

Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative
Privacy and Information Quality Working Group
Meeting Summary
Charleston, South Carolina
September 2-3, 2003

Meeting Background and Purpose

The Office of Justice Programs (OJP), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), convened the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) Privacy and Information Quality Working Group (GPIQWG or “Working Group”) meeting September 2-3, 2003, in Charleston, South Carolina. The GPIQWG was convened for the purpose of reviewing and gathering group input on integrated justice privacy policy. Mr. Cabell Cropper, GPIQWG Chair and Executive Director of the National Criminal Justice Association, chaired the meeting and set forth the following agenda and key discussion points:

- ❑ Purpose of Privacy Working Group
 - Global Advisory Committee (GAC) Strategic Plan
 - Privacy Guidelines
 - What Was Attempted
- ❑ Briefing on GAC Activities
 - Steering Committee
 - Global Intelligence Working Group
 - Global Security Working Group
- ❑ Integrated Justice Privacy Policy Paper
 - Prioritization of Issues
 - Privacy Concerns and Issues Post-9/11
- ❑ Biometrics and Information Quality
 - Presentation and Discussion of Facial Recognition Technology
 - Impact on Privacy and Information Quality
- ❑ Privacy Issues and Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA)
 - What is SOA?
 - Group Liaison

Convening and Introductory Remarks

Mr. Cropper, GPIQWG Chairman, convened the meeting by inviting participants to provide introductions and areas of interest relating to privacy and information quality. Mr. Patrick McCreary, Bureau of Justice Assistance, OJP, presented opening comments regarding the critical nature of information sharing within the justice community, and he provided an update on Global activities. The two Global priorities are increased support for interoperability and information sharing and privacy issues. The following individuals were in attendance:

Mr. Robert Boehmer
*Illinois Criminal Justice Information
Authority
Chicago, Illinois*

Mr. Alan Carlson
*The Justice Management Institute
Kensington, California*

Mr. Cabell Cropper
*National Criminal Justice Association
Washington, DC*

Mr. John Greacen
*Greacen Associates, LLC
Santa Fe, New Mexico*

Mr. Jim Main
*Pinellas County Sheriff's Office
Largo, Florida*

Mr. Scott McCallum
*Pinellas County Sheriff's Office
Largo, Florida*

Mr. Patrick McCreary
*Bureau of Justice Assistance
Washington, DC*

Ms. Jeanette Plante
*Executive Office for United States
Attorneys
Washington, DC*

Mr. Michael Ramage
*Florida Department of Law Enforcement
Tallahassee, Florida*

Ms. Monique Schmidt
*Institute for Intergovernmental Research
Tallahassee, Florida*

Ms. Cindy Southworth
*National Network to End Domestic Violence
Fund
Washington, DC*

Ms. Martha Steketee
*National Center for State Courts
Arlington, Virginia*

Mr. John Terry
*Institute for Intergovernmental Research
Tallahassee, Florida*

Mr. Scott Wallace
*National Legal Aid and Defender
Association
Washington, DC*

Mr. Carl Wicklund
*American Probation and Parole Association
Lexington, Kentucky*

Global Privacy and Information Quality Working Group Vision and Mission

Vision Statement: To accomplish justice information sharing that promotes the administration of justice and public protection by:

1. Preserving the integrity and quality of information.
2. Facilitating sharing of appropriate and relevant information.
3. Protecting individuals from consequences of inappropriate gathering, use, and release of information.
4. Permitting appropriate oversight.

Mission Statement: To advance the adoption of privacy and information quality policies by justice systems participants that promote the responsible collection, handling, management, review, and sharing of (personal) information about individuals.

Potential Privacy Initiatives and Tasks

The penultimate goal is to emphasize the importance of initiating privacy policy review to top-level decision makers. Two deliverables were identified to achieve this goal. The first product will be a brief informational policy paper for decision makers. It will explain essential privacy policies and the systematic review of policies. The second deliverable is the “Project Manual,” which will address interagency collaboration, governance, management controls, and fair information practices. During the course of the meeting, the group identified the following tasks as important initiatives:

1. Develop a brief informational white paper for policymakers (i.e., Decision Maker Document).
 - a. Problem: Raise awareness and interest in privacy information quality policies
 - b. Benefits—top level
 - c. Detriments
 - d. Case Studies (examples)
 - e. History
 - f. Cost/benefit
 - g. Task Force membership
 - h. Justification
 - i. History
 - j. Background information
2. Develop in-depth guidelines and documentation for mid-managers (i.e., Project Manual).
 - a. Best practices
 - b. Identification of issues unique to specific data types
 - c. Privacy policy templates
 - d. Questions, checklist, and/or tool kit
 - e. Project planning and implementation
 - f. Accountability
 - g. Federal and state statutes
3. Create business case for privacy and information quality policymakers.
4. Provide training materials.
5. Draft guidelines for law enforcement exceptions.
6. Write about privacy and information quality issues (i.e., Biometrics).
7. Review National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO) materials (i.e., Federal Privacy Law Compendium Version 1.0 April 2003).
 - a. Use NASCIO scenario development
 - b. Apply NASCIO summary to justice information sharing

Biometrics Briefing

Lieutenant Jim Main and Mr. Scott McCallum, Pinellas County Sheriff’s Office, provided a presentation on the Jail Inmate Management System. The purpose of this system is to use facial recognition as a component of their booking record. It will capture

a standardized image of the person about to be booked into the jail and will store the image for future retrieval. Facial recognition is a biometrics technology that analyzes facial features to produce a unique mathematical representation of the face. Successful use of biometrics applications requires a clear understanding of capabilities and limitations of the technology.

The business process and use of the system includes taking a standard facial image for use at each of the following steps:

- Pre-Booking Kiosk
- Pre-Booking Station
- Formal Booking
- Release

In summary, the Jail Inmate Management System has provided the following benefits to the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office for approximately 45,000 bookings a year:

- Improved inmate identification/reduction of fraud
- Improved image collection and standardization in booking
- Image verification and collection at release
- Little change to existing business process

Action Items

Issue One: Develop a future product regarding privacy policy development for the justice decision maker ("Decision Maker" Document).

Status: "Decision Maker" document – Draft for review in early November 2003. Review at the April 2004 GAC meeting.

Issue Two: Produce the future product regarding developing and implementing privacy policy templates for justice agencies ("Project Manual").

Status: "Project Manual"– To be completed. Review at the April 2004 GAC meeting.

Issue Three: Create subcommittee to address biometrics issues.

Status: To be completed.

Conclusion

The next GPIQWG meeting will be held on November 6, 2003, in Reston, Virginia. The purpose of the meeting will be to address new developed privacy guidelines. Once assignments were delegated, and with no further business before the GPIQWG, the meeting was adjourned.