Organized Crime Integrated Units: Analysis Report

by

Brenda Chorney, MSc

and

Rick Linden, PhD

and

Rita Gunn, MA

PRA Inc.

prepared for

Research and National Coordination
Organized Crime Division
Law Enforcement and Policing Branch
Public Safety Canada

The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Public Safety Canada or the Government of Canada.

Report No. 008, 2010

Cat. No.: PS4-101/2010E-PDF
ISBN No.: 978-1-100-19951-1

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Introduction

Public Safety Canada is maintaining a National Research Agenda on Organized Crime in support of the National Coordinating Committee on Organized Crime (NCC). As a step in this process, Public Safety Canada contracted PRA Inc., an independent research company, to compile an inventory of organized crime integrated teams and units operating across Canada and to conduct further analysis of a subset of the identified integrated units. This report presents the findings for the analysis component.

Methodology

We conducted interviews for 25 integrated units during this phase of the project and reviewed all additional written documentation provided by units, such as agreements, constitutions, and reviews. As well, the analysis draws on the interviews with NCC contacts, and the information collected for the inventory.

Summary of Findings

Integrated units are an approach for sharing skills, experiences, and resources for combating organized crime. Integrated efforts provide increased capacity to respond to the fluidity and transnational trends of organized crime groups.

A variety of integrated units operate across Canada with mandates linked to combating organized crime. Partners in these units commonly include some combination of municipal, provincial, and federal law enforcement agencies, as well as other government departments and agencies, primarily those acting in a regulatory or justice-related capacity. Integrated units use formal agreements to guide their partnerships, with agreements outlining roles and responsibilities.

Governance structures of units may include such entities as a senior management team, a joint management team, a steering committee, and a board of directors. Management bodies frequently include partner involvement. Internal management of the unit may involve one partner acting as the lead or shared lead; units also often involve partners in some type of supervisory capacity. Members of a unit are primarily responsible to their unit, taking direction from their unit supervisors.

Partners contribute to integrated efforts through provision of personnel, and may also provide equipment, infrastructure, and operational expenses. Governments may also assist by providing funds to cover salaries, infrastructure, and other expenses.

Respondents spoke of the many strengths of their integrated units and the best practices that contribute to these strengths and assist them in mitigating any challenges. Identified best practices for integrated units are summarized below.

- A strong MOU as a guide for unit managers to define the unit mandate and fully outline each partner's roles, responsibilities, and contributions. It is important to have the MOU worked out at the establishment of the unit.

- Ensuring all team members are aware of and adhere to their roles and responsibilities.

- Committed individuals willing to work as a team. Ensuring that positions are staffed with the right people is a requirement of a successful unit.

- Working with partners to ensure new members possess the required skills and qualities for working within the integrated unit.

- Provision of training opportunities to provide all team members opportunities to develop the high level of skills and expertise required in integrated units. Training opportunities are particularly important for new members who may be relatively inexperienced in the skills required by the unit.

- A governance and management structure that fully defines reporting and accountabilities.

- Gaining the trust and support of upper management of all partners as well as from government. Supportive management provides leadership, commitment, buy-in, and participation, and assists with accountability and oversight. Strong management support can also help to resolve issues within the unit. Government support, whether municipal, provincial, or federal, can assist in providing continued (financial and human) resources to the unit.

- Ongoing and inclusive communication with partners to keep them informed of unit activities and how their resources are used. Frequent communication is particularly important in large units with multiple partners.

- Having partners participate in unit management and/or planning and priority-setting involves them in the decision-making process and keeps them informed, further contributing to commitment. This includes involving partner team members in supervisory roles within the unit.

- Flexibility in considering partners' differences in policies and procedures and finding ways to make concessions and accommodations.

- Development of a common records management system is considered an ideal situation. As this is not yet in place in Canada, best practices for data and information sharing include having access to each partner's information system, and instituting a system for data entry to reduce duplication of effort.

- Co-location of unit members gives partners the opportunity for full integration of team members. An off-site location is good for team building and communication and improves independence from partners.

- Inclusion of partners beyond law enforcement that involve a continuum of agencies in the justice and social systems, including corrections, prosecution, and social services.

1.0 Introduction

Public Safety Canada is maintaining a National Research Agenda on Organized Crime in support of the National Coordinating Committee on Organized Crime (NCC). As a step in this process, Public Safety Canada contracted PRA Inc., an independent research company, to compile an inventory of organized crime integrated teams and units[1] operating across Canada and to conduct further analysis of a subset of the identified integrated units.

An important component of combating organized crime is a collaborative integrated approach. The inventory will provide a greater understanding of the integrated teams operating across Canada, and, as such, will identify existing teams and units, as well as some basic information on each unit.

The analysis component examines a subset of the integrated units identified through the inventory phase to gain a greater understanding of the operational aspects, challenges, and keys to success for these units. This report presents the findings for the analysis component. The report also incorporates information obtained while compiling the inventory database.

2.0 Combating organized crime in Canada

A criminal organization is defined in section 467.1 (1) of the *Criminal Code of Canada* as a group that:

> (*a*) is composed of three or more persons in or outside Canada; and,
>
> (*b*) has as one of its main purposes or main activities the facilitation or commission of one or more serious offences that, if committed, would likely result in the direct or indirect receipt of a material benefit, including a financial benefit, by the group or by any of the persons who constitute the group (Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, as amended).

Criminal Intelligence Service Canada (CISC) reports approximately 750 criminal groups operating across Canada in 2009 (CISC 2009). These include street gangs, outlaw motorcycle

[1] From the RFP: "teams and units are to include any organized enforcement or prosecutorial body at any level of jurisdiction (municipal, provincial, federal) that works to combat organized crime e.g. taskforces, working groups, integrated forces, unit, teams." We will refer to all of these initiatives as integrated units, or units.

gangs, and higher level criminal groups and international syndicates (Public Policy Forum, 2007). While organized crime is found in all areas of Canada, the groups and their activities/markets are concentrated in three locations: British Columbia's lower mainland, southern Ontario, and Greater Montreal (CISC, 2008). Groups based in these areas tend to network into other areas of Canada (Public Policy Forum, 2007).

The illicit drug market is the predominant area of activity for organized crime groups (CISC, 2008), with most groups involved to some degree in an annual trade worth an estimated $7 to $10 billion (Public Policy Forum, 2007). Other areas of illegal activities include mass marketing fraud schemes, mortgage fraud, payment card fraud with the production of illegal payment cards in card factories, securities fraud, contraband tobacco, smuggling illegal migrants, trafficking in persons (TIP) for sexual exploitation purposes, illegal firearms trade, distribution and trade of counterfeit goods, and stolen vehicles and parts.

Some of the challenges associated with addressing organized crime are that:

- the groups are diverse and involved in a wide scope of criminal activities (Public Policy Forum, 2007);
- many of the groups operate across multiple jurisdictions both within Canada and internationally (CISC, 2008);
- many organized crime groups participate in legitimate business ventures for the purposes of money laundering and other means of using legal activities to mask illegal ones (CISC, 2008); and
- the groups are adaptive and can quickly take advantage of opportunities created by disruption of markets by law enforcement activities (CISC, 2008).

2.1 The National Coordinating Committee on Organized Crime

The NCC is a cooperative effort between federal and provincial/territorial governments to address organized crime (Public Safety Canada, 2006). The NCC, along with its Regional/Provincial Coordinating Committees (RCCs), fosters links between law enforcement agencies and public policy-makers (Public Safety Canada, 2008a). While the NCC focuses on identifying issues, strategies, and policy priorities at the national level, the RCCs focus on

organized crime activities at the jurisdictional level, report to the NCC, and advise the NCC of their priorities. The NCC works towards advancing coordination of efforts at the various jurisdictional levels and keeping the federal and provincial/territorial Deputy Ministers and Ministers responsible for Justice apprised of organized crime and anti-organized crime initiatives (Public Safety Canada, 2008a).

The National Agenda to Combat Organized Crime adopted in 2000 by federal and provincial/territorial Ministers responsible for Justice essentially reached its conclusion. The National Agenda had four main pillars for addressing organized crime on a collaborative basis. These pillars included national and regional coordination; legislative and regulatory tools; research and analysis; and communication and public education (Public Safety Canada, 2006). To maintain national efforts to combat organized crime, a Ministerial Forum was held in 2007, at which priority themes were identified. These theme areas were further refined at the 2008 Organized Crime Summit. The themes include: 1) legislation, 2) training, 3) cooperation/collaboration, and 4) research. To advance these research themes and support efforts in other areas, the NCC established an FPT Research Working Group.

2.2 National Research Agenda on Organized Crime

The NCC Research Working Group was tasked with developing a National Research Agenda on Organized Crime. The research agenda is based on a recognized need for empirical research into organized crime activities and structures and to inform and enhance efforts in combating organized crime (Public Safety Canada, 2008b). The Research Working Group identified three research priority areas:

- Nature and scope of organized crime: for gaining a greater understanding of the structure of organized crime groups and how they operate.
- Resource development: to identify the tools, resources, and other information requirements of stakeholders to effectively combat organized crime.
- Effectiveness of efforts: to gain a greater understanding of existing practices that contribute to effective efforts and of the lessons learned from existing initiatives.

