



**Report to the Legislature  
Status of the Criminal Justice Information Sharing System**

---

**Criminal Justice Information System**

**Governing Board**

**July 1, 2010**



## Table of Content

Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Governing Board .....	5
Executive Director .....	6
Committee Chairs .....	6
Report to the Legislature .....	7
Accomplishments.....	7
CJIS Governing Board Meetings.....	8
Connecticut Information Sharing System (CISS) Status Report.....	8
Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS) Project Status Report.....	11
Connecticut Impaired Driving Record Information System (CIDRIS) Project Status Report ....	12
CJIS Governing Board Committees’ Updates.....	13
On-going Management and Maintenance of OBTS and CIDRIS .....	15
Project Steering Committee – Role and Responsibilities .....	15
Attachment A.....	18



**Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Governing Board**

**Agencies and Members**

**Office of Policy and Management**

**Michael Fedele, Lt. Governor**  
(Designee and Co-Chair)  
Brenda Sisco, Secretary  
Brian Austin, Jr., Under Secretary  
John Forbes

**Office of Chief Court Administrator**

**Patrick L. Carroll, III, Judge,**  
Deputy Chief Court Administrator,  
(Designee and Co-Chair)  
Barbara M. Quinn, Judge, Chief Court Administrator  
Lawrence D’Orsi, II  
Terry Walker

**Office of the Chief State's Attorney**

**Kevin Kane, Esq., Chief State's Attorney**  
John Russotto, Esq., Deputy Chief State's Attorney  
Jan Sniffin

**Department of Public Safety, Div of State Police**

**Thomas Daveron, Col.**  
(Acting Commissioner)  
Christopher Arciero, Lt. Col.  
Dennis C. Mitchell, Ph.D.

**Office of Chief Public Defender Services**

**Susan O. Storey, Esq., Chief Public Defender**  
Brian Carlow, Esq., Deputy Chief Public Defender

**Department of Correction, with Parole Functions**

**Brian K. Murphy, Commissioner**  
Carol Salisbury, Deputy Commissioner, (Designee)  
Robert Cosgrove

**Board of Pardons and Paroles**

**Robert Farr, Chairman**  
Richard Sparaco

**Office of Victim Advocate**

**Michelle Cruz, Victim Advocate**  
Merit LaJoie

**Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security**

**Peter Boynton, Commissioner**

**Department of Information Technology**

**Diane Wallace, CIO**  
Rick Bailey

**Department of Motor Vehicles**

**Robert Ward, Commissioner**  
Nicholas J. Demetriades  
George White

**Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association**

**Richard C. Mulhall, Chief**  
(Designee for)  
Matthew A. Reimondo, Chief, President  
James A. Cetran, Chief

**Chairpersons and Ranking Members of the Joint Standing Committee of the General Assembly on Judiciary**

**Michael Pollard**  
(Designee for)  
Andrew J. McDonald, Senator, Co-Chair  
**Arthur J. O’Neill, Representative, Ranking Member**

**William Tong, Representative**  
(Designee for)  
Michael P. Lawlor, Representative, Co-Chair

**John A. Kissel, Senator, Ranking Member**

---

## Executive Director

---

**Sean Thakkar**

### **Business Goals and Objectives**

- Optimize our current investments in technology and leverage existing infrastructure and resources.
- Create a simple way to implement new technologies, so that agencies can implement them smoothly.
- Develop a secure environment, which meets state and federal standards for security.
- Provide independent and objective opinions and recommendations to the CJIS Governing Board.
- Provide services that are boringly predictable and totally reliable.

---

## Committee Chairs

---

The committees and their chairpersons are as follows:

### **Administrative Committee**

Larry D’Orsi

Judicial Branch, Court Operations Division

### **Technology Committee**

Evelyn Godbout

Department of Criminal Justice

### **Implementation Committee**

Chief Richard Mulhall

Connecticut Police Chiefs Association (CPCA)

## Report to the Legislature

### **Criminal Justice Information Sharing System**

This report is pursuant to Section 40 (h), Public Act 08-01 of the January 2008 Special Session and explains the status of the information sharing system, specified under this legislation. The report is provided by the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Governing Board.

