



Criminal Justice Information System
Governing Board
State of Connecticut
55 Farmington, Hartford, CT 06105 • www.ct.gov/cjis

CJIS Governing Board Meeting

January 15, 2015, 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 Elliot Solomon, *Designee, Deputy Chief Court Administrator, Judicial*; Andres Ayala, Jr., *Commissioner, Department of Motor Vehicles*; Brian Carlow, *Designee, Division of Public Defender Services*; Cheryl Cepelak, *Designee, Department of Corrections*; James Cetran, *Chief, Designee, Connecticut Police Chiefs Association*; Carleton Giles, *Chairperson, Board of Pardons and Paroles*; Kevin Kane, *Chief State's Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice*; Natasha Pierre, *Advocate, Office of the Victim Advocate*; Mark Raymond, *Designee, CIO, Department of Administrative Services, Bureau of Enterprise Systems and Technology*; Dr. Dora Schriro, *Commissioner, Department of Emergency Services & Public Protection*; Scott Semple, *Interim Commissioner, Department of Correction*; and Joe Verrengia, *Designee, Representative*.

Other attendees

Sue Brown (DPDS), Bob Cosgrove (DOC), Frank DiMatteo (DPDS), Chris Duryea (JUD), Darryl Hayes (DESPP), Karl Lewis (DOC), Marc Montminy (CPCA), John Russotto (DCJ), Terry Schnure, Celia Siefert (JUD), Pete Smith (Rome, Smith, & Lutz), Terry Walker, (JUD) and Antoinette Webster (DESPP).

CJIS staff and contractors

Phil Conen (Xerox), Craig Holt (Qualis), Patty Meglio, Mark Morin, Sean Thakkar, Elizabeth Ugolik and David Wright (Xerox).

I. Welcome

- Mike Lawlor, Governing Board Co-Chair, brought the meeting to order at 1:33 pm and welcomed everyone.
- Mr. Lawlor welcomed Judge Elliot Solomon who is the designee for Judge Carroll.
- Mr. Lawlor introduced Commissioner Ayala (DMV), Chief Cetran (CPCA) and Chief Marc Montminy (CPCA) and Natasha Pierre (OVA). He stated that even though Representative Tong was not present for the meeting, the new Co-chair of the Judiciary Committee, will be taking an active role in the CJIS Governing Board. Mr. Lawlor also welcomed Scott Semple and Joe Verrengia.

II. Minutes of Previous Meeting

- Mr. Lawlor asked for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting held on October 16, 2014. A motion was made to approve the minutes by Mr. Kevin Kane and seconded by Mr. Mark Raymond. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. Introduction

