

MAJIC

**Alaska's Multi-Agency Justice Integration
Consortium**

**Strategic Plan for
Integrated Justice Information Sharing**

March 2010

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	4
1.1	Background	4
1.2	Scope	4
1.3	Strategic Planning Objectives	4
1.3.1	Promote Projects with System-wide Benefits	4
1.3.2	Address Needs that Cannot Be Met by a Single Agency	5
1.3.3	Confirm or Correct Direction and Expectations	5
2	Integration: A Common Understanding	6
3	MAJIC Overview	8
3.1	Vision.....	8
3.2	Mission Statement.....	8
3.3	Need for Interagency Organization:	8
3.4	Shared Principles:	8
3.5	Decision-making: Consensus, not Mandates.....	9
3.6	Membership, Governance & Organization	9
4	Context for Strategic Plan	12
4.1	Business Drivers	12
4.1.1	Public Expectations	12
4.1.2	Sponsor Demands for Quick Results	12
4.1.3	Legislative Support	12
4.1.4	MAJIC Funding	12
4.1.5	Overlap with Other Strategic Plans	12
4.1.6	Other Standards	13
4.2	Environmental Drivers	13
4.2.1	Need for Members to Maintain Organizational Autonomy	13
4.2.2	Need for Better Collaboration	13
4.2.3	Need for Agility	13
4.2.4	Geographic/Demographic Constraints	13
4.2.5	State/Federal Mandates	14
4.2.6	Leveraging More Data Sources/Resources	14
4.2.7	Lack of Staff, Expertise and IT infrastructure	14
4.2.8	Need for Project Management Resources. Frequently	14
4.2.9	Evolving Standards.....	14
4.2.10	Other Integration Tools.....	15
4.3	Guiding Principles	15

5	MAJIC Goals & Objectives	16
	Goal 1. Maintain Structure for Collaboration	16
	Objective 1.1. Maintain Governance Structure.....	16
	Objective 1.2. Maintain Budget Structure.....	16
	Objective 1.3. Maintain a Communications Plan.....	16
	Objective 1.4. Maintain MAJIC Membership	16
	Goal 2. Identify and Prioritize Information Sharing Needs	17
	Objective 2.1. Assess Data Quality, Accuracy, Timeliness	17
	Objective 2.2. Review Laws/Rules Affecting Information Sharing	17
	Objective 2.3. Evaluate Project Proposals	17
	Goal 3. Promote Standards (Service Oriented Enterprise Architecture).....	18
	Objective 3.1. Establish and Publish Data Exchange Standards.....	18
	Objective 3.2. Document Data Exchanges in the Context of the MAJIC Enterprise.....	18
	Goal 4. Promote Effective Project Management	19
	Objective 4.1. Track Project Status and Outcome Measures	19
	Objective 4.2. Provide Project Management Assistance	19

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Multi-Agency Justice Integration Consortium (MAJIC) was created in 2004 as a result of several agencies joining together to improve justice information sharing in Alaska. The Consortium is made up of twenty member agencies. Each agency joined the Consortium by signing a Memorandum of Agreement and appointing an agency liaison. One of the Steering Group's duties was to develop this strategic plan to provide a roadmap to improve data exchange between member agencies. Liaisons meet on a biweekly basis as a Steering Group.

The Steering Group appointed a committee of volunteers to draft a strategic plan in 2008. The committee met with consultants from SEARCH¹ to develop the basic outline, which was approved by the Steering Group. The original plan included a list of projects planned or underway by MAJIC member agencies. In March 2010, the list of projects was removed from this planning document because that level of detail was not appropriate for a long term strategic plan. Instead, the MAJIC Administrator maintains a list of project information submitted by agencies.

1.2 Scope

MAJIC is a collaborative enterprise designed to include and involve any entity that exchanges or needs to exchange information with a justice agency. MAJIC promotes communication, cooperation and shared decision-making between member agencies in the implementation and maintenance of integrated justice sharing to reduce duplicative data collection by all agencies, improve accuracy, efficiency and public safety.

