Virginia State Police

Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Division Newsletter

January 2013

Volume 23, Issue 1

AFIS ACTIVITIES -
AFIS to Integra-ID – Phases 2 and 3

VSP is continuing the endeavor to migrate the current AFIS system to NEC's Integra-ID platform. The new platform will provide Mobile ID functionality, dynamic workflow management capabilities, and a redundant hardware architecture.   The infrastructure for the Mobile ID functionality of Phase 1 was implemented in 2012; however, we are still in a test mode with the FBI perfecting the new web service interface. Phase 2 of the project is scheduled to be implemented in the May/June 2013, time frame.   This will complete the infrastructure at the VSP central site, and includes the conversion of the palm print database.   Phase 3 consists of replacing workstations at the remote AFIS sites, training for latent and ten print technicians, and implementation of the Integra-ID statewide. Cut over to the new Integra-ID system is expected to occur in November 2013.

Virginia Criminal Information Network (VCIN) - AMBER Alert Leads to Recovery of Toddler and Arrests

On November 15, 2012, the Cumberland County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court found that Eric Black and Jennifer Carwile constituted an imminent threat to the life and health of their one year daughter, and ordered them to surrender custody to Child Protective Services.   Rather than comply with the court order, Black and Carwile retrieved the child from the home of a relative in Halifax County and fled.

Halifax County authorities initiated an investigation into this abduction, and after identifying a suspect vehicle and possible destination, contacted the Virginia State Police, Criminal Justice Information Services Duty Sergeant at State Police Headquarters to activate the AMBER Alert System. The Virginia Missing Children Clearinghouse gathered the required information to process the request and transmit the information including photographs of all three subjects.

Virginia Criminal Information Network (VCIN)
AMBER Alert Leads to Recovery of Toddler and Arrests - Continued

As a direct result of the AMBER Alert, a UPS truck driver on I-95 spotted the suspect vehicle southbound in the early morning hours of November 16, 2012, and contacted Chesterfield County 911. The call was relayed to Virginia State Police, Division One, dispatch. As a result of the UPS driver's actions, the suspect vehicle was stopped by Trooper Matthew Meyer. The driver was identified as Eric Black, who was arrested on Abduction and Break and Entering warrants from Halifax County.

Shortly after the arrest of Eric Black, Prince George County, Maryland received an anonymous tip on the location of the child. The caller stated he recognized the child and abductor, Jennifer Carwile from the AMBER Alert coverage on the news. Prince George County Police Department investigated the tip, and located the child at the location provided by the anonymous caller. As a result of the caller's action, the child was located safely and Jennifer Carwile was arrested in connection to Abduction and Break and Entering.

The safe and quick recovery of the child is a testament of the success of the AMBER Alert program nationwide. Currently, AMBER Alerts have been credited for the safe recovery of 595 children. For more information on AMBER Alerts please visit www.missingkids.com.

Virginia Criminal Information Network (VCIN)
Advanced Authentication

In recent months, the VCIN office has received inquiries about the September 30, 2013, CJIS Security Policy mandate for Advanced Authentication. Some agencies have advised they do not know how to find the policy to reference the mandates. Each agency that has VCIN is required to have a designated Terminal Agency Coordinator (TAC). The TAC is responsible for providing their agency with NCIC/VCIN manuals, updates, important notices, and other materials related to the agency's VCIN access. All of these materials are maintained at www.leo.gov, under the VCIN-VSP SIG (Special Interest Group). In the event your TAC does not currently have access to this information, directions on how to obtain access is described in the 2011 VCIN Operating Manual on page I-13 in the Systems Section.

The CJIS security policy concerning identification and authentication describes agency requirements to identify information system users and processes acting on behalf of users, and authenticates the identities of those users or processes as a prerequisite to allowing access to agency information systems or service. It establishes that the requirement to use or not use advanced authentication is dependent upon the physical, personnel, and technical security controls associated with the user location. Section 5.6.2.2.2 includes a decision tree to help determine if a specific system or computer will require Advanced Authentication.

