Transcript of the NCS-X State Solicitation Teleconference Conference
Held on Tuesday, May 12, 2015

>> …[by way of] background, the purpose of this particular solicitation is to expand capacity across the states to accept incident-based data from local law enforcement agencies and report those data on the FBI's National Incident-Based Reporting System or NIBRS. We are focusing, at this point, with the funding that we were able to secure for FY 2015… specifically on implementation of new state-level IBR programs in those states that don't have that capacity within their UCR program currently, or the expansion of existing NIBRS programs--certified NIBRS programs in those states that do not have 80% or more of local law enforcement agencies reporting incident-based data to their state program. So this does exclude about 19 states from eligibility. The solicitation lists the 31 states that are eligible under this particular solicitation at this time. We are-- we recognize that those other 19 states may have some needs related to incident-based reporting and recording those data onto NIBRS right now because we had to determine priorities based on the funding that we were able to secure. We're focusing now on the other 31 states and we will hopefully have some plans in place for how to support the other 19 states at a later date. So if you are unsure about your eligibility, let me know and I can pull up that information from an appendix that is part of the solicitation online and let you know if you're eligible or not at this point.

>> Of course they have.

>> With that, I just think that we can open up the--we can open up the call to any questions that you all might have. I do have to do a quick roll call… I'd like to do a quick roll call just to find out who is actually on the line right now, and then we will go ahead and get started with your questions. So if the--we'll go around the room here. The folks at BJS who are present will let you know who you're talking to on the other end of the line. If we could then move on to any of the members of the NCS-X Implementation Team who may be taking part in the conference call, that would be great, and then we'll open it up to the folks from the states who are on the line as well. Like I said, my name is Erica Smith. I'm Chief for the Law Enforcement Statistics Unit here at the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

>> I'm Howard Snyder, Deputy Director of BJS.

>> I'm Alexia Cooper, I'm the Project Manager of BJS's side for the NCS-X Project.

>> I'm Shelley Hyland and I'm a statistician at BJS.

>> Are there any numbers of the NCS-X Implementation Team who are on the line? If you are, could you state your name and let everyone know your affiliation?

>> This is Mark Pope with RTI International.

>> And this is Karen Lissy with RTI International.

>> Dave Roberts and Betsy Self from IACP.

>> Hi, this is Becky Goggins with SEARCH.

>> It's Maria Cardiellos with the IJIS Institute.

>> Drema Fouch with the FBI UCR Program.

>> Paul Wormeli with IJIS Institute.

>> Great. Thank you all very much. I'm so glad that so many of you could join us this afternoon. So for the folks from the state UCR program too--or other state agencies that may be on the line, could we go ahead and it's--I know it's hard to do--it's hard to do on the phone, but if you could let us know your name and the state--the state and agency that you're with, that would be great.

>> From Florida, it's Sue Barton and the UCR staff.

>> Hey Sue, how are you?

>> From Nevada, it's Julie Ornellas, Special Services Manager and Erica Hall, the UCR Program Administrator.

>> Welcome.

>> Thank you.

>> From Missouri, Kyle Comer from Missouri State Highway Patrol and the UCR Program Staff.

>> Hi, Kyle.

>> Hello again.

>> From Utah, Chelsea Burns and the UCR staff.

>> From Washington State, Joan Smith, the UCR Program and the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs.

>> From Minnesota, Gary Link with the UCR Staff.

>> Hi, Gary.

>> From Maine, Tracy Poulin from the Maine Department of Public Safety.

>> George Shaler from the Maine Statistical Analysis Center.

>> Samantha Kanish from the Wyoming Division of Criminal Investigation.

>> Hi, Samantha.

>> Julie Donahue with State Police Records Management in Maine.

>> Oh, great. Thank you.

>> Did we get everyone? So let me just make sure I've got the states correctly, and if we missed anybody, please speak up. We have representatives from Florida, Nevada, Utah, Washington, Minnesota, Maine, Wyoming.

>> And Missouri.

>> And Missouri.

>> Correct.

>> Okay. All right. Thank you all for letting us jot all that down and make sure we have everyone on the line. So let's go ahead and open it up to questions. I know that some of you were already sending them along via email. So with that, actually, since I know that you have one Kyle, I'm just going to have you get things started, if you don't mind.

>> Sure. You want me to go ahead or do you want to read the email I sent you, which one?

>> Oh, why don't you go ahead?

