FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

REQUEST FOR INFORMATION (RFI) 1523
FOR
Statewide Law Enforcement
Data Sharing System

January 30, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Name	Definition
CJIS	Criminal Justice Information Services
CJNet	Criminal Justice Network
COPLINK	Name of the IBM software used for data sharing by R-LEX and TBSN
CVS	Concurrent Versions System
DOJ	Department of Justice
ESB	Enterprise Service Bus
ETL	Extract, transform, and load
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FDLE	Florida Department of Law Enforcement
FINDER	Florida Integrated Network for Data Exchange and Retrieval (Region 5 – Central Florida)
FLEX	Florida Law Enforcement Exchange
FS	Florida Statutes
GUI	Graphical User Interface
IEPD	Information Exchange Packet Document
JMS	Jail Management System
LETTR	Law Enforcement Technology, Training, & Research
LEXS	Logical eXchange Specification
LEXS-PD	Logical eXchange Specification – Publish and Discovery
LEXS-SR	Logical eXchange Specification – Search and Retrieval
MDT	Mobile Data Terminal
NCIS	Naval Criminal Investigative Service
N-DEx	The FBI's National Data Exchange
NIEM	National Information Exchange Model
ORI	Originating Agency Identification
RDSTF	Regional Domestic Security Task Force
RFI	Request for Information
R-LEX	Regional Law Enforcement Exchange (Statewide Law Enforcement, Regions 2 – North Florida, 6 – Southwest Florida, 7 – Southeast Florida); COPLINK
SAML	Security Assertion Markup Language
SE LInX	Southeast Law Enforcement Information Exchange (Region 3 – Northeast Florida and participating Georgia Agencies)
SmartShare	Northwest Florida Domestic Security Task Force Data Share System (Region 1 – Northwest Florida)
State Node	"Region" used to designate statewide law enforcement agencies
TBSN	Tampa Bay Security Network (Region 4 – Tampa Bay Area); COPLINK
WAN	Wide Area Network
WBS	Work Breakdown Structure
XML	eXtensible Markup Language

I.   INTRODUCTION

The Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE), Information Technology Services is requesting information regarding technology and systems that are available to provide and support the sharing of law enforcement data across all jurisdictions in the State of Florida.

II.   PURPOSE OF AN RFI

Pursuant to Rule 60A-1.042, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), an agency may request information by issuing a written Request for Information. Agencies may use Requests for Information in circumstances including, but not limited to, determining whether or not to competitively procure a commodity or contractual services, determining what solicitation process to use for a particular need, or researching general, special, and/or technical specifications for a solicitation. A Vendor's response to an RFI is not an offer and the agency may not use the Vendor's submission to justify a contract with that Vendor without otherwise complying with Chapter 287, F.S., and Rule 60A-1.042, F.A.C. Vendors submitting a response to an agency's RFI are not prohibited from responding to any related subsequent solicitation.

III.   BACKGROUND

Terrorists are among the most mobile, organized, and determined of all criminals. In the aftermath of 9/11, federal, state, and local jurisdictions recognized that the skillful acquisition, intelligent harnessing and systematic sharing of information was essential to providing domestic security within our jurisdictions.

In late 2001, one region broached the idea of a statewide data sharing system at the first meeting of the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Committee. By 2003, a number of independent law enforcement data integration projects were in various stages of development and implementation. Over time, the value and need for data sharing became evident, and Florida developed a statewide strategy to further ensure interoperability and standardization of the various projects.

In March 2004, FDLE formed a Data Integration Workgroup, comprised of state and local law enforcement representatives from the seven Regional Domestic Security Task Forces (RDSTFs) across Florida. The Workgroup was tasked to create a statewide criminal information and intelligence sharing strategy for Florida. In creating the statewide strategy, the Workgroup identified several issues related to the regional data sharing integration projects. These included such things as compatibility among regional and state systems; the capacity of Criminal Justice Network (CJNet) to support the increased traffic and demands on these systems; privacy and security of each system's information; and, the future financial requirements to continue the various programs. The future financial requirements are particularly important if ongoing operations are funded by grants or other similar discretionary funding sources. In addition, to ensure

statewide interoperability, it was essential that each regional project be designed to meet the minimum standards developed by the Data Workgroup or Technical Subcommittee.

