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1. Introductions
2. PCCD/SEARCH JIEM Engagement Review

- County Information Exchange Pilot Project
Excerpts from the 10/04 Justice Hub Focus Group Session  How might the system be fixed?
As a large group, participants were asked to identify what must happen to make the system viable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties need more <strong>executive sponsorship</strong>.</td>
<td><strong>Steering committee can identify a quick win.</strong></td>
<td>Strategy to develop viable deliverable that is valuable to the user – even a Yugo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get <strong>viable examples of product in front of end users</strong> (shared responsibility).</td>
<td><strong>Steering Committee takes lead on functionality.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Refocus</strong> what the system is supposed to accomplish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Refocus the system.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Vendor should not do work without authorization.</strong></td>
<td>Focus on what provides the <strong>biggest bang for the buck vs. time required to develop it.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties need to define business processed.</td>
<td><strong>Steering Committee needs more users.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Steering Committee: to include users and focus on the business aspect.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who manages project at county level? Who is in charge? (Implementation Manager).</td>
<td><strong>“Squeeze vendors”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift from IT to business practices.</td>
<td><strong>Better contracting with vendors to control costs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept generic product – then specialize; start with 2 or 3 functions (i.e., notifications).</td>
<td><strong>Vendor training should be outcome based.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counties should have reporting responsibilities</strong> rather than vendors.</td>
<td><strong>Adopt a single interface.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counties each need their own County Justice Hub Steering Committee representative.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Link to local RMS</strong> Operations (JNET does not do this).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Project needs leadership and accountability.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CCAP should have one person in charge.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PCCD Strategy for Integrated Justice at the county and local levels

- The Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD), Office of Criminal Justice System Improvements, has defined a strategic goal to promote communication and information sharing through the implementation and effective use of technology.

- To further endorse achieving this goal, PCCD strongly believes that direct collaborative efforts between local, municipal, county, and state agencies are key to building secure integrated justice systems.

- The PCCD is committed to fostering technical innovation and ensuring the use of business and technical best practices by the Commonwealth’s entire criminal justice community.
Historically, there are four common architectural approaches to achieving integrated justice via inter-agency data sharing:

- Single System
- Data Warehouse
- Point-to-Point Integration
- Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) (AKA. Broker, Hub and Spokes)

Each approach has it own set of Pros and Cons.

In PA, at the state level, via JNET, Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) has been the preferred direction since 1998.

The Internet, World Wide Web (WWW) and “Web Services” have put a “twist” on EAI over the past few years……...introducing SOA...........
Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA):
- Unique Approach.
- End User operational procedures and business practices driven.
- New system design begins from a concept of the business practices of an enterprise (e.g., case-flow management, investigations, or trial preparation).
- Critical components (e.g., personal identification, sentencing document, or arrest report) are identified and define the parameters of stand-alone pieces of software (i.e., the services).
- Evolutionary development of an information system as services are deployed.

Software can now be written to serve specific purposes (e.g., define the identity of an individual) and be shared on an approved basis with other programs (e.g., borrow the identity definition software of the postal service and “reuse” the “service” in a judicial case management system)
And of course, SOA has its own set of Pros and Cons......
- A major Con is that it has not been around very long...still evolving
- A major Pro is that it has the backing of DOJ/OJP/GLOBAL

Today in PA, at the county and local levels:
- Enterprise Application Integration (EAI) concepts (Broker, etc) necessary to support County Justice Information Exchange,
- deployed in a SOA fashion,
- along with other SOA “services” and “registry” components, defines the current architectural direction for Integrated Justice......
1. Once the pilot JIEM analysis is complete, select 1 or 2 of the documented processes, focusing on a set of intra-county (i.e. DA to Jail, DA to AP, etc.) exchanges, for design, development and implementation in selected counties. And as appropriate, utilize the documents developed for the API approach originally proposed for implementation earlier in 2004.

2. Selection of pilot deployment counties should be based on 2 counties that represent:
   
   a. DSI application users
   b. One small & one larger county
   c. The ability to dedicate resources to the timely participation and completion of a pilot
3. Selection of participant counties to be engaged with the JIEM analysis should include counties that are:

   a. Able to devote dedicated participants committed to the success of this process,

   b. Representatives of multiple criminal justice departmental users

4. Once pilot of select counties is complete, roll out new Justice Hub with new county justice application integration/brokering SOA capabilities at the application/service level (not database level) to additional tier one counties (dependent on pilot results).

