

Department of Justice (DOJ)
California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS)
Standing Strategic Planning Subcommittee (SSPS) Meeting

October 25, 2022
10:00 a.m. (PST)

Meeting Minutes

SSPS Members Present:

Chair Yosh Kakkad, representing the San Diego Sheriff's Department
Kirk Beardwood, representing the Department of Justice (DOJ)
Tracy Weber, representing the Menlo Park Police Department
Joey Williamson, representing the Hillsborough Police Department
Deirdre Todd-Miller, representing the Department of Motor Vehicles
Timothy Craney, representing the Riverside District Attorney's Office
Justin Riedel, representing the Sonoma County Sheriff's Office
Adam Vallejo, representing the Riverside County Sheriff's Office
Kim Honciano, representing the San Mateo Police Department (joined late after initial roll call)
Lisa Marie Gerard, representing the San Francisco Department of Emergency Management (joined late after initial roll call)

Members Not Present:

Laura Cerda, representing the California Highway Patrol

Other Subcommittee Non-Members Present:

DOJ CLETS Legal Counsel Milad Dalju
CLETS Advisory Committee Executive Secretary Maria Cranston
SSPS Staff Support Chris Blair

Chair Kakkad called the meeting to order. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present.

Chair Kakkad thanked the members for their participation in volunteering to be on the Subcommittee and thanked the CLETS Advisory Committee (CAC) and DOJ for making resources available to get the SSPS reinstated.

Prior to getting started with topics of discussion for the meeting, Chair Kakkad asked each member to introduce themselves and provide a little bit of background about themselves because this was the first SSPS meeting since the Subcommittee was reconvened.

Ms. Cranston conveyed the CLETS Advisory Committee Chair, DOJ CJIS Division Chief Joe Dominic's apology for not being able to join the first SSPS meeting and expressed how much he appreciated everyone taking the time and energy to participate as a member of this Subcommittee. Chief Dominic believes the SSPS' role is extremely valuable in helping strategically plan the future of CLETS and to provide the CAC with recommendations for improvements. Unfortunately, Chief Dominic had another commitment with the Attorney General.

Ms. Cranston provided information pertaining to the statutes and authority that establishes CLETS and the SSPS. Government Code 15150-15167 establishes CLETS, which is a communications system available to law enforcement and criminal justice agencies in California. These Government Code sections also establish the Advisory Committee, the *CLETS Policies, Practices and Procedures* (PPP), the open meeting requirements, and that the CAC shall provide recommendations to the Attorney General on any improvements to CLETS to meet the future requirements and to take advantage of advancements made in the science of telecommunications. These not only apply to the CAC, but as a Subcommittee, they also apply to the SSPS.

In addition, CLETS PPP section 1.2.2 gives the authority to establish the SSPS to evaluate the legislative, user and technical environments of CLETS; to make recommendations to the CAC; and to perform or update planning functions or documents as directed by the CAC. The SSPS may establish other work groups to assist in these endeavors. The CAC reconvened the SSPS to provide recommendations for CLETS. At times, the CAC may give direction for items they would like the SSPS to focus on, but otherwise, the SSPS is responsible for CLETS strategic planning to ensure it continues to grow with modern times and technologies.

Since the Government Code dictates that the CAC meetings are open to the public, these same requirements apply to the SSPS as a Subcommittee to the CAC and must meet the requirements established under Bagley-Keene. Copies of DOJ's Bagley-Keene document were sent to each of the Subcommittee members for their review and information.

A few things to keep in mind:

- All meeting notices must be posted at minimum of ten days in advance
- Meetings must have a quorum present. There are 11 members on the SSPS, so for each meeting, there must be a minimum of six members present.
- Meeting where a vote is needed, for the motion to pass there must be a minimum of six votes in favor of the motion to pass.
- When scheduling a meeting, seven members must be available for the meeting to be scheduled. If a member indicates they are available, please be there. Otherwise, if something unexpectedly arises, please notify the Chair right away because if it affects the quorum, the meeting may need to be rescheduled.
- All meeting notices or materials will be sent to each member individually or as bccs to avoid someone responding to “all”, which can be considered communication between members (a meeting), that was not properly advertised.
- SSPS members should not discuss SSPS-related matters with other members outside of these meetings as it may be considered as communication between members (a meeting), that was not properly advertised.
- Anything placed on the agenda must have enough description so that a member of the public can understand what will be discussed and decide if they want to attend the meeting or provide input.
- Since these meetings are open to the public, confidential information or information that may pose a threat security risk is not be discussed in the open meetings. Let the chair know in advance and he can add a closed session to the agenda, if necessary prior to posting the agenda.