>> Okay. That might--that might be easier--well, one of the questions that we've kind of--there's a couple of things that we've talked--we've had several internal meetings here between our senior division staff, which encapsulates our UCR Program, our IT staff as well as our SAC center. So this is all--everybody kind of has the invested interest in this grant program, and moving forward, as we go towards NIBRS. One question was kind of--it's kind of--may need some more information and some clarification on specifically what, I guess, what is a--what is an allowable cost for this? I know the cost has to be kind of related to UCR management for collecting, processing, and analyzing, but some of the questions that came up in our internal meetings were costs such as NIBRS Audit Software, or crime mapping with new NIBRS data, public web dashboards with NIBRS data to get the information out to the public and to the agencies, desktop publishing software that would allow us to produce brand new, you know, NIBRS publications for our state, software to possibly convert down from NIBRS to summary for, if necessary, for publication purposes. Video-based training, kind of, software, something to record and create new NIBRS training to be able to post on the web to agencies instead of having to do all classroom training. Those are some of the

ones that we came up with that we think are all definitely NIBRS, UCR Program related, but we weren't sure if it fits the--I guess directly support or enhanced language within a grant solicitation.

>> Okay. So I would say some of those could be justified as allowable cost and some not. Now I'll try to make sure that I hit everything that you--that you mentioned.

>> Sure. Sorry.

>> In terms of the audit software, I--in terms of audit software, the guidance I would provide is that that could be considered an allowable cost if it is--if you can make the justification in your application, that it is required in order for your state program to appropriately manage new data that is coming in from the locals, to ensure data quality, reliability across places, the validity of the information that you're receiving from the local agencies, and how it will manifest in improving the program that you currently have or standing up a better program ultimately in the long run by having that audit software capability built into the system, the system that you build to capture the data.

>> Perfect. Thank you for that clarification.

>> Sure. In terms of the crime mapping, I would say that that is probably--that would be probably--you'd have to really make a clear justification for why that is--why that would actually support the standing up of a new program or increasing the capacity to receive new data from additional agencies in your state. If you can clearly demonstrate why that is capacity-building in some way, then I would say that it would be considered as a justifiable cost within the--within your application.

>> Sure, yeah. We've already built in--you know, years ago, we built in latitude and longitude of the incident into our NIBRS specifications, so--for our additional state specifications, so that was one of our, kind of, potential selling tools that if we could expand NIBRS and open up, kind of, you know, crime mapping or--you know, to all agencies, not just certain--you know, only the 14 we have currently reporting NIBRS, that was--that was going to be, kind of, one of our selling points in our package, so just curious about that. Uh-hmm.

>> Yeah. I think it's a--it's a fine line between being able to increase the state capacity and--you know, at that core level and then with the understanding that one of the ways that you all, sort of, entice, I guess…

>> Right.

>> …the local agencies to report the incident-based data to you is by potentially having these tools that you can make available to them as well. So that's where I'd say that justification has to be clear and pretty strong in the--in the application, but if you can indicate that it's really necessary and why, then it would be considered.

>> Okay. Fair enough.

>> In terms of--I'm thinking that there is--would be less of a--less of an ability for these funds to support the public web dashboards and any desktop publishing software at this point in time, particularly just because we don't have an unlimited amount of funds right now. It's actually--we don't really know how many of these applications we're going to be able to support depending on how, you know, how many come in and how much folks are asking for. So I would probably say that those types of items are not on the table.

>> Okay.

>> And then in terms of the conversion from NIBRS to summary, we're actually trying--I shouldn't say trying, we actually have already paid another state and supported them with funding, to develop that capacity and because it is being developed with federal funds, we will hopefully be able to make that available to states relatively soon, sometime by the end of the year, for use in their own programs as well. And I think, you know, the--and the FBI has resources for that as well that we might bring to bear for that process, so I would say that's probably not something that is critical to support.

>> Sure.

>> Again, unless you can make the case that you're going to have to do that for some interim amount of time and there's some reason why you would have to build that capacity differently within your own program.

>> Okay.

>> Oh, there's one last item, the video--the video-based training software.

>> Howard, what do you think about that?

>> Well, I know that the FBI has talked about doing a lot more video training, and I'd like to hear what Drema's thoughts are on that, but I thought that the--there could be a lot more attention at the FBI level to do training around NIBRS. Now, I know there's need for special training within the states. I mean, honestly, this is--this is likely--just be ready for the actual cost of this. You know, if it costs 40 bucks, that's not a problem, but if it costs a lot, that's a problem. Oh, if you think it's necessary, if you could make a case for it, fine. But certainly, I think--the way I think about these grants, is that--or application, is this is--could be like line item veto problems.

