

Department of Justice (DOJ)  
California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)  
Standing Strategic Planning Subcommittee (SSPS) Meeting  
June 20<sup>th</sup> 2023  
10:00 a.m. (PST)

Meeting Minutes

*Agenda Item #1: Meeting was called to order at 10:02 A.M. by **Ashish Kakkad**.*

*Agenda Item #2: **Ashish Kakkad** took roll call:*

1. **Ashish Kakkad** - San Diego Sheriff's Department
2. **David Angulo** - Department of Motor Vehicles
3. **Justin Riedel** - Sonoma County Sheriff office
4. **Tracy Webber** - Menlo Park Police Department
5. **Joey Williamson** - Hillsborough Police Department
6. **Lisa Marie Gerard** - San Francisco Department of Emergency Management
7. **Laura Cerda** - California Highway Patrol
8. **Adam Vallejo** - Riverside County Sheriff office
9. **Timothy (Tim) Craney** - Riverside District Attorney Office
10. **Kirk Beardwood** - Department of Justice

Members not present:

1. **Kim Honciano** - San Mateo Police Department

*10/11 members in attendance, quorum is present.*

Other Subcommittee Non-Members Present

1. **Maria Cranston** - CLETS Advisory Committee Executive Secretary
2. **Chris Blair** - SSPS Staff support
3. **Lydia Shindelbower** - SSPS Staff support

Other Subcommittee Non-Members Absent

1. **Milad Dalju** - DOJ CLETS legal counsel

*Agenda Item #3: No housekeeping items needed to be addressed.*

*Agenda Item #4: **Ashish Kakkad** moved to approve minutes from previous SSPS meeting, **Justin Riedel** and **Adam Vallejo** seconded.*

***Maria Cranston's** Agenda Item #5 was paused due to technical difficulties.*

*Committee moved on to Agenda Item #6: Next Gen 9-1-1 infrastructure.*

**Ashish Kakkad:** Last time we had a presentation from CalOES for DOJ. Let's discuss that presentation as it relates to CLETS. Joey and I haven't really had a chance to talk about it, but based on the presentation, I'd like to open up the topic for discussion with the SSPS team.

**Tim Craney:** Unfortunately, I wasn't at the last meeting, can someone summary the presentation? Can you fill me in on what this is supposed to accomplish?

***Ashish Kakkad** described the infrastructure of Next Gen 9-1-1. **Maria Cranston** joined meeting.*

**Kirk Beardwood:** I don't believe this would work for DOJ. I don't believe it can handle the throughput. Why is this a discussion item?

**Ashish Kakkad:** This was requested by a member of CAC. It's not at every destination where we have individuals that need access to CLETS. Next Gen 9-1-1 might not be feasible for anything related to CLETS. I wanted to open it up to recommend having a similar infrastructure for CLETS. It may not be the same infrastructure, but by taking that idea and concept and seeing if there is an effort that needs that, we can collectively come together to recommend modernization of that infrastructure.

Kirk, you're probably in the best position to contribute to this discussion.

**Kirk Beardwood:** The part I still stumble with is the guaranteed connectivity and guaranteed throughput.

So just like a cellular device, how many times have you been in a spot where it's crackly just on the phone call alone? Most of us are connected wirelessly from our laptops to our routers and we've got all kinds of background noise. You've got lag and all kinds of stuff. Can you imagine introducing our system issues where law enforcement is expected to get the results in sub-second response time?

So that's my biggest concern out of all of this. We're going from a controlled guaranteed network to a cellular one that's all contingent on somebody else's infrastructure and equipment unless I misunderstood. I think it would be a topic for the tech gurus here at DOJ. It sounds like it's more of a networking issue of allowing Next Gen 9-1-1 to access the CLETS backbone.

**Maria Cranston:** Next Gen 9-1-1 connects to non-LEA also. It wouldn't be available to everyone. It only connects to the PSAP equipment. As far as current capabilities, it's not something that can happen immediately, but may be possible down the line. At the last CAC meeting, when Joe asked questions, he asked specifically if the network was meeting the CJIS requirements, and the response was no.

**Ashish Kakkad:** I agree with both of your points. I would pivot the conversation and zoom out and say OK, so we've seen that the clients deployed this engine and infrastructure to address specific outcomes that are related to non-emergency. Can we take a similar approach at implementing?

The intent of the infrastructure is different, but we can take a page out of that playbook and now say: in order for the State of California DOJ to be able to meet the demands of the next generation of applications or whatnot, start looking at potentially building out a similar infrastructure, that is delivering the same or better quality of service for the future, where it can be scaled out for the cloud workloads and capabilities that are starting to come around.

