Having a quorum of members present, Chairman Robert Brinson called the regularly scheduled meeting of the North Carolina Criminal Justice Information Network (CJIN) Governing Board meeting to order at 9:10 A.M.

Approval of Minutes
Minutes from the September 13-14, 2000 meeting were approved.

Mr. Bob Brinson asked Mr. John Carriker, host of the CJIN Board meeting, to give a brief history of the room renovations in the Historic New Hanover County Old Courthouse. Mr. Carey Gibson demonstrated the variety of equipment that was installed in the meeting room.
Magistrate System
Mr. Cliff Layman stated that the report on the Magistrate System was basically the same as his September 14, 2000 Board meeting report. The phase two software system testing is almost complete and parallel testing will be taking place in one county soon. The Magistrate Advisory Board is in its final review and providing comments to the project team. After the successful pilot in one county, phase two software will be installed in the sixty-three counties already implemented. Rollout of phase two software is expected to begin in January 2001 and be completed by early summer 2001.

Mr. Jim Persinger, the Magistrate’s representative on the CJIN Governing Board, said he has seen the phase two software and thinks it is very good. Mr. Layman said there is reduced mouse activity as well as a wizard, which walks you through what you have to key in.

Statewide Warrant Repository
Mr. Cliff Layman stated that the report on the Statewide Warrant Repository is a logical extension of the Magistrate System. The project is in the early conceptual design phase and the project team is presently being formed. This project is estimated to be completed approximately 6-8 months after the last county is implemented on the Magistrate System and should include all existing warrants in the system.

Mr. Layman said that the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) is working on infrastructure issues and that bandwidth has been increased 4-6 times its present capacity. Mr. Richard NiFong asked if AOC could accommodate local interfaces to the warrant repository and Mr. Layman said he wasn’t sure yet but that would be worked out during the design phase. Mr. Brinson asked about project funding and Mr. Richard Little answered that this project was in the AOC budget and there was NCHIP grant monies as well. Mr. NiFong asked if local interest was represented in the design phase and Mr. Layman said that other than the representation on the Magistrate System, there wasn’t any but he would secure someone. Ms. Carol Morin asked if the project has received Information Resource Management Commission (IRMC) certification and Mr. Layman said he didn’t know but he viewed this project as an extension of the Magistrate System, which is IRMC certified. Mr. Little said that AOC and the IRMC were working closely with Mr. Tom Runkle and Mr. Michael Fenton. Mr. Layman said that the AOC still had some software changes to make to get closer to the recommended IRMC architecture.

Mr. Brinson stated that the IRMC had a plan of how to build systems from a technical architecture perspective and this should ease the ability to interconnect to other systems. Sheriff Frank McGuirt said he would like to see civil orders for arrest entered in the warrant repository (i.e., deadbeat dad, etc.). Lt. Ken Wiseman asked if local Sheriff and Police Associations knew this was coming and did they understand the local impact. Mr. Layman said yes and Mr. Brinson said that the AOC technical committee is made up of all stakeholders and they should be carrying the message back to their peers. Mr. NiFong stated that Guilford County is working on a countywide warrant repository and their respective members may not be getting this information and it might restructure their plans if they knew about it. Mr. Layman said it could be a year or more before the warrant repository is done. Mr. Brinson asked if there were other venues to reach people. Mr. NiFong said he would be happy to have Mr. Layman talk to the Guilford County team. Ms. Rebecca Troutman said the best way to keep abreast of projects is to use a web site.
Capt. Clay stated that there was a previous meeting with a smaller group of interested parties and that the eCitation Oversight Committee would schedule their first meeting when all of the stakeholders have been confirmed. The front-end edits to move data smoothly from the car to the clerk’s office were being worked on and F/Sgt. Higgins has met with Steve Kulig, an AOC contractor. F/Sgt. Higgins had hoped to test multiple applications but this approach would be an undesirable burden to AOC and so it would be narrowed down to one internal application. The Governor’s Highway Safety Program grant has been awarded for October 2000 and approval has been given to start spending it. Capt. Clay said there is an IRMC memo that will allow the project team the latitude to operate as previously discussed and the next step was to proceed forward since the grant money was in place and the oversight committee was being formed. F/Sgt. Higgins has met with judicial officials who provided input and insight on the eCitation project.

