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Introduction

• Recognise the established need to more scientifically measure the effectiveness of counter-terrorism strategies

• CEPS and START partnership

• Describe the CEPS CTiL – Counter Terrorism Intelligent Library
Existing Research

• An absence of high quality, scientific evaluation of counter-terrorism strategies (see Lum, Kennedy & Sherley (2006, updated in 2009))

• The evidence base for policy making against terrorism is very weak

• There is an urgent need to commission research and evaluation on counter-terrorism measures to determine whether these strategies work

• A need to evaluate whether interventions are connected to measureable and desired outcome
What we do know

• The (scarce) results are inconsistent:
  – reduction with displacement (e.g., metal detectors in airports)
  – no evidence of reduction (e.g., fortifying embassies)
  – may even *increase* the likelihood of terrorism (e.g., retaliatory attacks)
Background to the Project

- In June 2009, the Australian Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet commissioned CEPS to undertake research examining the effectiveness of counter-terrorist strategies in Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand.

- A collaborative research project undertaken with START, with funding support from the US Department of Homeland Security.
Research Team

A international research collaboration

• CEPS
  – Professor Lorraine Mazerolle (Chief Investigator)
  – Dr Rebecca Denning (Chief Investigator)
  – Dr Gentry White
  – Federal Agent Paul Jones

• START
  – Professor Gary LaFree (Chief Investigator)
  – Assistant Professor Sue-Ming Yang
  – Brandon Behlendorf
  – Professor Daniel Mabrey
Terrorism Trends in SE Asia

- Indonesia increases in mid 1990s and 2001
- Philippines very erratic and generally increasing up until 1990
- Dramatic increase in the number of events in Thailand over the 2004-2007 period
Explaining Terrorism in SE Asia

- Continual rise of radical Islam in SE Asia

- Separatist claims for autonomous governance

- Important to understand the
  - Australia – US collaboration in Global War on Terror
  - Australia’s proximity to SE Asia
Counter-Terrorism Strategies

• In SE Asia, counter-terrorism responses stem from:
  – national governments
  – the regional body ASEAN
  – from the influence of international players such as the US, UN and Australia

• National responses of ASEAN states to counter terrorism is patchy
Data Sources and Integration

Merged Dataset
Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand

CTiL
The Counter-Terrorism Intelligent Library (CTiL)

- CTiL is the computer-based system that will automatically identify and store information on counter-terrorism strategies.

- The CTiL database will be linked with the GTD and ISVG data to allow analyses of the impact of counter-terrorism strategies on terrorist incidents, tactics and group activities.
CTiL Inclusion Criteria

- CTiL is looking to piece together three sides of a triangle

1. Any intentional change by nation states and/or their representatives to: governance structures, government policy, legislation or operational activity
2. Directed towards or impacting on
3. Terrorism (as defined by the START - Global Terrorism Database (GTD))
4. In Indonesia, the Philippines or Thailand
CTiL Architecture

• Leximancer
  – Leximancer takes a substantial body of text and rapidly consolidates it into meaningful ‘Themes', ‘Concepts' and their associated relationships

• Rule database
  – Complex codebook

• Web crawler
  – Grey literature: government reports, think-tanks, etc

• Systematic Search
  – Academic literature
Inclusion criteria

The CTiL Codebook is based on the Australian The National Counter-Terrorism Plan (2005) 2nd Edition, Australia’s highest level strategic CT policy document.

The Framework has four elements:

– Legal & Administrative
– Prevention & Preparedness
– Response
– Recovery

This framework has broad international application.
# Codebook - Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal &amp; Administrative</th>
<th>Prevention &amp; Preparedness</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Governance/Constitutional arrangements</td>
<td>Institutional capacity building/cooperation</td>
<td>Direct/Focused</td>
<td>Targeted programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnational Governance Arrangements</td>
<td>Specialised Units</td>
<td>Indirect/Unfocused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Legislation Domestic Coordination</td>
<td>Cooperation and Information/Intelligence</td>
<td>Operational Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protective Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education &amp; Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Emergent Data Co-variates**
Using Leximancer to “Tune” the Rules

Concept Map

Thematic Summary

Source Document Extracts
The CTiL Web Interface (1)

- CTiL identifies potential interventions
- Document, strategy and location filters
The CTiL Web Interface (2)

- Quality assurance: reviewer confirms the proposed intervention is “real”
The CTiL Web Interface (3)

- Auto-population of “parent” strategies further up the codebook hierarchy
The CTiL Web Interface (4)

• An ability to add emergent data – additional rich information on agency, resources, etc
Outcomes

- When linked with the GTD, the CTiL will be able to measure the effectiveness of:
  - different counter-terrorist strategies
    - Broad categories: Legal & Administrative; Prevention & Preparedness; Response; and Recovery
    - More specific strategies: e.g., legislative change, capacity building programs, physical security measures, arrest of key people
  - counter-terrorism strategies:
    - in different locations (CTiL data is geo-coded)
    - “delivered” by different government agencies, multiple agencies

- First phase of analysis is due at end 2010
- Expansion to transnational and organised crime, illicit drug importation