The MAJIC plan focuses on enterprise-wide architecture, infrastructure and interfaces. It addresses governance, organization, laws, policies, practices and standards used or needed to support interagency information sharing and which lie outside the control of any single agency.

1.3 Strategic Planning Objectives

1.3.1 Promote Projects with System-wide Benefits

¹ SEARCH, the National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, provided free technical assistance, including a three day work session in Anchorage in February 2007, to help MAJIC develop this plan. For more information about SEARCH, visit: <http://www.search.org/>.

This document is intended to help ensure that each agency's information sharing plans and efforts enhance the performance of the criminal justice system as a whole.

The plan and the regularly updated MAJIC website at:

<http://ajsac.uaa.alaska.edu/majic/DesktopDefault.aspx> focus on strategies to improve system-wide information sharing.

- A high level diagram of the "MAJIC Enterprise" is attached to this document. This diagram illustrates who creates, owns, needs and provides various types of data in possible or planned exchange projects.

This diagram provides a visual overview and assists agencies in identifying and understanding needed exchanges and assist in avoiding conflict or duplication with other projects.

- MAJIC maintains a list of data exchange standards, endorsed by the Steering Group, and these are published on the MAJIC website. Adherence to these standards is good for the enterprise because it promotes consistency and allows "reusability" of work done from project to project.

1.3.2 Address Needs that Cannot Be Met by a Single Agency

MAJIC provides a forum for agencies to work together on information sharing issues that require collaboration.

- This roadmap identifies gaps between current versus needed integration standards, tools and best practices. It provides a structure for projects designed to improve the integration infrastructure.
- Information sharing infrastructure is not limited to hardware, software and technology standards. MAJIC identifies laws and rules that impede effective information sharing and works through its member agencies accomplish legislative, regulatory or rule changes.

1.3.3 Confirm or Correct Direction and Expectations

- **Are we doing the right things?** This plan educates readers about MAJIC and identifies where action may be needed. The plan may be updated periodically if MAJIC needs to change course in response to changes in laws, business needs, technology and resources.
- **Are we doing things right?** Educating others about its approach, activities and outcomes helps make MAJIC more accountable.

- **Is our investment in MAJIC appropriate?** Publication of this plan enables policymakers to better measure the value of MAJIC. It allows them to approve or redirect the enterprise to ensure resources are used in a manner that reflects their priorities.

2 Integration: A Common Understanding

“Integration” can have many different meanings in the context of information sharing. An agreed upon definition helps prevent confusion and conflicting expectations.

Generally, people agree that “integrated justice” involves automation. Justice agencies have always shared information, and with changes in technology, there is an expectation that the information can move between agencies more effectively through automation. One definition of integrated justice information sharing is “the ability to share critical information at key decision points throughout the justice enterprise.”² Certainly, automation is a tool to help achieve this. However, there is more to “integration” than simply sharing data electronically between agencies.

MAJIC recognizes that incremental improvement is possible with any point-to-point electronic data exchange. However, to optimize the benefits of automated data exchange, it is necessary to look at data from the point it is created, not just at the various points “downstream” where it may be shared with many entities in many different ways. Therefore, MAJIC has agreed upon the following definition of “integrated justice information sharing”:

Integrated information sharing means that information is captured once at the source then shared electronically with those who need it, when they need it.

Any electronic exchange of data may improve data quality, timeliness and efficiency. However, customized system-to-system interfaces are time-consuming to implement and can be expensive to maintain and update as needs change. It is more efficient to write one interface from a source system to many user systems, which can be accomplished by using agreed upon standards, rather than having each project using a different set of rules for data definitions, format, and data transfer methodology.

Sharing information only with those who need it, when they need it, implies more than simply taking paper forms and “pushing” the information to current recipients in electronic form. (An approach also referred to as “paving the cow path”). An integrated approach takes advantage of the flexibility of automation by giving recipients only the data they need.

