

Western Identification Network Service Strategy

(January, 2008)


The purpose of this paper is to help members and other interested parties understand the unique nature of services provided by WIN that no state or single agency acting on its own could cost effectively provide. Through ongoing policy leadership provided by the WIN Board of Directors, WIN is well positioned to maintain and enhance WIN Identification Services in an open-architected, NIST-IAFIS compliant manner. The key result is that WIN, and its members are able to work with multiple service providers to ensure continued cost competitive delivery of quality identification services.

WIN's Foundation for Service to its Members:

1. WIN members are currently provided access to 22 million fingerprint records of the western United States that could not cost effectively be replicated by a state acting on its own.
2. WIN members recognize the highly transient nature of the population moving into and around member states. This population includes persons with criminal backgrounds and subjects of current interest to police. Being a part of WIN provides members with the ability to quickly search these western AFIS records including extended searches of CALDOJ and California and Washington Nevada local agencies.
3. At the time of formation, smaller states had neither the technical AFIS expertise nor the budget to move forward. These states observed the successes implemented in California including major cities and the benefits of connecting these databases to allow searching. California's successes were in part the catalyst for the smaller western states to expand the concept across state borders. To make it possible, these smaller western states banded together in an unprecedented cooperative law enforcement venture to pool financial and technical resources to establish these critical AFIS identification services.
4. Today, WIN provides a shared central staff to support WIN members with business and IT management, AFIS and forensic experience to oversee WIN-AFIS and manage service provider contracts. WIN provides a cost effective shared service that would otherwise have to be funded and managed individually by each state. Unless they remain a member of WIN, individual states could not feasibly afford to maintain a separate network and manage multiple policy agreements which are in place among the present WIN member states.
5. WIN provides in-house expertise for development of standards based specifications, support for interface development for capture devices, criminal history interfaces and IAFIS connectivity that a state or other agency would otherwise have to replicate on its own. These types of services are not generally provided with delivery of a stand-alone AFIS system without incurring additional cost¹.

¹ In a Post Implementation Review of the upgraded WIN-AFIS system (October 23, 2002), MTG Management Consultants included the following Finding: "WIN appears to provide a comparatively inexpensive yet effective means to integrate AFIS and criminal history record applications. The WIN member states are not alone in their efforts to implement fingerprint identification workflow management applications that integrate Live-Scan devices, state CCH

Who WIN is: The Western Identification Network (WIN) is a consortium of state and local law enforcement agencies that have implemented a shared network and AFIS processing service bureau to provide the ability to search the criminal and civil fingerprint records of these member agencies. At present, WIN facilitates the ability to search approximately 22 million western state fingerprint records. WIN is a 503(c) non-profit company, formed by western law enforcement as a cooperative government venture to provide an AFIS Service Bureau, including interfaces to other states and local agencies in California and Washington. WIN policy direction is provided through a Board of Directors comprised of member law enforcement managers. WIN vendor outsourcing agreements are managed by WIN Staff based in Sacramento, California in accordance with WIN Board policy direction.



WIN Goals are to facilitate member automated criminal and civil fingerprint identification requirements and to the extent feasible, enhance these services by providing the capability to search records of other jurisdictions that would not otherwise be accomplished.

There are approximately 60 million criminal records in the United States. A portion of which are indexed at state and local levels only. Accordingly, the only way to gain access to these records is to maintain the ability to search other state and local databases. Further, it is estimated that one in five criminals has a criminal record in more than one state. These statistical conditions are nationally recognized and form the basis for encouraging a national policy of conducting both state and national searches of fingerprint and related criminal justice information systems to obtain as complete and

applications, and the FBI’s criminal history/AFIS applications. However, while other agencies have spent several hundred thousand dollars and more to implement integrated CCH/AFIS work-flow applications, it appears that WIN member agencies are spending a small fraction of these amounts to obtain similar results.”

accurate a search as possible. WIN is especially relevant in that the fingerprint records of 8 geographically collocated states can be searched in one request.