Section 5.6.2.2 of the CJIS Security Policy v5.1 reads:

"Advanced Authentication (AA) provides for additional security to the typical user identification and authentication of login ID and password, such as: biometric systems, user-based public key infrastructure (PKI), smart cards, software tokens, hardware tokens, paper (inert)tokens, or "Risk-based Authentication" that includes a software token element comprised of a number of factors, such as network information, user information, positive device identification (i.e. device forensics, user pattern analysis and user binding), user profiling and high risk challenge/response questions."

With "Risk-based Authentication" you will need to include a series of factors, as indicated in this section. We have discussed "Risk-based Authentication" with the FBI, and they stated, when considering high-risk authentication, they are looking at contextual and historical data. Contextual is the username/password authentication. Historical is the behind the scenes review of where the user's logging-in from, the hardware attributes of the computer, what time of day is it, etc.? This historical data is compared to the user's history, and if the attributes have changed enough then the server returns the challenge question. Typically, this is similar to what most of us have experienced in other online challenge questions, e.g., name of first pet, city of birth, family names, first car driven, best man at wedding, etc. These challenge questions should be something personal enough that only the user can reply correctly to the challenge.

While the FBI currently acknowledges "Risk-based Authentication" as an advanced authentication solution, "Risk-based Authentication" is not their first choice. Obviously, the risk is higher with this solution as compared to PKI, smart cards, etc. We foresee a move away from "Risk-based Authentication" in the future, but for now, it is good per the security policy. So even though this type will currently meet the minimum standards, your agency should realize the risk associated with this type of AA, and that it may not meet the standards in the future.

Virginia Criminal Information Network (VCIN)
Advanced Authentication - Continued

Section 5.6.2.2 of the CJIS Security Policy v5.1 reads:

"Advanced Authentication (AA) provides for additional security to the typical user identification and authentication of login ID and password, such as: biometric systems, user-based public key infra-structure (PKI), smart cards, software tokens, hardware tokens, paper (inert)tokens, or "Risk-based Authentication" that includes a software token element comprised of a number of factors, such as network information, user information, positive device identification (i.e. device forensics, user pattern analysis and user binding), user profiling and high risk challenge/response questions."

The State Police CJIS Division is not requiring or recommending a specific vendor(s) or solution(s) because each agency's needs and systems are not universal and, in many cases, are unique to each agency. There are a variety of vendors available that can meet the agency needs as they proceed in meeting the requirements set forth in this mandate. We recommend that you contact the CJIS Information Security Officer with your solution for review before implementation of the system you intend to use to ensure that it meets the CJIS Security requirements. As we learn of vendors, we will maintain a list that can be used for guidance.

In addition, all new systems, new VCIN users, and new upgrades will need to meet the AA requirement when implemented.

Should you need further information or guidance, please contact the CJIS Information Security Officer at 804-674-6719.

UCR Highlights

IBR Quality Assurance Reviews

The FBI undertook Quality Assurance Reviews in Virginia during the last week of November, 2012. Conducted every three years, these reviews by national UCR Program staff are designed to assess the accuracy and consistency of data being submitted by contributors. Nine agencies, from different areas of the state, were selected though a cooperative process between federal and state Programs. The Quality Assurance Review has been revised compared to prior time periods. The focus is primarily on accurate and complete classification of the offense(s), victim/offender/arrestee demographics, and property data. To the agencies that underwent this process – Congratulations on a job well done!

There were, however, some general issues that appeared to impact several agencies. Two of the more important issues are noted below:

1) Type of Arrest [Data Element 43]:

   Discrepancies (inaccuracies) were noted for reporting the type of arrest. Closer investigation by state IBR personnel revealed there were two primary issues contributing to this error.

   a) Clarification is needed for the type of arrest options. For IBR purposes, an "on-view arrest" [Code "O"], takes place when an offender is taken into custody without an existing warrant or when a previous incident report has not been made. The arrest type "taken into custody"[Code "T"] should be used when an offender is taken into custody based on an existing warrant or when an incident report has been previously submitted. The distinction between "on-view arrest" and "taken into custody" often leads to confusion because the standard procedure in Virginia is that a warrant is obtained after an "on-view" arrest has taken place. This type of arrest, however, should be classified as an "on-view arrest," NOT "taken into custody" based on a warrant, because the warrant was obtained **after** the subject was arrested. The correct usage of "summons/cited" [Code "S"] as a choice for type of arrest does not appear to be a concern for agencies.

   b) Another part of the issue of "on-view arrest" and "taken into custody" may be that some vendor software does not display enough text to allow agency personnel to differentiate between these two types of arrest. That is, presented with the letter code choices of "O," "T" and "S", with no additional explanation, some agencies may have routinely selected the incorrect response. It is also possible that this may be a software issue in terms of how this data element has been programmed (i.e., through the use of a default code).

