

Fitting Square Pegs into a Round Hole?

An Assessment of the Feasibility of Linking Incident Based Crime Report Information to Criminal History Records through the South Carolina Law Enforcement Information Exchange

Rob McManus
Sarah Crawford
Muhammad Salaam

July 2013

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the assistance and active cooperation of South Carolina Law Enforcement Division (SLED) staff, both from the Crime Information Center and the Fusion Center. It is also important to highlight and acknowledge SLED's important contributions to crime analysis in South Carolina over the course of many years by making crime incident data readily available for analysis as well as making computerized criminal history records extracts available to the State Data Warehouse.

This publication was partially funded by Federal Grant Number 2011-BJ-CX-K003 from the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Points of view or opinions stated are those of the principal researcher and do not necessarily represent the opinion or official position of the United States Department of Justice

Introduction

South Carolina has a long and distinguished history of incident based crime reporting. SLED served as the test pilot site for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) in 1991. SLED developed and implemented a NIBRS compliant incident based crime reporting system, the South Carolina Incident Based Reporting System (SCIBRS). SLED has maintained and operated SCIBRS since that date. Nearly 100% statewide participation in SCIBRS and compliance with its requirements has been maintained each year since that date. The result has been the availability of a dataset with more than twenty years of detailed crime incident data. SCIBRS contains information concerning multiple offenses, weapon involvement, drug and alcohol involvement, time of day, type of locale, gang involvement, demographic information concerning crime victims, offenders and arrestees, the relationship between crime victims and offenders, specific illicit substances and a wealth of other information concerning the criminal incident. Currently, although thirty-two states are certified to report NIBRS data to the FBI, only fifteen states report 100% participation by all law enforcement agencies in a NIBRS compliant incident based reporting system. (JRSA, 2012)

Because it contains such a detailed level of information concerning the circumstances of criminal incidents, SCIBRS has long been and continues to be a useful source of policy relevant data. Analyses focusing on topics such as domestic violence, firearm violence, illegal drug activity, school violence and other policy relevant topics have been successfully undertaken relying exclusively upon SCIBRS data for law enforcement data. Such efforts could not have been successful in the absence of an incident based reporting system. SCIBRS provides South Carolina with an analytic capacity not available to most states or to any jurisdictions lacking incident based reporting.

Criminal history records, for which SLED is the repository agency, are another important data source and make possible analysis concerning criminal trends, arrest patterns and other policy relevant concerns. Criminal history records make possible recidivism analysis at a number of different points. Analyses using criminal history records have been successfully undertaken concerning the subsequent criminal behavior of individuals who have been through the state's juvenile justice, correctional and community correctional systems. Criminal history records data has also provided the basis for the development of risk assessment instruments and other analyses that use conviction data as an outcome measure. This has been possible because all the information systems of the involved agencies, including the state's criminal history record system, have individual identifiers that enable linking the information from one system to another. SLED has been providing criminal history records data to the State Data Warehouse for several years.

However state level analyses describing the criminal history of individuals involved in specific sorts of criminal activity; e.g., firearm violence, sexual violence, domestic violence, drug trafficking, have not been successfully undertaken. Criminal history

records alone are insufficient to identify specific types of criminal situations and the individuals involved in them. For instance, some crimes involve a deadly weapon, or specify a certain type of victim to offender relationship such as a child or spouse, but that information cannot necessarily be determined from the offense listed in the criminal history. This deficiency is partly due to a lack of specificity inherent in the conviction offense and partly because charges do not necessarily reflect the facts of the offense due to plea negotiations or other revisions. For example, an assault involving a deadly weapon might result in a conviction for a less serious assault offense, or even a charge which cannot be identified as an assault, such as disorderly conduct. Similarly, a domestic violence incident might result in a charge of another type of assault (simple assault or assault and battery) which does not identify the domestic aspect of the incident, making it impossible to determine that a domestic relationship existed between the victim(s) and offender(s) involved in the incident.

