

Crime Gun Intelligence Architecture Self-Assessment Tool

How to Use This Assessment

This tool is designed to give you an honest, structured picture of where your Crime Gun Intelligence Architecture stands today across all 13 essential elements. It is a diagnostic instrument, not a compliance checklist: the starting point for a strategic conversation about where your agency needs to invest, what it needs to build, and what it needs to fix.

Complete the assessment for your own jurisdiction before sharing it with your team, your chief, or your partner agencies. The most useful version of this tool is one completed with brutal honesty. A score of 3 that you actually earned is more valuable than a score of 5 you gave yourself to avoid an uncomfortable conversation.

Instructions

- 1. Work through each element table. For every performance indicator, select the score (1–5) that most accurately describes your agency’s current state, not your aspirational state, not what you are planning to build. What exists and functions today.
- 2. Write your score in the Score column. Use the Notes/Evidence column to document the specific evidence that justifies your score. It may be a policy document, a compliance report, a NIBIN turnaround log, a meeting record. Undocumented scores are assumptions.
- 3. Total each element’s score and transfer it to the Master Scorecard at the end. Calculate your overall program score and identify your maturity band.
- 4. Identify your three lowest-scoring elements. These are your Priority Action items. Build a 90-day plan addressing each one before reassessing.
- 5. Reassess every 6 months. A living assessment is useful. A one-time snapshot is history.

Scoring Scale

SCORE	WHAT IT MEANS
1: CRITICAL GAP	Element absent or fundamentally broken. Immediate leadership attention required.
2: DEVELOPING	Element exists in partial form. Significant gaps in policy, staffing, or execution.
3: FUNCTIONAL	Element is operational but inconsistent. Policy and accountability structures need strengthening.
4: PROFICIENT	Element is well-developed and routinely effective. Minor refinements remain.
5: EXEMPLARY	Element is fully integrated, measured, and continuously improved. A model for others.



PILLAR I — LEADERSHIP & POLICY

ELEMENT 1 A CRIME GUN INTELLIGENCE CHAMPION [PILLAR I]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Designated Champion Exists <i>Authority & organizational position</i>	No designated champion	Informal champion, no authority	Champion designated, limited authority	Champion with rank & cross-agency reach	Executive-level champion with documented mandate	—	
Stakeholder Alignment <i>Cross-agency collaboration</i>	No stakeholder coordination	Ad hoc coordination only	Regular meetings, limited follow-through	Structured collaboration with accountability	Unified cross-jurisdictional CGI strategy	—	
Technology Advocacy <i>Vendor-neutral, mission-driven</i>	No tech advocacy	Reactive to vendor pitches	Champion promotes tools, no strategy	Deliberate tech roadmap, monitored adoption	Integration reviewed & updated continuously	—	
Succession Planning <i>Program survives personnel changes</i>	Program depends on one person	No succession documented	Informal successor identified	Documented succession plan exists	Multi-level champions trained & active	—	
ELEMENT 1 TOTAL SCORE (max 20):						—	Avg: ___/4

ELEMENT 2 ADHERENCE TO GUIDING POLICIES AND BEST PRACTICES [PILLAR I]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Policy Documentation <i>Written, current, accessible</i>	No policies exist	Outdated or partial policies	Policies documented, not current	Current policies, regularly reviewed	Policies align with ATF MROS & AG directives	—	
Compliance Monitoring <i>Audits & accountability</i>	No monitoring	Reactive only	Annual reviews	Quarterly audits with follow-up	Continuous monitoring with dashboards	—	
Evidence Submission Timeline <i>24–48 hr NIBIN MROS standard</i>	No timeline	30+ days typical	7–14 days typical	3–5 days typical	24–48 hrs consistent, documented	—	
Cross-Agency Policy Alignment <i>Partner agencies follow same standards</i>	No partner alignment	1–2 partners aligned	Regional policies being developed	Most partners aligned	All partners operating under unified policy	—	
ELEMENT 2 TOTAL SCORE (max 20):						—	Avg: ___/4



