



Texas Justice Information Exchange Gap Analysis

*"The Texas Path to NIEM"
Update to the 2002 TJI3 Plan*

October 29, 2007

Prepared For:

Department of Public Safety
Office of Court Administration,
Department of Criminal Justice with the collaboration of the
Texas Integrated Justice Information Systems Steering Committee

Prepared By:

Unisys Corporation

5700 South MoPac Expressway, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78749

UNISYS
imagine it. done.

Gap Analysis

Unisys conducted a gap analysis related to the 28 exchanges identified by Texas stakeholders for the Texas Path to NIEM. The Gap Analysis was part of our overall project that included focus group sessions, follow-up meetings with key stakeholders, JIEM Workshops and analyses, IEPD workshops and other independent research. The Gap Analysis was developed using a structured methodology that included the following tasks:

- Examination of each exchange and determine the extent to which the exchanges now occur
- Determine the importance of each exchange
- Prioritize the exchanges by importance in consultation with focus group members
- For exchanges that now occur, examine the five dimensions (process, event, agency, condition, and information)
- Determine whether there are problems or issues that might prevent future automation
- For exchanges that are problematic, again examine the five dimensions
- Determine what the issues are
- Isolate the data elements that make the exchanges work
- Determine the extent to which source and receiving systems can handle the exchanges – This gap analysis is meant to identify the salient gaps that might impede the electronic exchange of information for these and perhaps other exchanges. More detailed systems analysis work – beyond the scope of this gap analysis - will be required for each participating agency system, as part of the implementation of an interoperability or information sharing solution. However, the Unisys team did identify the data elements and where necessary, a super-set of elements necessary to facilitate individual electronic exchanges. These data elements will be part of the IEPDs, which can serve as a foundation for the creation of adaptors in exchanging information.

In summary, this gap analysis report refers to the 28 exchanges identified for the Texas Path to NIEM and key data elements that are most important to stakeholders. It identifies problems or issues with data that could be impediments to sharing. Where issues exist, such as when data cannot be shared, the gap analysis report provides a high-level overview of the reasons as well as existing barriers to the collection, sharing, and integration of data. In addition, this report includes possible resolutions or steps that could be taken to resolve impediments.

Gap Analysis Report

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
1	Pen Packet Check List	<p>Manual – Sheriff is required by law to collect and send this check list to TDC with associated documents.</p> <p>Web version now available - TDC posted a web version of this form on their site for access by users. The extent to which this web form is used is unknown</p>	<p>Web version can be used to complete the document but it is still printed and sent to TDC via hard copy</p> <p>All forms in the pen packet must be automated if any in the pen packet are to be sent electronically; <u>if one form is sent electronically, all forms must be sent electronically.</u> The logistics issues associated with attempting to send part of the packet electronically and part manually will be too burdensome and will cause major problems in work flow.</p>	<p>Automate the web version so that it stores the data to be exchanged in a format that can be pushed to the TDC (or other systems, as needed)</p>
2	Standardized Felony Judgment Form	<p>A Standardized Felony Judgment form has been developed for use but not all participants are using that specific form; some are using their own forms that contain the data elements needed by the state.</p> <p>Largely a manual process - Generated by either the District Clerks or the District Attorney (depending on the local business processes) and sent to the Sheriff. Below are examples of how it is handled in different jurisdictions:</p> <p>In El Paso County: The District Clerk prepares all the judgments. The clerk of the Court sits in on the plea hearings and notes the terms of the plea agreement and punishment assessed. The defendant's thumbprint is imprinted on several blank sheets of paper and stored in the Judge's file (paper). The clerk then creates the judgment in WORD--being prompted to input certain information, and calculates time credit (all county entities share a common database in the JIMS system</p>	<p>By all accounts, the most significant potential impediments associated with this exchange are the capture of signatures and the defendant's thumbprints. Judges in some of these jurisdictions are likely to object to not having the paper documents to sign.</p> <p>Different Methods of Handling TRN, TRS numbers TRN is linked to the ORI and is issued in batches to the agency. It is the Texas arrest number and is linked to offenses; one physical arrest can have several TRNs. - Some Sheriff's offices have their own arrest number as well.</p> <p>Individuals interviewed in reference to this exchange expressed concern about the capabilities of the less technologically sophisticated jurisdictions. A significant issue raised is the lack of automation by some of these jurisdictions which will negatively impact their ability to engage in the electronic exchange of this information.</p> <p>The main issue with this exchange (and with may</p>	<p>Consider the use of electronic thumbprints extracted from the booking system</p> <p>Consider using a thumbprint capture device during the process to electronically capture the print for use in the form</p> <p>Gain acceptance of electronic signature</p> <p>Investigate if legislation required</p> <p>If automated, the system will need to account for variations and be able to handle special numbers generated.</p> <p>A suggestion was made to have the State develop a web-based form (in lieu of a word processing form) which could be used by the less technologically sophisticated jurisdictions to capture the data; this form would then automatically populate the State's system. Those data could then be pushed to other systems if desired.</p>

