

State of Connecticut
CJIS Governing Board
Meeting Minutes
Record of Proceedings, April 22, 2010

Members/Designated Representatives Present: Lt. Gov. Michael Fedele; Co-Chair; Judge Patrick L. Carroll III, Co-Chair; Deputy Chief Court Administrator, Judicial Branch; Senator John Kissel, Senate 7th District, Judiciary Committee; Designee Michael Pollard for Senator Andrew McDonald, Senate 27th District, Judiciary Committee; Undersecretary Brian Austin, Office of Policy and Management; Sean Thakkar, CJIS Executive Director; Chief State's Attorney, Kevin Kane, Division of Criminal Justice; Designee John Lahda, Board of Pardons and Paroles; Chief James Cetran, Connecticut Police Chief Association; Designee Richard Bailey, Department of Information Technology; Designee Brian Carlow, Division of the Public Defender Services; Commissioner John Danaher, Department of Public Safety; Michelle Cruz, Office of the Victim Advocate; Commissioner Robert Ward, Department of Motor Vehicle; and Commissioner Peter Boynton, Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security

Others Present: Elizabeth Bickley, Tracy Brown (Recorder), Bryan Cafferelli, Elisa Chase, Linda DeConti, Chris Duryea, Evelyn Godbout, Tina Good, Major Phil Halibozek, Darryl Hayes, Joan Hilliard, Jerry Johnson, Robert Kaelin, John Morrisson, Susan Naide, Capt. Patrick O'Hara, Denise Poncini, John Russotto, Celia Siefert, Len Smith, Thomas Sutkowski, Terry Walker, George White

I. Welcome

The CJIS Governing Board was called to order by co-chair Judge Patrick Carroll at 1:48pm.

II. Minutes

Judge Carroll stated that CIO Diane Wallace submitted changes to be made to the January 21, 2010 CJIS Governing Board meeting minutes. Judge Carroll proposed that the minutes be moved as presented and the concerns and changes from CIO Wallace be reduced to letter form and submitted as an appendix to the January 21, 2010 CJIS Governing Board meeting minutes. Judge Carroll moved the motion to accept the minutes; the motion was seconded by Senator John Kissel, Senate 7th District, Judiciary Committee and unanimously accepted by the voting members present.

III. Project Status Updates

Connecticut Information Sharing System (CISS):

Mr. Robert Kaelin gave an update on the CJIS Blueprint Project. They are finishing the System Development Methodology (SDM) Business Issue Phase and the Project Management Plan. DOIT is completing the stakeholdering plan for the CISS Project. A Project Steering Committee is going to be convened soon. Once this has been completed, Project Steering Committee will hold a meeting to discuss the business issues with project. MTG will recommend gating from the Business Issue Phase to the Business Requirement Phase. This will allow for the RFP to be issued for the project. MTG received a number of comments and are incorporating the comments into the RFP. The updated draft of the RFP will be sent once complete.

The event based view will be delivered this evening with three conversation diagrams. A review of the business process diagrams will be completed with the stakeholders. Mr. Kaelin made a proposal to the CJIS Governing Board to have representation from the following ten agencies on the CISS Project Steering Committee. These agencies are: Department of Public Safety,

Department of Corrections, Division of Criminal Justice, Connecticut Police Chiefs Association, Department of Information Technology, Department of Motor Vehicle, Division of Public Defender Service, Office of the Victim Advocate, Judicial Branch, and the Office of Policy and Management. Mr. Kaelin will contact each agency's head and send them the Delegation of Authority form to designate a primary and secondary designee to represent the agency on the CISS Project Steering Committee.

- Undersecretary Brian Austin of the Office of Policy and Management moved the motion to approve that the ten agencies mentioned above have representation on the CISS Project Steering Committee; the motion was seconded by Commissioner Robert Ward of the Department of Motor Vehicle and unanimously approved by the voting members present.

Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS):

Mr. Len Smith discussed the OBTS Project; he stated that the team is completing the warranty testing for the system. The first round of testing will be completed on May 7, 2010. Sierra System will take a look at the data and do an assessment of the work that will need to be completed. After which, a decision will be made for the next round of testing. The new environment is targeted for completion in the middle of October 2010. The initial testing of performance remediation by Sierra System has shown an eighty three percent increase in hourly processing capacity. The Offender Status was delivered by Sierra System and is undergoing system testing. There will not be enough time to complete full testing of the Offender Status before Sierra System leaves.

