



# The Implementation Board's responses to the IIJIS Institute/SEARCH Technology Assistance Report

20 OCTOBER 2004

---

## *THE TECHNOLOGY ASSISTANCE REPORT*

The Technology Assistance Report drafted by the consultants from the IIJIS Institute and SEARCH provided recommendations in four primary subject matters: (1) governance structure, (2) detailed planning, (3) role definition, and (4) project management. The report was very thorough and each area included several recommendations for the Implementation Board's consideration. On October 20, 2004, the IIJIS Implementation Board convened to discuss the report's findings and address each of its recommendations. The report's recommendations and the Board's responses to each of them follow.

### **1. Governance structure**

There were three recommendations under the section addressing IIJIS' governing structure. Specifically, the report suggested that (a) additional representation from the state courts be added to the board, (b) that the executive steering committee serve a more decisive role, and (c) that an operational committee be developed that focuses on justice and public safety operations and business requirements

- (a) **In response to the report's first recommendation, Director Levin sent a letter to Chief Justice Mary Ann McMorrow of the Illinois Supreme Court requesting an audience. Additionally, the director contacted Judge Paul P. Biebel Jr., Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Criminal Division, who agreed to assist the Implementation Board as a non-voting participant.**
- (b) **After some discussion as to the role of the Executive Steering Committee, the Board empowered the Executive Steering Committee to make *operational* decisions but retained the power to make *policy* decisions. Furthermore, decisions made by the steering committee, along with any minority reports, will now be communicated in a timely manner to board members to keep them informed and to provide them with an opportunity to object.**
- (c) **While the Board agreed with the concept of focusing on justice and public safety operations and business requirements to develop a tactical plan for the integration of information systems, it was the consensus of board members that an additional committee was not necessary. Rather, the board retained the current committee structure with the understanding that additional working groups would be created to focus on specific business case issues. These issues would eventually form the basis of the tactical plan recommended by the report.**

### **2. Detailed planning**

The report outlined several recommended steps that should take place during the detailed planning process that is necessary for the IIJIS initiative to move toward the development of a tactical plan. The recommended steps included: (a) conducting a Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) analysis of

state-level dataflow; (b) adopting a business perspective in which operational needs are identified and candidate projects are identified to fill those needs; and (c) creating a more detailed set of technical standards and business rules. The report suggested that the tactical plan be allowed to guide the integration of justice systems in Illinois.

**Instead of addressing each of the components of the detailed planning process as they were contained in the technology assistance report, the Board directed its committees to move forward with the development of a detailed tactical plan to take the project into its implementation phases. As one of the first steps, the Planning and Policy Committee was instructed to identify the specific information sharing needs identified in the Scenario Gap Analysis and develop plans to address those needs.**

### **3. Role definition**

The report called for the IIJIS initiative to more clearly define the state and local roles with regard to the exchange of justice information. The advisors from SEARCH and the IJIS Institute explained the characteristic differences between state and local exchanges:

Local exchanges – Local exchanges tend to focus on efficiently enabling the everyday workflow between local entities, as well as response to and prevention of crimes and incidents, and case processing.

State exchanges – State exchanges are primarily focused on maintaining statewide information on subject identification, status and history that are consumed by all agencies making decisions during critical events. Examples of state exchanges include, among others: (a) biometric identification, (b) warrant issuance and recall, (c) disposition and conviction reporting, and (d) access to probation conditions.

The report suggested that IIJIS, as a state-level initiative, focus its attention on fostering those key state-level information exchanges that help all jurisdictions share subject identification, status, and history information. Specifically, the state should set policy and standards for the state-level exchanges while the local entities remain free to implement local exchanges in the most effective way to meet their needs.

**The Implementation Board adopted the technology assistance report's explanation regarding the differing state and local roles in justice integration planning. The Board will use that explanation to help frame the integration business requirements that will comprise the tactical plan, and ultimately guide the development of integrated systems in Illinois.**

### **4. Project management**

The report recommended the development of a Project Management Office (“PMO”) to design, budget, track, and implement the IIJIS tactical plan. The PMO was suggested to improve coordination of statewide integration projects and to align them with the strategic goals of the state. As envisioned by the technical advisors, the PMO would assist in the detailed planning efforts, monitor the progress of integration projects over time, and guide any necessary changes in the implementation efforts to better satisfy the state's needs.

**Because of the IJIS initiative's scope and complexity, the Board agreed that project management efforts were indeed necessary. While project management reports and functions were initially generated during the development of the Strategic Plan, those efforts had, in recent months, been absent from the project. It was the Board's position that the IJIS initiative already had a PMO in the form of IJIS staff. The Board directed project staff to perform the functions of the PMO by more closely following the instruction of the technology assistance report.**

*EXPRESSING THE BOARD'S APPRECIATION*

**The Board requested Chair Levin to draft a letter thanking SEARCH, the IJIS Institute and the Bureau of Justice Assistance thanking them for the technical assistance work they provided to the IJIS initiative. Those letters were sent to their recipients on November 15, 2004.**