

## Microsoft Outlook

---

**From:** (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (CTR)  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 13, 2009 6:40 PM  
**To:** Smith, Tadgh A; Penney, Susan E; Archibeque, Vincent E; Greenberg, Randi L  
**Cc:** Nardi, Louis F (CTR); 'whiting\_emily@bah.com'; Phillips, Patricia [USA]; Murphy, Brian W (CTR)  
**Subject:** Decisions/Actions from Wednesday's meeting on improvements to Interoperability deployment  
**Attachments:** Weekly\_Interoperability\_20090813.ppt

The following decisions and actions were captured in Wednesday's marathon meeting about Interoperability deployment:

1. DRO ownership of deployment coordination - Agreed that SC should fund up to two positions per field office to lead and coordinate LEA deployment outreach and coordination

- Agreed to fund an AFOD-level position to lead LEA outreach and a SDDO-level to assist with coordination activities. AFODs require new SC funding while SDDOs can be reassigned from current DRO-funded field positions.
- Agreed to outline the concept, operating model and implementation plan for DRO ownership in a concise white paper, together with a draft announcement to DRO
- Agreed that branch chiefs will continue socializing the DRO ownership recommendation and need for collaborative implementation planning with DRO
- Agreed to target mid-September for DRO announcement

**Actions:**

- BAE team to draft white paper by end of next week 8/21, branch chiefs to present to Mr. Rapp who will formalize the decision with Mr. Venturella by early September
- Vince to lead ongoing conversations with DRO while paper being developed for executive directors

2. SIB de-coupling from deployment process - Agreed to accelerate SIB outreach to the 24 SIBs not yet covered

- Agreed to obtain Yvonne's consent to move forward with CJIS
- Agreed to send email to CJIS outlining proposed change in process, rationale and benefits and requesting face-to-face meeting
- Agreed to schedule a face-to-face planning meeting with CJIS

**Actions:**

- Tadgh to speak to Yvonne and obtain concurrence
- BAE to draft email for Tadgh to send to CJIS this next week 8/14
- Randi to identify potential dates in Sept/early Oct for CJIS meeting and request the adjustments to the outreach calendar to accommodate CJIS meeting

3. LEA role in activation – Agreed to continue conversation at Thursday's strategy meeting

- Agreed that the main question to settle before LEA role in deployment activation can be redefined is the meaning of "voluntary participation" in activation
  - o Can LEA opt out of the program by not having fingerprints checked against IDENT (i.e., ORI not turned on)?
  - o Does opt out mean LEA chooses not to receive identity and immigration information from ICE resulting from fingerprint checks?

**Actions:**

- Team reconvened Thursday, 8/13/09 to continue discussion of this topic
- The attached slides represent the outcome of the 8/13/09 meeting
- Branch chiefs to review with Mr. Rapp, results shared with CJIS at next face-to-face

Let me say thanks again for your time and efforts to move us towards some very positive changes.



ICE

## Role of LEAs in Interoperability Activation

### Problem Statement:

- Requiring a Go response from each LEA within a county will grind activations to a crawl or halt. In some SWB counties, there was considerable difficulty getting responses from *any* LEA.
- Accepting a Go response from *any* LEA to activate *all* LEAs within a county does not ensure that each LEA is aware of their activation.

### Solution Framework:

- SC, and the improved identification of Criminal Aliens (CAs), is Congressionally mandated
- It is a DHS ICE initiative to improve the identification of CAs via *federal* data-sharing
- LEAs relinquish their authority to control the federal government's use of prints once they are collected by CJIS



## Role of LEAs in Interoperability Activation

### Recommendation:

- Change LEA message to
  - Explain the Congressionally mandated, ICE SC initiative
  - Your state has agreed to participate
  - Your activation dates are ...
  - You have the opportunity to opt out of the receipt of the additional identity and immigration information
- Go/No-Go email recipients should only include
  - Impacted system owners, i.e. CJIS, US-VISIT, LESC, SIB
  - Impacted operational component, i.e. DRO
- A separate mechanism needs to be developed to track and capture the results of LEA outreach and any LEAs that choose to opt out
  - Most contentious issue
  - Assume LEA concurrence unless they ask to not receive the additional identity and immigration information
- A mechanism needs to be established to hear complaints from stakeholders



Smart Border  
Alliance





Header	Header	Header	Header
Text	▪ Bullets		