² Roberts, David J., *Information Systems Integration: A Library of SEARCH Resources for Justice and Public Safety Practitioners*, published by SEARCH, October 2001, updated 2004.

Some agencies get a form each time an event occurs, but need the data only if certain conditions apply. An integrated approach allows data to flow based on the value of a data element. For example, one agency may notify others about all events involving crimes, but some agencies need the information only if the crime is a felony. An integrated approach to information sharing ensures that data is broken down to the right level, so that each recipient can screen and use it to meet individual needs.

Automation can be helpful even when it is “downstream” from the point of origination, but it is more beneficial when data is shared electronically from the source. An example of downstream automation involves warrants and some other court orders. The court issues the warrant or order on paper, and law enforcement enters it into a statewide database, where it is shared with other agencies. An integrated approach would be for the court to create (and update) warrant and other court order data electronically “from the bench” and make it immediately accessible to law enforcement electronically.

It is not always feasible to take the ideal approach to integrated information sharing. One agency may have the resources to automate data flow through one part of the justice system when others do not. It may make sense to move forward with incremental improvements instead of waiting for all the conditions to be “perfect”.

However, one of MAJIC’s roles is to evaluate proposed projects to ensure that an integrated approach has not been overlooked unintentionally. MAJIC can also promote integration by building and managing a better integration infrastructure, including:

- Laws and rules that support and reflect the capabilities of automation
- Data exchange standards
- Enterprise diagrams showing who has and needs what data
- A repository of information about current and needed information exchanges
- A regular forum for agencies to communicate needs and plans with each other
- Integrated justice and project management tools and training
- A resource pool of experts in integrated justice and project management

3 MAJIC Overview

3.1 Vision

A criminal justice system that provides the right information to the right person at the right time.

3.2 Mission Statement

Help agencies more efficiently share complete, accurate, timely information with each other in order to enhance the performance of the criminal justice system as a whole.

3.3 Need for Interagency Organization:

- For the justice system to be effective, all branches and levels of government must share critical information at key decision points;
- Without a unified strategy, information sharing efforts are undermined by mistaken assumptions, incompatible approaches, and wasteful redundancy;
- No single entity has the authority, resources or knowledge to impose information sharing on other agencies;
- Because of complex political, organizational, geographical, policy, procedural, and technological challenges and the constitutional separation of powers, we need a formal organizational structure to coordinate information sharing;
- The events of September 11, 2001 underscore the need to broaden and accelerate information sharing efforts. The 9-11 Commission's Executive Summary concluded: *Across the government, there were failures of imagination, policy, capabilities, and management.*

3.4 Shared Principles:

- We see a need for innovation and creativity in planning and developing integration technology;
- We value the work being done at the national level to develop functional, process, information, and technical standards for information sharing;
- We believe that decision making by consensus is the best way to achieve integration;

- We acknowledge the Constitutional independence of parties charged with public protection and administration of justice, but agree that to operate effectively, each must cooperate with others;
- We recognize the need to protect the confidentiality of investigatory and deliberative processes to ensure effective operation of the justice system;
- We also recognize that public access to records declared open by law can help citizens obtain services more efficiently and help ensure accountability for the justice system;
- We understand the need to keep our information and systems secure and to protect the privacy, due process, and other rights of citizens under the United States and Alaska Constitutions;
- We seek opportunities to collaborate and cooperate with justice-related organizations at all levels of government to enhance the performance of the system as whole.

3.5 Decision-making: Consensus, not Mandates

We agree that justice information sharing can best be improved by working together to:

- Identify processes, standards, models, tools and “best practices” that have been proven effective in real-world applications; and
- Share operational, technical and project management resources to achieve agreed upon objectives.

Nothing in the MAJIC Memorandum of Agreement grants the Consortium the authority to:

- Impose rules or standards on any agency;
- Commit the resources of any agency;
- Create, change, use, or disseminate information other than as authorized by law.

