Criminal Justice Information System
Governing Board
State of Connecticut
101 East River Drive, East Hartford, CT 06108 • www.ct.gov/cjis

CJIS Governing Board Meeting
January 16, 2014, 1:30 pm
Division of Criminal Justice, 300 Corporate Place, Rocky Hill, CT 06067

CJIS Governing Board Members and Designees in attendance

Michael P. Lawlor, *Co-Chair, Under Secretary, Office of Policy and Management*; Judge Patrick L. Carroll, III, *Co-Chair, Chief Court Administrator, Judicial*; Garvin Ambrose, *Victim Advocate, Office of the Victim Advocate*; Reuben Bradford, *Commissioner, Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection*; Cheryl Cepelak, *Designee, Department of Corrections*; Brian Carlow, *Designee, Division of Public Defender Services*; Melody Currey, *Commissioner, Department of Motor Vehicles*; Kevin Kane, *Chief State's Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice*; Richard C. Mulhall, *Chief, Connecticut Police Chiefs Association*; Mark Raymond, *Designee, CIO, Department of Administrative Services, Bureau of Enterprise Systems and Technology*; Erika Tindill, *Chairperson, Board of Pardons & Paroles*; and Joe Verrengia, *Representative, Designee for State Representative Gerald Fox III, Co-Chair of the Joint Standing Committee of the General Assembly on Judiciary.*

Other attendees

Ken Barrone (CCSU), Susan Brown (DPDS), Bob Cosgrove (DOC), Joe D'Alesio (JUD), James Cetran (CPCA), Frank DiMatteo (DPDS), Chris Duryea (JUD), James Fazzalaro (CCSU), Evelyn Godbout (DCJ), Darryl Hayes (DESPP), Joan Hilliard (DESPP), Josh Kovner (Hartford Courant), James Lobb (JUD), Tom Martin (OAG), Eduardo Palmieri (JUD), Jason Rosa (DESPP), John Russotto (DCJ), Richard Sparaco (BOPP), Steven Spellman (DESPP), Thomas Sutkowski (JUD), and Terry Walker (JUD).

CJIS staff and contractors

Jeanine Allin, Phil Conen (Xerox), Rick Hegwood, Bob Kaelin (MTG), Patty Meglio, Sean Thakkar, Elizabeth Ugolik, and David Wright (Xerox).

I. Welcome and Introduction

- Judge Carroll, Governing Board Co-Chair, brought the meeting to order at 1:35 and welcomed everyone. The Governing Board members or designees at the table began the meeting by introducing themselves. Michael Lawlor, Governing Board Co-Chair, announced that Commissioner Bradford is retiring. He thanked him for his participation in the last three years and wished him well. He also said that the new Commissioner, Dr. Dora Schriro, wanted to be here today, but was unable. She will be participating in future meetings at which time she will be introduced to the Board. He also mentioned that the biweekly Governance meetings will continue. If anyone is interested in being a part of the meetings, they are welcome to participate in person or by conference call.
- Mr. Lawlor said that he is providing the incoming Commissioner (Schriro) with updates on these discussions, since she has some experience with this type of situation. At the last Governance meeting, we discussed how we can provide a proposal to the FBI for their approval. Kevin Kane

mentioned the discussion at the meeting on Tuesday, January 14th and asked Sean Thakkar to explain it.

- Mr. Thakkar gave a rundown of the meeting. He said that it was desirable to work with Ms. Hilliard and her team on issues related to the Management Control Agreement (MCA) and the security policy. John Russotto, Rick Hegwood, Commissioner Bradford, Chief Mulhall, and Ms. Hilliard were present. It was decided that Mr. Russotto, Mr. Hegwood, Chief Mulhall would meet with Ms. Hilliard and identify issues that might be constraints to signing the MCA. They would try to resolve them with Joan. If they cannot be resolved in discussions, than the issues will be brought before the Board.
- Mr. Kane said that it is important to get it all in writing and have something that the FBI can approve.

