

**HIGH INTENSITY DRUG
TRAFFICKING AREAS PROGRAM**

**PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
PROCESS**



Twelfth Edition

January 1, 2017

Changes from Eleventh Edition, dated June 27, 2016

Page	Section: Action
13-15	Drug Pricing section revised
17	Drug ROI section revised
19	Other Clandestine Laboratories: New section added
23	Other Outputs section revised
48-50	Table 11 revised
62	New Threat Specific Table described
68,76	New definitions added
	Leads section deleted entirely
	Leads table (former Table 9) deleted and following tables renumbered

Table of Contents

Changes from Eleventh Edition, dated June 27, 2016	i
Introduction.....	1
User Guide	2
Data Entry and Retention.....	3
Setting Performance Expectations	3
Database Locking.....	4
PMP Core Tables	5
Operational Guidelines for PMP Definitions.....	5
DTOs, MLOs, and Criminal Operations.....	5
Money Laundering versus Bulk Cash Smuggling	6
A Case versus a DTO or MLO	6
Cells and DTOs.....	7
“Walled-Off” Investigations	8
Case Disposition versus DTO/MLO Disposition	9
Case Disposition Markers: Open, Closed, and Suspended	9
DTO/MLO Disposition Markers: Dismantled, Disrupted	9
Counting and Reporting DTO/MLO Members.....	10
Chain-of-Command	11
Defining Operational Scope.....	12
Claiming Drug Seizures	13
Claiming Seizures by Non-HIDTA Entities	13
Drug Prices.....	13

Drugs and Drug Groups	15
Return on Investment	16
Other Law Enforcement Outputs Table for Arrests, Wiretaps, and Firearms Seized.....	17
Methamphetamine Labs	18
Other Clandestine Laboratories	19
Overseers and Sub-Initiatives	20
Education versus Training	20
Classroom Training.....	21
On-Line Training	21
Event Deconfliction Services.....	21
Case/Subject/Target Deconfliction Services.....	21
Case Explorer.Net, SAFETNet, RISSafe, Regional and State Deconfliction Systems	22
DTO and MLO Deconflictions	22
Case Support	22
PMP Other Outputs.....	23
Guidelines for Intelligence-Related Surveys	24
Appendix A - PMP Core Tables and Threat Specific Tables	27
Appendix B - PMP Definitions and Key Terms Alphabetical.....	66
Appendix C – Past Changes to User Guide	79

Introduction

The High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) Program is a grant program administered within the Office of National Drug Control Policy's (ONDCP) Office of State, Local and Tribal Affairs (OSLTA). The mission of the HIDTA Program is to disrupt the market for illegal drugs in the United States by assisting federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement participating in the HIDTA Program to dismantle and disrupt drug trafficking organizations, with particular emphasis on drug trafficking regions that have harmful effects on other parts of the United States. The HIDTA Program goals are to:

1. Disrupt the market for illegal drugs by dismantling or disrupting drug trafficking and/or money laundering organizations (DTOs and MLOs); and
2. Improve the efficiency and effectiveness of HIDTA initiatives.

ONDCP uses the Performance Management Process (PMP) to assess the performance of the individual HIDTAs and the overall performance of the HIDTA Program. Prior to 2004, ONDCP did not have a reporting system capable of quantifying the HIDTA Program's outcomes in a consistent and meaningful manner. When the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) used its Performance Assessment and Rating Tool (PART) to rate the HIDTA Program's performance, it concluded that the HIDTA Program could not demonstrate results. In response to this finding, the HIDTA Directors, with the support of ONDCP, formed the Performance Management Committee (PMC) and charged it with:

- Developing a performance measurement process and database capable of reporting the activities of the individual HIDTAs as related to the two HIDTA goals;
- Determining the accuracy and integrity of performance information;
- Identifying and explaining variances between performance expectations and outcomes; and
- Providing HIDTA management with suggestions to improve the quality and accuracy of reporting to better reflect individual HIDTA activities.

ONDCP has adopted numerous PMC recommendations to improve the quality, integrity, and accuracy of performance data stored in the PMP database.

PMP is a data-driven process that measures change over time for the individual HIDTAs and the HIDTA Program. As such, PMP is not designed to assess the performance of individual initiatives.

The PMP is based upon three guiding principles:

1. Say what you do;
2. Do what you say; and
3. Show what you did.

By virtue of these principles, individual HIDTAs are assessed by comparing the performance expectations they and ONDCP agreed upon in advance with what they accomplished by the end of the performance period (calendar year). Each HIDTA is dependent upon the success of its initiatives, and the HIDTA Program's success hinges upon the aggregate success of the individual HIDTAs. Using the PMP, HIDTAs are not compared with each other, but with their own expectations or a program-wide average. This approach to performance management vigorously encourages cooperative investigative efforts and the sharing of information and intelligence. Success is largely dependent upon how efficiently and effectively initiatives and HIDTAs cooperate to reach their performance expectations.

The PMP database makes it possible for each HIDTA to enter information about every DTO and MLO it identifies. This information includes descriptive characteristics of the DTO and MLO and indicates whether the HIDTA has succeeded in disrupting or dismantling the organization. The database is also a repository for information about HIDTA-funded training, information and intelligence sharing, drug and asset seizures, and case support. The compilation and analysis of the data entered in the PMP database facilitate the performance assessment for individual HIDTAs and the HIDTA Program.

The PMP provides data that ONDCP can use to assess the quantitative performance of individual HIDTAs and the overall performance of the HIDTA Program. However, the assessment of an individual HIDTA's performance must also include qualitative considerations that the PMP database does not collect. For example, the time required to develop an OCDETF case, the disruption of a significant international or multi-state DTO, a marked decline in crime in a city or neighborhood due to the HIDTA's actions, a change in an initiative's manpower, the resources and time devoted to a Title III, and other qualitative factors must be considered when assessing an individual HIDTA's performance.

User Guide

The purpose of the *High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program Performance Management Process User Guide (User Guide)* is to improve the quality, integrity and accuracy of information entered in the PMP database. The *User Guide* incorporates the PMC recommendations that ONDCP adopted to govern the operation of the PMP.

The *User Guide* will be provided electronically to ONDCP, ONDCP staff, HIDTA Directors and those responsible for entering data into the PMP database. The PMC will update the *User Guide* as needed to keep pace with the recommendations from ONDCP and the HIDTA Directors.

If you confront issues with PMP that are not addressed in the *User Guide*, or if the contents of the *User Guide* are not clear for you, contact Ron Jones, Washington/Baltimore HIDTA at (301) 489-1678 or RJones@wb.hidta.org.

Data Entry and Retention

Pursuant to *HIDTA Program Policy and Budget Guidance*, HIDTAs are to enter required data into the PMP database on a quarterly basis. Entering data quarterly rather than at the end of the year, improves the quality and accuracy of the data. The PMC encourages HIDTAs to enter data about investigative activity more frequently whenever feasible.

Whenever a user error for the current reporting period is discovered, the error should be corrected as soon as possible. On rare occasions, errors are not discovered until after the reporting period is closed. The two most frequent user errors involving past reporting periods are: failure to report a DTO or MLO when the case was opened and failure to report a seizure.

Whenever a DTO or MLO is not reported during the year it was identified and the DTO or MLO is under investigation during the current reporting year, enter the DTO or MLO information in the PMP database using January 1 of the current reporting year as the identified date. Make a comment in the notes field explaining the user error. When the DTO or MLO was not reported during the year it was identified and the DTO or MLO is not under investigation during the current reporting year, it cannot be reported in the PMP database.

Drug seizures must be reported in the PMP database for the current reporting year. Drug seizures that took place prior to the current reporting year and that, for whatever reason, were not reported cannot be included in the current reporting period. Further, the PMP database will not be reopened for past reporting years to correct this type of user error without the approval of ONDCP.

Other user errors that significantly affect the accuracy of the reporting in PMP for a past reporting period may be corrected with the approval of the National HIDTA Director.

User errors in past reporting periods affecting Threat Specific tables may be corrected upon the request of the HIDTA Director and with the approval of the ONDCP policy analyst.

HIDTAs will retain all supporting documentation for their entries in the PMP database for a minimum of 5 years or until audited.

Setting Performance Expectations

The HIDTA Program's budget process causes initiatives to set their performance expectations well in advance of when the actual performance period begins. To improve the setting of performance expectations, the PMP database provides annual averages for the immediately preceding three-year period based on the actual performance of the initiatives. Initiatives should review this information and use it to formulate the projections included in their budget submissions. Unless the initiative undergoes a change

in mission, focus, manpower, or budget, analyzing past performance is a sound and proven method to use for projecting future performance.

When the ONDCP budget review results in a change to the amount of funding, the composition or the focus of an initiative, the HIDTA Director and the affected initiative supervisor should review the proposed performance expectations and, when necessary, revise them. When these types of changes are made to an initiative, they often prompt commensurate changes to be considered for performance expectations.

Initiatives should review their performance expectations within thirty days of commencement of the new performance period and submit proposed revisions to the HIDTA Director. Once the HIDTA Director agrees that the revisions are justified, he or she should immediately contact ONDCP to negotiate a change in the PMP database. When ONDCP approves the change, the initiative will be permitted to revise its performance expectations in the PMP database.

Performance expectations for the current grant year must be finalized no later than March 31 of the current performance period. Changes in performance expectations occurring as a result of significant alterations to an initiative made after March 31 of each year will not be reflected in the PMP database. Instead, the HIDTA will need to explain the variations in its Annual Report.

Discretionary funds often become available to HIDTAs during the grant year, usually after March 31. It is most likely that discretionary funding will require the recipient HIDTA to adjust their expected values or, in some instances, to add initiatives. In either circumstance, HIDTA Directors receiving discretionary funding should negotiate their revised expected values with ONDCP and, upon approval, will be able to enter this information in the PMP database.

When discretionary funding is received prior to July 1 of the performance period and the HIDTA anticipates it will spend the funding by December 31, the expected values and the amount of funding will be entered for the current performance period. When the funding is received after July 1, and the HIDTA will not be able to spend the funding in the current performance period, the expected values and the amount of discretionary funding will be entered for the following performance period. ONDCP must agree upon the option selected and any proposed changes to the expected values.

Database Locking

At the Direction of ONDCP, the PMP Administrators will lock the WebPMP to new data entry. Data entry into PMP for Expected Values will be locked on April 1 of the program year in question. Data entry into PMP for actual accomplishments will be locked May 16 following the end of the program year. If a HIDTA Director wants to enter past year actual data or current year Expected Values, he or she must obtain approval from ONDCP.

For 2016 only, the database will be locked to all data entry on May 1 to accommodate the implementation of the revised PMP database. When the database reopens for data entry on May 5, any proposed revisions to 2015 data will not only require ONDCP approval but will also have to be entered into both the new version of PMP and the old version.

PMP Core Tables

Data reported in the PMP database are automatically transferred to one or more of the 12 Core Tables used to assess HIDTA performance. The 12 Core Tables depict the individual HIDTA's efficiency, effectiveness and workload for the performance period. The data reported in the Core Tables can be aggregated to provide the annual outcomes for the HIDTA Program.

In addition, each HIDTA has the option of developing threat specific measures that address expected and actual outputs and outcomes for activities that are not conducted by all HDTAs and are not reported in one of the Core Tables. Threat specific measures are not aggregated and reported as annual outcomes for the HIDTA program.

The Core Tables are described in Appendix A, Part One. The Threat Specific Tables are described in Appendix A, Part Two.

Operational Guidelines for PMP Definitions

Definitions form the foundation for all activity reported in the PMP database and used to assess performance. The definitions used in the PMP help to ensure the quality and accuracy of the information reported in the PMP database. The integrity of the PMP data relies upon strict and uniform compliance with these definitions.

Definitions can be compared to the markings on rulers; if the increments on the rulers are not uniform, the rulers will not produce accurate measurements. Likewise, if each HIDTA uses a different definition for a common term, such as a DTO, the aggregate number of DTOs will not be accurate and this, in turn, will diminish the quality of the data collected in the PMP database.

See Appendix B for a complete set of PMP definitions.

DTOs, MLOs, and Criminal Operations

The DTO and MLO are the PMP's primary units of analysis for Goal 1. In order for an organization to qualify as a DTO, it must:

- consist of five or more persons including at least one leader
- have a clearly defined chain-of-command, and
- generate income or acquire assets through a series of illegal drug production, manufacturing, importation, or distribution activities.

All three critical elements must be verified through investigation before the organization can be counted as a DTO in the PMP database.

In order for an organization to qualify as a MLO, it must:

- Consist of two or more individuals, and
- Be engaged in money laundering.

Both critical elements must be verified through investigation before the organization can be counted as a MLO in the PMP database.

While some DTOs rely on MLOs to launder their ill-gotten funds, other DTOs engage in both drug trafficking and money laundering. Based on the information garnered during the investigation, the case agent and/or initiative supervisor must select the classification that best describes the organization – either DTO or MLO – and enter this classification in the PMP database.

Criminal Operations (COs) are loosely knit organizations of two or more person who are working together to traffic drugs, firearms, and/or smuggle bulk cash proceeds. These groups do not meet the definitions of DTOs or MLOs due to the size of the organization (i.e., fewer than five persons) or its lack of a clearly defined chain-of-command. As an investigation proceeds and more information becomes available about COs, they may be reclassified as a DTO or a MLO. Criminal groups generally operate within the United States.

Money Laundering versus Bulk Cash Smuggling

Money laundering involves the placement, structuring and integration of cash. The bulk smuggling of cash should not be reported as money laundering unless the investigation demonstrates that placement, structuring, and integration of the cash occurred or was planned. For example, when a highway enforcement action results in the apprehension of two individuals and the seizure of \$1 million hidden in a secret compartment, this activity should not be reported in the PMP database as the dismantlement or disruption of a MLO. The seizure should be reported in the PMP database. However, without further information, the two individuals could just as likely be “mules” hired to smuggle cash as opposed to money launderers. Further, while the enforcement action may prove to be an irritant to the individual(s) who hired the two suspects to transport the cash, there is no indication in this example that a money laundering organization exists or that, should one exist, it was dismantled or disrupted.