3.6 Membership, Governance & Organization

A government agency or organization that exchanges information with an Alaska criminal justice agency may enter into the Memorandum of Agreement. By signing the agreement, the member agency commits to appoint an employee to serve as the agency’s liaison to the Consortium and carry out the responsibilities described below. Liaisons can be administrators, managers, practitioners, or information technology staff – all are equally welcome because cross-disciplinary involvement is an asset to integration.

The duties of the member agency liaison include:

- Serve as the agency's policy, business, and information technology point of contact for Consortium activities;
- Assist the Consortium with projects involving the agency and for matters outside the liaison's expertise or authority conduct the necessary research or provide the appropriate referral to ensure a timely response;
- Keep appropriate personnel within the agency informed of Consortium activities and convey agency concerns to the Consortium.

Agency liaisons may join the Steering Group. The duties of the Steering Group are:

- **Meet biweekly** to improve communications and knowledge transfer between agencies and disciplines. Steering Group meetings are also open to other employees of Consortium member agencies;
- **Identify and endorse information sharing standards** that maximize reusability and compatibility while minimizing conflicts and customization;
- **Develop a strategic plan** identifying needs and opportunities to improve information sharing;
- **Solicit, evaluate, prioritize and provide assistance for justice integration projects.** Assistance may include sponsorship, endorsement for a funding request, project management, JIEM documentation, other technical assistance, or referral to other resources;
- **Charter project teams** to implement or assist in implementing approved data exchange projects;
- **Develop a repository of information exchange documentation for reference and analysis.** The repository will include information about laws/rules/policies, forms, and constraints/conditions affecting data exchanges.
- **Participate in state, regional and national fora to share knowledge** of current tools, best practices, and lessons learned, as resources allow.

The Steering Group may also appoint *ad hoc* committees as needed (and as resources permit to address policy, operational and technical issues. For example, an *ad hoc* committee was appointed to develop the initial strategic plan for MAJIC.

An employee of the Alaska Court System, funded by a federal grant administered by the Alaska Department of Public Safety, performs the following administrative duties:

- Chairs and distributes agenda for Steering Group meetings;
- Maintains a Web-based Consortium library including this plan; contact information for Consortium liaisons and Steering Group members; meeting minutes; Memoranda of Agreement; project proposals; project files; reference materials, and other publications;
- Keeps Consortium liaisons and other interested persons informed of Steering Group meetings, plans and project proposals, projects, and other activities.

A list of MAJIC Member agencies, including the names and titles of agreement signatories and the appointed agency liaison is maintained on the MAJIC website.

In 2008 the Criminal Justice Working Group's Efficiencies Committee³ agreed to receive regular status reports regarding MAJIC. This provides another opportunity to keep policymakers informed of MAJIC's activities and to get direction from them.

³ The Criminal Justice Working Group is co-chaired by the Lieutenant Governor and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; its members include many of the same people who have signed the MAJIC Memorandum of Agreement.

4 Context for Strategic Plan

MAJIC must be responsive to business and environmental drivers or demands in order to be viewed as successful. MAJIC's plan must be both strategic and dynamic so that it is capable of changing as environmental and business demands change.

4.1 Business Drivers

Business drivers identify products, services, or capabilities demanded by customers, users, or stakeholders.

4.1.1. Public Expectations. There is a significant public demand for instant and reliable Internet-based services, increased access to information, and, at the same time, increased protection of confidential personal information. There exists an unrealistic perception among many people that today's justice agencies possess the fictional technologies and rapid response times shown in popular TV crime dramas.

4.1.2. Sponsor Demands for Quick Results. Funding cycles and sponsor requirements may lead to unrealistic project timelines. It is tempting to look for quick fixes. Gathering objective baseline measures and analyzing the cause of a problem lengthens the project schedule, however, subjective problem definition and lack of data analysis can result in project failure.