The statewide strategy was approved by the Domestic Security Oversight Board in December of 2004. Consistent with the approved state strategy, data integration projects were funded and initiated within all seven Regional Domestic Security Task Force (RDSTF) Regions to form a statewide information sharing network connecting the regional data sources. This strategy provided the ability to expand the availability, amount, quality, and data analytic capacity in performing crime analysis and domestic security detection of current and potential threats. The strategic goals were defined at that time and are as follows:

- Create a flexible, scalable information sharing system to meet future needs and partnerships
- Operate in accordance with established national standards and position Florida to share data with other states and the federal government
- Minimize impact to existing systems/agencies
- Eliminate redundant capture of data
- Ensure security of information that controls access and dissemination of data
- Balance investigative effectiveness with the privacy rights of individuals
- Provide relevant and useful information incorporating factual data analysis and maximize the use of the system to have greater applicability and multiple purposes

Regional Data Sharing Systems Overview

The data sharing projects began with the seven RDSTF regions and for the purposes of data sharing, statewide law enforcement agencies are considered to be a separate group called the "State Node". When the Statewide Data Sharing Strategy was created in 2004, some regions already had data sharing systems, and other regions began a search for vendors to support the strategy. Some regions had already spent significant amounts of time and money on data sharing systems within their region and desired to keep their systems. Based on those investments the decision was made to keep those existing regional systems in place and have the other regions procure their own systems. The long-term plan was to join all of the data sharing systems together in a single statewide system when all of the regional systems were completed.

Region 1 (Northwest), partnered with a local vendor, CTS America, to develop a regional data sharing system called SmartShare. Regions 2 (North), 6 (Southwest), 7 (Southeast), and statewide law enforcement (State Node) partnered together to procure the COPLINK system from Knowledge Computing Corporation (now IBM) to create the Regional Law Enforcement eXchange (R-LEX). Region 3 (Northeast) partnered with Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS) and a group of agencies in Georgia to create the Southeast Law Enforcement Information Exchange (SE LInX) system. The system is owned by the U.S. Navy and the system was developed and is currently supported by Northrop Grumman. Region 4 (West) also selected COPLINK to form the Tampa Bay Security Network (TBSN). Region 5 (Central) had already established the

Florida Integrated Network for Data Exchange and Retrieval (FINDER) system in partnership with the University of Central Florida and the Center for Law Enforcement Technology, Training, & Research (LETTR). The regions and system memberships are summarized in the table below:

Region	System	Vendor	System Type
1 - Northwest Florida	SmartShare	CTS America	Distributed Query
2 - North Florida	R-LEX	IBM	Data Warehouse
3 - Northeast Florida	SE LInX	Northrop Grumman	Data Warehouse
4 - West Florida	TBSN	IBM	Data Warehouse
5 - Central Florida	FINDER	LETTR	Distributed Query
6 - Southwest Florida	R-LEX	IBM	Data Warehouse
7 - Southeast Florida	R-LEX	IBM	Data Warehouse
State Node	R-LEX	IBM	Data Warehouse

In recent years, attempts to interconnect these systems have proven more difficult than anticipated based on the differences between systems, vendor capabilities, and the use of a challenging technical standard. In light of these experiences, when the new Statewide Data Sharing Committee was formed in 2014, its members were unified in direction and the commitment to having one statewide system for statewide data sharing.

Data Warehouses and Distributed Systems

While all of the regional systems are made up of participating agencies and partners, it is important to understand that there are two different models in place: data warehouse and distributed systems. SE LInX, R-LEX, and TBSN are data warehouse systems that import data and store it in large central databases. These databases are updated with new records and modifications to records on a regular (typically daily) basis. When a user runs a query, it is against this central database where all of the data is stored. FINDER and SmartShare are both distributed systems which means the data is exported from the agency's system(s) and stored in a database at each agency (instead of a centralized location). When a user queries the system, that query is distributed to these databases that are stored on a server at each location and the results that are returned from each agency are then combined and displayed as one set of consolidated results.