>> Yeah.

>> This is not--because we just can't afford this and--because we have a limited amount of money and the capability. So I think it's reasonable to say that the--that the--if the--

you can make a strong case for it and the cost is reasonable, that may be a possibility, but it's probably right on the edge.

>> And the other thing…

>> I think…

>> …too is that if some of what you proposed can be leveraged, like if there's a core that would be developed, like with the video-based training that could be leveraged by other states, then that would certainly be something that we would consider more heavily because it would get us more bang for the buck.

>> Good point. Thank you.

>> Uh-hmm. All right. So are there other questions about any of the required criteria in the solicitation, or any of the elements that you guys are wondering about?

>> This is Julie Ornellas Nevada Department of Public Safety. I have some questions and some comments about the solicitation, and in the front end, the--you know, in the opening statements are indicating in the grant that it is for states but don't have any, you know, NIBRS participation at all and we haven't developed anything, but when you start reading about what the application must include, you know, there's a lot of criteria there that we don't know yet because we've never been in the planning stage for this. So how would we even indicate that in the solicitation?

>> That's a really good question. I'm going to scroll just on my own document to make sure that I'm looking at the exact right requirements that are in the document, but we did anticipate that there were going to be a number of states that are in a similar situation where you'd essentially be forced to put your best guess on how much of the--on how much each of those required elements was going to cost to--was going to cost within the structure of the application. And we--that's why we wanted to indicate that we can provide some materials to you for that process. And also--let me just make sure I get to the right place. Sorry, it's just my computer is not moving very quickly right now. We have some materials that are available or are about to be available on the BJS website. One of which is documentation on the readiness assessments that we have conducted under the NCS-X pilot work that we've undertaken over the last 18 months to 2 years. That may be a place to start. And we also have a set of questions that we generally tend to ask--the team generally tends to ask of the state program at the beginning of the process. So things like--and we will get these posted on the BJS website, too. They're going to be on the NCS-X page. So just for you all to know how to actually get there, you--if you go to the bjs.gov website and just type into our search box, just at the top there, "NCS-X", it'll be the first link that pops up. We will--we'll make sure that this is posted under Resources for State and Local Agencies, I believe, is the header or something similar to that. But questions like, you know, will your state need to acquire new software or a database repository in order to collect and then--and store incident-based data? Do you anticipate needing additional staff if your program moves to an

incident-based system? If so, you know, provide some--how many staff would you need and some sort of workforce analysis that you might--that you might perform to make that determination. Are there any training needs that will be required for state program staff to make that transition? That might be something akin to what Kyle was talking about with the video-based training that you might be able to develop for your own--for your own staff as well as for any of the local agencies that begin reporting IBR data to your agency. Does your state UCR program currently train other local agencies about how to collect UCR data? Would that training need to change? Would there need to be more of it in order to have those local agencies report IBR to you? So we have a series of these questions and--that we will post online, things for your consideration in the application that may help a little bit in making some of those budget determinations. And then the implementation of the readiness assessment--what are the required elements within NIBRS and how can you crosswalk that information onto the NIBRS elements--may be helpful for you as well.

>> Here at the State of Nevada, I guess our biggest concern is we, you know, we definitely, you know, understand the need to transition over to NIBRS from the summary reporting. However, we're in a bit--the middle of a modernization with our whole system here, and all of our business process analysts that could even help us dissect any of this to get you answers, to even apply and give you even a best guess, we're not going to have it in time to actually apply for this grant. I mean, we would really like to use this grant to actually, like, hire a contracted BPA and someone that can help us do our planning and actually assess what we would need to do as far as any hardware-software staff training in the interfaces with our law enforcement agencies, but without somebody to assist us with that front end assessment, it would be nearly impossible at this point.

>> That's exactly what your application should say.

>> Okay.

>> Now I know this is probably a little, like, more simplified, then it really needs to be, but for the claims grants, we do understand that you're going to be in a--like, you're going to feel like you're behind the eight-ball, and that the application should address how anyone that you contract with will be chosen based on the needs that have to be assessed during that planning phase.

>> Okay.

>> So instead of actually--it is worded--I'm looking at the wording now and I can see how it could be interpreted. To me, you need to do all those things yourself, but it should say, like, we're going to--we're going to hire consultants with these particular--with this particular background, with this expertise, and that's what's going to allow them to do these assessments for us, to help us determine the increased technical capacity that we need, any of the systems requirements that are part of this process, et cetera. Does that help?