### **Organization of the CJIS Governing Board**

Public Act 08-01, Section 39, expanded the membership of the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Governing Board. In summary, co-chairs were established and the membership was expanded to include representation from the Legislative Branch through the chairpersons and ranking members of the joint standing committee of the General Assembly on Judiciary. Each member of the CJIS Governing Board may appoint a designee.

The legislation specifies the Chief Court Administrator and a person appointed by the Governor from the CJIS Governing Board membership to be co-chairs. The co-chair appointments were immediately made to facilitate the further organization of the CJIS Governing Board. The Chief Court Administrator designated Judge Patrick L. Carroll, III, Deputy Chief Court Administrator, who is one of the co-chairs. The Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management named Lt. Governor Michael Fedele as a designee, who is appointed by the Governor to be the other co-chair.

### **Accomplishments**

Following is the synopsis of the accomplishments since the report of January 1, 2010. More details are provided in a later part of this report.

- Track progress of OBTS and CIDRIS application as Executive Sponsor
- Oversee the CISS project as an Executive Sponsor
- Evaluate technologies that will help us implement Information Sharing project
- Reconstituted CJIS Governing Board's sub committees
- Provide report to the legislature in July as required by statute
- Provide OBTS Transition assistance to DoIT
- Conduct sub committee meetings for Administrative, Technology and Implementation committees
- Establish OBTS User Groups
- Facilitate access to DMV photo database by Capital Region system
- Complete CISS Request for Proposal (RFP)
- Present information on CJIS Governing Boards applications (CISS, OBTS and CIDRIS) to CJIS community at Judicial Cross Training Workshop
- Implement multiple directives approved by the Board
- Create Project Steering Committees (PSC) for OBTS, CIDRIS, and CISS

## **CJIS Governing Board Meetings**

There were three Governing Board meetings conducted since the last report. Following are the consolidated details of the meetings:

### **Connecticut Information Sharing System (CISS) Status Report**

Following is the update on the CISS project since January 1, 2010. It is organized to provide a summary in the key areas:

- Where We are Today
- Progress Made to Date
- Next 180 days Targets
- Risk and Issues Facing the Project
- Recommendations
- Conclusion

#### **Where We are Today**

The project team consisting of MTG Consulting, business and technical representatives from the CJIS community will be:

1. Finishing the DoIT System Development Methodology (SDM) Business Issue Phase and the Project Management Plan
2. Finalizing the CISS RFP
3. Gaining CJIS community understanding of the CJIS information and support for all of the elements within the CISS Program

While there is a wide support of the CISS effort, there are a myriad of details such as the 500 plus information exchanges that must be understood by the community. The level of understanding will increase as the effort moves forward and a vendor is selected.

#### **Progress Made to Date**

The CISS Program has achieved several milestones:

- The updated draft of the RFP was received on June 30, 2010
- A Project Steering Committee (PSC) for CISS has been approved by the CJIS Governing Board and convened. The stakeholder agencies and branch are:
  - Department of Public Safety
  - Department of Corrections
  - Division of Criminal Justice
  - Connecticut Police Chiefs Association
  - Department of Information Technology
  - Department of Motor Vehicle
  - Division of Public Defender Service
  - Office of the Victim Advocate
  - Judicial Branch
  - Office of Policy and Management



- Mr. Kaelin sent and received from each agency's head duly signed Delegation of Authority form to designate a primary and secondary designee to represent the agency on the CISS PSC
- The PSC has met and discussed the business issues and risks related to CISS
- Several meetings took place over the past five months discussing critical information exchanges<sup>1</sup> and efforts to refine the list and link to business processes will continue

Significant effort has gone into these milestones and the effort will continue into the next 180 days.