A Case versus a DTO or MLO

It is important to understand the difference between a case and a DTO or MLO. A case refers to a law enforcement agency’s administrative process to collate and track an investigation. A case may involve no DTOs/MLOs, one DTO or MLO, or multiple DTOs and MLOs. For example, a case is opened at the time of a drug interdiction. The case

number is entered in the PMP database and information about the seizures reported. Because fewer than five individuals are identified or suspected of being involved in the drug operation, it cannot be counted as a DTO in the PMP database. However, the seizure should be reported in the PMP database. In this example, a case may be opened and closed without reporting a DTO or MLO. Nevertheless, the performance activities of the initiative must be reported.

In another example, a case is opened when information warrants the investigation of a single DTO. However, as the investigation continues, three separate DTOs are revealed. Some agencies open separate cases to report the activities of the other two DTOs, while other agencies investigate all three DTOs using the same case number. Regardless of the reporting method, each DTO must be recorded in the PMP database, linked to a case number, and its disposition reported.

Cells and DTOs

More often than not, the drug supply chain consists of more than one DTO or MLO and is composed of a number of cells. A cell is a unit within a DTO or MLO. When a cell meets the definition of a DTO, then it is appropriate to designate the cell as a DTO or MLO and count it separately from other cells. For example, a large international DTO may have specialized cells responsible for smuggling drugs into the United States and other cells responsible for transporting the drugs to distribution centers within the United States, and still others for delivering drugs to lower level distributors. Using this example, any cell that operates independent from the other cells should be considered a separate DTO. Conversely, when a cell is a link in the chain-of-command for the larger DTO, it should not be counted as a separate DTO.

The demarcation of separate cells is often blurred. Under these circumstances, the investigator must determine the nature of the relationship between or among cells. The determining factor rests with the command and control (chain-of-command) one cell has over the other. When the leadership in one cell controls the activity of the other cell, the cells should be reported as one DTO or MLO in PMP. In contrast, when a cell can conduct business independent of other cells, the cell should be reported as a separate DTO or MLO in PMP provided it meets all of the other qualifications for a DTO or MLO.

When the relationship between cells is based on business transactions, each should be counted as a separate DTO or MLO. For example, when an international DTO sells drugs to a multi-state DTO, and there is no chain-of-command relationship between the two DTOs, each should be reported separately in PMP.

Similarly, a group that is a customer of a DTO or MLO does not qualify the group as a cell of that DTO or MLO. Outlaw Motorcycle Gangs (OMG) involved in drug trafficking often have a fraternal relationship, but determining whether a particular chapter of an OMG is a cell of a larger DTO or is a DTO on its own requires additional scrutiny of their drug trafficking business model. While individual chapters of the Hell's

Angels, as an example, are a part of the International Hell's Angels organization, they do not necessarily qualify as a cell. When the chapter acts under its own command and control in conducting its drug business, it should be considered a separate DTO and not a cell of the larger Hell's Angels organization.

The PMP is a performance management system, not a case management system. Therefore, PMP is designed primarily to report outcomes, not case activity. The PMP requires the case agent or initiative supervisor to continually examine each investigation to determine the membership, organizational structure, and activity of the organization and its cell/s. Care must be taken to apply the DTO and MLO definitions properly when identifying and classifying an organization and its cell/s in the PMP database.

Because the nature of DTOs and MLOs is secretive, the relationship between and among cells is rarely known at the inception of an investigation. Instead, the relationships generally become apparent as the investigation proceeds. Therefore, it is prudent to schedule periodic case reviews to assess cell relationships and determine the number of DTOs identified in an investigation. At a minimum, a quarterly review should be conducted to determine the accuracy of the DTO and MLO counts reported in PMP.

“Walled-Off” Investigations

In California and in some other areas of the country, the practice exists of isolating or building a legal “wall” around certain components of DTOs under investigation, and “handing off” that piece of the investigation to another initiative or agency for the purpose of “taking down” some key suspects and/or seizing particular drugs or assets without jeopardizing the larger investigation of the entire DTO. Those in charge of the main investigation will refer an investigation into a cell of individuals in a DTO, and refer that part of the case to another HIDTA task force or agency, as if it were a referral for the entire investigation. The task force receiving the case referral is not briefed on the entire scope of the case or DTO, and a new investigation is started and given a new case number. During discovery, as cases are prosecuted, some of the case information becomes public record, and other pieces of information in the case files become available to defense attorneys. If the main investigation team were to do the “take-down” of the one component of the larger investigation, but not separate that action from the rest of the case, it could compromise the larger case. If they did not have the option of walling off parts of the case, they would either have to do the take-down or seizure and risk the larger case, or forgo the take down or seizure to preserve the case, which would allow key suspects, drugs, and assets (all of which serve as evidence to build the larger case) to slip away.

The concern is that a walled off investigation might inflate the number of DTOs identified, disrupted, and dismantled, because it makes it appear as though there are three small DTOs rather than one larger organization.

PMP data are used to measure each HIDTA against its expected and actual performance. It is not used to compare individual HIDTAs with each other. As long as those HIDTAs

employing the walled off investigative strategy continue to count DTOs in the same fashion from year to year, PMP is not affected. Performance expectations must factor in walled off investigations wherever this strategy is implemented.

Case Disposition versus DTO/MLO Disposition

Case disposition refers to the status of the investigation/case into the activity of one or more DTOs or MLOs. A case is not equivalent to a DTO or MLO. To standardize the reporting of DTO and MLO dispositions, the following guidelines must be followed.

Case Disposition Markers: Open, Closed, and Suspended

Open, Closed, and Suspended markers report on the status of the case, not the status of DTO/s or MLO/s under investigation in the case. For the purpose of the PMP, a case is considered open when the case number is assigned. A case can report activities about one or more DTOs or MLOs.

A case is closed when all investigative action has ceased. Some agencies consider a case closed when arrests have been made and all suspects have been identified and charged. Others do not consider a case closed until all apprehensions have been made and all suspects adjudicated. For the purpose of PMP reporting, the case investigator should follow his or her agency policy when determining when a case is closed.

A case is considered suspended when all reasonable steps to resolve the investigation have been exhausted, but it remains unresolved. Agencies have different rules regarding the suspended marker. For the purpose of PMP reporting, the case investigator should follow his or her agency policy when determining when a case is suspended.

DTO/MLO Disposition Markers: Dismantled, Disrupted

The disposition markers dismantled and disrupted are used to track the status of DTOs and MLOs. DTOs and MLOs are considered operational until reported as dismantled. For example, in one case involving two DTOs and one MLO, each DTO or MLO will have an independent disposition. It would be appropriate for a case involving two DTOs and one MLO to report that one DTO is dismantled, the other DTO is disrupted, and that the MLO is operational. A DTO or MLO will always be considered operational unless reported as being dismantled.

PMP weighs dismantlements and disruptions equally, so there is no advantage to declaring a DTO or MLO dismantled rather than disrupted. Considering the scope of DTOs and MLOs, it is likely to be extremely difficult for an initiative to dismantle an international DTO. On the other hand, it is reasonable to expect that an initiative can dismantle a multi-state or local DTO. Even so, to claim the dismantlement of a multi-state DTO, the DTO must be incapable of operating and/or reconstituting itself in each state.

There is no precise way to calculate or measure whether a DTO or MLO is dismantled. By definition, an organization is “dismantled” when the leadership, financial base, and supply network of the organization are destroyed and incapable of operating and/or reconstituting itself. For HIDTA reporting purposes, a dismantlement of a DTO/MLO does not require that all fugitives have been apprehended, that all cases have been adjudicated, or that all appeals by those charged have been exhausted.

An organization is disrupted when the normal and effective operation of the organization is impeded, as indicated by changes in organizational leadership and/or changes in methods of financing, transportation, distribution, communications, or drug production.

When and whether a DTO or MLO is disrupted is clearly a judgment call by the case agent or initiative supervisor. However, a single arrest or seizure usually does not, by itself, result in the disruption of a DTO or MLO. Quite often DTOs and MLOs consider the loss of a load of drugs or the seizure of funds as a “cost of doing business.” The loss of several significant loads of drugs, the arrest of multiple members of the DTO or MLO, or the cessation of DTO or MLO activity should be considered indications of a disruption. Before a DTO or MLO is reported in PMP as being disrupted, changes in one or more areas of the following must be noted:

- organizational leadership
- methods of financing
- modes of transportation
- methods of distribution
- communications
- drug production

Dismantled and disrupted dates are used in PMP to ensure that the status of the DTO or MLO is accounted for in the proper performance period. For PMP reporting, enter the date when, in the judgment of the case agent or initiative supervisor, the DTO or MLO was dismantled or disrupted. Document in the notes field the reason that the dismantlement or disruption was entered.

In the new version of PMP, a DTO or MLO reported as dismantled or suspended will continue to appear on the DTO/MLO/CO screen of an initiative unless a date is entered in the “Closed” field of the Case Disposition section of that screen. The DTO or MLO will continue to appear on DTO/MLO/CO screen and will be included in tables for the year in which the case is closed but not the years following the closed date for the case.

Counting and Reporting DTO/MLO Members

From the introduction of the PMP reporting system until the 2011 program year, HIDTAs were required only to enter the total number of members the organization. There was no requirement to identify the number of members by their roles or functions within the organization. However, performance audits of HIDTAs conducted in 2009 and 2010 frequently questioned whether the groups under investigation met the criteria for a DTO.

In particular, reviewers were often unable to determine whether the individuals identified in PMP records and agency case files as members of a single DTO were subject to the same chain-of-command.

Beginning in 2012, additional detail is required to be reported about the individuals involved with an organization. Two roles – leader and member were selected to distinguish the activity of the individuals.

A leader is an individual who directs the operation of the group under investigation. The leader may be the head of an entire drug trafficking organization or the leader of a cell of a drug trafficking organization. The critical issue is that a person designated as a leader is known and is in the chain-of-command for the group under investigation.

A member is an individual who is part of an organization and takes direction from the organization's leader(s). A member includes all those individuals below the leader who produce (manufacture or cultivate) or transport the illegal drugs, provide security or communications for the organization's activities, handle the financial transactions of the organization, sell the drugs to the organization's customers, and all other activities related to the drug trafficking operation.

Some DTOs attempt to operate more efficiently by "outsourcing" a portion of their human resource needs. It is common for large cultivation operations to hire seasonal or temporary workers to tend or harvest marijuana crops. This reduces the DTO's need to pay employees year-round. Similarly, clandestine laboratories often hire chemists (cooks) on an as-needed basis to produce illegal drugs. In both examples, the outsourced or contractual employees should be counted as DTO members.

A customer does business with the organization, but is not a member of the organization. The critical distinction between a member of an organization and a customer is that the customer pays the organization for its goods and, unlike a member, is not bound by a chain-of-command to the organization's leader.

Counting and reporting the number of members of an organization under investigation is done only to establish that the organization includes the minimum number of people to be classified a DTO or MLO – five for a DTO and two for a MLO. The identification of roles is done to clarify that the organization has a clearly defined chain-of-command. Neither the number of members of a DTO/MLO nor the designation of roles is an attempt to measure the scale of a DTO's or MLO's operation.

Chain-of-Command

A clearly defined chain-of-command is needed to qualify an organization as a DTO. As previously mentioned, the demarcation of separate cells, and the complex and secretive business transactions among and between cells often masks the true business relationships within a DTO. This creates challenges for case agents and initiative supervisors classifying DTOs and MLOs. Further complicating the classification process is the often changing command and control structure within DTOs. Legitimate businesses employ executives, managers and workers to develop corporate strategies, run their

day-to-day operations, and perform work. In contrast, DTOs often metastasize across geographic regions and frequently add or remove executives, managers and workers for a variety of reasons. In the DTO world, the classic pyramid organizational structure is often not applicable. Indeed, more often than not, DTO leaders (executives) serve as managers and even workers at different times and during different drug deals. This structure can best be depicted as a circle structure, with leaders and members (executives, managers and workers) moving in and out of the leadership circle based on need, availability, ability, power and relationships.

Despite these challenges, the case agent or supervisor must identify a chain-of-command to qualify the organization as a DTO. Using wiretaps, confidential sources, witnesses, forensic evidence, documents and financial records, the chain-of-command for a DTO can generally be established to a sufficient degree to allow for classification. Absent a chain-of-command, the organization would be, at best, a loose-knit affiliation of individuals that occasionally collaborated to traffic drugs. In this instance, the case agent or supervisor should classify the organization as a CO rather than a DTO.

Defining Operational Scope

Operational scope refers to the geographic boundaries in which the DTO or MLO operates and is defined as either local, multi-state, or international. Categorizing an organization as local, multi-state, or international depends both on the location of identified members and on the geographic areas in which the DTO customarily operates. For example, there are international connections in networks that traffic most types of drugs since the sources of many drugs are Asia or Latin America, but for any DTO or MLO to be regarded as international in scope requires that a member of that organization (identified by name, alias, nickname, or other reasonable way of establishing his or her existence) in the DTO or MLO operates in another country. The same principles of geography and member location also guide the categorization of DTOs and MLOs as local or multi-state. Definitions of international, multi-state and local DTOs and MLOs are found in Appendix B. Be sure to apply these definitions when determining the scope of a DTO or MLO.

Among the factors affecting DTO geographic operational scope is the command and control one cell has over another cell. For example, when the leadership of a cell in Mexico has command and control over a cell operating in the United States, the cells should be reported as one international DTO in PMP. When the relationship between the cells is limited to business transactions, and the investigation is focused on the cell based in the United States, that cell should not be classified as international. This same logic applies for local and multi-state DTOs.

