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**Necessity**
New laws which overlap older ones, without studying if the previous laws could assess the same threat or without any financial resource. What really are the effects if we do not act?

**Effectiveness**
The adapted measures must face the identified risks and threats, with a previous definition of objectives and desired effects.

**Efficiency.**
A lot of research projects have been financed by states and supranational organizations but we do not have evidence that these programs are efficiency.

**Non-desired effects.**
Sometimes, the solution to a threat has other impacts or effects (secondary or collateral effects) that could be costly, harmful, illegal or negative.

**Other needs.** The utility of the great number of research and papers on terrorism. Evaluating CT is a way to discover what is being studied and the fields that need a greater effort, building bridges between the world of ideas and knowledge and the world of decision-making.
We treat the phenomenon in isolation

Terrorist acts are random events, there is not a continuous set of data

The problematic to adopt a cost-benefit approach

Deterrence is difficult to measure

Difficult to measure direct and individual effects of the great part of counter-terrorism measures

The need to have the evaluation of each pack of measures in an individual way as in general

Political cycles

Impossible to develop randomized controlled experiments

Gaps between government and knowledge institutions

Gaps between strategic, tactic and operational visions

Secret or limits to access to information and data

Lack of transparency in policymaking

A wrong culture of error

The need to balance rigorous analysis with time restrictions

What moves CT policies?

WE NEED A FRAMEWORK TO DO IT!!
HOLISTIC PROCESS OF CT DECISION-MAKING

STAKEHOLDERS

SOURCES
- Government
- Think tanks
- Academic
- Intelligence community
- Others: Citizens, NGOs, private sector, media, interest groups

ANALYST TEAMS
- Collecting
- "Connect the dots"
  - Scanning
  - Monitoring
  - Analysis
  - Dissemination

DECISION MAKER
- "Take decisions"
  - Strategic
  - Operational
  - Tactical

STATEGIES, PLANS & ACTIONS
- "Designing decisions"
  - Strategic
  - Operational
  - Tactical

EVALUATION PROCESS

FEEDBACK

PAST
PRESENT
FUTURE


*KNOWLEDGE
Intelligence + Experience + Over Time
Make sure that CT policies are facing the whole of terrorist phenomena.

Establish criteria, methodologies and indicators to evaluate CT impacts.

Compare the impacts of terrorist actions with the impact of CT policies.

Carry out a critical analysis of each CT measure, or at least, packs of them.

Confirm that the policies do not generate opposite effects to our goals or collide with our values.

Redefine CT policies, eliminating or changing former policies, and introducing a foresight vision before implementing new ones. Avoid overreaction and bad decisions of the past.
We understand CT as the policies, operations and programmes that governments implement to combat terrorism (values).
DIFFERENT COUNTER-TERRORISM MEASURES

- PHYSICAL SECURITY
- SOCIAL
- TECHNO
- MILITARY
- INTELLIGENCE
- LEAs
- LEGAL / JUDICIAL
- POLITIC
### CT DECISION-MAKING EVALUATION

**Firstly**

- Who
- What
- Why
- Where
- When
- How
- For what

**Secondly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Desired outcomes</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Effects / Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Politic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TERRORISM IMPACTS IN SOCIETY THAT SUFFERS IT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHYSICAL / MATERIAL</th>
<th>POLITIC / LEGAL</th>
<th>SOCIAL /PSYCHOLOGY</th>
<th>ECONOMIC</th>
<th>SECURITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>Scheduling changes</td>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>Value of damages</td>
<td>More controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths</td>
<td>Political decisions (i.e. participation in international missions)</td>
<td>Hate crime</td>
<td>Insurances</td>
<td>More restrictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries</td>
<td>Policies for victims</td>
<td>Xenophobia</td>
<td>Companies decision on internationalization or leaving countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnappings</td>
<td>Political polarization</td>
<td>Islamophobia</td>
<td>Commercial routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damages (Buildings, infrastructures...)</td>
<td>Debates about security and liberties</td>
<td>Social polarization</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debate about secret and transparency</td>
<td>Social fear</td>
<td>Financial instability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limits to rights and liberties</td>
<td>Mass media communication impact</td>
<td>Bourse Instability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over reaction of Western states</td>
<td>Change in way of life</td>
<td>Consume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Kidnappings for ransom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of security systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CT POLICIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CT IMPACTS

**PHYSICAL / MATERIAL**
- Number of attacks
- Leaders killed
- Arrested
- Condemned

**POLITIC / LEGAL**
- Laws needed
- Obsolete laws
- Overlapping measures
- Staff required
- Technological implementations / gaps
- Repealed laws
- Jurisprudential changes
- New alliances

**SOCIAL / PSYCHOLOGY**
- Impact on communities
- Changes on behaviour
- **RADICALIZATION**
  - Affected values
  - Institutional confidence of citizens
  - Perception on security
  - Over exposure in the media
  - XENOPHOBIA, ISLAMOPHOBIA, HATE CRIMES...

**ECONOMIC**
- Direct costs
- Indirect costs
- Cost of inaction
- Sectors affected (tourism, services, etc.)

**SECURITY**
- Controls
- Restrictions
- Staff required
- Researches needed

**INCREASED CONFLICTS**

**NON DESIRED EFFECTS**
• Torture (Abu Ghraib). Advanced interrogation techniques
• Condemns without judgement. Prisons like Guantanamo
• Hidden prisons all over the world
• Illegal flights for arrested people
• Negotiation without guarantees of leaving weapons and fight
• Balance between leaders killing and taking them to prison after being judged
• Collateral civil victims (drones, bombs...)
• International military operations without a stabilization plan
• Do not consider lessons learned
• Barriers between LEAs and intelligence services
• War Against Terrorism, legitimization of these groups, militarization of holistic problems
• Propaganda of terrorist actions. Mass media and Daesh.
• Imperialisms
• “Westernism” or “Occidentalism”
• Values that are not demonstrated (democracy, justice, empire of the law...)
• Collective punishment
• Bad use of language, for example with minorities, communities
• Criminalize communities
• No push conspirator theories
• Attack human rights
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