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FOREWORD

This is the report of the Interstate Compact Information Management System Planning Group (Planning Group). The Planning Group was formed by and is responsible to the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA). Its work is endorsed by the newly established Commission for the Interstate Compact for Adult Offender Supervision (Interstate Commission) and is supported by a grant made to APPA by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.

The Interstate Commission has determined that the products of this Planning Group may serve as the functional blueprint for its information management system. The Interstate Commission may employ this blueprint as the basis for writing a technology-specific request for proposal (RFP) to construct the system.

An effort has been made to avoid the use of technical language unique to information technology to facilitate readers’ understanding this report. There are, however, some terms included that are not common in everyday discourse. Those are listed and defined in the Glossary (Appendix B).

The Planning Group was composed of members representing the Interstate Commission Technology Committee, Interstate Commission Rules Committee, Interstate Compact administrators and deputy administrators, information technology staff from member states, probation and parole practitioners, and information technology vendors. A full listing of the membership follows this foreword. The Planning Group met three times from March to July 2003 to fully explore and share ideas about the functional requirements for the Interstate Compact information management system.
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I. THE AIM OF THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION’S INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

It is the ultimate aim of the Interstate Commission to create and maintain an information management system that effectively serves the Commission to effect the transfer and document the movement of offenders from one state to another, including all of the diverse activities associated with such transfer and movement.

This report describes in significant detail the capabilities and qualities needed in such a system. The vision features and the elements of each feature outline the major capabilities needed. The descriptors, implications, and anecdotes related to each element provide additional specificity.

This vision is cast at the intersection of three streams of facts: (1) the limits and problems in the current state of information exchange among states in the transfer of offenders as described in Section II, (2) the immediate and emerging needs for information exchange, and (3) the anticipated opportunities for expanded and improved information exchange as afforded by evolving technologies.
II. THE CURRENT STATE OF INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Before considering a vision for the information management system, it was important to have a shared view of the current state of the exchange of information as it relates to the work of the Interstate Compact. The Planning Group created a word-map of the current state of information exchange. The following words and phrases were offered as descriptive of the current state:

- Data entry errors
- Everything in hard copy
- Information credibility is low
- Everything sent by mail or fax
- Some are ignoring the system
- Relevant case information may not be effectively transmitted
- Silos exist both in the criminal justice system and in the civil system
- Copying at every level
- Redundant file creation
- Wide variance in data packets from different states
- Unsupervised offenders
- No information on numbers of transfers sent or received
- Damaged community corrections credibility
- Not able to authenticate identity of the offender
- Travel of offenders not tracked
- Multiple desktops receive offender transfer information in hard copy
- Victims do not receive accurate or up-to-date information about the offender’s status or location
- Extended time involved to initiate transfer
- Frustration and finger pointing
- Courts make decisions without information on transfer regulations
- Inadequate expertise at local/state level for processing transfers
- Inadequate training for staff
- Budget cuts and staff cuts have reduced the capacity to manage the number of transfers
- Untreated sex offenders
- No uniformity in diagnostics
- Offenders’ rehabilitation is affected negatively if they cannot be supervised in states where they have families and jobs.
- No uniform understanding of terms, e.g. social, treatment, or criminal history
- Extended time involved to exchange information
- Courts make decisions without adequate information regarding the offender
- Some of the principles contained in the Compact enacted in 1937 are the right ones hand have served well for many years

The six themes among these words and phrases reveal a graphic picture of the need for a radically improved information system. These themes include:

1. There is a need for standardization in the system.
2. There is a lack of real-time communication and information sharing that is vital in the quality performance of activities related to transfer of offenders and public safety.
3. Rules, accountability and enforcement are inadequate.
4. There are significant impacts on supervision because of information processing inefficiencies.
5. There are dramatic costs inherent in the existing IMS in terms of reduced public safety, high liability, and significant financial costs.
6. Case ownership is not clearly delineated.
III. THE GUIDING ASSUMPTIONS

Assumptions are brought to any planning effort. It is critical to be explicit about the assumptions for two reasons. First, the assumptions brought by members of the Planning Group were not identical and these disparities needed to be clearly identified in order to be resolved. Second, it is crucial that these resulting and shared assumptions be made explicit to every reader and user of this report since the assumptions influence the report’s content.

The shared, guiding assumptions are of four types and are listed below.

1. **Assumptions Regarding Ease of Use**
   a. We are not replacing systems that currently exist but are seeking methods for working with existing systems.
   b. The state-to-state exchange of data will be able to commence in a reasonably short time.
   c. Data will be entered once and used many times.
   d. Implementation of business rules formulated by the Interstate Commission will take advantage of workflow capabilities whenever possible to support operational probation and parole process efficiencies.
   e. The system will be scaleable to support varying and evolving applications, transactions, and user requirements of each state.

2. **Assumptions Regarding Phased Construction**
   a. The envisioned system will be built incrementally in a phased approach over time, perhaps a decade.
   b. This will be a process, not a project; and it will be dynamic, evolving over time in phases and designed with an architecture that supports all envisioned functionalities, but implemented in phases.