Claiming Drug Seizures

HIDTA initiatives should report all seizures of drugs, cash and other assets made in the PMP database at least quarterly. When two or more initiatives are involved in the seizure, each initiative may enter seizure information in the PMP database but each should enter only a portion of the quantity/value of the seizure. The sum of the quantities and values entered by all the initiatives involved should not exceed the total quantity/value of the seizure. Within the HIDTA, credit can be given to those initiatives involved in the seizure, but the seizure information entered in PMP should be reviewed regularly to avoid double counting.

All seizures should be associated with a case number. If entering all seizures individually is too burdensome, HDTAs have the option of occasionally aggregating multiple seizures related to the same case into a single entry. However, the HIDTA must be able to disaggregate those seizures and provide sufficient detail so that ONDCP, ABT Associates, or any auditing entity can verify each seizure during an audit.

The location reported for each seizure should be the specific place where the seizure took place. The precise location is important because the value of the seizure is determined by where it took place. Do not enter the source area of the drug seized or the assumed destination of the seizure.

Claiming Seizures by Non-HIDTA Entities

HIDTA initiatives are called upon routinely to assist non-HIDTA agencies with drug seizures, and, more often than not, HIDTA initiatives try to continue the investigation. When the HIDTA initiative continues the investigation, it is appropriate for the initiative to claim the seizure and enter it into the PMP database. However, in cases where the HIDTA initiative does not continue the investigation but only holds or processes the seizure in a custodial function, the seizure should not be claimed by the initiative.

Drug Prices

All HDTAs must use reliable information, preferably from a non-HIDTA source, to establish the wholesale price for drugs seized within its boundaries. The primary sources for establishing these prices are reports issued by the Drug Enforcement Administration and data maintained by the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services, a part of the Department of Health and Human Services.

United States Illicit Drug Prices Report. The Drug Enforcement Administration issues an annual report listing drug prices for major categories of illicit drugs in the United States. This report, prepared by the DEA's Office of Intelligence collects retail and wholesale level (kilogram or pound) prices of major drugs in each of the 21 DEA Divisions and estimates a national average for each. Where sufficient information exists,

the report also contains an estimated average for each of the 21 Divisions. The report includes prices for the following substances:

- Cocaine (Powder and Crack)
- Heroin (S. American, SW Asian, Mexican Black Tar, and Mexican Brown Tar);
- Methamphetamine (Powder and Ice);
- Marijuana (Domestic, Mexican, and Sinsemilla);
- Synthetic Designer Drugs (Cannabinoids, Cathinones, and other substances);
- PCP.

The data collection, analysis, and clearance process for this report generally means the report for a year is published several months after the year ends. However, much of the data in the report is available earlier in the year Global Drug Pricing section of the EPIC website.

Trends in the Traffic Reports. Intelligence staffs in each of the 21 DEA Divisions prepare a *Trends in the Traffic Report* twice a year. One part of the *Trends in the Traffic Report* reports drug prices for drugs within the Divisions area of operation. The *Trends* report generally includes wholesale level prices for additional substances not included in the DEA's annual *United States Illicit Drug Prices Report*.

The *Trends* report is more timely than the annual report on illicit drugs prices, but the prices in the report may not be as reliable as the Illicit Drug Prices Report because of smaller number of seizures involved.

National Average Drug Acquisition Cost (NADAC). The Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) The prices for pharmaceuticals will be drawn from the National Average Drug Acquisition Cost (NADAC) that is used to provide state Medicaid agencies information regarding retail prices for prescription drugs. The NADAC prices can be found at <https://data.medicaid.gov/Drug-Prices/NADAC-as-of-2016-04-13/4hap-dmsr>.

Use of Alternative Prices. Drug prices reported by the DEA and the CMS are the preferred source for prices in HIDTA Program, and any price in these documents/datasets can be used without prior approval from ONDCP. However, if a HIDTA believes it has a more accurate price for a drug seized in its region, it should contact the appropriate HIDTA program analyst and request using those prices in lieu of the DEA or CMS price.

WebPMP will no longer calculate averages for drug prices and enter those substances that are missing prices for a HIDTA. If neither the DEA nor the HIDTA has a wholesale price for a drug (typically those drugs that are not frequently seized in the DEA Division or HIDTA region), a HIDTA may propose using the price established for that drug by another HIDTA that is geographically close and/or has similar drug market characteristics. Approval by the HIDTA program analyst for the HIDTA is required for such substitutions.

Out-of-Area Seizures. Seizures claimed outside a HIDTA's area should be valued using the price where the drug is seized. For example, marijuana seized in Texas by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA will use the price established for Texas rather than a price in Maryland.

Occasionally, a HIDTA is credited with seizures in a foreign country. In 2015 and earlier, the foreign country was included in one of the seizing HIDTA's LGAs and the price for that LGA was applied. Beginning in 2016, seizures should be valued using estimated prices collected by the 86 DEA offices in 67 countries and posted on the EPIC website. If you need assistance pricing these seizures, contact the PMP Help Desk.

Data Entry of Drug Prices. At the beginning of each year, PMP administrative staff will enter into PMP the most recent national average price published by DEA in the United States Illicit Drug Prices Report or posted on the EPIC website for the marijuana, cocaine, heroin, and methamphetamine drug groups listed above. Individual HIDTAs may: use those prices; substitute a DEA price in its region for those prices; request approval from ONDCP to use a different price developed by the HIDTA; and enter prices for any other substance it seizes.

Drugs and Drug Groups

Users should enter specific names for the drugs they report seizing. For example, rather than entering "prescription drug," the entry should be for the specific drug; e.g., OxyContin, Vicodin, etc. PMP staff will review all seizure entries on a quarterly basis to ensure the substance named as a seizure meets this requirement. HIDTAs will be asked to clarify any entry that is not specific. PMP staff will also attempt to consolidate multiple terms used for the same substance into a single category for pricing purposes; e.g., MDMA/Ecstasy and PCP/Phencyclidine.

When the user enters a drug seized into PMP, that drug/substance will be automatically placed into one of fourteen (14) drug groups approved by ONDCP. The categories and a brief description of the specific drugs in each are shown in the chart below.

Drug Group	Explanation/Examples
Cocaine/Crack	Includes coca Leaves
Heroin	<u>Only heroin</u> -- all types (e.g., Southwest Asian, Mexican Black Tar, Mexican Brown Tar, etc.)
Other Opiates	Opium, poppy plants, etc. - <u>Cultivated non-prescription substances derived from opium poppies</u>
Marijuana Plants - Indoor	Self-evident; unless definitely known to be indoor plants, all plants are classified as outdoor
Marijuana Plants - Outdoor	Self-evident; unless definitely known to be indoor plants, all plants are classified as outdoor
Marijuana/Cannabis	<u>All cannabis products not plants</u> -- hash, edibles, honey oil, butane oil, etc. <u>Does not include Marinol</u> , which is categorized as an "Other Prescription drug."
Methamphetamine/Ice	Includes powder, crystal meth, and methamphetamine oils
Natural Hallucinogens	<u>Cultivated/natural psychoactive substances</u> -- khat, psylisbon, mushrooms, toads
Synthetic Hallucinogens	<u>Manufactured psychoactive substances</u> -- Cannabinoids (Syn. Marijuana) cathinones (bath salts), PCP, MDMA, LSD
<i>Prescription Drugs: Narcotics</i>	OxyContin, Hydrocodone, Methadone, Morphine. etc.
<i>Prescription Drugs: Benzodiazepines</i>	Sedatives, hypnotic (sleep-inducing), anti-anxiety, anticonvulsant, and other drugs with muscle relaxant properties
<i>Prescription Drugs: Stimulants</i>	Amphetamines and related products
<i>Other Prescription Drugs</i>	Antibiotics and all others not properly classified as a narcotic, stimulant, or Benzodiazepine
Other Drugs and Substances	Anabolic steroids, precursors of all kinds

Return on Investment

Return on Investment (ROI) is the ratio between the wholesale value of drugs, cash, and non-cash assets seized and the amount of HIDTA funds budgeted for all activities other than treatment, prevention, and research and development.¹ Unlike cash and non-cash assets, illicit drugs do not have a legitimate, commercial value. Nonetheless, in the black market, drugs have a commercial value and the ROI uses this value to demonstrate the efficiency and effectiveness of HIDTAs in removing drugs from the marketplace.

¹ Prior to 2013, only the amount of funds budgeted for Enforcement and Intelligence and Information Sharing Initiatives was used to calculate the ROI.

Prior to the beginning of each reporting period, HIDTA Directors are required to set ROI performance expectations for drugs, cash and assets, and a combined ROI for both. The budget information for calculating the ROI is incorporated into PMP from the Financial Management System.

Beginning in 2017, the HIDTA Program Drug ROI will be calculated differently from past years. The wholesale value of drugs will be determined by multiplying the most recent DEA national average wholesale price for the marijuana, cocaine, heroin, and methamphetamine drug groups by the total kilograms of those substances seized by all HIDTAs. This amount will be divided by the amount of HIDTA funds budgeted for all activities other than treatment, prevention, and research and development. This change will result in a slightly lower program ROI than in past years but the wholesale value of the seizures in the four groups used has generally constituted at least 96 percent of the total wholesale value of all seizures in any year.

The process for determining the Drug ROI for an individual HIDTA will not change.

Other Law Enforcement Outputs Table for Arrests, Wiretaps, and Firearms Seized

Beginning in 2015, arrests, wiretaps and firearms seized are reported in the Threat Specific Table, "Other Law Enforcement Outputs." Table 4a Firearms Seized, has been eliminated. While this is not a core table, HIDTAs are strongly encouraged to report their activities regarding arrests, wiretaps and firearms seized in this other outputs table.

Arrest refers to the taking into custody of a person for the purpose of holding them to answer a criminal charge. Report the total number of persons arrested, not the total number of charges filed against those persons.

A wiretap is a form of electronic monitoring where a court order authorizes law enforcement to surreptitiously listen to phone calls or intercept wireless electronic text messages or video communications.

Report the number of lines (telephone numbers) for which a court order issued pursuant to Federal or state law authorized eavesdropping. By way of example, when the original order was granted in 2014 and the wiretapping continued into 2015 without an extension, the wiretapping should be reported in both 2014 and 2015. Likewise, when an extension was granted for a wiretap that began in 2014 and the order extends the wiretapping into January 2015, the wiretap should be counted in both 2014 and 2015. Do not report an extension of a court order for the same telephone line (number) unless the extension is spanning the calendar year being reported. Dialed number recorders (Pen registers) are not considered a wiretap for PMP reporting purposes.

For PMP purposes, the term "firearm" means any weapon that is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive. This is a shortened definition of 18USC921, which contains the definitions used in the chapter of the United States Code dealing with firearms.

The values of firearms seized are not included in the ROI calculations. This was a policy decision by ONDCP, the HIDTA Directors, and the PMC. HIDTAs are encouraged to include information about firearms seizures in their Annual Reports, but they may not enter the value of firearms seized into PMP or use a value in calculating their ROI.

Other Law Enforcement Outputs by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Arrests	1,720	1,652	1,991
Wiretaps (Lines)	297	200	229
Firearms Seized	823	893	1,019

As of 5/25/2016

Methamphetamine Labs

To receive credit for dismantling a clandestine methamphetamine laboratory, the HIDTA must submit an EPIC form 143 (EPIC-143) to the El Paso Intelligence Center (EPIC). Typically, there is a significant lapse of time between the submission of the form and EPIC’s recordation of the event in the National Seizure System (NSS). In addition, there are one or more opportunities that occur after the HIDTA submits EPIC-143 for the classification of the laboratory to be changed without the knowledge of the HIDTA. To resolve any discrepancies that may appear due to the time lag or a classification issue, HIDTAs must retain a copy of EPIC-143 for three years or until audited. Further, HIDTAs should review PMP data on a quarterly basis making sure to compare NSS records with those recorded in PMP. When necessary, HIDTAs should contact EPIC to ensure the data recorded in PMP and NSS match.

HIDTAs reporting a dismantlement of a “super lab,” i.e., a lab capable of producing 10 or more pounds of methamphetamine in a single cook, by an initiative must include on “Clan/Meth Lab” screen the NSS number assigned to that lab dismantlement by EPIC. No superlab seizures can be entered without an NSS number,

The PMP staff is responsible for reporting the cost for an ounce of methamphetamine in the HIDTA region. In HIDTAs that are part of multiple DEA Divisions, this may require comparing the cost of methamphetamine across those Divisions. The price will be set using the process described previously for establishing other drug prices, including giving the HIDTA Director the opportunity to propose an alternate price.

When an alternative source is used for the methamphetamine price, the HIDTA should note that substitution in an appendix to their Annual Reports.

Other Clandestine Laboratories

Beginning in 2017, HIDTAs have the option to report all types of clandestine labs they dismantle in addition to the methamphetamine labs they now are required to report.

A clandestine laboratory is a facility that manufactures, converts, refines, or transforms illegal substances for personal use by the operator of the laboratory or for sale to other parties.

For PMP purposes there are two types of clandestine labs: Production and Conversion. A Production Laboratory makes controlled substances from precursors or otherwise legal substances; e.g., labs that produce methamphetamine, LSD, K2/Spice, etc. A Conversion laboratory changes or transforms the form of an illegal substance; e.g., cocaine HCL to crack, morphine to heroin; marijuana to hashish, methamphetamine powder to crystal meth, “wax,” or an oil; etc.

Information about these labs will be collected in a new section of the Clandestine Labs tab. In this section, you can select a laboratory type, either Production or Conversion, and an end product for each lab reported.

For Production Labs we have initially identified LSD; Fentanyl; Synthetic Cannabinoids (e.g. K2/Spice); PCP; GHB; MDMA (Ecstasy); OxyContin; and DMT N,N-Dimethyltryptamine as end products. For Conversion Labs, the initial list of end products includes Crack; Ice; Hashish; Cannabis Oil Extraction (includes honey butane oil, and variants such as oils, wax, shatter, crumble); Methamphetamine HCl from meth in solution; and Counterfeit Pill Manufacturing. Additional end-products will be added as needed.