WIN members have historically averaged 25% more ten print identifications as a result of being able to concurrently search records of other member states. WIN members use WIN-AFIS to (1) Verify identity of arrested persons, (2) Determine identity associated with fingerprints left at crime scenes, (3) Verify identity of individuals to facilitate determination of the existence of previous criminal activity of these persons who are seeking employment, license or gun permit authorized by law.

WIN provides a central AFIS service bureau that combines the fingerprint records of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

Feature	Present Capability	Projected 2012 Capability
Daily Ten print Submissions	5,000	7,000
Daily Latent Submissions	300	500
Ten print Database Size	5,000,000	7,000,000
WIN Connected Ten print Database Size	21,000,000	23,000,000
Connected AFIS Devices	125	150
Shared FBI IAFIS Interface	Exists	Exists
Palm Matching	2008	Exists
Flat Applicant Processing	2008	Exists
Slap Images Latent Cognizant	2008	Exists
Latent Searches to FBI (ULW)	Exists	Exists
Common Criminal History Interface	Exists	Exists
Common Fingerprint Submission Specification, WIN-EFTS/EBTS	Exists	Exists
Telecommunications Network including 7 X 24 Network Monitoring and Response, firewalls and VPN	Exists	Exists
Ability to search King County	Exists	Exists
Ability to reciprocally search California Department of Justice and agencies connected to CALID Network	Exists	Exists
Ability to Reciprocally Search Las Vegas	Exists	Exists
Ability to search the WIN database from remote wireless handheld devices	Exists	Exists
Subject Cross Reference Multi-State	Exists	Exists
WIN Developed Future System Acquisition Documentation Suite	Exists	Exists

Key Policy Question:

Given the pace of technology change and vendors participating in the AFIS marketplace, how does WIN appropriately address issues of competition in maintaining, enhancing and replacing AFIS systems?

Since the creation of the first version of this document in January, 2004, WIN has completed a strategic plan that has resulted in a three year effort to define a Next Generation - WIN Multi-Modal-Biometric Information System Specification (MMBIS).

In February, 2008 the suite of documentation related to the future WIN – MMBIS will be made available to interested biometric systems providers in the form of a Request for Information (RFI) to solicit vendor comment on the viability, development characteristics and timeline should WIN decide to move forward with procurement. WIN will tabulate vendor feedback and compile this information and report on it at the May 2008 Board meeting. The package of documents vendors will be requested to review and comment on will include:

- Request for Information
- Future Requirements Specification
- Electronic Biometric Transmission Specification
- Contract Template

WIN is confident that the future WIN – MMBIS system specification will provide the documentation and governance necessary to overcome the challenging issues WIN and other large AFIS systems have been faced with to facilitate a broader array of sourcing opportunities.

WIN Structural Underpinnings:

1. WIN is unique in that WIN does not own an AFIS system. WIN manages an outsourced service from the private sector. No other vendor to date has implemented this form of AFIS business model to the degree represented by WIN today. There are several small-scale examples of shared AFIS environments, but no other configuration nears the scale of WIN.

The vendor, not the customer, houses the service bureau. The outsourcing agreement is performance-based and does not specify hardware or software components to be installed when meeting performance specifications. This is in contrast to the more traditional model that is typically employed by initiating a bid process to purchase a system with listed components for specific purposes with particular size, volume and functionality characteristics. The WIN model provides flexibility and opportunity for costs savings in several fundamental areas:

- a. WIN consolidates central expertise into a small staff that provides management outsourcing services for 8 states. If each member needed to separately maintain this type of expertise, costs would increase to each of these members above what they are paying now.
- b. Similarly, the core AFIS system is centrally located on vendor premises and not spread out among 8 western state locations thus making it much more efficient for the vendor to maintain. This substantially limits the amount of hardware and software that is required to be maintained at remote locations.

In 1989 the networked, shared AFIS concept was previously unprecedented. The Council of State Governments recognized WIN with an award for “Innovations in Government” for this achievement in cooperative law enforcement.