This current project, contracted by Public Safety Canada, is a first step in research to support enhanced operations and effectiveness of integrated efforts. This will provide the Research

Working Group with a greater understanding of the integrated units currently in operation across Canada and whose mandate has linkages to organized crime. Integration of efforts for combating organized crime is recognized as an effective and efficient use of limited resources that reduces potential for duplication of efforts by affected agencies.[2]

3.0 Methodology

Because this analysis report incorporates information collected throughout the project, we provide a comprehensive review of the methodology used. Interviews with key stakeholders represented the primary method for obtaining the required information for both the inventory and detailed analysis. Most interviews were conducted by telephone. Participants received the interview questions in advance and interviews were audio-recorded with permission.

Inventory of integrated units. The process began by way of initial interviews with NCC contacts from across Canada. These interviews served several purposes; those involved in specific integrated units were able to provide the required information for the inventory, while others gave background information on the units operating in the province and the partners involved. As well, they also provided contact names for obtaining information on specific units. NCC contacts were also asked to give their perspective on challenges encountered by integrated efforts as well as the strengths and best practices of such units.

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) are involved in many integrated efforts across Canada. The protocol for contacting RCMP on a provincial/territorial basis began with an email from the Assistant Commissioner of Federal and International Operations to the Criminal Operations (CROPS) Officer of each Division to introduce and provide details on the project. PRA then contacted the CROPS Officers to arrange for obtaining the information on units in their Division.

Participants provided the information for the inventory in several ways. Some preferred to provide information in written form and others selected a telephone interview. The information was used to populate a standard inventory template, which was returned to the contact for their review and clarification. Appendix A provides the short form template. The information on units for the inventory component included:

[2] Personal communication with Project Authority.

- The unit's name
- Its mandate and objectives, including the target crime/criminal group
- The partners involved and who is the lead agency
- When the unit was established and its time frame
- The unit's geographical scope
- Any agreements established between partners, such as MOUs
- Basic operational procedures (e.g., are the partners co-located, is there sharing of equipment/infrastructure)
- Whether any reports/documents are available on the unit.

PRA then entered inventory template information for each unit into the inventory database.

A total of 24 formal interviews were conducted during this phase of the project. Appendix C provides the interview lists. Appendix C does not include contacts that we spoke with briefly by phone or who provided us with written information.

Interviews for the analysis: PRA and Public Safety Canada collaboratively identified a subset of the integrated units for the analysis section. Units were chosen to ensure a representative sample from across the country according to the following criteria:

- Geographic area
- Jurisdictional lead
- Type of organization
- Composition and size of the organization
- Duration of the mandate
- Memoranda of understanding, other agreements

- Operating procedures, protocols
- Other characteristics, as required.

Prior to initiating the analysis of each of the selected units, PRA contacted the key stakeholder(s) to invite them to participate. A guide, similar to the long form interview guide initially used for the inventory component, was used (Appendix B). Participants received the guide prior to the interview, as well as a copy of the notes for their records and review following the interview.

We conducted interviews for 25 integrated units during this phase of the project (see Appendix C) and reviewed all additional written documentation provided by units (e.g., agreements, constitutions, reviews). As well, the analysis draws on the interviews with NCC contacts, and the information collected for the inventory.

4.0 Findings

This section reports on the analysis of integrated units. The findings first consider any agreements (formal or informal) that guide these units, and the types of integrated units found in Canada. This is followed by a discussion of the various operational aspects of the units, of the challenges encountered in operating as an integrated unit, and of the strengths and best practices identified. Finally, a brief summary is provided, including some suggested areas for further research.

4.1 Types of integrated units

Numerous types of integrated units with mandates linked to organized crime activities are operating across Canada. Units mainly involve law enforcement agencies as the primary partners, but also frequently include provincial or federal government departments or agencies as either primary or secondary members of the unit.

Units range from those whose primary focus is organized crime activities and groups, to those that include both serious and organized crimes, and to others that focus on a specific type of criminal activity and may include crimes committed by individuals or groups (e.g., fraud-related crimes). Areas of law enforcement activity primarily involve one or a combination of intelligence gathering and dissemination, investigations, and enforcement. Some mentioned education and prevention as being within their mandate.

Most units operate as ongoing or permanent entities with no defined time frame. Some operate within the guidelines of some type of formal written agreement of a specified duration; however, it does not appear that the units themselves are dissolved at the end of the agreement. Rather, it is more likely that the agreement would be renewed, and the continuation of the partnership is at the discretion of the individual partners.

Geographical scope is primarily provincially focused, either encompassing the whole province, such as British Columbia's Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit (CFSEU), or one part of a province, such as Ontario's Thunder Bay Regional Integrated Gang Unit. While there are units that have a national context, these will generally have multiple units located at various sites across Canada involving local agencies. One such example is the RCMP's Integrated Proceeds of Crime (IPOC) units. Most provinces have their own IPOC unit involving the core partners of the RCMP, Canada Revenue Agency (CRA), Public Prosecution Service of Canada (PPSC), Forensic Accounting Management Group (FAMG), and the Seized Property Management Directorate (SPMD), as well as local municipal police forces. Some units also have an international context, involving U.S. partners. These units generally are concerned with criminal activities related to smuggling or national security.

Size of units varies from a small number of members to large, multi-tasked entities. Some small joint force operations (JFOs) may consist of one municipal police member and several RCMP members. Others may have upwards of 400 members, with a large number of partners, and may also consist of several different teams. For example, one unit mentioned having an intelligence team, a surveillance team, a firearms enforcement team, a disclosure team, as well as uniformed team members, analysts, support people, and a media relations person. Units may also represent an integration of other units, some of which may or may not be integrated. British Columbia's CFSEU is one such unit. A recent reorganization has merged several units within the CFSEU, including the Gang Task Force, the Organized Crime Enforcement Unit, the Outlaw Motorcycle Gang Enforcement Unit, and the Firearms Enforcement Unit.

4.2 Agreements

Most of the units identified for the inventory have formal written memoranda of understanding (MOU) between partners of the integrated units. Other types of agreements include Charters, Letters of Intent or Agreement, and verbal agreements. MOUs generally define partners' roles,

responsibilities, and contributions, as well as outline liabilities. Examples of items that may be covered in MOUs include:

- Purpose and scope of the initiative
- Personnel contributed and their location
- Governance structure
- Supervisory and reporting responsibilities
- Experience and rank requirements—this may include defining experience and/or rank requirements
- Member selection and conditions of appointment
- Financial commitment, including equipment contribution and acquisition, and coverage of operational costs
- Reports and file maintenance
- Security screening requirements
- Funding
- Dispute resolution
- Indemnities and liabilities
- Which agencies' policies and procedures will be followed
- Exchange and ownership of information
- The process for media/public releases
- How leave time will be arranged/approved
- Responsibilities for disciplining of members when required.

Units may have one common MOU that all partners sign, the lead agency (if there is one) will have an MOU with each of the partners, or each partner will have an MOU with each individual partner. Those who were interviewed noted that rather than individual MOUs, there are efforts to streamline the process and develop a common MOU signed by all partners. Several specific examples of agreements include:

- The Alberta Law Enforcement Response Team (ALERT) is a relatively new corporate entity funded by the Alberta government. ALERT is intended to bring together a variety of separate units funded by Alberta under one management umbrella. While there are currently also a number of different MOUs in place for each of the units and their

partners, ALERT plans to develop one common MOU signed by all agencies involved in any ALERT unit.

- The Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) has recently restructured to regionalize organized crime units into four Organized Crime Enforcement Bureaus (OCEBs). Currently, the OPP has separate MOUs with each partner for each unit, which relate to a large number of MOUs. As part of the regionalization process, they are working towards developing one MOU for each individual partner that covers all of the units the OPP is involved in with that partner.

Finalizing an MOU can take considerable time as partners and their respective legal departments work through the process of finding terms acceptable to all parties. Involvement of multiple partners understandably increases the time requirements for working out the details of the MOU. As a result, units are often operational for a significant amount of time prior to the finalizing and signing of an MOU. Of the units included in the inventory, 13 indicated that they do not yet have a finalized MOU, either because it is being drafted or partners have not all signed the document. One respondent noted that their unit, established in 2004, does not yet have a signed MOU, but commented that this is in process. Another one, established in 2005, said they currently had a verbal agreement, with a written agreement also in process.

An MOU or some type of formal written agreement, however, is considered an important requirement of the partnership. Unit managers use these agreements as their guide for defining the rules and procedures under which their unit operates. As one respondent noted, the MOU removed uncertainty on what they could do as a unit. Regular review of the MOU is also important. The landscape for organized crime is changing so quickly that the MOUs and partnerships need to be updated to be responsive to such changes. The important first step, however, is to have a formal MOU in place; reviewing and updating an established MOU as required is an easier process.