In addition to the type of lab and the specific end product, the size of the lab can be recorded as well. The lab size categories are the same as those used for methamphetamine labs.

A new Threat Specific Table has been developed for these data and that table is described in Appendix A.

The collection and reporting of this information is optional.

Overseers and Sub-Initiatives

In some cases, a HIDTA might wish to combine several small initiatives (“Sub-initiatives”) into a single reporting unit (“Overseer”) or subdivide a large initiative (“Overseer”) into several smaller more manageable entities (“Sub-initiatives”). The purpose of the distinctions is to enable the HIDTA Executive Board to evaluate the initiatives more easily.

For example, the Hawaii HIDTA has similar enforcement initiatives on each of the islands in the Hawaii HIDTA. Similarly, the New Mexico Region of the Southwest Border HIDTA organizes several prosecutorial sub-initiatives into one large overseer.

Each of the sub-initiatives must complete all the relevant data screens for the type of initiative the sub-initiative represents.

Education versus Training

Training describes the act of providing an individual with the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to perform her/his job. This is in contrast to education, which in its broadest sense is any act or experience that has a formative effect on the mind or character. PMP recognizes four types of training: management, analytical, enforcement, and demand reduction. For PMP, HIDTAs report training activity, not educational activity.

The distinction between education and training is not the composition of the audience, but the information imparted. For example, when a HIDTA enables an investigator to attend a class on interrogation techniques or surveillance, the training activity should improve the knowledge, skills and abilities of the investigator to perform these tasks, tasks that one would reasonably expect a HIDTA investigator to perform. This activity should be reported as a training activity in the PMP database. On the other hand, a conference designed to inform participants about drug trends or the advantages of certain treatment modalities should not be reported as a training event unless the participant is expected to improve his or her knowledge, skills and abilities to perform his or her duties. Education is designed to inform, whereas training is designed not only to inform, but also to provide or enhance skills and abilities.

While informal on-the-job training that a supervisor or senior investigator provides to initiative members is important, it should not be reported as training unless the trainer provides lesson plans and learning objectives for the training course. Similarly, trainers offering demand reduction training must produce lesson plans and learning objectives before the activity can be counted as a training event. For example, when an initiative member speaks to a high school class about the danger of drug use, the event should be considered educational and not reported as training. However, when a school resource officer funded through HIDTA provides classroom instruction to a high school class that

teaches students how to cope with peer pressure to use illegal drugs, the event should be reported as training in PMP.

Classroom Training

When reporting classroom (conventional) training in the PMP database, report only the number of students trained for which HIDTA funds are expended. For example, when HIDTA funds are used to pay for such items as a class registration fee, travel, lodging, per diem, or books, report the number of students trained in the PMP database. When HIDTA space is used to host the training, even if no other costs were covered with HIDTA funds, report the number of all students trained in the PMP database. Training financially supported entirely with funds from an agency (non-HIDTA funds), even though HIDTA assigned investigators, administrators or support staff attended, should not be reported in the PMP database.

On-Line Training

On-line training has gained in popularity primarily because of its convenience and cost savings. More and more HIDTAs are either offering or encouraging personnel to attend on-line training courses. Whenever a HIDTA expends funds, to include but not limited to efforts such as advertising on-line training opportunities, the HIDTA should report the number of students from that HIDTA trained in the PMP database. As an example, HIDTA A developed and hosted an on-line training course that it offered at a minimal cost or free of charge. HIDTA B seized the opportunity and advertised the course to its participating agencies. In this example, HIDTA B should report the number of students from its participating agencies trained via the on-line course in the PMP database. HIDTA A should report only the number of students from HIDTA A who took the training in the PMP database. This will avoid double counting. HIDTA A should also report its work on the development and hosting of the on-line training in a Threat Specific Table as an “Other Output” and in its Annual Report.

Event Deconfliction Services

Event deconfliction services enhance officer safety and assist in the coordination of investigative activity. Because of the importance of these services, they must be provided to all HIDTA initiatives and offered to law enforcement agencies, regardless of whether they participate in the HIDTA. It is important to report in the PMP database the number of times event deconfliction services were provided to both HIDTA initiatives and non-participating law enforcement agencies. It is not necessary to differentiate between HIDTA and non-HIDTA requests for event deconfliction services.

Case/Subject/Target Deconfliction Services

Case/subject/target deconfliction services assist in the coordination of investigative activity and help to ensure the best use of HIDTA and agency resources. It is important to report in the PMP database the number of times case/subject/target deconfliction services

were provided. It is not necessary to differentiate between HIDTA and non-HIDTA requests for case/subject/target deconfliction services.

Case Explorer.Net, SAFETNet, RISSafe, Regional and State Deconfliction Systems

HIDTAs use one of three systems – Case Explorer.Net, SAFETNet, or RISSafe to provide both event and case/subject/target deconfliction services. For event deconfliction, the systems match the location, date and time of enforcement actions and notify the contributing parties of potential conflicts. For case/subject/target deconflictions, the systems process case elements specified by the HIDTAs and notify the contributing parties of potential matches.

DTO and MLO Deconflictions

ONDCP requires all DTOs and MLOs to be deconflicted in the year in which they are first reported in the PMP database. A DTO or MLO is deconflicted when the names of the targets are entered into the HIDTA's Case/subject/target deconfliction system. The case agent, supervisor or PMP coordinator is responsible for reporting this information by checking the DTO/MLO deconfliction box located on the DTO entry screen to verify that the DTO or MLO was deconflicted.

Case Support

Case support is defined as the assignment of an analyst(s) to provide analytical services for an investigation. HIDTA analysts provide valuable support to HIDTA and non-HIDTA cases. In most instances, HIDTA analysts support complex cases that require an extensive commitment of resources to close. The processing of inquiries, event deconfliction services, and similar tasks are not considered case support in PMP even though these services often aid an investigator.

For example, when an investigator contacts the Investigative Support Center (ISC) and asks that 20 names and addresses be checked in the ISC databases, this activity should not be recorded as case support. Only when one or more analysts analyze case data and produce at least one of the following products can the activity be reported as case support:

- association/link/network analysis
- commodity flow analysis
- crime-pattern analysis
- financial analysis
- flow analysis
- geospatial analysis
- telephone toll analysis

PMP is intended to capture the number of cases that receive support from any analyst assigned to any HIDTA initiative, including non-HIDTA funded analysts, as opposed to the number of analytical services provided or the number of database inquiries performed. Whether one analyst or a number of analysts provide support to a particular case is immaterial for PMP purposes. The critical information for PMP is the number of individual cases that received analytical services in support of the case.

PMP Other Outputs

Beginning in 2017, the use of “Other Outputs” in PMP will be significantly reduced. The Other Outputs tab will only be available to Enforcement and Treatment and Prevention Initiatives.

All Enforcement Initiatives will have only three Other Outputs available to them in PMP drop-down screens: Arrests; Wiretaps (Lines); and Firearms Seized. These terms are described in the section on the Other Law Enforcement Outputs Table described on page 65.

Treatment and Prevention Initiatives will have Other Outputs unique to the purpose of the initiative. The Other Outputs list for those initiatives were entered into PMP by PMP Administrators based on input provided by each HIDTA in the summer of 2016. If changes to that list are needed, please provide the requested changes to the PMP Help Desk.

HIDTAs can continue to track information previously reported and/or any additional information using the “Other Outputs Template” available in the drop down list for “Documents” at the bottom of the sidebar on the left side of the Information Network/PMP portal. That template is reproduced below.

The information entered in the Other Outputs Template will not be part of the PMP database. It must be saved and stored by each HIDTA.

As in the past, the collection and reporting of Other Outputs by a HIDTA is entirely optional.

distributed. For example, if you do five strategic products in a year, each member of the Executive Board should receive five surveys, one for each product. HIDTAs are encouraged to send the surveys to other relevant officials who have received the strategic intelligence document. However, you should ensure those recipients hold executive level positions within their agencies.

A case support survey should be sent for any case that received case support in the calendar year. Surveys can be sent to on-going and closed cases but only one survey a year should be sent for a case. For some cases, the case support will have been started in a prior year. For PMP purposes, when the case support activities began does not matter. We are concerned about the assessment of services that were completed in the calendar year being assessed. Cases that last longer than one year may be surveyed multiple times if the HIDTA provided case in multiple years.

The surveys can be administered by the HIDTA or by the National HIDTA Assistance Center (NHAC). These surveys should not be conducted over the phone. If the HIDTA administers the surveys they can be sent to the case agents and law enforcement executives by email, regular mail, fax, or distributed during meetings. HIDTAs should keep copies of the responses and make them available to ONDCP or other authorized parties if requested.

Number of Surveys and Response Rates. HIDTAs should complete a minimum of 50 surveys of the Case Support surveys and 50 surveys of Strategic Intelligence Products each calendar year. Fifty surveys are needed to ensure a reliable estimate of the proportion of respondents that consider the CS or SIPs useful. More than 50 surveys should be completed if possible. The additional cases will provide greater confidence in the results of the survey.

The cases selected to be surveyed should provide a representative picture of the case support provided each year. For example, you should attempt to include cases that: were supported throughout the year (not just those supported in the first or last six months of the year being assessed); involve MLOs, not just DTOs; and cases that required different levels of support, e.g., long-term extensive assistance v. relatively short-term and less intensive assistance. This does not mean that the ISC should select only cases that it knows were well received to ensure good ratings. The procedures you use to select the cases to be surveyed should be documented and available to ONDCP staff or other reviewers on request.

Obtaining 50 completed surveys will require sending out more than 50 surveys. We recommend sending out 80 surveys. If you expect to provide case support to fewer than 80 cases in the year being assessed or you distribute SIPs to fewer than 80 individuals, include all those involved in your sample.

There is no widely accepted standard for an adequate response rate to a survey. Response rates deemed adequate in academic studies have ranged from 25% to 75% for mail surveys. That being said, extremely low response rates raise questions about non-response bias. Nonresponse bias can result when individuals that receive a survey are

unwilling or unable to respond, and they differ in meaningful ways from those who do respond. To avoid extremely low response rates, you should do follow-up contacts to non-respondents.

Appendix A - PMP Core Tables and Threat Specific Tables

Part One: Core Tables

The following information is provided to assist HIDTA Directors, PMP coordinators, and ONDCP policy analysts with issues relating to data entry, performance expectations, and the uniform application of PMP definitions. Information is organized sequentially on a core table by core table basis. For each table there is a brief description of the table, an example of the table, and a matrix indicating where any definition or explanation of any key terms can be found in the User Guide. There is also a description of how the table was changed in the re-write of PMP.

Core tables 1 through 6 have a green header and report Goal 1 achievements. Goal 1 outcomes are located on tables 1 and 5. Tables 7 through 12 have a blue header and report Goal 2 outcomes. A green column or row on a performance table reports an outcome expressed as a percentage of the performance expectation set for the reported activity.

A variance of 15 percent above or below a performance expectation requires the reporting HIDTA to provide an explanation for the variance in its Annual Report.

Table 1: DTOs and MLOs Disrupted and Dismantled as Percent of Expected

Table 1 is a core table that displays the number of drug trafficking and money laundering organizations that were expected to be disrupted or dismantled and the number that were actually disrupted or dismantled during the program year. There is a specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table, and the extent to which the HIDTA met this expectation is highlighted in the green cells of the table. The Table does not separately calculate the percentage of disruptions or dismantlements that were reported because there is no separate performance expectation for dismantling a DTO or MLO vs. disrupting a DTO or MLO. Information in this Table is presented for the most recent three program years. Performance expectations are not established for the three types of DTOs and MLOs – international, multi-state and local-- that are used to describe the operational scope of each.

No substantive change made during the rewrite.

Table 1: DTOs/MLOs Disrupted or Dismantled by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA as a Percent of Expected			
	2013	2014	2015
Expected	137	158	144
Actual			
International	35	30	20
Multi-State	64	52	65
Local	38	36	33
Actual Total	137	118	118
Actual Total as Percentage of Expected	100%	75%	82%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 1

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Drug Trafficking Organization (DTO)	68	5
Money Laundering Organization (MLO)	72	5
Dismantled	68	9
Disrupted	68	9
Operational Scope	73	12
International DTO/MLO	71	12
Multi-state DTO/MLO	72	12
Local DTO/MLO	72	12

Table 2: DTOs and MLOs Disrupted and Dismantled as Percent of all DTOs/MLOs Open

Table 2 is a core table that displays: (1) the number of organizations identified; (2) the total number of organizations that were under investigation according to their operational scope; (3) the total number of organizations that were disrupted and dismantled, according to their operational scope; and (4) the percent of organizations under investigation that were disrupted or dismantled, in total and according to their operational scope. This table does not contain a performance expectation. It is a workload table.

No substantive change made during the rewrite.

Table 2: DTOs/MLOs Disrupted or Dismantled by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA as a Percent of all DTOs/MLOs Under Investigation			
	2013	2014	2015
Identified	498	404	456
Under Investigation			
International	124	92	102
Multi-State	214	171	200
Local	158	140	152
Total	496	403	454
Disrupted or Dismantled			
International	35	30	20
Multi-State	64	52	65
Local	38	36	33
Total Disrupted or Dismantled	137	118	118
Disrupted or Dismantled as a Percentage of those Open			
International	28%	33%	20%
Multi-State	30%	30%	33%
Local	24%	26%	22%
Percentage based on the Total Disrupted or Dismantled vs. Total Under Investigation	28%	29%	26%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 2

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Identified	70	N/A
Open [<i>For this table only means “DTO/MLO Under Investigation</i>]	N/A	N/A
Drug Trafficking Organization (DTO)	68	5
Money Laundering Organization (MLO)	72	5
Dismantled	68	9
Disrupted	68	9
Operational Scope	73	12
International DTO/MLO	71	12
Multi-state DTO/MLO	72	12
Local DTO/MLO	72	12

Table 3: Priority Organizations Disrupted or Dismantled

Table 3 is a core table that displays information concerning the HIDTA’s accomplishments in disrupting or dismantling priority targets. The table has two sections – one section that displays information about drug trafficking organizations (DTOs) and a second that displays information about money laundering organizations (MLOs). Each section has four sub-categories showing information for organizations that are (1) part of a Consolidated Priority Organization Target (CPOT); (2) part of an Organized Crime and Drug Enforcement Task Force (OCDETF) case; (3) a Regional Priority Target (RPOT) designated by the OCDETF Program’s Regional Coordination Committee; (4) or a Priority Target Organization designated by a DEA field office. (Note the sum of these four sub-categories will not equal the total number because (1) not all DTOs/MLOs will be priority targets; and (2) some organizations may have been designated as more than one type of priority.)