Lt. Ken Wiseman said that the Fayetteville Police Department pilot team is still in production mode with eCitation and they have loaned some newer laptops to the State Highway Patrol (SHP) to determine if the memory leak was being caused by older SHP equipment. Mr. Brinson asked if the early generation of mobile data terminals were aging out and Lt. Wiseman said yes. Capt. Clay said some the front-end edits need to be done regardless of which laptop is being used but that the SHP error rate was significantly higher than that of the Fayetteville Police Department. Mr. Layman projected that the error rate would probably go to zero when the front-end edits were completed. Lt. Wiseman said that the popularity of eCitation is growing in the Fayetteville Police Department and his staff wants to expand it to sixty newly purchased laptops.

Lt. Wiseman stated that the printout to the violator doesn’t match what’s in the courtroom and requested that some refinements be made in this area. Mr. Layman said that the pilot didn’t capture enough data to reproduce the ticket and it has caused some anxiety in the courtroom. Mr. Layman stated that the eShuck project will take data electronically submitted to the clerk and transmit it within the courtroom. The judge will be able to call up a ticket, put in a disposition, transfer the data electronically to the financial system, and ultimately there will be a paperless trail for the shuck. Ms. Layman said that eShuck would provide financial savings in terms of more accurate data, faster speed in the courtroom, and the clerk would save time as well. Mr. Layman stated that there were good lessons learned during the eCitation pilot which would be applied to the next phase – an advisory team, project management controls, and a project plan.

Mr. Brinson stated that the approach of building pieces sequentially has been grounded in common architecture and systems will play together better. Although eCitation and eShuck were not in the CJIN Final Study Report dated April 1996, the CJIN infrastructure can be leveraged for projects like these. Mr. Brinson asked if the statewide rollout cost or schedule had been established yet. Capt. Clay said that sometime during this grant cycles, which ended in September 2001, this would be worked on. Capt. Clay said that when the software and front-end edits were in place, it should be a seamless flow from the patrol car to the courtroom. Preliminary estimates are around the second quarter of 2001 but the design of eShuck was not in the grant scope.
Capt. Clay reminded the CJIN Board that eShuck was a separate project from eCitation. Mr. Layman stated that most of the initial expense for eCitation was in the infrastructure (i.e., a mobile data terminal and printer) but eShuck would require the courtrooms to be fully wired and have PC functionality. Mr. Layman stated that they are looking at wireless technology in the courtrooms where only one wire could be the receiver. Mr. Layman said that the counties were responsible for courthouse maintenance. Ms. Troutman asked that everyone be mindful of the budget cycles for the counties and to try to anticipate projects, which needed contingency county budgets. Mr. Brinson stated that it was not too early to start thinking about recurring costs for mobile data terminals because they had a discrete life cycle and the first round of SHP laptop equipment has already shown that it needs to be replaced.

**Mecklenburg County and their Integrated CJIS Project**

Mr. Duane Campbell and Mr. Peter Clifford, both from Mecklenburg County, attended the CJIN Board meeting and had requested to be a brief agenda item. Mr. Bob Brinson recognized Mr. Duane Campbell from the audience. Mr. Campbell stated that there is an integrated CJIS project underway between Mecklenburg County and AOC and he hoped that it could be rolled out as a statewide model. Mr. Campbell said there was a Request for Proposal (RFP) issued and it is down to four finalists and Gardner Group will be helping in evaluating responses, reviewing project demonstrations, and a decision would probably be made by mid-December 2000. Mr. Campbell stated that the RFP is on the Internet. Mr. Richard Little stated that Mecklenburg County was working closely with IRMC and AOC standards and architecture. Ms. Troutman asked if all systems were being replaced and Mr. Campbell said yes. Mr. Brinson asked how this fits with CJIN. Mr. Cliff Layman said that the courts have outdated legacy systems and it makes sense to replace the criminal area first. This system could serve as a model for other parts of the state, AOC is sharing the development costs with localities, it meets IRMC architectural standards, and it meets the CJIN network security requirements. Mr. Campbell said the project strategy may look like it is conflicting with the Magistrate System and the Warrant Repository but it is running in parallel. Mr. Layman said that this project has scalability for court systems, both upward (for multiple courtrooms) and downward (for single courtrooms). Ms Troutman asked about implementation dates and Mr. Campbell said probably 2½ - 3½ years with phased approaches. Mr. Campbell said that funding was being done on a local level but it was probably insufficient for project needs and he would appreciate all CJIN and AOC funding leads. Ms. Troutman asked if this was an IRMC certified project but Mr. Brinson said he didn’t think so because IRMC has jurisdiction over state agencies and this is a local effort right now. Mr. Troutman asked if CJIN could endorse this project and Mr. Brinson said this was the first time that the CJIN Board has seen this project and he was not prepared to endorse it at this point in time.