4.3 Operational aspects of integrated units

4.3.1 Partners and how they contribute to the unit

Partners of units most commonly involve municipal police agencies and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), as well as, for Ontario and Quebec, the Ontario Provincial Police

(OPP) and the Sûreté du Québec (SQ), respectively. First Nations police agencies may also be involved. Many units incorporate provincial or federal departments or agencies beyond law enforcement agencies as primary partners of the integrated unit, depending on the mandate and scope of the unit. This includes, for example, the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA), the provincial Crown prosecution, the federal Public Prosecution Service Canada (PPSC), Corrections Services (either federal or provincial, or both), the Department of National Defence (DND), Canada Revenue Agency (CRA), the Forensic Accounting Management Group (FAMG), the Canadian Coast Guard (DFO-CCG), and Transport Canada (TC). International entities may also be included as formal partners, such as the United States' Customs and Border Protection (CBP), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Coast Guard (USCG), Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI).

Units may also involve other departments or agencies beyond those with law enforcement, justice, or regulatory capacity, such as social, health, or victim services, although such agencies are more likely to be involved as an informal or secondary partner. Units also regularly work and cooperate with other law enforcement and other types of partners on an as-needed basis. Some may establish short-term partnerships with other agencies or even other integrated units for specific projects.

The number of formal primary partners of units ranges from two to 15 or more. Where there are a large number of partners, these are most frequently where units involve more than law enforcement agencies and/or in provinces with a large number of municipal police agencies, such as Ontario, British Columbia, and Quebec.

Partnerships are established to draw upon and share expertise and resources to combat organized crime groups that are becoming increasingly complex and internationally based. Resources provided by partners in the unit include some combination of personnel, infrastructure and equipment, and operational funds. Competencies include specialized skills and experience and knowledge of and familiarity with jurisdictions. Examples of how partners contribute to units include:

- A municipal police agency that partners with the RCMP, OPP, or SQ can draw upon these agencies' resources as well as expand their jurisdictional capabilities beyond their municipal boundaries. Similarly, recognizing that organized crime groups usually operate

out of urban areas, the RCMP, OPP, or SQ are provided with an avenue into these jurisdictions through partnerships with the municipal agencies.

- The CBSA is a formal partner in many of the units. Respondents note that because so many of the crime groups cross international borders, or involve crossing borders with criminal commodities, partnering with the CBSA provides the unit with access to not only national information but also international. Some units have CBSA personnel (usually one) embedded in the team. CBSA personnel may be assigned to units full-time or part-time.

- Involvement of Crown prosecution right at the beginning of an investigation provides police agencies with legal advice and guidance for investigations. As discovered in the inventory development process, units more frequently use the Crown prosecution as secondary partners that provide advice as required but are not embedded as formal members of the partnership. Those that do formally include federal Crown prosecution from the PPSC are mainly the Integrated Proceeds of Crime (IPOC) units or Integrated Market Enforcement Teams (IMETs). Another unit that does not have the Crown as a formal member of their MOU does have access to between 45 and 50 provincial Crown attorneys located in their building and dedicated to their initiative. These Crown attorneys provide advice and prosecution services. Crown prosecution co-located with a unit is considered a valuable asset that allows for ready access to legal advice and establishes trust between law enforcement and prosecution.

- Corrections services personnel, whether provincial or federal, provide units with information and intelligence on gang members under supervision.[3]

- Taxation agencies, such as CRA, and accountant specialists, such as FAMG, provide taxation and financial advice and expertise for units focusing on seizing assets of crime (e.g., IPOC) or on financial or fraud-related crimes.

- Involvement of agencies providing social services assists in ensuring other required resources are in place, such as assisting those who may be affected by the crime or the

[3] Note that while some units in the inventory identified the Correctional Service of Canada as a primary partner, the Correctional Service of Canada indicated they currently are not formal partners in any integrated unit. Correctional Service of Canada involvement is primarily to provide information on an as-needed basis.

arrests of individuals involved in the crime. One example given is the involvement of victim services to help ensure resources are directed to affected community members. While one unit cited victim services as a primary partner, and some mentioned involving social services in some manner, no unit in the inventory process identified having an MOU with a social services agency.

- Units that partner with international agencies (US agencies, such as the Border Patrol, ICE, and the Coast Guard) are those whose mandate focuses on international smuggling and/or national security activities, such as the Integrated Border Enforcement Teams (IBETs) or National Port Enforcement Teams (NPETs).

4.3.2 Governance

All units have some type of governance structure in place. Respondents mentioned several functions of their governance structures, including to:

- Provide oversight to the unit, ensuring it is staying on track with its mandate and making progress towards expected outcomes.

- Provide expertise and advice to the unit, assisting in resource allocation decisions, and prioritizing targets and investigations.

- Act as an accountability forum for partners to inform them of the unit activities and how their contributions are being used. Partners have to answer to their own communities on resource use and justify dedicating resources to the unit, particularly where units are either located or operate outside of the partner's own jurisdiction.

- Provide partners with a say on the use of their resources and the activities and targets of the unit.

- Inform partners on criminal activities and measures being taken to combat crime and how these may affect their communities.

Governance structures vary by unit as well as the extent of their involvement in the above functions. Units with a larger number of partners are more likely to have a more structured and formalized governance body overseeing the unit.

Some units are guided by a Joint Management Team (JMT), or senior management team, normally comprised of managers from each of the partner agencies. This might be at the Inspector level or even up to the Deputy Chief level. JMTs are more likely to be involved in the operational and decision-making aspects of the unit. Frequency of meetings for JMTs also varies, with some cited as meeting monthly and others biannually. Some units do not have permanent JMTs, but will establish them on a project basis.

Governance bodies above the JMTs may include a Steering Committee (or Executive Steering Committee), a Police Executive Team, or an Advisory Committee. These are usually comprised of more senior members of the partner agencies, such as Chiefs or Deputy Chiefs of municipal police agencies or the RCMP Divisional Criminal Operations (CROPS) Officer. These Committees or teams meet less frequently, such as quarterly or biannually, and serve more for oversight, or to assist with resolving particular issues, as well as an accountability mechanism for keeping partners informed and aware of unit activities.

Several units have further governance structures above their Steering or Advisory committees. This may include a Board of Directors or Board of Governance.

Some specific examples of the governance structure of units include the following:

- ALERT is an incorporated entity that receives grant funding from the Government of Alberta. It is directed by a civilian Board of Directors that provides oversight and assists in business and strategic planning. A Law Enforcement Advisory Committee (LEAC), consisting of Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs of the major Alberta municipal police agencies as well as representatives of the RCMP, provides policing advice to the Board of Directors and ALERT Chief Executive Officer (CEO). The five Inspectors/Director responsible for the individual ALERT units and teams comprise the ALERT management team. The Inspectors/Director are responsible for the day-to-day operations of their teams, and, as members of the management team, assist the CEO in operational and management decisions.

- Integrated Border Enforcement Teams (IBETs) operate across Canada. The five core Canadian and U.S. partners of IBETs (RCMP, CBSA, and the U.S.'s ICE, CBP, USCG) signed a Charter outlining the principles for administration of the IBETs. An International Joint Management Team (IJMT), with representation from each partner,

meets quarterly to provide guidance to the program. A National Coordination Team with assigned personnel from each agency is located in Ottawa to oversee the program, and local JMTs across Canada that include representatives from local agencies oversee and prioritize decisions for the local IBET units.

- As a permanent joint force operation with approximately 400 members from RCMP and municipal police forces, the British Columbia CFSEU is overseen by a Board of Governance with representation from the RCMP, the B.C. Association of Municipal Chiefs of Police, the B.C. Association of Chiefs of Police, the Vancouver Police Department, and the Province of British Columbia. The police executive team consists of a Chief Officer and two Deputy Chief Officers; these can be representatives of any of the partner agencies. The senior management team consists of five team leaders (Inspector rank) and several advisors. The executive team and senior management team assist the Board of Governance in identifying strategic direction. Team leaders are accountable to the executive team.

- A unit involving the RCMP and several municipal police agencies that is guided by an Executive Steering Committee consisting of an RCMP Commanding Officer, a municipal Chief of Police, and a provincial Justice Department Assistant Deputy Minister, and then a JMT consisting of the RCMP Division CROPS Officer and Deputy Chiefs.

- A unit involving the RCMP and a municipal police agency is guided by a three-member JMT with representation from the RCMP and municipal police agency. There is also a JMT Steering Committee that meets annually to monitor the unit, which consists of the RCMP Division CROPS Officer and a Deputy Chief of the municipal agency.

4.3.3 Unit structure and management

Units have structures and management processes defined by the rank structures of unit members and which agency is considered the lead, where applicable. Of the units in the inventory, the RCMP were most frequently identified as the lead agency, followed by units that said there was either no lead agency or the partners jointly lead the unit. Other lead agencies were primarily provincial police, such as the OPP or SQ, or a governing or joint management body. Several units identified a municipal police force as the lead agency. Shared or joint leadership is most frequently found in units involving mainly two partner agencies. Multiple partner units are

primarily led by one agency, but may include input or direction from a JMT or Steering Committee involving representation from all partners.

Units where one agency is considered the lead will usually have a member of their agency as the Officer In-Charge (OIC) of the unit. Frequently, this is at the Inspector or Staff Sergeant level. Units with shared command between two agencies may either have two OICs—one from each agency—or they may rotate the OIC between the agencies for set time periods. Inspectors are frequently responsible for other programs operating within their agency (which may or may not involve integration of partners), with a non-commissioned officer (NCO), such as a Staff Sergeant or Sergeant, responsible for the day-to-day operations of the unit itself.