### **Next 180 Days Targets**

The next 180 days are centered on the procurement process and getting ready for design and implementation process with the selected vendor:

- The CISS project will update the RFP again to comply with the State's newly publish technical architecture standards (CTEA-TA) announced on June 28, 2010
- The RFP current planned release schedule is August 2010. Once the RFP is released we plan on conducting a pre-proposal meeting, receiving the proposals, and completing the selection process
- DoIT is completing the stakeholdering plan for the CISS Project. This effort is part of the SDM process for every project to ensure DoIT resources are programmed and committed to the project for the current phase (Business Requirements)
- MTG Consulting will continue to work with the CJIS Community to define the critical information exchanges
- The CISS program will hire staff necessary to continue and implement the program (see risks and issues below)

As these efforts are completed the CISS program will need to resolve several risks and issues.

### **Risks and Issues Facing the Project**

At the January 19, 2010 Judiciary Hearing six recommendations were made to the Judiciary committee. The CISS program is working with the CJIS Governing Board to review and adopt the elements of those recommendations.

In addition, several risks and issues remain within the CISS effort. The risks and issues listed below have program level impact:

---

<sup>1</sup> Information Exchanges are documents moved from one agency to another within the CJIS community. Given the potential impact to agencies with each automated information exchange it was critical to spend time working with agencies to gain the priorities and understanding of this information. This effort has also delayed the CISS RFP.

**Risks:**

- The Connecticut State Bond Commission has cancelled meetings and might not meet until after elections. CISS cannot move forward without the bond funding.
- DoIT has been under resources and budgetary constraints. DoIT's System Development Methodology (SDM) can only commit resources one phase at a time. This creates a risk for the CISS project if DoIT cannot commit the resources in a timely manner (two weeks)
- Agency personnel necessary to work the CISS effort and test the information exchanges are not available. Further there is no funding in the CISS program to backfill agency staff if assigned to CISS tasks
- This issue involves the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The CISS data store is a staging repository and not the official repository of record; therefore, it should be exempt from FOIA requests and require any requests to be submitted to the agencies that are the repository of record. CJIS Governing Board's Administrative subcommittee is working on this risk

**Issues:**

- The Business Manager position for CISS is now filled by a contractor not a state employee. According to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) this critical position should be staffed by a state employee
- The CISS Budget did not account for the DoIT fees that are now applied to any new solution supported by DoIT. CISS will add additional servers, technologies, and network devices which will incur additional DoIT support costs; therefore, CISS project will incur additional support costs. These costs were not anticipated and not included in the budget estimates

Most of the program issues and risks are centered on the State's ability to fund and staff this effort. In fact, most of the risks and issues are directly related to recommendations made to the Judiciary committee on January 19 and March 26, 2010.

**Recommendations**

The CISS program is actively monitoring the risks and working to address the issues. Several actions will help in this effort:

- Support the CJIS Governing Board efforts to adopt and implement the recommendations made in January 2010
- Support a meeting of the State Bond Commission to address the CISS Funding
- Support funding modifications to allow CISS support for agency business and technical staff participation, fees increases, and CISS staffing, including the business manager
- Support the staffing plan for CISS that directly reports to the CJIS Executive Director

These recommendations do require immediate action and continued, strong legislative support is critical.

## **Conclusion**

The CISS project is at a critical juncture and we are eager to release the RFP and procure a solution that provides for efficient and effective information-sharing in our state. To this end, we will be making a request to the CJIS Governing Board and OPM in the next four to six months to have the bond dollars appropriated, so that the project can move forward and the momentum we have developed will continue. If not, the consequences of delay and/or inaction are significant, including:

- Inability to meet the Public Act 08-01 mandate.
- Increased potential for making public safety mistakes.
- Continued suboptimal use of resources.
- Continued justice process inefficiencies.
- Increased technology costs.