Both types of systems have their advantages and disadvantages, and the decision to go with one technology over the other was based on differing design philosophies and at the time, there was a reluctance by some to put their data into a data warehouse. The regions that selected a data warehouse system saw their system's primary use as a tool for investigators and analysts. The data warehouse provided a means to run sophisticated queries and use analytical tools to search for leads and search for links and patterns. The regions that selected the distributed query systems were primarily looking for real-time data that could be used by the officer in their vehicle as a means of enhancing officer safety. This idea of analytical vs. operational use was the driver

behind their decisions, but both types of systems are capable of on-the-road and analytical use.

State and National Data Sharing Systems

In 2012, the regional data sharing systems began working together to form the Florida Law Enforcement eXchange (FLEX). This system is based on a Hub that routes queries and results between Florida's regional data sharing systems. This design allows the individual systems to remain autonomous but have query access to the other systems through their native interface. The Hub was completed in early 2014 with the four systems sharing data, but only three systems (FINDER, SE LInX, & TBSN) are capable of querying those four systems at present. The system was based on the Logical Entity eXchange Specification (LEXS) framework for the development of information exchanges created by the Department of Justice (DOJ). The ambiguous nature and overall complexity of the LEXS standard has created difficulty and delays for the vendors working on the project. The final two systems, R-LEX and SmartShare, are working to complete their interfaces to query (R-LEX) or query and send results (SmartShare). All of the systems are expected to be fully-connected by early 2015.

On the national level, there are two data sharing systems that are accessible to law enforcement. As part of the development of LInX, the Navy's NCIS created the Law Enforcement Defense Data Exchange (D-DEx) for the Department of Defense. This portion of the LInX system contains data from all branches of the military law enforcement agencies. Additionally, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has developed the National Data Exchange (N-DEx) which houses data from most of the Federal law enforcement agencies and many state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies. N-DEx is the system that Florida would like to participate in for data sharing via submission and data query purposes. Currently, SE LInX is querying N-DEx data and is working on the process of submitting their data to N-DEx.

Information Regarding Florida's Law Enforcement Agencies

Some aspects of Florida's law enforcement agencies may be unique to this region of the United States or to Florida and may be of help to vendors completing their responses. These distinctions (in no particular order) are as follows:
- A law enforcement agency in Florida is defined as an agency with law enforcement officers, with the key distinction being that these officers possess arrest powers
- In all 67 counties, the Sheriff's Offices run or oversee management of the local jails and the associated jail management system (JMS)
- Miami-Dade Police Department and the Jacksonville Sheriff's Office have merged with their respective Sheriff's Office or police department(s) and their names are consistent with the county and city of their jurisdictions, respectively
- Numerous small municipalities have contracted with the Sheriff's Office in their county to provide policing services
- Some police departments have shared records management systems (RMS) with the Sheriff's Office in their county

- The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission officers are dually-deputized as State and Federal law enforcement officers
- The Florida Highway Patrol runs a computer-aided dispatch (CAD) system called the "Joint Dispatch" that is used by all statewide law enforcement agencies
- Florida statute prohibits the storage of system firearms data that is not part of an investigation records in a state system
- Juvenile and sexual assault victim records are not public records, but they can be shared among law enforcement
- FDLE maintains three registry databases: Florida Career Offender Application for Statewide Tracking, Missing Endangered Persons Information Clearinghouse, and Florida Sexual Offenders and Predators
- Palm Beach County is in Region 7, a region of R-LEX, but has elected to participate in FINDER for their regional data sharing needs. Other regions have also elected to participate in FINDER in addition to their regional data sharing system.
- Florida has over 50 RMS, JMS, and pawn vendors, which has complicated data sharing efforts in the past due to the large variety of architectures and disparate standards of databases and technologies used by these systems

Detailed information about Florida's current data sharing systems can be found in Appendix A: Current Data Sharing Systems Information.