The ability to link incident based information with criminal history records data would allow for a new level of analysis; one that would inform policy concerns regarding the criminal backgrounds, or subsequent criminal convictions of individuals involved in specific sorts of criminal activity. This would allow analytic efforts to overcome the existing limitations of the criminal history records and address issues such as determining the prior criminal history of domestic violence offenders or charting the subsequent criminal histories of offenders who have used firearms to commit violent offenses, to provide just two examples. Consequently, this project was undertaken to determine if it was feasible to use data from the South Carolina Law Enforcement Information Exchange (SCIEEx) as an alternate means to link together information from incident based crime reporting to a person's criminal history.

Previous Efforts

This was not the first effort to link crime incident information and criminal history records. An earlier effort funded by the Justice Research and Statistics Association focused on linking SCIBRS to computerized criminal history records by using the incident case number as the linking mechanism. The case number is a number generated by each reporting jurisdiction that is unique within that agency and assigned to the incident in the SCIBRS dataset. Combined with the Originating Agency Identifier (ORI), a unique number assigned to each law enforcement agency, it creates a unique identifier for each incident. The computerized criminal history records also provide fields for the incident case number and the ORI, making it possible to create the same unique identifier. Seemingly, this provided a relatively straightforward way to link these two data sets and enable the desired analysis combining data from both the criminal incident and the criminal history records. Unfortunately, although the case number is present on all SCIBRS records (importantly, no duplicate ORI/case numbers were encountered) and ORI numbers were present on all criminal history records, the case number was found on only 25% of the criminal history records reviewed. While the case number is required in the SCIBRS dataset, it is neither an essential or required field in the criminal history record as it serves no particular function in the day to day, tactical, uses of criminal

history records. As a result, the case number was not consistently present and did not provide a trustworthy means of linking the two datasets. (Bradberry & McManus, 2010)

Methodology

The Office of Research and Statistics (ORS) was chosen to undertake the linking process. Their expertise in linking datasets by creating a common identifier across different data sets provided them with unique qualifications to undertake this project. Additionally, ORS has extensive experience with analysis of the computerized criminal history records.

SCIEx contains fields for identifiers associated with individuals involved in criminal incidents as well as the case numbers assigned to an incident report by the local jurisdiction. Among SCIEx's data fields are included name, social security number, gender, race and date of birth. SCIEx also contains fields for the ORI of the contributing agency and the case number for the incident. ORS maintains extract files of the computerized criminal history records. As a dataset in the State Data Warehouse, the criminal history record files have already been assigned a unique identifier based on name, gender, race and date of birth. Each SCIBRS record contains fields for the ORI of the contributing agency and the case number for the incident that is unique to that agency. Concatenating the ORI with the case number results in a unique identifying number for each incident.

The method proposed to link these datasets was to use the individual identifiers in SCIEx to create and assign unique identification numbers to individuals contained in that dataset, using an algorithm developed by ORS. The algorithm uses personal identifiers that include, but are not limited to: social security number, first name, middle initial, last name, date of birth, race, and gender. The data are cleaned (i.e., characters are removed from SSN, dates are compared to valid ranges) and standardized (i.e., all characters are converted to uppercase) before being run through the algorithm. The availability of identifying data are important; i.e., the greater the number of individual identifiers the greater the chance of being able to make a link to information concerning that individual from another data source. Missing or invalid data decreases the probability of being able to match data from one source to another. The algorithm accounts for misspelling, name changes, transposed digits and slight differences in the date of birth.

Once a unique identification number is assigned to an individual from the SCIEx dataset, the second step is to match that person to an individual in the criminal history records dataset. Records from the computerized criminal history records would be subjected to the same algorithm to generate an identification number. A "Matchscore" is generated based on how well the record fields match to an existing record. The fields used are first name, last name, date of birth, social security number, race and gender. Those with a match of least 90% receive an identification number from the record. Otherwise, the record is put into a pool for a "fuzzy match" of the indicators. The matched data records would be linked, creating a dataset with both SCIEx and computerized criminal history data. The next step would be to use the unique incident identifier created by combining

the ORI and incident report number (contained in SCIEEx) to link the combined SCIEEx and criminal history data to crime incident information contained in SCIBRS. The final product would contain incident information from SCIBRS and the criminal history records of individuals involved in that incident. In effect, SCIEEx would be used to create a conduit to link crime incident information from SCIBRS to computerized criminal history records.