>> Okay. Yeah, and it makes me feel much better.

>> Very good.

>> Yeah.

>> [inaudible]

>> So the…

>> And that was--I'm speaking for Nevada so I'm--thank you for that clarification. I really appreciate that, that helps us a lot.

>> Sure, absolutely. I'm wondering if that maybe took care of a number of questions that people might have had. Are there any other questions from folks on the line?

>> Yeah, this is Florida. We'd just like to maybe get some elaboration on the NCS-X Implementation Team's collaboration for the planning part of--part of it. What were you envisioning there?

>> Are you referring to the collaboration with the NCS-X Team?

>> Right.

>> So really, our vision for--the reason why we included that requirement is basically so that we can keep this project coordinated in some way. We--again, based on the--you know, the funding that we have available, we are really not sure how many states are going to end up with successful applications, you know, because we don't--we don't really know whether all of you who are eligible will apply, and then we also don't know how much you're going to ask for it. So it could--it could be a relatively large number of agencies that we are making awards to, and we wanted to be able to keep that--keep that coordinated with the larger goals of NCS-X in general. And to do that, we felt the best way--the best way we can do that was to ensure that the NCS-X Implementation Team was an integral part of the planning processes that you all engage in, or the implementation that you engage in at the state level. That will allow us to understand if there are some commonalities that can be leveraged across the states. If there are activities that one state is engaging in that, because it's being done with federal dollars, we may be able to transfer some of that knowledge over to another--or software development, if that's what it might be, over to another state. And so that was our main goal with ensuring that we have the full team's participation in this process. I mean, and let's see about that [inaudible]

>> Yeah. And just to give a slight expansion on that, that statement is not intended to mean that the Implementation Team is going to tell you how to do your planning or implementation?

>> Very true.

>> It's not intended to mean we are going to dictate how you do what you do. It is more intended to help--that we can provide web resources for you as you go through the process. So if there are questions that come up, or issues that come up, or things we discover from other states that could be helpful, we can help provide that coordination and information, not be involved in every little nitty-gritty thing and tell you, "No. You won't do this. Yes, you won't do this." It's not like--not like that.

>> It's more to operate as a group of folks that can provide technical assistance, provide information about what's been--what's been done or options that we have determined with other states that we've worked with or that are—or what we will be working with through this process. But the other thing to keep in mind that I was just reminded of is that you don't have to factor that into your budget. That's--that technical assistance that the team can provide is already handled elsewhere. So you'll be able to leverage their expertise without having to include that information as a budget item for yourselves in the application.

>> Okay. Actually, that sounds excellent. We were hoping we would have a staff resource that could help us out with everything. So having worked with them already--some, we were looking forward to that. I just wanted to get an idea of the scope of what that would be. The other…

>> Very good.

>> …question of--is just--in terms of how much funding is available, I have to throw that out there just to--for the planning segments. If there's anything you all can say about that.

>> Yeah. I think it's safe to say that we were envisioning, of course, the planning awards to be a smaller dollar amount than the implementation awards of course. I don't want to put a cap on it though, because I think every state is going to have some different--I think if there's anything that we've learned in this process so far, every state has different challenges. There are some commonalities in the types of things that need to be assessed in the process, but definitely, the responses on the back end and how detailed that has to be is--has proven to be different across all the states. So I would say if you can--whenever you're low--whenever you're--not low end, I didn't mean to say that. Whatever your--whatever your final estimate is, if you can make a clear justification for all the components, then it will be considered.

>> Okay. Thanks.

>> Sure.

>> Well, I can certainly say that if the--if the--if the raw figure is very high, there will be the possibility of negotiating things down. I'm just going to [inaudible] your office aid.

>> Right.

>> So--but that's going to be like we want you give a high, fat, big numbers either. No.

>> Are there any other questions?

>> Yes. This is Joan Smith from Washington State.

>> Hi, Joan.

>> And we are a NIBRS agency. We've been pretty successful in getting our state implemented. We're--we have a few very large counties left to go because they've been upgrading their records management system and--systems, excuse me, and then we have several tribal agencies who have not implemented and so we're on the eligibility list. However, my repository is failing and in--our vendor will not--they will not do any more upgrades to it. So I'm faced with, I need to either look at a new repository with a different vendor, or be forced to take their "new product" that is actually not too much better than their failing product in a different platform. It's not been fully tested. It was off-the-shelf RMS that they've been attempting to convert into a repository, and there are several data validation problems. It's a very poor product and we've been testing it for almost three years, trying to get it to be a repository. It's not working out very well. So I know there are rules about supplanting and all sorts of other things. I'm not trying to do that. I just--I'm afraid I won't have a NIBRS repository in a few months, so this is my dilemma. I want to apply for it to be able to expand my program but I'm afraid my programming will collapse if I don't get a new repository. How do I approach this?