Mr. Thakkar did speak to Sierra System and they will give a second round of code deliverables. There are remediation issues on a technical item in the current legacy environment. If the issue is not remediated, then the license will have to be renewed that will cost an estimated \$150,000. Mr. Thakkar will address this issue with Sierra System.

OBTS receives approximately 1000 inquiries a day. A report was completed to see how often the system has been used over twelve months. There are one hundred and twenty-three groups that are eligible to use the system; only forty-five groups have used the system within the twelve month period.

OBTS has processed approximately five million events monthly. The top three average daily users for OBTS are the Department of Public Safety who averages three hundred and thirty-four, the Department of Correction who averages one hundred and forty-three, and the Department of Motor Vehicles who averages fifty-two. Most agencies average about two to three inquiries on a weekly basis.

- Two questions were asked at the meeting, the first question to Mr. Smith was has the knowledge transfer begun and where does the CJIS Support Group (CSG) stand on the ability to maintain the system? Mr. Smith responded that they have set-up a number of deliverables for the knowledge transfer. Most of the knowledge transfer sessions have been completed. They are currently concentrating on the knowledge transfer for the Department of Information Technology (DOIT) staff that are going to support the OBTS System.

- The second question to Mr. Smith was does the DOIT staff have the knowledge to continue maintenance on the OBTS System once Sierra System is gone? Mr. Smith responded that the staff has enough information that was transferred to them; the rest will be based on experience once they start to get inside and work with the OBTS System.

Connecticut Impaired Driver Information System (CIDRIS):

Ms. Elisa Chase, the new Project Manager for the CIDRIS project, came on board February 12, 2010 to replace Mr. Steve Looney. Ms. Chase spoke about the CIDRIS Project; she stated that the CIDRIS project had to be retrofitted into the SDM Project Methodology, which has been accomplished. The choice was made to retrofit the project at the Designed Phase, which is now coming to an end. The next phase will be the Construction Phase. The System Detailed Design (SDD) document has been completed. The SDD was presented before the Technical Review Board (TRB) on March 31, 2010. They asked TRB for their approval of the design to construct CIDRIS in the DOIT environment. The TRB provided six recommendations that needed to be incorporated into the SDD document to be approved. The six recommendations were addressed and the document was re-presented to TRB on April 20, 2010. A confirmation was received from TRB on April 21, 2010 stating that the project document was approved.

In order to move from the SDM Designed Phase into the Construction Phase, the CIDRIS Project team needed to complete the Stakeholding process at DOIT. The CIDRIS Project team made a request to DOIT to review the Construction Project Plan for availability of time, schedule, effort, and resources to get the CIDRIS Project done. The Stakeholding process with DOIT begun on April 8, 2010, they are two weeks from completing the process. Ms. Chase defined what the term Stakeholding to the members of the CJIS Governing Board. Once they receive the dates and commitments from DOIT, they will need to re-baseline the Project Plan. There was a delay, because CIDRIS had to pass the TRB review.

Sierra System delivered the application and most of the artifacts needed to complete the engagement on April 12, 2010 for CIDRIS. The final deliverable from Sierra System will be the code base. By contract, the CIDRIS team has thirty days to use and complete the users' base testing for this deliverable. This will not happen, therefore, the other alternative is to leverage the potential to extend the contract with Sierra System, so that, they can assist with the deliverable (Mr. Thakkar will speak further about this matter). When Sierra handed over their deliverables, they handed over a large amount of documents and information. The team will not have enough time or resources to review all of the documents and information supplied by Sierra System. Ms. Chase asked the CJIS Support Group to develop a process to identify resources that can assist them from a technical review perspective.