2. Even though WIN is largely unique, WIN employs a NIST open standards approach thus facilitating a choice in solution providers in selected areas.
 - a. WIN has adopted a common Electronic Biometric Submission Standard (WIN-EBTS). Members are able to address their own local procurement requirements by including this specification in their procurements for Live Scan and Card Scan devices. WIN facilitates connectivity with any vendor device that meets these specifications.
 - b. WIN has adopted a common Criminal History Interface specification by which members may choose to develop using in-house resources or outsource to the private sector as has been done in most member cases. Accordingly, members can work with any vendor they choose to complete and maintain these interfaces.
3. Core AFIS Processing – WIN facilitates compliance with NIST and IAFIS processing. However, not unlike other systems installed in the late 1980s – early 1990s, all of which were proprietary in nature, there are system generational and other issues to consider in establishing policy to frame future system expansion and position for periodic system replacement. Some of the system replacement issues to consider would include:
 - a. The implications to system accuracy if member record quality improvements are unable to be retained.
 - b. The cost of conversion to a new system, including but not limited to:
 - i. **User re-training** – State Repository and Crime Lab employees of 8 western states and several federal agencies are trained in the current system. Any transition to a new system requires training in the new technology. This directly involves more than 100 users who access the central service bureau and indirectly involves those interfaced AFIS sites that form the combined WIN network.
 - ii. **Infrastructure Transition** – WIN maintains a dedicated network but connects to state and federal domains and local agencies which requires close coordination to properly connect and secure more than 100 devices through reconfiguration of network firewalls, employment of encryption such as VPN and other security techniques. Additionally, the effort required to maintain the legacy system in parallel with a new system requires additional floor space and coordination to ensure critical AFIS processing is not interrupted.
 - iii. **Degree of customization and development risk to retain present functionality** – WIN –AFIS is customized to address WIN’s unique business model. Enabling WIN members to realize the benefits of a shared service bureau will require customization to manage multiple user agreements, isolate member records and workflows, and provide flexibility to members to accommodate local requirements.
 - iv. **Remaining useful life of the present system** – The present system was accepted by WIN in 2006. We expect that, with the exception of capacity

enhancements, this system will largely serve the needs of WIN members through 2012.

- v. **Cost of converting member records** – Even though WIN-AFIS is NIST compliant, as was the case with many agencies, WIN adopted a day one forward policy of capturing NIST records with implementation of the current system. To avoid costs of converting several million, paper fingerprint records, it is estimated that over a period of 5 –7 years, fingerprint images of the active criminal population will be captured and stored in the WIN NIST Document Archive. The strategic importance of this is that any AFIS vendor could then use these records to convert them to their native (proprietary) formats without undergoing a costly paper conversion.
 - To accelerate population of NIST records, WIN has implemented a project to download approximately 1.5 million NIST records from IAFIS.
 - There will be approximately 1.5 million paper fingerprint records (some with palms) that will need to be converted to carry forward into the future WIN-MMBIS.
- vi. **Cost of converting unsolved latent records** – WIN latent fingerprint examiners have developed, enhanced, encoded, searched and registered at least 75,000 crime scene fingerprints (latents) that need to carry forward into the future WIN-MMBIS.
- vii. **The ability to continue to utilize input device, criminal history and other system interfaces that are presently in place** – Members have incurred substantial costs to implement capture device, criminal history and other application interfaces. Any new core AFIS system that is contemplated should not require that these interfaces be rewritten. Such a request would force a vendor to incur the burden of rewriting these interfaces to implement their proprietary AFIS solution.
- viii. **Continue to cost effectively retain the ability to search other member connected AFIS databases** – Some vendors argue that with NIST, dissimilar AFIS systems can be interfaced. WIN agrees that this is possible. However, at this time large-scale implementation of NIST interfaces between dissimilar AFIS systems is not generally being undertaken, and such implementation is not expected in the near future. WIN is discussing how a dissimilar interface could be worked out with the State of Arizona.

The primary issue is that more complex policy agreements, labor impacts and resource considerations are involved when approaching a NIST interface between dissimilar vendor product lines.