**Kirk Beardwood:** I don't disagree with forward thinking of the infrastructure -- like you're saying -- to accommodate that. I don't disagree with the vision at all. I think that's something we should talk about.

You brought up photos or videos earlier, right? Now, if I start jamming a bunch of pictures and videos into the network, then obviously we're going to need to talk about network size to accommodate that, right? I don't have the ability to dump those out-of-state photos down to your county, but your county can log into LEAWEB and get those out-of-state photos, right?

I don't disagree with that concept, I'm just not sure that using somebody else's equipment is the correct approach. Taking a page, I agree with that stance.

**Ashish Kakkad:** We are discussing the updates and points right now, and as Joey & I take on the particular components, potentially we can provide our assessment of what Next Gen 9-1-1 brings to the table versus the challenges in the scope of CLETS. To have any kind of interruption to a 9-1-1 call would be disastrous. The need for 9-1-1 calls is significant. The infrastructure is designed to be resilient and deliver voice. The Next Gen 9-1-1 will also include data & video – it is designed for the best availability and delivery.

**Maria Cranston:** I would also recommend that the two of you meet with our network team to discuss limitations, redundancies that exists, etc.

**Ashish Kakkad:** I would really appreciate it. It would give me some insight, knowing exactly what things look like behind the scenes. I'll be up in Sacramento on the 27<sup>th</sup>, and if we could get a chance to meet, that would be a good time to discuss.

**Kirk Beardwood** stated he will not be at the CAC Meeting on June 27<sup>th</sup>.

**Maria Cranston:** I'm not sure if the DOJ network team will be available. They were supposed to be at a CAC meeting, but I was advised something came up and they couldn't attend. I will check.

**Joey Williamson:** I have spoken to Budge Courier a couple of times at different events within the past couple of months, and they are interested in working with us. They have their hands full with another project at the moment, and I have been bounced around for a bit even with just basic

technical questions. So, we may run into issues trying to get a tech spec on the CALOES side of it, since there are so many hands involved in this project because it's quite large.

**Ashish Kakkad:** Glad to hear you've been in touch with Budge. So, the next steps for us will be trying to coordinate -- between Joey and I -- a meeting with the DOJ networks team just to make sure that we're doing our due diligence and homework. Then we can try to put some of our recommendations together under that banner.

Maria, do we open it up for public comment at this point?

**Maria Cranston:** Yes.

*Ashish Kakkad asked for public comment at 10:30 A.M.; no response.*

*Committee moved back to Agenda Item #5: Update on the modernization of the CLETS application process (Maria Cranston)*

**Maria Cranston:** The CLETS application process has been a problem for a very long time. In a nutshell, the process is this: an agency emails the application to our network's information security unit because they are much more technical. They review it and discussion happens. Once the applications go through that level and no concerns show up, it goes to management for approval. The problems lie with the heavy load -- the sheer number of emails analysts receive; questions that are sent out and then we don't hear back from the clients, or they give us piecemeal answers. It's difficult to consolidate all those pieces, sometimes things fall through the cracks, and then I often have follow-up questions.

I would like to see an automated process. I have the vision, but don't know how to make it happen. Imagine Turbo Tax: when you submit your taxes, it asks you a question. If you answer yes, you get a new series of questions; if no, you move onto the next one. This process would go into a queue, the agencies can check the status, and we would get reminders & notifications. We each get so many emails -- hundreds per day -- it would be nice to lessen the risk of things getting lost. It would be great to have this system populate the database with the items submitted from the clients electronically, and then have it give us something like a status report. If we can do this for taxes, can't we create something on a smaller scale?

**Ashish Kakkad:** The good news is CJIS requirements aren't as stringent as IRS requirements. Because we're a recommendation engine, I'm 100% supportive of this. If we were to prioritize our recommendations to CAC, this would be the #1 priority. But that's just me. We would need to ensure DOJ provides adequate funding & resources to make this happen. If we don't have either, then it's just toothless.

**Tim Craney:** I unequivocally agree & support this idea and initiative.

**Kirk Beardwood** agreed.

**Joey Williamson:** I agree as well and would like the idea to be two-way – so that the agencies can log in to see the status as well.

**Maria Cranston:** Yes, it would be great for them to see it as it progresses, as well.

**Kirk Beardwood:** I 100% agree with this. This is something Maria has spoken about for years, and I wish I could assist, but I think it's a great idea for DOJ to help support agencies getting CLETS access. I'd like to see a really quick turnaround time on this.

**Adam Vallejo:** So, maybe I am oversimplifying, but is it basically an IT help desk solution that we're looking for? Or a ticketing system where you can see projects in the queue?