Ms. Chase has asked the infrastructure groups at DOIT and the other support units pertaining to construction to assist as quickly as possible. On April 21, 2010, they had another kick-off session for the infrastructure piece that has to be moved through quickly. They will ask the CIDRIS Project Steering Committee for their approval to move into the Construction Phase, testing, Test Plans, and strategies. The CIDRIS Project was in the Construction Phase, but the team had to step back to the Design Phase to help the project move forward. The project is delayed due to this reason. Once the code is delivered by the vendor, they have only thirty days to do users' base testing with the code.

- Mr. Gary Wollman was hired on April 5, 2010 as the Business Analyst for the CIDRIS Project. Ms. Chase made a request to Mr. Wollman to take a look at the CIDRIS Project, assess where the project is from a requirement perspective, and the test efforts for construction. He will identify the gaps and come up with a mitigation plan to allow the CIDRIS Project team to catch up.
- Mr. Richard Bailey complimented Ms. Chase for her work with the Detailed Design Document and the work she has done so far on the CIDRIS Project.
- Mr. Thakkar thanked Ms. Tina Good for her work on the Detailed Designed document, Mr. Bailey for assisting with the TRB, Mr. Dean Myshrall for assisting in getting the project through the TRB Review, and Mr. Smith for the work he does for CJIS.

IV. On-going Management and Maintenance of OBTS and CIDRIS

Mr. Thakkar discussed the extension of Sierra System's services that would help OBTS and CIDRIS immensely. If the extension is not given, the State will incur \$150,000 worth of licensing fees. If Sierra is on board, then this cost will not be incurred by the state and will be defrayed by the amount being paid to Sierra System at a one year extension with two one year options. Mr. Thakkar stated he has the money in his budget to pay Sierra System for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 with one caveat that his budget for FY 2011 remains the same as approved with no cuts or lapses. No additional money will be asked for unless Sierra System is extended past the first year. Extending Sierra System will help:

1. The OBTS and CIDRIS teams have breathing room to be able to do other aspects of the projects and have the ability to catch up.
2. The DOIT resources will get the opportunity to get familiar with the maintenances and managements of the applications.
3. The CJIS community will have two projects moving along and the CJIS community will benefit from these two projects.

To do the testing aspect for OBTS System, the State would have to purchase three licenses. As part of the extension, Sierra System will be asked to fix the OBTS System to only need two licenses. When CISS is implemented, the goal is to have OBTS and CIDRIS integrated into CISS. Once this is completed, there will be no need for the services from Sierra System. There will be a team who will maintain and manage the CISS System. Mr. Thakkar requested from the CJIS Governing Board to approval the extension of Sierra System and to allow DOIT's proposed Transition Plan to proceed, but augment it with the application support from the vendor for both OBTS and CIDRIS.

- Commissioner Ward moved the motion to approve Option 2 and the extension of Sierra System; the motion was seconded by Undersecretary Austin and unanimously approved by the voting members present.

V. Project Steering Committee – Role and Responsibilities

Mr. Sean Thakkar discussed the roles and responsibilities of the Project Steering Committee as it relates to the CJIS Governing Board. The DOIT SDM requires project steering committees to

provide direction to both OBTS and CIDRIS projects on operational issues and specifically when SDM decision points are reached to go from one stage of the project to next (From Design to Construction).

Generally Project Steering Committees (PSC) are made up with stakeholders from a single agency because most projects are single agency oriented. In that case the stakeholders, having direct control over agency resources, have a much broader span of control of the project, because it impacts only their organization.

The CJIS Governing Board (Board) is made up of eleven Executive Branch agencies, Judicial Branch, Legislative Branch and Local Law Enforcement (CPCA). The Project Steering Committee for OBTS, as an example, is made up of only five stakeholders from the CJIS community (Judicial, DPS, CPCA, DOC and OVA).

Project Steering Committee Role and Responsibilities under SDM and those responsibilities as viewed by the Board:

The SDM has the following four responsibilities for the stakeholders.

1. Provide governance and decision making to the project team.

Board Perspective: Provide operational governance for the project as a community stakeholder to the project team.

2. Remove barriers for the project team.

Board Perspective: Assist the project team by working with your agency to help them accomplish project tasks.

3. Review the Phase-End Decision Point presentation material prior to the Phase-End Decision Point meeting.

Board Perspective: As a project steering committee member review the SDM Phase-End presentation and provide feedback.