3. **Assumptions Regarding the Nature of the System**
   a. This will be a system between states; therefore, the system architecture should provide a foundation for integration of state and local systems.
   b. System design assumes a web-based environment.
   c. This will be a paperless system of exchange.
   d. The information management system (IMS) will be developed consistent with open architecture guidelines and when practical will take advantage of those justice standards resident in the Justice Clearinghouse for Information Sharing.

4. **Assumptions Regarding Sustaining Quality in the System**
   a. For the life of this project, best practices for project management will be followed, i.e., setting milestones and describing deliverables.
   b. Business rules will be periodically evaluated in light of efficiencies and advantages offered by current and future technology.
IV. THE VISION FOR THE SYSTEM

We define a vision as:
A description of the desired future that those who cast the vision are committed to create.

The characteristics of a vision include:

- It is a desired future we can point to, but is beyond our grasp.
- The exact pathway to the vision is not usually known.
- The vision obligates only the vision makers, not others.
- It describes WHAT we seek, not HOW to achieve it.
- It includes enough concreteness to guide decision-making.
- It shapes the goals and objectives, all of which are tested against the degree to which they move us toward the vision.

This report casts a vision with an eight- to ten-year horizon. This vision is purposefully crafted without constraint by the current capability of the states, by politics, or by traditional interstate compact practices. It is cast so that it will guide the development of the Interstate Compact information management system into its foreseeable future.

THE VISION

We envision an information management system that with its features and elements:

A. Provides support for decisionmaking:
   1. Has the ability to collect and extract accurate data to support national and state needs.
   2. Has the ability to query disparate databases and assemble a relevant response.
   3. Will include automated verification of the completeness of the information required for transfer.

B. Addresses offender-related issues:
   1. Will have the capacity to process the transfer of offenders efficiently with an information flow through the Compact office that requires little manual intervention.
   2. Will have the capacity to hold and transmit information to allow for positive identification of offenders.
   3. Will provide for the capability for automatic notification of interested parties.*
   4. Will promote an effective offender tracking system.

C. Provides the appropriate security and confidentiality:
   1. Will consider and follow the privacy guidelines of the Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative (Global) and the Health Information Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).
   2. Will provide a secure environment for transacting business.
   3. Will establish a security matrix for users.
   4. Will be able to track who is accessing or manipulating information, when it occurred and where, as well as being able to determine if there had been any system compromises.

* Interested parties may include crime victims, law enforcement, courts, agents, supervisors, the Compact office and the sending state. The Commission will determine the priority for notification among the stakeholders.
D. **Ensures accountability and management of the system:**
   1. Will be user-friendly.
   2. Will strive for a cost-effective maintenance and administration methodology.
   3. Will incorporate end-user and administrative training.

E. **Allows for management of, exchange of, and immediate access to needed electronic data:**
   1. The system will be developed using a tiered approach in order to allow immediate access to approved users.
   2. There is an evolving transition to reach the goal of a paperless system.

F. **Is an information sharing system:**
   1. The system will share information with appropriate stakeholders.
   2. The system will allow information sharing and leveraging of existing and disparate networks, systems, and databases.
   3. The system takes advantage of and utilizes relevant work already completed or ongoing, especially in the area of justice standards.

It is anticipated that the business rules established by the Interstate Commission will be developed in full congruence with this vision, and those rules will be embedded in the system technologies so that this vision is reinforced in routine use.
V. DESCRIPTION AND IMPLICATIONS OF VISION

The Planning Group gave fuller meaning and definition to each of the vision features and elements in Section IV of this report. The following components have been attached to each vision element:

a. Descriptor(s) – These include defining language and/or specific aspects of the vision feature.

b. Implication(s) – Each vision feature will have implications. Some of these implications may be viewed as obstacles to the fulfillment of a particular aspect of the vision. It is advisable to identify these implications in advance and thus allow for the early development of prescriptive responses.

c. Anecdote(s) – These are included to put each vision feature into a real-life working context.

A. We envision an information management system that provides support for decisionmaking.

A-1. The Interstate Compact IMS has the ability to collect and extract accurate data to support national and state needs.

DESCRIPTORS
A. The IMS has the capacity to produce transfer activity by location.
B. The IMS has the capacity to extract data for customized reports by state from the information collected. Inputting of established information is not required.
C. The Interstate Commission must set rules about data to be collected, including data to support immediate and long-term outcome-measuring capabilities.

IMPLICATIONS
A. All states will have to collect and provide the same data.
B. The Interstate Commission will have to put rules in place that require states to collect and provide specific, minimal data.
C. There may be resistance from states that don’t want information about their performance made available to others.
D. Rules must address the type of offender identifying information that will be required.
E. Someone must be responsible for managing the information to ensure integrity and accuracy of data.
F. The system will have the capacity to generate required, standardized and ad hoc reports.

ANECDOTES
A. On a national perspective we will have an accurate picture of transfers and thus a basis for setting dues.
B. A state could use the data in decisionmaking. For example, they might choose to assign additional personnel to service areas with high number of transfers.
C. Information will be available to make appropriate decisions about staffing in a state’s Interstate Compact office.