WIN has been advantaged that most western state AFIS systems share a common vendor. This has facilitated the ability to connect these common

AFIS systems and train users how to conduct searches. Any new vendor would need to continue the network and reciprocal search capability that exists presently in the WIN network community of users.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE EXPERIENCE

The issues discussed above were largely present and evaluated by Gartner Consulting in a recent report² commissioned by the California Department of Justice (DOJ) to assist in evaluating business risks and expected costs associated with implementation of several future alternatives to continue AFIS and related services in that state. The business alternatives that were evaluated included:

1. **Alternative 1 - Status Quo:** Continue to operate the current system as is.
2. **Alternative 2 – Upgrade Existing System, No future System Replacement:** Upgrade the existing system in a piece meal fashion with no future system replacement planning or intentions.
3. **Alternative 3 – Upgrade Existing System, future system Replacement:** Upgrade the current NEC system with needed additional processing power and minimal functionality and position DOJ for future system replacement.
4. **Alternative 4 – Immediate System Replacement:** Immediately replace the current system.

Gartner evaluated each of these four business alternatives by performing analysis in seven key assessment areas:

1. Cost
2. Meets DOJ Requirements
3. Minimizes Implementation Risk
4. Minimizes Operational Risk
5. Minimizes Risk to other Law Enforcement Agencies
6. Flexibility
7. Ease of Management

Gartner concluded that **Alternative 3** to upgrade the present DOJ system while positioning for future system replacement to be the soundest, most cost effective approach for meeting DOJ's future needs.

Basis for Original WIN AFIS Acquisition:

WIN acquired its original system by competitive bid. WIN issued "RFP WIN-001," June 1, 1988. The RFP process was a collaborative effort undertaken by members appointed by their respective law enforcement agencies. These members determined project scope and specifications, then drafted, evaluated, and benchmarked the system before approving the contract.

Present System Life Cycle:

² A Report for California Department of Justice, CAL-ID Independent Study Report, 19 February 2003, Engagement: 220311320.

Life Cycle Status of Present System – The WIN Board of Directors accepted the present WIN-AFIS system in October 2006. The estimated useful life of the present system will serve WIN through 2012. WIN will need to incrementally increase capacity of the system over time and work with our service provider to keep application software on currently supported operating systems and hardware components. However, primary application functionality will remain largely the same. If WIN were to contemplate an interim bid for addition of incremental capacity, any new vendor would be required to provide all of the functionality that exists within the current system. Accordingly, to allow members to make cost effective use of the remaining system life, WIN anticipates negotiating interim capacity enhancements with its current service provider.

The WIN Board of Directors has undertaken a strategic planning effort to determine the scope of the next system replacement and identify the most appropriate procurement method. This plan was reviewed at WIN Board meeting in October 2005. The Board provided direction to complete tasks to move forward with direction contained in the Strategic Plan.

Summary:

1. WIN was formed in 1988 as a State of Nevada, 503(c) non-profit corporation. At formation, WIN was advised by senior law enforcement managers, technology leaders and government attorneys to arrive at an appropriate vehicle to facilitate these member agencies goals for implementation and management of a shared law enforcement network.
2. WIN competitively bid for the original system acquisition. Members from each state participated in determining project scope, specifications, RFP drafting, response evaluation, benchmark testing and the final contract award decision.
3. WIN is unique. No other entity provides the combination of a shared service bureau and network connecting multiple AFIS systems and providing the reciprocal ability to collectively search all of these connected systems.
4. To cost effectively realize the benefits of its investment in the current WIN-AFIS; WIN needs to take full advantage of its expected life cycle. Only incremental capacity, component refreshment and limited functionality changes are anticipated.
5. WIN has completed a strategic planning effort to confirm future system requirements including an assessment of the marketplace and identification of business risks that need to be managed. WIN is issuing an RFI to solicit vendor input on the viability of the future WIN-MMBIS specification to allow WIN to finalize its requirements and plan for acquisition of its next generation system.