4. Render a Phase-End decision of “Go”, “No-Go” or “Redirect” as it relates to the project team proceeding to the next phase.

Board Perspective: Provide your feedback as a community stakeholder on how the project should proceed.

Issue:

While project decisions are clearly within the PSC responsibility, the larger issue of lifecycle and funding need clarity:

- Should the PSC make decisions on the lifecycle of OBTS (and other CJIS Enterprise Projects)?
- Should the PSC make decisions on how much additional funding application(s) should receive?

Mr. Thakkar made the following Policy recommendations:

1. The Steering Committee should be able to make operational decisions, as well as, SDM decision point approvals for projects that are in the best interest of the CJIS Community.
 2. The Steering Committee should provide recommendation(s) to the Board regarding project lifecycle decisions or funding. Based on the recommendation(s) the Board can make an informed decision.
 3. Strategy or directional recommendations will be made by the committee when a critical decision is needed from the Board. The process will be:
 - a. The PSC will draft, review, and approve a “recommendation document” stating: the decision needed from the Board, the issue or problem remedied by the decision, background information on the issue or problem, and any supporting materials.
 - b. The PSC will ask the Executive Director to place the item on the next Board agenda and provide the recommendation document.
 - c. PSC members will brief the issue or problem and recommendation to their organization’s representative on the Board.
 - d. The PSC members will be present at the Board when the Executive Director presents the recommendation to the Board meeting. If desired, a representative of the PSC may present the recommendation.
 - e. The Board will act on the recommendation or refer it back to the PSC for follow-up.
- Mr. Bailey explained the roles and responsibilities of the Project Steering Committee. Within SDM, the Project Steering Committee is established; for instance, at the time the project is established the project sponsor and the Project Steering Committee is identified. The Project Steering Committee feeds into the decision making but ultimately the project sponsor or executive sponsor should make the final decision associated with the project. The project sponsor or executive sponsor is the gate keeper of the project and will be the one to present to the CJIS Governing Board. The Project Steering Committee stays together throughout the lifecycle of the project. Once the project has ended, the Project Steering Committee normally gets disbanded.
 - Mr. Thakkar responded that there is a governance structure to assist via the Implementation Committee, which has users groups. Each users group will be providing input to the Implementation Committee on what are the project needs and what needs to be fixed in the next iteration. Once this is done, a new project is formed, SDM will kick in, and a Project Steering Committee will be formed again. According to Executive Order 19, executive branch agencies have to follow the SDM and establish a Project Steering Committee.
 - Judge Carroll made the motion to approve the Executive Director’s proposed policy and associated recommendations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Michael Pollard, designee for Senator Andrew McDonald and unanimously approved by the voting members present.

VI. Status Update from the CJIS Governing Board Sub-Committees:

Administrative Committee:

Mr. Chris Duryea gave an update on the Administrative Committee on behalf of Mr. Larry D'Orsi, chair of the Administrative Committee. The Administrative Committee held their quarterly meeting on March 17, 2010. At this meeting the Administrative Committee granted the Federal Public Defenders access to the OBTS System. Public Act 09-26 allows the Federal Public Defenders access to the OBTS System and provides them the same access rights as the State Public Defenders. The Administrative Committee recommended to the CJIS Governing Board that the Federal Public Defenders have the same access rights as the State Public Defenders, which will include all convictions and all pending cases that are available to the public. There is no way to determine within the OBTS System if an individual is represented by the Federal Public Defender. Therefore, the Administrative Committee is not recommending that the Federal Public Defender have access to confidential or sealed records that have not been erased, youthful offender cases, and sealed diversionary program cases.