      Agencies should be aware of these differences, and make sure that type of arrest, "O," "T" or "S" is entered correctly.

2) Property Description [Data Element 15]:

   Identifying the best property description category often presents difficulty for many agencies. Continuing effort needs to be placed on reporting the most specific category to help ensure that property is being recorded correctly. This has become even more critical with the expansion of twenty-six (26) additional property codes required as of July 1, 2012.

UCR Highlights – Continued
Tip(s) of the Month

At the beginning of each month, the state Program posts a 'TIP OF THE MONTH' on the IBR website (located under 'Bulletin' when you logon to the IBR secured website). We discuss situations that frequently come to the attention of the IBR staff, along with ideas or "tips" to help agency personnel resolve these issues. We encourage all IBR personnel to review these postings on a regular basis, and determine how they may impact your agency. The most recent 'tips' include:

Vandalism of a Motor Vehicle

When officers report vandalism of a motor vehicle, such as breaking the windshield or 'keying' a car, they should use the property code to indicate what type of vehicle was damaged rather than the property code of '38 motor vehicle parts/accessories.' In other words, report the actual vehicle code such as 03 = Automobile, 05 = Bus, 24 = Other Motor Vehicle, 28 = Recreational Vehicle, or 37 = Truck because it is a better property description than 38 = Vehicle Parts/Accessories. This is a requirement made by the FBI national IBR program. It does not matter if the damaged/vandalized parts are located inside the vehicle or on the exterior. When the property description is reported as 38 vehicle parts/accessories, one cannot determine whether the vandalized parts and accessories were specifically from an automobile, truck, bus, recreational vehicle, or other motor vehicle. Therefore, reporting agencies should use the most specific vehicle description instead of the description 38 vehicle parts/accessories. Examples: Slashed tires on school bus = 290 with 05 property; damage done to the protective shield between the front and back of the inside of a car = 290 with 03 property description; smashed windshield on an RV = 290 with 28 property.

Statistical Reports on the IBR Website

The statistical reports on the IBR website will show you the number of offenses and arrests you have submitted by type of offense. Keep in mind that any incidents on the unresolved error list will not be counted in your crime and arrest numbers, so please review the errors and resubmit the corrected reports, as soon as possible. In particular, many agencies will see unresolved errors for the last few months if the new cargo theft field was missing. You will have to open each of those incidents and indicate whether or not cargo theft was involved. A very important point is to verify that you have followed the process required by your RMS vendor to actually resubmit the incidents with your next monthly IBR submission file. When the errored incident has been successfully resubmitted to the state Program, that incident number will automatically be removed from the unresolved error list. Please call the state Program office with any questions about your data and/or if you need any help in correcting errors.

Cargo Theft

Cargo theft is not considered an offense by itself; cargo theft is required to be reported if an incident includes at least one of the following offenses: Robbery, Extortion/Blackmail, Burglary, Theft From Building, Theft From Motor Vehicle, All Other Larceny, Motor Vehicle Theft, False Pretenses, Credit Card Fraud, Impersonation, Wire Fraud, Embezzlement or Bribery. Two key phrases in the classification of cargo theft are 'commercial shipment' and 'in the supply chain.' To be considered cargo, the items must be part of a commercial shipment and must be in the supply chain (that is, moving in commerce). Thefts from United Parcel Service (UPS), Federal Express (FedEx), the U.S. mail, etc., are considered to be cargo until items are received at a final distribution point.