- Mr. Lawlor mentioned that the up-coming Focus Group Sessions are critically important to the success of the project. The input of the frontline folks who are familiar with the most of the day-to-day operations is significant. The folks from Xerox and the CJIS team are not the day-to-day professionals. They are the technical experts who rely on input from the stakeholders about how to build the software so that it's useful when it is up and running. When asked about the dates, Mr. Sean Thakkar said that there are two sessions scheduled in February (11, 19) and two in March (12, 19). He said that the Focus Group Sessions will involve anyone associated with the first forty-six Exchanges that Xerox is going to be building. The first session will review the Uniform Arrest Report (UAR) Workflow and the 56 artifacts (documents) associated with that Workflow. Mr. Thakkar said that CJIS will work with stakeholders on the data fields. Decisions need to be made on the business rules, security and permissions required for each field.
- Mr. Thakkar said that there will be more Focus Groups scheduled, not just those involved in the first four exchanges. Mr. Lawlor said that it is important to have the key people involved in these meetings. Mr. Brian Carlow wanted to confirm if it is intended that the people who attend these meeting are those that make decisions for the agency. If so, it is important that they have the authority to speak for the agency. Mr. Thakkar said that the attendees need to be able to make decisions and provide feedback.
- Mr. David Wright urged that knowledgeable and authorized participants from the agencies to come to the meetings. One of the governance measures moving forward is that there will be sign-off from CJIS, Xerox, and the stakeholders on key points of the project (sign-off is a prerequisite to begin design, Signoff on design begins development.) Mr. Lawlor agreed that it is important to send people who have authorization.
- Mr. Thakkar said that the Focus Group Sessions are scheduled for four days at around six hours per session. Mr. Lawlor said that the goal is to get everyone on the same page, once the Sessions are over.
- Mr. Wright said that there would be more Focus Group Sessions, and some small ones in between the Sessions. He mentioned that there will be additional Focus Group Sessions to help with requirements gathering. CJIS will start scheduling the Sessions next week.
- Mr. Lawlor spoke about the bi-weekly Governance Committee Meetings. He said that they will continue to hold them as they have made a lot of progress with the issues.
- Commissioner Dora Schriro spoke about the progress of her team's communication with the FBI the day before. She said that their feedback was positive. The FBI read all of the materials provided and felt that the CJIS Governing Board is addressing their concerns. She felt that some summary of the CISS core operating principals would be worthwhile, to guide all of our work. She said that the FBI can count upon us to honor these principles regardless of who serves in those capacities and felt that it would be a worthwhile thing to have.
- Ms. Antoinette Webster also said that the teleconference with the FBI went well. She and Mr. Darryl Hayes explained how the materials had changed since the original request made in 2012. Though pleased with this, the FBI wanted more substantial materials. She said the information was verbally presented but that they would update their reports with the new plans. Commissioner Schriro said that they would make the changes and do a quick turnaround. They will continue the informal communications with the FBI.

IV. Xerox Contract Update

- On the status of the Xerox Contract Amendment, Mr. Lawlor said that Ms. Karen Buffkin reported that the state and Xerox came to an agreement. Ms. Buffkin sent the document to the Attorney

General's Office for their approval and asked that it be expedited. She said that they hope to have a decision soon.

V. PowerPoint Slide Presentation

What is FBI Data?

- Mr. Darryl Hayes began the slide presentation with his explanation of what constitutes FBI data (slides 3 and 4). He gave the FBI definition from the CJIS Security Policy 5.3. According to Mr. Hayes, the FBI considers their data "CJI", which stands for criminal justice information. He first explained the five categories of criminal justice data, which includes Biometric Data (physical or behavioral traits related to a person), Identity History Data (person's criminal history), Biographic Data (case data), Property Data (stolen property), and Case/Incident History (case history). He explained CHRI and how it requires additional security measures according to the FBI Security Policy 5.3. Mr. Hayes said that CHRI is under some contention on when it can be disseminated, to whom and why.
- Mr. Hayes then gave some examples of FBI data and non-FBI data (slide 4). FBI data is source and context related. He defined data that is definitely not FBI data. This is an in-state arrest record that is not attached to, or combined with, information on out-of-state arrests or FBI-sourced information, and an FBI ID or transaction numbers by themselves. Mr. Hayes gave the following examples: He said that if the town of Groton arrests someone, and they put their information into the arrest system and send it to the state, that is not FBI data. If they take fingerprints and sends it to the FBI and the record comes back with an FBI number attached to it, that whole state record becomes FBI data. If they take that same data and strips out the FBI number, that data is no longer FBI data. If they just published an FBI number, that is not considered FBI data.
- Mr. Lawlor asked how SPBI compared to FBI ID. Mr. Hayes said that SPBI is information from local agencies that is entered into criminal history, and it's all in state. Once an FBI number is added, it becomes FBI data, because it originates from the FBI. Mr. Lawlor asked if they get a FOIA for information and the FBI number is redacted, whether it's considered non-FBI data. Mr. Hayes agreed that it is. As long as the information is just state information. Aliases that come from the FBI must be removed. Mr. Lawlor asked if this information is redacted now and the answer was yes.
- Chief Marc Montminy said that no data is FBI data until it originates from the FBI. The source of the information is important. If you lived in Georgia and you did a query and you get information from the FBI, it would be considered FBI data. He said that if he runs a criminal history for the state of Connecticut, it will only come back with a SPBI. Chief Montminy said that they don't give out the FBI number. He said that it's possible that information is in a narrative and does not get redacted, but very few officers put that number in the text. If he ran a query on someone in Connecticut, it would not come back with FBI data, only SPBI. If he runs an III (Triple I) query, it will come back with FBI data. Mr. Hayes said that it depends on the source.
- Mr. Hayes said that we may have a solution to the issue of being able to mark the source of data after talking to Xerox about it.
- He went on to say that what constitutes definitely FBI data is an out-of-state arrest record, Information sourced from a request to the FBI. For example, if he ran something III in Alabama, it would come back with FBI data. An in-state arrest record to which FBI information has been added (if we have information in SPBI, we then add an FBI number, it becomes FBI data).
- Situational data is an in-state arrest record to which an FBI ID number has been attached *becomes* FBI data and the same record with the FBI ID number stripped off is *not* FBI data.
- Chief Montminy wanted clarification on the data received and the safeguards for the information. Ms. Webster said that part of what we identified to the FBI is the community and the agencies that will have access to data and the restrictions we have placed on the access to that data. Also, we

