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FOREWORD

This is the report of the first meeting of the Interstate Compact Information Management System Planning Group (ICIMSPG) held March 18-19 in San Antonio, Texas. 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 National Commission of the Interstate Compacts for the Supervision of Adult Offenders (Interstate Compact) and is supported by a grant made to APPA by the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

The National Commission anticipates that the products of this Planning Group will serve as the functional blueprint for its information management system. The National Commission will employ this blueprint as the basis for writing a technology-specific request for proposals from vendors who will assist in constructing the system as the means for information exchange among parties that engage in or have interest in the transfer of offenders across state lines.

The Planning Group will hold its second meeting during the last week of April and its final meeting will be held the last week of May. Another interim report will follow the second meeting and a final report of the Planning Group’s work will be issued when the meetings are complete.

This report represents a work in progress. No aspect of the Planning Group’s work is, at this point, complete in content or form. No segment of this report has been formally adopted by the Planning Group. All is subject to review and revision by the Planning Group at its subsequent meetings.
I. 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
- Info credibility is low
- Everything sent by mail or FAX
- Silos exist both in the criminal justice system and in the civil system
- Copying at every level
- Redundant file creation
- Wide variance in data in packet from different states.
- Unsupervised offenders
- No info on numbers of transfers sent or received.
- Damaged comm., corr., credibility
- Not able to authenticate identity of the offender
- Travel of offenders not tracked
- Multiple desktops get the info
- Victims can’t follow the offender
- Extended time involved to initiate transfer
- No uniform understanding of terms, e.g. social, treatment, or criminal histories
- Some are ignoring the system
- Reality in a case not reflected in case information
- Extended time involved to exchange info
- Courts make decision without info on the offender
- Frustration and finger pointing
- Courts make decisions without info on transfer regulations
- Uneven expertise at local/state level
- Inadequate training for staff
- Budget cuts, staff cuts, reduced capacity
- Untreated sex offenders
- Current compact has been in place since 1937 and the principles are the right ones
- No uniformity in diagnostics
- Offenders’ rehabilitation is affected negatively if he/she can’t get to the state where there is family, job and support.

The themes and threads of connection that exist among these descriptive terms:

1. Need for standardization
2. Need for real-time communication and information sharing.
3. Need for rules and enforcement.
4. Two types of issues: (a) Case specific and (b) Info sharing concerns.
5. We see the impacts of processing inefficiencies.
6. There are costs to the system as it is in terms of reduced public safety, high liability and significant financial costs.
7. There is low accountability.
8. Case ownership is unclear.
II. THE GUIDING ASSUMPTIONS

1. We are not replacing systems that currently exist.
2. The envisioned system will be built incrementally over time, perhaps a decade.
3. The state-to-state exchange of data will be able to commence in a reasonably short time.
4. This is a process not a project. It is dynamic, evolving over time in phases.
5. This is a system between states (Interstate Compact) calling for a system architecture that provides a foundation for integration of state and local systems.
6. There will be a single point of data entry (data entered once, used many times.)
7. The information management system will be created using standards from the criminal justice system.
8. This design assumes a web-enabled environment.
9. This will be a paperless system of exchange.
10. A governance issue for the commission is timeliness of transfer which will need to consider state capabilities, set milestones, and describe deliverables.
11. For the life of this project, best practices for project management should be followed, i.e., setting milestones and describing deliverables.

The following assumptions were not explicitly tested with the Planning Group, but arose in the discussion, were noted by the consultant, and are listed below for review at the April meeting.

1. The system should be driven by the Commission’s business rules for interstate compacts.
2. The system is scaleable, i.e. the bigger states can enlarge the scale and the smaller states can reduce the scale.
3. Each state can decide, once the minimum capacity required by the system is achieved, the extent to which they add new applications and can select a pace that can be sustained and afforded.
4. Functional business standards for probation and parole automated case management systems are fairly well defined, so systems adhering to these standards can easily produce, disseminate, receive and share data.
III. 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 all the goals and objectives, all of which are tested against the degree to which they move us toward the vision.

The Planning Group is casting a vision with an 8-10 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 management information system into its foreseeable future.

The Vision: We envision an information management system that:

**A. Provides support for decision making:**

- has the *ability to collect and extract accurate data* to support national and state needs;
- has the ability to *query disparate data bases and assemble* a relevant response;
- will include *automated evaluation* of required and court or parole ordered conditions;

**B. Addresses Offender-Related Issues:**

- will have the *capacity to process the transfer of offenders* efficiently with an information flow through the Compact office that requires little manual intervention;
- will have the capacity to hold and transmit information to allow for *positive identification* of offenders;
- will provide for the capability for *automatically notifying interested parties*;
- will promote an effective *offender tracking system*;
C. Provides the Appropriate Security and Confidentiality:
- will consider and follow the privacy guidelines of Global Justice Information Network (GLOBAL) and the Health Information Portability and Accountability Act. (HIPAA)
- will provide a secure environment to transact business. *
- will establish a security matrix for users;
- will be able to track who is accessing or manipulating information and when it occurred and where, as well as being able to determine if there has been any system compromise.