The bottom line is, it will cost Connecticut a significant amount of money to delay action on the CISS project, and inaction may further erode public confidence in the justice system. We have a complex justice system that faces a volume of activity it cannot handle and mistakes will be made. The sooner we act to acquire and implement CISS, the sooner the problems with the current environment can be alleviated and the benefits of the CISS solution can be realized.

## **Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS) Project Status Report**

Mr. Len Smith provided status on the OBTS Project; he stated that the team is completing the warranty testing for the system. The first round of testing will be completed on May 7, 2010. Sierra System will take a look at the data and do an assessment of the work that will need to be completed. After which, a decision will be made for the next round of testing. The new environment is targeted for completion in the October 15, 2010 time frame. The initial testing of performance remediation by Sierra Systems has shown an eighty-three percent increase in hourly processing capacity.

The Offender Status was delivered by Sierra Systems and is undergoing system testing. There is not enough time to complete full testing of the Offender Status before Sierra System leaves. Mr. Thakkar spoke to Sierra Systems and they will give a second round of code deliverables. There are remediation issues on a technical item in the current legacy environment. If the issue is not remediated, then the license will have to be renewed with an estimated cost of \$150,000. Mr. Thakkar will address this issue with Sierra Systems.

### **There were two questions asked at the meeting**

Question: The first question to Mr. Smith was, has the knowledge transfer begun and where does the CJIS Support Group (CSG) stand on the ability to maintain the system?

Answer: Mr. Smith responded that they have setup a number of deliverables for the knowledge transfer. Most of the knowledge transfer sessions have been completed. They are currently concentrating on the knowledge transfer for the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) staff that is going to support the OBTS System.

Question: The second question to Mr. Smith was, does the DoIT staff have the knowledge to continue maintenance on the OBTS System once Sierra System is gone?

Answer: Mr. Smith responded that the staff has enough information that was transferred to them, and the rest will be based on experience once they start to get inside and work with OBTS.

### **Conclusion**

The OBTS transition to DoIT has been delayed and has not met the May 14, 2010 completion deadline. The testing of the new version provided by the vendor (Sierra) is not complete. CJIS Governing Board has engaged Sierra to provide on-going application maintenance and support.

### **Connecticut Impaired Driving Record Information System (CIDRIS) Project Status Report**

Ms. Elisa Chase, the Project Manager for the CIDRIS project, came on board February 12, 2010 to replace Mr. Steve Looney. She stated that the CIDRIS project had to be retrofitted into the SDM Project Methodology, which has been accomplished.

According to SDM, the project needed to be retrofitted back to the Design Phase, which has been successfully completed. The next phase will be the Construction Phase. The System Design Document (SDD) has been completed. The SDD was presented before the Technical Review Board (TRB) on March 31, 2010. They asked the TRB for their approval of the design to construct CIDRIS in the DoIT environment. A confirmation was received from TRB on April 21, 2010 stating that the project document was approved.

In order to move from the SDM Design Phase into the Construction Phase, the CIDRIS Project team needed to complete the resource commitment process at DoIT. The CIDRIS Project team made a request to DoIT to review the Construction Project Plan for availability of time, schedule, effort, and resources to get the CIDRIS Project done. The Stakeholding process with DoIT begun on April 8, 2010, they are two weeks from completing the process. Once they receive the dates and commitments from DoIT, they will need to re-baseline the Project Plan. The project re-baselining is complete.

Sierra Systems delivered the application and most of the artifacts needed to complete their engagement on April 12, 2010 for CIDRIS. The final deliverable from Sierra Systems will be the code base.

By contract, the CIDRIS team has thirty days to use and complete the users' base testing for this deliverable. This will not happen because the application server environment is not ready at the DoIT Data Center.