4.1.3. Legislative Support. The Alaska Legislature's Senate Judiciary Committee invited MAJIC to participate in its 2007 Crime Summit hearings. Legislators expressed strong interest in and support for increased efficiency and accuracy through automated information sharing.

4.1.4. MAJIC Funding. In FY09 the Legislature appropriated \$100,000 to the Alaska Court System's operating budget to support MAJIC. Prior to that time only federal grant funds had been used to support MAJIC. Data exchange projects are funded within individual agency budgets, with state and federal funds. This \$100,000 annually recurring appropriation allows MAJIC to support agency data exchange projects.

4.1.5. Overlap with Other Strategic Plans. Other organizations have strategic plans that include or reference justice integration needs and projects. For example, the Division of Juvenile Justice has a strategic plan which calls for better collaboration and information exchange with community partners and sister agencies, many of whom are MAJIC members. MAJIC must coordinate its planning not only with its own member agencies, but also with other interagency groups in order to avoid conflicts or needless duplication of work. Some of the other multi-agency strategic plans which MAJIC members are involved in or aware of include:

- Alaska's Highway Safety Plan;
- Alaska Traffic Records Coordinating Committee's (ATRCC) Traffic Records Improvement Strategic Plan;
- Alaska Traffic and Criminal Software (TraCs) Steering Group's Strategic Plan;
- State of Alaska Department of Administration's Enterprise Information Technology Strategic Plan.

4.1.6. Other Standards. Many MAJIC members are subject to standards imposed by state or federal agencies. For example, state Executive Branch agencies must conform to information technology standards set by one state agency. Although not all MAJIC members are bound by the same constraints, MAJIC must take into account the lowest common denominator when it comes to certain requirements affecting its members.

4.2 Environmental Drivers

Environmental trends identify economic, demographic, legal, and other external factors affecting the environment in which the MAJIC enterprise operates.

4.2.1. Need for Members to Maintain Organizational Autonomy. MAJIC must set goals and objectives that can be met through voluntary compliance, not mandates.

4.2.2. Need for Better Collaboration. Agencies set their own priorities internally, but there is a need for MAJIC-level prioritization. Otherwise, one agency can become engaged in a project before its partners are ready, or agencies may duplicate or conflict with each other's information sharing objectives.

4.2.3. Need for Agility. Agencies know that laws, policies, organizational structure, leadership, priorities, resources and technology are subject to frequent change. Agencies that cannot adapt to change are ineffective. MAJIC needs to plan for integration architecture that promotes agility, allowing its members to respond quickly and efficiently to inevitable changes. MAJIC members received training from SEARCH in 2007 to better understand how Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) can improve agility. SOA primarily means having a set of clearly written rules for information exchanges. MAJIC data exchange projects are based on these rules.

4.2.4. Geographic/Demographic Constraints. Integrated justice solutions that work well for large agencies supported by robust telecommunications infrastructures may not work for all communities in Alaska. Lack of bandwidth must be factored into information sharing projects in Alaska. Small communities spread over large distances present challenges in attaining economy of scale. Although Alaska has a unified court system and many other criminal justice services in Alaska are provided by state agencies,

regional and local practices may vary greatly and may not be well-documented. Integrated justice initiatives must recognize that not everything is or can be done the same way in all locations.

4.2.5. State/Federal Mandates. Laws, grant conditions, terms of interagency agreements, and policy initiatives from state and federal government are sometimes outdated, and information is shared on paper. Some of these mandates need to be reviewed and changed before automation can be effective. At the same time, MAJIC recognizes that changes in laws are inevitable, and this requires members to develop the most agile, flexible integration architecture possible.

4.2.6. Leveraging More Data Sources/Resources. Unlike state and local agencies, federal agencies have participated in MAJIC only sporadically. By increasing the involvement of federal agencies, MAJIC can increase access to information as well as information sharing expertise and resources. MAJIC has received generous assistance from organizations such as SEARCH, the IJIS Institute⁴, the National Center for State Courts, the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center - Alaska, and the Global Advisory Group.