The first line of each section presents the total number of such DTOs/MLOs that were (1) investigated during the program year, (2) described as violent; and (3) disrupted or dismantled that year. The fourth column displays the percent of each type of organization under investigation that was disrupted or dismantled. The next four lines display the same information for organizations designated a specific type of priority target.

This table does not contain a performance expectation. It is a workload table.

Changes made during the rewrite of PMP include: including more detailed data about each type of organization and priority target; adding a column for violent organizations, and changing the color of the headers.

Table 3: Priority Organizations Disrupted or Dismantled by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA in the year 2015

Type	Active Investigations During Reporting Year	Violent Organizations	Disrupted or Dismantled	Disrupted or Dismantled as a Percent of Investigated
DTO	406	51	107	26%
CPOT	5	2	4	80%
RPOT	5	1	3	60%
OCDETF	82	13	26	32%
PTO	16	0	5	31%
MLO	48	0	11	23%
CPOT	0	0	0	N/A
RPOT	0	0	0	N/A
OCDETF	4	0	1	25%
PTO	1	0	1	100%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 3

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Consolidated Priority Organization Target (CPOT)	67	N/A
Regional Priority Organization Target (RPOT)	75	N/A
Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force (OCDETF)	72	N/A
Priority Target Organization (PTO)	74	N/A
Dismantled	68	9
Disrupted	68	9
Violent	76	N/A

Table 4: Quantity and Wholesale Value of Drugs Removed from the Marketplace

Table 4 is a core table that displays the quantities of illegal drugs seized during the specified year, the estimated wholesale value of those drugs, and the percent each drug represents of the total wholesale value of all seizures. Three units of measure for quantity are shown: kilograms; liters, and dosage units. Seizures reported in other units of measurement are converted into these three categories by PMP. Seizures of marijuana plants are automatically converted to kilograms at a rate of one pound per plant.

The pricing of drugs seized is described beginning on page 13 of this document.

PMP allows the user to display the drugs seized by a HIDTA in several ways. The default is for Table 4 to display seizures in one of fourteen (14) categories and to show only the quantities of drugs seized. The user has the option of checking a box on the report screen to display every specific drug seized in a particular year and/or to display the wholesale value of those drugs and the share of the total wholesale value of all seizures. The default is the Core Table to be used in the Annual Report to ONDCP. See below.

There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table. The information is provided to account for drugs seized during the program year.

Changes made during the rewrite of PMP include revising drug categories, displaying multiple units of measurement for each drug seized, and changing the color of the table headers.

Table 4: Quantity and Wholesale Value of Drugs Removed from the Marketplace by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA for 2015

Drug	Amount Seized			Wholesale Value	Percent
	Kilograms	D.U.	Liters		
Cocaine/Crack	1499.4594	0.0000	0.0000	\$24,642,001	37%
Heroin	275.5149	0.0000	0.0000	\$17,947,893	27%
Marijuana Plants - Indoor	164.6308	0.0000	0.0000	\$1,299,266	2%
Marijuana Plants - Outdoor	110.2070	0.0000	0.0000	\$869,754	1%
Marijuana/Cannabis	1975.9067	0.0000	0.0000	\$15,559,991	23%
Methamphetamine/Ice	17.5201	0.0000	0.0000	\$731,199	1%
Natural Hallucinogens	86.1606	0.0000	0.0000	\$72,533	0%
Other Drugs and Substances	0.8178	0.0000	0.0000	\$1	0%
Other Opiates	10.3732	0.0000	0.0000	\$518,660	1%
Prescription Drugs: CNS Depressant	0.0000	597.3500	0.0000	\$2,465	0%
Prescription Drugs: Narcotics	0.5620	2447.9000	0.0000	\$237,399	0%
Prescription Drugs: Other	0.4180	2340.0000	0.0000	\$13,569	0%
Prescription Drugs: Stimulants	0.0000	124.0000	0.0000	\$717	0%
Synthetic Hallucinogens	705.1376	294.5200	42.0638	\$4,931,163	7%
Total	4,846.7081	5,803.7700	42.0638	\$66,826,612	100%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 4		
Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Wholesale Value	76	13

Table 5: Return on Investment (ROI) for HIDTA Activities

Table 5 is a core table that reports the expected and actual ROI for (1) drugs removed from the marketplace, (2) cash and assets seized, and (3) the total for those two activities. There are specific performance expectations in the Strategy for each of these ROI figures, and the extent to which the HIDTA met these expectations is highlighted in the green cells of the table. This outcome measure clearly demonstrates the worth of the HIDTA and, when aggregated, the HIDTA Program in disrupting the marketplace for illegal drugs.

The table also displays the data used to calculate the various ROI figures. Information in this table is presented for the most recent three program years to assist the HIDTA Director in setting these performance expectations.

Note that beginning in 2013 the definition of “Investigative Budget” was changed to include all HIDTA funds except those budgeted for treatment, prevention, and research and development. Consequently, ROIs reported for 2013 and later years will be lower, in some cases substantially lower, than in prior years. Any comparison between ROIs reported in 2013 and later to ROIs reported for 2012 and prior years is not valid.

In 2017, the way the HIDTA Program ROI is calculated was changed. See page for a description of that change.

No substantive change made to the table during the rewrite.

Table 5: Return on Investment (ROI) for HIDTA Activities by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA

	2013	2014	2015
Drugs			
Expected	\$6.00	\$5.00	\$4.50
Actual	\$4.77	\$5.33	\$5.66
Actual as Percentage of Expected	80%	107%	126%
Cash and Assets			
Expected	\$6.83	\$4.00	\$4.50
Actual	\$4.36	\$6.76	\$1.34
Actual as Percentage of Expected	64%	169%	30%
Total ROI			
Expected	\$12.83	\$9.00	\$9.00
Actual	\$9.14	\$12.09	\$7.01
Actual as Percentage of Expected	71%	134%	78%
Investigative Budget and Seizures			
	2013	2014	2015
Investigative Budget	\$9,670,232	\$10,761,235	\$11,796,803
Wholesale Value of Drugs Seized	\$46,168,083	\$57,365,840	\$66,826,612
Assets Seized			
Cash Assets	\$36,416,315	\$70,621,910	\$12,978,077
Other Assets	\$5,790,442	\$2,118,586	\$2,884,641
Total Assets	\$42,206,757	\$72,740,496	\$15,862,718
Total Drugs and Assets Seized	\$88,374,840	\$130,106,335	\$82,689,330

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 5

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Return on Investment (ROI)	75	17
Drug ROI Expected	N/A	N/A
Actual Drug ROI	N/A	N/A
Cash and Assets ROI Expected	N/A	N/A
Actual Cash and Assets ROI	N/A	N/A
Total ROI Expected	N/A	N/A
Actual Total ROI	N/A	N/A
Investigative Budget	71	17
Wholesale Value of Drugs Removed	N/A	13

Table 6: Clandestine Methamphetamine Labs Dismantled

Table 6 is a core table that displays the number of dismantled clandestine meth labs, classifies the labs according to EPIC categories for production capacity, and calculates the estimated value for each category of dismantled labs. The estimated value assumes a single “cook” for each lab and for each lab multiplies the average wholesale price of an ounce of methamphetamine in the HIDTA region by the mid-point of each lab size range. There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table. The information is provided to indicate the extent to which the HIDTA initiatives identified and dismantled methamphetamine labs operating in its area.

Changes made during the rewrite of PMP include adding an estimated value of the labs dismantled for each year shown (previously only the value of the most recent year’s lab dismantlements were displayed) and changing the color of the table headers.

Table 6: Clandestine Methamphetamine Labs Dismantled by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Labs Dismantled			
Less than 2 Oz	0	1	8
2 - 8 Oz	0	0	3
9 - 31 Oz	0	0	0
32 - 159 Oz	0	0	2
10 - 20 Lbs	0	0	0
Over 20 Lbs	0	0	0
Total Labs Dismantled	0	1	13
Meth Cost Per Ounce			
	\$725	\$750	\$750
Estimated Lab Value			
Less than 2 Oz	\$0	\$1,500	\$12,000
2 - 8 Oz	\$0	\$0	\$11,250
9 - 31 Oz	\$0	\$0	\$0
32 - 159 Oz	\$0	\$0	\$144,000
10 - 20 Lbs	\$0	\$0	\$0
Over 20 Lbs	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Estimated Lab Value	\$0	\$1,500	\$167,250

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 6

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Methamphetamine Labs	N/A	18

Table 7: Training Funded and Supported by HIDTA

Table 7 is a core table that reports the number of students the HIDTA initiatives expected to train, the number of students they actually trained, the percent of the expected number of students that were actually trained, and the number of training hours provided. The table also displays the results of surveys sent six months following the training asking the students whether the course improved their job-related knowledge, skills, and abilities and whether the student applied the course material since completing the training course. This table refers to trainings conducted by HIDTA staff or training providers and is required for all HIDTAs. It does not include training that is funded entirely by an agency. There is a program-wide performance expectation of 85% positive responses established for these surveys, and the extent to which the expectations were met is highlighted in the table.

To enable a reader to assess the validity of the survey responses, the table has been expanded to include the number of surveys sent for each type of training, the number of responses received, and the resulting response rate.

Table 7: Training Funded and Supported by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA in 2016					
Type of Training	Expected Students	Actual Students	Actual as Percent of Expected	Training Hours Provided	
Enforcement	300	33	11%	1,056	
Analytical	100	106	106%	891	
Management	30	1	3%	4	
Demand Reduction	40	0	0%	0	
Total	470	140	30%	1,951	
Six Month Follow-Up Responses.					
Type of Training	Surveys Sent	Surveys Received	Response Rate	Question 1 - Yes	Question 2 - Yes
Enforcement	297	50	17%	94%	78%
Analytical	126	11	9%	91%	73%
Management	14	3	21%	67%	67%
Demand Reduction	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	437	64	15%	92%	77%
Survey Results from 07/01/2015 - 06/30/2016			As of 6/16/2016		
- Question 1 - Did the course improve your knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to perform your job?					
- Question 2 - Since the completion of this course, have you used the knowledge, skills, or abilities acquired in the training?					

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 7

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Training	76	19
Enforcement Training	69	19
Analytical Training	65	19
Management Training	72	19
Demand Reduction Training	68	19
Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities	N/A	19

Table 8: Deconflictions Processed

Table 8 is a core table that reports three types of information. —event deconflictions, case/subject/target element deconflictions, and DTO/MLO deconflictions.

The first two lines show the number of law enforcement agencies that use the HIDTA’s deconfliction system and the number of event deconflictions processed during each year.

The third line shows the number of case/subject/target elements that were processed for the year.

The fourth and fifth lines show the number of newly-identified DTOs/MLOs (i.e., organizations first identified during the program year in question) that were deconflicted and the percent this represents of all newly-identified DTOs/MLOs. There is a program-wide performance expectation that 100% of all newly-identified DTOs/MLOs are deconflicted in the year they are identified. The extent to which this expectation was met is highlighted in the green cells of the table.

The number of event and case/subject/target deconflictions processed includes requests from all sources, regardless of whether the requesting agency participated in the HIDTA.

No substantive change made to the table during the rewrite.

Table 8: Deconflictions Processed by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Event Deconflictions			
Agencies Participating in Event Deconfliction	79	84	86
Event Deconflictions Processed	7,078	6,992	4,515
Case/Subject/Target Elements Processed	32,529	29,188	27,395
DTO/MLO Deconflictions			
DTOs/MLOs Deconflicted	125	103	126
Percent of DTOs/MLOs Deconflicted	100%	100%	99%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 8

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Event Deconfliction	69	21
Case/Subject/Target Deconfliction	66	21
Agencies participating in deconfliction	65	21

Table 9: Cases Provided Analytical Support

Table 9 (formerly Table 10) is a core table that shows the number of cases for which the HIDTA expects to provide analytical support; the number of cases that actually received analytical support; and the percentage of the expected number that was actually supported. There is a specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table, and the extent to which the expectation was met is highlighted in the green cells of the table.

No substantive change made to the table during the rewrite.

Table 10: Cases Provided Analytical Support by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Analytical Case Support			
Expected to Provided	249	264	235
Actually Provided	255	260	425
Actual as Percent of Expected	102%	98%	181%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 10		
Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Analytical Support (Case Support)	65 & 66	22

Table 10: Case Agent Satisfaction with Case Support Provided

Table 10 (formerly Table 11) is a core table that shows the results of surveys sent to case agents inquiring about their perception of the accuracy and usefulness of the intelligence analysis they were provided. Accuracy is described as: Inaccurate, Somewhat Accurate, Mostly Accurate, or Very Accurate. The usefulness of the analysis is described as: Not Useful; Somewhat Useful; Useful; and Very Useful. Unlike the other performance measures in PMP, HIDTAs do not set unique performance expectations for case agent satisfaction with case support. Instead, there is a program-wide performance expectation for this measure -- ONDCP expects that 85% of the respondents to follow-up surveys will report the accuracy of the analysis was either Mostly or Very Accurate and usefulness of the information was either Useful or Very Useful. The extent to which these standards are met is highlighted in the green cells of the table.