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
		<p>(vendor is TSG). The clerk prints the judgment on one of the blank sheets that contains a thumbprint, takes it to the judge for signature, copies are made, and distributed. All court filings, including the judgment are scanned. For pen packets, the indictment and judgment are certified, put in a bin for the jail to pick up daily. Note - neither the prosecutor nor the defense attorney is given an opportunity to review the judgment before the judge signs it, resulting in a number of nunc pro tunc judgments.</p> <p>In Montgomery County the District Attorney's Office prepares the standardized felony judgment, along with other required documents--written waivers of rights, written admonishments of the court, written stipulation of evidence, trial court's certification of the right to appeal. Using WordPerfect, the preparer opens the directory of the case - using the District Attorney case file number - and selects the appropriate standardized felony judgment from a forms bank. A secondary merge with the computerized case file information occurs, to fill in the Cause Number, Court Number, Defendant's Name, offense, degree of offense, and names of the attorneys. The terms of the plea agreement, pre-sentence jail time credit and/or conditions of community supervision are added and any corrections are made. The judgment is printed out for signatures to be affixed in the courtroom. In some courts, copies of the judgment are made before the docket; in other courts, copies are made after the signatures are affixed.</p>	<p>of the others) is the variety of methods and technologies used to capture this information by the different jurisdictions. Many of the larger and more technologically sophisticated jurisdictions are either partially or fully automated and already exchange information among internal systems. Other jurisdictions, such as Montgomery, have partial automation but rely on stand-alone apps like Word Perfect to complete the document. And finally, there are other jurisdictions that lack baseline technologies to participate in these exchanges.</p>	

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
3	Booking Report	Manual - process involves the Sheriff, Jail, DA, Probation, Court, Law Enforcement, TDC	<p>Lack of a standard format</p> <p>Various booking report formats exist throughout the State. There is no one standard format of the booking report used by all agencies.</p> <p>Most of the agencies - even the small jurisdictions – have some form of automation (usually a jail system) to capture at least part of the information needed for this exchange.</p>	<p>Use a “super-set” of data elements in the IEPD to ensure that all variations in forms (to include all data elements) are captured.</p> <p>The TIJS oversight group should consider gaining concurrence from stakeholders in developing a Standard Booking Report to provide a statewide electronic document for Jails to exchange booking information with all other agencies in the justice process model to facilitate these exchanges while accounting for the mentioned variations.</p>
4	Offense Report	Manual – Process initiated by the DA or Court to the Sheriff.	<p>Lack of a standard format</p> <p>No standardized offense report exists for law enforcement agencies in the State of Texas; different modes of offense reporting is also a problem</p> <p>Data elements needed might differ according to jurisdiction.</p> <p>Addition of photos or other images and material by the DA could be a problem; in many cases it is a hard copy</p> <p>Conversion of these hard copy reports and images to electronic format (e.g., pdf) could create security concerns</p> <p>Signatures of officers and supervisors required</p>	<p>Standardize to a common set of data elements required by the state</p> <p>Account for the additional data elements used by the many jurisdictions and create a “super set” of elements; this might require flexibility in allowing the IEPDs to evolve as more systems are brought on line</p> <p>Standardize the protocol for capturing images</p> <p>Consider a security protocol that all can agree upon and which is approved by the court and/or other authority, as necessary</p> <p>Gain acceptance of electronic signature</p> <p>Investigate if legislation required</p>
5	Indictment or Information (Charging Document)	Manual – Process initiated by the DA or Court who send it to the Sheriff.	<p>Court seal and signature of DA and foreman of the grand jury required</p> <p>Unformatted text from paragraphs needs to be captured and associated with TRN and TRS numbers</p>	<p>Investigate if electronic signatures are acceptable and if the seal can be replaced with an electronic marker of some sort.</p> <p>Data fields might need to be created to capture information now contained in the paragraphs</p>
6	Jail Conduct Report	Manual – Process initiated by the (Jail) Sheriff and sent to Probation, Court, Law Enforcement, TDCJ - Corrections	Typically a MS-Word document or hand written document.	Standardize or capture a superset of elements