IV.   STATEMENT OF NEED AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION

General Description
The information obtained from responses to this RFI will be used to support FDLE's request for funding to complete this effort. The primary purpose of this RFI is to obtain information from qualified vendors regarding:
- Products available for law enforcement data sharing in a statewide environment
- Specific architectural and technological improvements now available for data sharing
- Information about products that could meet the needs of both operational (officers in the car) and analytical (investigators and analysts) users
- Information about how data feeds are managed, monitored, and maintained, specifically when agencies' vendors make records system changes and when agencies switch records system vendors
- Information about how the quality of data (both accuracy and timeliness) from the source systems to end-user query is maintained, measured and reported

- General costs regarding implementation and maintenance of statewide system, including full maintenance of all data feeds

System Performance
The data sharing system is not considered "mission critical" but the Agency requires the system to be designed for high availability and redundancy:

- Vendor should provide the uptime (e.g. 99.9%) that this solution would be able to meet
- For operational use purposes (i.e. inside of police vehicle on the roadside), please specify response times for the following types of queries that Vendor expects to be able to meet:
  - Simple name query (Last, First)
  - Driver's license number query (ID number and State)
  - Simple vehicle query (tag number and vehicle make)
  - Simple telephone query (ten digit number)
- Development and testing are to be performed on separate, non-production systems.

Functional and Non-Functional Requirements

FDLE requires a system that, at minimum, supports the existing capabilities and capacity provided in the current data sharing systems as described in Appendix A.

V.   VENDOR QUALIFICATIONS

Vendors responding to this RFI must meet the following criteria:
- Demonstrated experience successfully implementing law enforcement data sharing systems for a U.S. State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

- Successful operation and support of a law enforcement data sharing system for more than one year

- Retain staff working on similar projects who currently maintain active State and/or Federal background clearances

Vendors who have only implemented their systems within a single county or municipality or who lack experience with systems within the US should not respond to this RFI.

VI.   QUESTIONS FOR VENDORS

In response to this RFI, and addressing the items identified in the Statement of Need and Technical Information, please provide the following information:

TAB 1 – Introduction
Provide a cover letter, the vendor's primary point of contact and contact information (name, title, address, telephone number(s), fax number, and an e-mail address)

TAB 2 – Requested Information and Responses
(Please reprint each request with your response)

The Department's intent is to identify potential solutions that can fulfill the functional requirements listed in Section IV. Vendors should address all of the needs in a statement of work with the following sections at a minimum:

1. Introduction
   Provide a brief description of corporate capabilities, including:
   a. How long the company has been doing work related to data sharing
   b. Information about similar data sharing projects
   c. CMMI, ISO, or other certifications
2. Background
3. Implementation Goals
4. Implementation Objectives
5. Deliverables
6. Technical details (all hardware, software and operating systems required)
7. Services
   Describe the software and hardware implementation services to replace Florida's current data sharing systems with a single statewide system.
   - Describe the overall approach including the system architecture and technologies that could be used for mapping and extract, transform, and load (ETL) of data from RMS, JMS, CAD, Pawn, and other types of systems
   - Describe how data could be updated on a regular basis to keep records current. How often could this be done and what mechanisms could be used to keep the data as current as possible?
   - Describe how ETL processes could cleanse and normalize data, including entity resolution (consolidation of persons with numerous matching data elements) and filtering of restricted data
   - Describe how addresses could be geocoded for geospatial purposes
   - Describe what processes could be used to ensure data quality during import and updates – how is this monitored and how are errors handled?
   - Describe how adds, updates, and deletes could be processed for things like updated records and sealed and expunged records
   - Describe the user interface and what types of queries and features are included in the standard core license (and if applicable) optional licenses
   - Describe any advanced features (beyond basic queries) that could be used to query, monitor, or analyze the data
   - Describe how the system could be accessed using mobile devices such as smartphones, tablets, and mobile data terminals (MDTs)
   - Describe the user account management, audit, and reporting capabilities available to administrative users
   - Describe how the system could meet the United States Department of Justice CJIS (Criminal Justice Information Services) Security Policy requirements including encryption, audit logging, and reporting
   - Describe how the system could connect to other data sharing systems such as N-DEx. How could data be exported for upload and what interface would be used to query other systems? How could other systems be able to query the data of the system?
   - Describe the estimated schedule including durations and dependencies for major tasks