D. Ensures Accountability and Management of the System:
- (To be developed at April Meeting)

E. Allows for Document Management:
- (To be developed at April Meeting)

F. Is a Fully Integrated System:
- (To be developed at April Meeting)

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

The Planning Group gave fuller meaning and definition to each of the vision elements listed in section III of this report. They attached to each vision feature the following:

a. **Descriptors** – These include defining language and/or sub-elements within the vision feature.

b. **Challenging Implications** – Each vision feature in the course of being put into place or when in place and used will have implications. Some of these will be challenging, sometimes presenting themselves as obstacles to the fulfillment of the particular vision feature. It is advisable to identify these implications in advance and thus allow the early development of prescriptive responses.

c. **Anecdote(s)** – These are included to “make real” for the reader each of the vision features by depicting the way the actual work is enhanced when this vision feature is in place.

**VISION FEATURE #1: The Interstate Compact IMS has the ability to collect and extract accurate data to support national and state needs.**

**DESCRIPTORS**

A. Ability to extract data for customized reports by a state from the information collected. Does not require inputting of new information.
B. Data collected can be used to support outcome-measuring capabilities.

**IMPLICATIONS**

A. All states will have to collect the same data.
B. Commission will have to put rules in place that require specific, minimal data.
C. There may be resistance from states that don’t want performance measurement made available to others.
D. Rules must address identifying information.
E. Someone must be responsible for managing the information to ensure integrity and accuracy of data.
ANECDOTES
A. From the national perspective we will have an accurate picture of transfers and thus a basis to set dues.
B. A state could use the data in decision making, for example they might choose to assign additional personnel to an area with a high number of transfers.
C. This capacity of this vision feature justifies staff in a state’s Interstate Compact office.

VISION FEATURE #2: The Interstate Compact IMS has the ability to query 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.

IMPLICATIONS
A. Connectivity. This is how the end user accesses the information.
B. Security concerns are present with this capacity.
C. Technology gaps in some geographies that don’t allow real-time access.
D. State by state decisions regarding whom has access. This will create secondary dissemination issues that are difficult and take time to resolve.
E. The Interstate Commission will need to set standard data items that all states must input and that are then available to other users. Beyond those data items the access to other 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 this required data, 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.
VISION FEATURE #3: The Interstate Compact IMS will include automated evaluation of required and court or parole ordered conditions.

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

IMPLICATIONS
A. The Rules Committee must build business rules that force agents to enter proper information, and this implies a uniform transfer application for use in this national system.
B. There may be short-term resistance from line staff persons who feel that the system with its imbedded logic is “doing my job.”
C. Must be possible for the state Compact Administrator to be able to override the system with a manual edit.
D. Business rules that are developed decide what can get edited and what cannot.

ANECDOTE
We will have more complete transfer applications by virtue of a built-in audit.

VISION FEATURE #4: 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.

DESCRIPTORS
(No list)

IMPLICATIONS
A. The Rules Committees 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 IT Committee of the National Commission. A question to be asked is: “Are we asking for more information than we need, for example, do we really need all of the pages 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 to find a particular segment of information.

ANECDOTE
(None listed)

VISION FEATURE #5: The Interstate Compact IMS will provide the capability to ensure positive identification of offenders.

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

IMPLICATIONS
A. We expect that this technology exists at a broad-based level.
B. Compression of files will allow sending images with a low demand on system space.
C. Training will need to be done with staff to use 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.

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

VISION FEATURE #6: The Interstate Compact IMS will be capable of automatically notifying interested parties. *

DESCRIPTORS
A. Subscription access…choose what notifications you want.
B. Task management will be improved. For example, if progress report is due it will alert you or 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.

*Interested parties may include victims, law enforcement, courts, agents, supervisors, the Compact office and the sending state.
C. This feature assumes supervisory control and enforcement to ensure that tasks and deadlines are fulfilled. (The new Interstate Compact does create sanctions)

D. There must be flexibility to deal with mandated and/or desired notification nuances.

ANECDOTE
A victim will receive an automatic notification if an offender moves from one state to another.

VISION FEATURE #7: The Interstate Compact IMS will promote an effective offender tracking system.

DESCRIPTORS
A. Will be able to verify address immediately or the physical presence of an offender in the community.
B. Permitted travel and movement of the offender is visible and available to all necessary users, e.g. law enforcement, field officers in the receiving state and locale.

IMPLICATIONS
A. We will actually know where transferred offenders are.
B. There may be information overload, to the extent that people will stop reading the information.
C. This tracking system could lead to over-reactions by the public or the media.
D. A media relations strategy may be required as a result. (See C above)

ANECDOTES
A. No offender walks into a local probation or parole office and announces “I’m here” with the officer unaware of the transfer.
B. Investigators of crimes will know what offenders have been transferred into their area.

VISION FEATURE #8: The Interstate Compact IMS will consider and follow the privacy guidelines of GLOBAL and HIPAA (Health Information Portability and Accountability Act)
DESCRIPTORS
There is a “privacy assessment” to see if governing principles of our system meet the test of privacy standards.