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
7	Detainers and Holds Notification	<p>Manual – Process initiated by the (Jail) Sheriff and sent to TDCJ - Corrections, DA</p> <p>In smaller jurisdictions this is a completely manual process. However, most of the agencies – even some of the small jurisdictions – have some form of automation (usually a jail system) to capture at least part of the information needed for this exchange.</p>	<p>Typically word document or form</p> <p>May contain a copy of an TCIC/NCIC query</p> <p>No standard format</p>	<p>Standardize - Consider using the data elements from the INS form as a model</p>
8	Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) Report	<p>Manual - Probation creates this form and sends to the Sheriff</p>	<p>This is Typically a word document</p> <p>No standard exists</p>	<p>Standardize - Isolate and capture data elements (super set; should be accomplished via IEPD)</p> <p>Several national initiatives related to standards and IEPDs for Pre-Sentence investigation exchanges should be used as a reference in creating the model for the Superset. These include the following:</p> <p><i>BJA's Functional Standards Development for Automated Case Management Systems for Probation</i></p> <p>This document discusses functional standards and includes reference to the Pre-sentence investigation process.</p> <p>For more information go to: http://it.ojp.gov/servlet/ShowDocument?attachment_id=144</p> <p>NLECTC -NE Launched the Corrections, Probation and Parole Information Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD) Project.</p> <p>As part of this project, a decision was made to design the Pre-sentence Investigation IEPD as a collection of multiple Reusable Schema Components (RSC). Each area is to be designed as its own independent component. These components can be used individually or with other components (depending on the jurisdiction's needs) to form a Pre-sentence Investigation (PSI) exchange as well as other possible exchanges. The reusable components that</p>

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
				<p>currently exist within the PSI are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment- Interview(s), Court Proceeding Criminal History Currently Pending Matters Defendant Education History Employment History Financial History Mental Health History Military History Organization, Person Physical Health History Present Incident Residence History Sexual Offender Social History Substance Abuse History Supervision History Victim <p>For more detailed information go to - http://nlectc-ilp.org/index.php?q=Corrections for more detailed information</p>
9	Client Supervision Plan	Manual – Probation creates this form and sends to the Sheriff. If requested, it is sent to the Court, District Attorney and Public Defender	Part of the pre-sentence investigation – this is a subset of #8; see # 8 for issues	See #8
10	Victim Impact Statement	Manual - District Attorney sends Sheriff the Victim Impact Statement	Lack of a standard format – A modified version was recently published, however the standard form contains legal jargon and some of the counties modified the form to read in plain English. Most of the forms do capture the same essential information Confidentiality of the different pieces of this	Account for the variation in data elements or additional data elements (if any) used by the many jurisdictions and create a “super set” of elements Identify confidential elements that cannot be shared by all Investigate the handling of electronic signatures Investigate the possibility of scanning the form and creating an electronic document linked to associated data

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
			<p>statement will prohibit sharing among all agencies; Agencies must carefully assess what information can be shared</p> <p>Requires victim's signature</p> <p>In the majority of cases the statement is hand-written by victim</p> <p>Victim impact information is not always captured electronically at the source</p>	elements in the exchange package
11	Sex Offender Release Notification	Manual - TDCJ & Sheriff send Law Enforcement the Sex Offender Release Notification & DPS	<p>Release notice and registration form are both created together</p> <p>Thumb print and signature of offender required on the notification form</p>	<p>Consider the use of electronic thumbprints from the booking system</p> <p>Gain acceptance of electronic signature</p>
12	Licensed Foster Care Provider Notice	Manual - Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) sends address information to law enforcement agencies	This information can be sent electronically; however, it is unknown whether all CAD systems in the State of Texas have a hazardous location file into which it can be imported.	For agencies that cannot handle the automated data stream, create a file that can be opened with a standard word processor or spreadsheet so that the receiving agency can use the information even if they cannot import it
13	Law Enforcement notification to DFPS of dispatch to Foster Care Provider Notification	Manual – Law Enforcement agency sends notification to the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) after being dispatched to an address of a licensed foster care facility/home,	The notification is made by using a variety of forms that can be in numerous formats (e.g., Arrest / Incident / Supplemental Report). Many law enforcement agencies generate these forms manually; these do not lend themselves to electronic transmission in a manner that will automatically populate the State system	<p>The minimally acceptable data (and elements) will be identified as part of the IEPD creation process. This set of elements should be made known to all participating agencies.</p> <p>Consider as an interim step, using a pdf or similar format to create an electronic copy of the manual forms for ease of transmission</p> <p>Consider capturing the header output of the CAD systems (where possible) that captured the basic elements. This can populate the State system in advance of receiving the original report.</p>
14	Notice of Release from Jail/Prison	Manual– sent by TDCJ, Jail to Law Enforcement, DA, Court, and Public Defender notified for parole	There should be no impediments to the electronic exchange of this information	
15	Expungement or Non-Disclosure Notice sent by Court	Manual and Electronic – Court sends the Expungement or Non-Disclosure Notice to DPS, Probation, and or Law Enforcement ; In the case of non-disclosures, they are sent to DPS as part of the normal	The expungement report, if sent electronically, cannot be uploaded to the DPS receiving system without first being reviewed. DPS must review all expungements to ensure that the dates and charges are correct (they match the incidents).	<p>Consider developing a conversion table to standardize the nomenclature (charges etc)</p> <p>A review of the entire process could help to identify the specific issues and determine whether any of the processes associated with the DPS review can be</p>