>> Gosh, I think--I think I would say that, you know, if the--if the way to expand your program is to invest in a new repository, then you should include that in your application and indicate why--indicate, you know, the short--the challenges that you're faced right now with the current not-quite repository that you're--that you have. It's--you believe that transitioning to a new product would be a better option, and some--you know, maybe a talk a bit about the functionality of other--of other repository options that are available, how you're going to make that decision about the right one to go with, you know, sort of leveraging the--I used that word a lot today. You know, taking a look at the cost benefit of going with, you know, the various options that are out there. Talk a little bit about that process that you'll engage in, and then how you think that will also help support getting some of those other large counties and the tribal agencies that are still left to convert, and how you think it will just be, you know, helpful to the same program down the road as it pipelines from the local agency, to the state, to the FBI. I think that would be--I think that would be good.

>> Okay. You don't think this is in a dangerous territory of the supplanting or anything like that?

>> No. I don't think that--we certainly do not view it that way in terms of the overall NCS-X project implementation in the long run.

>> Okay.

>> So I would--I would say that we would evaluate--we would evaluate your application with that information, and then based on the merits of the argument for certain…

>> Okay. Well--and it truly is. I mean, but up to this point, it's been a pretty robust system until they started writing their .net platform, and now just since November, I've had, you know, 20 issues I've had to report to them. And they, you know, some of them, they can fix. Some of them, they say, "No, we're not going to put any more effort into this legacy system." And yet, you know, their .net platform is not nearly ready yet and we're facing--you know, they won't even move it over to our new servers and our old servers won't be supported after June 30th, so security risk coming up. So, you know, I'm really stuck in this tough spot of I need--I need something to happen soon, you know, I haven't had funding so thank you for the funding opportunity.

>> Sure, absolutely.

>> [inaudible] an example of where the NCS-X Implementation Team could help, the--this--I imagine the different states should talk to each other, but in case they don't in this area, the team should know what went on with all the states, what other states' repository software is being used and how well it's being done, or I would love to have you talk about how badly yours is going so no one else will make that same mistake.

>> Absolutely, I've already warned the…

>> [inaudible]

>> So--but just a year ago, things were relatively good and now it has circled the drain so quickly. I've already warned a couple people that, "Hey, please don't go there because they've always had customer service issues." And now not only are the customer service issues still bad, but they're--actually, their product has become so horrible, I would never recommend them to anyone. Except my worst enemy, so…

>> Well, that's the kind of knowledge and experience that we hope that we can--that we can help to share among the states, through the team or through the means we have, with three [inaudible] whatever that is so that--we may be getting an application from some state that proposes to use that software you don't like and we could--we'd [inaudible]

>> Absolutely. And I wrote my application, the current system that I'm using, and, you know, what's happening here. So they're all very nice people but still, it's a failing system and they can't seem to get it to the point where it needs to be a really solid--you

know, I can't even pull reports. We just finished up our crime in Washington, our annual report, and I couldn't rely on that repository report system to give me accurate statistics to do our annual report, and that's not good. That--it was really difficult for my staff, and we had to recheck, and check, and double check, and I always have two people doing the work so it made it much more complex than it needed to be because the statistics were so poor coming out of that system.

>> Wow. Well yeah, I would say…

>> So…

>> …that definitely, if you can provide--if you can provide all that background, you know, then we will--we will certainly consider the application.

>> Okay, perfect. Thank you.

>> Great, thank you.

>> I'll just say we're in a--we're in a similar situation where the product is just going to a dead end, and so we're going to have to replace the repository as well, but it sounded like maybe they had a product in mind. I know--I know we're going to have to get a competitive bid, which might affect how to write the response to the solicitation. Any suggestions on how try to craft that in the--in the nature of having [inaudible] we've gotten a couple of bids out of FYI's and talking to companies, so, I mean, I've got some handle on potential cost, but I just couldn't give an exact cost.

>> Sure. Well, it's--so there's a couple things here. First, you're from Maine, is that correct?

>> No, I'm from Nebraska.