- Describe the project management methodology that could be used to manage the project
- Describe the tools and techniques Vendor expects to use to complete the project
- Describe the tools and methodologies Vendor expects to use for testing. Testing is considered a critical component for a successful project, therefore vendors are asked to highlight their testing solution with as much detail as possible.
- Describe the major risks involved in implementing a statewide data sharing system and actions that should be taken to mitigate these risks

8. Provide examples of previous projects that are similar in nature and scope
9. Hardware and COTS Software
   - FDLE requires high uptime; therefore hardware and software designs must be robust and offer redundancy with no single points of failure. Since robust designs drive costs up, to assist FDLE in its information-gathering effort, multiple designs could be proposed to illustrate the tradeoff in costs and service levels.
   - Describe and list the hardware and commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) software needed to complete the project
   - Describe and list the hardware and software needed to provide ongoing operations for the System
   - Provide a description of system management tools. List the tools by system function (for example, security, database maintenance, scheduling, system monitoring and reporting)
   - Specify tools and resources required from source vendors (e.g. extraction tools) and associated costs
   - Specify hardware/software requirements for the contributing agencies and associated costs
   - Describe how the system could be scaled to ensure performance levels are maintained as the system and volume of data grow
10. Implementation Requirements
    - Provide an installation and implementation plan. This plan shall include, but is not limited to, the topics listed below.
    - Roles and Responsibilities
    - Specify resource expectation from contributing agencies
    - Environmental requirements (including power and cooling)
    - Hardware, software, and tools
    - Development methodologies
    - Installation activities and schedule
    - Deployment procedures, patches, and fixes
    - System configuration (e.g. web services type, port configuration, security certificates)
    - Go-Live Strategy and Tasks
    - Maintenance and Monitoring

11. Staffing Requirements

Describe contractor and FDLE staff positions needed to complete the project. Include a description of the qualifications required for both contractor and FDLE staff. An onsite project manager will be required and should be factored into the order of magnitude pricing.

12. Training

Provide an overview of the training services for the proposed system including:

- Training requirements & strategy
- System administrator training
- End user training

13. Technical Support

Provide details on how the system would be supported, specifically:

- Onsite support options/personnel requirements
- Helpdesk/call center support
- Support resources
- Proposed service levels & incident response times
- Capacity management

Other Issues

Include other issues you recommend FDLE should consider regarding this project.

TAB 3 – Sample Pricing Information

Provide general pricing information (not a specific price quote) for variables impacting the price.

PLEASE DO NOT PROVIDE A SPECIFIC PRICE QUOTE. To preserve your ability to bid on a future procurement related to this RFI it is important to provide general pricing information only (i.e., competitive ranges and variables impacting price; not a specific price quote.)

TAB 4 – Additional Information

Provide additional information that will be helpful in evaluating whether and how to contract with an exceptional service provider.

VII.   PROCESS

Responses to this RFI will be reviewed by the Department for informational purposes only. A vendor's response to this Request for Information is not an offer and FDLE will not use the vendor's submission to justify a contract with that vendor without otherwise complying with Chapter 287, F.S., and Chapter 60A-1, F.A.C.

FDLE Information Technology Services is requesting information, and will review the responses received from this RFI, for purposes including, but not limited to, determining whether or not to competitively procure a solution, determining what solicitation process

to use for a particular need, or researching general, special, and/or technical specifications for a solicitation.

Vendors submitting answers to an agency's Request for Information are not prohibited from responding to any related subsequent solicitation.

VIII.   RESPONSE INSTRUCTIONS AND FORMAT

Please submit one electronic copy to the Procurement Officer noted in Section XII below no later than the time and date noted in the Section X., Timeline. Responses must reference the RFI No.: FDLE RFI 1523 in the subject line of the response submission.