PILLAR II — DETECTION & SURVEILLANCE

ELEMENT 3 | A REALTIME REGIONAL/STATEWIDE SHOOTING EVENT DATABASE [PILLAR II]

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Database Exists & Is Active <i>Including non-fatal shootings</i>	No database	Homicide-only database	Partial shooting data captured	All fatal & non-fatal captured	Real-time, regional, 500+ agency feeds	—	
Data Entry Timeliness <i>How quickly incidents are entered</i>	No standard	Weeks to months	5–7 days	24–48 hours	Same shift as incident	—	
Cross-Jurisdictional Access <i>Partner agencies can query & contribute</i>	Single agency only	2–3 agencies sharing	Regional partial access	Most agencies in region connected	Full regional access, API-connected	—	
Integration with NIBIN/eTrace <i>Database feeds and is fed by other elements</i>	No integration	Manual cross-reference only	Some automated feeds	NIBIN/eTrace data linked	Fully automated: NIBIN + eTrace + ALPR + mapping	—	
ELEMENT 3 TOTAL SCORE (max 20):						—	Avg: ___/4

ELEMENT 4 | DEPLOYED AUTOMATED LICENSE PLATE READERS [PILLAR II]

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
ALPR Infrastructure <i>Fixed & mobile camera coverage</i>	No ALPR	1–3 cameras, limited coverage	Moderate coverage, major corridors	Comprehensive arterial coverage	Perimeter + hotspot + mobile integrated	—	
Post-Shooting Query Protocol <i>Standard procedure after every shooting</i>	No protocol	Occasional ad hoc queries	Protocol exists, inconsistent use	Routine queries within 2 hrs	Automated query triggered by GDT/CAD alert	—	
Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing <i>Data shared with regional partners</i>	No sharing	Case-by-case requests only	Informal sharing agreement	Formal data sharing MOU	Real-time regional ALPR network (e.g., ROIC)	—	
Data Retention & Privacy Compliance <i>Policy-governed retention timeline</i>	No policy	Inconsistent retention	Policy exists, not audited	Policy audited annually	Privacy-compliant, retention optimized for investigations	—	
ELEMENT 4 TOTAL SCORE (max 20):						—	Avg: ___/4



ELEMENT 5 DEPLOYED CLOSED-CIRCUIT TV CAMERAS [PILLAR II]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Camera Infrastructure <i>Coverage, resolution, placement strategy</i>	No CCTV	Low-quality, minimal coverage	Moderate coverage, mixed quality	High-resolution, evidence-grade cameras	1,000+ cameras, AI-analytics integration	—	
RTCC Integration <i>Cameras monitored by trained analysts</i>	No RTCC	Recording only, no monitoring	Part-time monitoring	24/7 monitoring staffed	Real-time analyst-to-officer intelligence push	—	
Footage Retrieval Protocol <i>Speed of access after shooting</i>	No protocol	Days to weeks	Within 24 hours	Within 2 hours	Automated: GDT triggers camera pan/record	—	
Private Camera Integration <i>Business & residential cameras in network</i>	No private network	Case-by-case canvass	Voluntary registry exists	Majority of key locations registered	Integrated private feeds in RTCC platform	—	
ELEMENT 5 TOTAL SCORE (max 20):						—	Avg: ___/4

ELEMENT 6 DEPLOYED GUNSHOT DETECTION/GEOLOCATION TECHNOLOGIES [PILLAR II]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
GDT Deployment Coverage <i>Geographic sensor coverage</i>	No GDT	Pilot/limited area	Covers highest-violence zones	Covers most violence corridors	Full jurisdiction coverage, perimeter sensors	—	
Evidence Recovery Protocol <i>Casing collection after every alert</i>	No protocol	Occasional response	Inconsistent casing recovery	Standard casing recovery procedure	100% casing recovery rate documented	—	
NIBIN Pipeline Integration <i>Recovered casings enter NIBIN within timeline</i>	No NIBIN connection	Manual, delayed submission	5–7 day NIBIN entry	24–48 hr NIBIN entry	Same-day entry, automated alert to CGIC	—	
Shooting Database Feed <i>All GDT alerts logged as shooting incidents</i>	No logging	Partial logging	Most alerts logged	All alerts logged	Automated log + RTCC notification + analysis	—	
Multi-System Integration <i>GDT feeds ALPR, CCTV, drone response</i>	Standalone only	Manual hand-off	2 systems connected	3 systems integrated	Full stack: GDT + ALPR + CCTV + Drone + RTCC	—	
ELEMENT 6 TOTAL SCORE (max 25):						—	Avg: ___/5