Findings

ORS undertook the effort to link these data. The first step was to receive and read in the SCIEEx data. The very size of the data set (1.3 terra-bytes) and complexity (see attachment) was itself something of an obstacle, necessitating a number of measures designed to limit the amount of data processed. The problem of excessive processing time was addressed by reducing data fields to their maximum required length whenever the actual field length exceeded the amount of number of characters contained in them, a step which greatly decreased processing time. A total of 2.1 million records were reviewed for unique identification assignment. The first step in this process was to access the name, race, gender, date of birth and social security fields and use that data to assign unique identifiers for the linking process. This step proved to be unsuccessful. This failure was due to the large volume of missing and unusable information in the identifying fields.

Missing and Invalid Data in SCIEEx Identifier Fields

Field	Missing	Invalid Data
First Name	0.02%	0.50%
Last Name	0.22%	2.12%
Race	7.59%	7.66%
Gender	6.61%	6.62%
Date of Birth	8.26%	0.34%
Social Security Number	17.02%	26.28%

Data were defined as missing if there was no value in the field, or if the field contained an indicator that the information was unknown. Data were defined as invalid differently for each field. For first and last name, any value that contained symbols or numbers was considered invalid. For gender, any value other than M or F was considered invalid. For race, any value other than A, B, H, I or W was considered invalid. For social security number, any entry that contained letters, symbols or was not nine digits in length was considered invalid. For date of birth, any date indicating the person was younger than ten years old was considered invalid.

Beyond the problems of missing or bad data, a great many records contained information in the first and last name fields that were not legitimate names. Some of the names appeared to be aliases, nicknames or fanciful gang names. Street addresses, car models and other descriptive comments were occasionally entered in the name fields. Because there was no way to write a program to differentiate between these types of entries and valid names, it was not possible to accurately enumerate the number of name entries that were technically valid but not usable. In total, an estimated 33% of the records were insufficient to generate unique identifiers. While it was not clear in all cases what the information contained in the field represented, it was clear that in many cases the information contained was not a usable name or valid social security number that could be used for identification purposes. Absent the identifying information in those fields, there was no prospect of successfully completing the first step in the project; i.e., identifying individuals in the SCIEEx dataset for subsequent linking to their criminal history records.

Discussion

First of all, it is important to note that the lack of usable identifiers should not be identified as a negative comment assessing the quality of the SCIEEx dataset. The SCIEEx dataset was created for tactical, not statistical, purposes. Data which for statistical purposes might be interpreted as lacking the rigorous edits required for statistical analysis may well translate into valued flexibility for investigative purposes; i.e., the governance and editing process for a tactical dataset is quite different from what would be required for a statistical dataset. The SCIEEx dataset is a repository of information contributed by a variety of participating law enforcement agencies. Unlike its role in administering SCIBRS in which SLED serves as a strict data quality manager creating data edits and enforcing standards, as administrator of SCIEEx, SLED's role might better be described as a facilitator, enabling participants to contribute and access data with minimal restrictions. In order to make linking with other data sets possible it would be necessary to introduce new governing rules for the SCIEEx data. Such rules would include:

- Developing edit procedures to ensure all information is entered correctly and completely;
- Performing regular data checks to ensure that the data have been entered correctly and to identify problem areas;
- Installing fail-safe measures to ensure that key identifiers are entered. Such measures might include not allowing for the entry of records for which those identifiers are missing;
- Checking the SCIEEx database against other existing databases to ensure the data are complete and accurate.

Rules such as these would increase the quality of information submitted and make it much more likely that some sort of linking up of incident based information and criminal history records would be possible. An alternative to modifying the SCIEEx data process would be to ensure incident numbers are entered on computerized criminal history

records. This approach would make the step of obtaining individual identifiers from SCIEEx unnecessary. As with the SCIEEx dataset, additional quality control measures for the computerized criminal history records would have to be enacted to ensure that incident report numbers were entered and that the information was accurate and reliable. Mandating the entry of case numbers would necessarily require additional time, effort and resources.

It is important to note that there would be limitations to a dataset if one could be created by linking SCIBRS and CCHR data through SCIEEx. Sorting out the respective roles of multiple offenders involved in criminal incidents would be difficult. Additionally, the degree of system participation would be an issue. Unlike SCIBRS and the computerized criminal history records, participation in SCIEEx is voluntary and has never included 100% of South Carolina's law enforcement agencies. Presumably, non-participation would result in some unknown number of missing cases which would limit the ability to generalize from any findings.