The Vendor shall organize their response submittal contents as follows:

> **Tab 1** Introduction
> **Tab 2** Requested Information and Responses
> **Tab 3** Sample Pricing Information
> **Tab 4** Additional Information

IX.   VENDOR DEMONSTRATIONS

FDLE will be offering an opportunity for eligible vendors to present their software's capabilities (see Section X., Timeline for dates). Trade secrets are confidential and exempt from disclosure under Chapter 119, F.S., pursuant to the statutory provisions in F.S. 812.081, F.S. 815.04, and F.S. 815.045. If vendor claims trade secret information is required to demonstrate their product, their meeting will be deemed confidential and closed to other vendors and the public.

X.   TIMELINE

Listed below are important dates/times on which actions must be taken or completed. If the Department finds it necessary to update any of the dates/times noted, it will be accomplished by an Addendum to the RFI. All times listed below are local time in Tallahassee, Florida.

DATE	TIME	ACTION
January 30, 2015		RFI posted on Vendor Bid System (VBS)
February 27, 2015	5:00 PM ET	Vendor Questions Due, by 5:00PM ET
March 6, 2015		FDLE Posts Responses to Questions
March 13, 2015	3:00 PM ET	Vendor Responses Due
March 15, 2015		Schedule Vendor Demonstrations (optional)
March 18, 2015		Begin Vendor Demonstrations (optional)

XI.   RFI QUESTIONS AND CONTACT WITH THE STATE

Please submit all questions concerning the RFI in writing via electronic mail or fax.

Questions regarding this RFI shall be submitted in writing to the Procurement Officer identified in Section XIV by the date and time specified in the Timeline or as amended by the Department. Questions may be submitted via email. Questions will not be answered via telephone. The Department will post answers to questions received on the Vendor Bid System by the close of business on the date stated in the Timeline.

Please direct any questions or issues regarding this RFI to the Procurement Officer identified herein.

XII. VENDOR COSTS

Vendors are responsible for all costs associated with the preparation, submission, and any potential meeting to discuss this Request for Information. The State of Florida, Department of Law Enforcement, or Information Technology Services will not be responsible for any vendor-related costs associated with responding to this request.

XIII. CONFIDENTIAL, PROPRIETARY OR TRADE SECRET MATERIAL

The Department takes its public records responsibilities as provided under Chapter 119, Florida Statutes and Article I, Section 24 of the Florida Constitution, very seriously. If Vendor considers any portion of the documents, data or records submitted in response to this RFI to be confidential, trade secret or otherwise not subject to disclosure pursuant to chapter 119, Florida Statutes, the Florida Constitution or other authority, Vendor must also simultaneously provide the Department with a separate redacted copy of its RFI, on CD, and briefly describe in writing the grounds for claiming exemption from the public records law, including the specific statutory citation for such exemption. This redacted copy shall contain the Department's RFI name, number, and the name of the Vendor on the cover, and shall be clearly titled "Redacted Copy."

The Redacted Copy shall be provided to the Department at the same time Vendor submits its response to the RFI and must only exclude or obliterate those exact portions which are claimed confidential, proprietary, or trade secret. The Vendor shall be responsible for defending its determination that the redacted portions of its RFI response are confidential, trade secret or otherwise not subject to disclosure. Further, Vendor shall protect, defend, and indemnify the Department for any and all claims arising from or relating to Vendor determination that the redacted portions of its RFI response are confidential, proprietary, trade secret or otherwise not subject to disclosure. If Vendor fails to submit a Redacted Copy with its response, the Department is authorized to produce the entire documents, data or records submitted by Vendor in answer to a public records request for these records.

XIV.   PROCUREMENT OFFICER

Diana K. Trahan, CPPB, FCCM, FCCN
Office of General Services/Purchasing
2331 Phillips Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32308
Telephone No.: (850) 410-7316
Fax No.: (850) 410-7333
E-mail: FDLEOGSCONTRACTS@fdle.state.fl.us

This contact person is the only authorized individual to respond to RFI comments and questions.