UCR Highlights – Continued
Tip(s) of the Month - Continued

Once the business receives the items (that is, personnel at the company sign for the goods), the goods are no longer considered cargo because they are outside of the supply chain. Therefore, deliveries from UPS, FedEx, to individuals or other businesses (e.g., flowers, pizza, electronics, appliances, etc.) are not considered to be cargo because they are outside of the supply chain. The dollar amount, and the number of items taken are not factors in determining whether a cargo theft occurred. Examples of cargo theft incidents include:

- A tractor-trailer loaded with kitchen appliances is en route from a manufacturing facility to a commercial establishment when the tractor-trailer is stolen at a rest stop. Agencies should report the incident as a Motor Vehicle Theft (IBR Offense Code 240).
- A truckload of pizza sauce, cheese, and pizza dough were being transported from the processing/manufacturing facility to a chain pizzeria store when the items were removed from the truck. Agencies should report the incident as a Theft from a Motor Vehicle (IBR Offense Code 23F).
- A truck driver is hauling appliances from a distribution center to a local store and stops to refuel the vehicle at a rest stop. He is confronted by an armed individual who takes the keys to the truck and drives away with the vehicle. Agencies should report the incident as a Robbery (IBR Offense Code 120).
- A distribution point for a national electronics chain is broken into and 75 flat-screen televisions are taken. Agencies should report the incident as a Burglary/Breaking & Entering (IBR Offense Code 220).

Please see the Publications/IBR Publications link on the IBR website for more examples. Contact the state Program office with any questions or to request a review of a case narrative.

Many agencies are experiencing '101' errors from their last monthly submissions for incidents that are missing cargo theft data for applicable offenses. Please review your monthly submission error report and contact the state Program office with any questions. Remember that errored incidents must be revised and resubmitted via your next monthly IBR submission file, in order to be accepted in the state IBR database and be included in your agency's official crime and arrest numbers.

Uniform Statute/Conversion Table

A new Uniform Statute/Conversion Table (Modified) was uploaded to the IBR website. This table is located under IBR Publications, and includes new state statutes enacted July 2012 that are most applicable to the UCR/IBR program. Any additions or changes are identified with the '7/1/2012' date entered in the column 'Most Recent IBR Modifications.' Please remember that this table is intended to be used as a tool and, depending on the specific circumstances of a case, the IBR code may need to be modified to reflect the actual scenario for a specific incident.

UCR Highlights – Continued

Clarification Regarding Drug Types

Since the latest August 2011 version of the IBR Data Dictionary has been posted to the IBR website, we have received notification of additional drugs to include in specific categories. If you have printed out the Data Dictionary, you may want to add these drugs on page 42 for field 020 Suspected Drug Type. If you have any questions about a drug category, please let us know.

- Code 'H Other Narcotics': vicodin, pentazocine/talwin (change of category from 'other depressants' - common street names are Kibbles & Bits, Sets, T's and B's, tease and bees, tease and blues, tease and pies, Teddies and Bettys, tops and bottoms, or tricycles and bicycles) and propoxyphene/darvon (change of category from 'other drugs' - common street names are Pinks, Footballs, Yellow Footballs, 65's, and N's).
- Code 'K Other Hallucinogens': 25i (25I-NBOMe, NBOMe-2C-I, BOM-CI, Cimbi-5, Solaris), ectasy and marinol/dronabinol).
- Code 'L Amphetamines/Methamphetamines': methcathinone.
- Code 'M Other Stimulants': bath salts, KHAT.

Anomaly Detection

We continue to expand our list of anomalies. Currently, we have developed over 25 different anomalies that we send to reporting agencies, as needed, on a quarterly basis. For IBR purposes, an anomaly can be thought of as any data field or combination of data fields that initially appears to be "out of the ordinary" or "unusual." It is important to keep in mind that an anomaly may indicate a data error or there may be no data error. If, for example, an incident of Murder (09A) with the Type Weapon [Field 13A] Motor Vehicle (35) were submitted to the state program, we would ask the agency to verify that the incident meets the correct IBR offense classification for murder with the motor vehicle as a weapon and the incident was not a traffic accident with an unfortunate outcome resulting in a death (which would not be reported through IBR).

A recent addition to the list of anomaly reviews includes incidents of simple assault (13B) that were reported with no weapon used and no or minor injury. Although these incidents can pass the IBR edits, the state program will be asking agencies to provide examples of narratives for these reports. In many cases, we suspect that personal weapons (hands, feet, fists, etc.) were actually used and should be reported as the type of weapon. Please be aware of simple assault incidents over the next few months to ensure that your 13B simple assaults are being reported with the correct type of weapon used. Please call the state Program office with any questions. We would be happy to review any case narratives that are questionable to you.