II. Minutes of previous meeting
- Judge Carroll asked for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meetings held on October 17, 2013. Mr. Kane wanted a change, as the court doesn't have clients, as stated on page 4, under Brian Carlow's text. A motion was made to approve the minutes with the modification by Ms. Erika Tindill and seconded by Mr. Lawlor. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. PowerPoint Presentation
- Mr. Thakkar reviewed the details of the agenda. [Slide 2] He then introduced Mr. Rick Hegwood, CJIS Durational Project Manager, for an update on CISS.
- Mr. Hegwood said that he was able to review the project plan with the stakeholders in November. He said that there were concerns about whether there was enough time for stakeholders to test the release, so he said that he would bring the agencies in earlier than originally planned and get them more involved in the training process. Other concerns were for agency resources to help determine how data that originates from CISS will be consumed in their system, and wanted to know what the requirements were. Meetings are just beginning with each stakeholder to address these items. He said that it will be necessary to carefully monitor agency resource constraints.
- Mr. Hegwood stated that the dates originally given for implementation will slide a bit. Dates are dependent on the resolution of the contract amendment. He hopes that the contract issues will be resolved within two weeks.
- Wave 0 (technical environments) is on schedule (slide 4) to be released to the CJIS Operations team. He said that CJIS is set to go into development and testing for future releases. SR1 was data was replicated successfully. CJIS is working with Xerox on the actual requirements. The CJIS team and Xerox are developing a user interface prototype that they will present to the stakeholders soon for their input on the layout. With their approval, CJIS and Xerox can finish the SR1 design.
- Mr. Hegwood said that they are working on finalizing the Project Charter for Search Release 2 (slide 6), and working on requirements with Judicial. He said that they are increasing the audience for SR 2 to include additional local law enforcement, Judicial agencies, and parole officers and DOC staff.
- For Wave 1, Mr. Hegwood said that they are considering adding Wave 2 and 3 to Wave1 as well. The current focus is on the arrest report, and working with Xerox on requirements. He also explained the integration zone and how CJIS will work to assist agencies with consumption of information (slide 7). The CJIS team will plan workshops with stakeholders to continue work on the CISS Community Portals. They will also work with agencies to define claims using the GFIPM model.

- Mr. Kane asked how Global Federated Identity & Privilege Management (GFIPM) relates to the FBI problem. Mr. Hegwood explained that the FBI is happy that we are using GFIPM as a standard, since it is a trusted system and a national standard. CJIS is working with stakeholders to understand the way it works and be comfortable with the trust system. Melody Currey asked what the claim in Connecticut was that's not like the rest of the world. Mr. Hegwood said that it is Youthful Offender. Mr. Lawlor said that it is a status that no longer exists.
- Judge Carroll asked about scope creep and the specifications on the CISS project. He wanted to know that, if the specifications will change as the systems evolves how it will affect the scope. Mr. Hegwood said that it has not come up in discussions yet. Hegwood said that we need to address the issue that CJIS is not a public safety agency, which is a major hole in the security policy piece. He believes that the MCA discussions will take care of that. The other concern that the FBI has is with AFIS. He believes that we can alleviate FBI concerns by not using AFIS, but instead using the RMS systems.
- Mr. Hegwood talked about Wave 1 scope (slide 8) and limiting the audience for Wave 1. The Wave 1 Vote was then presented (slide 9). A discussion followed on the pros and cons of only allowing public safety agencies to participate in Wave 1. A question about testing involving both groups was put forth by Mark Raymond. Mr. Hegwood said that he would recommend that each agency should be a part of the testing process, but that it was up to the agency to decide. Agencies not in Wave one would continue to see information as they do today, but they just would not be able to use the Information Exchange. There would be no negative impact on any agency not included in Wave 1. Mr. Carlow was concerned with the return on investment. Mr. Kane was concerned on whether the CISS staff knows how police and prosecutor documents are processed. Mr. Hegwood said that is what GFIPM comes in with the definition of claims. Mr. Kaelin said that the collection of information is still based on the workflow model that was originally created, though it's been adjusted over time. The vote was formally taken, eleven members or their designees present voted yes; none voted no and none abstained. The motion was carried.
- CJIS's involvement with Racial Profiling was discussed (slide 10). Two men, Ken Barone and Jim Fazzalaro of CCSU, were introduced as leaders of the implementing the legislation. Mr. Lawlor went over the background of Racial Profiling, and emphasized that the CJIS Governing Board will collect and store the information electronically until e-Citation is capable of taking over and then CJIS will only provide a repository. There will be no access to CISS.
- Mr. Kane asked if the Governing Board should see the Project Plan document and the Contract Amendment. Mr. Thakkar said that if they wanted to see them, it could be arranged, but that it wasn't necessary to show it to them as the information is very technical.
- The slide on the Bond Fund Overview was presented (slide 13). Mr. Raymond wanted to know if we know how much more money we will need to finalize the contract. While it was not yet known, Mr. Lawlor said that Karen Buffkin met with Xerox to discuss additional costs. By the next Governance meeting, they should have an agreement and we will know what the additional costs will be.
- There was a discussion about staffing consultants versus state workers. Mr. Kaelin pointed out that consultants usually work on projects for short periods of time and then move on, taking their knowledge and experience with them. It would make better sense to hire workers, thereby retaining workers with the latest technical knowledge.
- Joe Verrengia wanted to know if we are progressing with working out the major problems with the contract and the security issue with the FBI. Mr. Lawlor said that we have made a lot of progress in the last month and that Xerox is committed to the success of CISS. Verrengia said that there is a perception that the project is not progressing as anticipated.