explained how the security for the data is laid out in the security policy and how the application will apply to that.

- Mr. Raymond said that the definition seems to only apply to the access of data, not the storage of the data. Mr. Hayes said that there are requirements on how long FBI data can stay in CISS. For example, III data from another state can only be in CISS for as long as a case is active.
- Mr. Raymond said that the number is stripped off for display purposes, but not when storing it.
- Mr. Hayes said that he is correct, that it's not about what is stored underneath; it's about what we're showing them. We don't want to send data out and have it available on a Webpage. It's important to make sure that what is sent is only what that person is allowed to see.
- Mr. Raymond wanted to know if an agent uses an FBI number to join two pieces of information that would not necessarily be joined, and it was returned without the FBI number, whether this is considered FBI data. For example if Newington and Wethersfield had information on the same guy and they don't know it, they link it together through the FBI number, the linkage itself might be FBI but the information itself still belongs to the state. In that case, the information would have a State ID number.

Release Plan Overview

- Mr. David Wright spoke about the Release Plan (slides 5 and 6). Mr. Wright said that the Release Plan was broken into nine separate releases. (Each Governing Board member received a copy of the release plan in their email) Each release will begin with an initiation phase that involves business requirements, and deployment at the end - Production Ready. It's the requirements work that is the critical step that is needed to get stakeholder engagement (the experts) to obtain the right business rules, which is the foundation for the entire system from which design and development work originates. Each of the Search rows represents the activities to get the fourteen Search sources completed. For the Workflows, there will be 46 Information Exchanges. We are scheduled for having the last set of Search sources by the end of 2017.
- Ms. Webster wanted to know at what point CISS will be accessible. Mr. Wright said that it would be available to those who have authorization to access the system. Mr. Lawlor reiterated that it depended who has authorized access to the system. He explained the changes from the previous plan and the changes because of redactions.
- Mr. Brian Carlow said that the timing for access to CISS will depend on who the user is, the information available and when the user will have access to it. He wanted to know if this is what the Focus Groups are going to be about. He said that he expected there would be some contention in some areas. He wanted to know how a situation is resolved if you are in one of these groups and you are working through the who, what and when, and there's not agreement.
- Mr. Wright said that they will create a replica of the data (the what), and that viewing will depend on the business requirements. If there are any disagreements, they will be escalated to the Governance Committee.
- Mr. Lawlor made it clear that under no circumstances can the Governing Board vote to require an agency to give up their data. He said that whoever owns the data will forever own the data and the owner of the data decides to whom they will share it. Mr. Wright agreed and said that CISS is never intended to be a system of record. Only the agency that holds the data can decide who has access to the data. Mr. Lawlor said that as in Google, an individual can only search what they are allowed to see.
- Mr. Carlow asked if an agency can decide what information goes into CISS and whether they can deny access. He also wanted to know if the agency decides on the business rules. Mr. Lawlor said it is up to the agency but that it is important to collaborate to work with others to work out issues.