WIN ACCESSIBLE DATABASES

	TOTAL SUBJECT RECORDS			Unsolved Latents
	Tenprint	Palmprint	Latent	
Alaska	420,259		420,259	2,980
Idaho	399,389		399,389	4,083
DHS	152,876		24,599	2
Montana	169,376		169,376	1,778
Nevada	730,116		597,384	6,584
Oregon	1,306,314		961,135	9,658
Utah	476,932		476,932	23,048
Wyoming	158,300		139,966	160
WIN	3,813,562		3,189,040	48,293
WSP	1,433,367		1,433,367	11,803
CAL-DOJ	17,107,553	2,121,648	7,426,454	172,225
Total	22,354,482	2,121,648	12,048,861	232,321

Records*
as of June 30, 2008

*In addition, records in King County, Washington plus the California Counties of Alameda/Contra Costa, Orange, San Bernardino/Riverside, San Diego and San Francisco are available.

WIN Hit Distribution Report YTD Totals for 2007

	<u>Submitting Member</u>	<u>Lowest Hit Score</u>	<u>Total Hits</u>	<u>AK</u>	<u>ID</u>	<u>MT</u>	<u>NV</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>UT</u>	<u>WY</u>	<u>DHS</u>	<u>UU</u>	<u>XX</u>						
LI	Alaska	310	99	88	3	2	5	1											
	Idaho	97	244		242				2										
	Montana	558	40		2	38													
	Nevada	61	466	1	3		455	3	3	1									
	Oregon	51	476	2				473	1										
	Utah	5	642		2	3	10	6	617	3	1								
	Wyoming	575	40							40									
Summary for LI:		(5)	2007	91	252	43	470	483	623	44	1								
Total Percent of WIN:				5 %	13 %	2 %	23 %	24 %	31 %	2 %	0 %								

LRI	Alaska	557	9	8			1												
	Idaho	63	30		21	3		2	4										
	Nevada	683	8				8												
	Oregon	123	64	1	3		5	50	2	1		2							
	Utah	154	29					4	24			1							
	Wyoming	5454	6				6												
Summary for LRI:		(63)	146	9	24	3	20	56	30	1	3								
Total Percent of WIN:				6 %	16 %	2 %	14 %	38 %	21 %	1 %	2 %								

L-T/LI	Alaska	1733	22	20			2												
	Idaho	998	59	1	57			1											
	Montana	1218	9			8		1											
	Nevada	1683	78				76	1	1										

Wednesday, January 9, 2008

Operator: RC\JPepper, Execution Time: 1/9/2008 2:50:36 PM

WIN Hit Distribution Report YTD Totals for 2007

	<u>Submitting Member</u>	<u>Lowest Hit Score</u>	<u>Total Hits</u>	<u>AK</u>	<u>ID</u>	<u>MT</u>	<u>NV</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>UT</u>	<u>WY</u>	<u>DHS</u>	<u>UU</u>	<u>XX</u>					
L-T/LI	Oregon	971	113	1		1		110	1									
	Utah	975	126	1		1	6		118									
	Summary for L-T/LI:	(971)	407	23	5Z	10	84	113	120									
	Total Percent of WIN:			6 %	14 %	2 %	21 %	28 %	29 %									

TI	Alaska	937	318	294	3	1	1	14	2	2		1						
	Idaho	1977	93	1	73	1	2	10	5	1								
	Montana	3355	127	1	5	100	1	7	4	9								
	Nevada	102	28962	395	465	148	26076	871	807	119	75	6						
	Oregon	896	198	12	19	8	19	117	16	5	2							
	Utah	479	3341	8	44	7	61	31	3155	26	6	3						
	Wyoming	893	890	4	27	25	13	21	36	763		1						
	Summary for TI:	(102)	33929	715	636	290	26173	1071	4025	925	83	11						
	Total Percent of WIN:			2 %	2 %	1 %	77 %	3 %	12 %	3 %	0 %	0 %						

TRI	Idaho	19998	2		2													
	Nevada	3705	15				15											
	Utah	18640	2						1	1								
	Wyoming	9999	6					1	1	4								
	Summary for TRI:	(3705)	25		2		15	1	2	5								
	Total Percent of WIN:				8 %		60 %	4 %	8 %	20 %								