A-2. The Interstate Compact IMS has the ability to push, pull, query and subscribe to and from disparate databases and assemble a relevant response.

DESCRIPTORS
A. The end-user sees the benefit.
B. Decisions can be made in a real-time situation.
C. Established data will not have to be recreated.

IMPLICATIONS
A. This system will increase connectivity between state users.
B. The potential to query disparate databases raises security and privacy concerns that must be addressed.
C. Technology gaps in some locations do not allow real-time access.
D. State-by-state decisions must be made regarding who has access. This will create secondary dissemination issues that are difficult and will take time to resolve.
E. The Interstate Commission will need to specify standard data items that all states must input and make available to other users. Access to other items beyond those data items can be set by the states. (The Rules Committee will need to determine the attributes that each case must have in order to be considered for transfer. Examples are available from the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators [AAMVA] and the Standardized Rap Sheet.)
F. Other documents beyond these required data items, such as the presentence investigation and sentencing conditions, can be attached.

ANECDOTE
A law enforcement officer making a traffic stop queries the system and discovers that the driver, with two young boys in the back seat, is a sex offender who was transferred from another state.

A-3. The Interstate Compact IMS will include automated verification of the completeness of the information required for transfer.

DESCRIPTOR
All of the required data elements will be present and subject to system audit.

IMPLICATIONS
A. The Interstate Commission Rules Committee must build business rules that require agents to enter proper information before the application will be
accepted. This implies use of a uniform transfer application in this national system.  
B. There may be short-term resistance from line staff persons who feel that the system with its embedded logic is usurping their jobs.  
C. It must be possible for an administrator to be able to override the system in compliance with or as allowed by business rules.  
D. Commission rules will determine what can be added and/or overridden.  

ANECDOTES  
A. We will have more complete transfer applications by virtue of a built-in audit.  
B. The system will be able to reject an application that lacks required information, but the officer will be able to override the rejection. The override will cause the application to be sent to the state’s compact administrator for review.  

B. We envision an information management system that addresses offender-related issues.  

B-1. The Interstate Compact IMS will have the capacity to transfer offenders efficiently with an information flow through the Compact office that requires little manual intervention.  

DESCRIPTOR  
There is capacity for local probation and parole offices to forward an interstate compact transfer packet, travel permit, violation reports and other data directly to the receiving state’s Interstate Compact office, provided that embedded business rule logic is met. Then the system would electronically notify the sending state’s Interstate Compact Office.  

IMPLICATIONS  
A. The Interstate Commission Rules Committee will have to create rules regarding this feature that will alter the responsibilities of the Compact Administrator. This alteration will relieve him or her of perfunctory activities and allow for a focus on the exceptions.  
B. This will call for enforcing a culture shift.  
C. There will need to be coordination between the Rules Committee and the Technology Committee of the Interstate Commission. A question to be asked, for example, is: “Are we requiring more information than we really need in an offender’s packet?”  
D. There must be a reduction in the information deemed “absolutely necessary” for transfer.  
E. The system will need a search capacity at the receiver end so that, if scanned materials are sent, one need not scroll through all of it to find a particular segment of information.  
F. States are responsible for converting existing case data to be accessed by the interstate information system. This is not the responsibility of the vendor.
ANECDOTE
Transfer information that met embedded business rules logic would be transferred immediately to the receiving state’s Interstate Compact office along with an electronic notice to the sending state’s Interstate Compact office and to the Interstate Commission’s office. Exceptions would notify the sending state’s Interstate Compact office of a need for action.

B-2. The Interstate Compact IMS will provide the capability to transmit positive identifiers of offenders.

DESCRIPTORS
A. Will be able to store and transmit identifiers.
B. There are a number of identifying tools available, e.g. fingerprints and photos.
C. There are other systems that already have this capacity that will serve as models or can be adopted in their entirety.

IMPLICATIONS
A. We expect that this technology exists on a broad-based level.
B. Compression of files will allow images to be sent with a low demand on system space.
C. Training will need to be given to staff for using this technology.
D. Hardware will be needed if, for example, a reader is used for fingerprints.
E. Up-front costs, depending on the technology chosen, need to be considered.

ANECDOTES
A transferred offender walks into a local probation office and the officer can positively identify him or her as the person transferred.

B-3. The Interstate Compact IMS will be capable of automatically notifying interested parties.

DESCRIPTORS
A. Users will be able to subscribe to specific notifications.
B. Task management will be improved. For example, if a progress report is due the system will produce an alert, or it can be set to indicate, “You have five days to complete the application.”

IMPLICATIONS
A. Security and privacy considerations must be addressed.
B. The data entered must be accurate.
C. This feature assumes supervisory control and enforcement to ensure that tasks and deadlines are fulfilled. (The new Interstate Compact provides for sanctions to be enacted when there is a lack of compliance with established rules.)
D. There must be flexibility to deal with mandated and/or desired notification nuances.
ANECDOTES
A. A victim will receive an automatic notification if an offender moves from one state to another.
B. There will be an alert function for probation and parole officers’ tasks.

B-4. The Interstate Compact IMS will promote an effective offender tracking system.

