Interstate Commission for Adult Offender Supervision

Technology Committee Meeting MINUTES

January 13, 2021 · 1:00 pm ET
Video conference

Members in Attendance:
1. Chris Moore (GA), Chair
2. Sally Kreamer (IA)
3. Steve Turner (KY)
4. Mac Pevey (WA)
5. Joselyn López (WI)
6. Natalie Latulippe (CT), Ex-Officio
7. Matthew Billinger (KS), Ex-Officio
8. Alyssa Miller (ND), Ex-Officio

Members not in Attendance:
1. Dan Blanchard (UT)

Staff:
1. Ashley Lippert, Executive Director
2. Allen Eskridge, Policy and Operations Director
3. Mindy Spring, Administrative and Training Coordinator
4. Xavier Donnelly, ICOTS Project Manager
5. Kelsey Moore, Web Applications and Tech Support Manager

Call to Order
Chair C. Moore (GA) called the meeting to order at 1:01 pm ET. Five out of six voting members were present, a quorum was established.

Approval of Agenda and Minutes
Chair C. Moore (GA) asked to remove *Chair's Report* from the agenda to allow adequate time to review the ICOTS enhancement.

Commissioner M. Pevey (WA) moved to approve the agenda as amended. Commissioner J. López (WI) seconded. Agenda approved as amended.

Commissioner C. Moore (GA) moved to approve the minutes from August 18, 2020 meeting as drafted. Commissioner M. Pevey (WA) seconded. Minutes approved as written.

Discussion
Chair C. Moore (GA) reminded the committee that the Rules Committee formally recommended amendments to six ICAOS Rules (2.110, 4.111, 5.101, 5.102, 5.103 & 5.103-1) expanding the

timeframe for issuing compact compliant warrants to a standard 15 business days when an offender fails to arrive/return as instructed or is subject to retaking. In addition, their recommendation includes a proposed ICOTS enhancement to create new managed processes for tracking warrants for compact offenders enhancing the Commission's efforts and goals to provide effective tracking, communication, and a measurable compliance tool. The rule amendments and ICOTS enhancement will be considered as separate votes at the 2021 Annual Business Meeting.

Chair C. Moore (GA) continued that the Technology Committee needed to determine the functionality required to track warrants in ICOTS by March 1, 2021. The proposal will go through the process of a formal statement of work, with a cost component, developed by Appriss. The national office is working with SEARCH to finalize specific data elements around tracking warrants for this proposal to ensure comprehensive information is shared among states. These data elements include dates of issuance, entry into NCIC, verification of compliance, names of issuing authority, warrant served/withdrawn, general comments, etc.

The committee reviewed and made changes to the ICOTS enhancement to create new managed processes for tracking warrants for compact offenders (see addendum for details).

The committee will meet again on February 1st to finalize the enhancement's functional specifications.

Old/ New Business
There was no old/new business.

Adjourn
Commissioner C. Moore (GA) made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner S. Turner (UT) seconded.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm ET.

Warrant Tracking Enhancement

Background

The Warrant Timeframe Workgroup, charged by the Rules Committee to review all ICAOS rules related to warrant timeframes and propose a standard timeframe for issuing compact compliant warrants (as defined,) presented the following rule amendment (summary below) with an included ICOTS enhancement to create new managed processes for tracking warrants for compact offenders.

> *'Warrant' – means a written order of the court or authorities of a sending or receiving state or other body of competent jurisdiction which is made on behalf of the state, or United States, issued pursuant to statute and/or rule and which commands law enforcement to arrest an offender. The warrant shall be entered in the National Crime Information Center (NCIC) Wanted Person File with a nationwide pick-up radius with no bond amount set.*

Rule Amendment Summary:

In November 2020, the ICAOS Rules committee formally recommended amendments to six (6) rules (**2.110, 4.111, 5.101, 5.102, 5.103 & 5.103-1**) expanding the timeframe for issuing compact compliant warrants to a standard **15 business days** when an offender fails to arrive/return as instructed or is subject to retaking. In addition, their recommendation includes a proposed ICOTS enhancement to create new managed processes for tracking warrants for compact offenders enhancing the Commission's efforts and goals to provide effective tracking, communication and a measurable compliance tool. The rule amendments and ICOTS enhancement will be considered as separate votes at the 2021 ABM.

Technology Committee Feedback

The Technology Committee feedback is needed on how this proposed enhancement should function in ICOTS finalizing its recommendation *no later than March 1, 2021*. The proposal will go through the process of a formal statement of work, with a cost component, developed by Appriss.   The national office is working with SEARCH to finalize specific data elements around tracking warrants for this proposal to ensure comprehensive information is shared among states. These data elements include dates of issuance, entry into NCIC, verification of compliance, names of issuing authority, warrant served/withdrawn, general comments etc.

Committee Feedback in **RED** was discussed at Technology Committee meeting on 1/13/2021.

Considerations:

- Which ICOTS users associated with a case should have access to create/update a warrant record? (Sending State PO, Compact Staff role only, etc.)

    1. Sending state only – Compact Office Users, Sending State PO/Supervisor
    2. Compact staff do not need to reassign the case to themselves to add a warrant status update

- Which ICOTS users associated with a case should receive email notifications regarding warrant status when data is entered?

    1. All users associated with managed process in both states (PO/Supervisor/Compact Office)

- What should the 'warrant' status be called?
    o 'Active Warrant Status'?
    o Display similar to special status, like sex offender?