PILLAR III — EVIDENCE & INTELLIGENCE

ELEMENT 7 A NATIONAL BALLISTIC IMAGING, ANALYSIS, AND SHARING NETWORK (NIBIN) [PILLAR III]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
NIBIN Enrollment & Access <i>Agency or regional hub</i>	No NIBIN access	Access via another agency	Own NIBIN unit	Own NIBIN + test-fire capability	Regional hub serving multiple agencies	—	
Evidence Submission Timeliness <i>Versus 24–48 hr MROS standard</i>	No standard	Months	1–2 weeks	3–5 days	24–48 hrs consistent, MROS compliant	—	
Recovered Firearm Test-Fires <i>All crime guns test-fired and entered</i>	Not performed	Selective only	Most guns test-fired	All handguns test-fired	All guns + serial restoration protocol	—	
Lead Assignment Protocol <i>Every NIBIN lead assigned and documented</i>	No protocol	Leads generated, unassigned	Leads assigned, no follow-up tracking	Tracked with supervisor review	Documented workflow + prosecution feedback loop	—	
Cross-Jurisdictional Lead Sharing <i>Leads shared with impacted agencies</i>	No sharing	Case-by-case	Informal agreements	MOU-governed sharing	NESS + eTrace Data Sharing+ real-time notification	—	
ELEMENT 7 TOTAL SCORE (max 25):						—	Avg: ___/5

ELEMENT 8 A NATIONAL CRIME GUN TRACING SYSTEM (ETRACE) [PILLAR III]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Universal Trace Policy <i>Every recovered crime gun is traced</i>	No policy	Selective tracing	Most guns traced	Universal policy written	Universal + same-day submission enforced	—	
Trace Submission Speed <i>From recovery to submission</i>	No standard	Weeks	5–7 days	24–48 hours	Same day as NIBIN submission	—	
Time-to-Crime Analysis <i>Aggregate analysis of trafficking signals</i>	Not performed	Requested only	Ad hoc analysis	Quarterly trend analysis	Monthly Time-to-Crime analysis drives ATF referrals	—	
eTrace-NIBIN Integration	Used independently	Occasional cross-reference	Manual combination	Protocol links both tools	Automated: NIBIN hit = urgent	—	



<i>Both tools used together on same firearms</i>					trace request		
International & Interstate Sharing <i>Cross-border coordination on trafficking</i>	No international use	Domestic only	Some interstate coordination	Interstate + 1–2 international partners	eTrace data sharing + iARMS + active ATF task force partnership	—	
ELEMENT 8 TOTAL SCORE (max 25):						—	Avg: ___/5

ELEMENT 9 PROCESSING RECOVERED CRIME GUNS FOR FORENSIC EVIDENCE [PILLAR III]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Forensic Processing Protocol <i>Documented sequence: prints → DNA → NIBIN</i>	No protocol	Ad hoc processing	Protocol exists, inconsistent	Protocol followed consistently	AG directive / state law compliant + audited	—	
Latent Print Examination <i>Including superglue fuming</i>	Not performed	Selective cases	Most recovered guns	All recovered guns	All guns + ForenScope/multispectral imaging	—	
DNA Swabbing <i>Contact surfaces swabbed at recovery</i>	Not performed	Lab request only	Inconsistent field swabbing	Standard scene protocol	Field + lab integration with pre-approval workflow	—	
Timeliness of Processing <i>From recovery to completed forensic processing</i>	No standard	Months	2–4 weeks	1 week	24–48 hrs priority; same-day NIBIN (FastTRAX model)	—	
Arrest Biometric Collection <i>Arrestee prints & DNA collected at booking</i>	No protocol	Inconsistent	Protocol exists	Protocol enforced	Officer-level accountability + database comparison verified	—	
ELEMENT 9 TOTAL SCORE (max 25):						—	Avg: ___/5

