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# 1. Scope and Purpose

## 1.1. Scope

This Arrest Warrant Information Exchange Package Documentation (IEPD) is intended to serve as a national reference model that can be adapted to meet the data requirements of states, localities, or tribes. Its scope is the initial creation, posting, and packing of an Arrest Warrant.

Excluded from the scope of this IEPD are subsequent phases in an Arrest Warrant’s lifecycle (e.g., quash, clear), other types of warrants (e.g., bench warrant, search warrant), and other types of legal documents that authorize law enforcement officials to take a person into custody (e.g., protection orders).

## 1.2. Purpose

An Arrest Warrant is a legal document that authorizes a law enforcement official to arrest a person. An Arrest Warrant is typically requested by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor and then issued by a court upon its finding that there is probable cause to believe that the person committed specified crimes. (But note that in some jurisdictions a prosecutor is empowered to issue an Arrest Warrant.) Once issued, an Arrest Warrant is often reported to state and national repositories. *See* Attachment A for a high-level business process model.

The Arrest Warrant describes the criminal charges pending against the person, the terms of bail and extradition, and contact information for the court and the law enforcement agencies that have requested, filed, and packed the warrant. It also contains essential information for locating and positively identifying the person to be arrested.

# 2. List of Artifacts

1. Document Schema (ArrestWarrant.xsd)
2. Extension Schema (ncsc.xsd)
3. Subset Schema
4. Instance Document (ArrestWarrant.xml)
5. Data Model Diagram
6. Mapping Spreadsheet
7. Wantlist
8. Master Document

# 3. Development

## 3.1. Background

With funding from the Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), the National Center for State Courts (NCSC) began developing an Arrest Warrant IEPD in 2004, using the Global Justice XML Data Model. The original team gathered examples of Arrest Warrants from several states and performed an extensive analysis of all of the data elements represented in the examples. From this analysis, a national reference model was created and published in 2005.

With the evolution to the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM), the BJA agreed to fund the NCSC’s conversion of the GJXDM IEPD. Also, given four years’ accumulation of experience with real-world electronic information sharing in the justice community, the NCSC wished to vet the new national reference model with experts who had implemented or were developing Arrest Warrant data exchanges. Thus, the NCSC invited a team to Orlando, Florida, in March 2009 for a three-day, face-to-face workshop.

## 3.2. Participants

**FBI**: Patrice Yuh and Mari Rodriguez

**California AOC**: Fati Farmanfarmaian

**Colorado AOC**: Stacey Kirk

**Florida Department of Law Enforcement**: Jerilyn Ammons and Christopher Larry

**Clay County, Florida**: Sally McCoy, Sheriff’s Department, Information Resource Manager

**Gulf Breeze, Florida**: Peter Paulding, Chief of Police

**Hillsborough County, Florida**: Rebecca Iverson, Sheriff’s Department, Warrants Section

**Orange County, Florida**: Laura Ernst, Clerk’s Office, Criminal Division, and Debbie McMillan, Sheriff’s Department, Warrants Division

**Kentucky**: Larry Bugg, AOC Department of Technology Services; Sergeant Shane Bates, State Police; Bob Holtgrave, Contractor

**New York AOC**: Chet Zink

**Pennsylvania AOC**: Barbara Holmes, Common Pleas CMS Software Development Manager and Appellate Court CMS Project Manager

**Wisconsin**: Andrea Olson, Consolidated Court Automation Project, and Tom Gries, Department of Justice

**NCSC**: Jim Harris, Di Graski, and consultants Tom Carlson (Tom Carlson Consulting), Kortni Clemmons (Waterhole Software), and Myron Pecora

## 3.3. Process

During its face-to-face meeting in Orlando, Florida, the team developed business process models for the primary phases of an Arrest Warrant’s lifecycle: create, pack, modify, quash/cancel, and clear. *See* Attachment A.

Next, the team discussed the data elements that could be included in an Arrest Warrant data exchange, including information about the subject, the incident, the charge, the court case, and the warrant itself.

Finally, the team reviewed a draft instance, analyzed some of the “candidate” NIEM data elements, and determined whether they matched the intended concept.

After the face-to-face meeting, the team posted Arrest Warrant information on a Wiki: <http://www.ncsconline.org/AWVWiki>.

## 3.4. Business Rules

The following policy and process considerations were discussed during the team’s meeting in Orlando and are included here to illustrate the kinds of decisions that a data-exchange governing body will need to make. Obviously, the list is not comprehensive:

1. Some jurisdictions use the term “Arrest Warrant” in juvenile delinquency cases; however, others use a juvenile-specific term, such as “Custody Order” or “Pick-Up Order.”
2. “Packing” is the term used to describe the process of enhancing an Arrest Warrant with additional information about the person who is the subject of the warrant. Packing practices vary widely: different jurisdictions have adopted different business rules regarding which types of Arrest Warrants are packed (e.g., only warrants that include felony charges), which law enforcement agency packs Arrest Warrants, when an Arrest Warrant is packed, and which data elements are mandatory.
3. Many jurisdictions are wrestling with the traditional requirements for authenticating hardcopy warrants, such as a judge’s “wet” signature, a clerk’s stamp, and the like. Some jurisdictions have modified their statutes and court rules to eliminate such requirements; others accommodate these requirements in a digital environment.
4. A significant implementation consideration is the creation of a unique, persistent identifier for each criminal charge contained in the Arrest Warrant. An identifier enables programmatic communications and updates regarding a specific criminal charge.
5. An informal poll of the team indicates that approximately half of the jurisdictions that have implemented an Arrest Warrant data exchange use a single IEPD for all phases of the warrant’s lifecycle (e.g., creation, quash, clear), and the other half use separate IEPDs for messages related to different phases.
6. The Arrest Warrant Extension Schema (ncsc.xsd) includes data elements for some biometric techniques that are not widely used today but might become more prevalent in the future.

## 3.5. Development Tools

The GJXDM IEPD published in 2005 did not include a Wantlist. Tom Carlson created a tool – “Got Wantlist?” – that is capable of extracting a Wantlist from a set of schema. Anyone who could benefit from this tool should contact Tom Carlson Consulting LLC (<http://tomcarlsonconsulting.com>) or the National Center for State Courts’ Technology Division (<http://www.ncsc.org>) for more information about securing a free copy.

Once a GJXDM Wantlist was reverse-engineered, Tom Carlson submitted it to the Migration Tool that is available at [www.niem.gov](http://www.niem.gov). Given the significant differences between GJXDM and NIEM, the Migration Tool cannot deliver a one-to-one mapping of every component. In addition, there are particular structures that do not migrate well: for example, inputting a Substitution Group typically results in missing components in the output Wantlist. Nonetheless, the Migration Tool was extremely useful in converting more than half of the GJXDM components to the NIEM.

# 4. Revision History

2005: GJXDM Arrest Warrant IEPD published

October 2009: NIEM 2.0 Arrest Warrant IEPD published (version 1)

# Attachment A: High-Level Business Process Model

This model reflects typical business processes during an Arrest Warrant’s lifecycle, but individual states, localities, and tribes’ practices will vary. For example, some jurisdictions empower their prosecutors to issue Arrest Warrants without the court’s participation; others permit prosecutors to modify the charges without the court’s participation.