IMPLICATIONS
A. This feature may require accommodation in Compact rule(s).
B. It may limit what is considered “absolutely necessary” information in the transfer request.

ANECDOTE
Every system user has confidence that confidential and private information is appropriately disseminated.

VISION FEATURE #9: The Interstate Compact IMS will provide a secure environment to transact business.*

DESCRIPTORS
A. There will be encryption capability, firewalls, and virus protection.
B. Use of the system will require a user I.D. (Biometrics or a password)
C. We will be able to tell when someone tries to enter the system without authorization.

IMPLICATIONS
A. If we don’t include this feature in the system, we will face attacks from the outside.
B. Some people or agencies may feel left out, so we will need to explain the basis for granting access.
C. This feature will require a security manager, either the Compact Administrator or someone under his/her supervision.
D. The tighter the security the less likely that a user can receive five second responses.

ANECDOTE
Only authorized users will be able to enter the system.

*Vendors should review the security guidelines that come out of GLOBAL.
VISION FEATURE #10: *The Interstate Compact IMS will establish a security matrix for users.*

DESCRIPTORS
- A. This will allow us to describe who can do what, what information they can manipulate and what they can read only.
- B. This will establish who owns the data.
- C. Certain people will be able to read only selected parts of the data.

IMPLICATIONS
- A. Rules will have to be developed.
- B. Someone will have to maintain the matrix.
- C. The Commission will have to determine who has authority to decide who gets access. (Is it uniform across states, or is it determined by the states?)
- D. This feature raises liability issues.
- E. Training and re-certification will be required.

ANECDOTE
- A. States are assured that only those who should see information are seeing it.
- B. Each authorized user will be able to access the level of information to which they have been granted access.

VISION FEATURE #11: *The Interstate Compact IMS will be able to track who is accessing or manipulating information and when it occurred and where, as well as being able to determine if there has been any system compromise.*

DESCRIPTORS
- A. Automatic time and identifying information create a dissemination loge.
- B. There will be alerts for a system compromise.

IMPLICATIONS
- A. There will be a high volume of users and thus this 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.)

ANECDOTE
A state administrator can tell if system was compromised and if someone was using information for unauthorized purposes.
V. NEXT STEPS

1. Write and distribute a report of this first meeting. (Fahy Mullaney, the consultant, will write the report in collaboration with the Linda Sydney of APPA. Linda will disseminate the report to members of the Planning Work Group.)

2. Build an agenda for the April 28-29 meeting and design a process for working through that agenda.

   A. The Planning Group identified the following issues that should be included on our agenda for April:
      - Review the report from meeting number one.
      - Complete the Vision
      - Gap Analysis, i.e. What’s missing?
      - Document Management (PSI, etc. that are beyond the demographic information to be entered.)
      - Prioritize the Vision features.

   B. Carl Wicklund (Executive Director of APPA), Linda Sydney (APPA’s Project Director) and Fahy Mullaney (Consultant to the project) will establish the agenda.

   C. The consultant will design a process for working through the agenda.
APPENDIX A: CRITERIA FOR SETTING PRIORITIES

The Planning Group will be setting priorities for the features of the vision. This presumes some criteria that guide that prioritization. The following was offered by members of the Planning Group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Necessary in order to fit the rules.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Not required by rules but preferred and is ignored at our peril.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Nice to have.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Optional.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Give bonus points for those that lead to “quick wins.”

Consultant’s Note: Some additional criteria that the group should consider include:
- Urgency (If not attended to quickly, there are unhappy consequences)
- Scope (Will have the broadest impact in terms of numbers of persons, states, and/or data elements impacted)
- Feasibility (Can be put into place with existing or few additional resources)

APPENDIX B: THE PLANNING GROUP’S GROUND RULES

The consultant proposed “ground rules” which when followed will increase the group’s effectiveness and quality of products. Members of the Planning Group discussed and added to the rules. The resultant operating rules are:

- Consensus decision making (Majority rule as backup method)
- Everyone gets heard. (The 3x3 rule)
- Differences are expected, accepted.
- Common ground is sought.
- No jargon without explanation.
- Monitor our “level” of discussion to stay at the level of the “What” of the IMS not the “How.”
APPENDIX C: RANDOM NOTES

1. The following recommendation was made and discussed briefly, but no decision was made:

   Before release of the RFP, conduct a two-day concept conference to support RFP development.

   (See Gerry Wethington for a model design for such a conference.)

2. Vision features were not developed for some of the categories within the vision. The notes below indicate which member of the Planning Group took responsibility to bring the sub-group’s information to the April meeting.

   a. Decision Support
   b. Offender Related
   c. Security and Confidentiality
   d. Accountability and Management of System (Christie has the notes and will bring to next meeting.)
   e. Document Management (The group working on this did not develop any Vision Features, thinking that there are no documents in a paperless system. However, Document Management has been identified as a major topic for discussion at the next meeting.)
   f. System Integration (Laura has the notes)