### **Conclusion**

The CIDRIS project has made considerable progress. The project was in the Construction Phase a year ago, but the team had to step back to the Design Phase on DoIT's request to help the project move forward. The project is delayed due to this reason. We also face another risk of losing NHTSA Federal funding of \$1,600,000, if we do not have the CIDRIS application transmitting information by September 30, 2010. The CIDRIS team is working hard to meet the deadline.

## **CJIS Governing Board Committees' Updates**

### **Administrative Committee**

Mr. Chris Duryea gave an update on the Administrative Committee on behalf of Mr. Larry D'Orsi, Chair of the Administrative Committee. The Administrative Committee held their quarterly meeting on March 17, 2010. At this meeting the Administrative Committee granted the Federal Public Defenders access to OBTS. Public Act 09-26 allows the Federal Public Defenders access to OBTS and provides them the same access rights as the State Public Defenders.

The Administrative Committee recommended to the CJIS Governing Board that the Federal Public Defenders have the same access rights as the State Public Defenders, which will include all convictions and all pending cases that are available to the public. There is no way to determine within OBTS if an individual is represented by the Federal Public Defender. Therefore, the Administrative Committee is not recommending that the Federal Public Defender have access to confidential or sealed records that have not been erased, youthful offender cases, and sealed diversionary program cases.

- Chief State's Attorney Kevin Kane did not have any objections to the Administrative Committee's recommendations for the Federal Public Defenders.
- Mr. Thakkar added the Federal Public Defenders will have to become CJIS Security Compliant by completing the necessary paperwork. They will also need to make sure from a technology perspective, that they will have connectivity to OBTS.

If there is a cost involved, then they will need to know this and be in agreement to incur the cost. Mr. Thakkar will get in contact with the Chief Public Defender Thomas Dennis at the Federal Public Defenders in Hartford, Connecticut to discuss this matter further. The Technology Committee will work with the Federal Public Defenders to discuss whether or not access to the system can be provided.

- Judge Carroll stated that conviction and pending case information is available to the public on the Judicial Branch website. He has requested that Mr. Thakkar share this information with the Federal Public Defenders.

Chief State's Attorney Kane moved the motion to approve the recommendations made by the Administrative Committee to allow the Federal Public Defenders access to the OBTS System. The motion was seconded by Commissioner John Danaher of the Department of Public Safety and unanimously approved by the voting members present.

### **Technology Committee**

Ms. Evelyn Godbout, Chair of the Technology Committee, discussed the recommendation made at the CIDRIS Workshop on February 5, 2010 to resolve some of the business process issues that came up in the application. A number of agencies involved in the CIDRIS Project attended the CIDRIS Workshop. A consensus was reached on nine issues in regards to CIDRIS. However, a consensus was not reached on six additional issues pertaining to CIDRIS. Ms. Godbout is looking to receive the CJIS Governing Board's validation and approval of the nine

recommendations. Ms. Godbout reviewed these nine recommendations, which were agreed upon by the CJIS agency's representatives at the workshop.

Commissioner Danaher made the first motion to approve the nine recommendations made by the CJIS community stakeholders at the CIDRIS Workshop, which will be incorporated into CIDRIS and be used by all CJIS agencies. Chief State's Attorney Kane seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by the CJIS Governing Board members present.

In addition, she reviewed the six open items, which require further discussion by the CJIS Governing Board. These items include the need for toxicology laboratory results within thirty days to DMV, the need for the arrest package from the police departments to be complete before it is sent to DMV, the need for the warrant and warrantless case documents to be defined, the validation of the supplemental documentation that should be provided to DMV along with the A44, the clarification on who can receive electronic Intoxilizer results from the laboratories, and if it's possible for DMV to accept OUI information electronically outside of CIDRIS.

Ms. Godbout upon the request made by Mr. Thakkar; recommended that a workshop be held with the CJIS Governing Board members to gain a consensus on the six open items.

Judge Carroll recommended that Ms. Godbout schedule the workshop and send the invite to all CJIS Governing Board members.