Wednesday, January 9, 2008

Operator: RC\JPepper, Execution Time: 1/9/2008 2:50:36 PM

WIN Hit Distribution Report YTD Totals for 2007

<u>ESSO</u>	<u>Submitting Member</u>	<u>Lowest Hit Score</u>	<u>Total Hits</u>	<u>DOJ</u>	<u>KCP</u>	<u>LV MPD</u>	<u>WSP</u>											
LI	Nevada	9999	2	2														
	Oregon	9999	2				2											
	Utah	4530	1	1														
	Wyoming	9999	1	1														
Summary for LI:		(4530)	6	4			2											
Total Percent of WIN:				67 %			33 %											

LRI	Alaska	578	4	1			3											
	Idaho	8273	2	1			1											
	Nevada	495	43	18		24	1											
	Oregon	551	17	10			7											
	Utah	1567	14	14														
Summary for LRI:		(495)	80	44		24	12											
Total Percent of WIN:				55 %		30 %	15 %											

TI	Alaska	4200	41	16	10		15											
	Idaho	2597	1				1											
	Montana	4471	2	1	1													
	Nevada	1483	62	62														
	Oregon	766	71	51			20											
	Utah	6085	11	10			1											
Summary for TI:		(766)	188	140	11		37											
Total Percent of WIN:				74 %	6 %		20 %											

Wednesday, January 9, 2008

Operator: RC\JPepper, Execution Time: 1/9/2008 2:50:36 PM

WIN Hit Distribution Report YTD Totals for 2007

<u>ESSO</u>	<u>Submitting Member</u>	<u>Lowest Hit Score</u>	<u>Total Hits</u>	<u>DOJ</u>	<u>KCP</u>	<u>LV</u>	<u>WSP</u>											
<i>TRI</i>	Idaho	1239	2	2														
	Nevada	409	133	133														
	Oregon	4075	21	14			7											
	Utah	2609	9	8			1											
	Wyoming	7410	2	1			1											
	Summary for TRI:	(409)	167	158			9											
	Total Percent of WIN:			95 %			5 %											

WIN Hit Distribution Report YTD Totals for 2007

<u>Submitting Member</u>	<u>Lowest Hit Score</u>	<u>Total Hits</u>	<u>AK</u>	<u>ID</u>	<u>MT</u>	<u>NV</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>UT</u>	<u>WY</u>	<u>DHS</u>	<u>UU</u>	<u>XX</u>						
NameSearch	Alaska	0	15892	15262	101	69	97	290	51	21		1						
	Idaho	0	69462	316	61982	727	1248	2780	1745	538	49	77						
	Montana	0	18804	85	567	16670	258	457	292	458	1	16						
	Nevada	0	71893	260	546	310	67448	1386	1601	190	139	13						
	Oregon	0	86594	402	1047	413	909	83131	416	188	71	15	2					
	Utah	0	67007	131	1348	307	2365	776	61241	769	44	26						
	Wyoming	0	10878	38	143	222	127	132	324	9887	1	4						

Summary for NameSrch: (0) **340530** 16494 65734 18718 72452 88952 65670 12051 305 152 2
Total Percent of WIN: 5 % 19 % 5 % 21 % 26 % 19 % 4 % 0 % 0 % 0 %

TechSearch	Alaska	1081	1263	712	88	58	91	248	43	22	1							
	Idaho	512	14866	699	7292	745	1236	2766	1517	521	62	28						
	Montana	867	4911	385	822	1645	392	899	326	437	2	3						
	Nevada	451	38742	559	1085	391	30826	2384	2606	409	404	78						
	Oregon	360	9346	1095	1639	440	1357	3777	689	199	135	15						
	Utah	263	22151	394	1598	369	2621	1072	14999	830	189	79						
	Wyoming	619	4260	313	498	486	393	327	741	1496	4	2						

Summary for TechSrch: (263) **95539** 4157 13022 4134 36916 11473 20921 3914 797 205
Total Percent of WIN: 4 % 14 % 4 % 39 % 12 % 22 % 4 % 1 % 0 %