Table 11: Intelligence Measures for Case Support by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Survey Statistics			
Cases Supported	255	260	425
Surveys Sent	18	22	52
Survey Responses	10	14	28
Percentage Useful	100%	100%	100%
How accurate was the Intelligence Analysis or Case Support			
Inaccurate	N/A	N/A	N/A
Somewhat Accurate	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mostly Accurate	N/A	N/A	N/A
Very Accurate	N/A	N/A	N/A
Overall, how accurate was the intelligence analysis	N/A	N/A	N/A
How useful was the Intelligence Analysis or Case Support			
Not Useful	0	0	0
Somewhat Useful	0	0	0
Useful	0	0	0
Very Useful	7	13	28
Overall, how useful was the intelligence analysis	100%	100%	100%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 11

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Analytical Support (Case Support)	65 & 66	22

Table 11: Law Enforcement Executives Assessment of Strategic Intelligence Products Produced

Table 11 (formerly Table 12) is a core table that shows: the results of surveys sent to the HIDTA Executive Board and other law enforcement executives inquiring about how effective and how useful were the Strategic Intelligence Products they received that were produced by HIDTA initiatives. The survey asks whether the documents were very effective, mostly effective, somewhat effective, or not effective. A similar question was asked about the usefulness of the document; i.e., was it very useful, somewhat useful, or not useful. Unlike most other performance measures in PMP, HIDTAs do not set unique performance expectations regarding satisfaction with its Strategic Intelligence Products. Instead, there is a program-wide performance expectation for this measure -- ONDCP expects that 85% of the respondents to follow-up surveys will report the products very useful or somewhat useful and the extent to which the expectation was met is highlighted in the green cells of the table.

Table 11: Law Enforcement Executives Assessment of Strategic Intelligence Products Produced by All HIDTAs

	2015	2016	2017
Survey Statistics			
Strategic Products	408	123	0
Surveys Sent	127,489	10,883	0
Survey Responses	980	381	0
Percentage Useful	82%	88%	N/A
How effective was the Strategic Intelligence Document in describing the situation or threat it addressed?			
Very Effective	N/A	N/A	0
Mostly Effective	N/A	N/A	0
Somewhat Effective	N/A	N/A	0
Not Effective	N/A	N/A	0
Overall, how accurate was the intelligence analysis	N/A	N/A	N/A
How useful was the Strategic Intelligence Document?			
Very Useful	900	295	0
Useful	0	0	0
Somewhat Useful	187	38	0
Not Useful	4	2	0
Overall, how useful was the intelligence analysis	82%	88%	N/A

As of 1/12/2017

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS TABLE 12

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Strategic Intelligence	75	N/A
Strategic Intelligence Document	75	N/A

Part Two: Threat Specific Tables

The following information is pertains to the eight Threat Specific Tables that HIDTAs can, at their discretion, include in their Annual Reports to ONDCP. As in the preceding section, the information is organized sequentially on a table by table basis. For each table there is a brief description of the table, an example of the table, and a matrix indicating where any definition or explanation of any key terms can be found in the User Guide. There is also a description of how the table was changed in the re-write of PMP.

Because these are not Core Tables, there is no performance expectation included in these tables. However, if these tables are included in the Annual Report the HIDTA should include an explanation of any variance greater than plus/minus 15% of any for the variance in its Annual Report. A variance of 15 percent above or below a performance expectation requires the reporting HIDTA to provide an explanation for the variance in its Annual Report

MLOs Disrupted and Dismantled as Percent of Expected

This table is identical to Core Table 1 except that it includes data only on money laundering organizations that were expected to be disrupted or dismantled and the number that were actually disrupted or dismantled during the program year. There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table. Like Core Table 1, the percentages of disruptions or dismantlements of MLOs that were reported are not separately calculated. Information in this Table is presented for the most recent three program years. No performance expectations are established for the three types of MLOs – international, multi-state and local, which are used to describe the operational scope of each.

No substantive change made during the rewrite.

MLOs Disrupted or Dismantled by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA as a Percent of Expected			
	2013	2014	2015
Expected	25	24	21
Actual			
International	11	9	7
Multi-State	7	7	3
Local	3	2	1
Actual Total	21	18	11
Actual Total as Percentage of Expected	84%	75%	52%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Money Laundering Organization (MLO)	72	5
Dismantled	68	9
Disrupted	68	9
Operational Scope	73	12
International MLO	71	12
Multi-state MLO	72	12
Local MLO	72	12

MLOs Disrupted and Dismantled as Percent of all MLOs Open

This table is identical to Core Table 2 except that it includes data only on money laundering organizations. The table displays: (1) the number of MLOs identified; (2) the total number that were under investigation (open) according to their operational scope; (3) the number of MLOs that were disrupted and dismantled, according to their operational scope; and (4) the percent of organizations under investigation that were disrupted or dismantled, in total and according to their operational scope. This table does not contain a performance expectation. It is a workload table.

No substantive change made to this table during the rewrite.

MLOs Disrupted or Dismantled by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA as a Percent of all MLOs Open			
	2013	2014	2015
Identified	81	46	48
Open			
International	36	24	26
Multi-State	32	14	13
Local	13	8	9
Total Open	81	46	48
Disrupted or Dismantled			
International	11	9	7
Multi-State	7	7	3
Local	3	2	1
Total Disrupted or Dismantled	21	18	11
Disrupted or Dismantled as a Percentage of those Open			
International	31%	38%	27%
Multi-State	22%	50%	23%
Local	23%	25%	11%
Percentage based on the Total Disrupted or Dismantled vs. Total Open	26%	39%	23%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Identified	70	N/A
Open [<i>For this table only means “MLO Under Investigation”</i>]	N/A	N/A
Money Laundering Organization (MLO)	72	5
Dismantled	68	9
Disrupted	68	9
Operational Scope	73	12
International MLO	71	12
Multi-state MLO	72	12
Local MLO	72	12

Prosecution Activities

This Threat Specific Table has two parts. The first part displays: the number of individuals that were indicted (or referred for prosecution), the number prosecuted, and number convicted by HIDTA-funded prosecutors, compares that number to the number of each that was expected that year; and calculates the percentage of the expected that was accomplished. The second part displays: the number of search warrants, wiretap orders, and other court orders that HIDTA-funded prosecutors reviewed during the year; compares that number to the number of each that was expected that year; and calculates the percentage of the expected that was accomplished.

There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table.

No substantive change was made to this table during the rewrite other than to drop the “Baseline” fields.

Prosecution Activities by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA

	2013	2014	2015
Number of Indictments			
Expected	200	217	498
Number of Indictments	175	174	407
Actual as Percentage of Expected	88%	80%	82%
Individuals Prosecuted			
Expected	147	162	300
Individuals Prosecuted	171	146	281
Actual as Percentage of Expected	116%	90%	94%
Individuals Convicted			
Expected	101	116	256
Individuals Convicted	118	125	175
Actual as Percentage of Expected	117%	108%	68%

As of 5/25/2016

Optional Prosecution Data by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA

	2013	2014	2015
Search Warrants Reviewed			
Expected	0	22	45
Search Warrants Reviewed	72	40	56
Actual as Percentage of Expected	N/A	182%	124%
Wiretap Orders Reviewed			
Expected	0	13	33
Wiretap Orders Reviewed	61	45	47
Actual as Percentage of Expected	N/A	346%	142%
Court Orders Reviewed			
Expected	0	14	47
Court Orders Reviewed	98	54	43
Actual as Percentage of Expected	N/A	386%	91%

As of 5/25/2016 page 57

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Indictment	70	N/A
Individuals Referred for Prosecution	71	N/A
Individuals Prosecuted	71	N/A
Individuals Convicted	70	N/A
Search Warrants	75	N/A
Wiretap Orders	76	N/A
Court Orders	67	N/A

Other Outputs

This table allows users to specify a specific single “Other Output” and to generate a table showing the number of such outputs reported over the past three years.

There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table.

No substantive change made during the rewrite.

Other Outputs: by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Output Name			
Expected	0	0	0
Actual	0	0	0
Actual as Percentage of Expected	N/A	N/A	N/A

As of 5/25/2016

Fugitive Apprehensions

This Threat Specific Table can be used by HIDTAs that choose to highlight an initiative designed to apprehend fugitives. The table displays the number of fugitives the initiative expected to apprehend in the program year, the number they actually apprehended, and the percent of the expected number that was apprehended. Information for this table comes from the data entered in the “Fugitives” tab for HIDTA initiatives.

There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table.

No substantive change was made to this table during the rewrite.

Fugitives Apprehended by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Apprehensions			
Expected	4,500	4,500	4,503
Apprehensions	4,526	5,064	5,222
Apprehensions with Drug Charges	1,340	1,734	1,800
Actual as Percentage of Expected	101%	113%	116%
Apprehensions with Drug Charges as Percentage of Apprehensions	30%	34%	34%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS		
Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Apprehension	65	
Fugitive	69	

Criminal Operations Activity

This Threat Specific Table can be used to report on investigative activity associated with investigations of individuals and groups that do not meet the definition of a drug trafficking organization or a money laundering organization. The information about the criminal operations that appears in this table is based on data entered in the “DTO/MLO/CO” tab for HIDTA initiatives.

There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table.

Criminal Operations Activity Dismantled or Disrupted by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Under Investigation	7	6	5
Dismantled or Disrupted	0	0	0
Dismantled or Disrupted as a Percentage of Under Investigation	0%	0%	0%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS		
Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Criminal Operations	67	5

Other Clandestine Laboratories Dismantled

This Threat Specific Table can be used to report on the dismantlement of clandestine laboratories other than those that produce methamphetamine. The information for this table comes from data entered in the “Clan Lab” tab for DTOs.

Two types of other clan labs are identified – Production and Conversion labs. In addition, the end product of each lab and the lab capacity for a single “cook” must be entered.

There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table.

Other Clandestine Laboratories Dismantled by All HIDTAs in the year 2017						
End Product	Capacity					Total
	2 oz. or Less	3 - 9 oz.	10 - 31 oz.	32 - 159 oz.	More than 10 lbs	
Production Laboratories						
Conversion Laboratories						

As of 1/12/2017

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS		
Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Clandestine Lab	19	68
Conversion Lab	19	68
Production Lab	19	76

Clandestine Lab Activities

This Threat Specific Table can be used to report on investigative activity associated with investigations of clandestine methamphetamine operations that do not involve the dismantlement of a laboratory. The information for this table comes from data entered in the “Clan/Meth Lab” screen for DTOs.

There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table.

No substantive change was made to this table during the rewrite other than to drop the “Baseline” fields.

Clandestine Lab Activities by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Laboratory Dump Sites Seized			
Expected	0	0	0
Laboratory Dump Sites Seized	0	1	10
Actual as Percentage of Expected	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chemical/Glassware Equipment Seizures			
Expected	0	0	0
Chemical/Glassware Equipment Seizures	0	0	0
Actual as Percentage of Expected	N/A	N/A	N/A
Children Affected			
Expected	0	0	2
Children Affected	0	0	3
Actual as Percentage of Expected	N/A	N/A	150%

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS

Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Laboratory Dump Sites	71	N/A
Chemical/Glassware Equipment Seizures	66	N/A
Children Affected	67	N/A

Other Law Enforcement Outputs

This Threat Specific Table displays the number of arrests made by the HIDTA’s initiatives, the number of wiretaps (lines) carried out, and the number of firearms seized during the reporting year. NOTE: You must use the specific terms shown in the table below (Arrests, Wiretaps (Lines), and Firearms) to have outputs included in this table. Outputs labeled with similar terms; e.g., “Title III wiretaps,” will not be recognized as entries for this table.

There is no specific performance expectation in the Strategy related to this table.

No substantive change made to this table during the rewrite.

Other Law Enforcement Outputs by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA			
	2013	2014	2015
Arrests	1,720	1,652	1,991
Wiretaps (Lines)	297	200	229
Firearms Seized	823	893	1,019

As of 5/25/2016

KEY TERMS AND CONCEPTS		
Term/Concept	Definition in Appendix B on Page:	Explanation on Page:
Arrests	65	18
Wiretaps (Lines)	76	18
Firearms	69	18

Appendix B - PMP Definitions and Key Terms Alphabetical

Agencies Participating in Deconfliction. The number of separate law enforcement agencies, including those that are not HIDTA participants, that have signed agreements allowing them to access and receive information from whichever one of the three DOJ-mandated deconfliction systems the HIDTA uses.

Analysis. Analysis is the systematic examination of diverse information through the application of inductive or deductive logic for the purpose of enhancing criminal investigations or assessment.

Analytical Support. Analytical support refers to those services an analyst provides to support an investigation; i.e., Association/Link/Network Analysis, Commodity Flow Analysis, Crime-Pattern Analysis, Financial Analysis, Flow Analysis, Geo-Spatial Analysis, or Telephone Toll Analysis.

Analytical Training. One of the four types of training reported in PMP that deals with the creation of analytical services. Training in the use of I2, Pen Link, Visual Links, and similar intelligence software programs are examples of Analytical Training, as are basic or advanced analytical training courses such as those offered by DEA or FLETC.

Apprehension. Service of a warrant to capture a fugitive.

Arrest. Arrest refers to the taking into custody of a person for the purpose of holding them to answer a criminal charge. Arrests are reported in the Other Enforcement Outputs table. Report the total number of persons arrested, not the total number of charges filed against those persons.

Association/Link/Network Analysis. Association/link/network analysis is the collection and analysis of information that shows relationships among varied individuals suspected of being involved in criminal activity that may provide insight into the criminal operation and which investigative strategies might work best.

Baseline. The baseline is a starting point against which performance or accomplishments can be measured. It provides a historical perspective on the performance that permits analysis of trends over time. The baseline year for the HIDTA PMP is 2004. Once a baseline is set, it should NOT change.

