
From: O'Reilly, Thomas
Sent: Sunday, January 03, 2010 3:23 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: NSI PMO suggestion

Actually I was having similar thoughts. There are four big ticket issues that need to be addressed. Privacy, A training plan, a state access plan and the actual technology solution. I suppose you could be operational after the privacy, training (at least the Exec and vetting) and the state plan is adopted. Then they could use EG, faxes, email etc to capture the info. Lets discuss on Tues. The fastest way to the goal line that still lets us have a sound SS base for the all crimes works. Another option is to put yow Tetras like teams of.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, January 03, 2010 3:04 PM
To: O'Reilly, Thomas
Subject: NSI PMO suggestion

Tom

As I worked on the NSI Implementation outline, it occurred to me that we may want to consider two levels of fusion center participation: Participating and Contributing.

Participating means that the center has completed a privacy policy and received training. They are now able to access the Shared Spaces and use SAR information within their center.

Contributing means that the FC also has implemented a Shared Space environment.

In this way, the PMO can more rapidly expand the number of FCs that are part of the NSI in one way or another. It would also let us bring in FCs that have adopted eGuardian (e.g. Connecticut). Frankly, if Connecticut has provided a privacy policy and had training, there should be no reason why they cannot access other FC SARs in the Shared Space. I imagine that at least one of the UASI FCs or perhaps large but non-designated regional FCs might also be inclined to go with eGuardian.

By uncoupling the technology component from participation in the Shared Space, as States consider a Statewide strategy and possible delays in a statewide technology solution such as in Ohio, Texas or California, the PMO can still make headway in the SAR information sharing world.

I understand that this approach is counter to the "pay to play" methodology we have used to date and some team members may not like the idea. And certainly the existing FCs may need to be advised – that is if you agree.

When you look at the NDEX model, they used a "if you build it they will come". Obviously that hasn't worked well either but with only 72 centers, we can probably use peer pressure from adjacent FCs or the regional FC meetings to slowly move FCs from a participation status to contributing.

Just my thoughts – shoot it down if it seems foolish

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

IJS Institute