- Mr. Carlow said it's more a question of when, specifically for a probable cause document. He said that he was concerned that it would just be an electronic version of what they currently have and it won't make much difference and may not increase efficiency. Mr. Wright said that for further discussion, they can take it off line.
- Mr. Mark Morin said that the Production Ready date at the end of the green bar on the Release Plan is flexible. There is time built in to be flexible for the release.
- Mr. Thakkar said that Xerox will do their part and deliver something signed off by the CJIS team and stakeholders saying that it's Production Ready. Mr. Morin said that in reference to deployment, not everyone will have access right away. People will be brought onboard in stages.
- Ms. Webster asked when they will be able to see their piece of the rollout. Mr. Morin said they will be working with each agency to decide when it would work best.
- Mr. Wright said the new Release Plan is slightly changed from the July Release Plan. He spoke about how the UAR and Misdemeanor Summons had to be split because of the concern over redactions.

Overall Deployment Strategy

- Mr. Morin presented the deployment strategy (slides 7-9).
- He reviewed the feedback from stakeholders, including their concerns about scheduling and resources. These concerns are documented. He mentioned that they have created a template with a timeline to help work out the resources, hours, and skill sets. They will use the document to weigh the impacts with each agency. There is a Parking Lot document that lists concerns that will be visible in a community SharePoint site. On this site, stakeholders can track the issues and the progress made on the issues.
- Mr. Morin also spoke about the SharePoint sites that CJIS has developed for the stakeholders. He showed how the stakeholder can use the site to get updates on the project and to view the resource use and timeline. He said that they have three sites so far and are building seven more sites for stakeholders. He gave a short live demonstration of a sample site.
- Mr. Hayes asked if CJIS was assigning resources. Mr. Morin said that CISS project managers will maintain the plan. CJIS will go to each agency and collaborate on resources.
- Mr. Morin also announced the first group of police departments that will receive the deployment and the partners that will work with them. From a search perspective, there will be a total of twenty police departments. Three police departments, Newington, Wethersfield, and New Britain, will be the first. After three months, they will then decide which departments are next. It will depend on the RMS vendors and if they want to come in and be CISS certified.

CJIS Project Update

- Mr. Thakkar provided the overview of the Governance Committee's Issue Log (slides 10, 11 and 12).
- On the durational project manager position, Mr. Thakkar said that they are still working on this. As soon as there is more clarification from OPM and DAS on how to proceed, he will inform everyone on the progress.
- The eighteen positions were going to be funded by pay phone revenue. The FCC said that the funding is going to be drastically curtailed. Mr. Raymond said that the FCC is currently accepting their second round of comments on their proposed rulemaking. Mr. Raymond said that they typically don't have jurisdiction over intrastate calling, but they may go beyond their jurisdiction on this case, and they may decide to eliminate any of the surcharges due to inmate calling. There is currently discussion on whether or not the funds will be available. The FCC will give its final ruling in the first quarter of this year, either in February or March. Mr. Thakkar said Judge Solomon and

Judge Carroll are aware that there is a substantial amount of funding coming to Judicial, and that we may be impacted quite a bit.