**CJIN Network Security and CJIN Security Oversight Committee (SOC) Report**

Mr. Richard Little, who serves as the Chair of the CJIN Security Oversight Committee (SOC), presented an overview of the committee membership for the SOC and stated that the Service Level Agreement (SLA) for firewall and Virtual Private Network (VPN) was being negotiated with ITS. Mr. Little said that CJIN information security policies were being developed and it was being reviewed by the technical workgroup as well as the SOC.
Mr. George Bakolia, who is the project manager for the CJIN Security Project, reported that phase 1 of the CJIN network security project involved CJIN state agencies, locals, plus other non-criminal justice state agencies (i.e., Department of Revenue, Department of Health and Human Services, Employment Security Commission, and Information Technology Services). Mr. Bakolia stated that other state agencies have requested a copy of the CJIN service level agreement (SLA) and that it is a general consensus that other state agencies could benefit from the CJIN security project. Since Phase 1 of the project is completed, CJIN has decided to hire a dedicated project manager for the Phase 2 efforts. Mr. Bakolia said the IRM project office demonstrated admirable neutrality of effort during Phase 1 and it would be inappropriate to have the IRM project office drive Phase 2. Mr. Bakolia introduced Mr. Luke Andersen, the new CJIN Security Project Manager, and Ms. Kim Grant, a technical writer. Mr. Bakolia said this staff addition would compliment the two technical security resources already working on the project. Mr. Bakolia said that hardware was on order, its delivery was expected during the next few weeks, and software would be ordered soon. Mr. Bakolia stated that the SOC had agreed that the J-NET project had a high priority business need and as a result, the Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (DJJDP) would go first but after that, no agency prioritization had been set. Mr. Bakolia said the network security infrastructure was needed to deploy an application across multiple entities and there would probably not be enough funding for the authorization component of the grant. Mr. Bakolia said that the consultants would be developing a statement of work for an encryption pilot and some of the remaining grant money would connect a local entity for proof-of-concept. Mr. Bakolia reminded everyone that there was no grant money for deployment at the local level but that the locals should target their migration/replacement funds towards CJIN network security standards.

Mr. Little solicited from CJIN Board members feedback regarding how he could better communicate SOC efforts and other pertinent information to the CJIN Board. Mr. Little said he intended to have the CJIN network security standards posted to the CJIN web site. Mr. Bakolia said he needed the CJIN Board members and SOC participants to spread the word to their respective groups. Mr. Little said that a glossary of terms is being developed and he would distribute the final copy of the SOC charter to the CJIN Board via e-mail. Ms. Troutman asked if local government was involved and Mr. Little replied that Mr. Bill Clontz was a member of the SOC and represented those interests.

Mr. Brinson reminded the CJIN Board members that this was a $3,500,000 grant awarded to CJIN but was one-time funding and CJIN would need to secure a funding stream when the grant money ran out. Ms. Carol Morin mentioned that she had included a Full Time Equivalent (FTE) for a Network Security Administrator in the CJIN expansion budget request for FY2001 - 2002. Mr. Bakolia said the authentication solution chosen by ITS is very expensive but the costs would probably drop when more state and local entities subscribe to it. Mr. Bakolia said there were other less expensive solutions for CJIN to consider. Ms. Troutman said that over 100 local agencies haven’t done their TCP/IP migration yet because they can’t afford the ITS charges but they could afford a local ISP service provider. Mr. Bakolia said that NCIC has imposed the deadline dates on the Department of Justice (DOJ) and that DOJ notified its DCI (Division of Criminal Information) users about 1½ years ago. Mr. Bakolia said that everyone might not be migrated by the January 2001 deadline but that local entities should be procuring devices, a router, and then budget for the recurring cost. Chief Glen Allen said the TCP/IP migration was a problem for his department before they updated their records management system. Mr. Bakolia said that the security issues need to be addressed when a Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) system is secured. Mr. Bakolia said that DOJ is promoting the use of existing ITS connections rather than spending initial installation costs. In emergency cases, DOJ might have the equivalent of a PC or will try to make arrangements for a router so no one will loose connectivity to DCI.
**Juvenile Justice Network (J-NET)**
Ms. Tracy Nichols presented a handout to the CJIN Board which had 19 findings to be corrected from J-NET’s quality assurance review. Ms. Nichols said that 17/19 findings were completed on or before the deadline date and 2 findings could not be completed because they were beyond the J-NET team’s control. Ms. Nichols said that J-NET had a quick strike assessment in mid-September and it was positive. The assessment concentrated in 3 areas: did the project team complete the identified corrective actions on time?; did the deliverable for each item appear to be a quality product?; and did it appear that the project team could completed the remainder of the Version 1a project on time? Ms. Nichols said that a network security agreement is in place with New Hanover County.