**Ashish Kakkad:** This is more a workflow and work order management situation.

**Adam Vallejo:** Well, we just deployed a system built on SharePoint and it's super robust. We're using it for a bunch of other applications of asset tracking. Our PSEC radio unit uses it now. Maria, if you'd like, I can schedule a demo for you to see it.

**Maria Cranston:** Yes, I would love that!

**Ashish Kakkad:** I would love to see this move forward and would like to see if someone can work with Maria so we can write it up as part of our recommendation packet.

**Tim Craney:** We've been looking at a help desk product that has a robust workflow system in it, and it could address some of the functionality that we were talking about.

**Kirk Beardwood:** The Application Development Bureau uses JIRA quite frequently for project-tracking and bug defects. We can log into that and see the capabilities of doing a workflow for CLETS applications.

**Ashish Kakkad:** What I'm hearing from Kirk and Maria is that if we -- as SSPS -- can help condense this priority to help them obtain resources, this group will be happy to support that effort as it moves forward. I think we'll need somebody else to work with Maria.

**Maria Cranston:** We do have something that was written up for management. I can review it, make it current, and submit it to the group for input. I have this vision, and I know where the problems are, but where do I go from here? I appreciate everyone's recommendations so far.

**Ashish Kakkad:** Tim will work with Maria and will have an update it at our next meeting. Any other thoughts on item #5?

**Ashish Kakkad** asked for public comment at 10:44 A.M.; no response.

*Committee moved on to Agenda Item #7: Suggestions for CJIS Training*

**Ashish Kakkad:** Adam and I have had conversations around this in previous meetings. Because there's been a lot of turnover, there's been reeducation at the agency level. Lots of changes in the CJIS policy combined with new people in the seats. A lot of feedback I've received is that we should have regular training from DOJ broken down into three parts:

- Topic 1: CJIS Security Policy that allows agencies to hear from CA DOJ updates on policy, what the changes mean, etc.
- Topic 2: Agency coordinators have questions and concerns regarding what their roles are and their capacity at local level.
- Topic 3: The application process itself. As we look into streamlining potential solutions for the application, I think having webinars and training sessions regularly regarding how the process works would be valuable. I don't think these trainings need to be elaborate -- bi-annually or once a year would be sufficient to address the questions and concerns that go back and forth.

Adam, anything else?

**Adam Vallejo:** You covered that well. I would like to emphasize that the ongoing training is the most important thing, and is the main thing we're missing now.

**Ashish Kakkad:** We'll write this up for the next session and have a better synopsis and recommendations.

**Maria Cranston:** For the ACC Training, our CSP does have that. If someone is interested, they can reach out to them. Another thing regarding the CLETS application process: a webinar is great, but a recording would be helpful. Having webinars stored on the CLEW website for people to access any time would be really helpful.

**Ashish Kakkad:** We will ensure that's included as part of the discussion. Thank you, Maria. Anything else this group thinks would be beneficial? Do you think as a group this is something we should recommend as SSPS?

**Justin Riedel:** Yes, I agree we should, especially as the CJIS policy gets more complicated. I imagine ACCs at smaller agencies could be getting quite confused with some of the CJIS policies and are going to need help dissecting some of that.

**Tim Craney:** Automation will be even more important if we're going to educate more people on how to send in more applications. That way Maria and I won't be inundated with more emails. I agree it

should happen, but am concerned for Maria's team.

**Ashish Kakkad:** Anything else around training? If not, I'll open it for public comment on that topic.

*Ashish Kakkad asked for public comment at 10:53 A.M.; no response.*

*Committee moved on to Agenda Item #8: Agenda topics for next meeting*

**Ashish Kakkad:** Hopefully we'll have an update on modernization process and Next Gen 9-1-1 feasibility.

**Joey Williamson:** I will reach out to OES again for more background info on their network and to see if it is feasible for what is required on the DOJ side.

**Ashish Kakkad:** We'll have a write-up on training for the team to vote on. Any other agenda items the group can think of for next time?

**Maria Cranston:** I just want to make sure --- for the training, next time you'll have a vote. Will there be a vote for Next Gen 9-1-1 also?

**Ashish Kakkad:** Just discussion. Also, modernization will just be up for discussion again, and then a vote for the NEXT time. What do you think?

**Maria Cranston:** For the upcoming CAC meeting, there's nothing to be submitted, right?

**Ashish Kakkad:** Correct. We'll be updating them on the status on all the work we've been doing, and we'll see if CAC wants us to focus on any other items. Any other agenda items?

*Ashish Kakkad asked for public comment at 10:59 A.M.; no response.*

**Ashish Kakkad:** Any comments from the public on items not on the agenda?

*Ashish Kakkad asked for public comment; no response. Meeting adjourned.*