Global Intelligence Working Group
Information/Intelligence Sharing System Survey

Background

In spring 2003, the Global Intelligence Working Group conducted a preliminary survey of several multistate or interstate information sharing systems/initiatives that are in place or being developed at the local, state, federal, and regional levels.

Overview

Information was reported on 22 systems/initiatives:

- Nine interstate systems
- Six state systems
- Three city or county regional systems
- Four reported but did not fit the electronic system criteria

General observations:

- Numerous systems seem to be designing their system architecture for purposes of expansion beyond initial stages to connect or interface with other systems.
- Several systems cover significant population areas, even though they are not national systems.
- Around half of the systems do not currently contain intelligence information.
- Some of the systems are messaging systems but have the possibility for electronic intelligence sharing.
- Riss.net is connecting to several of the other systems: CISAnet, HIDTA, LEIU, LEO, MATRIX, and NLETS.
- Information was obtained on most, but not all, major systems of interest (missing: JRIES [CATIC] and Joint Terrorism Task Force Information Sharing Initiative [Gateway]).

Systems/Initiatives

CDU-Houston: Community Defense Unit – Houston, Texas, Police Department
CISAnet: Criminal Information Sharing Alliance Network (Southwest Border States Anti-Drug Information System)
CLEAR-Chicago: Citizen Law Enforcement Analysis and Reporting – Chicago, Illinois, area
Summary Results

- Of the 22 systems, 14 were governed/controlled by host agencies and 12 by policy boards (there was some overlap). Policy board governance is especially popular among the larger systems.

- Sixteen of the 22 systems receive federal grants or appropriations as a source of funding for their system/initiative.

- Of the 22 systems, 8 were national in geographic service coverage, 7 regional, and 7 state/local.

- Of the 22 systems, 15 have federal agency members, 17 state members, 18 local members, and 13 other agency members.

- Seven of the 22 systems/initiatives indicated their scope of geographic access as intrastate, 12 interstate, and 3 international.

- Twelve systems have law enforcement-only agency access, and 10 law enforcement-plus access.

- Thirteen systems contain general criminal data, 11 terrorism data, 11 drug data, and 9 gang data.

- Eight systems store system data at a central location, and 14 at decentralized locations.
Nine systems own the data in the system, and 13 report that data contributors own the data.

Eleven systems contain intelligence data and are compliant with 28 CFR Part 23.

Means of connectivity include the following applications: VPN, intranet, extranet secure environment, firewall, Web-based, routers, and IP encrypted. Media used for connectivity include fiber, satellite, T-1, T-3, dial-up, and fractional (T-1).

Nearly every system described itself as a limited access system (an invited community).

Membership vetting methods include an application process, verification, screening, background checks, user certification training requirements, sponsorship, board approval, and member agency approval.

User authentication methods include passwords, PKI, Smartcards, tokens, key fobs, and digital certificates.