There may well be alternative approaches to the issue of linking criminal incident data and criminal history records worth exploring in the future. Identifying one or more jurisdictions in which the SCIEEx data are of sufficient quality and completeness for successful identification and subsequent linking to criminal history records might constitute a viable alternative approach. While such a limited approach would not be allow for statewide analyses, it might make more local analyses possible, from which more global findings might be extrapolated.

Summary

The analysis is rather convincing: using SCIEEx data as a conduit for linking SCIBRS and SCIEEx data is not feasible under the existing circumstances. Although SCIEEx provides fields for the individual identifiers needed to create a reliable and unique identification number, the quality of the data contained within those fields is not in any sort of consistent format. The first and last name fields contain too much invalid and unusable data and the other identifier fields are also lacking in some respects. Aliases, addresses and other information are often entered in the name fields and social security number fields too often contain invalid characters. These inconsistencies make it impossible to use the ORS unique identification process to assign an identifier, which is a necessary first step toward linking these data to data records from the computerized criminal history records. In order to make that first step possible, it would be necessary to introduce a number of radical changes, including a number of edit and revision procedures. Given the current use of SCIEEx data as an investigation tool, such changes might not be desirable.

It is important to stress that this finding in no way diminishes the importance or usefulness of the SCIEEx dataset. Indeed, assessing the tactical effectiveness of the dataset was not the purpose of this effort. The SCIEEx dataset was designed and functions as a tactical system that assists the investigative process. Current data entry and processing rules reflect that purpose.

Sources

Bradberry and McManus, *Identifying Impediments to Joining Incident Based Records with Computerized Criminal History Records*, 2010.

Justice Research and Statistics Association, *Status of NIBRS in States*, 2012.
http://www.jrsa.org/ibrcc/background-status/nibrs_states.shtml

Attachment

SCIEx data tables follow on the next page.

ORGANIZATION	
11	LENTITYID
12	LACTIVITYENTYID
13	LCONTEXT
14	LPARENTTYPE
15	LAPARENTENTYID
16	ABBREVIATION
17	CHAPTER
18	CODEAGENCYOR
19	COORGANIZATIONALLOCAL
20	COORGANIZATIONALNACC
21	DATELASTUPDATED
22	DATELASTUPDATED_PRE
23	DATELASTVERIFIED
24	DATELASTVERIFIED_PRE
25	DATEREPORTED
26	DATEREPORTED_PRE
27	DEPARTMENT
28	ENTYIDENTIFICATION
29	FULLNAME
30	ORGANIZATIONACTIVITY
31	ORGANIZATIONDESCRIPTION
32	ORGANIZATIONID
33	ORGANIZATIONRELATIONSHIP
34	ORGANIZATIONSTATUS
35	ORGANIZATIONTYPE
36	PARENTORGANIZATION
37	SOURCE
38	USERID
39	TSTAMP

MEDICAL	
11	LENTITYID
12	LACTIVITYENTYID
13	LCONTEXT
14	LPARENTTYPE
15	LAPARENTENTYID
16	CONDITION
17	CONDITIONCODE
18	CONDITIONSEVERITY
19	DATELASTUPDATED
20	DATELASTUPDATED_PRE
21	DATELASTVERIFIED
22	DATELASTVERIFIED_PRE
23	DATEREPORTED
24	DATEREPORTED_PRE
25	ISPRESNT
26	MEDICALNARRATIVE
27	RELATIONSHIP
28	SOURCE
29	USERID
30	TSTAMP