Mr. Bob Brinson asked for a review of Version 1a. Mr. Nichols said it was for court counselors and focused mainly on event processing. Ms. Nichols said that Version 1a would be in pilot for 60 days and that a statewide rollout implementation would take place afterwards. Mr. Brinson asked if there was sufficient budget forVersion 1a and Ms. Nichols said the $5,000,000 federal grant would cover it. Ms. Morin asked the dates for the grant but Ms. Nichols replied that she wasn’t sure.

**Transfer of images over CJIN-MDN**
Capt. Fletcher Clay stated that the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was being developed with North Carolina State University and funding was coming from the National Science Foundation with the State Highway Patrol supplying the match monies. Capt. Clay said that they had identified sources for the images database and there was a sample of 5,000 records to test and evaluate. Several state agencies as well as the Sheriff’s departments will be getting together to discuss this in the near future. There is interest from Washington, D.C. to see if a photo from the side of the road could be moved up the line to another source. Right now, the focus is on sending the photo from the database to the patrol car in smaller pieces but alternatives will be looked at. Mr. Brinson asked about size reduction of the photo and Capt. Clay said that with a normal jpeg file, the bandwidth usage is known and the MDT rebuilds the photograph on the laptop. Capt. Clay said that when this application is finished, it will be state owned and there should be no licensing fee for its use.

**Local CJIN Subcommittee Report**
Ms. Carol Morin reported that there would be a special CJIN Board meeting held on Monday, November 27, 2000 and the only agenda item would be the AG’s advisory opinion on the request from local governments to use CJIN-MSN infrastructure to access their local applications. Mr. Brinson suggested that those Board members who didn’t live locally in Raleigh considering a videoconference or telephone conference so they could participate remotely. Ms. Rebecca Troutman asked if the Town of Cary could come and Mr. Brinson said yes.
CJIN Governing Board By-Laws
Mr. Richard Little stated that he had not received any feedback from CJIN Board members regarding the draft by-laws presented to the Board at its last meeting. Mr. Little noted that Captain Clay had volunteered to assist with preparing a draft of the by-laws for consideration by the Board. Mr. Little solicited the Board’s wishes with regards to several key matters: proxies, absent members, advisory membership, etc. Mr. Little reminded the Board that the draft by-laws was modeled after the by-laws of the Governor’s Crime Commission. Mr. Little said he would redistribute the by-laws one more time to solicit feedback and then he planned to seek approval at the January 2001 Board meeting.

CJIN Executive Director Report
Ms. Carol Morin reported that she has started distributing her monthly status reports to the CJIN Board via e-mail. Mr. Brinson mentioned that it was taking a lot of Ms. Morin’s time to perform the administrative duties associated with running the Board. Capt. Clay asked if financial reports could be developed which would show project reports and all sources of funding (i.e., grant dollars as well as state appropriations). Ms. Morin also reported that she had attended the National Governor’s Association workshop in Nashville and the North Carolina CJIN efforts appeared to be in the middle tier of a state ranking because some states were more advanced than North Carolina while others were just starting to work on this effort.

CJIN Recurring Costs
Mr. Bob Brinson opened this agenda item to the CJIN Board members for discussion. Mr. Brinson stated that we need to know what it costs to maintain the operational status of CJIN projects and this dollar amount should include federal, state, and local government contributions. Ms. Morin stated that it is sometimes difficult to interpret information when each project supplies their data in a different format. The CJIN Board requested that Ms. Morin develop a standard template to include project staffing, technology upgrades (depending on the life expectancy of equipment), maintenance, and infrastructure needs. The template will also include a section to note an individual agency’s operating budget versus CJIN acquired funds. Mr. Brinson stated that Senate Bill 222 has placed new fiscal reporting requirements on the projects and the State Controller’s Office is expanding its services to support this effort. There will be a quarterly report published and the next edition will be at a project level. The CJIN Board agreed that the state funds needed to better reflect North Carolina’s contribution when matched against the federal funding received to date.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:45 pm.