APPENDIX A: CURRENT DATA SHARING SYSTEMS INFORMATION

Current Data Sharing Systems

Regional Data Sharing Systems
The existing data sharing systems are a blend of technologies but have a number of things in common:
- All systems take data from the source system (RMS, JMS, CAD, etc.) and allow that data to be shared
  - The data warehouse systems typically use a server (or virtual server) that resides at the agency and perform ETL on this server. This data is then uploaded to the data warehouse.
  - The distributed systems either connect directly to each other's database or have a server (or virtual server) that resides at the agency. ETL is performed and the data is placed in a database that is connected to all of the other databases sitting at the agencies.
- All records in the systems are considered investigative data, and none of the systems contain intelligence data (that would be subject to 28 Code of Federal Regulations Part 23)
- All systems have graphical user interfaces (GUIs) that allow users to perform queries on the data, export and print results
- All systems meet United States Department of Justice CJIS Security Policy requirements and have comprehensive audit logging and reporting

An assessment of the regional data sharing systems was conducted in 2014. An excerpt of relevant information obtained during the assessment is provided below. All information is as of August, 2014:

Database Size (if applicable)	FINDER	SE LInX	R-LEX	SmartShare	TBSN	Total
Size in Terabytes	N/A	2.50	7.49	N/A	1.70	**11.69**

Regional System Participation*	FINDER	SE LInX	R-LEX	SmartShare	TBSN	Total
Participating Agencies**	132	41	113	32	51	**369**
Agencies able to Participate***	3	7	27	3	6	**46**
Agencies unable to Participate****	10	0	3	9	0	**22**

* This set of information (only) was collected during December 2014 and January 2015.

**Please note that there agencies that overlap regional data sharing systems crossing geographic RDSTF boundaries. These agencies have elected to share data with multiple systems for various reasons.

***These agencies that are capable of sharing data have been unable to participate in the regional data sharing systems for a variety of reasons but have systems and staff capable of working with a vendor to share their data.

****These agencies that (at the present time) lack a records system, do not have sufficient data to make the investment viable, or simply do not have the resources to connect their system.

Regional System Records*	FINDER	SE LInX	R-LEX	SmartShare	TBSN	Total
Arrest	Included in RMS count below	2,571,456	1,352,509	1,453,790	2,440,582	**7,818,337**
Booking	Included in RMS count below	2,770,774	1,905,745	815,008	1,633,455	**7,124,982**
Case Report	Included in RMS count below			N/A	1,273,814	**1,273,814**
Citation	Included in RMS count below	18,876,209	11,245,250	466,700	5,234,143	**35,822,302**
Regional System Records* (cont'd)	**FINDER**	**SE LInX**	**R-LEX**	**SmartShare**	**TBSN**	**Total**
Departmental/Incident Report		10,103,223	7,213,866	467,766	11,262,554	**29,047,409**
CAD/Dispatch		36,374,960	16,170,173	26,326,027	29,360,198	**108,231,358**
Field Interview		1,018,728	732,648	450,866	2,392,504	**4,594,746**
Master Record			3,709,329	6,802'744PER 4,962,672VEH	3,193,161	**18,667,906**
Miscellaneous Incident			6,363	N/A	7,639	**14,002**
Occurrence				N/A	10,245,854	**10,245,854**
Pawn Ticket	27,556,989	9,557,622	3,072,020	2,270,528	12,300,005	**54,757,164**
Permit				N/A	212	**212**
Supervision/Registry/Watch List		128,173	42,968	163,748	43,460	**378,349**
Supplemental Report			598,241	293,093	338,803	**1,230,137**
Traffic Collision		2,478,085	817,587	12,052	50,920	**3,358,644**
Visitation				344,448	41,415	**385,863**
Warrant		1,425,685	388,908	1,300,351	164,503	**3,279,447**

RMS	30,466,063					**30,466,063**
Second Hand	9,185,663					**9,185,663**
Metal Recycling	8,986,506					**8,986,506**
Narratives - **NOT INCLUDED IN TOTALS**		91,775,725				**-**
	76,195,221	**85,304,915**	**47,255,607**	**46,129,793**	**79,983,222**	**334,868,758**

*Record counts are for total number of records and include records from GA and may include duplicate counts if an agencies data is stored in more than one regional data sharing system