LOCALE	
11	LENTITYID
12	LACTIVITYENTYID
13	LCONTEXT
14	LPARENTTYPE
15	LAPARENTENTYID
16	CITY
17	CODECOUNTY
18	CODEJUDICIALDISTRICT
19	COUNTRY
20	COUNTY
21	DISTRICT
22	EMERGENCYSERVICEID
23	FBIJURISDICTION
24	JUDICIALDISTRICT
25	NEC@BORHO
26	POLICEGRID
27	POLICEJURISDICTION
28	STATE
29	SUBDIVISION
30	ZPCODEEXTENSION
31	ZONE
32	SOURCE
33	USERID
34	TSTAMP

blocknames.lu	
PK	LASTNAME

LOCATION	
11	LENTITYID
12	LACTIVITYENTYID
13	LCONTEXT
14	LPARENTTYPE
15	LAPARENTENTYID
16	APARTMENTNUMBER
17	COORDINATESPACE
18	CROSSSTREETDIRECTION
19	CROSSSTREETNAME
20	CROSSSTREETTYPE
21	CROSSSTREETTYPEEXTENSION
22	DATELASTUPDATED
23	DATELASTUPDATED_PRE
24	DATELASTVERIFIED
25	DATELASTVERIFIED_PRE
26	DATEREPORTED
27	DATEREPORTED_PRE
28	DIRECTIONTRAVELED
29	EMERGENCYSERVICEDEPARTMENT
30	FREBOX
31	LOCATIONNAME
32	LOCATIONTYPE
33	POBOX
34	STREETADDRESSEXTENSION
35	STREETDIRECTION
36	STREETNAME
37	STREETNUMBER
38	STREETNUMBEREXTENSION
39	STREETTYPE
40	STREETTYPEEXTENSION
41	XCOORDINATE
42	YCOORDINATE
43	ZCOORDINATE
44	SOURCE
45	USERID
46	TSTAMP

PROPERTY	
11	LENTITYID
12	LACTIVITYENTYID
13	LCONTEXT
14	LPARENTTYPE
15	LAPARENTENTYID
16	AGESEX
17	AGEVALUE
18	BORROWINDICATOR
19	BRANDAUTHORITYTEXT
20	BRANDDESCRIPTIONTEXT
21	BRANDTEXT
22	CATEGORYTEXT
23	COLORDESCRIPTIONTEXT
24	COLORPRIMARYCODE
25	COLORSECONDARYTEXT
26	COLORTRIMCODE
27	COLORWRITETEXT
28	CONDITIONTEXT
29	DESCRIPTIONTEXT
30	ENGRAVINGDESCRIPTION
31	ENGRAVINGTEXT
32	FEATURECODE
33	FEATUREDESCRIPTION
34	FININCODE
35	HEIGHTTEXT
36	HEIGHTTEXT
37	HOLDINGINDICATOR
38	LEADINGINDICATOR
39	LENGTHTEXT
40	MAKETEXT
41	META.TEXT
42	MODELNUMBERTEXT
43	MODELTEXT
44	OWNEDINDICATOR
45	REPORTAMOUNTRECOVEREDTEXT
46	REPORTAMOUNTTEXT
47	REPORTAMOUNTTYPETEXT
48	SIZETEXT
49	STOLENINDICATOR
50	STYLETEXT
51	TEXTURETEXT
52	TYPECODE
53	TYPETEXT
54	USAGETEXT
55	VALUEAMOUNT
56	VALUEAMOUNTTEXT
57	VALUENUMBER
58	VALUETEXT
59	WIDTHTEXT
60	YEARTEXT
61	STATUS
62	TSTAMP
63	USERID
64	class

Cust_CHARGE	
11	LACTIVITYENTYID
12	LCONTEXT
13	LPARENTTYPE
14	LAPARENTENTYID
15	ACCOUNTRELATED
16	ATTEMPTFLAG
17	BONDAMOUNT
18	BODYTYPE
19	CATEGORYCODE
20	CATEGORYDESCRIPTION
21	CHARGEACOUNT
22	CHARGEDEGREE
23	CHARGEDESCRIPTION
24	CHARGELEVEL
25	CHARGEQUALIFIER
26	CHARGESTATUS
27	CHARGESTATUSDATE
28	CHARGESTATUSDATE_PRE
29	CITATIONDATE
30	CITATIONDATE_PRE
31	CITATIONNUMBER
32	CITESPEED
33	CODEID
34	CODESECTION
35	CODECUR
36	CRIMECLASSCATEGORY
37	EMPLOYMENTRELATED
38	HIGHESTCHARGEFLAG
39	INCIDENTDATE
40	INCIDENTDATE_PRE
41	ISARRESTREASON
42	LEGALCODE
43	MACRODISPOSITION
44	MACROINDICATIONLEVEL
45	MACROJURISDICTIONLEVEL
46	MACROSTATUS
47	MODIFIERNUMBER
48	OBSERVEDWEIGHT
49	POSTEDSPEED
50	USERID
51	TSTAMP
52	CUSTFLAG
53	id
54	name