DESCRIPTORS
A. Information will be available to verify an offender’s address in the community.
B. Permitted travel and movement of the offender will be visible and available to all necessary users, e.g. law enforcement and field officers in the receiving state and locale.

IMPLICATIONS
A. The quantity of information may produce an overload, perhaps to the extent that people will stop reading the information.
B. This tracking system could lead to overreactions by the public or the media.
C. A media relations strategy may be required as a result. (See B above.)

ANECDOTES
A. Reduces the chances of an officer being unaware of a transfer until an offender walks into a local probation or parole office and announces “I’m here.”
B. Investigators of crimes will be aware of offenders who have been transferred into or are traveling through their area.

C. We envision an information management system that provides the appropriate security and confidentiality for offenders, victims, families, and users.

C-1. The Interstate Compact IMS will consider and follow the privacy guidelines of Global and, to the extent applicable, HIPAA

DESCRIPTOR
There is a privacy assessment to determine whether governing principles of the system meet the test of privacy standards.

IMPLICATIONS
A. This feature may require accommodation in Interstate Compact rules.
B. It may limit what is to be considered “absolutely necessary” information in the transfer request.
C. Given the sensitivity of data and the prospects of web-based capabilities, the IMS should specifically include the capacities to address the security and privacy of data in transit and data at rest, e.g. encryption.
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ANECDOTE
Every system user has confidence that confidential and private information is appropriately disseminated.

C-2. *The Interstate Compact IMS will provide a secure environment in which to transact business.*

DESCRIPTORS
A. There will be encryption capability, firewalls, and virus protection.
B. Access to or manipulation of the data will require a user ID (biometrics or a password).
C. We will be able to detect when someone tries to enter the system without authorization.

IMPLIEDS
A. The system could be compromised if this feature is not included.
B. The basis for granting access must be explained so that no one feels left out.
C. This feature will require security managers at the state and national levels to coordinate with Information Sharing and Analysis Centers (ISACS). Security managers may be either the Compact Administrator or the Compact Administrators designee.
D. The tighter the security the less likely that a user will receive rapid responses.

ANECDOITE
Only authorized users will be able to access and/or manipulate the system.

C-3. *The Interstate Compact IMS will establish tiers of security for users.*

DESCRIPTORS
A. Tiers of security will facilitate description of who can do what, what information they can manipulate and what they can only read.
B. Certain people will be restricted to reading only selected parts of the data.

IMPLIEDS
A. Rules will have to be developed.
B. Someone will have to maintain the tiers of security.
C. The Commission will have to determine who has authority to decide who is allowed access. (Is it uniform across states, or is it determined by each state?)
D. This feature raises liability issues.
E. Training and recertification will be required.

ANECDOOTES
A. States are assured that only approved individuals access information.
B. Each user will be able to access only the level of information for which they are authorized.

** Vendors and system administrators should review the security guidelines that are being developed by Global.
C. Corruption of data will be minimized.

C-4. *The Interstate Compact IMS will be able to track who is accessing or manipulating information, when it occurred and where, and whether the system has been compromised.*

**DESCRIPTORS**
A. The system will automatically create a log to track user access time and identification information.
B. There will be alerts for a system compromise.

**IMPLICATIONS**
A. There will be a high volume of users and thus this tracking feature will be data- and resource-intensive.
B. This feature can slow down the system.
C. How we choose to disseminate alerts and interact with auditors is crucial. (Vulnerabilities may end up on a website in an auditor’s report.)
D. There will be a need for security administrators at the Interstate Commission and at individual state sites.

**ANECDOTE**
State administrators and the Interstate Commission will know if the system is compromised and if someone is using information for unauthorized purposes.

D. We envision an information management system that ensures accountability and management of the system.

D-1. *The system will be user friendly.*

**DESCRIPTORS**
A. The system has the ability to provide notifications such as ticklers, alerts, and prompts.
B. Incorporates intelligent forms including auto population.
C. System incorporates edit checking.
D. System offers tutorial and online help features.

**IMPLICATIONS**
A. Must adhere to national standards of both the justice and information technology industries.
B. Ticklers and alerts must be commission and business rule driven.

**ANECDOTES**
A. Timely and accurate collection and reporting of information facilitates compliance and reduces time for transfer and return of cases.
B. Officers will be able to complete case initiation and maintenance activities more efficiently.
D-2. *The system will strive for a cost-effective maintenance and administration methodology.*

DESCRIPTORS
A. System will be table-driven vs. hard-coded with an open architecture design.
B. System may be administered by the Interstate Commission and/or a vendor, depending on cost, tasks, and required skill sets.
C. System will be modular as well as scaleable, i.e., components may be added or removed to alter the functionality and size.

IMPLICATIONS
A. A change control process must be implemented that ensures a cost-benefit analysis is conducted regarding implications of commission rule changes.
B. Forms related to interstate transfer must be created as an intelligent form set.
C. Commissioners must review and reapprove baseline rules before system development initiates.
D. System(s) will require administrative (owners or vendors) overhead for maintaining and modifying databases, forms, system activity reports, and links.

ANECTDOTE
System changes will be implemented with relative ease and can often be accomplished by in-house IT staff.