4.2.7. Lack of Staff, Expertise and IT infrastructure. Adherence to industry best practices may be thwarted by limitations involving agencies' current technologies, lack of training and expertise, and lack of infrastructure. MAJIC's plan should reflect not only best practices, but recognition that adherence to them requires on-going education and advocacy. No matter how well-funded a particular project is, internal agency subject matter experts must be available to help locate, update or create documentation of current practices, including forms, laws, policies and procedures. Information technology (IT) experts are scarce in remote areas of the state. Even in urban areas, these positions are often hard to fill and IT employees are often assigned to multiple projects. Shifting priorities within each agency make it hard to commit resources to data exchange projects that are viewed as "external priorities".

4.2.8. Need for Project Management Resources. Frequently IT or other subject matter experts are assigned responsibility to manage integrated justice projects. This is often a necessity in smaller agencies and can be successful. However for larger, more complex projects, professional project management expertise is needed. A good integration infrastructure must include tools, templates, and experts to help manage these projects.

4.2.9. Evolving Standards. MAJIC adopted the Global Justice XML Data Model (GJXDM), and then its successor, the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM). There are also national standards for Global Federated Identity Management (GFIM).

⁴ IJIS provided on-site technical assistance to MAJIC to develop Extensible Markup Language (XML) schema and other Information Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD) artifacts for a data exchange involving court charge filing and disposition data.

4.2.10. Other Integration Tools. MAJIC originated as a project to build a database of documentation about the Alaska's justice information exchanges using a free web-based software tool provided by SEARCH. Subsequent versions of SEARCH's Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) and similar tools have and will continue to be used by MAJIC to develop and maintain a repository for exchange project information.

4.3 Guiding Principles

- The needs of the criminal justice enterprise should be factored into agency projects.
- Data should be captured only once, at the originating point, re-used as needed and not duplicated.
- Integrated justice information sharing should leverage operational systems of participating agencies.
- Agencies retain the right to design, operate and maintain internal systems to meet their own operational requirements.
- Security, privacy and accessibility are priorities in the development of integrated justice information sharing capabilities.
- The owner of data is responsible for making updates/corrections available to those who need them.
- Agencies should establish written agreements on the use and dissemination of data.
- Information sharing initiatives should be business-driven and based on best practices.
- Procedures and technology should be implemented to ensure positive identification of the record subject at every stage in the criminal justice process.
- Integrated justice projects should be supported by strong project management, well-defined outcome measures and objective criteria.

5 MAJIC Goals & Objectives

Goal 1. Maintain Structure for Collaboration

Objective 1.1. Maintain Governance Structure

Two groups provide governance to MAJIC: the Criminal Justice Working Group's (CJWG) Efficiencies Committee and the Collaborative Statewide Governance Group. Both groups are kept apprised of MAJIC's activities and provide direction upon request.

The MAJIC Steering Group meets to address information sharing needs of the criminal justice enterprise from each agency's perspective.

Objective 1.2. Maintain Budget Structure

The Alaska legislature appropriated \$100,000 to the Alaska Court System's operating budget to support MAJIC. The court develops its annual spending plan with input from MAJIC Steering Group.

Objective 1.3. Maintain a Communications Plan

The MAJIC Administrator maintains and routinely updates the MAJIC website and email distribution lists for agency signatories, liaisons and other interested parties.

Objective 1.4. Maintain MAJIC Membership

The MAJIC Administrator assures continued viability and growth of MAJIC by scheduling regular meetings with agenda reflecting the needs and interests of members and maintaining liaison appointments and email distribution lists.

Goal 2. Identify and Prioritize Information Sharing Needs

Objective 2.1. Assess Data Quality, Accuracy, Timeliness

Many information sharing project plans omit baseline performance measures because data are unavailable. To gather the baseline measures would slow projects and increase expenses. Sometimes the data are not available at all. This prevents us from accurately assessing information needs or measuring project success. We need on-going, objective measures of justice data.