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
		disposition process and are forwarded to the others by DPS	Non-standard nomenclature is a problem (e.g., the labeling of DUI verses DWI)	automated.
16	Affidavit of Indigence and Election of Counsel Notice	Manual – form is created in MS Word (this can be downloaded from the Task Force on Indigent Defense web site) completed and sent by the Office of Court Administrative to the Task Force on Indigent Defense	Lack of a standard format/data elements Three different forms exist, which can be downloaded from the Task Force on Indigent Defense web site. There is no requirement to use any of the forms; the forms may be customized to suit a jurisdiction's needs by downloading them in MS Word by clicking on the appropriate link. Signature required by defendant (and potential legal requirements)	Identify a common set of data elements required by the state and include the customized additional data elements used by the many jurisdictions to create a "super set" of elements; this might require flexibility in allowing the IEPDs to evolve as more systems are brought on line Possible use of an electronic signature or facsimile. Investigate statutory requirements and possible legislative changes if necessary
17	Inmate Ready List	Manual – TDCJ sends the local Jail a list of inmates that will be accepted for transport to the State Correctional Intake and classification center.	There should be no impediments to the electronic exchange of this information	
18	Probation Case Status Information	Manual - Probation, Clerk of Court sends (upon request) status information on a given to Law Enforcement, DA, Court, and/or DPS. This includes updated demographics, employment and program status	Probation records are judicial records and not open to requests; no central probation database (State-wide) exists. Each areas/county has its own system. In some cases documents are scanned and sent as e-mail attachments when requested. Not all departments have this information in automated systems; many probation departments are doing this as a completely manual process No outside agency can get into and review the probation info – confidentiality is an issue Security is an issue Internal networks not linked to State network	Establish network connections for these County system to exchange information with the state Protect confidentiality by establishing permissions; Consider establishing rules that are agency-specific to allow non-probation agencies to see only the allowable information Establish strong security
19	Probation Completion Information	Manual - Probation, Clerk of Court sends a notice to Law Enforcement, DA, Court, Public Defender and DPS indicating that the offender has successfully completed the terms of Probation.	No central probation database (State-wide) exists. Each area/county has its own system. This information is only shared upon request. No routine completion of probation is sent to anyone Getting everyone linked to the same system	See #18
20	Service Request Notice	Manual - OAG, DFPS, Clerk of Court, DA,	Will private process service providers be a part of	Develop an Internet portal application with the necessary