D-3. *The system will incorporate user and administrative training.*

DESCRIPTORS
A. System will incorporate initial user and administrative training utilizing various methodologies.
B. Training will be system-based, not focused on how to do interstate transfers.

IMPLICATIONS
A. Methods for training must be developed to accommodate learning differences/styles.
B. Training materials must be regularly updated based on vendor input.
C. Training curricula must be coordinated/approved by the Interstate Commission’s Training Committee.
D. State or national "help desk" functionality may/will be required.

ANEDCOTE
The “help desk” has limited activity.

E. We envision an IMS that allows stakeholders to manage, exchange, and access the electronic data necessary to support public safety and case management while utilizing appropriate information technologies.
E-1. *The system will be developed using a phased approach to allow immediate access to approved users.*

**DESCRIPTORS**
A. From the start there will be a discreet standard set of data fused to a common model that connects all member jurisdictions.
B. The RFP should be built with the phases clearly delineated and invite bids on phase one with awareness of final projected capacity.

**IMPLICATIONS**
A. Priorities will need to be set by the Interstate Commission.
B. There may need to be policy development and information sharing initiatives at the state level.
C. There are implications for Commission rules.
D. The data schema is standardized.
E. There will be implementation costs within states.

**ANECDOTES**
A. The start of the system occurs earlier than if using a non-phased approach.
B. The costs at start-up are reduced.

E-2. *There is an evolving transition to a paperless system.*

**DESCRIPTORS**
A. Documents are assembled data elements that may include pictures, audio clips, videos, and paper notes.
B. The system will accommodate data in many forms: raw, formatted, JPEG, and PDF.
C. Paper documents (e.g. presentence investigation, agreement to return, travel permits, violation reports, case notes, and reporting instructions.) may be scanned, keyed in element-by-element, or adopted in their entirety in PDF.
D. There is the capacity for input and output, indexing, storage and archiving, search and retrieval, manipulation, maintenance, protection, and purging of electronic and imaged documents.
E. It may not be necessary to send a specific document (e.g. court order and PSI) but rather to describe the location (e.g. pointers and links) and make it available on the sender’s server.

**IMPLICATIONS**
A. Costs may go down or be displaced.
B. Resistance may arise from differences in organizational culture and from initial fiscal implications.
C. When we think of a document as a collection of data elements rather than a paper form we can make great progress in solving transfer timeline issues across the country.
D. There may be instances of staff redirection, i.e., changes in job duties.
ANECDOTES
A. Not looking at documents as paper but rather seeing them as a collection of
data elements makes “enter once, use many times” possible.
B. An officer can search by any of a number of data elements and quickly view
important case documents.
C. Replacing paper with electronic documents is environmentally friendly.
D. Individual states can display documents in a view of their choosing and can
create forms that are to their liking.

F. This system will facilitate information sharing.

F-1. The system will have the ability to share information with appropriate stakeholders.

DESCRIPTORS
A. Stakeholders may include but are not limited to local and state probation and
parole agencies and officers, courts, state compact offices, the office of the
Interstate Commission, law enforcement, formal criminal justice associations,
victims, victim groups, and treatment providers.
B. The standards for information sharing will be different for stakeholders
outside the criminal justice system, and the Interstate Commission will set the
standards.

IMPLICATIONS
A. The inconsistent privacy laws across the states and agencies make this a
complex task requiring management coordination.
B. Standardization will be necessary for the exchange of data.
C. The Interstate Commission will need to determine the stakeholders outside the
criminal justice community.
D. Memoranda of understanding will be needed between stakeholders.

ANECDOTES
A. Statistical information will be readily available and accessible.
B. Victims will be able to track offenders’ documented movement.
C. Public safety will be enhanced by the ability to track offenders’ documented
movement.
D. The Interstate Commission will be able to monitor compliance with its rules
and timelines.

F-2. The system will allow information sharing and leveraging of existing and disparate
networks, systems, and databases.

DESCRIPTORS
A. The system design is consistent with open architecture guidelines.
B. The system operates over an Internet Protocol (IP)-enabled network.
C. The system is developed in modular fashion in phases.
D. Available resources will dictate the implementation of phases.
IMPLICATIONS

A. Replication to a single national database is not required.
B. Business units must subscribe to enterprise architecture.
C. All participating member jurisdictions must be IP-enabled.
D. Turf issues must be overcome.
E. Appropriate information regarding privacy and security must be provided.
F. Staff time will need to be invested at the state and local levels to initiate this system, and those staff resources may not currently exist.
G. In light of implication “F” above staff development and education of administrators may be required in the form of training and/or resourcing.
H. We will need champions and sponsors to support this initiative and to buffer resistance.
I. A marketing plan must be developed and implemented, including soliciting endorsement from other groups such as Global, National Association of State Chief Information Officers, National Law Enforcement Telecommunications Services, and SEARCH.
J. Assessing the extent of information technology resources at each state Interstate Compact Office is critical so that an RFP can estimate the amount of “up-front” work the system developers will need to do and for rule-making implications.

ANECDOTES

A. Data are entered once and used many times.
B. The “help desk” has limited activity.
C. States may be able to begin using the system with limited investment in replacement hardware.
D. See all the previous anecdotes in this document.