    1. Call the special status "Warrant Status"

- Disclaimer and clear audit trail needed to ensure what is displayed in ICOTS and in the email notifications is user entered

    1. Users need to know ICOTS/ICAOS does not confirm warrants are active and in compliance
    2. Include this disclaimer on the warrant status screens in ICOTS as well as on every email notification regarding warrant status updates:

        "Arrests should not occur based on this information alone. Warrant Status does not necessarily indicate an active NCIC warrant, though the process of issuing a warrant may have been initiated. Inaccurate information should be reported to your state compact office as quickly as possible."

- Be clear that each state will need to determine how to train on these new processes as procedures to obtain compact compliant warrants varies.

    1. *For example, it is anticipated in many states the ICOTS users is not necessarily who verifies warrant compliance. States will need to determine those lines of communication to ensure data is accurately entered.*

- Create new CAR/new activity for managing 'Discretionary Retaking'? or build into warrant status? For example, when creating a new warrant record, the user could be prompted to select 'reason for warrant' (Mandatory retaking, Absconder, Discretionary retaking, Failure to arrive/report as instructed)

    1. Make the activity its own special compact activity, as to not be confused with a CAR. Managed activity from the sending state side (*i.e., how progress report functions on the receiving state side*)
    2. Add language around the 'Retaking' definition. If the sending state is not physically removing the offender from the receiving state via warrant, then

this activity shouldn't be used. The processes for discretionary return (under Rule 5.101) via reporting instructions will not change.

To be discussed at meeting on 2/1/2021:

Email Notifications:

Awaiting Warrant Record: Prompted when No Warrant Record or Incomplete Record (Issuing authority and NCIC verification are NULL) Exists and:

- Discretionary Retaking (new CAR type or build into 'warrant' status? See bullet above)
- Notice of Failure to Arrive
  - 5 days after FTA
  - 10 days after FTA
  - 15 days after FTA
  - 30 days after FTA
- OVR response (warrant requested/issued) (including closed cases for absconders)
  - When 'warrant' record has not been created, emails should be sent to the assigned user, supervisor and compact office:
  - 5 days after OVR Response
  - 10 days after OVR Response
  - 15 days after OVR Response
  - 30 days after OVR Response
- Warrant status active/case remains open (non-absconders)

Warrant Record Entered: Prompted when Warrant Record is created/updated:

- Simple notification to all users associated with case?

Notes:

- *Emails for mandatory retaking would be generated only with cases with an OVR response of 'Warrant Issued/Requested.' This will prevent confusion when an OVR is withdrawn and prevent emails when an offender is ordered to return in lieu of retaking.*
- *Compliance dashboards to key off the OVR transmission date per the rules with data elements available for states to quickly view its compliance and performance in providing comprehensive information related to warrants.*
- *Emails would also cease when state utilizes the new process for 'removing retaking obligation' to be implemented late spring/early summer 2021*

Email Language:

In addition to the normal compact case language included with all ICOTS notifications, what other data from the OVR (if applicable) or warrant status elements should be included in email notifications?

- What are the most important data elements to include in the email itself?
  - Should 'Awaiting Warrant Record' and 'Warrant Record Entered' include same language? Be different?
  - OVR and response transmission dates?
  - Data elements from the warrant entry?

> **Commented [m2]:** I think this is already a decision above?

- o Comment field (s)?
- Should the email language include specific language from the definition of Warrant in the ICAOS Rules?
- To increase addendum usage for managing retaking. Should language be added to emails/screens for reminders?
    - o Receiving state user's email and/or screen language to remind the user; *'if warrant issuance is for mandatory retaking (Violation Report Requiring Retaking previously transmitted on this case) be sure to utilize the violation report addendums to update location and custody status.'*
    - o Sending state user's email and/or screen language to remind the user; *'if warrant issuance is for mandatory retaking (Violation Report Requiring Retaking previously transmitted on this case) be sure to utilize the addendum to existing violation report response to provide retaking logistic information.'*

Addendum

Proposed Data Fields

Data Field	Data Type	Description	Source
[WARRANT_STATUS_ID] Unique identifier	INTEGER	Primary Key	System Generated
[Date] Date Warrant Status was updated	DATETIME		System Generated
[USER_ID] User that updated Warrant Status	INTEGER		System Generated
[RECSTA] Receiving State	VARCHAR(2)		System Generated
[SENSTA] Sending State	VARCHAR(2)		System Generated
[OFFENDER_ID] Unique offender ID in ICOTS	INTEGER	Foreign Key	System Generated
[COMPACT_CASE_ID] Unique compact case ID	INTEGER	Foreign Key	System Generated
[SUPERVISION_TYPE] Supervision type associated with COMPACT_CASE_ID	VARCHAR(255)		System Generated
[Date] Request for a warrant be issued was sent to the Court/Parole Board/Other Issuing Authority	DATETIME		User Entered
[Date] Court/Parole Board/Other Issuing Authority issued the warrant	DATETIME		User Entered
[Name/Phone/Email/Contact] of Issuing Authority	VARCHAR(255)		User Entered
[Text] Warrant Identifier Number {NIC Number}	VARCHAR(255)		User Entered
[Date] Warrant NCIC entry	DATETIME		User Entered
[Date] NCIC Verification (nationwide, extradition, with no bond)	DATETIME		User Entered
[Name/Phone/Email/Contact] NCIC Verification (if not the ICOTS user)	VARCHAR(255)		User Entered
[Name/Phone/Email/Contact] of Retaking Authority	VARCHAR(255)		User Entered
[Date] Warrant Served Record becomes 'read only'	DATETIME		User Entered

[Date] Warrant Withdrawn Record becomes 'read only'	DATETIME		User Entered
[Text] Comments	VARCHAR(2048)		User Entered
[Attachment]	FILE		User Entered