>> Oh, Nebraska. Where…

>> I came on late. I had another meeting. I just jumped on the line with you, so…

>> Oh, okay [inaudible]

>> Oh, is this Mike?

>> Yes.

>> Oh, Mike, how are you?

>> It sounds like you, Mike.

>> Oh, howdy, everybody. I don't…

>> Sorry.

>> Oh, no, no, no, I'm sorry. I just snuck in after my other meeting got out, so I'm…

>> Well, so there's a couple--I think a couple issues there, right? So first, if you have already put out an RFP, then presumably, there's funding there to support that currently.

>> No, we didn't have an RFP. We just got a, kind of informal RFI to try to get some cost estimates to run by our state budget folks, but we're not going to get funding, so…

>> I see, okay. So I--well, okay, so let's think about it. Yeah, I would say that you include the information you got, you know, that you gathered through the RFI, you know, as the justification for final cost that you would need to put out the RFP, and then go--I'm not sure if you were on the line when we were talking about this a little bit ago. You know, taking a look at those elements required for the planning grant, the application should say something about how you're going to let out the RFP for the system and how we're going to do--you know, how you're going to engage in these various assessments and determining how much technical capacity that the systems need that you have as part of that process. You don't--the application on the planning side doesn't have to indicate exactly what those assessments are, but how you're going to guarantee that--or well, make assurances, I guess. How you're going to make assurances that the way that you--the people that you use to do those assessments actually have the expertise to do it.

>> Okay.

>> And if you're on the--do you think that you would be applying for planning or implementation fully?

>> Probably implementation.

>> Okay. Just let me make sure I have the right requirements in front of me.

>> Yeah. Yeah.

>> Yeah, then I would say that probably, what you learned from RFI can be really important for justifying the cost of the system, and then having some knowledge based on, you know--but you guys are a hybrid reporting state right now, is that correct?

>> Correct. Yeah. So we need to…

>> So…

>> …guarantee interfaces and merging data.

>> Right. And you have some of that experience about how that--you have experience already about how that works.

>> Right.

>> So I--so then you do have to be a little bit more specific in your application about how you're assessing the increase for [inaudible] associated with expanding the NIBRS collection, how you're going to--you know, how you've gone about making that--doing that analysis of the technical capacity, and so it has to be a little bit more on the--on the back end. Some clear dollar figures, FTE, workforce analysis type of information that is included in your application.

>> Okay. Okay. Sounds good.

>> Great.

>> I have some real minutiae questions. This is [inaudible] from Florida. I was--okay [inaudible] like to go to ASUCRP out--to visit other states that already have a fully-functioning NIBRS. That's something we would approach other states, possibly in conjunction with the NCS-X group the adviser format, how do you all feel about that?

>> Oh, having using ASUCRP as a resource for advice in the process?

>> Attending the--cost to attend conference.

>> Oh, probably not, unfortunately. I can see--I can see where you're headed with that, but that would be a good place to talk with other people about this process, but I don't think that that would be a cost that we would want to support as part of this solicitation. Yeah.

>> I thought it was worth asking.

>> Absolutely.

>> We have the same problem here. Conference attendance is very difficult to get--supported by the financial team.

>> Right.

>> Very hard.

>> This is Kyle from Missouri. A question regarding, I guess--I guess one of our bigger problems, and I know most states have the same thing, is, you know, we have hundreds of agencies with either no RMS or a antiquated RMS that we just know they're not going to upgrade or--maybe the RMS might not even be upgradeable to become NIBRS compliant. I know Ohio, Michigan, North Carolina, they've all kind of turned to the idea

of coming up with, kind of, a state NIBRS compliant RMS. I think that's the direction that we would look into to kind of solve that problem. How do we get, you know, how do we get these agencies up to NIBRS compliancy without adding, you know, either non or, kind of, minimal technical ability and funding? Is that something you guys, I guess, support, or do you have an opinion on, or pros and cons either way of state programs kind of developing a state RMS or at least a state or web-based reporting tool to gather that data?

>> Absolutely. I wish we were a little further down the road as a general--you know, within the rubric of the general NCS-X work and being able to even offer some sort of product for this, but--and any of you from the Implementation Team who'd want to jump in on this, please feel free, but, you know, we have--like New Jersey for instance, so Maria, if you want to say a little bit more about that, they're working to establish a web-based or a cloud-based system for New Jersey. So there definitely are some states and even, like, regionally-based sets of local agencies that are trying to come together in a similar way to try to keep cost down, which would certainly be what you're talking about here. Will you be able to offer one product to a bunch of different agencies, especially those that don't have a lot of quantity into a system? So yeah, I mean, Maria, do you want to say--if you have a second to say a little bit more about what's going on in New Jersey and sort of how they're approaching this?