Units may assign members to various teams that each focus on one particular aspect of the unit's mandate. For example, a unit combating gangs may have project-based teams and street-level teams. Team leaders may be from any of the partner agencies, depending on the experience and ranks of the members provided by each partner agency. While one respondent said their team leaders may be members of either the lead agency or the partner agency, another commented that their team leaders are often from their own agency. This is mainly because they have the highest number of resources assigned to the unit. Municipal partners apparently do not object to this because most can only justify contributing members at the Constable level.

The majority of units in the inventory indicated that partner members are co-located. In some instances, some of the partners are co-located while others are not, and a few indicated that all of the partners' members are located with their home agencies and not with the unit. Units may also have various teams, consisting of members from all or some of the partner agencies, located in and operating out of different jurisdictions.

Where unit partners are not co-located, commitment to the unit can be a challenge. Unit members located within their own agencies rather than with the unit are more likely to experience pressures to spend time on their home agency's priorities rather than those of the unit. There may be conflicting priorities when members have duties within their own municipal department. However, in one case, it was noted that members of several integrated units may at times work out of the lead agency's facilities and, at other times, the partners' facilities, depending on where in the province the unit is working. This was thought to promote the spirit of the partnership and help ease partners' concerns that members were removed from their own agency.

Units may be physically located within one of the partners' facilities or in stand-alone facilities, either owned or leased by one of the partners. Of the units considered in the analysis, and where one of the partners served as the lead agency, units were located either in the lead agency's facilities or at an off-site location. An exception to this is the example given above, where units may at times work out of the lead agency or partner facilities. In units with shared leadership or where neither agency served as lead (led by a governing body or JMT), the units could be located in either partner's facilities or an off-site location.

Off-site locations may also be in a covert location. An observed benefit of an off-site location is that the unit is then not associated with either partner agency and there is greater emphasis on the unit as a team. This also reduces the potential for unit members being asked to work on partner priorities rather than the unit mandate. However, locating the unit within one of the partners' facilities also provides opportunities for drawing upon other resources; for example, respondents spoke of using the host partner's intelligence units, administrative support, and office supplies.

Partners also have other considerations when planning the location of units. For example, as noted above, the OIC of units is often responsible for several units or programs within their agency. One unit located the team within the lead agency's own facility to ensure all programs overseen by the Inspector In-Charge were situated in one place. An officer with responsibilities for units located in different areas of the province observed that his physical separation from the unit can present challenges, particularly if the unit experiences pressures to work on municipal priorities.

Members of a unit are primarily responsible to their unit, and once assigned, are expected to take direction from their team leaders within the unit, regardless of their home agencies. In units with shared command, members may report to the Officer In-Charge from their agency. For example, in one unit with shared command by Sergeants of the two agencies involved, members report to the Sergeant of their home agency when available; otherwise, they report to the Sergeant of their partner agency. Unit members stationed at their home agency and not with other team members may be required to report both to their unit supervisor and to their home agency supervisor.

Program managers are not generally responsible for disciplining partner members; members are accountable to their own agency for conduct issues.

4.3.4 Planning

Units plan their priority targets/investigations and resource allocation based on various information sources, with most citing use of their provincial threat assessments to assist in planning. Other sources might include their own in-house threat assessments based on information gathered locally, information from intelligence units, or provincial priorities. Units may also set priorities and allocate resources in response to opportunities or situations that arise.

Most units involved in the analysis component have incorporated processes for involving partners in the planning and priority-setting process. This may be at the JMT or Steering Committee level, where these exist, or, in other cases, senior levels of each partner agency. Units also make internal target selection and resource allocation decisions based on immediate situations (e.g., an immediate threat of gang violence).

Specific examples given of the planning process include:

- Monthly meetings of the JMT to select priority targets based on provincial threat assessments and other local information. Resources are then allocated based on these priorities.

- The unit has its own budget and can plan and set priorities internally for drawing from this budget. Factors considered when prioritizing are: the potential harm of the target to the community, whether the target fits within the mandate of the unit, the resource required, and the potential for successful prosecution. Major projects requiring funding outside of the internal budget require a business case reviewed by the management team that oversees all units.

- Another unit that, while led by one of the partners, involves unit commanders of both partner agencies to discuss priorities and targets and make decisions jointly.

- One unit that has no JMT or Steering Committee makes decisions within the unit. The three lead members of the unit (one unit commander and, under him, a Non-Commissioned Officer from each of the two partner agencies) prioritize targets, keeping in mind the mandates of both partners. When they believe it is necessary, they will consult with their Inspectors from each partner agency.

- One unit will plan and target priorities based on the provincial threat assessment and obtain approval from the Executive Steering Committee through the JMT.

- Another unit with a large number of partners uses a participatory process that involves partners through the JMT. The unit's Inspector and Staff Sergeant will compile briefing notes on potential priorities. These are presented and discussed with the JMT, who then make decisions on investigation targets. The OIC noted, however, that there is also flexibility to take advantage of immediate opportunities without the prior consent of the JMT, provided they are kept informed of such actions. This unit also invites partner agencies to submit potential targets for investigation through the JMT.

4.3.5 Policies and procedures

MOUs may or may not specify which partner's policies and procedures the unit will follow. If the MOU does include such specifications, it would be the policies and procedures of the lead agency, if applicable. Several respondents mentioned that their MOU does not specify such conditions. Members of the unit may be individually responsible for ensuring they are following the policies and procedures of their own agency. Others said that, where necessary, the unit uses the most risk-averse policy, on a case-by-case basis. Several observed that because RCMP policy is often more restrictive, this is the policy followed by the unit (several examples given include the process of approval for undercover work, or for handling and processing confidential human sources). Also, partners that provide the majority of the personnel resources may request that other partners follow their policies and procedures.

In other cases, units will follow the policies and procedures of the agency where the unit is located. For example, a particular unit has one team located in RCMP facilities, following RCMP reporting procedures, and another in the municipal partner's facilities, following the municipal agency's reporting procedures.

Respondents noted, however, that regardless of whose policies and procedures are adhered to, the unit must consider each partner's policies. In particular, adjustments and flexibility may be required to respect unionized partners' collective agreements. Several respondents noted that differences exist in partners shifts. Units place priority on harmonized shifts, and so many have made adjustments and concessions to ensure unit members' shifts are compatible. This may include the RCMP members aligning their shifts with their unionized partners.

4.3.6 Communications and reporting

Communications and reporting are important for keeping superiors and partner members informed of activities and progress. Reporting at a higher level also serves to keep law enforcement agencies informed of organized crime activities and trends and of the measures taken to combat these activities. Participants spoke of unit reporting that followed their agency's regular reporting process through the chain of command. This might include daily briefings between team members, and weekly, biweekly, or monthly reports by investigators or team leaders to program managers. Program managers, in turn, will provide written reports to their next in command and JMTs or Steering Committees as applicable. Respondents spoke of providing written reports to partner agencies, as well. Several noted that the team leaders or program managers provide partner management with the written reports, while others said that members themselves may provide status updates to their home agency.

Most members do not have dual reporting responsibilities between the unit and their home agency. Members mainly report to their unit, and it is then the responsibility of the OIC to keep the partner agencies informed of activities and progress. This would be through both written reports and meetings. For example, one OIC of a two-partner unit spoke of attending both partners' internal meetings to ensure good communication. Any dual reporting by team members is primarily for administrative purposes; for example, members may be required to provide their home agency with overtime or expense forms. Respondents also noted that members are free to correspond with their home agency and provide updates to keep lines of communication open.

The manner and process of communications to media may be outlined in the MOU. One example given of a particular two-partner unit is that media releases always recognize both partners.

Respondents noted that reporting and ongoing communications to other partners outside of those directly involved in the unit is important for keeping all crime-fighting partners informed of unit activities, and for ensuring there is no duplication of effort.

4.3.7 Resources and funding arrangements

Partners' contributions to the unit include some combination of personnel, infrastructure and equipment, and operational funding. Three types of funding arrangements appear most prevalent, although combinations of these exist. These include where:

- Partners cover all of their own members' salaries and benefits (including overtime), provide their members' equipment, and cover any per diem or travel expenses. The host or lead agency primarily provides the office space. Partners may share operational expenses.

- Partners cover their members' salaries and benefits and provide basic personal equipment, but the host or lead agency provides other equipment such as vehicles and radios, and may cover per diems, travel expenses, and operational expenses.

- Members' salaries of all partners are fully or partially covered by the lead agency or government, primarily provincial governments. The province may also provide office space, equipment, and vehicles, and cover per diems, travel expenses, and operational costs.

Provincial government funding to units through salaries and other expenses provides incentives for municipal police partners to participate in the integrated unit. One observation made is that municipal police partners may not be able to afford or justify contributing positions to the initiative without such assistance. In particular, justifying municipal police member(s) working outside their home agency jurisdiction is difficult for municipal managers in general, but would be even more so without the provincial funding. For example, in one long-running unit, the provincial government provides funds for each partner's members, but at 1997 salary rates. Factoring in the costs of benefits, partners are now funding close to 50% of the costs of each member and, as a result, some are reconsidering their participation in the partnership.