- Mr. Russotto asked if there were any other obstacles to do with filling the positions. Mr. Thakkar said that on the position of Durational Project Manager, there are not, but with filling the eighteen positions, there are obstacles. The problem is that the job classes created fifteen years ago don't match up with current technology requirements. Mr. Lawlor said that the problem that goes beyond CJIS' control.
- On the Non-Disclosure topic, CJIS has two documents in place for people working for CJIS and for vendors. Mr. Russotto said they have information from the FBI that addresses these issues. The Security Workgroup needs to review the state statutes and will have a rough draft by the next Governance Committee Meeting. Mr. Thakkar said that he will present the findings at the next Governing Board Meeting for review and a vote will be taken.
- Mr. Raymond asked that someone from DAS procurement to be a part of the discussions. In some ways, it may be a state to vendor relationship as well as individuals. Mr. Thakkar suggested that once the Governance Committee puts together a document, that he and Mr. Raymond would take the information to DAS for their review. A decision would be presented to the Governance Committee. Mr. Lawlor clarified stating that we already have contractors who are already signing those two documents, but we want to improve on what we have.
- Mr. Thakkar brought up the FOIA letter. There is nothing being stored in CISS right now. The Governance Committee is drafting a letter to inform the requestor of the correct procedure. This will be necessary once CISS goes into production.
- Mr. Thakkar said that CJIS is working with DESPP on the statement of work (SOW) to allow 3M to do the AFIS interface. DESPP has a proposal in place of what it will take and a timeline to do the work.
- Mr. Thakkar went on to talk about the budget (slide 13).

Project Health Check

- Mr. Thakkar introduced Craig Holt from Qualis. He gave the first quarterly presentation of the Project Health Check Report for 2015 (slides 14-19). He explained that the report that Qualis is presenting is not an IV&V report as it does not compare deliverables with industry standards. Rather it is a report based on a survey and follow-up questions based on survey answers. It is about how people are feeling about a project and a 360 degree view of how it is progressing.
- Mr. Lawlor said that a Project Health Check Report is not required by law, and Mr. Thakkar mentioned that he asked for the report when he began work at CJIS. It is an additional safety check.
- Mr. Holt said that there was 100 percent return on the two surveys given, which doesn't usually happen. The risks and issues were based on responses from people who were surveyed. He said that Connecticut is a unique situation.
- Mr. Holt reviewed the way the Health Check is measured. He said that you will never see a four (the top level where everyone is happy) and conversely, you should never see a one (where everyone is unhappy). Looking at the chart (slide 15), he said that the project is holding steady.
- Mr. Holt went over risks and issues and the mitigations. Those that are labeled perceived are based on stakeholder comments. He said that trust is improving, sustainable communication and limited access to documentation has no change, and stakeholder engagement and inconsistent information are new. Any issues in development are items that have limited time to be solved before they become a problem. This is a unique situation, since we are working with a changing board. He went

over the scheduling of the survey and interviews for the next quarter. At that time, Qualis will also review the project structure and project management. Overall the project is about average.

- Mr. Raymond said that there seems to be several outliers, with some really low answers. And he said that there is a level of process that may not meet someone's needs. Mr. Holt agreed and he said the outliers will change as the project moves along and that it is important to be aware of that. Mr. Holt said that they are being cautious and are not pointing fingers at a certain group.
- Mr. Kane said that sometimes an agency is not involved or doesn't need as much and is happy with things, while there may be an agency that is heavily involved with people who are very unhappy. Mr. Holt suggested looking at the report to see the specifics to better understand how the answers balance out.
- Mr. Raymond said that depending on whom it is and if it is in scope, it could be a big red flag. Mr. Holt suggested that everyone should look at the report and the issue, not at the agency.
- Ms. Webster asked if the report identifies the issues and concerns, and Mr. Holt said yes, it does. Mr. Kane said they are looking at the processes, versus substantive issues. Mr. Holt said that Qualis is not looking at deliverables, but rather the health of the project and the processes used.
- Mr. Morin mentioned that the dates may coincide with the Focus Group Sessions. Also, there is a problem with a holiday that overlaps with their schedule.

VI. Other Business

- Mr. Lawlor announced that next Governing Board meeting dates as shown on the agenda.

VII. Adjournment

- There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:19 pm.