Chair Kakkad requested Ms. Cranston to share the previous SSPS recommendations with the members for their review, so they could be prepared to discuss at the next meeting. As the Subcommittee starts looking into the future of CLETS, it is good to know what the previous SSPS gave as recommendations. Ms. Cranston confirmed a copy of the last CLETS Strategic Plan was attached to the meeting invites posted to the meeting notice on the Attorney General’s public website. The recommendations given from the previous SSPS should be used as a guide, but it does not mean the SSPS must focus on attempting to accomplish those items. On page 9, it identifies the CLETS Strategic Goals the previous SSPS recommended.

In order to ensure the meetings are making the most of everyone’s time, it is important for everyone to understand what the current CLETS roadmap looks like, so the SSPS is not redoing or overlapping efforts that may or may already be underway.

Current things going on with CLETS include:

- DOJ is working on phasing out legacy formats to the FBI replacing them with NIEM XML transactions. The same thing is happening with Nlets. Currently, DOJ is working on both efforts, making some changes on the backend, so it is not intrusive to the downstream agencies because current legacy is what is transported through the switches. If DOJ doesn't do this and attempts to deliver the full XML payload, none of the agencies would recognize that content and everyone would be out of the water, otherwise every agency would have to make these changes. DOJ is working on making the transformation of the information the downstream agencies send in the legacy formats to DOJ, converting it to the new standards for the FBI and Nlets, and doing the same on the returns.
- Currently CLETS is a machine to machine communication using mnemonics, IP addresses, ORIs, etc. However, there is a bold movement expected with the FBI Security Policy where the FBI is wanting user information. This will be a major undertaking for both DOJ as well as the downstream agencies, for DOJ to shift from a mnemonic/ORI paradigm to knowing 26 attributes about the user sending the transaction. Going forward, Subcommittee member and DOJ representative Kirk Beardwood believes this to be one of the priorities collectively as a group to try to figure out how this change should be made. Some options may include a federated approach, or DOJ having a repository of all the users; however, neither of these are ideal.
- AB1747 required all CLETS inquiries to include purpose. Ninety-six percent of the law enforcement/criminal justice community using CLETS are transmitting these purpose codes. DOJ staff are working with the remaining few agencies to meet this legislative mandate.
- Some agencies have reached out to DOJ requesting ASAP to PSAP capabilities using CLETS. This is where alarm companies send their notification through Nlets to CLETS to the local agency (PSAP) CAD system, thereby eliminating the need for human interaction and telephone calls. This is supposed to be more efficient by reducing human errors and saving dispatchers time. DOJ worked with one agency to set this up, testing was successful and this functionality was moved into Production. Other agencies interested in doing this can in the near future.
- For California law enforcement agencies using LoJack, the information is accessed via CLETS and to servers maintained at the Los Angeles Police Department. CLETS currently routes this traffic to LAPD for processing; however, the system located in Los Angeles is a legacy system and is constantly failing. LoJack already has a presence via Nlets, so DOJ is currently working to make the changes to route the traffic to Nlets instead of the legacy system in Los Angeles. SSPS representative Kirk Beardwood indicated his team is making the modifications, so it will be transparent to the end users. End-users will continue using the same message keys as they always have and CLETS will convert the information to be routed to Nlets instead of sending it to Los Angeles.

Audience member Greg Park asked SSPS member and California Nlets representative Kirk Beardwood about the conversion to XML and if other states are making the move. Mr. Beardwood responded that other states are making the move, but California has one of the highest volumes of traffic so it is taking a while. Some smaller states are fully XML compliant; however, California is progressively moving along. DOJ is further along with the Nlets conversion than with the NCIC conversion. CLETS is already transmitting some message keys in XML, but it is seamless to the downstream agencies. When the responses come back in XML, CLETS converts it to the legacy format for the downstream agencies.

The biggest obstacle is with DMV. DMV data comes to DOJ in the legacy format, but if DOJ adds the XML tags, it makes DOJ responsible for that data if there are any misalignments. Some of these issues will take a while to work through as DOJ needs to get tagged data from DMV, so DOJ can move it to the subsequent XML tags versus DOJ attempting to parse through the legacy payloads and screen scrape and for specific values.

Chair Kakkad asked if there will be the opportunity for the downstream agencies to submit data in the XML format for those that are willing. DOJ uses something called the CLETS client, which is used internally to connect all their systems. The CLETS client has the ability to do both, legacy or XML and when the connection is opened to an agency using XML, it would be able to communicate in XML. The rules have not all been built out other than what DOJ uses, but that framework has started being developed. Today, DOJ only does it internally, this is something that could be explored in the future.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 13, 2022 at 10:00 a.m. It will be a virtual meeting.