In almost all of the units included in the analysis section, regardless of the funding arrangements for providing salaries, members are paid at their home agency rate. This includes overtime rates as well as per diems and travel expenses covered by the home agency. Partner agencies may cover expenses of municipal members when they are required to travel out of their home jurisdiction. Most units appear to have the capacity to approve required overtime from within the unit, although this is not universal. For example, one respondent commented that the partner members have to obtain approval from their home agency for overtime and that this can challenge the responsive capacity of the unit. Leave time is also according to members' home agency policies, although members may require approval of leave schedules from unit managers. Respondents reported that unit members are aware of and accept any differences in pay

schedules and holiday time; no one reported this as a source of disharmony between unit members. One unit that seconds members of partner agencies for a specified period of time covers salaries during the secondment period and does so at a set level; this can cause problems, however, where either the partner agency's rate is higher than the seconded rate, or the partner member's union agreement sets a limit on the allowable pay scale.

Host agencies generally provide the infrastructure requirements for the unit, such as workstations, office supplies, telephones (although members may come with their own cell phones), radios, and any equipment required for investigations (e.g., wiretap devices). Some members bring their own computers and/or vehicles, while in other cases, computers and vehicles are provided by the lead agency. MOUs generally outline provisions for sharing of vehicles, as applicable, as well as liabilities for vehicle damages.

Most units also have associated support staff and some may have civilian members, such as civilian analysts. Support positions are often provided by the lead or funding agency; however, some partners will also contribute support staff positions, even if another agency is the lead.

Home agencies often continue to have responsibilities for any required training activities while their members are part of the unit. Host or lead agencies may also provide training, and partners may share training opportunities with other partners.

The length of time members stay in the unit varies from two to three years up to four to five years. Respondents said that it takes time for members to become proficient in the unit, particularly units requiring specialized skills, and where members come to the unit with little experience and require training, which can be time-consuming and expensive. Therefore, managers prefer that placements stay as long as possible.

Respondents said that members who leave do so mainly for promotions, development to obtain promotions, or retirement. Several noted that the MOU specifies a time commitment for members to stay with the unit. However, it was also noted that the MOU may only specify that a partner will provide resources to the unit for that time period and not commit to the length of time any one member will stay with the unit. Another observation made is that turnover in staff due to promotions or retirements is not limited to integrated units. Another unit created a Corporal rank in order to retain their promoted municipal members.

Replacement of municipal police positions can be fairly quick; partners are usually aware of upcoming vacancies and can plan the replacement in advance. Replacement of municipal police members may be immediate or within a few months. Replacing RCMP members takes longer; units gave examples of RCMP positions taking 18 months or more. Respondents attribute this both to the need to relocate members as well as more complex RCMP hiring procedures. The relocation process may involve selling and repurchasing of a home and uprooting a family. RCMP vacancies in units was identified as a concern to some units. Where such vacancies exist, partners may have concerns that the RCMP is not upholding their share of the contribution. Plus, vacancies can result in understaffed shifts and create safety concerns.

Units do not have consistent practices in the selection of members for the unit. As noted previously, while some MOUs might define the rank and experience required, others only define ranks, and some neither. Selection may be at the complete discretion of the home agency. In some situations, the home agency may select the candidate but the partner agency is able to provide input on the choice. For example, one unit respondent said their partner agency will present managers with several options for consideration; another indicated that the partner will inform them of the selection to ensure the person meets their requirements. Several others commented that their partners know the type of individuals required for the unit and would strive to select good candidates. However, selection of candidates with little to no required skills appears to be quite common. This could be due to the lack of availability of experienced investigators and partners' own internal requirements. Another respondent commented that partners will use the involvement in the unit as an opportunity to develop their members.

4.3.8 Data and information collecting/sharing

While law enforcement agencies are making attempts to streamline the data collection and sharing process, there are a large number of information systems in operation across Canada. Several respondents identified this lack of a common records management system as a challenge, not only for units, but for law enforcement agencies in general. Alberta is in the process of developing a common shared information system for the province. The Alberta Police Integrated Information (APi3), once implemented, will be used by all policing agencies across the province.

Respondents commonly spoke of entering data into the Automated Criminal Intelligence Information System (ACIIS), the national database used by criminal intelligence personnel for entering intelligence information on criminal groups and their activities. Several respondents

noted that agencies have the capacity to restrict information entered into ACIIS while an investigation is ongoing.

Members within the unit have equal access to the information systems used by the unit. Some unit members will come with their own computers and make the appropriate installations to access their own system. This provides unit members with access to both partners' systems and information, which most considered an asset for expanding information sources. Members may have requirements for entering information into their agency's system as well as the system of the host agency. Units find various ways of dealing with partners' differing information systems. Below, some of the examples given are summarized:

- The lead agency is considered the owner of the intelligence information. Information is entered into the home agency's system as well as ACIIS. All partner members as well as non-partner agencies have access to the lead agency's database. Partner members are free to enter the information into their own systems, if desired.

- Some units have their own internal dedicated database; all members make use of this database. Units may provide partners or other agencies access to the database.

- To avoid double counting, files are opened as a primary investigation file on one partner's system and as an assistance file on the other.

- Similar to above, another unit will enter the information into the host agency's file system and open a shadow file on the partner's system. The shadow file identifies the person(s) involved and cross-references to the main file. Anyone requiring the information can contact the host agency. This process has, apparently, improved data quality.

- Several respondents said the information is entered only into the lead agency's information system (and ACIIS). One noted that partner members have access to their own system, but use it only to facilitate the unit's work, and do not create files on the system.

As noted above and discussed in the next section, information management and sharing is a challenge.

4.4 Challenges and mitigation strategies

This section discusses some of the challenges encountered by units in the operation of the integrated initiative. Some of these have already been discussed and will be touched on only briefly in this section. As well, some of these challenges would likely apply to all law enforcement members, and are not specific to integrated units.

4.4.1 Establishing formal agreements (e.g., MOUs)

The process of establishing a formal agreement such as an MOU can be a lengthy process. As noted previously, units may be in operation long before the MOU is finalized and signed by all parties. Nevertheless, respondents expressed the need for a well laid out MOU to clarify roles and responsibilities and to use as a guide.

It is important that MOUs are comprehensive and provide solid guidelines for the unit. For example, an observation made is that it can be challenging for units to ensure all of their activities fall within their mandate. This is where a well-defined MOU can assist program managers. Furthermore, the unit may require more than just an MOU to provide the regulations around which the unit operates.

4.4.2 Financial and human resources

Resources can be a challenge, both in terms of staffing and finances for operational expenses. One observation made is that while all units experience growing pains when first established, those that are properly funded can more easily work through the issues encountered to become a successful integrated unit. We were told that partners who receive no additional funding for their participation in the unit can be constrained by their own internal requirements and restricted in contributing to the partnership to the extent desired by all parties. Funding was a commonly mentioned challenge for integrated units.

Inexperienced members create constraints on units both in terms of their capacity to do their job and the subsequent time and cost requirements for training. Respondents recognized there is competition for experienced investigators and that agencies have their own requirements that can make it difficult for them to give up that experience to the unit. Retirements and large numbers of junior officers with little experience create further challenges. However, there is recognition that not only integrated units are challenged by staff turnover and junior members. One unit's

response to inexperienced members is to first place these officers into the street team to give them an opportunity to develop skills before putting them into an investigative position on a project team. Another provides a training and orientation package to new unit members.

Frequent turnover in the unit, whether due to retirements or promotions, can also result in loss of experience to the unit. Respondents cited the need to retain members for at least three to five years, considering the costs of training and the level of skills required by some of these positions. One respondent believed that even five years was not enough because it can take several years for the member to gain the required skills for the position.

Because of the specialized skills required for integrated units, training opportunities are also identified as an area of need. This includes, for example, training in intelligence gathering, investigative techniques, working with information sources, and computer skills. Team leaders and program managers require specific skills and training opportunities. With the current fiscal restraints, providing training opportunities can be a challenge. Providing partners' members with training opportunities can serve as an additional benefit for participation in a joint effort. Unit managers also have to consider the mandatory training requirements of each partner agency. One unit has implemented a procedure where all members train at the highest level required by partners.

Another resource restraint affecting integrated units and law enforcement in general is in Crown prosecution capacity. The level of organized crime arrests and prosecutions is challenging the Crown's ability to keep up with the increased workload.

Units that second team members for only a temporary period have the additional pressures of providing sufficient financial incentives where relocations are required. A program manager noted the importance of adequate compensation to justify a short-term move.

4.4.3 Differing policies and standards

Operating under two or more sets of policies, depending on the number of partners, can also be challenging. Program managers need to have a good understanding of each partner's policies and systems for ensuring unit members and activities are in adherence with their home agency policies. Concessions may need to be made by one of the partners to make allowance for partners' policies. One municipal respondent commented that overly stringent RCMP policies

may place restrictions on the unit's ability to respond quickly operationally. An RCMP respondent, however, noted that restrictive policies are usually in place for preventative measures. Respondents in general observed, however, that all partners have to be flexible and consider their partners' policies and procedures. As with information sharing, policy differences can be magnified when partners include other agencies besides law enforcement and each partner operates under a different mandate (e.g., law enforcement or regulatory).