Another new anomaly check identifies all incidents reported with cargo theft property. We ask agencies to review each of these incidents and provide the state Program with narratives of all cases that do involve cargo theft. If the agency's review indicates that cargo theft was documented in error, those incidents must be revised and resubmitted with the next monthly IBR submission file.

UCR Highlights – Continued

FBI National Program Beta Websites

The national Program notifies the state Program when previews of national crime and arrest data are posted to the FBI website. You will find notifications of these postings, along with required user names and passwords, under 'Bulletins' on the state IBR website. Please be aware that until the FBI makes these data public, the review period (which usually lasts one week) is restricted to authorized agency personnel only. If you have any questions about these beta sites, please call the state Program office.

Group A Offenses and Group B Arrests

Statewide, the Group A Offense nine month preliminary data figures for 2011 and 2012 are as follows:

Group A Offenses - Nine Months	2011	2012	Percent Difference
Murder/Non-negligent	231	215	-6.9
Kidnapping/Abduction	1,097	951	-13.3
Forcible Rape	1,159	1,091	-5.9
Other Forcible Sex Offenses	2,609	2,598	-0.4
Robbery	3,950	3,284	-16.9
Aggravated Assault	6,762	6,716	-0.7
Simple Assault & Intimidation	74,772	71,552	-4.3
Arson	866	864	-0.2
Extortion/Blackmail	84	82	-2.4
Burglary	21,768	20,422	-6.2
Larceny Theft	107,115	101,468	-5.3
Motor Vehicle Theft	7,262	6,536	-10.0
Counterfeiting/Forgery	5,119	4,711	-8.0
Fraud Offenses	19,059	19,554	2.6
Embezzlement	2,013	1,735	-13.8
Stolen Property Offenses	1,114	916	-17.8
Damage/Vandalism of Property	55,569	51,825	-6.7
Drug/Narcotic Offenses	37,686	40,261	6.8
Non-Forcible Sex Offenses	158	134	-15.2
Pornography/Obscene Material	509	481	-5.5
Gambling Offenses	131	39	-70.2
Prostitution Offenses	656	800	22.0
Bribery	20	21	5.0
Weapon Law Violations	6,575	6,536	-0.6
TOTAL	356,284	342,792	-3.8

UCR Highlights – Continued
Group A Offenses and Group B Arrests - Continued

Nine Month Arrests 2011-2012					Adult Difference	Juvenile Difference
	Adult	Juvenile	Adult	Juvenile		
	2011		2012			
Group A	95,178	12,123	92,558	10,548	-2.8	-13.0
Group B	150,894	11,589	141,099	10,467	-6.5	-9.7
TOTAL	246,072	23,712	233,657	21,015	-5.0	-11.4

Comparing preliminary nine months' data for 2011 and 2012, the number of Group A and Group B arrests experienced declines for adults (-2.8% and -6.5%, respectively). Juvenile arrests also experienced a decrease for both Group A arrests (-13.0%) as well as Group B arrests (-9.7%).

YEAR-END CONSIDERATIONS

The final date for submitting 2012 data that will be included in 'Crime in Virginia' and 'Crime in the U.S.' is quickly approaching. Based on prior years, mid-March of 2013, will be the deadline to submit any revisions, updates, and/or corrections to 2012 crime and arrest data that will be published in the state and federal reports. These numbers are based on data that agencies submit error-free. We suggest that on the day after you submit each IBR file, you check back on the website and view the 'error report.' The 'error report' includes descriptions of any errors. It is also important to verify that data intended to be submitted was actually included in the IBR file and was accepted. Occasionally, an IBR file may appear on the website as 'processed.' However, the error report will show that no data was accepted because the IBR file contained a fatal error, such as an incorrect agency name. In addition, it is a good idea to verify that you've submitted the appropriate monthly IBR file. We've seen cases where an agency has submitted the same IBR monthly file multiple times in error.

Please contact the state IBR Program office with any questions or concerns. As always, thank you all for your efforts to make the state's crime data as complete and accurate as possible.