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• A component of the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, which also includes:
  • National Institute of Justice
  • Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
  • Office for Victims of Crime
  • Bureau of Justice Statistics

• Supports law enforcement, courts, corrections, treatment, victim services, technology, and prevention initiatives that strengthen the nation’s criminal justice system
BJA comprised of 3 components;

- Policy
- Programs
- Planning

★ These components administer grant programs, shape and promote sound justice policy, and plan for fiscal and legislative changes affecting over 7,000 grants.
BJA provides leadership, services, and funding to America’s communities by:

- Emphasizing local control;
- Building relationships in the field;
- Developing collaborations and partnerships;
- Promoting capacity building through planning;
- Streamlining the administration of grants;
- Increasing training;
- Technical assistance;
- Creating accountability of projects;
- Encouraging innovation;
- Ultimately communicating the value of justice efforts to decision-makers at every level.
Training and Technical Assistance
Training and Technical Assistance:

• BJA-sponsored training and technical assistance provides direct assistance to develop and implement comprehensive, system-wide strategies for public safety and improving criminal justice systems.

• BJA’s TTA supports:
  • State
  • Local
  • Tribal jurisdictions
Supporting state, local, and tribal through:

- Onsite technical assistance
- Offsite technical assistance (via telephone, e-mail, Internet, distance learning, etc.)
- Peer-to-peer information exchange and mentoring (individual, group, or jurisdictionwide)
- Publication drafting and dissemination

- Information sharing
- Conferences, workshop, and training events (agenda development, speaker identification, and logistical support)
- Curriculum development
- **GTTAC** – GJXDM Training and Technical Assistance Committee
Types of TTA;

- Problem assessment
- Strategic planning and development
- Program sustainability
- Cutting-edge practice(s) documentation and identification
- Evidence-based practice(s) identification and development
- Team building and collaboration
- Community partnership development
- Staff development
- Resource identification and management
- Information management
- Program evaluation
\[ x(t) = a_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( (a_n - j b_n) e^{j \omega_0 t} + (a_n + j b_n) e^{-j \omega_0 t} \right) \]

\[ a_0 = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T x(t) dt \]

\[ a_n = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T x(t) \left( e^{j \omega_0 t} + e^{-j \omega_0 t} \right) dt \]

\[ = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T x(t) e^{j \omega_0 t} dt + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T x(t) e^{-j \omega_0 t} dt \]

\[ b_n = \frac{1}{jT} \int_0^T x(t) \left( e^{j \omega_0 t} - e^{-j \omega_0 t} \right) dt \]

Multiplying both sides by \( j \) yields the following:

\[ jb_n = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T x(t) e^{j \omega_0 t} dt - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T x(t) e^{-j \omega_0 t} dt \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March-April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June-October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal agencies submit funding requests to OMB 2 years out. (e.g., In 2007, agencies submit requests for 2009.)</td>
<td>President submits his budget proposal to Congress.</td>
<td>House and Senate floors vote on their respective budget resolutions.</td>
<td>House and Senate appropriations subcommittees develop appropriations bills.</td>
<td>House and Senate appropriations committees mark up appropriations bills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House and Senate budget committees each formulate a budget resolution.</td>
<td>Leading budget committee members from both chambers develop an agreement on the budget resolution.</td>
<td>Appropriations subcommittees report bills to appropriations committees.</td>
<td>House and Senate floors vote on their respective appropriations bills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both Houses vote on the agreed budget resolution.</td>
<td>Budget resolution is reached.</td>
<td>Leading appropriations committee members from both chambers reach a consensus on the appropriations bills, called a conference report.</td>
<td>Leading appropriations committee members from both chambers reach a consensus on the appropriations bills, called a conference report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House and Senate floors vote on appropriations conference report.</td>
<td>Appropriations bill sent to the President.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President signs or vetoes bill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Congress passes continuing resolution if President does not sign bill by Oct. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY 2008 Funding Levels (By category)

- Crime Prevention: $100,000,000; 9%
- Law Enforcement: $187,513,000; 17%
- Adjudication: $47,636,667; 4%
- Substance Abuse: $53,946,665; 5%
- Corrections: $39,496,667; 4%
- Information Sharing: $187,513,000; 17%
- Discretionary Earmarks: $31,466,667; 3%

Total: $443,708,667; 39%
Byrne Competitive Grant Program

FY 2007: $200,000,000
FY 2008: $40,000,000
Byrne Discretionary Grant Program (Earmarks)

FY 2000: $20,000,000
FY 2001: $40,000,000
FY 2002: $60,000,000
FY 2003: $80,000,000
FY 2004: $100,000,000
FY 2005: $120,000,000
FY 2006: $140,000,000
FY 2007: $160,000,000
FY 2008: $180,000,000
FY 2009: $200,000,000
Gun Violence Prosecution/
Project Safe Neighborhoods
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Bureau of Justice Assistance
Training Programs to Assist Probation and Parole Officers (Sex Offender Management)
When Seeking Funds

- Did you respond to the established criteria of the RFP?
- Did you have someone outside of the process proofread your proposal?
- Are your leaders and target community supportive of the application, to include a formal Memorandum of Understanding?
- Is your application clearly written and do the headings match the information requested in the RFP?
- Do not assume the reviewer understands your needs.
- Have you been timely?
The “must have”

• Executive Summary
  • NO MORE than 2 ½ pages
  • The problem
  • The solution (include methodology)
  • The time
  • The cost