ELEMENT 10 ACCESS TO GUN CRIME MAPPING TOOLS [PILLAR III]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Mapping Platform Availability <i>GIS or equivalent operational tool</i>	No mapping tools	Basic PIN maps only	GIS software, limited use	Dedicated crime mapping analyst	Integrated platform: NIBIN + shooting DB + ALPR	—	
Data Currency <i>How current is the data feeding the maps</i>	Months old	Weekly updates	Daily updates	Near-real-time	Live feeds from shooting DB + NIBIN + GDT alerts	—	
Commander Use & Decision-Making <i>Maps inform operational decisions</i>	Maps not used operationally	Occasional reference	Monthly review	Weekly operational briefings	Daily commander dashboard + deployment decisions	—	
Risk Terrain / Predictive Analysis <i>Environmental risk factors identified</i>	Not performed	Historical hotspots only	Basic cluster analysis	RTM or equivalent performed	RTM + intervention targeting + outcome evaluation	—	
ELEMENT 10 TOTAL SCORE (max 20):						—	Avg: ___/4

ELEMENT 11 CRIME ANALYSIS CAPABILITIES [PILLAR III]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Dedicated Gun Violence Analyst <i>Staffed & assigned to CGI mission</i>	No analyst	General crime analyst, no CGI focus	Partial assignment	Dedicated CGI analyst	Analyst team: tactical + strategic products	—	
Integration with Investigations <i>Analyst embedded in investigative workflow</i>	No connection	Reactive requests only	Weekly briefings	Daily briefings + lead generation	Analyst co-located with investigators, real-time support	—	
Data Source Access <i>Analyst can query all relevant systems</i>	No database access	1–2 systems	NIBIN + shooting DB	NIBIN + eTrace + ALPR + shooting DB	All 13 elements + court data + probation/parole	—	
Analytical Products Produced <i>Quality and utility of intelligence products</i>	No products	Basic crime stats	Monthly trend reports	Tactical briefings + network charts	Finished intelligence: threat assessments + predictive products	—	
ELEMENT 11 TOTAL SCORE (max 20):						—	Avg: ___/4



PILLAR IV — INTEGRATION & SUSTAINMENT

ELEMENT 12 AN INFORMATION SHARING PLATFORM [PILLAR IV]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Platform Exists & Is Active <i>Centralized CGI hub in operation</i>	No platform	File-sharing only (SharePoint, email)	Basic case management system	CGI-specific platform (NESS, RMS integration)	Full CGIC platform: NIBIN + eTrace + shooting DB + analyst products	—	
Cross-Agency Participation <i>Partner agencies actively using platform</i>	Single agency	1–3 partners	Regional group with MOU	Majority of regional agencies	Full regional network: all agencies + prosecutors + ATF	—	
Real-Time Intelligence Push <i>Leads pushed to investigators automatically</i>	No push capability	Email notification only	Basic alert system	Real-time lead notification	Automated: NIBIN lead → assigned detective → documented follow-up	—	
GunStat / Accountability Model <i>Recurring structured sharing meetings</i>	No meetings	Ad hoc case discussions	Monthly meetings, inconsistent	Structured bi-weekly or monthly GunStat	Executive-level GunStat + per-arrest synopsis + federal prosecution review	—	
eTrace / NIBIN Collective Sharing <i>Data shared through ATF federal mechanisms</i>	Not enrolled	eTrace enrolled, no sharing	eTrace enrolled + some collective data sharing	eTrace + active collective data sharing + NESS enrolled	eTrace active collective data sharing + NESS + iTrafficking + international MOU	—	
ELEMENT 12 TOTAL SCORE (max 25):						—	Avg: ___/5