F-3. *The system takes advantage of and utilizes relevant work and initiatives especially in the area of justice standards.*

DESCRIPTIONS

Justice standards such as those resident in the Justice Standards Information Clearinghouse for Information Sharing are incorporated.

IMPLICATIONS

A. There is a need to urge the Interstate Commission to become involved in local or state information-sharing initiatives.
B. Homeland Security funds may become available for this IMS initiative where its connection to that work can be shown.

ANECDOTES

A. Standards relevant to this system will be referenced in the RFP.
B. Researchers will be using common data in a common format.
VI. THE PROCESS OF SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

It is important that the Interstate Commission hire a project manager to oversee the development of the IMS and monitor the work of the selected vendor to ensure compliance with the contract.

A developmental sequence is implicit in the content of this report. The following list makes the sequence explicit.

1. Develop the business rules and the list of required elements in the transfer of an offender and use a process-modeling tool, for example Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM), as a means for developing the business rules.
2. Conduct a survey of existing compact member jurisdictions to document their current information systems and technical environment, highlight any proposed future enhancements, detail the types of data that is currently collected, and note any policies and/or procedures that could affect the dissemination of this data. This information may be compiled and included as an addendum to the RFP.
3. Define the development phases for the information management system.
4. Acquire funding for at least phase one of the IMS. Phase one capabilities should include the following:
   A. Generate reports on interstate activities.
   B. Allow for queries including those on individual cases, e.g. case notes.
   C. Push documents including some that the system is not capable of creating, e.g. a photograph.
   D. Pull data.
   E. Share data among Interstate Commission members. (The ability to share information with stakeholders outside the Interstate Compact membership will occur at a later date.)
5. Hold the Design Conference (see Appendix A of this report).
6. Write and disseminate the request for proposal.
7. Receive bids from registered vendors.
8. Review bids and select the vendor.
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION

The recommendations fall into four general categories.

1. Recommended integration of state initiatives and this Interstate Commission initiative:
   a. Contact the states’ information technology (IT) groups to alert them of this initiative to allow them to make plans.
   b. Include an information technology specialist on each State Council.

2. Recommended linkages to existing systems and resources:
   a. Enter into a memorandum of understanding with an existing system (e.g., NLETS, RISS or LEO) prior to the RFP process to facilitate information sharing.
   b. Alert vendors and system administrators of the need to review the security guidelines that are being developed by Global.

3. Recommended relationships with vendors:
   a. Provide each vendor with the following addenda to the RFP:
      1. This Report of the Planning Group.
      2. A list of the Interstate Commission’s member jurisdictions.
      3. A copy of the Interstate Compact.
   b. The Interstate Commission should maintain ownership of the source code, not allowing the successful vendor to be the owner. (This does not apply to the intellectual property of the vendor.)

4. Recommended process steps for development:
   a. Manage the tasks of the environmental scan, writing the RFP, and managing the RFP process either by contracting for professional services or by assembling a team of experienced IT project development managers from several states.
   b. Complete the business rules before proceeding to the development of the RFP.
   a. Test the standards in a model or simulation as a proof of concept.
VIII. APPENDICES

Appendix A – The Design Conference

It is recommended that the Interstate Commission plan and host a Design Conference prior to the issuing of the official request for proposal (RFP). The purpose would be to adequately prepare RFP requirements by securing through this Design Conference meaningful and manageable input from industry experts during the RFP drafting stages. This will ensure that the requirements of the RFP will align with and be supported by the information technology industry. The suggested features of a Design Conference that are listed below are based on the experience of the State of Missouri. Additional information on Missouri’s experience is available through the Division of Purchasing and Materials Management.

A. Interactive RFP Developmental Process – Prior to issuing any RFP the Technology Committee of the Interstate Commission hosts a series of RFP Development Discussion Group meetings and an eGovernment website forum. Vendors are encouraged to participate in the meetings and in the website forum as the Interstate Commission begins preparing its RFP’s technical and performance requirements and its proposal evaluation criteria.

B. Vendor Registration – The Interstate Commission emphasizes its online bid registration system website and implements a policy that states that vendor registration is a prerequisite for participating in the Discussion Group meetings and the website forum.

In advance of the Discussion Group meetings, a list of topics to be covered at each meeting is posted on the website. Vendors are asked to respond with their top three topic preferences for the discussion groups. The Interstate Commission assigns a user ID/password to each vendor who registered for the website forum in order to preserve the anonymity of the organization submitting feedback on the forum and to ensure only those vendors who were properly registered with the Interstate Commission are participating in the effort.

C. RFP Development Discussion Group Meetings – A limited number of organizations are allowed to have subject matter experts sit at the head table and actively participate in the discussion. The remaining vendors sit in the audience to observe. Vendor participants are rotated for each of the major discussion topics. Every effort is made to allow each company to have one representative participate at the head table for at least one of the discussion groups for which they expressed a preference in their discussion group registration.