VEHICLE	
11	LENTITYID
12	LACTIVITYENTYID
13	LCONTEXT
14	LPARENTTYPE
15	LAPARENTENTYID
16	AXLECOUNTVALUE
17	CARGOWEIGHT
18	CHPFRSUBMITTEDINDICATOR
19	CONDITIONTEXT
20	CURBWEIGHTTEXT
21	EMISSIONINPECTORCODE
22	EMISSIONINPECTORCODE
23	ENGINECYLINDERCOUNTVALUE
24	GARAGEINDICATOR
25	GROSSCOMBINEDWEIGHTTEXT
26	GROSSWEIGHTTEXT
27	INTERIORCOLORTEXT
28	LOWERCOLORTEXT
29	MAKECODE
30	MAKETEXT
31	MODELCODE
32	MODELTEXT
33	NARRATIVETEXT
34	NUMBEROFDOORTEXT
35	OVERALLCOLORTEXT
36	STATUSCODE
37	STATUSTEXT
38	STYLECODE
39	STYLETEXT
40	TOWINGINDICATOR
41	TRANSMISSIONTYPETEXT
42	TYPECODE
43	TYPETEXT
44	UPPERCOLORCODE
45	UPPERCOLORTEXT
46	USECLASSCODE
47	USECLASSTEXT
48	USETEXT
49	VALUETEXT
50	WANTEDINDICATOR
51	WANTEDINDICATOR
52	SOURCE
53	USERID
54	TSTAMP

ACTIVITY	
11	LENTITYID
12	LACTIVITYENTYID
13	LCONTEXT
14	LPARENTTYPE
15	LAPARENTENTYID
16	ACTIVITYNARRATIVE
17	ACTIVITYNUMBER
18	ACTIVITYSTATUS
19	ACTIVITYSUBTYPE
20	ACTIVITYTYPE
21	ACTIVITYWARNINGTEXT
22	ALTERNATEACTIVITYNUMBER
23	CODEAGENCYOR
24	CHARGEDEGREE
25	CHARGEDESCRIPTION
26	CHARGELEVEL
27	CHARGEQUALIFIER
28	CHARGESTATUS
29	CHARGESTATUSDATE
30	CHARGESTATUSDATE_PRE
31	CITATIONDATE
32	CITATIONDATE_PRE
33	CITATIONNUMBER
34	CITESPEED
35	CODEID
36	CODESECTION
37	CODECUR
38	CRIMECLASSCATEGORY
39	EMPLOYMENTRELATED
40	HIGHESTCHARGEFLAG
41	INCIDENTDATE
42	INCIDENTDATE_PRE
43	ISARRESTREASON
44	LEGALCODE
45	MACRODISPOSITION
46	MACROINDICATIONLEVEL
47	MACROJURISDICTIONLEVEL
48	MACROSTATUS
49	MODIFIERNUMBER
50	OBSERVEDWEIGHT
51	POSTEDSPEED
52	USERID
53	TSTAMP
54	CUSTFLAG
55	id
56	name

PERSON	
11	LENTITYID
12	LACTIVITYENTYID
13	LCONTEXT
14	LPARENTTYPE
15	LAPARENTENTYID
16	DATELASTUPDATED
17	DATELASTUPDATED_PRE
18	DATELASTVERIFIED
19	DATELASTVERIFIED_PRE
20	DATEREPORTED
21	DATEREPORTED_PRE
22	ENTYIDENTIFICATION
23	PERSONCODE
24	PERSONTYPE
25	STATUS
26	SYSPAL
27	SOURCE
28	HASPHOTO
29	USERID
30	TSTAMP
31	MASTER_PERSON_LID

PHYSICALFEATURE	
11	LENTITYID
12	LACTIVITYENTYID
13	LCONTEXT
14	LPARENTTYPE
15	LAPARENTENTYID
16	DATELASTUPDATED
17	DATELASTUPDATED_PRE
18	DATELASTVERIFIED
19	DATELASTVERIFIED_PRE
20	DATEREPORTED
21	DATEREPORTED_PRE
22	FEATURECLASS
23	FEATUREDESCRIPTION
24	FEATURELOCATION
25	FEATURESUBCLASS
26	FEATURETEXT
27	SOURCE
28	USERID
29	TSTAMP