ELEMENT 13 LAYERING/LEVERAGING OF DATA ACROSS DISPARATE SYSTEMS [PILLAR IV]							
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	1	2	3	4	5	SCORE	NOTES / EVIDENCE
Single Pane of Glass / RTCC <i>Integrated operational view exists</i>	No integration	Manual combination of systems	2–3 systems connected	Dedicated RTCC with 4+ systems integrated	Full RTCC: ALPR + CCTV + GDT + drone + NIBIN + eTrace	—	
API / Interoperability Architecture <i>Systems technically capable of integration</i>	No interoperability	Point-to-point manual feeds	Some API connections	Open-architecture platform (Milestone, Fusus, Genetec)	Cloud-based integration layer, vendor-agnostic	—	
Drone / Aerial Integration <i>DFR or aerial capability connected to RTCC</i>	No drone capability	Drone available, standalone	Drone with manual RTCC coordination	DFR auto-deploy on shooting call	DFR + RTCC live feed + ALPR + NIBIN submission protocol	—	
Analyst Integration <i>Analyst actively monitoring all data streams</i>	No RTCC analyst	Analyst available on request	Analyst staffed during business hours	24/5 analyst coverage	24/7 analyst coverage with field push capability	—	
IT Leadership & Governance <i>Structured plan for sustaining integration</i>	No IT strategy	Reactive IT support only	Annual IT review	Integration roadmap with timeline	MOU-governed data sharing + annual interoperability audit	—	
ELEMENT 13 TOTAL SCORE (max 25):						—	Avg: ___/5

MASTER SCORECARD

Transfer your element totals here. Calculate your overall score and identify your maturity band.

#	ELEMENT	PILLAR	MAX	YOUR SCORE	% SCORE	PRIORITY ACTION
1	CGI Champion	I	20	___	___%	
2	Guiding Policies & Best Practices	I	20	___	___%	
3	Shooting Event Database	II	20	___	___%	
4	Automated License Plate Readers	II	20	___	___%	
5	Closed-Circuit TV Cameras	II	20	___	___%	
6	Gunshot Detection Technologies	II	20	___	___%	
7	National Ballistic Imaging Network	III	25	___	___%	
8	National Crime Gun Tracing System	III	25	___	___%	
9	Crime Gun Forensic Processing	III	25	___	___%	
10	Gun Crime Mapping Tools	III	20	___	___%	
11	Element 11 — Crime Analysis Capabilities	III	20	___	___%	
12	Information Sharing Platform	IV	25	___	___%	
13	Data Layering/Leveraging	IV	25	___	___%	
OVERALL CGI PROGRAM SCORE (max 285):			285	___	___%	

CGI PROGRAM MATURITY BANDS

SCORE RANGE	MATURITY LEVEL	WHAT TO DO NOW
229–285 (80–100%)	OPTIMIZED	Your CGI program is operating at or near best-practice standard. Focus on integration depth, sustainment, and mentoring other agencies. Pursue formal recognition and share your model.
200–228 (70–79%)	ADVANCED	Strong program with solid foundations. Identify your lowest-scoring elements and target them for focused improvement. Build the data integration and sharing layers that will push you into Optimized.
143–199 (50–69%)	DEVELOPING	Core elements are in place but the program is inconsistent. Prioritize policy and accountability structures. Establish baseline timelines and audit compliance. Build analytical capacity.
86–142 (30–49%)	EMERGING	Significant gaps across multiple elements. Immediate focus on leadership, policy, and the evidence-processing pipeline. Consider requesting a CGI technical assistance visit from ATF or a peer jurisdiction.
0–85 (0–29%)	CRITICAL	The program is in a foundational stage or has systemic failures across multiple elements. Executive leadership must own this assessment and establish a structured 12-month rebuilding plan.

YOUR 90-DAY PRIORITY ACTION PLAN

Based on your three lowest-scoring elements, define one concrete action for each below. Assign an owner and a deadline.

#1	Element:	Success Metric:	Owner:	Target Date:
	Priority Action:			
#2	Element:	Success Metric:	Owner:	Target Date:
	Priority Action:			
#3	Element:	Success Metric:	Owner:	Target Date:
	Priority Action:			

This assessment was completed by: _____ Title: _____

Agency: _____ Date: _____ Next Review Date: _____

For technical assistance on building your CGI program, contact RF FACTOR™ at www.rffactor.com.