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
	and Service Document	DPS (or any state or local agency petitioning the court) sends a request that a document is to be served on an individual. Request is sent to the Sheriff, Constable, or Private Service Provider	<p>the State network to participate in electronic exchange of this information? If so, how?</p> <p>Some participants do not capture this information in their case management system; might require different levels of automation to feed a State (central) system.</p> <p>Security issues will likely arise on how to process civil and criminal service of process using a common exchange model.</p>	<p>user profile infrastructure and access privileges (restrictions) defined. For example, restrict access to only service process assigned to that specific provider.</p> <p>Provide multiple options to update and pass information through the State system – include online query & update capability in addition to automated exchanges.</p> <p>Define special coding as needed to enable separate processing by service type.</p> <p>Office of the Attorney General has already done considerable work developing business and system requirements for this exchange. DPS should partner with OAG to further develop this exchange.</p>
21	Results of Service	Manual - Service Results Notification sent by the Sheriff, Constable, or Private Service provider to the initiating agency (OAG, Court, DA, DPS).	Same issue as #20	Same resolution as #20
22	Suspicious Activity Reports (SARs)	Manual – exchanged between and among Law Enforcement, Fusion Center, and other Criminal Justice Agencies	<p>Extent to which each participating agency captures SAR information electronically is unknown.</p> <p>Data elements captured by participating agencies may not be comprehensive of the elements required or suggested by the national CJIS community.</p>	<p>Determine, via TJIS, the minimally acceptable information (data elements) needed to participate in the electronic exchange of SAR</p> <p>Use a "super-set" of data elements in the IEPD to ensure that all variations in forms (to include all data elements) are captured.</p> <p>Align with national efforts related to SAR</p> <p>Publish the above to all agencies</p>
23	Delinquent Child Support Notification	Manual - OAG, Court and Child Support Office sends a report indicating that an individual is delinquent on child support payments	<p>An extensive number of agencies (see below) are licensed under 232-002. It is critical that those agencies which are to participate in this exchange are provided with the IEPD information necessary.</p> <p>Business process is not very well defined at this point – this is a work in progress</p> <p>In addition, the extent to which many of these non-public safety and justice agencies are willing to participate is unknown.</p> <p>(1) Department of Agriculture;</p>	<p>Identify the key agencies that are important to the success of this electronic exchange.</p> <p>Formalize the process flow in concert with new legislation</p> <p>Ample notification and where necessary, dialog with these agencies should take place as part of this overall effort</p>

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (2) Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission; (3) Texas Appraiser Licensing and Certification Board; (4) Texas Board of Architectural Examiners; (5) Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners; (6) Comptroller of Public Accounts; (7) Court Reporters Certification Board; (8) State Board of Dental Examiners; (9) Texas State Board of Examiners of Dietitians; (10) Texas Funeral Service Commission; (11) Department of State Health Services; (12) Department of Aging and Disability Services; (13) Texas Board of Professional Land Surveying; (14) Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation; (15) Texas State Board of Examiners of Marriage and Family Therapists; (16) Texas State Board of Medical Examiners; (17) Midwifery Board; (18) Texas Commission on Environmental Quality; (19) Board of Nurse Examiners; (20) Texas Board of Occupational Therapy Examiners; (21) Texas Optometry Board; (22) Parks and Wildlife Department; (23) Texas State Board of Examiners of Perfusionists; (24) Texas State Board of Pharmacy; (25) Texas Board of Physical Therapy Examiners; (26) Texas State Board of Plumbing Examiners; (27) Texas State Board of Podiatric Medical 	

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
			<p>Examiners;</p> <p>(28) Polygraph Examiners Board;</p> <p>(29) Texas Private Security Board;</p> <p>(30) Texas State Board of Examiners of Professional Counselors;</p> <p>(31) Texas Board of Professional Engineers;</p> <p>(32) Department of Family and Protective Services;</p> <p>(33) Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists;</p> <p>(34) Texas State Board of Public Accountancy;</p> <p>(35) Department of Public Safety of the State of Texas;</p> <p>(36) Public Utility Commission of Texas;</p> <p>(37) Railroad Commission of Texas;</p> <p>(38) Texas Real Estate Commission;</p> <p>(39) State Bar of Texas;</p> <p>(40) Texas State Board of Social Worker Examiners;</p> <p>(41) State Board of Examiners for Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology;</p> <p>(42) Texas Structural Pest Control Board;</p> <p>(43) Board of Tax Professional Examiners;</p> <p>(44) Secretary of State;</p> <p>(45) Supreme Court of Texas;</p> <p>(46) Texas Transportation Commission;</p> <p>(47) State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners;</p> <p>(48) Texas Ethics Commission;</p> <p>(49) Advisory Board of Athletic Trainers;</p> <p>(50) State Committee of Examiners in the Fitting and Dispensing of Hearing Instruments;</p> <p>(51) Texas Board of Licensure for Professional</p>	