- Bob Kaelin then presented his report. He mentioned two most important areas that are at risk: oversight and scope. He said that because of rescheduling due to a lack of a vendor contract, the scope will change. He also said that without a full time project manager, there is a lack of oversight on the project. Mr. Kaelin expects the risks to go down in the next report because he expects Xerox will sign the contract amendment. To get CISS in operation is critical. We need to be able to see what is being worked on and to start working with it.
- One key thing Mr. Kaelin said is the need to hire the planned staff, rather than have them remain as consultants. He explained the reasons why it is important to hire employees, including the potential loss of knowledge and expertise if they are not hired. He mentioned that contractors don't have the commitment to the project as state employees would. They are more transitory.
- Mr. Kaelin explained the contract amendment. He said that it addresses two things: it re-baselines the project and it ties the new deliverables to the actual schedule. He said that the delay increased the costs.
- Another issue Mr. Kaelin mentioned is the importance of hiring a new project manager. He mentioned that Mr. Thakkar besides doing his job is also filling in the gap of project manager. There is a search being conducted for a new project manager that will be able to work full time.
- Mr. Kane said that he would prefer to get Mr. Kaelin's report a little earlier, and it was decided that the report will be sent to the Governing Board no later than two weeks before the Governing Board meeting.
- Mr. Kane said the Governing Board needs to make critical decisions, but it is not doing that. He also spoke about the decision to go with AFIS versus the RMS systems. It is important to know what FBI data is as well. He said that there is a lack of communication and a certain degree of mistrust on the part of some members of the Board. He felt that the Governing Board needs to do something different, but he did not have any suggestions.
  Mr. Lawlor said that at the Governance Meetings, the Board is addressing the problems. They are considering all of the ways to do things, and have run into some technical issues with some of the proposals. Mr. Kane felt that there were a lot of unfocused discussions.
- Mr. Raymond said that it is important that information is brought before the Board. The direction of the Governing Board should be what it stands for and it should give direction to the team. Mr. Lawlor also said that discussions about AFIS began about two years ago and no concerns were raised then, but that things change. Mr. Lawlor said that the Governing Board was made aware of things over the life of the project. Mr. Kaelin and Mr. Raymond said that sometimes decisions need to be revisited, especially when you are working in the design phase of a project. Mr. Raymond said that we should continue to have signoff and buy-ins for the changes. Mr. Kaelin said that there are only five original Board members from the beginning of the project that are still with the Board. Erika Tindill felt that we need to focus on where we are now and not look back to the past.
- Reuben Bradford reiterated that it is important that the Governing Board gets all of the information. Mr. Kane felt that the Governing Board was not being fully informed by Mr. Thakkar and the CJIS staff of the issues that need to be addressed. We should get all of the MTG reports. We haven't discussed the Auditor's report.
- Mr. Bradford commented that, for example, the FBI letter on security was not presented to the Governing Board last year which he felt should have been presented.
- Ms. Currey asked if there is a report on the Governance meeting. It was stated that there are Issues and Action Items logs. Mr. Thakkar offered to send out the Issues and Action Items Logs to anyone who requests it.
- Mr. Lawlor said that he would like everyone to look at the Legislative Report and provide feedback by the end of next week. Garvin Ambrose asked about hiring the nineteen people and whether this

was still on track. Mr. Thakkar said that the schedule was dependent on the signing of the contract amendment and that the schedule is undecided at this time.

- Another discussion centered on job classification. The skill sets are not properly classified in the state system and pay scales are not in line with the private sector.

IV. Conclusion

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:45.