4.4.4 Jurisdictional boundaries

Municipal partners involved in the unit may find it difficult to accept having their members work outside of their jurisdictional boundaries. Partners need to be recognized for the expertise and skills they bring to the unit.

Municipal police forces, however, may not always be willing to let their members leave their jurisdiction. In one such case, the agreement between partners is that municipal members of the unit do not travel with other unit members outside the municipal partner's jurisdiction, unless program managers can demonstrate a linkage back to the municipality. In other units, municipal partners travel the same as other partners; in such cases, municipal police are provided supernumerary constable status to enable them to act as peace officers outside their jurisdiction.

4.4.5 Information management and sharing

Information management and file management control can be a challenge. Law enforcement agencies in general have to deal with large volumes of information that needs to be analyzed and managed. Similarly, units can be faced with a large number of files and requests for assistance. Respondents noted that file numbers are increased and cases are becoming more complex, requiring specialized skills. Program managers and management teams deal with this volume by prioritizing and establishing targets, and use training opportunities for required skills. Development of common records management systems is expected to assist with this.

Disclosure is also burdensome, and although not an exclusive challenge of integrated units, one respondent noted that while investigations are to be intelligence led, there is not a streamlined process in place for information sharing between intelligence and enforcement officers. As noted in Section 4.1, another unit spoke of incorporating intelligence and enforcement capacity within the unit.

Partners use a variety of records management systems that can create issues for managing and sharing information. As noted above, units have ways of working around this issue, such as entering data only into one partner's system, or implementing processes to ensure files are not double counted by entering the information into both systems. Respondents spoke of the need for a common records management system. As noted, Alberta is in the process of developing such a system.

Such issues as information sharing can be magnified when the partner is not a law enforcement agency. For example, only law enforcement agencies have access to ACIIS information. Privacy or other regulations and policies agencies work under may impede information flow between partners. One example is a five-partner unit, only one partner of which is a law enforcement agency. Members of the five partners have access to their own systems, but they do not share a common database.

Respondents noted that unit managers need to have an understanding of the policies and procedures of their partners, as well as the privacy and protection of information legislation partners must abide by. They also need to understand the extent to which other agencies can share information, and how to request, manage, and protect shared information. For example, any disclosure of information by CBSA is dictated by Article 107 of the *Customs Act.* One respondent noted that training sessions and information packages have assisted in educating partners on the information sharing process.

4.4.6 Reporting requirements

As discussed earlier, program managers are often tasked with reporting to both their own agency and partner agencies. As one respondent noted, he essentially has two bosses to report to. Even greater reporting may be required where multiple partners are involved. However, respondents generally did not identify the reporting as overly onerous; there appeared to be acceptance that this was a requirement of a partnership. Moreover, respondents spoke of providing copies of the same report to all partners.

4.4.7 Commitment to the integration

Lack of commitment from partners can impact the effectiveness of the integrated unit. Financial and other internal pressures may undermine a partner's ability to commit to the team. This may

result in agencies that do not provide the expected number of personnel, that remove their member(s) from the unit, or that have expectations that committed members spend time on home agency priorities. The latter can be magnified where team members are not co-located. For example, one unit where members are all located at their own home agency was identified by the program manager as not operating as an integrated unit and that commitment is a challenge for the unit members. Base funding provided to partners for their staff members committed to the unit is an identified mitigation strategy for lack of commitment. Furthermore, a program manager said it is important to revisit the level of funding to ensure it keeps pace with current salary levels.

Partners new to the concept of integration may have difficulties accepting their members' commitment to the unit. In particular, if the unit or some members of the unit are located in a partner agency's facilities, there may be pressures for the unit members to work on agency priorities outside of the unit's mandate. Similarly, partners may have expectations of the level of effort units should be expending within their own community and express dissatisfaction when this is not at the desired level of effort. Respondents said that the best mitigation strategy for such instances is ongoing and open communication between unit managers and their partners' management.

Partners may also have dissimilar priorities. For example, a municipal police force may place priorities on their growing street gang violence and crimes issues, whereas their partners may want to target higher-level gang groups.

Unit members from different agencies may also have difficulties working together as a team. Mitigation methods mentioned include an information package and briefing for new members and careful selection of members initially.

Strategies with goals of widespread jurisdictional involvement are diminished when major partners either decline to participate or pull out of the partnership. This can affect the strategy's ability for seamless service provision across the target area. Only a few units were identified where partners had withdrawn from the unit.

4.4.8 Strengths and best practices

There is a high level of commitment and belief in the integration of efforts as an effective approach for responding to organized and other serious crime. Respondents were positive about their units, their partners, and the members of their units. This section summarizes the strengths and best practices.

4.4.9 Formal agreements, such as an MOU

Some respondents stressed the need for a strong MOU as a guide for unit managers, clarifying roles and responsibilities and contributions. The MOU provides a plan of action and gives guidance on what can and cannot be done by the unit and partners. Furthermore, because of the liabilities and risks involved, it is important to have the MOU worked out at the establishment of the unit, and that once this is accomplished, the MOU only needs to be regularly reviewed and refreshed. Once in place, program managers need to ensure they are familiar with the MOU.

Because MOUs are primarily for managers, an example given of how members are made aware of their responsibilities is through a unit supplement document similar to the MOU, but targeted to unit members further defining their roles. Unit members must sign the supplement and are expected to be familiar with and use the document.

4.4.10 Committed team members

Many respondents spoke highly of their team members, describing them as focused and committed individuals willing to work as a team. Ensuring that positions are staffed with the right people was identified as a requirement for ensuring a successful unit. Desirable team members include those who are self-starters, have a high level of self-esteem, and are capable of working independently with little supervision, but are also willing to work with others as a member of the unit. Teams strive to cultivate an environment where members recognize themselves as a member of the unit rather than of their home agency. Several respondents noted that their team does this so successfully that outside observers do not know which agency the members originate from.

4.4.11 Management and partner support

Support from upper management contributes to the strength of the team. This includes support from within each partner's management structure, including the JMT, where one exists, as well as support from government. It was emphasized that support is required from all levels of government—municipal, provincial, and federal.

Partner involvement in the management of the unit includes them in the decision-making process and keeps them informed, contributing to the strength of the unit. Support provides leadership, commitment, buy-in, and participation, and assists with accountability and oversight. Strong management support can also assist in resolving issues within the unit. Gaining trust from management provides the unit with a certain amount of autonomy and prevents micro-managing. Strong management support also requires experienced managers who understand the partnership.

4.4.12 Good communication

Support and buy-in is achieved through regular and inclusive communication with all partners. Regardless of their involvement in the management or direction of the unit, partners need to be kept informed of unit activities. Respondents frequently mentioned this and reinforced the importance of communication in building trust between partners/management and the unit, and allowing the units to function without risk of interference from senior members of agencies. In particular, frequent communication is particularly important in large units with multiple partners. One unit with numerous partners mentioned they were in the process of establishing a formalized procedure to facilitate the communication process between partners.

Good communication can also help to inform and educate partners on any structural changes or reorganizations that affect the unit. For example, the OPP has recently reorganized crime units into four regionalized OCEB centres; this has required considerable interaction with unit partners to alleviate concerns.

Respondents also spoke of the need for open and frequent communication with all partners combating organized crime, not only the partners of the unit. This keeps everyone informed and reduces duplication of efforts.

4.4.13 Increased capacity

This is perhaps considered one of the greatest strengths of integrated units. Members bring skills, experiences, and contacts with them into the unit. These may be specific types of skills or knowledge of a specific jurisdiction. Federal and provincial police say that partnering with municipal police gives them access to municipal resources that they would not have otherwise. And because municipal police have long-term ties to the community, they have greater knowledge of it and a more extensive network of contacts established. Similarly, municipal police say that partnering with agencies responsible for provincial and/or federal policing allows them to obtain information on what is happening outside of their jurisdiction and gain greater knowledge of criminal activities that may affect their municipality. Integration facilitates sharing of information provincially, nationally, and internationally. Further, this increased capacity puts agencies combating organized crime in a better position to respond to the fluidity and transnational trends of organized crime groups.

Partnerships between law enforcement agencies, as well as with other agencies, facilitate sharing of expertise and resources for responding to these increasingly complex and, at times, widely distributed organizations. Because organized crime groups do not recognize boundaries and jurisdictions, these partnerships provide police agencies with a means of expanding their jurisdiction and area of operation. Integration efforts increase information sharing from a provincial, national, and international perspective.

Beyond the human resources, integration also allows partners to share physical and financial resources. For example, partnership with the RCMP, OPP, or SQ may give a municipal partner access to physical resources they might not have on their own. Units also work cooperatively with other units on operations.

A comment made was that integration efforts need to go beyond law enforcement agencies and involve the spectrum of agencies that may be involved in the justice and social system, including corrections, prosecution, and social services. A true measure of success of an integrated effort is the positive impact on the community. This includes not only arrests and successful prosecutions, but also intervention and preventive measures.

