosecution cases and outcomes, court cases and outcomes, prisoner populations, correctional supervision cases and outcomes, and many more.
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