**SmartShare is a distributed system and cannot readily supply record counts

System Usage	FINDER	SE LInX	R-LEX	SmartShare	TBSN	Total
Registered Users*	13,352	5,549	25,844	4,500	3,275	**52,520**
Users from outside participating agencies	567	455	455	895	153	**2,525**
Logins in last 30 days (logins)	12,692	1,907	1,873	N/A	777	**17,249**
Logins in last 90 days (logins)	37,091	2,566	5,365	N/A	2,464	**47,486**
Logins in last 180 days (logins)	72,860	3,013	10,162	N/A	4,794	**90,829**
Approximate Number of Avg. Monthly Queries	52,585	215,000	18,000	902,000	43,279	**1,230,864**

*This number may be misleading, because there are a number of very large agencies that have provided user credentials for all of their personnel, regardless of their actual intent to utilize the system. FINDER also has 4,177 users in their retail PawnWeb system.

System Performance	FINDER	SE LInX	R-LEX	SmartShare	TBSN	Average
Response time - Avg. Person Query (in sec.)	17.5	2.5	2.5	5.0	5.0	**7**
Response time - Broad Person Query (in sec.)	70.0	14.0	90.0	11.5	120	**61**
Limit (in mins.) for results to be returned	2.0	No limit	30.0	0.5	N/A	**-**
Maximum number of records returned*	No limit	1,000	5,000	100 per agency	5,000	**-**

*User configurable at 5000 or less in COPLINK and 1000, 500, 200, or 100 in LInX

Regional System Connectivity	FINDER	SE LInX	R-LEX	SmartShare	TBSN
FLEX (# of other systems)	Yes (3)	Yes (3)	No*	In Progress	Yes (3)
N-DEx Query	In Progress	Yes	In Progress	No	In Progress
N-DEx Upload	In Progress	In Progress	In Progress	No	In Progress
Other COPLINK Systems (# of other systems)	No	No	Yes, TBSN	No	Yes, R-LEX
Other LInX Systems (# of other systems)	No	Yes (9)	No	No	No
D-DEx	No	Yes	No	No	No
	3.0	**13.5**	**1.5**	**0.0**	**4.0**

*R-LEX data can be queried, but R-LEX cannot query other systems

Advanced System Features	FINDER	SE LInX	R-LEX	SmartShare	TBSN
Entity Resolution/Data Consolidation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Associated queries (i.e. person + vehicle)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Geographic area queries (i.e. search radius)	Pending	No	Yes	No	Yes
Geocoding (percent of addresses geocoded)	Pending	Yes (35%)	Yes (Unk.)	No	Yes (Unk.)
Free Text	Pending	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Link Analysis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Possible Associates	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
COMPSTAT/Graphing	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Advanced System Features (cont'd)	**FINDER**	**SE LInX**	**R-LEX**	**SmartShare**	**TBSN**
Hotspot/Crime Mapping	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
FCIC Stolen Property Matching	Yes	No	No	No	No
Frequent Pawner/Scrapper - Top 100-1000 each	Yes	No	No	No	No
Success Tagging (tag a useful report/arrests/$)	Yes	No	No	No	No
Monitoring (Person/Query)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Pending	Yes

Save Search Session	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Export search results	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Online Help	Pending	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Florida Law Enforcement eXchange

The FLEX system is a hub that receives and routes queries in the LEXS-SR (search and retrieval) format. It is based around a Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) that:
1. Receives inbound queries that come directly from a regional system (with embedded regional data sharing system destination[s])
2. Collects basic user and query information, stores that information in a audit log database
3. Relays the query to one or more requested regional data sharing system destination(s)
4. Waits a pre-determined interval for responses from the regional data sharing system(s) that were queried
5. Aggregates the results and logs system responses and record counts returned
6. Sends the aggregated results back the querying system

The system resides at FDLE Headquarters and as noted, captures basic audit information in addition to connecting the systems together. Each vendor is using a common mapping that to an Information Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD) based on the N-DEx IEPD.

The FLEX system could be used as a interim solution to connect existing regional data sharing systems to a new system as it is being developed, allowing for a phased implementation approach. If a single statewide data sharing solution can be found, the FLEX system would be decommissioned when it is no longer needed.