4.4.14 Relationship building

Integration of efforts assists in establishing and developing relations between the partner agencies. Such relationships help to develop trust between agencies. This can contribute to continued commitment to the partnership as well as extend beyond the integration partnership. One observation made is that "trust drives relationships." These relationships also create efficiencies in exchange of information by reducing the need to go through formal processes for requesting information from other agencies.

4.4.15 Co-location

Co-location of unit members gives partners the opportunity for full integration. An off-site location is good for team building and communication and improves independence from partners.

4.4.16 Personal growth of members

Integrated units provide personal growth opportunities for partner members. Members are provided specialized training and a working environment where they are sharing and learning from other partners with a range of experiences and skills. Respondents said that members receive skills and experiences from the unit that they take back to their home agency, and that also facilitates their advancement in their home agency. This does not only apply to law enforcement agency members. For example, Crown attorneys dedicated to an integrated unit focus on unit-related prosecutions and develop expertise in that area. Furthermore, team members from different agencies may participate in shared training/professional development activities that further develop all participants.

4.5 Trends in integration

Several provinces are moving towards even greater integration of their resources. This can be through merging some of their integrated units to better facilitate sharing of expertise and information between units. Such moves are expected to provide better coordination of and oversight over funded resources. Integration of units also allows for movement of staff between units, as required.

Some integrated efforts also involve US agencies. Respondents said that many of these efforts came about since September 11, 2001. IBETs, for example, are distributed across Canada involving the five core Canadian and US partners; individual IBETs may also involve local police enforcement agencies.

5.0 Summary

Integrated units are an approach for sharing skills, experiences, and resources for combating organized crime. Integrated efforts provide increased capacity to respond to the fluidity and transnational trends of organized crime groups.

A variety of integrated units operate across Canada with mandates linked to combating organized crime. Partners in these units commonly include some combination of municipal, provincial, and federal law enforcement agencies, as well as other government departments and agencies, primarily those acting in a regulatory or justice-related capacity. Integrated units use formal agreements to guide their partnerships, with agreements outlining roles and responsibilities.

Governance structures of units may include such entities as a senior management team, a joint management team, a steering committee, and a board of directors. Management bodies frequently include partner involvement. Internal management of the unit may involve one partner acting as the lead or shared lead; units also often involve partners in some type of supervisory capacity. Members of a unit are primarily responsible to their unit, taking direction from their unit supervisors.

Partners contribute to integrated efforts through provision of personnel, and may also provide equipment, infrastructure, and operational expenses. Governments may also assist by providing funds to cover salaries, infrastructure, and other expenses.

Respondents spoke of the many strengths of their integrated units and the best practices that contribute to these strengths and assist them in mitigating any challenges. Identified best practices for integrated units are summarized below.

- A strong MOU as a guide for unit managers to define the unit mandate and fully outline each partner's roles, responsibilities, and contributions. It is important to have the MOU worked out at the establishment of the unit.

- Ensuring all team members are aware of and adhere to their roles and responsibilities.
- Committed individuals willing to work as a team. Ensuring that positions are staffed with the right people is a requirement of a successful unit.
- Working with partners to ensure new members possess the required skills and qualities for working within the integrated unit.
- Provision of training opportunities to provide all team members opportunities to develop the high level of skills and expertise required in integrated units. Training opportunities are particularly important for new members who may be relatively inexperienced in the skills required by the unit.
- A governance and management structure that fully defines reporting and accountabilities.
- Gaining the trust and support of upper management of all partners as well as from government. Supportive management provides leadership, commitment, buy-in, and participation, and assists with accountability and oversight. Strong management support can also help to resolve issues within the unit. Government support, whether municipal, provincial, or federal, can assist in providing continued (financial and human) resources to the unit.
- Ongoing and inclusive communication with partners to keep them informed of unit activities and how their resources are used. Frequent communication is particularly important in large units with multiple partners.
- Having partners participate in unit management and/or planning and priority-setting involves them in the decision-making process and keeps them informed, further contributing to commitment. This includes involving partner team members in supervisory roles within the unit.
- Flexibility in considering partners' differences in policies and procedures and finding ways to make concessions and accommodations.
- Development of a common records management system is considered an ideal situation. As this is not yet in place in Canada, best practices for data and information sharing

include having access to each partner's information system, and instituting a system for data entry to reduce duplication of effort.

- Co-location of unit members gives partners the opportunity for full integration of team members. An off-site location is good for team building and communication and improves independence from partners.

- Inclusion of partners beyond law enforcement that involve a continuum of agencies in the justice and social systems, including corrections, prosecution, and social services.

5.1 Potential areas for additional research

This report touched on a number of aspects of integrated units but could not probe extensively into any one area. Public Safety Canada may wish to consider further research into some targeted areas. Some of the potential areas for additional research are summarized below.

- Funding and sharing the costs of integrated units. There may be reluctance to fund initiatives that agencies perceive as operating outside of their jurisdiction and benefiting primarily other jurisdictions. But organized crime, while it may be concentrated in one area, has a wide-ranging impact. How best to fund such initiatives and how partners can share in the funding and contributions is a potential area for research, especially when working across jurisdictions.

- How to measure success of integrated units. What impact do the integrated units have on their priority target crimes, and how do these initiatives benefit all partners? This could further contribute to justification of integrated units and partner contribution in these units. For example, one unit has implemented formal performance measures for each of their objectives.

- The process used by units for targeting organized crime, and for decisions on allocating resources.

- The process of establishing and using formal agreements such as an MOU. What managers believe is important to include in the MOU and how to make greatest use of the MOU for managing the unit.

- Information and data sharing. We could only touch on this area briefly, but with the variety of systems in operation, it would be worthwhile to explore this area in greater depth, looking at the systems in place, how they differ, and the various processes units use for entering and managing data and information.

- Governance and management structures of integrated units and how partners and unit managers believe these contribute to the strength of the unit. This could include considering the policies and procedures used by units and how they deal with the varying policies of partners.

- Impediments to a successful integrated team and how these can be overcome.

References

Criminal Code, R.S.C. 1985, c. C-46, s. 318(1), online: Department of Justice Canada, http://laws.justice.gc.ca.

Criminal Intelligence Service of Canada. (2008). *2008 Report on Organized Crime.* Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://www.cisc.gc.ca/annual_reports/annual_report_2008/frontpage_2008_e.html

Criminal Intelligence Service of Canada. (2009). *2009 Report on Organized Crime.* Retrieved February 6, 2010, from http://www.cisc.gc.ca/annual_reports/annual_report_2009/document/report_oc_2009_e.pdf

Public Policy Forum. (2007). *Overview of the National Agenda to Combat Organized Crime: 2000-2006.* Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://www.ppforum.ca/common/assets/publications/en/overview_combat_organized_crime.pdf

Public Safety Canada. (2006). *Working together to combat organized crime.* Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/prg/le/oc/_fl/ogcrime06_e.pdf

Public Safety Canada. (2008a). National Coordinating Committee on Organized Crime. Retrieved February 27, 2009, from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/prg/le/oc/ccoc-eng.aspx

Public Safety Canada. (2008b, October). National Research Agenda on Organized Crime.

Appendix A: Inventory template

Organized Crime Integrated Units Inventory and Analysis

Public Safety Canada is undertaking several research projects to advance the National Research Agenda on Organized Crime. One such project, entitled "*Organized Crime Integrated Units Inventory and Analysis*", has been awarded to the consulting firm PRA Inc. The project has two components, one being to create an inventory of integrated units across Canada. An integrated unit is considered to be any organized enforcement or prosecutorial body at any level of jurisdiction (municipal, provincial, federal) that works to combat organized crime (e.g., taskforces, working groups, integrated forces, units, teams).

The below information was compiled on your integrated unit based on information obtained through interviewing team members and reviewing any documentation provided on the unit. This information will be used to develop the inventory database. After reviewing the information, please feel free to make any required changes or contact PRA to clarify or add to the information in the template. Please inform PRA of any necessary changes **within the next two weeks**. If no changes are requested by then, the information will be entered into the inventory database.

Note that measures are in place to handle any sensitive information you may provide PRA. All PRA researchers working on this project have federal security clearance at the "secret" level. PRA has a privacy policy that adheres to PIPEDA. PRA's Winnipeg office holds approved Document Safeguarding at the level of PROTECTED B, and is located in a highly secure building with 24-7 security.

If you have any questions about the information in this template, please contact Brenda Chorney of PRA at 1-888-877-6744 or chorney@pra.ca. If you have any questions about the research study, please contact Cameron McIntosh, Organized Crime Division, Public Safety Canada, 613-949-4135 or cameron.mcintosh@ps-sp.gc.ca.

Organized crime integrated units – << Unit Name >>	
Overview	**Description**
Unit/Team name	
Known acronym/abbreviations	
Website(s)	
Date formed	
Time frame	
Reasons for establishing: Mandate/goals/objectives	
Area served (geographical scope)	
Target crime(s)/criminal group(s)	

Organized crime integrated units – << Unit Name >>		
Jurisdictional structure	**Name**	**Location and role in unit**
Lead agency (if applicable)		
Primary partners		
Secondary partners		
Operating structures	**Name/type/parties involved**	**Terms/description**
Agreements (e.g., MOUs, formal, informal, contracts)		
Operating procedures		
Number of staff (officers and other staff)		
Reports/reviews/evaluations	**Description and availability**	
Available reports on the unit		

Thank you for your input.