5. Provide Justice Hub Transactional Service API specifications to all county justice application vendors so they may implement the API into their applications as they are prepared to become Justice Hub Transactional API “ready”. 
County Information Exchange Pilot Project Timeline

- County and PCCD leadership.
- 3 Counties.
- 4 Agencies within those 3 counties.
- Sub-set of the Adult Justice Process.
- Focused only on exchanges between the 4 agencies within the selected sub-set of the entire county level Justice Process.
Pilot Phase JIEM AS-IS and TO-BE Model Creation

Pilot Exchange Analysis

Pilot Exchange Design

Pilot API Specification Creation

- County and CCAP leadership.
- Pilot project focused only on an even smaller set of TO-BE exchanges identified between the 4 agencies within the selected sub-set of the entire county level Justice Process.

Pilot API Specification Implementation

Pilot API Spec Deployment to Pilot Counties

Pilot Phase Evaluation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- County and PCCD leadership
- ? Counties
- ? Agencies within those ? counties
- Remaining set of county level Justice Process ?
- Focused only on exchanges between the ? agencies within the remaining set of exchanges within the entire county level Justice Process

Next Phase
JIEM Model Creation
County Information Exchange Pilot Project Timeline

- County and CCAP leadership
- Focused only on exchanges between the agencies within the remaining set of exchanges within the entire county level Justice Process

Next Phase Analysis, Design, Specification, Implementation, Deployment and Evaluation
County Information Exchange Pilot Project Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JUL</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next Phase JIEM Model Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Next Phase Analysis, Design, Specification Implementation, Deployment and Eval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpts from the 10/04 Justice Hub Focus Group Session

**Initial Expectations**

As a large group, participants were asked to identify what their initial expectations of the hub system were.

- One-time data entry
- Create efficiencies
- More complete records that are current, reliable, historical
- Common infrastructure
- Deliver information
- County driven
- “Low cost means to connect”
- Generic, accessible, easy to configure
## Excerpts from the 10/04 Justice Hub Focus Group Session

### How Criminal Justice Hub System is currently used

As a large group, participants were asked to identify how they currently use or plan to use the Hub system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notification of release and commitments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notification, queries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queries sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General court information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notifications post ARDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Look up warrants and information from clerk of courts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Excerpts from the 10/04 Justice Hub Focus Group Session

| Benefits/Strengths | ✓ Ease of use  
|                   | ✓ Saves time – don’t have to search for information  
|                   | ✓ Key driver in collaboration  
|                   | ✓ Facilitates other kinds of collaboration  
|                   | ✓ Improve the continuity of supervision |

As a large group, participants were asked to identify benefits and strengths of the hub system.
### Expectations Fallen Short/Weaknesses

Participants were divided into four groups to discuss weaknesses to the hub system and where it fell short of their initial expectations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Will not reach “perfect world”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Does not meet “one stop shopping”, one stop shop is not there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Never considered system integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Lacked feedback from users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Doesn’t work yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Need a specific tangible deliverable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ End users not involved until later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Lack of project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Lack of follow-thru/follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Lack of fixes promised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Lack of financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Non value-added vendors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Too much vendor control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Little concrete central authority to keep project focused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Results of the JIEM Analysis

- Current Exchange Models
- Proposed Future To-Be Model
- Comparative Analysis
- Integration Opportunities
4. Data Exchange Priorities – Discussion and Decision on Pilot Scope

A. Data Exchange Priorities
   1. Guiding Principles
      a. Legal and policy environment
      b. Available funding
      c. Leverage existing work (AOPC)
4. Data Exchange Priorities – Discussion and Decision on Pilot Scope

d. Conversations (groups of related exchanges) rather than individual exchanges

e. Potential extension (technology)
4. Data Exchange Priorities – Discussion and Decision on Pilot Scope

2. Priority Criteria
   a. High-volume common exchanges (system to system)
   b. High volume common documents (actual form)
4. Data Exchange Priorities – Discussion and Decision on Pilot Scope

c. High-volume common processes
d. Time-sensitive exchanges
e. Structured common documents
4. Data Exchange Priorities – Discussion and Decision on Pilot Scope

f. Common exchanges
g. Common documents
h. Common processes
i. Structured documents
4. Data Exchange Priorities – Discussion and Decision on Pilot Scope

B. Discussion and Decision on Pilot Scope
5. Subject Matter Expert (SME) from a Pilot County

- Volunteer needed to validate business flow as needed

- Dauphin Operational
- Lancaster Operational
- Berks Operational
- Support for Counties Operational
7. What we have accomplished with the Justice Hub

- Greater accessibility to legacy data
- Increased communications between departments
- Increased timeliness in receiving information
- Reduced Costs
8. Feedback from Dauphin & Lancaster on their usage of the Justice Hub

- Dauphin – Tom Guenther (written)
- Lancaster – Mike Burnette
9. Other Grant Funding

- Prison Overcrowding Data Analysis
- Security Infrastructure
- Public Defender Update
- Jail OMS Update
10. Status update for Jail OMS & Web Enablement Phase

- Application Submitted
- Web Phase will begin July 1
- Letters of commitment to go out week of 4/18/05
- Project Plan