D. e-Government Website Forum – The Interstate Commission and its staff, through its Technology Committee, hosts the public online development of each of the RFP’s technical specifications, performance requirements and proposal evaluation criteria through its E-Government website forum. Within a few days after each of the RFP Development Discussion Group meetings, the Interstate Commission opens the forum, posts summary findings from each of the Discussion Group meetings and invites
feedback from the registered vendors for a specified number of days. The forum is then closed to allow the Interstate Commission to consider the vendor feedback and to consolidate the information into a draft RFP, which is subsequently posted on the website for a number of days for vendor review and input.

E. Participation – Participation in the interactive RFP development process is not mandatory in order to respond to the official RFP, when it is issued. However, vendors are advised that the Interstate Commission will give minimal consideration to vendor recommendations for changes to the RFP’s technical and performance requirements after the official RFP has been issued. Vendors are told that participation in the interactive RFP development effort in no way guarantees a contractual commitment or even favorable consideration during the official RFP process.

F. Benefits – By approaching the vendor community in an open and organized fashion, the process gains immediate vendor acceptance, being perceived as a fair and credible effort. Based on the Missouri experience the Interstate Commission can expect that vendors will provide the Commission with experts not only in the various topic areas during the RFP Discussion Group meetings, but also in their responses to the website forum. It is anticipated that vendors will be appreciative of the opportunity to provide input at this formative stage of the RFP and to gain insight into the Interstate Commission’s functional needs. This mutual sharing of information will help vendors minimize their risk factors by providing as much clarity as possible about what is needed/desired.

Additionally, by utilizing this specification development mechanism the Interstate Commission will gain a multi-vendor perspective that more accurately reflects the best practices in the industry.
Appendix B – A Glossary

Alerts – Any message or report from the system notifying the user that a condition has been met. The alerts for this system will notify the user that contrary information is being entered and provide the capacity to post a warning or explanatory information.

Auto population – This capacity of the system allows the user to enter currently held data into a new and different form without the user having to re-enter the data. The system automatically “populates” the new form with the original data.

Biometrics – Biological data that define the characteristics of an individual (e.g., photo, fingerprints, eye scan).

Business Rules – Described guides based on business processes that define the system elements and the forms. Business rules enable scheduling of future events based on completion of prior events and evoking actions including the production of documents associated with those actions. The system will, unless overridden by the user, automatically perform specific tasks within the system based on the completion or scheduling of certain events.

Commission Rules – Policy and/or procedures promulgated by the Commission of the Interstate Compact on the Supervision of Adult Offenders that have the force of law, e.g., deciding the criteria to be eligible for transfer.

Component – A small object or program that performs a specific function and is designed in such a way to easily operate with other components and applications.

Connectivity – The ability of a program or device ability to link with other programs and devices. For example, a program that can import data from a wide variety of other programs and can export data in many different formats is said to have good connectivity. On the other hand, computers that have difficulty linking into a network (many laptop computers, for example) have poor connectivity.

Design Conference – A systematic process for engaging vendors and the Interstate Commission in a mutually beneficial dialogue during the formative stages of the request for proposals that results in an RFP that represents a more complete and accurate description of the functional needs of the proposed system that recognizes the current and emerging technological capabilities and costs.

Edit-Checker – A program that enables the creation and editing of text files. There are many different types of editors, but they all fall into two general categories: line editors: a form of editor that requires that a particular line of text be specified before changes can be made to it and screen-oriented editors, also called full-screen editors, that allow modification of any text that appears on the display screen by moving the cursor to the desired location.
**Embedding** – Creation of objects with one application and then tying (embedding) them to a second application. Embedded objects retain their original format and links to the application that created them.

**Enterprise architecture** – A rigorously defined information-sharing framework that captures a vision of the “entire system” and all its dimensions and complexities and incorporates: business architecture (strategy, governance, organization, process); data information architecture; application (systems) architecture; and technology (IT) architecture.

**Encryption** - The translation of data into a secret code. Encryption is the most effective way to achieve data security. To read an encrypted file, one must have access to a secret key or password that enables one to decrypt it. Unencrypted data is called plain text; encrypted data is referred to as cipher text.

**Global** – The Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative is a "group of groups," representing more than thirty independent organizations spanning the spectrum of law enforcement, judicial, correctional, and related bodies. Member organizations participate in Global out of shared responsibility and shared belief that, together, they can bring about positive change in inter-organizational communication and data sharing.

**GTRI** – Georgia Tech Research Institute

**Hard-coded vs. Table-driven** – In a hard-coded design the data elements are embedded in the system code and must be modified by a programmer. Changes must be scheduled into a future release. In a Table-driven design the data elements are added into the tables that users can select from drop down boxes for data entry. If new data elements are required or not needed, an administrator can quickly change the table.

**HIPAA** – The Health Information Portability and Accountability Act. The first-ever federal privacy standards to protect patients' medical records and other health information provided to health plans, doctors, hospitals and other health care providers took effect on April 14, 2003. Developed by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), these new standards provide patients with access to their medical records and more control over how their personal health information is used and disclosed. They represent a uniform, federal floor of privacy protections for consumers across the country. State laws providing additional protections to consumers are not affected by this new rule.