MASTER_PERSON	
PK	MASTER_PERSON_LID
11	FIRSTNAME
12	LASTNAME
13	DATEOFBIRTH
14	RACE
15	SEX

PERSONNAME	
11	LCONTEXT
12	FIRSTNAME
13	LASTNAME
14	LENTITYID
15	LACTIVITYENTYID
16	LCONTEXT
17	LPARENTTYPE
18	LAPARENTENTYID
19	DATELASTUPDATED
20	DATELASTUPDATED_PRE
21	DATELASTVERIFIED
22	DATELASTVERIFIED_PRE
23	DATEREPORTED
24	DATEREPORTED_PRE
25	INITIALS
26	MIDDLENAME
27	NAMEPREFIX
28	SUFFIX
29	SOURCE
30	USERID
31	TSTAMP
32	LASTNAME_SGX
33	SOURCE

CONTACT	
PK	LENTITYID
11	LACTIVITYENTYID
12	LCONTEXT
13	LPARENTTYPE
14	LAPARENTENTYID
15	CONTACTTEXT
16	CONTACTTYPE
17	DATELASTUPDATED
18	DATELASTUPDATED_PRE
19	DATELASTVERIFIED
20	DATELASTVERIFIED_PRE
21	DATEREPORTED
22	DATEREPORTED_PRE
23	ADDRESS
24	CONTACTTEXT
25	CONTACTTYPE
26	DATELASTUPDATED
27	DATELASTUPDATED_PRE
28	DATELASTVERIFIED
29	DATELASTVERIFIED_PRE
30	DATEREPORTED
31	DATEREPORTED_PRE
32	SOURCE
33	USERID
34	TSTAMP

PERSONDESCRIPTION	
11	DATEOFBIRTH
12	RACE
13	SEX
14	LENTITYID
15	LACTIVITYENTYID
16	LCONTEXT
17	LPARENTTYPE
18	LAPARENTENTYID
19	AGE
20	BIRTHCOUNTRY
21	BIRTHPLACE
22	BUILD
23	CITIZENSHIP
24	COMPLEXIONNACC
25	COMPLEXIONNACC
26	COMPLEXIONNACC
27	COMPLEXIONNACC
28	COMPLEXIONNACC
29	COMPLEXIONNACC
30	COMPLEXIONNACC
31	COMPLEXIONNACC
32	COMPLEXIONNACC
33	COMPLEXIONNACC
34	COMPLEXIONNACC
35	COMPLEXIONNACC
36	COMPLEXIONNACC
37	COMPLEXIONNACC
38	COMPLEXIONNACC
39	COMPLEXIONNACC
40	COMPLEXIONNACC
41	COMPLEXIONNACC
42	COMPLEXIONNACC
43	COMPLEXIONNACC
44	COMPLEXIONNACC
45	COMPLEXIONNACC
46	COMPLEXIONNACC
47	COMPLEXIONNACC
48	COMPLEXIONNACC
49	COMPLEXIONNACC
50	COMPLEXIONNACC
51	COMPLEXIONNACC
52	COMPLEXIONNACC
53	COMPLEXIONNACC
54	COMPLEXIONNACC
55	COMPLEXIONNACC
56	COMPLEXIONNACC
57	COMPLEXIONNACC
58	COMPLEXIONNACC
59	COMPLEXIONNACC
60	COMPLEXIONNACC
61	COMPLEXIONNACC
62	COMPLEXIONNACC
63	COMPLEXIONNACC
64	COMPLEXIONNACC
65	COMPLEXIONNACC
66	COMPLEXIONNACC
67	COMPLEXIONNACC
68	COMPLEXIONNACC
69	COMPLEXIONNACC
70	COMPLEXIONNACC
71	COMPLEXIONNACC
72	COMPLEXIONNACC
73	COMPLEXIONNACC
74	COMPLEXIONNACC
75	COMPLEXIONNACC
76	COMPLEXIONNACC
77	COMPLEXIONNACC