Benchmark. A benchmark is a comparative goal or standard drawn from a similar program or other source, by which performance can be measured or judged. Using a benchmark to measure performance allows for a systematic comparison with other organizations to identify best practices that can lead to more efficient and/or effective performance.

Case. A case is an official investigation into criminal activity that has been assigned an agency investigative number for tracking purposes. See Investigation. A case is synonymous to an investigation and the terms are used interchangeably. Note: A case may contain information about no, one or multiple DTOs or MLOs.

Case Closed. A case is closed when all investigative action by the HIDTA initiative on the case has ceased. For HIDTA reporting purposes, a closed case does not require that all fugitives have been apprehended, that all cases have been adjudicated, or that all appeals by those charged have been exhausted.

Case Closed Date. The case closed date is the date when all investigative action of the DTO/MLO by the HIDTA ceased. For HIDTA reporting purposes, a closed case does not require that all fugitives have been apprehended, that all cases have been adjudicated, or that all appeals by those charged have been exhausted. For the purpose of PMP reporting, the case investigator should follow his or her agency policy when determining when a case is closed.

Case Open. A case is open as long as it is still under investigation.

Case Opened Date. The case opened date is the date investigative case number is assigned.

Case/Subject/Target Deconfliction. Case/subject/target deconfliction is the process of determining when multiple law enforcement agencies are investigating the same person, place or thing. Elements of an investigation are compared and the number of matches is reported as a positive hit to verify the deconfliction. The deconfliction process includes notifying each agency of the potential conflict.

Case Support. Case support is the assignment of an analyst(s) to provide analytical support for an investigation. See Analytical Support.

Case Suspended. A case is suspended when investigative action on the case has been temporarily halted and no regularly scheduled reporting is required.

Case Suspended Date. The case suspended date is the date when investigative action on the case was temporarily halted. For PMP reporting purposes, suspended investigations are treated as closed cases even though the investigation is temporarily halted.

Cell. A cell is a unit within a DTO or MLO. When a unit acts under its own command and control in its drug business, it should be considered a separate DTO or MLO and not a cell of the larger organization.

Chain-of-command. The chain-of-command is the line of authority and responsibility along which orders are passed within a DTO/MLO. Orders are transmitted down the chain-of-command from a higher authority to a subordinate individual or cell that either carries out the order or transmits it farther down the chain until it is received by those expected to carry out the order. When there is no expectation that a cell or individual carry out an order, then that cell or individual is not part of the DTO/MLO giving the order.

Chemical/Glassware/Equipment Seizure. A chemical/glassware/equipment seizure is a seizure of chemicals, glassware, and/or equipment normally associated with the manufacturing of a controlled/illicit substance, but where there is insufficient evidence that the items were actually used in the manufacture of a controlled/illicit substance.

Children Affected. Children affected is the number of children residing in the immediate vicinity of the clandestine laboratories or visiting the areas that are exposed to or potentially exposed to the chemicals present. The number should include children who frequently visit the site of the laboratory or who reside in the immediate vicinity.

Clandestine Laboratory. A clandestine laboratory is a facility that manufactures, converts, refines, or transforms illegal substances for personal use by the operator of the laboratory or for sale to other parties. For PMP purposes there are two types of labs: Production Labs and Conversion Labs.

Commodity Flow Analysis. A commodity flow analysis is a graphic depiction and description of transactions, shipments, and distribution of transactions, shipments and distribution of contraband goods and money derived from unlawful activities in order to aid in the disruption of the unlawful activities and apprehend those persons involved in all aspects of the unlawful activities.

Consolidated Priority Organization Target (CPOT). A Consolidated Priority Organization Target DTO/MLO is an organization known to have a hierarchical chain-of-command relationship with a major international drug trafficking organization and/or money laundering enterprise that is included on the Department of Justice's Consolidated Priority Organization Target list. To claim a DTO/MLO is linked to a CPOT-list target, there must be reliable evidence of a chain-of-command relationship, not simply a business relationship no matter how frequent or extensive that relationship.

Controlled Delivery. A controlled delivery is the technique of allowing illicit or suspect consignments of illegal or controlled drugs and substances to be delivered while under the control and supervision of law enforcement to identify persons involved in the commission of a crime.

Conversion Lab. A Conversion Lab is a clandestine lab that changes or transforms the form of an illegal substance; e.g., cocaine HCL to crack, morphine to heroin; marijuana to hashish, methamphetamine powder to crystal meth; "wax," or an oil; etc.

Core Measure. A core measure is a performance measure that describes a significant activity that is generally performed by each HIDTA. All HIDTAs must project expected accomplishments toward most of these measures in their annual Strategies and report their performance towards all core measures in their Annual Reports.

Court Order. An order issued by a competent court that requires a party to do or abstain from doing a specified act.

CPOT Date. The CPOT date refers to the date the DTO/MLO was identified as linked to or affiliated with a CPOT. Note: This date may be confirmed with the Regional OCDETF Coordinator.

Crime-Pattern Analysis. Crime pattern analysis is the assessment of the nature, extent, and changes of crime based on the characteristics of the criminal incident, including modus operandi, temporal, and geographic variables.

Criminal Operations (COs). Loosely knit organizations of two or more person who are working together to traffic drugs, firearms, and/or smuggle bulk cash proceeds. The groups do not meet the definitions of DTOs or MLOs due to the size of the organization or its lack a clearly defined chain-of-command.

Demand Reduction Training. One of four types of training reported in PMP that concentrates on improving the student's knowledge, skills and abilities to ~~develop or implement a program or project designed to~~ reduce the demand for drugs by means other than criminal prosecution.

Dismantled. An organization is dismantled when its leadership, financial base, and supply network are destroyed and incapable of operating and/or reconstituting itself. NOTE: For HIDTA reporting purposes, a dismantlement of a DTO/MLO does not require that all fugitives have been apprehended, that all cases have been adjudicated, or that all appeals by those charged have been exhausted. Dismantling a DTO/MLO does not occur very often, especially for international DTOs.

Dismantled Date. The dismantled date is the date when the initiative commander determines that the DTO/MLO was dismantled. NOTE: For HIDTA reporting purposes, dismantling a DTO/MLO does not require that all fugitives have been apprehended, that all cases have been adjudicated, or that all appeals by those charged have been exhausted.

Disrupted. An organization is "disrupted" when the normal and effective operation of the organization is impeded, as indicated by changes in organizational leadership and/or changes in methods of financing, transportation, distribution, communications, or drug production. There is no precise way to calculate or measure whether a DTO/MLO is disrupted. This is a judgment call by the case agent or initiative supervisor. NOTE: A drug seizure, the execution of a search warrant or another enforcement activity, by itself, does not constitute a disruption unless the action truly results in the alteration of the organization's operations or membership.

Disrupted Date. The disrupted date is the date when the initiative commander determines that the DTO/MLO was disrupted. Note: The exact date this occurred is a judgment call by the investigator or supervisor.

Drug Trafficking Organization (DTO). A DTO is an organization consisting of five or more persons that (1) has a clearly defined chain-of-command and (2) whose principal activity is to generate income or acquire assets through a continuing series of illegal drug production, manufacturing, importation, transportation, or distribution activities.

Drug Trafficking. Drug trafficking is the complex system that illegally supplies drugs to consumers. It encompasses smuggling, importation, cultivation, manufacture, transportation, sales, distribution, and possession with intent to distribute or sell controlled substances.

DTO/MLO Characteristics. The DTO/MLO characteristics are the most salient descriptive characteristics of the organization. These characteristics can include race, national origin, and group membership (i.e., outlaw motorcycle gangs) so long as the information is drawn from trustworthy sources and is relevant to the locality in which the DTO/MLO operates.

Education. Any act or experience that has a formative effect on the mind or character that provides the individual with knowledge. Education is not reported in PMP. Meetings and conferences are generally considered as education.

Efficiency. Efficiency is a calculation based on inputs used per unit of output, e.g. cases reviewed per prosecutor, drugs seized per dollars expended on enforcement and intelligence.

Efficiency Measure. Efficiency measures are based on the ratio of inputs to outputs. For example, the average amount of HIDTA dollars allocated to Enforcement Initiatives and Intelligence and Information Sharing Initiatives for each DTO/MLO disrupted or dismantled is an efficiency measure.

Element. An element is one of the fundamental components of an investigation. Elements, such as persons, places, things, or event locations are compared for case/subject/target and event deconfliction purposes. The number of elements that match indicates a positive hit and is used to verify that a deconfliction occurred.

Enforcement Training. One of the four types of training reported in PMP that concentrates on improving the student's knowledge, skills and abilities to conduct a criminal investigation.

Event Deconfliction. Event deconfliction is the process of determining whether multiple law enforcement agencies are conducting an enforcement action (e.g., a raid, undercover operation, surveillance, or other high risk activity) in close proximity to one another during a specified time period. When certain elements are matched, it is referred to as a positive hit. The process includes notifying each agency of the conflict.

Expected. See Performance Target.

Financial Analysis. Financial analysis is the review and analyses of financial data to ascertain the presence of criminal activity. It can include bank record analysis, net worth analysis, financial profiles, source and applications of funds, financial statement analysis, and/or Bank Secrecy Act record analysis. It can also show destinations of proceeds of crime and support prosecutions.

Firearm. The term "firearm" means any weapon that is designed to expel a projectile by the action of an explosive. This definition is based on 18USC921(3).

Flow Analysis. Flow analysis is the review of raw data to determine the sequence of events or interactions that may reflect criminal activity. It can include timelines, event flow analysis, commodity flow analysis, and activity flow; it may show missing actions or events that need further investigation.

Fugitive. A fugitive is any individual for whom a warrant for arrest has been issued; who has escaped from the custody of federal, state, or local law enforcement or correctional authorities; for whom a warrant for arrest, or equivalent document, has been issued by a foreign government; or who has escaped from the custody of foreign law enforcement or correctional authorities, and for whom the United States has received a request for assistance in locating or apprehending. (Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, Evaluation and Inspections Division; “Review of the United States Marshals Service’s Apprehension of Violent Fugitives”, 2005; p. 1)

Gang. A gang is a group or association of five or more persons with a common identifying sign, symbol, or name, the members of which, individually or collectively, engage in criminal activity that creates an atmosphere of fear and intimidation. A gang may also be a DTO/MLO providing it meets the requirements set forth in the respective definitions. A gang differs from a DTO/MLO in that while the principal criminal activities of a DTO/MLO are directly related to drug trafficking and money laundering; the criminal activities of a gang can be more diverse.

Geospatial Analysis. Geospatial analysis is an approach to applying statistical analysis and other informational techniques to geographically based data. Such analysis employs spatial software and analytical methods with terrestrial or geographic datasets, including geographic information systems and geomatics.

HIDTA. The term HIDTA, without the words “Program” or “regions” following it, means either: the designated area (e.g. The HIDTA includes the District of Columbia and 14 counties; or the coordinating organization and the initiatives that are funded by the HIDTA (e.g., The HIDTA funds more than 50 initiatives.)

HIDTA PMP Matrix. The HIDTA PMP Matrix was a spreadsheet depicting the goals, threats/needs, initiatives, targets, and expected outcomes for a given year on the Y-axis and the HIDTA initiatives on the X-axis. The Matrix was a required part of the Annual Strategy in the early years of the PMP. It has been replaced by sections of the Annual Strategy that list the initiatives that have responsibility for addressing the threats identified in the Strategy.

HIDTA Program. The term HIDTA Program means the program funded by ONDCP at the national level. It includes the designated HIDTA regions and the five components of the Southwest Border HIDTA. By practice, the Southwest Border HIDTA has been treated only as a pass-through to the five separate components and the five components are treated as separate HIDTAs.

HIDTA Regions. The term HIDTA regions means areas of a HIDTA used to demarcate specific drug market areas for which drug prices are entered and drug seizures assigned.

Identified. A DTO/MLO is identified when the HIDTA becomes aware of the organization’s operation within the HIDTA boundaries.

Identified Date. The identified date refers to the date the organization was identified by the HIDTA.

Indictment. An indictment is a formal written accusation originating from a prosecutor and issued by a grand jury against a party charged with a crime.

Individuals Convicted. Individuals convicted are the number of individuals projected to be convicted and actually convicted during a reporting period regardless of when the individual was actually referred, charged, or indicted.

Individuals Prosecuted. Individuals prosecuted is a subset of the individuals referred for prosecution. It is the number of individuals projected to be and actually prosecuted during the reporting period.

Individuals Referred for Prosecution. Individuals referred for prosecution are the number of individuals that are indicted or charged through a complaint filed by a prosecutor.

Inputs. Inputs are resources used to produce a result, e.g., funding, labor hours.

Intelligence Products. Intelligence products are reports or documents that contain assessments, forecasts, associations, links, and other outputs from the analytic process that are for use by law enforcement agencies for prevention of crimes, apprehension of offenders, and prosecution.

Interdiction. The process of interrupting the flow of drugs or money, either while in route to the United States or from point-to-point within the United States.

International DTO/MLO. An international DTO or MLO is an organization, or identifiable cell of an organization, that regularly conducts illegal drug trafficking or money laundering activities in more than one country or that is based in one country and conducts or coordinates illegal activities in another. To be considered an international organization, the group must have an established connection to an international DTO/MLO. Simply being a customer of such an organization is not sufficient. See Cell.

Investigation. An investigation is synonymous with a case. The terms are used interchangeably.

Investigative Budget. This includes all funds budgeted by the HIDTA for activities other than treatment, prevention, and research and development. Discretionary funds added to the HIDTA budget during the grant year will be classified accordingly.

Laboratory Dump Site. A laboratory dump site is a seizure at a location where discarded laboratory equipment, empty chemical containers, waste by-products, pseudoephedrine containers, etc., were abandoned or dumped but no lab was found.

Lead. A lead is the provision of sufficient information to another initiative in the same HIDTA, another HIDTA or law enforcement agency for the purpose of enabling that entity to conduct an independent investigation; it does not matter if or when an independent investigation is opened. You do not need to have a case to pass on a lead.