**Hook** – A location in a routine or program at which the programmer can connect or insert other routines for the purpose of debugging or enhancing functionality.

**Imbedding** – See “embedding.”

**Intelligent Forms** – Data entry application that provides help screens and low levels of artificial intelligence in aiding the user to enter the correct data.
**IP-enabled network** – (Internet Protocol-enabled) machine that is capable of being connected on the Internet by virtue of having a unique number consisting of four parts separated by dots.

**ISACS** – Information Sharing and Analysis Centers.

**JPEG** – Joint Photographic Experts Group – is most commonly mentioned as a format for image files. It is a standardized image compression mechanism and JPEG is the committee that wrote the standard.

**Justice Standards Information Clearinghouse for Information Sharing** – ([www.it.ojp.gov](http://www.it.ojp.gov)) provides details about technology and communications standards promoting information sharing across the justice system.

**Link** – a connections between two objects. To link is to paste a copy of an object into a document in such a way that it retains its connection with the original object. Updates to the original object can be reflected in the duplicate by updating the link. In data management systems, a link is a pointer to another record. You can connect one or more records by inserting links into them. In some operating systems a link is a pointer to a file. Links make it possible to reference a file by several different names and to access a file without specifying a full path. In hypertext systems, such as the World Wide Web, a link is a reference to another document. Such links are sometimes called hot links because they take you to other document when you click on them.

**Member jurisdictions** – The states that comprise the Interstate Compact Commission and/or are governed by the Commission’s rules.

**Modular** – A coupling of business capabilities usually constructed of some components and objects.

**NASCIO** – ([www.nascio.org](http://www.nascio.org)) National Association of State Chief Information Officers represents state chief information officers and information resource executives and managers from the 50 states, six U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia. State members are senior officials from any of the three branches of state government who have executive-level and statewide responsibility for information resource management. The mission of the association is to shape national IT policy through collaborative partnerships, information sharing and knowledge transfer across jurisdictional and functional boundaries.

**NLETS** – ([www.nlets.org](http://www.nlets.org)) The National Law Enforcement Telecommunication System is a sophisticated message-switching network linking local, state, and federal agencies together to provide the capability to exchange criminal justice and public safety related information interstate.

**Object** – An item that can be individually selected and manipulated. This can include shapes and pictures that appear on a display screen as well as less tangible software entities. In object-oriented programming, for example, an object is a self-contained entity that consists of both data and procedures to manipulate the data.
Open Architecture – The design of an information management system that employs standard, non-proprietary components.

PDF – Abbreviation for Portable Document Format, a file format developed by Adobe Systems, that is used to display documents and different operating systems while maintaining the original format of the document.

Phased Approach – Incremental construction of a system over time. For example, when building a house the foundation is built first to allow occupancy followed by the framing and so forth. As time and resources allow, custom cabinetry, paint, carpet and other features can be added.

Pointers – A variable that contains the address of a location in memory. The location is the starting point of an allocated object, such as an object or value type, or the element of an array.

Privacy Assessment – Examination of the security and integrity of the information management system to assure governing principles of the system meet the test of privacy standards.

Pull – To obtain data by requesting it.

Push – To send data to a recipient without the recipient requesting it.

Prompt – Displayed text indicating that a computer program is waiting for input from the user.

Query – A request for information from a database. There are three general methods for posing queries:

- Choosing parameters from a menu: In this method, the database system presents a list of parameters from which you can choose. This is perhaps the easiest way to pose a query because the menus guide you, but it is also the least flexible.
- Query By Example (QBE): In this method, the system presents a blank record and lets you specify the fields and values that define the query.
- Query Language: Many database systems require you to make requests for information in the form of a stylized query that must be written in a special query language. This is the most complex method because it forces you to learn a specialized language, but it is also the most powerful.

Scalable – Refers to how well a hardware or software system can adapt to increased demands. For example, a scalable network system would be one that can start with just a few nodes but can easily expand to thousands of nodes. Scalability can be a very important feature because it means that you can create a system with confidence you won't outgrow it.

SEARCH – (www.search.org) The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics is a nonprofit membership organization created by and for the States, which is dedicated to improving the criminal justice system and the quality of justice through better information
management, the effective application of information and identification technology, and responsible law and policy.

**Silos** – Refers to a unit within an organization that in walled off from the rest of the organization in terms of collaboration and communication. This isolated unit is likened to the farm silo, which is a vertical, feed storage cylinder 40’ tall with concrete or steel walls, open only at the top. The various department in state governments are great examples of silos.

**Standardized Rap Sheet** – A single complete response in a uniform format that details an offender’s criminal history.

**Subscribe** – Allows collaboration among various data systems with the ability to join data from multiple systems.

**Ticklers** – Mechanism for providing notification during data entry that something is missing.

**Tiered security** – Multiple levels of access based on users’ roles.

**Web-based** – An application whose main interface is a web browser.

**Web-enabled** – An application whose main interface is not a web-browser, but provides web access as a secondary interface, either via HTML or via applets/Active X. For instance, MS Exchange could be considered “web enabled” since it can be used in a web browser.

**XML** – Extensible Markup Language – facilitates effective information exchange across diverse information systems.