- Chief State's Attorney Kevin Kane did not have any objections to the Administrative Committee's recommendations for the Federal Public Defenders.
- Mr. Thakkar added the Federal Public Defenders will have to become CJIS Security Compliant by completing the necessary paperwork. They will also need to make sure from a technology perspective, that they will have the cognitivity for the OBTS System. If there is a cost involved, then they will need to know this and be in agreement to incur the cost. Mr. Thakkar will get in contact with the Chief Public Defender Thomas Dennis at the Federal Public Defenders in Hartford, Connecticut to discuss this matter further. The Technology Committee will work with the Federal Public Defenders to discuss whether or not access to the system can be provided.
- Judge Carroll stated that conviction and pending case information is available to the public on the Judicial Branch website. He has requested to Mr. Thakkar to share this information with the Federal Public Defenders.
 - Chief State's Attorney Kane moved the motion to approve the recommendations made by the Administrative Committee to allow the Federal Public Defenders access to the OBTS System. The motion was seconded by Commissioner John Danaher of the Department of Public Safety and unanimously approved by the voting members present.

Technology Committee:

Ms. Evelyn Godbout, chair of the Technology Committee, discussed the recommendation made at CIDRIS Workshop on February 5, 2010 to resolve some of the business process issues that came up in the application. A number of agencies involved in the CIDRIS Project attended the CIDRIS Workshop. A consensus was reached on nine issues in regards to CIDRIS. However, a consensus was not reached on six additional issues pertaining to CIDRIS. Ms. Godbout is looking to receive the CJIS Governing Board's validation and approval of the nine

recommendations. Ms. Godbout reviewed these nine recommendations, which were agreed upon by the CJIS agency's representatives at the Workshop.

- Commissioner Danaher made the first motion to approve the nine recommendations made by the CJIS community stakeholders at the CIDRIS Workshop, which will be incorporated into CIDRIS and be used by all CJIS agencies. Chief State's Attorney Kane seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved by the CJIS Governing Board members present.

In addition, she reviewed the six open items, which require further discussion by the CJIS Governing Board. These items include the need for toxicology laboratory results within thirty days to DMV, the need for the arrest package from the police departments to be complete before it is sent to DMV, the need for the warrant case and warrantless case documents to be defined, the validation of the supplemental documentation that should be provided to DMV along with the A44, the clarification on who can receive electronic intoxilizer results from the laboratories, and if it's possible for DMV to accept OUI information electronically outside of CIDRIS. Ms. Godbout upon the request made by Mr. Thakkar; recommended that a workshop be held with the CJIS Governing Board members to gain a consensus on the six open items.

- Judge Carroll recommended that Ms. Godbout schedule the workshop and send the invite to all CJIS Governing Board members.

Ms. Godbout discussed the Technology Committee recommendation for PDF/A archiving format. She stated that the Technology Committee recommends that new CJIS initiatives that includes hard copy document scanning, utilize the PDF/A document format whenever possible.

The next steps for the Technology Committee are to create a central repository for official CIDRIS forms, determine what documents can be sent via the RMS systems into CIDRIS, and identify the business requirements for eSignature. Once all these items have been discussed, Ms. Godbout will present the Technology Committee's recommendations to the CJIS Governing Board.

SEARCH has agreed to do NIEM training on May 19, 2010 at the Division of Criminal Justice in Rocky Hill, Connecticut. This training will be at no cost to the state, Ms. Godbout has sent out invitations to many agency members. She is encouraging everyone who can to attend the training to let her know by sending her an email.

- Commissioner Danaher made the first motion to accept the Technology Committee's recommendation for the PDF/A archiving format for hard copy scanning. The motion was seconded by Judge Carroll and unanimously accepted by the CJIS Governing Board members present.

VII. Executive Session

Executive session begun at 3:25pm, Chief State's Attorney Kane gave the first motion to go into executive session to discuss a personnel matter. Commissioner Ward seconded the motion and it was unanimously accepted by the CJIS Governing Board members present. Executive Session ended at 3:47pm. Judge Carroll reconvened the regular CJIS Governing Board session at

3:49pm. Judge Carroll stated that no action was taken on the personnel matter and no vote was required by the CJIS Governing Board members present.

The CJIS Governing Board ended at 3:50pm, Commissioner Danaher made the first motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Undersecretary Austin and unanimously accepted by the CJIS Governing Board members present.

VIII. Dates of Next Meetings

The following CJIS Governing Board meeting dates have been established for calendar year 2010. All meetings will be held at the Division of Criminal Justice, 300 Corporate Place, Rocky Hill, Connecticut 06067.

Thursday July 22, 2010

Thursday October 21, 2010