The next steps for the Technology Committee are to create a central repository for official CIDRIS forms, determine what documents can be sent via the RMS systems into CIDRIS, and identify the business requirements for eSignature. Once all these items have been discussed, Ms. Godbout will present the Technology Committee's recommendations to the CJIS Governing Board.

SEARCH has agreed to do the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) training on May 19, 2010 at the Division of Criminal Justice in Rocky Hill, Connecticut. This training will be at no cost to the state, Ms. Godbout has sent out invitations to many agency members. She is encouraging everyone who can to attend the training to let her know by sending her an email.

Ms. Godbout discussed the Technology Committee's recommendation for a PDF/A archiving format. She stated that the Technology Committee recommends the new CJIS initiatives, that includes hard copy document scanning; which utilize the PDF/A document format whenever possible.

Commissioner Danaher made the first motion to accept the Technology Committee's recommendation for the PDF/A archiving format for hard copy scanning. The motion was seconded by Judge Carroll and unanimously accepted by the CJIS Governing Board members present.

### **On-going Management and Maintenance of OBTS and CIDRIS**

Mr. Thakkar discussed the extension of Sierra Systems' services that would help OBTS and CIDRIS immensely. If the extension is not given, the State will incur \$150,000 worth of licensing fees. If Sierra is on board, then this cost will not be incurred by the state and will be defrayed by the amount being paid to Sierra System at a one year extension with two, one year options.

Mr. Thakkar stated he has the money in his budget to pay Sierra Systems for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 with one caveat, that his budget for FY 2011 remains the same as approved with no cuts or lapses. No additional money will be asked for unless Sierra Systems is extended past the first year. Extending Sierra System services will help:

- The OBTS and CIDRIS teams have breathing room to be able to do other aspects of the projects and have the ability to catch up.
- The DoIT resources will get the opportunity to get familiar with the maintenances and managements of the applications.
- The CJIS community will have two projects moving along and the CJIS community will benefit from these two projects.

To do the testing aspect for OBTS, the State would have to purchase three licenses. As part of the extension, Sierra Systems will be asked to adjust OBTS to require only two licenses. When CISS is implemented, the goal is to have OBTS and CIDRIS integrated into CISS. Once this is completed, there will be no need for the services from Sierra Systems. There will be a team who will maintain and manage the CISS Systems. Mr. Thakkar requested from the CJIS Governing Board to approve the extension of Sierra Systems and to allow DoIT's proposed Transition Plan to proceed, but augment it with the application support from the vendor for both OBTS and CIDRIS.

Commissioner Ward moved the motion to approve Option 2 (Attachment A) and the extension of Sierra Systems; the motion was seconded by Undersecretary Austin and unanimously approved by the voting members present.

### **Project Steering Committee – Role and Responsibilities**

Mr. Sean Thakkar discussed the roles and responsibilities of the Project Steering Committee as it relates to the CJIS Governing Board. The DoIT SDM requires project steering committees to provide direction to both OBTS and CIDRIS projects on operational issues and specifically when SDM decision points are reached to go from one stage of the project to next (from Design to Construction).

Generally, Project Steering Committees are made up with stakeholders from a single agency because most projects are single agency oriented. In that case, the stakeholders, having direct control over agency resources, have a much broader span of control of the project, because it impacts only their organization.

The CJIS Governing Board (Board) is made up of eleven Executive Branch agencies, Judicial Branch, Legislative Branch and Local Law Enforcement (CPCA). The PSC for OBTS as an example

is made up of only five stakeholders from the CJIS community (Judicial, DPS, CPCA, DOC and OVA).

Project Steering Committee Role and Responsibilities under SDM and those responsibilities as viewed by the Board:

The SDM has the following four responsibilities for the stakeholders.

- Provide governance and decision making to the project team.

*Board Perspective: Provide operational governance for the project as a community stakeholder to the project team.*

- Remove barriers for the project team.