.

Appendix B: Interview guide

Organized Crime Integrated Units Inventory and Analysis
Interview guide for analysis of integrated units

Public Safety Canada is undertaking several research projects to advance the National Research Agenda on Organized Crime. One project, entitled "*Organized Crime Integrated Units Inventory and Analysis*", has been awarded to the consulting firm PRA Inc. The project has two components. One is to create an inventory of integrated units across Canada. The inventory will document a range of information for each integrated team, such as history and mandate; size and composition. For the purposes of this study, an integrated unit would be considered any organized enforcement or prosecutorial body at any level of jurisdiction (municipal, provincial, federal) that works to combat organized crime (e.g., task forces, working groups, integrated forces, unit, teams).

The study will also involve a more detailed look at up to 25 of the integrated units to gain a greater understanding of the operational aspects, challenges, and keys to success for these units, as well as member satisfaction with team processes and outcomes. PRA will obtain information for both aspects of the study through interviews with key stakeholders across Canada and review of relevant documents/literature.

You are being asked to participate in this interview to provide PRA with information on the integrated unit with which you are involved. This information will be used as a component of the detailed analysis.

Note that measures are in place to handle any sensitive information you may provide PRA. All PRA researchers working on this project have federal security clearance at the "secret" level. PRA has a privacy policy that adheres to the regulations set out in Part 1 of the Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act (PIPEDA). PRA's Winnipeg office holds a valid Designated Organization Screening (DOS), with approved Document Safeguarding at the level of PROTECTED B, issued by the Canadian and International Industrial Security Directorate of Public Works and Government Services Canada, and is located in a highly secure building with 24-7 security.

This interview should take 30-45 minutes and, with your permission, will be tape-recorded to ensure the accuracy of the information reported. The recording will not be heard by anyone outside of PRA and will be erased at the end of the project.

Please note: PRA may have acquired some of the below information through an interview or correspondence with either a representative of your agency or your partner agency. The interviewer will only ask the questions where the information was not previously received.

1. Could you briefly describe your own involvement with this unit, including how long you personally have been involved with the unit?

2. Please briefly describe how the unit operates on a day-to-day basis (e.g., reporting structures, acquisition and distribution of equipment, assignment of duties and work distribution, ongoing team communication, training)?
   a. Have any protocols been established to assist in the operation and/or management of this integrated unit (e.g. communication protocols, data/information-sharing protocols, staffing protocols)?

3. Is there any particular communication process in place for team members and partner agencies?
   a. How do partner agencies discuss the functioning of the unit (e.g. teleconferencing, face-to-face, videoconferencing)? How often do they meet?

4. Were any legislative, policy, or procedural changes required by any of the partner jurisdictions in order to establish this integrated unit?

5. What sort of planning process do you undertake to help decide how to allocate resources for this integrated unit? Do you conduct a threat assessment as a component of your planning? Who participates in this planning?

6. Please describe the personnel contributed by each partner agency for this integrated unit (number of officers and other staff contributed by each, whether they are assigned full-time, positions/rank of personnel).

7. What other resources does each partner agency contribute to the integrated unit (equipment, vehicles, office space, operational funds, etc.)?

8. Please describe how this integrated unit manages each of the below:
   a. Are pay scales and benefits, such as leave, harmonized for members of the integrated unit?
   b. Are issues such as leave and overtime authorized by the integrated unit or by the unit members' home agency?
   c. What is the rate of turnover for members of the unit, and approximately how long does it take to replace a member of the unit? How are new members assigned to the team by each partner agency?

9. How do members manage their accountabilities to the team and to their own organization? Do team members have dual reporting requirements? How do team members report back to their home agency?

10. Please describe the process for collecting, storing, and analyzing data/information related to this initiative.
    a. How is data/information shared between partner agencies?
    b. Is there a shared database that all partner agencies can access?

11. What have been the main operational challenges experienced by this integrated unit as a whole (both in establishing and maintaining the unit)? What steps were taken to overcome or mitigate these challenges? Are there any issues specific to your own organization?

12. What are some of the main strengths of this integrated unit?

13. What are some of the main successes of this integrated unit?

14. What would you identify as the best practices of this integrated unit contributing to the above successes?
    a. Are there any particular lessons learned from this integrated unit that you believe would assist you in any future initiatives involving integrated units?

15. Is there any other information you could share with us about this integrated unit?

Thank you for your input.
We will provide you with a copy of your interview notes for your records and to give you an opportunity to review the information.

Appendix C: Interview lists

Interviews with integrated units		
Unit	**Prov.**	**Name and agency**
Aboriginal Combined Forces Special Enforcement Team	QC	Inspector Lino Maurizio, RCMP
Combined Forces Special Enforcement Team	BC	Superintendent D.W. (Doug) Kiloh, RCMP
CFSEU Gang Task Force	BC	Supt. Dan Malo
CFSEU – North	AB	Inspector Kevin Galvin, Edmonton Police Services
CFSEU - South	AB	Inspector Kevin Forsen, Calgary Police Services
Regional Combined Forces Special Enforcement Teams	AB	Inspector Bob Simmonds, RCMP
Regina Integrated Intelligence Unit	SK	Sergeant Murray Walton, Regina Police Services
Saskatoon Integrated Drug Unit	SK	Staff Sergeant John Heibert, Saskatoon Police Services
Regina Integrated Commercial Crime Unit Saskatoon Integrated Commercial Crime Unit	SK	Inspector Stewart Kingdon, RCMP
Integrated Gang Intelligence Unit	MB	Sgt. Pat Olson
Manitoba Integrated Organized Crime Task Force	MB	S/Sgt. Paul Saganski
Asian Organized Crime Task Force	ON	Inspector Randy Frank, Toronto Police Service
Biker Enforcement Unit, Organized Crime Enforcement Bureau	ON	Superintendent Dan Redmond and Inspector Stu McDonald, Ontario Provincial Police
Illegal Gambling Unit – Organized Crime Enforcement Bureau	ON	Superintendent Dan Redmond and Inspector Stu McDonald, Ontario Provincial Police
Integrated Guns and Gangs Task Force	ON	Superintendent Gregory Getty, Toronto Police Services
Provincial Auto Theft Team	ON	Superintendent Dan Redmond and Inspector Stu McDonald, Ontario Provincial Police
Bathurst Edmundston Regional Drug Unit	NB	Staff Sergeant Gary Legresley, RCMP
Criminal Intelligence Service New Brunswick	NB	Allen Bodechon, Manager, CISNB
Combined Forces Intelligence Unit	NS	Inspector Greg Laturnus, RCMP
L Division Drug Section JFO Charlottetown City Police	PEI	Sergeant Randy Gallant, RCMP
Corner Brook RCMP/RNC Joint Forces Drug Section	NL	Inspector Mark McGowan, RCMP
Integrated Border Enforcement Team	YT	Acting Staff Sergeant Doug Harris
Partner agency for ON BEU, ICE, PAFU	ON	Inspector Todd Zimmerman, Sudbury Police Services
Criminal Intelligence Service Canada	CA	Superintendent Michel Aubin, Director General, CISC

Interviews with other stakeholders	
Name	**Position and organization**
Barry MacKillop	Director General, Law Enforcement and Border Strategies Public Safety Canada
Chief Superintendent Todd Shean Superintendent Bill Malone	Director General Drugs and Organized Crime, RCMP Headquarters Director, Organized Crime Branch, RCMP Headquarters
Chief Supt. Norm Mazerolle	CROPS Officer, “O” Division (Ontario)
Deputy Chief Tony Warr	Deputy Chief of Police Specialized Operations Command, Toronto Police Services
Deputy Commissioner Vince Hawkes	Deputy Commissioner, Ontario Provincial Police
Don Slough	Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Criminal Justice Division, Department of Justice
Drew Goddard	Manitoba Department of Justice
Glen Lewis	Manitoba Department of Justice
Inspector Doug Ellerker	Director of Drug Enforcement, RCMP Headquarters
Kevin Begg	Assistant Deputy Minister and Director of Police Services, Policing and Community Safety Branch, British Columbia Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Mark Tatchell	Executive Director, Police Services Division, British Columbia Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Michael Bernstein	Chief Counsel, Crown Law Office, Ontario Attorney General
Michael Thompson	Senior Program Manager, Terrorism & Critical Infrastructure, British Columbia Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General
Murray Sawatsky	Executive Director, Policing Services Division, Saskatchewan Police Commission
Pierre Sangollo	Director, Preventive Security and Intelligence, Correctional Service Canada
Sébastien Aubertin-Giguère	Director of Intelligence Development and Field Support, Enforcement Branch, Canada Border Services Agency
Superintendent Andre Rivard	Director of Marine & Ports, RCMP Headquarters
Superintendent E.D.(Ted) Miles	Chief Executive Officer, Alberta Law Enforcement Response Teams Ltd.
Superintendent Jim Templeton	OIC Federal Policy, Division “R”, RCMP
Superintendent Warren Coons	Director of IBETs, RCMP