Leader. A leader is an individual who directs the operation of the group under investigation. The leader may be the head of an entire drug trafficking organization or the leader of a cell of a drug trafficking organization.

Link. A link is a connection to a previously identified DTO or MLO. Links are used only for activities that are part of the Domestic Highway Enforcement (DHE) project. If the arrest and/or seizure affected by the DHE action is connected to a previously identified DTO or MLO, a link is thereby established.

Liquid Methamphetamine. “Liquid meth” is finished methamphetamine powder dissolved in a liquid for smuggling purposes. Once in the United States, it is separated from the liquid back to the powder form. Liquid methamphetamine reported in gallons/liters will be converted to a weight at the rate of 4.5 pounds per gallon.

Local DTO/MLO. A local DTO or MLO is an organization whose illegal drug trafficking or money laundering activities are generally, but not always, limited to the same metropolitan area, or—for non-metropolitan areas—are limited to an easily defined region or small number of geographically proximate counties. If a DTO’s activities regularly take place within a single metropolitan area, it should be considered a local DTO/MLO even if that metropolitan area includes parts of more than one state.

Local Geographic Area. The local geographic area of an organization is the area or areas within the HIDTA boundaries where a DTO, MLO, or a cell of a DTO/MLO under investigation by a HIDTA produces, manufactures, distributes, or stores the drugs or money it traffics or launders. Note: Even if the DTO/MLO is a multi-state organization, the local geographic area is still only the areas within the HIDTA’s region.

Management Training. One of the four types of training reported in PMP that focuses on managerial, organizational, or secretarial topics, including Microsoft training.

Member. A member is an individual who is part of an organization and takes direction from the organization’s leader(s). A member includes all those individuals below the leader who facilitate or carry out any of the organization’s activities.

Methamphetamine Oil. “Methamphetamine oil” is the final process in methamphetamine production before the meth crystals are produced. Like “liquid methamphetamine,” this form is commonly used as a smuggling technique. Methamphetamine is not usually sold in this oil form. Methamphetamine oil reported in gallons/liters will be converted to a weight at the rate of four pounds per gallon.

Money Laundering Organization (MLO). A MLO is an organization of two or more individuals engaged in processing illegal drug profits through a continuing series of illegal activities (placement, layering, and integration) to disguise the source of the money and make the illegal profits appear to be legitimate income.

Multi-state DTO/MLO. A multi-state DTO or MLO is an organization that regularly carries out illegal drug trafficking or money laundering activities in more than one state. An organization should not be considered multi-state if the organization’s activities regularly take place within a single metropolitan area or region, even if that metropolitan area includes parts of more than one state.

Need. A need is a capability or activity that contributes to disrupting or dismantling a drug trafficking organization by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of HIDTA-funded Initiatives.

OCDETF. OCDETF refers to the designation given to a DTO or MLO by the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force Regional Coordination Committee. An OCDETF case number must be assigned by the OCDETF Regional Coordination Committee before a case is reported in PMP as an OCDETF case.

OCDETF Date. The OCDETF date refers to the date the DTO/MLO was identified as linked to or affiliated with an OCDETF investigation. Note: This date may be confirmed with the Regional OCDETF Coordinator.

Operation. An operation is a coordinated enforcement action taking place within a specified time period in a defined geographic area.

Operational Intelligence. Operational intelligence is an assessment of the methodology of a criminal enterprise or organization that depicts how the enterprise performs its activities; including communications, philosophy, compensation, security, and other variables that are essential for the enterprise to exist.

Operational Scope. Operational scope refers to the geographic area where a DTO or MLO carries out its activities - in PMP, the geographic areas are local, multi-state and international. Operational scope is used to characterize the impact a DTO or MLO has on the geographic area.

Organization Identifier. The organization identifier is a unique identification given to each DTO or MLO identified by a HIDTA. The organization identifier can be any combination of words, names, letters, or numbers. Select the name or alias that best suits your purposes. Once selected, use the same name on all subsequent reports.

Outcome. An outcome is the consequence or change resulting from an activity. For example, the dismantlement of a DTO/MLO results in a reduction in the unknown number of DTOs operating in an area. A seizure of drugs results in a reduction in the unknown amount of drugs available in the area. A student trained means a more skilled and knowledgeable investigator, and the degree to which the student's knowledge is applied can be used as an outcome measure.

Outcome Measure. Outcome measures are based on the actual effect of the initiative or HIDTA on a population, inventory, or condition and are derived from the strategic goal of a program. For example, a reduction in the availability of cocaine in the District of Columbia or Washington/Baltimore HIDTA would be outcome measures. A measurable increase in officer safety and student knowledge could be outcome measures for event deconflictions and training, respectively.

Outcome Proxies. In almost all cases, HIDTAs do not have an accurate count of the population, inventory, or condition they are attempting to change. For example, there is no reliable, comprehensive, definitive, or timely data on the amount of drugs available at any city, county, state, or national level. Consequently, a proxy measure is needed to monitor performance towards the strategic goal of the HIDTA Program. Because of the obvious logical connection

between the number and size of Drug Trafficking Organizations (DTOs) and the drug supply in an area, ONDCP established performance measures for the HIDTA Program that are related to the dismantling and disrupting of drug trafficking organizations (DTOs) and the seizure of drugs and drug-related assets from DTOs.

Output. An output is a specific activity or service that an initiative conducts or produces. For example, a dismantled DTO, a seizure of drugs or assets, a student trained, a meth lab dismantled, a referral of case information, a toll analysis, and an event or case/subject deconfliction are all examples of outputs.

Output Measure. An output measure is a performance measure that is based on the expected number of specific activities or services that a HIDTA conducts or produces. For example, DTOs disrupted or dismantled, drugs and assets seized, and the number of students trained can all be used as output measures.

Outsourcing. The transfer of the management and/or day-to-day execution of a business function to an external service provider.

Performance Expectation. A performance expectation is an objective stated as a number that a HIDTA expects to achieve for the reporting period. For example, disrupting or dismantling 100 DTOs, seizing \$50 million in drugs and \$20 million in cash and other assets are examples of performance expectations. Performance expectations can be based on past performance (i.e., two or three year averages) or, if the expectation is new, a baseline from a specific year or a benchmark from a specific similar program. Performance expectations should be “SMART” -- Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Specific.

Performance Level. The performance level is the extent to which a HIDTA or the HIDTA Program meets the stated performance expectation for a specific period. For example, disrupting or dismantling 60% of the 100 DTOs expected to be disrupted or dismantled or seizing twice the amount of drugs expected in a year are performance levels.

Performance Management Committee (PMC). The Performance Management Committee is the group of HIDTA Directors that make recommendations to ONDCP about the Performance Management Process and the structure and content of the Performance Management Process database and related procedures.

Performance Management Process. A set of successive steps designed to assist in determining the efficiency and effectiveness of the National HIDTA program and individual HDTAs. The PMP requires the individual HDTAs to quantify their threats using reliable data, establish performance targets, develop initiatives to achieve the performance targets, and report their outcomes.

Performance Measure. A performance measure is the statistics, indicators, or other metrics used to gauge the performance of an individual HIDTA or the HIDTA Program. For example, the number of DTOs disrupted or dismantled, the wholesale value of drugs taken off the market, and the value of cash and other assets seized can be used as performance measures. The number of deconflictions, cases provided analytical support, students trained, and referrals of case

information can be used as a performance measure. Performance measures can be output measures, outcome measures, or efficiency measures.

Priority Target Organization (PTO). Priority Target Organizations are drug trafficking organizations with an identified hierarchy engaged in the highest levels of drug trafficking and/or money laundering operations, having a significant international, national, regional, or local impact upon drug availability. PTOs are designated by a DEA Special Agent in Charge or Country Attaché.

Production Lab. A Production Lab makes controlled substances from precursors or otherwise legal substances; e.g., labs that produce methamphetamine, LSD, K2/Spice, etc.

Regional Priority Organization Target (RPOT). A Regional Priority Organization Target DTO/MLO is an organization known to be linked to or affiliated with a major regional/national drug trafficking organization and/or money laundering organization that is designated as an RPOT by the Organized Crime and Drug Enforcement Task Force Program's Regional Coordination Committee.

Resource Initiative. An initiative created by a HIDTA to consolidate indirect/infrastructure costs such as rent, utilities, site alarm fees, monthly landline communications charges, and copy machine lease costs that are shared by multiple initiatives

Return on Investment (ROI). For the purpose of PMP, ROI is the ratio between the wholesale value of drugs, cash, and non-cash assets seized and the amount of HIDTA funds budgeted for all activities except treatment, prevention, and research and development.

RPOT Date. The RPOT date refers to the date the DTO/MLO was identified as linked to or affiliated with a RPOT. Note: This date may be confirmed with Regional OCDETF Coordinator.

Search Warrant. A court order authorizing the examination of a place for the purpose of discovering contraband, stolen property, or evidence of guilt to be used in the prosecution of a criminal action.

Source Area. The source area for a drug is the county, state, or foreign country from which the DTO or DTO cell under investigation obtains the drug from another DTO or individual. The source area must be the most direct and immediate source of the drug acquired by the DTO and not necessarily the area where the drug was produced or manufactured.

Source Organization Characteristics. The "Source Organization" characteristics reported should be the most salient descriptive characteristics of the group that has been identified as the source from which the DTO directly obtains its drugs. These characteristics can include race, national origin, and group membership (i.e., outlaw motorcycle gangs) so long as the information is drawn from trustworthy sources and is relevant to the source area in which the organization operates.

Strategic Intelligence. An assessment of targeted crime patterns, crime trends, criminal organizations, and/or unlawful commodity transactions for purpose of planning, decision-

making, and resource allocation; the focused examination of unique, pervasive, and/or complex crime problems.

Strategic Intelligence Document. A document that provides a long-term, high-level look at the law enforcement issues that not only considers current activities but also tries to provide a forecast of likely developments. The HIDTAs' annual threat Assessments are examples of strategic intelligence documents.

Tactical Intelligence. Evaluated information regarding a specific criminal event that can be used immediately by operational units to further a criminal investigation, plan tactical operations, and provide for officer safety.

Telephone Toll Analysis. Telephone toll analysis is an analysis that: graphically shows what calls are being made to or from a target phone; establishes links and associations within and among criminal enterprises; identifies patterns and locations related to criminal activity.

Threat. The threat is the capability and intent of an individual or group or an existing or impending condition that potentially can do or cause harm.

Threat Assessment. A threat assessment is a strategic document that examines the propensity for violence or criminality or the possible occurrence of a criminal activity in a certain time or place and focuses on drug and money laundering organizations and their communication, the movement of drugs or money, the environment, transportation, and security issues.

Threat Specific Measure. A threat specific measure is a measure that addresses expected and actual outputs and outcomes for an activity that is not generally funded by all HIDTAs (e.g. fugitive initiatives) and is not one of the core measures for the HIDTA Program.

Training. The act of providing an individual with the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to perform her/his job or, for demand reduction purposes, better able to resist drug usage. In PMP, there are four types of training: management, analytical, enforcement, and demand reduction.

Violent. An organization is considered violent if it routinely engages in kidnapping, extortion, murder, aggravated assault, robbery, or other crimes involving force or the threat of force.

Wholesale Value. The wholesale value of a drug is the price that the drug can be purchased for in kilogram quantities or, in the case of drugs usually reported in gallons or dosage units, quantities sufficient for resale to other DTOs or multiple consumers. HIDTAs are expected to use STRIDE data to establish a wholesale value for drugs seized unless they have a more accurate price list for drugs seized in their region.

Wiretap. A wiretap is a form of electronic monitoring where a Federal or state court order authorizes law enforcement to surreptitiously listen to phone calls or intercept wireless electronic text messages or video communications. Wiretaps are reported in the Other Law Enforcement Outputs table. Report the number of lines (telephone numbers) for which a court order authorized eavesdropping. Do not report an extension of a court order for the same telephone line (number) unless the extension is spanning the calendar year being reported. Note: Dialed number recorders (Pen registers) are not considered a wiretap for PMP reporting purposes.

Wiretap Order: A court order allowing the law enforcement to listen in on electronic communications. The order requires a showing by law enforcement of "probable cause" to believe the communications are part of criminal activities.

Appendix C – Past Changes to User Guide

Changes from Tenth Edition, June 22, 2015

Page	Section: Action
3	Setting Performance Expectation: Removes reference to PMP providing two-year averages
4-5	Database Locking: New Section added
5-6	DTOs, MLOs, and Criminal Organizations: Adds criminal organizations
9-10	DTO/MLO Disposition Markers: Added paragraph describing how dismantled and suspended DTOs/MLOs are handled for reporting purposes in new PMP.
13	Claiming Drug Seizures: Added paragraph emphasizing importance of reporting specific locations where drug seizures take place.
13-15	Drug Prices: Changes made to identify new sources of prices and describe how out-of-area seizures, including seizures in foreign countries are established
15-16	Drugs and Drug Groups: New section describing new organizational logic for grouping specific drugs.
17	Return on Investment: Updates source of budget information used in calculating ROI
17	Other Law Enforcement Outputs: Clarifies that wiretaps to be reported includes those pursuant to state court orders
18-19	Methamphetamine Labs: Revises description of how meth prices are set for lab dismantlement
19	Overseers and Sub-Initiatives: New Section
23-24	Specifying Other Outputs: Describes new process related to identifying Other Outputs

25-27	Guidelines for Intelligence-Related Surveys: New Section
33-34	Appendix A: Core Table 3 description updated
35-36	Appendix A: Core Table 4 description updated
40-41	Appendix A: Core Table 6 description updated
44-45	Appendix A: Core Table 8 description updated
48-49	Appendix A: Core Table 11 description updated
52-65	Appendix A: Part Two: Threat Specific Tables: New section
66-78	Appendix B: Definitions: Numerous new or revised definitions highlighted throughout