*Board Perspective: Assist the project team by working with your agency to help them accomplish project tasks.*

- Review the Phase-End Decision Point presentation material prior to the Phase-End Decision Point meeting.

*Board Perspective: As a project steering committee member review the SDM Phase-End presentation and provide feedback.*

- Render a Phase-End decision of “Go”, “No-Go” or “Redirect” as it relates to the project team proceeding to the next phase.

*Board Perspective: Provide your feedback as a community stakeholder on how the project should proceed.*

**Issue:**

While project decisions are clearly within the PSC responsibility, the larger issue of lifecycle and funding need clarity:

- Should the PSC make decisions on the lifecycle of OBTS and other CJIS Enterprise Projects?
- Should the PSC make decisions on how much additional funding application(s) should receive?

Mr. Thakkar made following recommendations:

4. The PSC should be able to make operational decisions, as well as, SDM decision point approvals for projects that are in the best interest of the CJIS community.
5. The PSC should provide recommendation(s) to the Board regarding project lifecycle decisions or funding. Based on the recommendation(s) the Board can make an informed decision.
6. Strategy or directional recommendations will be made by the PSC when a critical decision is needed from the Board. The process will be:
  - a. The PSC will draft, review, and approve a “recommendation document” stating: the decision needed from the Board, the issue or problem remedied by the decision, background information on the issue or problem, and any supporting materials.
  - b. The PSC will ask the Executive Director to place the item on the next Board agenda and provide the recommendation document.



- c. PSC members will brief the issue or problem and recommendation to their organization's representative on the Board.
- d. The PSC members will be present at the Board meeting when the Executive Director presents the recommendation to the Board. If desired, a representative of the PSC may present the recommendation.
- e. The Board will act on the recommendation or refer it back to the PSC for follow-up.

Mr. Bailey explained the roles and responsibilities of the PSC. Within SDM, the PSC is established; for instance, at the time the project is established the project sponsor and the PSC are identified. The PSC feeds into the decision making, but ultimately the project sponsor or executive sponsor should make the final decision associated with the project. The project sponsor or executive sponsor is the gate keeper of the project and will be the one to present to the CJIS Governing Board. The PSC stays together throughout the lifecycle of the project. Once the project has ended, the PSC normally gets disbanded.

Mr. Thakkar responded that there is a governance structure to assist via the Implementation Committee, which has users groups. Each users group will be providing input to the Implementation Committee on what are the project needs and what needs to be fix in the next iteration. Once this is done, a new project is formed, SDM will kick in, and a PSC will be formed again. According to Executive Order 19, executive branch agencies have to follow the SDM and establish a PSC.

Judge Carroll made the motion to approve the Executive Director's proposed policy and associated recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Michael Pollard, designee for Senator Andrew McDonald and unanimously approved by the voting members present.

## Attachment A

April 5, 2010

Sean Thakkar, Executive Director  
(860) 418-6394  
[Sean.Thakkar@ct.gov](mailto:Sean.Thakkar@ct.gov)

### **Overview:**

The **Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS)** is an integrated, information system that was developed with the state criminal justice agencies to respond to the growing demand for criminal justice data on criminal offenders. The goal of the system is to provide timely, complete, and accurate data on persons involved in crimes are necessary to assure these persons are apprehended and prohibited from continuing their criminal activity. The application is being transitioned from the vendor to DoIT's operational control on May 14th, 2010.

The **Connecticut Impaired Driving Records Information System (CIDRIS)** is in construction and is scheduled for being in production by July with DPS and later roll out to other municipal law enforcement agencies through December 2012. Construction of the software is underway. National data sharing standards are being used. Information on OUI offenses and offenders will be provided to law enforcement and court staff on a near real time basis. Currently, the information on offenses may not be known for up to a month, until the adjudication starts which is the present time of data entry and the provision of data to the OBTS.