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
			<p>Medical Physicists;</p> <p>(52) Texas Department of Insurance;</p> <p>(53) Texas Board of Orthotics and Prosthetics;</p> <p>(54) Savings and loan commissioner;</p> <p>(55) Texas Juvenile Probation Commission; and</p> <p>(56) Texas Lottery Commission under Chapter 466, Government Code</p>	
24	Consolidated Digital Photograph Notification	Agencies with photo capabilities sending copies of photos to each other including demographic information (AKA) and a chronological sequence of photographs	<p>Availability of electronic photograph chronology</p> <p>Format requirements - uniformity may not be consistent with photos among different agencies. While all images taken in a given agency might be uniform in their appearance, the uniformity may not be consistent with photos from different agencies (backgrounds, image aspect ratio and digital resolution among other things vary). These differences could limit the value of the images for prosecution purposes and result in defense challenges to uses of images in court (for instance, poor lighting can create shadows causing facial images among different subjects to vary in appearance).</p>	<p>Consider a statewide image capture and submission policy for agencies purchasing or upgrading photo imaging systems; it will help in facilitating the exchange of digital images among agencies by providing a standard by which images can be taken and shared. A set of common standards would be helpful in ensuring compatibility.</p> <p>Consider at a minimum, NIST ver 2 Standard</p> <p>Statewide standards and guidelines should promote access to the FBI's Interstate Identification Index (III) Image System.</p>
25	Standard Citation (Traffic / Ordinances)	Manual – law Enforcement sends copies of citations to Court, DA, Probation, Fusion Center, and State Law Enforcement Agencies	<p>Extent to which each participating agency captures citation information electronically is unknown.</p> <p>Given the number of local jurisdictions, the non-state citations associated with local ordinances will vary in type and associated data elements.</p>	<p>Identify a common set of data elements required by the state and include the customized additional data elements used by the many jurisdictions to create a "super set" of elements.</p> <p>While the state enters all traffic citations, direct entry by the submitting agencies is the preferred method. Consider determining which agencies electronically capture citation information and developing a plan and method to port citation information from those agencies into the state system</p> <p>Develop a plan to handle citations that are hard copy, e.g., scanning, pdf, data entry, etc</p>
26	Criminal History Notification to Licensing	Manual and Electronic – DPS sends licensing agencies the notification of	No standard business process - Some licensing agencies prefer paper; some have an ftp site;	Consider developing a standardized process

	EXCHANGE / IEPD	Occurring Now – How?	ISSUES - IMPEDIMENTS TO ELECTRONIC EXCHANGE	POSSIBLE RESOLUTION
	Agency	criminal convictions and or grant of deferred adjudication	some want full criminal history. 90% of the agencies already accept an electronic file. Entities with large number of applicants do it electronically others do it on paper Capabilities of agencies to receive electronically could be an issue.	Consider other methods of sending electronic notification (e-mail, posting pdf on a State site, etc)
27	Prosecutor Action Report	Manual and automated - District Attorney makes a decision on filing to either accept on not; Attorney makes a decision on specific charges based on ITN and TRS numbers. DA could change the agency's charge based on the prosecutor's review (accept, reject, or change)	This is a bifurcated system; some DA offices do this manually others have a completely automated process (e.g., Tarrant County). Those following the manual process write accept, reject, etc on the action report. It might be difficult to capture this hand written, hard-copy information electronically. Any electronic exchange must be able to handle changes made by the DA and provide some sort of feedback loop to the submitting agency	The implementation of Live-scan devices can help to automate the charge information flowing from the agencies using the manual process; this should be investigated Automated systems should have a trigger that captures the prosecutors decision to either accept, reject or change the charges Consider using the Tarrant or similar process as a baseline model for the flow of this information
28	CCH Disposition Report	Manual and electronic - Courts and DA exchange Disposition and Sentencing information with all other agencies; the DA office sends the disposition report to TXDPS DPS has established a secure web site and has posted an on-line form which the sending agency can complete	Bifurcated system; some offices do this manually others have a completely automated process; approximately 80% are automated using either a secure website or a dedicated line. Capabilities of the sending agency is an issue	This issue is related to the capabilities of the sending agency and is not easily resolved by the State or governing body. Investigate the feasibility of developing a State-wide case management system; this could solve this problem for the agencies that send manually

Each of these exchanges is subject to the following limitations/issues:

- The Pen packet must be considered as one entity - if one form is sent electronically, all forms must be sent electronically. The logistics issues associated with attempting to send part of the packet electronically and part manually will be too burdensome and will cause major work-flow problems
- The ability of a given system to electronically send or forward the information pertaining to a particular exchange must always be considered
- The ability of a given system to electronically receive the information pertaining to a particular exchange must always be considered
- By creating the IEPDs key stakeholders have identified the data elements necessary to create any of these exchanges. This information **MUST** be provided to all stakeholders and system users to ensure that they know what is expected, especially in advance of preparation for the implementation of new systems or when they automate the associated manual processes

- A formal notification/implementation plan should be developed to ensure that all affected agencies understand these IEPDs and the implications for future system development and implementation