MAJIC recognizes the need for independent, system-wide audits of data quality and timeliness.

Objective 2.2. Review Laws/Rules Affecting Information Sharing

Members identify laws that may impede information sharing or may need to be changed. The MAJIC Administrator maintains a list on the MAJIC website. These may include statutes, regulations, local ordinances, rules of court, written policies, forms, or interagency agreements. The Steering Group develops strategies to correct and prevent problems. MAJIC members then work with agency legislative liaisons, regulation drafters, and local governments and others to address the issues.

Objective 2.3. Evaluate Project Proposals

In order for the Steering Group to evaluate a proposed project, its potential impact on other agencies, and its relative priority for the MAJIC enterprise as a whole, the project sponsor must provide at least the following information:

- Project name;
- Project sponsor;
- Project manager;
- Project purpose - statement of problem, including baseline measure(s);
- Expected outcome – including proposed outcome measures;
- Project scope;
- Project stakeholders;
- Related projects (especially if there are dependencies);
- Estimate of resources needed/available for the project;
- Project timeline.

Goal 3. Promote Standards (Service Oriented Enterprise Architecture)

Objective 3.1. Establish and Publish Data Exchange Standards

Standards are published on the MAJIC website following discussion and adoption by the Steering Group. MAJIC supports “open architecture”, i.e., standards that are vendor-neutral.

Objective 3.2. Document Data Exchanges in the Context of the MAJIC Enterprise

The Steering Group has completed a high level diagram showing who creates, who owns and who provides key criminal justice information. More detailed diagrams are needed to portray individual information sharing projects. Diagrams can convey current as well as proposed information locations and paths. The group continues to evaluate and assess potential tools and approaches for maintaining a useful repository of information exchange documentation.

Goal 4. Promote Effective Project Management

Objective 4.1. Track Project Status and Outcome Measures

The MAJIC Administrator maintains project tracking information and encourages project status reports and discussions during biweekly meetings of the steering group.

Objective 4.2. Provide Project Management Assistance

The MAJIC administrator arranges for training and discussions, and publishes information about project management standards, best practices, forms, and other tools.

MAJIC Enterprise

Key	
S	Source
C	Custodian
P	Provider

DOT Highway Safety	
S	Traffic Data Road Data
C	LE Crash Data Citizen Crash Data

DHHS Juvenile Justice	
C	Delinquency Cases Detention Condition of Release

Corrections	
S	Offender Detentino Status Offender Supervision Photo Finger Print Card
C	Offender Demographics

MOA - DHHS	
S	DV Case Analysis Sexual Assault Forensic Repository
P	DV Offenders/BCOR DV Case Repository

DMV	
S	Driving History Records Vehicle Records DL/ID Record/Photo
P	LE Crash Data Citizen Crash Data

MOA Prosecutor	
C	Prosecution Cases

DOR - PFD/CIU	
P	Person Address Personal Asset Case Date

City Prosecutor	
C	Prosecution Cases

DHSS Treatment & Recovery	
---------------------------	--

APD	
S	Arrest Charges Citations LE Case Data

Communications Path

Chiefs of Police	
P	LE Case Data

Elections	
-----------	--

DHSS ASAP	
P	Misdemeanor Case Supervision

Judicial Council	
S	CJ Statistical Analysis
C	CJ Data

DPS - AST	
S	AST Arrests AST Citation Repository
C	Criminal History Locates Warrants Protective Orders Finger Prints UOCT DNA SOR
P	Photo Lineups Person Photos

UAA Justice Center	
S	CJ Statistical Analysis
C	CJ Data

Courts	
S	Case Dispositions Sentencing Hearing Schedules Warrants Protective Order Status Conditions of Release
C	Case Filings
P	Minor Offense Table

Law	
S	Prosecution Cases Arrest/Charges Tracking Number
C	Collection Cases

DHSS Background Check	
C	Applicant/Licensee Status