• The “elevator speech”
  • Ability to clearly state the project in a short amount of time
  • Convey the value; not only to you, but the masses (including that person)

• Strong strategic champion

• Know the difference between “start up” and “proof-of-concept”
Why programs don’t get funded

• Not meeting the guidelines
• No clear mission or description of project
• Failure to answer questions
• Roles of partners not defined
• Required partners not identified

• Failure to follow directions
  • Length/spacing
  • Number of copies
  • Binding
  • Attachments

• Deadline
• Grant history
• No performance measures
NEED TO KNOW

- Where to find funding opportunities
  - www.grants.gov

- Your representation at BJA
  - SAA
  - State Policy Advisor

- Byrne Solicitation to be posted soon
  - Preventing Crime and Drug Abuse
  - Enhancing Local Law Enforcement
  - Enhancing Local Courts
  - Enhancing Local Correction and Offender Re-entry
  - Facilitating Justice Information Sharing
National Initiatives

- The National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan

- National Strategy for Information Sharing
National Initiatives

- Information Sharing Environment (ISE) Implementation Plan

- Fusion Center Guidelines
What Is a Fusion Center?

- Defined as a “collaborative effort of two or more agencies that provide resources, expertise, and information to the center with the goal of maximizing their ability to detect, prevent, investigate, and respond to criminal and terrorist activity”

- State and major urban area fusion centers are key to the nationwide information sharing framework
Why Is the Fusion Process Important?

- Supports an all-sources, all-crimes, all-hazards, all-threats approach to intelligence
- Blends data from different sources, including law enforcement, public safety, and the private sector
- Supports risk-based, information-driven prevention, response, and consequence management programs
- Supports intelligence-led policing
- Fusion is the overarching process of managing the flow of information and intelligence across all levels and sectors of government and the private sector
A Summary of State or Regional Intelligence Fusion Centers

The following map depicts states that have some variation of a fusion center, either operational or under development.

- Blue: States that have some variation of a fusion center
- Gold: States that have a fusion center under development
- White: States that have no operational fusion center at this time
- Red Star: Designated federal fusion center site

Weaving Your Way through the Web of Technology
Development of Formalized Regions

- Formalized regions will
  - Promote interconnectivity
  - Leverage existing resources
  - Facilitate delivery of DHS/DOJ Fusion Process Training and Technical Assistance program offerings
Current Fusion Center Efforts

- Designation of a primary fusion center within state
- Nationwide assessment of fusion center capabilities by DHS and DOJ
- Addressing use of National Guard personnel within fusion centers
- National Information Exchange Model (NIEM)
- Development of Regional Training and Technical Assistance
Information sharing is a national imperative

In detecting, preventing, responding to and investigating crimes, disasters and terrorist acts, the exchange of information among multiple engaged agencies must be *timely and accurate* and therefore highly *automated*.

Most existing computer systems are not designed to facilitate information sharing *across disciplines* and jurisdictions.

Automated information sharing *between agencies* requires the definition of common *standards for linking* disparate systems among federal, state, local and tribal agencies.
NIEM IS:

• A data **standard**
  - with **agreed-upon terms, definitions, and formats**.

• **Independent** of the way data is stored in individual systems.

• A way to achieve **consensus** on the content of specific exchanges

• A structured approach to data interoperability
Defining Data Components

Defining data components unique to a domain will be done by subject matter experts who are representatives of the domain following basic rules for definitions and terms.

A group representing all participating domains will define those data components that are universal or commonly used by more than one domain again using the same basic rules.
Federal Adoption and Use

- **OASIS** Electronic Court Filing Technical Committee plans a 2008 release of IEPDs conformant with NIEM.

- **DOJ** programs, such as LCMS and Sentinel, through their system design efforts are ensuring their exchanges will be NIEM-conformant.

- **DHS** built a Hospital Availability IEPD and is planning or building 10 other NIEM-conformant IEPDs, including Federated Person Query and Terrorist Watchlist.

- The **Program Manager-Information Sharing Environment** has declared that NIEM will be the standard for sharing counterterrorism information.

- **FBI** has released the preliminary IEPD and schema for N-DEx consistent with release 2.0 of NIEM.

- **FBI** has created an IEPD based on the planned interface between N-DEx and Sentinel.

- **FEMA** has developed some specific NIEM-compliant schema – vetted through the NIEM Help Desk – for partner agencies at the federal, state, tribal and local levels to use for external data submission exchanges with the Homeland Security Exercise and Evaluation Program (HSEEP) Toolkit.
• **New York** Division of Criminal Justice Services is utilizing NIEM to implement all CJIS information exchanges.

• **Florida** is utilizing NIEM for all law enforcement information exchanges.

• **Pennsylvania** JNET project is developing a plan for upgrading its installed GJXDM based information exchanges to NIEM.

• **Texas** has begun to develop a plan for statewide adoption of NIEM as the standard for information exchanges.

• **Maryland** Department of Transportation is exploring the use of NIEM for information exchanges between transportation centers and public safety.

• **California** is planning to convert their court content management system interfaces to NIEM and to map their e-filing standard (2GEFS) to NIEM.

• **New York** state and **NLETS** are developing a NIEM RAP Sheet pilot IEPD.
Why NIEM Now?

1. NIEM Is Tested, Ready, and in Production.


3. Training and Technical Assistance Are Available.


6. Reference IEPDs Are Being Developed.

7. NIEM Is the Means for Intergovernmental Information Sharing.
Questions?
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