>> Absolutely. I can tell you that the preferred vendor in New Jersey is a data aggregator, and without necessarily mentioning the names, first of all, we can certainly either hook you up with representatives from New Jersey and let them discuss with you, and certainly our facilitations, the, sort of, the basis for their design, because as I'm understanding from the question, it really is about trying to collect the entirety of the audience when some of them are big players, some of them have tools, some of them don't, some of them are the mom and pop shops, and that is the diversity that New Jersey faces. So at this juncture, they're going to go from UCR to NIBRS, funnelling it through the 21 counties, and where providers or where service agencies may not have the tools, there will this--there will be this web-based approach. So honestly, it's taking some time to finally get to a solution that makes sense and may make financial sense, so if you would like at the--Kyle, was that your question?

>> Yes, it was.

>> We certainly hope--okay. So certainly, we could set up what would be a conference call before, during, or after any of these activities and get into more detail, and where there are lessons learned or where others would like to participate, we can certainly facilitate that in one session or in--or in multiple sessions because what I would say is that where the data aggregator in New Jersey has had a long standing relationship with them and has proven it, there are other providers out there doing similar things. Not a lot of them, because many of them may not be data aggregators, but the basis for the technology and the new design is there, so we wouldn't want it limited to just one, but we could certainly share those experiences.

>> Kyle [inaudible] Kyle, this is Paul. There's at least several states that have now adopted a cloud-computing based RMS to serve the smaller organizations and kind of [inaudible] taking in particular. There are now at least [inaudible] providers that are offering other solutions. We can help you get in touch [inaudible] matter.

>> That'd be great, Paul. I appreciate it.

>> Hey, this is Becky. Also, Kyle, I know that there's at least eight states that have state platforms that are web-based that are--they're not fully robust RMS systems, but they certainly have basic functionality, seven of those, they offer for free to the smaller agencies. One has a per officer per year charge to it, but I had the contact information for their state program managers, if that would be helpful as well.

>> Sure. I'll take any I can get just as we, kind of, iron out our details on how we're going to move forward here because we have, you know, we have quite a bit--we have 650 agencies we're trying to service and I know some of our big ones are going to keep what they have because they have, you know, expensive, customized RMS systems, but we have--we got to fill that hole there that's going to have a lot of agencies where they're not going to know where to turn or they have nothing to turn to, so we're going to have to be the ones to be able to fill that void with something that stays hosted.

>> That makes a lot sense, Kyle.

>> I think the other things to consider when you're--it--for you--for you there in Missouri as well for any of the other state agencies that might think that would be--some of them will be useful to some of the agencies in their states, definitely, if you can identify the agencies--the local agencies in your state that are part of the sample of 400 law enforcement agencies that were pulled for the NCS-X project. Let's talk about how that particular product might help convert those 400--you know, your subset of that 400-- those 400 agencies, that would be something to include your application.

>> Perfect. Thank you.

>> Yup. Other questions?

>> Well, this is Kyle again, I guess I'll just keep going and I'll take--I'll hijack the phone call here if no one else has a question. But the next thing, I know it's on the, kind of, the plates of other states too, is kind of, what is the BJS/FBI position, kind of, on index data moving forward, or at least using this grant application at this point of--historical point of NIBRS conversion to start the forward-thinking and consider building a system that will also take index data as well converted NIBRS data?

>> I guess, I'll start that off and then turn it over to Drema to maybe make a few more comments specific specific to the FBI's position. I think that our concern from BJS's standpoint is that whatever is proposed needs to ensure that the data--that whatever system is in place to capture the incident-based data has a way of ensuring the

reliability and validity of the information that's received. Right now, it's my understanding that the way that data come in the index, those types of data quality assurances are not built into the system, that it is not structured in a way that NIBRS is, and I don't just mean the edit and validation checks, I just--I mean the structured way that the data must be provided, it doesn't exist in the same way within the index IEPD, in its structure. And so we are--we do have a state that is a pilot for NCS-X that is attempting to build a successful single submission. It's single submission from the local agencies to the state, but it is--but it's at the state level that the agency is--has determined what they say right now, and it has yet to be fully tested. A successful way for the state to split those two--those two pieces out is submit index separately and NIBRS separately up to the FBI. So it's not single submission from the states, but it's single submission from the locals, and they have crosswalked the index and the diverse IEPDs in a way that they say was working on their test front, but they haven't yet tested that capability with the FBI. So I don't think anyone thinks that should be off the table because certainly, simplification and data integration is the name of the game, but it--we have to ensure that the data quality checks that are present right now in the NIBRS system and the way that it's constructed so far that we can ensure that those still invest moving forward. And Drema, I don't know if you want to add anything to add, so please feel free to jump in.