### **Business Issue:**

OBTS and CIDRIS are strategic components of the **Connecticut Information Sharing System (CISS)**. These applications once integrated with CISS will provide a robust data repository with high-availability access to offender information from across all CJIS agencies. No other CJIS system is currently capable of centralizing and managing this function.

It is of great importance that the State have the ability to maintain both CIDRIS and OBTS properly so that the investments made in these applications is maximized for the State and CJIS Community. Due to State's budgetary challenges DoIT's resources are strained. The resources available do not have the expertise and the experience to manage and maintain the application code. Due to this gap and the feedback from the staff that is working with DoIT to transfer knowledge for OBTS, it will be difficult for DoIT's application management personnel to properly manage and maintain the application code base.

Both the applications are built on the same technology so that CIDRIS and OBTS application maintenance and upkeep will need strong technology expertise and experience.

**Options:**

Following are the two options that need consideration in order for us to achieve a smooth and successful outcome:

Scenario	Description
<b>Option #1</b>	<p>Physically transition OBTS to State ownership using new hardware conforming to State standards and provide knowledge transfer to state staff. Apart from approved warranty work by Sierra, due May 14th, no further changes are authorized. Future changes to OBTS are treated as unique SDM projects, each requiring separate project funding.</p> <p>Work with DoIT to provide maintenance and upkeep support for CIDRIS when it goes into production in July, 2010.</p>
<b>Option #2</b>	<p>Allow the DoIT proposed transition plan to proceed but augment it with the application support from the vendor for both OBTS and CIRIS.</p>

**Option #1**

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will lower the cost of application maintenance to the State.</li> <li>• The State will have complete control of the application.</li> <li>• Issues with Performance, Offender Status and Documentation are resolved,</li> <li>• Requires no additional State staff,</li> <li>• OBTS technology environments are upgraded to State-compliant technologies and environments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited ability to support any emerging needs,</li> <li>• Resolution of Information Purity issues is unlikely,</li> <li>• Staff “single points of failure” remains,</li> <li>• Access to DOIT Java developers is limited and staff will be inexperienced with OBTS and CIDRIS.</li> <li>• There will be additional cost for DoIT to support CIDRIS applications.</li> </ul>

**Option #2**

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for ongoing maintenance and improvement of OBTS and CIDRIS,</li> <li>• Issues with Performance, Offender Status and Documentation are resolved,</li> <li>• Requires no additional state staff,</li> <li>• OBTS technology environments are upgraded to state-compliant technologies and environments.</li> <li>• Provides ability to resolve data purity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires additional funding for OBTS. This will be defrayed (\$150,000) by savings in SSA NAME3 license maintenance fee for year one.</li> <li>• Less control over the application.</li> </ul>

Pros	Cons
<p>issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development expertise available to resolve any applications needs and issues.</li> <li>• Better positions the CSG to support CIDRIS and OBTS,</li> </ul>	

**Recommendation:**

**Option #2** is the preferred choice.

**Benefits Derived (Option #2):**

1. It will save OBTS budget \$150,000 in license fee for SSA Name3 application which will go towards defraying the first year cost of vendor support.
2. The applications will be managed and maintained properly.
3. The users will be able use both the application to their full potential.
4. The agencies will be able to work with the vendor to modify interfaces if the need arises.
5. This will allow DoIT to transition the OBTS and CIDRIS smoothly into their data center.
6. It will alleviate the additional strain that will be put on DoIT programming resources.
7. The integration into CISS will proceed smoothly.
8. The State will be able to maximize its investment on both applications.

**Target date for Smooth Transition (Option #2):** May 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010

**Funding (Option #2):**

Total cost of the managing and maintaining both application by the vendor \$652,500 for 2011. This will be paid via:

- CIDRIS Budget:       \$326,259 – The current budget can support it.  
 OBTS Budget:         \$326,250 – The current Carry Forward budget can support it.

**Next Steps:**

1. Review and approve the option.
2. Work with DoIT Procurement to acquire the vendor services.