>> I think you covered our position pretty well, Erica. However, I will say that I was just in a meeting with some of the index folks and Mr. Darvis, and right now, the FBI--the single submission solution is off the table, but we do support the single submission coming in from the locals to the state level and the state leading those and sending the FBI to states, one to index and one to NIBRS. And right now, that's really all we're supporting as far as working with index. More to come if, you know, that changes.

>> I'm sorry. We're kind of under a mandate here, kind of, you know, kind of the modernization push to be efficient and, you know, less connections, let's not reinvent the wheel two years later and start building seven hundred index interfaces so it's kind of trying to be forward-thinking and efficient. If we could build it now--at least make the capability built now that we can actually get everybody onboard at one time.

>> That's understood. And we--you know, of course, everybody's pushing for modernization, so--and everything is such a change.

>> Well, and if I can interject here, Erica, if you wouldn't mind, just to sort of--I won't say commercial, but at least a statement from the IJIS, but--Kyle, just in response to where I think you're going with your questions, like coming from the December meetings, just understand none of that, as Erica said, is off the table. We understand collectively, and as an enterprise, the value to it. It's just at this moment, right? So just be aware that we understand the utility of it, we just--you know, we are where we are right now.

>> Okay.

>> Yeah, I will--I will agree and I would also add that if North Carolina is the pilot state, then I don't think there's anybody who's surprised here. North Carolina is the pilot state that we've working with. They have developed, again, what they say is this ability to take a single submission from the locals. They are quite excited, to be honest with you, about the possibility of sharing this capability with other states, should you all want it. So we could potentially--if you--if you wanted it, we could put you in touch with some of the folks at--in North Carolina who might be able to at least let you know about their plan--you know, what their--how they went through the planning process, share any documents with you that they might be willing to do at this point in time. They've been pretty open about their desire to make this information available as a resource to others.

>> Yeah. I mean, that's great. I know--I know I can always reach out to Jim Parker [ph] or whoever the UCR program manager. He's done some presentations for the UCR subcommittee on this--on this exact single submission topic. I was just making sure for myself and other similarly situated states who are considering this, it's not that we are not allowed to include an index single submission concept in our plan, it's not off the table, it's just still kind of conceptual so we could include it moving forward if we want to.

>> Yeah. And I think it's a slip of the single submission notion, right, instead of the single submission to the FBI and single submission review.

>> Yes. We know that's off the table. It's from the locals' mistake, exactly like North Carolina.

>> Yeah. No, I would say that that--that that would be something, if you--that's the direction you want to go in, that would be considered.

>> Okay. Great.

>> And [inaudible] key to that, is that at the local level, the NIBRS submission is--goes through the edit and checks at the local level to make sure that the right codes are used, and the right fields are completed, and index has been laid on top of that. Just as [inaudible] might get to the state level, so the state then tries to figure it out, and recode index fields into NIBRS codes. So that's been shown to not be able to work.

>> Right. Right.

>> Any other questions? Any other questions from folks on the phone?

>> Kyle?

>> No, I've used up my time, thanks.

>> All right. All right. Well, we have another call on Friday at 1:00. For anyone who could make it today, if you all think of any questions in the meantime, you can always hop back on that call as well. And any other questions, you can send to the @BJS

email address that's listed in the solicitation and that will get routed to one of us in the room. And we will do our best to respond very quickly to that because we know that we're under a tight timeline for your applications in the first place, so this--the audio transcript of this will be up within, I believe, 72 hours, if not sooner, of this call. That's a goal. Anyway, so that if anything was said you want to listen back to--you know, have this exciting call playing in the background in your office, that would be great. It'll be available to you. We're also going to try to write up the questions that you all asked and the responses to the best of our ability, but if you want the audio, it will be available.

>> Okay. Thank you.

>> Well, thank you all very much. We really appreciate it and we look forward to seeing your applications.

>> Great, thank you for calling.

>> Bye.

>> Thank you.

>> Thanks Erica, great job.